



The University's fundamental mission is to discover knowledge and to disseminate it to its students and to society at large.



# Why the tobacco companies fund universities



- **Doubt** is our product since it is the best means of competing with the “body of fact” that exists in the mind of the general public. It is also **the means of establishing a controversy ...**

-- B&W “Smoking and Health Proposal,” 1969

# Tobacco Companies Racketeers

- Created an illegal “enterprise” to defraud the public
- Continuing and likely to continue in the future
- Funding of universities first element of the enterprise
- PM External Research Program specifically identified as part of the *continuing* illegal enterprise
  - Now funding projects at UC

# Understanding This, Many Academic Institutions Decline Tobacco Industry Money

- Brigham and Women's Hospital
- Columbia University School of Public Health
- Georgetown University School of Nursing
- Harvard School of Public Health
- Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
- Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health
- Massachusetts General Hospital
- MD Anderson Cancer Center
- Morgan State University
- Ohio State University Research Foundation
- Penn State University
- Roswell Park Cancer Center
- St. Louis University School of Public Health
- Temple University
- University of Arizona School of Public Health
- University of Alabama at Birmingham
- University of Hawaii
- University of Montana-Missoula
- University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center
- University of South Carolina School of Public Health
- University of Washington
- West Virginia University Research Corporation

# The situation at UC

- Several units independently decided to decline tobacco money
  - UCSD Family and Community Medicine
  - UCSD Cancer Center
  - UCLA School of Nursing
  - UCSF Cancer Center
  - UCSF Institute for Health Policy Studies
  - UCB School of Public Health
  - UCSF faculty vote
- Overruled by Systemwide
- UC is the *only* university in the world that prohibits its academic units from adopting policies to decline money from the tobacco industry
- Faculty have demurred to the Regents

# Academic Senate Position

- “Regental intervention on the basis of *assumptions* about the moral or political standing of the donor is unwarranted.”
- “Assembly declares its deep disapproval of funding arrangements in which an appearance of academic freedom belies an actual suppression of academic freedom.”
- “The Assembly asserts its conviction that past funding arrangements involving the tobacco industry have been shown to suppress academic freedom.”

# What about the “slippery slope”?

- Argument raised when Regents divested tobacco
  - Haven’t slid down the slope
- Many other academic institutions have declined tobacco money
  - None have slid down the slope
- The proposed policy is well conceived and sets an appropriately high bar

# Put into Plain English

- We Indians like to stay warm.
- Generally blankets keep us warm; so generally, it is good to accept blankets.
- But we are banning the blankets from this Jeffrey Amherst guy and his cronies.

-- Faye Crosby, Chair, UCSC Senate



Extra slides if needed

“We trust our faculty to do high-quality, objective research irrespective of where their funding comes from.”

- Federal Judge Kessler cited a UCLA study as a specific example of the ongoing illegal enterprise
- The American Cancer Society wrote UC in October that the study researcher “ignored multiple communications about fundamental methodological problems with his analyses” and that “the Society could provide additional documentation of scientific misconduct, if this is helpful.”
- As of January 11, 2007 no one from UC had requested the documentation.

# ACS letter October 12, 2006

The second instance [of misrepresing scientific evidence] involved analyses lead by Dr. James Enstrom of UCLA, who *misled* long term colleagues at the [American Cancer] Society by failing to mention to the Society that he had applied for and received funding from Philip Morris, and who *ignored* multiple communications about fundamental methodological problems with his analyses. Although the decision currently before the Regents is much broader than any individual case of scientific misconduct, *the Society could provide additional documentation of scientific misconduct, if this is helpful.*

As of January 11, 2007 no one from UC had requested this documentation.