

THE TOBACCO INSTITUTE, INC.

September 17, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: Earle C. Clements

FROM: Wm. Kloepfer, Jr.

Attached is a draft position paper for the Tobacco Institute. It is corrected to conform with the handwritten suggestions by Dave Hardy shown on the second attached copy which bears his initials on each page. A third attachment is Dave's September 13 letter to me containing significant comments.

Having responded to the request of the chief executives to rework the earlier Tiderock draft with Mr. Shinn, I now submit this draft for your approval.

I do not at this time make any recommendation for use of this paper other than suggesting that if it meets with your approval, it be submitted to the chief executives for their approval.

Hopefully, approval may be granted with the understanding that the document would be made public by the Institute in various ways which will be subject to further recommendations and appropriate clearances, step by step. Perhaps the pertinent question to be answered at this time is, "Is this document suitable and supportable for exposure by the Institute to the first member of the general public?"

Let me comment on matters raised by Dave in his letter:

1. He suggests that it might be well to discuss with Professor Sterling the phase of this paper dealing with the morbidity study prior to any wide use of that material. I agree with this and would urge that such a discussion take place if you find that the paper is suitable from your standpoint.

2. Dave suggests a possible litigational difficulty posed by this paper and I believe that this possibility should be brought to the attention of general counsel and Tommy Austern in the process of obtaining company approval for the paper.
3. I have a different opinion from Dave's as to the impression left by the treatment herein of the "300,000 deaths" episode. To me, the paper does question whether any deaths have resulted from cigarette smoking. I believe, however, that it is essential to establish the proper wording of this, if it is not yet so, rather than to omit a description of this very large and wholly contrived area of anti-smoking propaganda.
4. Dave's final major comment has to do with the bibliography, and I heartily concur with it. As far as I am concerned, this will remain steadily fluid. While the present references support the statements we make, new literature may support them even more firmly and therefore may deserve to be cited as time goes on. I would not recommend any exploitation of this paper without rechecking the bibliography each time we propose to make a new use of it.

cc: David Hardy