[redacted]ndards as Modified November 5, 1954

Cigarette advertisements——

(1) Should not represent directly or by implication that cigarette smoking in general or the smoking of any brand of cigarette is beneficial to health in any respect,

(2) Should not represent directly or by implication that cigarette smoking in general or the smoking of any brand of cigarette is (a) not harmful or (b) non-irritating, N.B. There was a long discussion about this. [illegible] pointed out that "by implication" meant practically [illegible] thing the interpreter wanted it to mean and that the expression "non-irritating" covered dozens of points and in effect kept the copywriter from saying anything. The Commission men explained that the word meant long term effect and not immediate effect. Various kinds of words were suggested which seem to fall within the suggested prohibition and yet were words in common use and not really misleading at all, such as subjective words like smooth, etc. Mr. Grandey explained that the illustrative words smooth and soothing in the footnote to original Standard 2 should be dropped because the words were in litigation.

(3) Should not represent directly or by implication, including illustrations, that by virtue of its ingredients, method of manufacture, length, added filter, or for any other

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
This document is being provided in accordance with a Court Order for its primary inspection in The State of Minnesota, et al. v Philip Morris, Inc. et al. Its use is strictly limited by Court Orders

LG 2022256

UG - 26731

[redacted] of any brand of cigarettes contains [redacted], tar, resin or other components unless [redacted] is supported by competent scientific proof which is currently applicable at the time of dissemination of the claim, and which proves the existence of the claimed differences to a significant degree, and the claim is limited to the particular component or components or substances,

N.B. There was a good deal of discussion as to the word 'significant'. It was asserted by some of the companies that whatever the degree was, if it existed, they [redacted] entitled to say so.

(4) Should not in any way that would conflict with the [redacted] standards of Standards 1, 2, 3 and 5 refer to (a) the throat, larynx, lungs, nose or any other part of the body, (b) digestion (c) energy (d) nerves or (e) doctors,

(5) Should not use any word, term, illustration, or combination thereof, in such a way as to represent or imply general medical approval,

(6) (This would be dropped),

(7) [redacted] no comparative claim regarding the volume of [redacted] competitive brands or the purchase of particular types, qualities or grades of tobacco unless such claim is based on reliable current information.

(8) Should contain only genuine testimonials which represent the current opinion of the author who currently smokes the brand named.

N.B. It is the Commission's position that in

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
This document is being provided in accordance with a Court Order for its contents. Inspection by The Board of Advisors, et al. v. Philip Morris, Inc. et al. Its use is strictly limited by Court Orders

LG 2022257

LG - 26732

[redacted] any testimonial the advertiser makes all of [redacted] and implied representations contained therein [redacted] the standards herein listed apply thereto.

(9) Should not contain claims amounting to false or misleading disparagement of other cigarette manufacturers or their products.

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
This document is being provided in accordance with a Court Order for its primary inspection in the Board of Administration, et al. v. Philip Morris, Inc. et al. Its use is strictly limited by Court Orders

LG 2022258

LIG- 26733

[redacted]STED STANDARDS FOR CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

Cigarett[redacted]

(1) Should not represent directly or by implication that cigarette smoking in general or the smoking of any brand of cigarette is beneficial to health in any respect,

(2) Should not represent directly or by implication that cigarette smoking in general or the smoking of any brand of cigarette is (a) not harmful or (b) non-irritating.1/

(3) Should not represent directly or by implication, including illustration that by virtue of its ingredients, method of manufacture, length, added filter, or for any other reason the smoke of any brand of cigarette contains less nicotine, tar, resins or other deleterious substances unless such representation is supported by impartial scientific test data, whi are current at the time of dissemination of the claims and which conclusively prove the existence of the claimed differences to a significant degree, and the claim is limited to the particular delete[redacted] or substances,

(4) Should not refer to (a) the throat, larynx, lungs, nose, [redacted] part of the body (b) digestion (c) energy (d) nerves or (e) doctors,

(5) Should not use any word, term, illustration, or combination thereof, in such a way as to represent or imply medical approval.

(6) Should generally be limited to the subjects of quality, taste, flavor, enjoyment and other similar matters of opinion,

(7) Should make no comparative claim regarding the volume of sales of competitive brands or the purchase of particular types, qualities or grade of tobacco unless such claim is based on verified current information,

(8) Should contain only genuine testimonials which represent the current opinion of the author who currently smokes the brand named.
NOTE: By publishing any testimonial the advertiser makes all of the dire[redacted] representations contained therein and all of the sta[redacted] listed apply thereto.

(9) Sho[redacted] claims amounting to false disparagement of other cigarette manufacturers or their products.

1/ The use of words which do not have a clear and well understood meaning to the public in connection with cigarette smoking, such as "smooth" and "soothing" are deemed to imply lack of harmful or irritating effects.

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
This document is being provided in accordance with a Court Order for its release in connection with the State of Minnesota, et al. v. Philip Morris, Inc. et al. Its use is strictly limited by Court Orders

LG 2022259

LG-26734

[redacted] at Federal Trade Commission

November 5, 1954

Alfred S. Forsyth - United States Tobacco Co.

F. J. Daniels - P. Lorillard

Milton M. Sherman - Riggis Tobacco Corp.

Sidney Bunker - Peter Jackson (Overseas/Ltd.

Alfred Lewis - Columbia Tobacco Co., Inc.

James E. Wood - Stephano Brothers

W. T. Reed, Jr. - Larus & Bro. Co.

Edward F. Ragland - Associated Tobacco Manufacturers

E. M. Lewis - Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.

Addison Yeaman - " " " "

John V. Hewitt, Atty - Philip Morris

Horace G. Hitchcock, Atty - The American Tobacco Co.

F. H. Horan - Liggett & Myers

Fred Irish
[redacted] } Federal Trade Commission
Charles E. Grandey

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL

LG 2022260

LG - 26735