

tobacco free sports


play it clean

World No Tobacco Day



31 May



 **For more information or to order
copies of this brochure, contact:**

Tobacco Free Initiative (TFI)

World Health Organization

Avenue Appia 20

1211 Geneva 27 – Switzerland

telephone 41 22 791 2108

fax 41 22 791 4832

tfi@who.int

<http://tobacco.who.int>

TFI would like to thank ASH UK for their valuable contribution to this document.

Product of WHO/NMH Communications.
Creating space for public health.

© World Health Organization, 2002

This document is not a formal publication of the World Health Organization (WHO) and all rights are reserved by the Organization. The document may, however, be freely reviewed, abstracted, reproduced and translated, in part or in whole, but not for sale or for use in conjunction with commercial purposes. The views expressed in this document are solely the responsibility of the authors.

World No Tobacco Day is celebrated around the world every year on May 31. The Member States of the World Health Organization created World No Tobacco Day in 1987 to draw global attention to the tobacco epidemic and the preventable death and disease it causes. This yearly celebration informs the public on the dangers of using tobacco, the business practices of tobacco companies, what WHO is doing to fight the tobacco epidemic, and what people around the world can do to claim their right to health and healthy living and to protect future generations.

WORLD NO TOBACCO DAY



Global deception

What must you do to market a product that kills half of its regular users? What enticements must you resort to in order to addict those regular users early, sometimes as early as nine years old? How do you package death as life, disease as health and deadly addiction as the taste of freedom and a celebration of life?

Look no further than your nearest playground or the shirt on your favorite athlete's back or the shoe, bag, or jacket. Look no further than tobacco companies' own documents that tell you how they promote death in the playground to unsuspecting children. The tobacco companies say they don't want to market cigarettes to young people, and even lecture parents and teachers to become more involved in tackling youth smoking. But whose examples will teenagers follow – teachers' or race car drivers' parents' or cricket superstars'?

The World Health Organization (WHO) says tobacco use is a communicated disease – communicated through advertising and sponsorship. Perhaps the most pernicious form of that marketing pitch is to be found in stadia and sports arenas worldwide.

Tobacco companies pump hundreds of millions of dollars every year into sponsoring sports events worldwide. In the United States alone, according to the Federal Trade Commission, the major domestic cigarette companies reported spending US\$ 113.6 million on sports and sporting events in 1999. In countries where direct tobacco advertising is banned by law, sponsorship of sports amounts to a cynical manipulation of national laws. Despite a federal ban on tobacco advertising on television, it is estimated that

tobacco companies achieve the equivalent of more than US\$ 150 million in television advertising every year in the U.S. through their sponsorship of motor sports events. Formula One motor racing has been described as

"... the ideal sport for sponsorship. It's got glamour and worldwide television coverage. It's a 10-month activity involving 16 races in 14 countries with drivers from 16 nationalities. After football it's the number one multinational sport. It's got total global exposure, total global hospitality, total media coverage and 600 million people watching it on TV every fortnight...It's macho, it's excitement, it's color, it's international, it's glamour...They're there to get visibility. They're there to sell cigarettes"¹

Tobacco companies claim they are sponsoring sports out of a sense of philanthropic duty. Their internal documents, however, tell another story.

An internal R.J. Reynolds memo from 1989 has this to say:

"We're in the cigarette business. We're not in the sports business. We use sports as an avenue for advertising our products. We can go into an area when we're marketing an event, measure sales during an event and measure sales after the event, and see an increase in sales."

That is no idle boast. When an Indian associate of the British American Tobacco (BAT) group sponsored the Indian World Cup Cricket in 1996, a survey showed that smoking among Indian teenagers increased five-fold. There was also marked increase in false perceptions about athletic excellence and smoking. Tobacco companies think that if they can place their logos, their branding, on enough sportsmen and women, in enough stadia, then people will be fooled into thinking that smoking can't really be all that bad. If it is associated closely enough with sport, people will think it must stand for all the same things as sport stands for – health, excitement, fitness.

The deception is for the public. The profits are for the companies. And the death and disease burden is for countries to cope with. Tobacco companies know exactly how many smokers they can get for every dollar spent on advertising in the sports arena. *“We're not handing out money for nothing. We have gone into this very thoroughly and the entire...publicity is built around motor racing seen as a fast, exciting and trendy sport for the young and, if you like, the young at heart. That's who we are aiming at in the local market and early indications are that we are on target,”* said Gordon Watson, BAT official quoted in the South China Morning Post in 1984.

The company is on target, but so are the death rates. Some twenty years after that early addiction set in, new studies show that one-third of Chinese men currently under 29 years of age will die prematurely due to a tobacco-related disease. Of the 8.4 million tobacco deaths that will occur by 2020, seven out of ten will occur in the developing countries.



Global appeal

Sport is a celebration of life. From the impromptu game in the park to school teams and local leagues to national championships, world cups and the Olympics – sports inspire healthy living, healthy competition and fun.

Tobacco products, on the other hand, do not celebrate life – they cause disease and death. Tobacco kills more than four million people every year, and is estimated to kill 8.4 million people every year by 2020.

For the professional athlete, tobacco use lowers performance level and can end a career. Even for people who play sport at a less intense level – simply playing frisbee with their children, taking part

in weekend football with friends or doing a charity fun-run – smoking can affect their ability to perform. In one study, of 4,100 regular joggers who took part in a yearly 16km race, smokers were consistently slower than non-smokers. It was estimated that for every cigarette smoked per day, the time to complete the run was increased by 40 seconds. Smoking reduces lung capacity, increases recovery time and destroys the benefits of exercise and sport.

For the spectator at sports events, tobacco use and exposure to second-hand smoke contributes to the development of disease and reduces their enjoyment of the game. For sports teams and facilities, tobacco advertising and sponsorship run counter to the ideals of health and fair play embodied in sports. For the companies who co-sponsor sports events along with tobacco companies, the reputation of the hazard merchants becomes indelibly associated with their products. In short, tobacco and sports do not mix.

Many athletes, sports fans and spectators are young people. Recent data suggest that one-third of young smokers start before the age of ten, and the vast majority of adult smokers started before the age of 18. Youth consumption of tobacco is up in many parts of the world. Most people who start so young become addicted to nicotine very early in life.

Tobacco companies claim that they do not target youth, but in practice they ensure that sponsorship and advertising flourish at events attended by and attractive to youth. Team jerseys and caps, tote bags and T-shirts, fields and stadia, cars and sports equipment bearing tobacco brand logos create a positive association between tobacco and the strength, speed, grace, success, fun and excitement of sports.

In 2000, a BBC investigation in the Gambia, found that BAT sponsored beach volleyball during the school holidays, and handed out free cigarettes and branded merchandise for its Benson and Hedges brand – the promotion was clearly designed to promote a youthful exciting beach sports culture around its product. In Colombia, Marlboro – the world's highest selling cigarette – sponsors kart racing, a sport where almost all of the participants are children and teenagers.



The tobacco industry spends hundreds of millions of dollars a year sponsoring sports around the world, mainly on high-profile, exciting sports which receive a lot of television coverage. In their internal documents, they are remarkably frank about the real reasons why they do this. The reasons why tobacco companies sponsor sporting events include trying to get around advertising restrictions; wanting to associate their cigarettes with healthy, active pursuits; and trying to create an image of respectability for companies rocked by accusations of smuggling and racketeering.²

Sports sponsorship has become increasingly important to the tobacco industry as other promotional routes have been cut off by governments around the world. In particular, sponsorship has substantially increased since tobacco advertising on television has been banned in most countries.

Tobacco multinationals sponsor sporting events around the world. Here are just a few examples:



Uganda

In Uganda, the leading BAT brand, "Sportsman" sponsors the main soccer competition, the Sportsman Kakungulu Cup.³ In addition, until 2000, BAT also sponsored the well-organized Ugandan Sports Press Association, including an annual award, the "Sportsman of the Year", given to a leading Ugandan sporting personality. Critics have alleged that this sponsorship of the press association has led to censorship of journalists opposed to links between tobacco and sport.⁴



Pakistan

The BAT brand John Player Gold Leaf has sponsored an ocean-going sailing boat, the "Voyage of Discovery" to undertake a tour around the Indian sub-continent. This boat, the same type as those used in long-distance sailing races, was marketed as being part of an exciting, sporting lifestyle. After being banned from Bangladesh and Sri Lanka⁵, the boat arrived for a promotional visit to Karachi. BAT gave a gift of Rs 4.5 million (approx. US\$ 75,000) to a local radio station for a live broadcast of the climax of the event, a concert for local young people. Health groups again believe that this donation helped to improve the publicity and to dull criticism of the activities.⁶



United Kingdom

Many UK sporting events are sponsored by domestic tobacco companies Imperial and Gallaher. In 2001, Gallaher sponsored a number of sports including Golf (The Benson and Hedges International Open), Snooker (The Benson & Hedges Masters Tournament), Cricket (The Benson & Hedges Cup) and Rugby (The Silk Cut Challenge Cup).⁷ Imperial sponsors several snooker events, including the Embassy World Championship and the Regal Welsh Open.⁸



USA

In the USA, NASCAR motor-racing is the number one live spectator sport, and the second most watched sport on television⁹. Tobacco sponsorship is prominent in the sport, with the R.J. Reynolds brand Winston the sport's major sponsor. Winston sponsors the Winston Cup, the NASCAR's premier competition, as well as a racing team. Camel (also R.J. Reynolds) and Marlboro (Philip Morris) also sponsor events and teams¹⁰. NASCAR actively markets their sport to children. Race weekends often include live music, rides, contests and hospitality areas. There is a brand of NASCAR family restaurants, racing video games and a new animated series on the "Fox Kids" network: "NASCAR Racers".¹¹



Indonesia

All major Indonesian tobacco companies sponsor sporting events. Djarum (a domestic producer) sponsors badminton and boxing¹². BAT sponsors badminton and motorbike racing¹³. Sampoerna sponsors basketball and soccer competitions¹⁴. The effectiveness of this, along with the rest of Indonesian tobacco advertising, has been studied in some depth by the Journal "Tobacco Control". The researchers concluded that "*Indonesian tobacco companies are, without compunction, using advertising to encourage younger people to smoke*".¹⁵



Malaysia

There are strict controls on direct tobacco advertising in Malaysia. However, sports sponsorship is very commonly used as a way around these regulations. The BAT brand Dunhill sponsors both the domestic soccer league, the Dunhill M-League, and the telecasts of the English Premier League, which is extremely popular in Malaysia. In addition, Dunhill also sponsors the national soccer team.¹⁶

Other brands also have sports sponsorships. For example, Benson & Hedges sponsor the Malaysian Golf Open, and the R.J. Reynolds Brand Winston also sponsors the Malaysian Television coverage of sporting events, such as boxing¹⁷. In Malaysia, it is clear that tobacco companies use sponsorship as a way of getting around restrictions on tobacco advertising.



Worldwide

Formula 1 Motor racing is the sport most closely associated with tobacco sponsorship. Tobacco sponsorship accounted for around two thirds of the sponsorship of the sport up to 1999.

In 1999, around US\$ 250 million was invested by tobacco companies in Formula One teams, with British American Racing (BAR) (US\$ 75 million), McLaren (US\$ 45 million) and Ferrari (US\$ 63 million) the most sponsored teams. The Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile Association (FIA), Formula One's governing body have, however, undertaken voluntarily to end tobacco sponsorship of the sport by 2006. As a result, the prevalence of tobacco sponsorship, while still extremely high, is beginning to fall.

Tobacco use effects sporting performance and physical fitness

It is well-known that tobacco kills. In fact it kills half its long-term users. What is less well-known, however, is the effect that smoking can have on people's ability to live their daily lives to the full – especially when it comes to taking part in sport or other kinds of physical activity. In addition to its long-term effects on health, tobacco use can have short-term effects, especially on lung function, but also on muscular strength and sleep patterns. Many studies have shown that smokers are less able than non-smokers to take part in sport at all levels, from the international elite to the weekend amateur, and these effects also make it more difficult to live a normal active daily life, when activities such as climbing the stairs or running for a bus become more difficult.

Numerous studies have shown that smokers are simply less fit than non-smokers. For example, in a large study of young army recruits, smokers were twice as likely to fail to complete basic training

compared with non-smokers.¹⁸ In studies of endurance exercise, smokers reach exhaustion earlier than non-smokers and derive less benefit from training.¹⁹ In one study of 6,500 19-year old army conscripts, smokers ran a significantly shorter distance in 12 minutes compared with non-smokers, and the more cigarettes smoked per day and the longer the duration of smoking, the shorter the distance run. The same non-smoking recruits ran an 80 meter sprint in a significantly shorter time than smokers.²⁰ In the same study, of 4,100 regular joggers who took part in a yearly 16km race, smokers were consistently slower. It was estimated that for every cigarette smoked per day, the time to complete the run was increased by 40 seconds. The authors suggested that smoking 20 cigarettes a day increased the time taken to run the 16km race by the equivalent of 12 age-years (i.e. a 30 year-old smoker took, on average, the same time to complete the race as a 42 year-old non-smoker) or destroys the endurance enhancing effect of running 20km per week.

Other studies have shown that short-term exercise is also affected by smoking. Regular smokers are twice as likely to discontinue exercise treadmill tests because of symptoms of exhaustion, fatigue, breathlessness, and leg pain than non-smokers.²¹ These disadvantages are directly related to the duration of smoking and the number of cigarettes smoked.^{22,23}

In addition to the effects of tobacco use on lung function, studies have also found other effects on the ability to perform well at sport. For instance, a 1998 study showed that young adult smokers (age 19-30) had less muscular strength and flexibility than non-smokers²⁴. Another study in 1982 found that sportspeople who smoked also had disturbed sleep patterns, and other complaints of ill-health.²⁵

Not only does smoking affect short-term fitness, but studies have shown that smoking also exerts a long-term consequence on physical performance. A study of 1,393 middle-aged Norwegian men examined the association

between smoking and decline in physical fitness over a period of seven years. It found that the decline in physical fitness and lung function among healthy middle aged men was considerably greater among smokers than among non-smokers and could not be explained by differences in age and physical activity.²⁶

For the lungs and heart to work efficiently they require oxygen-rich blood. Carbon monoxide in tobacco smoke binds with haemoglobin, the oxygen-carrying molecule in the blood, to form carboxyhaemoglobin. This means that there is less haemoglobin to carry and deliver oxygen to the body's cells and less oxygen reaches the heart and lungs.

Smoking also reduces the lungs' ability to absorb oxygen. Smoking destroys the alveoli, the tiny air sacs where the air exchange takes place, making the lungs less elastic and less able to exchange oxygen. Smokers' lungs also have decreased surface area and fewer capillaries, resulting in less

blood flow. Consequently, the lungs receive fewer nutrients and oxygen needed to make them healthy and function normally. Every inhalation of smoke causes the airways to constrict. Over time, more prolonged airway narrowing occurs and lung damage may be irreversible.²⁷

In addition, all tobacco use, including smokeless tobacco (chewing tobacco, snuff, snuss, etc) as well as cigarettes, increases the speed of smokers' resting heartrate, which reduces endurance.²⁸

Short- and long-term effects of tobacco use on health and physical fitness

Unlike cancer and heart disease which may take many years to develop, the effects of smoking on the respiratory system can occur within a year or two of taking up smoking.²⁹ The Royal College of Physicians report, Smoking and the Young, notes that of studies covering more than 50,000 subjects in the 10-20 year age range, nearly every report has been able to demonstrate increases in the rates of cough, sputum,

wheeze and shortness of breath among smokers, usually of the order of between two and six times the non-smoking rate.

Young smokers are also at increased risk of acute bronchitis. A ten-year study in Sydney, Australia, found more episodes of bronchitis in smoking children, particularly among girls.³⁰ Another study of 2,885 young people, 12-13 years old, found that minor ailments and time off from school were greater in smokers.³¹

The good news: damage caused by tobacco use can be reversible

The longer a person smokes, the greater the risk of irreversible damage to the airways and lungs. However, quitting smoking can reduce the decline in lung function caused by smoking. One U.S. study showed an improvement in lung function within five years among ex-smokers aged 45-55³² while another prospective study of more than 5,000 men and women aged 65 years and older found that smokers who quit, even after the age of 60, recorded better pulmonary function than continuing smokers.³³

The advertising story

Tobacco advertising helps persuade non-smokers to start smoking, and helps dissuade smokers from quitting – the overwhelming majority of independent research into the effect of tobacco advertising and sponsorship on tobacco consumption shows that there is a link and that this link works across cultures.

The tobacco industry has always maintained that the only function of advertising is to persuade smokers to switch between brands and that advertising does not effect overall consumption. Clive Turner from the Tobacco Advisory Council – a body set up by the tobacco industry – reiterates the industry line:

“Certainly no tobacco advertising is concerned with encouraging non-smokers to start or existing smokers to smoke more and it seems blindingly obvious that, unless you are a smoker, tobacco advertising or sponsorship has absolutely no influence whatsoever in persuading or motivating a purchase.” (1986)³⁴

But according to advertising executive Emerson Foote, former CEO of McCann-Erickson, which has handled millions of dollars in tobacco industry accounts:

“The cigarette industry has been artfully maintaining that cigarette advertising has nothing to do with total sales. This is complete and utter nonsense. The industry knows it is nonsense. I am always amused by the suggestion that advertising, a function that has been shown to increase consumption of virtually every other product, somehow miraculously fails to work for tobacco products.” (1981)³⁵

In fact, the consensus is that, while there is no doubt that tobacco advertising can have an effect on the brand of cigarettes chosen by smokers, it also has an effect of the overall size of the market – whether or not non-smokers

choose to start smoking, and whether smokers will attempt to stop. In addition, advertising is used to maintain “brand equity” – the proportion of the product’s price which has less to do with the intrinsic value of the product than with the branding that it represents. The cost of producing “premium” cigarettes is similar to that of producing budget brands. However, people are willing to pay more for a “premium” product because of the positive associations which the brand has for them. Without advertising, this “brand equity” will gradually erode, and brands will cease to be fashionable and begin to look more old-fashioned. This will reduce the ability of tobacco companies to charge a premium for certain brands, reducing companies’ profitability.

A number of economic studies have shown that comprehensive bans on tobacco advertising can have an effect in reducing the prevalence of smoking in society. Internal tobacco industry documents show that both the tobacco and advertising industries have been aware for many years that tobacco advertising affects overall consumption, as well as market share.

The tobacco industry and the advertising agencies they work with are particularly concerned with increasing the number of smokers, as well as the share of the market occupied by individual brands.

The New York advertising agency, Ted Bates, presented advice to a tobacco company on how to reach teenagers.

“In the young smoker’s mind, a cigarette falls into the same category with wine, beer, shaving, wearing a bra (or purposely not wearing one), declaration of independence and striving for self-identity.... Thus, an attempt to reach young smokers, starters, should be based, among others, on the following major parameters:

Present the cigarette as one of the few initiations into the adult world.

Present the cigarette as part of the illicit pleasure category of products and activities.”³⁶

The weight of evidence

It is therefore clear that, despite their denials, tobacco companies have always proceeded on the assumption that overall consumption, as well as brand share, is influenced by advertising – they are able to recruit non-smokers, especially the young, by advertising to particular people in a particular way.

The overwhelming weight of evidence supports the theory that tobacco advertising encourages children to start smoking and reinforces the social acceptability of the habit among adults and children. The 1998 report of the UK’s Scientific Committee on Tobacco and Health concluded that *“Tobacco promotion helps to recruit young smokers, and this promotion occurs without manufacturers making clear the true extent of the harm the products cause and the risk of addiction.”³⁷*

In his 1989 report, “Reducing the Health Consequences of Smoking: 25 years of progress”³⁸, the US Surgeon General set out seven ways in which tobacco consumption was influenced by advertising:

- *By encouraging children or young adults to experiment with tobacco and thereby slip into regular use*
- *By encouraging smokers to increase consumption*
- *By reducing smokers’ motivation to quit*
- *By encouraging former smokers to resume*
- *By discouraging full and open discussion of the hazards of smoking as a result of media dependence on advertising revenues*
- *By muting opposition to controls on tobacco as a result of the dependence of organizations receiving sponsorship from tobacco companies*

- *By creating through the ubiquity of advertising, sponsorship, etc. an environment in which tobacco use is seen as familiar and acceptable and the warnings about its health are undermined.*

The report concluded, *“the collective empirical, experiential and logical evidence makes it more likely than not that advertising and promotional activities do stimulate cigarette consumption.”*

A review in 1992 by the UK Department of Health’s Chief Economic Adviser, Dr Clive Smee³⁹, constitutes the most comprehensive study of the link between advertising and tobacco consumption. Smee looked both at the correlation between advertising and consumption in countries (such as the UK and USA) where advertising is allowed, and at the effect of total advertising bans (in countries such as Finland and New Zealand) on tobacco consumption. After reviewing extensive data on advertising spending compared to total tobacco consumption, Smee concluded that

“The balance of evidence thus supports the conclusion that advertising does have a positive effect on consumption.”

That is, the more money is spent on advertising tobacco products, the higher the total consumption of tobacco.

Reviewing the impact of advertising bans that had been introduced at the time, Smee concluded that

“In each case the banning of advertising was followed by a fall in smoking on a scale which cannot be reasonably attributed to other factors.”

Of the countries reviewed in detail, there was a drop in tobacco consumption of between 4% (in Canada) and 16% (in Norway) following a ban on advertising.

In addition, a recent international overview: *“The effect of tobacco advertising bans on tobacco consumption”*⁴⁰ concluded that

“a comprehensive set of tobacco advertising bans can reduce tobacco consumption but a limited set of advertising bans will have little or no effect”.

This is because tobacco companies respond to partial bans by diverting resources from the restricted to the non-restricted media.

The World Bank has also conducted an investigation in this area. In its publication, *Curbing the epidemic: government and the economics of tobacco control*⁴¹, the Bank analyzed the evidence and concluded that tobacco advertising causes tobacco consumption to increase and partial advertising bans are ineffective:

“Policymakers who are interested in controlling tobacco need to know whether cigarette advertising and promotion affect consumption. The answer is that they almost certainly do, although the data are not straightforward. The key conclusion is that bans on advertising and promotion prove effective, but only if they are comprehensive, covering all media and all uses of brand names and logos.”

The Bank went on to estimate that, judging from the available data, the effect of a total ban

on tobacco advertising in high-income countries would be a reduction of around 7% in tobacco consumption.

A study of the effect of tobacco advertising bans in reducing consumption was conducted in four countries Norway, Finland, New Zealand and France, in the years following the introduction of a ban on tobacco advertising⁴². In each of these countries, the ban was followed by a substantial reduction in tobacco consumption, ranging from 15% in the seven years following a ban in France to 34% following the 1978 ban in Finland. In each of these cases, an advertising ban was introduced as part of an overall tobacco control policy. The researcher concluded that *“advertising bans do work if they are properly implemented as part of a comprehensive tobacco control policy.”*

The World Bank estimates that the tobacco industry’s advertising and promotion budgets are relatively large – around 6% of sales revenues, which is about 50% higher than the average industry⁴³. In the last few decades, many countries have introduced progressively tougher controls on tobacco advertising either by voluntary agreements with the tobacco industry, or through legislation. However, unless restrictions on advertising and promotion are comprehensive, the tobacco industry simply diverts its promotional activities from those activities which have been banned to those which have not.


Sports without tobacco

Some people fear that a withdrawal of tobacco sponsorship will harm sports which are currently heavily sponsored by cigarette brands. However, all the evidence shows that this is not the case – many sports have voluntarily given up tobacco sponsorship money, including both the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup. Some people fear that a withdrawal of tobacco sponsorship will harm sports which are currently heavily sponsored by cigarette brands. However, all the evidence shows that this is not the case – many sports have voluntarily given up tobacco sponsorship money, including both the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup Football – the world's two biggest sporting events. They have not suffered financially as a result.

There are also many examples of sports team, sports federations and countries, who have decided voluntarily to do away with tobacco sponsorship. Since the late 1980s, the Olympic movement has been tobacco free. The Fédération Internationale de Football Association, FIFA, the world Football governing body, has refused to take tobacco sponsorship at any of its events since 1987. UEFA, Football's European Governing body, has taken a similar stance. In both of these cases, there has been no discernable difference to the financial viability of the events, with football in particular enjoying unprecedented financial success in the 1990s.

In India, the National Cricket Team has recently ended its long-term association with Wills Cigarettes (a subsidiary of BAT), who were, for many years, the team's sponsor. This is a significant step, given the growing importance of India as a television market for cricket.





Cricket in South Africa, formerly sponsored by tobacco companies, is now flourishing and tobacco free.

In 1992 the Australian federal government, passed legislation banning tobacco sponsorship of national and state sporting events.

There is no evidence that the bans on tobacco company advertising and sponsorship through sport has harmed Australian sportspeople or sporting organizations from either the perspective of raising revenue or of sporting achievement.⁴⁴

Rather than harming sport, all of the evidence points in the other direction, with Australian corporate sponsorship of sport at record and rising levels. Since the federal ban on tobacco advertising and sponsorship became effective in 1996 corporate support for Australian sport has risen from US\$ 350 million annually to US\$ 700 million in 2000 – excluding Olympic sponsorships, an increase of 45%.⁴⁵

The most prominent sponsorship of Australian sport has been the Benson & Hedges sponsorship of the Australian Cricket Team. Since Benson & Hedges stopped sponsoring Australian cricket, revenues to the Australian Cricket Board have increased and the on-field success of the Australian Cricket Team, in both One Day and Test Matches, has been at an all time high.

Far from harming sport, the exodus of the *“easy tobacco money”* has caused sporting administrators to need to know the real commercial value of their sports and to be more creative in marketing their sports to commercial sponsors.⁴⁶

There is no evidence to support the idea that banning tobacco sponsorship would harm sport – indeed, the success of sports that have ended their associations with tobacco show that sport simply does not need tobacco money.

The tobacco industry uses sports sponsorship as a way of getting around national restrictions on tobacco advertising. As the examples show, tobacco companies simply cannot be trusted to regulate themselves responsibly. The only effective way forward is for governments to legislate to ban tobacco sponsorship of sport.

The moment has come to remove tobacco from sports. A comprehensive ban on tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship is one way to reach this goal. WHO's 191 Member States are currently negotiating these and other crucial issues in the development of the world's first legally enforceable treaty on tobacco, the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control.



Reclaiming health

Sports federations and sportspeople around the world know tobacco is incompatible with their values and their health. Athletes take pride in their strength, skills, and dedication and in their ability to act as positive role models for all of society. They want to put an end to tobacco's manipulation of sports.

Countries want to reclaim their right to protect public health. WHO's 191 Member States are negotiating a global public health treaty to bring down tobacco-related deaths. The Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) will mesh science and economics with legislation and regulation and in some cases, litigation. It will seek global and national solutions for problems such as global tobacco advertising or smuggling – issues that cut across national boundaries, cultures, age groups and socio-economic strata. In fact, the

FCTC is a call for international scrutiny and responsibility that normally accompanies a freely available consumer product in the international marketplace.

Under pressure by this global call for an end to the deception and the resulting death, tobacco companies are unleashing yet another attempt to derail meaningful regulation of their corporate activity. In this round of recycled arguments, companies such as British American Tobacco, Philip Morris and Japan Tobacco now promise to enforce "*International Tobacco Marketing Standards*". They propose to enforce these standards voluntarily and to target advertising only at adult smokers.



WHO says no country has succeeded in designing regulations – especially voluntary ones – that eliminate children’s exposure to tobacco advertising while allowing advertising aimed only at adults who use tobacco. Self-regulation invariably fails because it was never meant to succeed – tobacco companies know this and now so does the rest of the world.

Tobacco Free Sports — Play it Clean

In response to the global appeal for action, WHO and its partners are launching a campaign to clean sports of all forms of tobacco tobacco consumption, and exposure to second-hand smoke, tobacco advertising, promotion and marketing.

The United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), International Olympic Committee (IOC), Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), Federation Internationale de L’Automobile Association (FIA), Olympic Aid and other regional and local sports organizations have joined WHO in this campaign for Tobacco Free Sports. Tobacco free events have been organized all over the world, including the 2002 Salt Lake City Winter Olympic Games in the U.S. and the 2002 FIFA World Cup in the Republic of Korea and Japan.

Athletes, sports organizations, national and local sports authorities, school and university sports teams, sports media

and everyone interested in physical activity are invited to join this campaign for Tobacco Free Sports. WHO urges people everywhere to take back their right to health and healthy living and to protect future generations from the preventable death and disease caused by tobacco.

1. Barrie Gill, chief executive of Championship Sports Specialists Ltd., a sports sponsorship company
2. Reported in "Trust Us, We're the Tobacco Industry", Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids & Action on Smoking and Health, May 2001.
3. Reported in *The EastAfrican*, 10 September 2001. (<http://www.nationaudio.com/News/EastAfrican/17062001/Sports/Sports1.html>)
4. Reported in *Tobacco Control* 2000; 9; 129 (Summer)
5. Reported in *Tobacco Control* 2000; 9; 9; 129.
6. Reported in *Tobacco Control* 2000; 9; 359 (Winter)
7. Gallaher Group Website (www.gallaher-group.com).
8. Website of the *World Professional Billiards and Snooker Association (WPBSA)*, Snooker's Governing body. (http://www.wpbsa.com/snooker_tournaments/main_tour/tour_index.asp)
9. *Racing to Addiction: Tobacco Company Auto-Racing Sponsorships*. (2000). Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids. (<http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/>)
10. Joyce Julius, *Sponsor's Report, 2000*.
11. Nascar website (www.nascar.com) ; Heavy, B, "The New Sport of Kings", *American Way* (June 15 2000).
12. Chapman S. *Great expecorations: advertising and the tobacco industry*. London: Comedia, 1986.
13. *Annual report*. PT BAT Indonesia, 1995.
14. PT HM Sampoerna. *Annual report*. PT HM Sampoerna, 1996.
15. Tobacco Advertising in Indonesia: "the defining characteristics for success", *Tobacco Control*, 1999; 8; 85-88.
16. BAT Malaysia, 3rd Quarter Results, October 2001. (<http://www.batmalaysia.com/CorporateInformation/InvestorRelations/InvestorBriefings/2001Q3V6web.pdf>)
17. Source: *Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids* advertising gallery. (<http://tobaccofreekids.org/adgallery/display.php?ID=7>)
18. Blake, KH and Parker JA. Success in basic combat training: the role of cigarette smoking. *J Occup Med* 1991; 33: 688-690.
19. Cooper, KH, Gey GO and Bottenberg, RA. Effects of cigarette smoking on endurance performance. *JAMA* 1968; 203: 688-90.
20. Marti B, Abelin T, Minder CE, Vader JP. Smoking, alcohol consumption and endurance capacity: an analysis of 6,500 19-year-old conscripts and 4,100 joggers. *Prev Med* 1988; 17: 79-92.
21. Gordon DH et al. Smoking, physical activity and other predictors of endurance and heart rate response to exercise in asymptomatic hyper-cholesterolemic men. *Am J Epidemiol* 1987. 125: 587-600.
22. Klausen K, Andersen C, Nandrup S. Acute effects of cigarette smoking and inhalation of carbon monoxide during maximal exercise. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 1983; 51: 371-379.
23. Hirsch GL et al. Immediate effects of cigarette smoking on cardiorespiratory responses to exercise. *J Appl Physiol* 1985; 58: 1975-81.
24. Kumar PR, Kumar NV. Effect of cigarette smoking on muscle strength of flexibility of athletes. *Indian J Exp Biol*. 1998;36:1144-6.
25. Bale P, White M. The effects of smoking on the health and sleep of sportswomen. *Br J Sports Med* 1982;16:149-53.
26. Sandvik L, Erikssen G and Thaulow E. Long term effects of smoking on physical fitness and lung function: a longitudinal study of 1393 middle aged Norwegian men for seven years. *BMJ* 1995; 311: 715-8.
27. Cigarettes: What the warning label doesn't tell you. *The American Council on Science and Health*, 1996.
28. Van Duser BL, Raven PB. The effects of oral smokeless tobacco on the cardiorespiratory response to exercise. *Med Sci Sports Exercise* (1992) 24:389-395.
29. Smoking and the Young. Royal College of Physicians, 1992.
30. Woolcock, AJ et al. The development of lung function in Sydney children: effects of respiratory illness and smoking. A ten year study. *Eur J Respir Dis* 1984; 65: suppl 132.
31. Charlton, A, Blair, V. Absence from school related to children's and parental smoking habits. *BMJ* 1994; 1989; 298: 90-2.
32. Nemery B, Moavero NE, Brasseur L, Stanesco DC. Changes in lung function after smoking cessation: an assessment from a cross-sectional survey. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1982; 125(1): 122-4.
33. Higgins MW et al. Smoking and lung function in elderly men and women. The Cardiovascular Health Study. *JAMA* 1993; 269(21): 2741-8.
34. C. Turner: "Cigarette ads: the aim is branding", *Campaign*, 14 March 1986
35. Foote E. Advertising and Tobacco. *JAMA* 1981 Apr 24; 245 (16): 1667-8.
36. Ted Bates, 1975.
37. Report of the Scientific Committee on Tobacco and Health (SCOTH). Department of Health, 1998.
38. Reducing the Health Consequences of Smoking: 25 years of progress. A report of the Surgeon General, US\$ HHS, 1989.
39. Effect of tobacco advertising on tobacco consumption: a discussion document reviewing the evidence. Department of Health, 1992.
40. Saffer, H and Chaloupka, F. The effect of tobacco advertising bans on tobacco consumption. *J of Health Economics*, 2000; 19: 1117-1137.
41. World Bank. *Curbing the Epidemic: Governments and the economics of tobacco control*. Washington D.C. 1999. (<http://www.worldbank.org/tobacco/reports.htm>)
42. Joossens, L. "The Effectiveness of Banning Advertising for tobacco products" Union Internationale Contre le Cancer, Brussels, 2000. (<http://www.ash.org.uk/html/advspo/html/experience.html>)
43. World Bank. *Curbing the Epidemic: Governments and the economics of tobacco control*. Washington D.C. 1999.
44. ASH (UK) Report: "Effects on Sport of Bans on Tobacco Advertising and Sponsorship in Australia", July 2001. (<http://www.ash.org.uk/html/advspo/html/ausreport.html>)
45. "Where the Value lies in Sports Sponsorship" *Business Review Weekly*, March 1998.
46. ASH (UK) Report: "Effects on Sport of Bans on Tobacco Advertising and Sponsorship in Australia", July 2001. (<http://www.ash.org.uk/html/advspo/html/ausreport.html>)