

Big tobacco says the payoffs stopped years ago. So why are Hollywood's biggest names still shilling for the world's deadliest industry?

Schindler's List. The Killing Fields.

Hollywood is famed for commemorating mass murders after the fact. Yet some of Hollywood's biggest names aid and abet the darkest killing machine of our own time: a multibillion dollar industry that sends *three million* people to their deaths each year.

Yes, tobacco is a legal product. But advertising tobacco brands on TV has been illegal since 1970. Instead, Big Tobacco paid to place their cigarette brands in Hollywood movies.

In 1989, this scandal was exposed and payola was "voluntarily" banned.

Yet ten years later, Hollywood is promoting smoking and tobacco brands more intensely than *before* the ban. And America's charismatic actors are now even more directly involved.

Of America's 25 top-grossing movies each year, 9 in 10 dramatize use of tobacco. More than 1 in 4 depict a particular brand. 80% of the time, the featured brands are the ones most heavily advertised in other media.

Actors now display or smoke featured brands *ten times more* than before the 1989 payola ban — celebrity endorsements the size of billboards.

And it works. Nonsmoking teens whose favorite stars smoke frequently on screen are *16 times* more likely to develop positive attitudes toward smoking.



Up for an Oscar®?

America's most heavily advertised cigarette was featured in at least 28 top-grossing films in the 1990s. Smoking is just as common in youth-rated movies as in films rated for mature audiences.

This isn't about censorship — or "free expression." In Hollywood, nothing is free. Commercial tie-ins and product placements are routine.

Big Tobacco's files are full of covert strategies, like arranging to pay Sylvester Stallone \$500,000 to use its products in five films (1983), and \$350,000 to place Larks in James Bond's "License to Kill" (1988).

In view of this slimy history, can anyone in the industry — studio heads, agents, directors, writers, actors — not realize that smoking looks like selling

out? Might there be a moral issue here that glib claims of "free expression" do not finesse? Or are tobacco fatalities not dramatic enough, the victims not noble enough? Is this evil too...banal?

This year 480,000 Americans, smokers and nonsmokers alike, will die from smoking-related causes. Over *one billion* more smokers live in nations where tobacco's hazards go largely unpublicized — an overseas market that now yields *half* of Hollywood's income.

So we personally challenge the U.S. film industry to take these four steps:

1] ROLL AN ON-SCREEN CREDIT certifying that nobody on the production accepted *anything* of value from any tobacco company, its agents or fronts.

2] RUN STRONG ANTI-TOBACCO ADS IN FRONT OF SMOKING MOVIES. Put them on tapes and DVDs, too. Strong spots are proven to immunize audiences.

3] QUIT IDENTIFYING TOBACCO BRANDS — in the background *or* in action. Brand names are unnecessary.

4] RATE ANY SMOKING MOVIE "R." This may identify smoking with maturity, but should give producers pause.

This is just the first of these ads. Next, we start identifying who's responsible.



**SMOKE
FREE
MOVIES**

For what's next, visit SmokeFreeMovies.ucsf.edu

Smoke Free Movies aims to sharply reduce the film industry's usefulness to Big Tobacco's domestic and global marketing — a leading cause of disability and premature death. This initiative by Stanton Glantz, PhD (coauthor of *The Cigarette Papers* and *Tobacco War*), of the UCSF School of Medicine is supported by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund. To learn how you can help, visit our website or write to us: Smoke Free Movies, UCSF School of Medicine, Box 0130, San Francisco, CA 94143-0130.