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**Topic of Discussion**

Our topic of discussion is the social responsibility of cigarette companies, more specifically of Philip Morris and the Marlboro brand. Cigarette smoking is the most preventable cause of illness and death. Cigarettes are filled with nicotine, which acts like a poison in your body. Tobacco use is the leading cause of preventable deaths in the United States. Tobacco use causes approximately 440, 000 deaths annually, which is twice the number of deaths attributed to alcohol, homicide, illicit drug use, and suicide combined.There are more than 60 million daily smokers in the United States.Each year, approximately 1 million additional people become daily cigarette users, 44.2% of whom are younger than 18 years.Every day, more than 4,000 adolescents aged 12 to 17 years try their first cigarette, and 1,300 of them go on to become daily smokers.Given these statistics, it is clear that preventing initiation of tobacco use among adolescents is crucial to reducing adult-onset disease and mortality.

The tobacco industry has used corporate social responsibility tactics to improve its corporate image with the public, press, and regulators who increasingly have grown to view it as a merchant of death. Regardless of their efforts one fact remains the same: the tobacco industry’s products are lethal when used as directed, and no amount of corporate social responsibility activity can compete with that ethical corporate responsibility.
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# In this article, Hammond and associates discuss how the health warnings on cigarette packages are the most common means of communicating the health risks of using cigarettes and smoking. However, are these warnings doing enough to warn users about the risk of smoking tobacco? By use of a telephone survey, the writers were able to assess whether or not people believed that smoking cigarettes caused various health issues, such as heart disease, stroke, impotence and lung cancer in both smokers and non-smokers. Respondents were also asked whether certain chemicals were found in cigarettes. These chemicals included: cyanide, arsenic and carbon monoxide.

# This source is helpful to our research paper because its findings point out that cigarette companies are not adequately educating users on the health issues of using their products. They are putting in 50% effort with the use of the warning labels but not doing all they can. As the analyzers, we can assume that this is because too much effort into the negative aspects of smoking cigarettes will negatively affect sales. The database we found this article off of is BMJ Group under the Tobacco subcategory. The BMJ database focuses on medical issues and the most recent and up to date findings on these issues. This article was written in 2005 but is still relevant and can be used for this research paper because cigarette companies have not since altered their warnings for using their products. We consider this article credible and trust that will be useful in writing our paper.
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# The article discusses the tobacco industry’s corporate responsibility efforts and assesses whether or not there are substantive changes in the way these corporations do business in regards to the issues of secondhand smoke. The results of the assessment are that the tobacco industry has made no substantial efforts to combat these issues and continues to do business as usual. Tobacco industries are always defensive in their tactics rather than offensive which is what they need to be.

# This source is helpful to our research paper in that it outlines the reasons as to why the tobacco industry has not been doing more to warn consumers about the dangers of their products. As mentioned in the explanation of the last source, business tactics overtake health issues that are caused by using the products. “…their desire to appear to be good corporate citizens clashed with their aversion to further regulation and jeopardizing their legal position, perhaps an irreconcilable conflict (Friedman).” Though this article was written in 2009, we find that it continues to be relevant because the tobacco and cigarette industries have not make any strides to alleviate the issue of better health warnings on their products. This source was found on pubmed.org, the United States National Library of Medicine website. PubMed comprises more than 23 million citations for biomedical literature from MEDLINE, life science journals, and online books. We would consider this database to be creditable.

# Mendes, P., Kapur, S., Wang, J., Feng, S., & Roethig, H., (2008). A randomized, controlled exposure study in adult smokers of full flavor Malboro cigarette switching to Marlboro Lights or Marlboro Ultra Lights cigarettes. *Regulatory Toxicology & Pharmacology: RTP, 51295-305.*

# This article is discussing whether or not the introduction of lower tar cigarettes reduces exposure to smoke constituents in humans. Mendez, Kapur, Wang, Feng, and Roethig did the study using 225 adult smokers of Marlboro full flavor cigarettes for 8 days with a 24-week follow up. Subjects smoked tar cigarettes then smoked Marlboro Lights and Ultra Lights randomly. The study showed that switching from regular to light cigarettes showed a decrease in nicotine exposure and switching to ultra light showed an significant decrease in nicotine exposure.

# This source is helpful for our research paper because it gives a dissenting opinion to our initial topic. Is the introduction of Light and Ultra Light Marlboro cigarettes the cigarette company’s way of addressing the growing health risks of using their products? This article is fairly recent and its research is general enough (in regards to timing) to include in our paper. This source was found on pubmed.org, the United States National Library of Medicine website. PubMed comprises more than 23 million citations for biomedical literature from MEDLINE, life science journals, and online books. We would consider this database to be creditable.
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This article presents experience of the author whose makes cigarettes. His company makes a dangerous product that is addictive and causes serious diseases. Cigarettes cause lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema and other serious diseases. There is no such thing as a safe cigarette. And, with all that is known about cigarettes, some question whether it is possible to market them responsibly at all. The company could keep doing business as usual and risk being put out of business. Or, it could change to more closely align itself with society's expectations of a responsible company. It chose to change the way it does business.

This source is a great source to use for our research paper because it is written by from the perspective of the CEO of a cigarette company. Addressing the fact that he knows that he manufactures and sells a dangerous product, the author Farriss discusses how his company helps and makes the situation worse. This is a good article to use for our research paper because it provides a alternate viewpoint on the issue of whether or not cigarettes are dangerous to use. It makes the same point that cigarettes are dangerous but comes from the head of a huge cigarette company. It is an inside look to what cigarette executives think. This source was found on EBSCOHost, a Pace library database that includes articles on all different subjects. Pace University, Danielle and I all consider this source creditable.

Brusvang, Katrine. (May 2012). Philip Morris USA Inc. & Corporate Social Responsibility – going up in flames. International Virksomhedskommunikation. Retrieved from: <http://pure.au.dk/portal/files/45322046/Philip_Morris_USA_Inc._and_CSR.pdf>

This article presents an argument that awareness amongst the public on issues like human rights, child employment, and environmental impacts, the demands from stakeholders are not only on the product, but also on the way the products have been manufactured. This is relevant because the tobacco industry is seen as an “inherent contradiction” in that the big tobacco companies and stakeholders are contradicting what they say regarding CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility).

This source is a great source for our research paper because it gives insight to how the big tobacco companies handle corporate social responsibility and the opinions of others on their efforts. This source was found online as a PDF and we consider it credible.

(February 2003). Tobacco industry and corporate responsibility...an inherent contradiction. Tobacco Free Initiative – World Health Organization. Retrieved from: <http://www.who.int/tobacco/media/en/tob-industry.pdf>

This article discusses the boom of the socially responsible investment (SRI) products and attests to this trend as investors express their concerns and make their social and ethical stands known to the companies they invest in and patronize.

We find that this article is relevant to the issues we are discussing in our research paper because it discusses the option of a tobacco free cigarette as well as the responsibility of the tobacco corporation to provide these options. This source was found on the tobacco free initiative website, a site committed discussing various issues presented by the cigarette companies. We find this source to be creditable.

Altria Group, Inc. Altria Group Inc. Home Page. Retrieved from: <http://www.altria.com/Pages/default.aspx>

This webpage is the Altria Group’s homepage. We find this entire webpage to be relevant to our topic because it completely outlines the goals and ambitions of Altria, the company responsible for Philip Morris products. This source is creditable and a primary source of information for our topic.

Philip Morris USA. Philip Morris USA Homepage. Retrieved: <http://www.philipmorrisusa.com/en/cms/home/default.aspx>

This webpage is the Philip Morris USA homepage. We find this entire webpage to be relevant to our topic because it completely outlines the goals and ambitions of Philip Morris as well as their marketing schemes, etc. This source is creditable and a primary source of information for our topic.

# Talkto Harry. (8 Dec 2011). Corporate Social Responsibility in the Tobacco Industry. Retrieved from: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IOTn5OORC7I>

# This YouTube video discusses one man’s opinion on what the tobacco industry should be doing in order to save consumers from health issues when using cigarette products.

# We find that this video is relevant to our topic but may not be a creditable source since it is based on opinion. Since our research paper can include the opinions of others, we find this to be a helpful source to show us what others may think about this position.

# Wojdacz, Mariah. (Sep 2008). Tobacco companies pay big bucks for anti-smoking campaigns. Legal Zoom Home. Retrieved from: <http://www.legalzoom.com/us-law/more-us-law/tobacco-companies-pay-big-bucks>

This article discusses how as part of a $206 billion dollar settlement, major tobacco companies like Philip Morris agreed to pay for advertising campaigns to educate consumers about the dangers of tobacco. Not only were they barred from advertising their own products or sponsoring events geared towards teenagers, they also had to contribute millions annually to support these anti-smoking ads in every state.

This source is relevant to our research topic because it discusses the flip side of our topic: how tobacco companies are fighting to keep themselves in good graces in the eyes of their consumers. This article basically says that tobacco companies are doing all they can to warn consumers of the harmful effects of cigarettes, short of them shutting down their company altogether. This source is from legal zoom, a website that specializes in finding legal aid or legal advice regarding businesses and/or business practices. We find this source to be creditable since it is specializing in topics of this nature.

# Nocera, John. (June 2006). If It's Good for Philip Morris, Can It Also Be Good for Public Health. The New York Times. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/18/magazine/18tobacco.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>

# This article discusses how Philip Morris and all its tobacco products are here to stay regardless of the measures the media; the company or consumers take in order to change the warning labels on the products. People will continue to smoke even if they are forewarned incredibly.

# We find that this topic is relevant for use in our research paper because it can offer us a dissenting paragraph and a look into the other side of the topic. The source of this article is The New York Times, which is a very creditable newspaper.