Tobacco Promotion to Military Personnel: “The Plums Are Here to Be Plucked”
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ABSTRACT Smoking rates among military personnel are high, damaging health, decreasing short- and long-term troop readiness, and costing the Department of Defense (DOD). The military is an important market for the tobacco industry, which long targeted the military with cigarette promotions. Internal tobacco industry documents were examined to explore tobacco sponsorship of events targeted to military personnel. Evidence was found of more than 1,400 events held between 1980 and 1997. In 1986, the DOD issued a directive forbidding such special promotions; however, with the frequently eager cooperation of military personnel, they continued for more than a decade, apparently ceasing only because of the restrictions of the Master Settlement Agreement. The U.S. military collaborated with the tobacco industry for decades, creating a military culture of smoking. Reversing that process will require strong policy establishing tobacco use as unmilitary.

INTRODUCTION

The 1.3 million active duty personnel in the U.S. military are a desirable market for tobacco companies; people near the typical age of smoking uptake, entering an institution with high smoking prevalence (32.2% in 2005). Military recruits skew toward some of the tobacco industry’s prime targets: young adults, high school educated, and African-American. Smoking diminishes even short-term troop health and readiness and increases medical and training costs.

Goods, such as cigarettes, may be promoted through sponsorship of events. Sponsorship creates a public presence for the product, advertising for the event becomes advertising for the sponsor as well. Sponsorship builds on loyalties and associations customers already have. Sponsorship can be more powerful than advertising, as it is more covert, and does not trigger the skepticism recognized advertising invokes. Consumers will even pay to participate in sponsored events, although the events communicate commercial messages they otherwise avoid. When the sponsor is perceived as having made a desired event possible, the consumer may see the brand as a benefactor. This study examines tobacco industry use of sponsorship to promote cigarettes to active duty military.

BACKGROUND

Tobacco use has long been associated with military service; until 1975, tobacco was included in basic field rations. The Department of Defense (DOD) sells tobacco products through commissaries and exchanges, stores located on military bases. Before the mid-1990s, tobacco products sold in these stores were deeply discounted; prices have been raised to within 5% of the local retail price, but, as for all items in the stores, no state or local taxes are applied.

METHODS

Some 10 million tobacco industry internal documents have been made public through state attorneys general litigation. We searched the Legacy Tobacco Documents Library (http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/index.html) and http://tobaccodocuments.org using a snowball strategy, beginning with keywords (e.g., “military AND sponsorship”). Additionally, we searched news stories on the Lexis-Nexis and NewsBank databases. Documents were deemed relevant if they mentioned military tobacco sponsorships.

Data from approximately 1,200 documents, including correspondence, contracts, marketing research, and reports, dated 1981–2001, were analyzed using an interpretive approach.

Profits from tobacco products help fund Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) programs. MWR is responsible for promoting the physical, mental, and social well-being of military members and their families through programs such as sports, child development, and youth programs. Commanders also support these programs out of their Operations and Maintenance budgets; however, no specific amounts are earmarked for MWR programs, which must compete with operational requirements for funds. The exchanges, the MWR program bureaucracy, and base commanders may thus be motivated to continue sales of tobacco products.

Directive 1010.10

In 1986, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger released Health Promotion Directive 1010.10. In addition to declaring many areas nonsmoking and mandating cessation and prevention programs, the directive forbade participation “with manufacturers or distributors of . . . tobacco products in promotional programs, activities, or contests aimed primarily at DOD personnel.” The directive specified that support from alcohol or tobacco companies “for worthwhile programs” was acceptable as long as there was no advertising “directly or indirectly identifying [a] . . . tobacco product.”
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All documents were reviewed by the first author, and both authors reviewed selected key documents and took detailed notes. We used iterative reviews of documents, notes, and secondary source materials to develop an historical case study.29,30

This study has limitations. The document set is not comprehensive, but a selection of litigation-related material. As no tobacco litigation to date concerns the military, there may be unavailable documents that contain additional information. We also may not have identified all relevant available documents because of their volume. Military records were not readily available; thus, descriptions of the military perspective are limited.

RESULTS

Tobacco industry contracts with MWR offices show two kinds of sponsorship. For large events, such as concerts, tobacco companies paid fees (e.g., performers' fees) in exchange for the right to promote the event and their product. MWR offices retained money from tickets and concessions. For smaller events, such as bowling tournaments or bar nights, tobacco companies paid fees (under $5,000) to “brand” the event. In addition, companies supplied branded items such as prizes, napkins, and T-shirts.31–33 Between 1981 and 2000, tobacco companies sponsored more than 1,450 events for military personnel (Table I). Most of these events were held on military bases; 217 were held at off-base bars and clubs that catered to military personnel. Services targeted and event location details are summarized in Tables II and III. All figures are minimums; the total number of events is unknown, as the document collections are not complete. Philip Morris (PM) noted that in both 1994 and 1995 the company sponsored over 35,000 events that were not included on their own event calendars;31 whether or how many of these were on military bases is unknown.

Promotional Events, 1980–1986

Kool Super Nights

Sponsorship of large events on military bases began in 1981, when Brown & Williamson (B&W) expanded its Kool Jazz festivals onto military bases. According to a B&W overview of the program’s first year, the military was “virtually an untouche[d] market for this type of activity.”35 Neither B&W nor the military knew how to proceed, since it was “a totally new concept.”35 However, B&W learned to get approval for their Kool Super Nights (KSN) concerts through the Morale and Welfare Support Office (later MWR).35

There were 132 KSN events over 5 years. In 1983 more than 40 concerts were held, including on bases in West Germany and an aircraft carrier.36 In 1984 the overseas component covered more West German bases13 and others in Panama,37 Guam,38 and Okinawa.39 Overseas, tobacco company promoters noted, “your audience is even more isolated,”40 making it more dependent on on-base events.

B&W personnel noted that KSN concerts could be exploited through “special promotional programs” for stores and clubs on base, and “incentive items that are personalized to tie in Kool with the individual base.”35,41 Marketing managers were told to “develop a three- to five-week promotional program” for each show.42 On some bases, local bands competed to be the opening act for the concert.40 B&W distributed branded premiums such as “keychains, cards, and notebooks”43 with purchases of Kools in base stores, and sponsored events at the base clubs featuring “Kool napkins and Kool ash trays” as well as prizes such as “T-Shirts, caps, and radios.”43 Branded items, B&W hoped, would “be around long after each concert and thus serve as a reminder of Kool’s sponsorship.”35 These activities helped the company “aggressively saturat[e] each military base.”31

Belair Bingo

Military wives were targeted through a B&W Belair Bingo promotion, starting in 1982. The brand provided bingo cards and chips, and prizes including lighters, T-shirts, and gift certificates. Participants received cigarettes, coupons, matches, romance novels,44 and catalogs for more branded items.43 The brand manager suggested that account managers approach MWR offices that sponsored bingo nights, and that already

| Event Type          | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|
| Contest/Game*       | 576       | 39.6    |
| Concert             | 344       | 23.6    |
| Bar Night           | 134       | 9.2     |
| Participatory Sport | 116       | 8.0     |
| Sampling            | 80        | 5.5     |
| Spectator Sport     | 78        | 5.4     |
| Outdoor Event       | 49        | 3.4     |
| Other Performance   | 10        | 0.7     |
| Other               | 69        | 4.7     |
| Total               | 1,456     | 100.0   |

*Note: Contests and games were frequently held in bars; items were counted under “bar night” if no special activities were mentioned.
had a relationship with B&W through the KSN program.\textsuperscript{46} However, in both cases he emphasized that they were “not sponsoring the bingo events . . . Rather, we are donating specific items intended to supplement a base function.”\textsuperscript{44,46}  

\textit{Newport Face-to-Face Marketing}\textsuperscript{82}  
According to a Lorillard brand planning document, “there isn’t a market in the country that has the sales potential for Newport like the military market,” adding that “the plums are here to be plucked.”\textsuperscript{84} Furthermore, the “face-to-face” promotions they were planning were new:\textsuperscript{77,48} the “Newport Military Challenge” organized activities such as tug-of-wars, and milk chugging, one-armed pushup, and dance contests at fairs and picnics.\textsuperscript{95,50}  

The advantage of such programs over large event sponsorship, according to the brand manager, was that large events didn’t “involve” participants,\textsuperscript{51} while base fairs allowed Newport to “become PART of an already-established event” that was “ENDORSED by the military”\textsuperscript{10} (emphasis in original). Thus, “enlistees had a pre-disposition to become involved in Newport activities.”\textsuperscript{75} Brand exposure was good; at the Fort Bragg fair the “Newport camp” was at the “the only entrance/exit to the fair,” so that attendees “could not miss the Newport stage” and the “Alive with Pleasure” banners “strung in all the trees in the immediate area.”\textsuperscript{78}  

Company personnel distributed cigarettes at these events (100,000 sample packs at 5 bases in 1983)\textsuperscript{53} as well as premiums. A beach fair at the San Diego Naval Training Center resulted in “young Marines everywhere wearing ‘Alive with Pleasure’ Newport T-shirts and baseball caps.”\textsuperscript{74} Another Newport program parked a van on base—frequently in front of the base store—to distribute free cigarettes or coupons.\textsuperscript{55-57} In 1985, DOD apparently forbade sampling (i.e., giving out free cigarettes) on military bases;\textsuperscript{49} after this time, tobacco companies handed out coupons.  

\textit{Merchandising Policy Implementation}\textsuperscript{12}  
Response to the 1986 Directive 1010.10, disallowing most tobacco sponsorship,\textsuperscript{23} was mixed. The Director of Commissary Operations for the Army and the Air Force Commissary Commander issued directives restricting promotional activity in stores.\textsuperscript{58-60} A legal memo to R. J. Reynolds (RJR) noted that the commissary directors had formulated these regulations voluntarily, to avoid stricter regulation from the DOD;\textsuperscript{51} the Army Commissary Director asserted that the regulations would “ensure that, in the future, we will be able to sell cigarettes.”\textsuperscript{78} However, tobacco companies were concerned that Directive 1010.10—particularly its restrictions on smoking—was causing a decline in sales;\textsuperscript{52-64} because sales had been declining before the directive was issued and restrictions were introduced gradually, the evidence was inconclusive.\textsuperscript{65,66}  

\textit{Promotional Events, 1988–2000}\textsuperscript{10}  

\textit{Marlboro Music Military Tour}\textsuperscript{10}  
The sponsorship restrictions were eased in February 1988. Although soliciting sponsorship from tobacco companies was still prohibited, it could be accepted if offered, and if “the company sponsors similar events in civilian communities.”\textsuperscript{67} PM became aware of this change in July,\textsuperscript{68,69} and sponsored a series of concerts at bases in Germany.\textsuperscript{70} In October 1988, Marlboro supplied country music bands for grand reopening celebrations at seven Air Force commissaries. In 1989 Philip Morris began the Marlboro Music Military (MMM) tour, which presented 151 concerts through 1997. The MMM tour was designed to target young adult men,\textsuperscript{71} as well as to generate “positive publicity to counteract the anti-smoking message”\textsuperscript{72} promulgated by the military.  
The events had particular value, PM thought, because of the target audience’s situation; MMM events were often “the only professional concert entertainment in military communities.”\textsuperscript{73} In addition, the sponsorship money, concession profits\textsuperscript{74} (and ticket receipts, if any) allowed MWR to “fund . . . their year long activities,”\textsuperscript{75} thus earning gratitude from MWR and command personnel. For example, a 4-day Marlboro-sponsored Independence Day event on a Navy base in Spain included concerts, a golf tournament, fireworks, product sampling, and a “Marlboro Country Store” that sold over 10,000 branded items.\textsuperscript{76} Marlboro had “enthusiastic support and goodwill on the base at every command level.”\textsuperscript{77} A PM employee reported that, “On the last evening of activities several thousand people were standing with tears in their eyes singing ‘Proud to be an [sic] American.’ They couldn’t thank Marlboro enough.”\textsuperscript{78} Overall, PM concluded that MMM gave them “a great return on our investment.”\textsuperscript{76}  
Like KSN concerts, MMM events were promoted on bases for weeks.\textsuperscript{77-79} From at least 1984, advertising material was required to have a disclaimer of military or government endorsement (see Figure 1).\textsuperscript{10,80} which appeared in type approximately half the size of the mandated government health warning. The disclaimer was made weaker by the mention of the military location and ticket sales conducted by the base MWR office. In at least one case, PM was advised that the Army insisted that the “base name must preceed [sic] Marlboro Music,” so posters read, “Fort Polk Welcomes Marlboro Music.”\textsuperscript{80}  
When queried by a reporter about the conflict between the sponsored concerts and DOD policy, PM replied that “the concerts offer no free give away items, there is no promotion of the product other than the sign for the concert with the name Marlboro on it, and there is no ‘pushing’ of the product.”\textsuperscript{81} It is possible that this was true at the concert in question; however, planning documents for another concert that same year specified: “Marlboro Music flags placed on main road leading to the festival entrance; Marlboro pennants to be placed throughout venue . . . ; light boxes with Marlboro music logo placed in strategic locations; banners . . . to enhance overall Marlboro visibility; van/truck participation . . . for on-site and bar night coverage; two . . . tents, six kiosks, and four pick-up trucks for on-site name generation and pack sale activities; . . . T-shirts, caps, lighters, fanny packs, cassette holders, stadium seats, [and] additional incentives.”\textsuperscript{82}
Tobacco Promotion to Military Personnel

Other PM Activities

In 1990 and 1994 Marlboro Grand Prix auto races were heavily promoted at military bases in California, Arizona, Oregon, Ohio, Virginia, Colorado, and South Carolina. In 1994 these promotions included agreements with Camp Pendleton and MCAS El Toro for Marlboro bar nights, Marlboro banners throughout the bases, and product sales at the base stores. Marlboro paid each base $1,000, and donated 2,000 Grand Prix time trial tickets, 60 tickets to the race, and branded premium items.

Like Newport, Marlboro used branded vans to distribute samples or coupons. This program lasted through the late 1990s; however, no details as to number or location of events could be found. In 1994 and 1995, the Marlboro van was involved in over 36,000 events; it is unknown how many of these were directed toward military audiences.

Exchange Initiative Program

RJR’s “Exchange Initiative Program” (EIP) held events at locations on base, such as noncommissioned officer and enlisted clubs, and at bars and nightclubs near bases that catered to young military personnel. We identified nearly 200 events held on base during the EIP’s 2 years, 1990–1991, and 124 off base. On-base EIP events included concerts, air shows, bowling nights, Superbowl parties, golf tournaments, Halloween parties, and beach picnics, among others.

Military disclaimer reads: “This flyer does not express or imply an endorsement of the sponsor or its products or services by the U.S. Navy or any other part of the Federal Government.”

FIGURE 1. Event promotion materials with military disclaimer.
Many events featured the “Smooth Character,” (a.k.a. Joe Camel), accompanied by women called “Joe’s Squad.” Joe’s Squad gave smokers “the opportunity to converse and partake in entertaining activities with these women; and create exciting atmosphere and visibility,” while promoting Camel. The Squad conducted games at bar nights, signed autographs, and had their pictures taken “with key VIP’s and military personnel.” An RJR-created musical group called “Smooth Moves,” consisting of “four beautiful and talented singers plus a Rock and Roll MC,” also performed at these venues.

Military Cooperation and Resistance

MWR Personnel

The Morale, Welfare, and Recreation officers who arranged the events were, according to PM, frequently grateful and “enthusiastic partners . . . responsive to our every request.” MWR directors provided contacts with “athletic directors and on-base club managers,” and assisted in “obtaining [commanding officer] approval.” Contracts for large scale events such as concerts specified that the MWR office would supply considerable logistic support (see Table IV).

MWR units frequently went beyond the terms of their contract, acting energetically on behalf of the companies. B&W reported that MWR offices eagerly promoted KSN concerts, initiating activities such as handing out fliers, putting announcements on the base radio station and in the base newspaper, creating signs for on-base high-traffic locations, “announcing the show via sound trucks routed through housing areas[, and] busing basic trainees to the shows.”

| TABLE IV. Typical Contractual Responsibilities of Military Organization in Exchange for Major Event Sponsorship |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Acknowledgment of the legal name of concerts as Marlboro Music. |
| 2. Agreement not to solicit cosponsors. |
| 3. Security at gates and entrances. |
| 4. Adequate electricity and electrician . . . |
| 5. Stagehands and loaders, approximately 25 people for 4 or 5 days total . . . |
| 6. Forklifts and work lights . . . |
| 7. On-site backstage catering for all working military personnel . . . |
| 8. Tents for catering area. |
| 9. Portable trailers for use as production office and dressing rooms. Philip Morris will pay for the cost of the production trailer. |
| 10. Telephone service for the production office . . . Philip Morris will pay for installation of phone lines and long distance charges . . . |
| 11. Chairs or bleachers to VIP viewing area. |
| 12. Port-O-San toilets . . . |
| 13. First aid service availability from set-up through tear-down. |
| 14. Cleanup services. |
| 15. Public announcement to advertise concerts prior to day of show. |
| 16. Providing access . . . to local media to attend the concert, interview military personnel, and conduct interviews on base with talent. |
| 17. Proper credentials . . . for all staff, crew, and talent . . . |
| 18. Ticket takers and ushers, if tickets are sold. |
| 19. Printing of tickets and box offices facilities, if admission is charged. |
| 20. Approximately 30 sheets of plywood, to be used and returned after event. |
| 21. Access to shower facilities or base gymnasium. |
| 22. Appropriate personnel on base to assist in advertising and publicity of concerts. |
| 23. General logistics support to assist in traffic control. |
| 24. Parking areas . . . |
| 25. Topographical maps of concert area . . . |
| 26. Overnight security every night while Philip Morris concert equipment is on premises. |

In 1991 the MWR representative described Pearl Harbor Navy Exchange activities to “move product” for RJR at the Top Gun Hydrofest. These included special placement of Winston in the stores, a “massive promotion campaign offering” $3 cartons of Winston, selling Winston T-shirts and caps, displaying the Winston Eagle hydroplane at the Aloha Family Festival, and placing the “Winston name and logo . . . on the only electronic display sign in Hawaii . . . at the key intersection on the Naval installation,” which showed it “a minimum of 100 times per day for a 30-day period.”

This MWR representative was equally enthusiastic about the “Smokin’ Joe” (Camel) Hydroplane in 1995. His goal was “to make the pit area look and feel like a Smokin’ Joe’s pit with signs, banners, flags, and anything else.” He planned to create a 16 × 16 foot mural and requested “costumed characters . . . flags or pennants . . . The bigger the better.” He also wanted “Smokin’ Joe’s pens, key chains etc.,” to give to the guests at the Kick Off Breakfast at the Hawaii governor’s home, and to use as prizes at the associated golf tournament.

The typical sponsorship contract between the MWR office and the tobacco company specified MWR’s objective as promoting a “healthy lifestyle . . . for soldiers and their families.” The contradiction between promoting tobacco and promoting healthy lifestyles was not acknowledged.

Military Store Personnel

Sponsorship was used to improve relationships with commissary and exchange managers. Tobacco companies and brands competed for limited shelf space at military stores; good relationships could increase orders. For instance, PM believed...
that MMM had created “a number of close working relationships with” military store managers\textsuperscript{16} and that “as a result, all brands now have merchandising participation and shelf space which they would not normally have.”\textsuperscript{105}

**Command Personnel**

All events had to be approved by base commanders.\textsuperscript{106,107} In addition, high-ranking military personnel frequently attended\textsuperscript{98,108,109} or participated in tobacco-sponsored events.\textsuperscript{110} For instance, Marlboro-sponsored golf and bowling tournaments at Guantanamo Bay in 1991 featured a raffle of a “Marlboro golf bag and a bowling ball and bag . . . with the proceeds going to the base Navy Relief Fund,” a favorite charity of the base commander.\textsuperscript{111}

PM noted that the Marlboro concerts helped the company “develop a close working relationship with the base commander . . . the most important contact we can make.”\textsuperscript{76} The commander could get “compliance from all parties.”\textsuperscript{76} The base commander could also solve problems. At Fort Bliss in 1995 there was discontent over the lack of acts on the Marlboro concert bill that appealed to African-American personnel. A PM report noted that the “base commandant . . . did an excellent job of handling the situation and from that day forward, was present at every interview . . . . The question . . . disappeared.”\textsuperscript{98}

**Resistance**

Some commanders attempted to restrict tobacco company activity. In the first year of KSN concerts, Fort Sill required B&W to use coupons rather than samples.\textsuperscript{112} When Barksdale AFB objected to sampling, the Kool brand manager said the concert would be held elsewhere.\textsuperscript{113} Evidently, this threat worked, as there were no restrictions at Barksdale; in addition, a later report mentioned that Fort Sill personnel “advised that approval for sampling could now be obtained.”\textsuperscript{75} Lorillard also ran into resistance to its van program.\textsuperscript{114,115} One Lorillard employee reported that all military bases in the Washington, DC area, except Fort McNair, had rejected sampling, and Fort McNair withdrew approval after base medical personnel objected.\textsuperscript{116}

In 1986, Fort Benning demanded that KSN comply with regulations forbidding tobacco product advertisement.\textsuperscript{117} In response, B&W cancelled the concert.\textsuperscript{118} No other bases made this demand. In May 1988—2 months after the sponsorship rules were eased—the commander of the Navy base in Guantanamo Bay reaffirmed that events could only be sponsored by tobacco or alcohol companies if the product name was not associated with the event.\textsuperscript{119}

In 1991, a PM sales manager reported that the Air Force MWR director said he would not accept tobacco sponsorships, “despite expected funding problems.”\textsuperscript{120} This policy was apparently rescinded, as MMM concerts were held on Air Force bases in 1992 and 1993. In 1996 a Navy policy prohibited tobacco brand sponsorship.\textsuperscript{121} However, the primary reason event sponsorship appears to have lessened dramatically in 1997, and halted by 2000, was the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA), which specified that tobacco companies could only sponsor one event per year.\textsuperscript{24} Military regulations required that events also be offered to civilians, thus the one event could not be military.

**DISCUSSION**

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s tobacco companies supplied military bases around the world with branded entertainment, targeting personnel—and their families and dependents—with intensive cigarette marketing. The events described here are only part of this picture, both because the documentary evidence is incomplete and because other promotions (e.g., advertising in military periodicals and coupon offers in military stores\textsuperscript{2}) were also used. Furthermore, military officials volunteered extra services, suggested improvements, and expressed gratitude on behalf of the troops. Rarely, tobacco companies encountered resistance, despite regulations intended to limit their activities.

The types of promotion described in this study may be particularly salient in the military environment. Military personnel may be isolated from other entertainment, making events particularly meaningful.\textsuperscript{15} Event marketing is hypothesized to be particularly attractive to audiences predisposed to belonging to the “social community” or “neo-tribe” associated with the event; a concert on base, targeted to military personnel, exemplifies this aspect.\textsuperscript{122} Such events may build on military identity by emotionally attaching it to smoking and to the brand. The process by which individuals identify with advertised products may be enhanced by brand association with both the event and the military, in a three-way “co-branding.”\textsuperscript{123}

Other studies have described the tobacco industry’s heavy focus on the inner city, using billboards, point of sale advertising, and van programs to create an environment saturated with tobacco promotion.\textsuperscript{57,124,125} Some have hypothesized that environments containing cues to smoke may increase uptake and inhibit cessation.\textsuperscript{126} This study suggests that for nearly 2 decades, military bases were such an environment, likely contributing to high rates of smoking among military personnel.

A military culture supportive of tobacco use has a long history; from the beginning of the 20th century to today, that culture has been shaped and sustained by the tobacco industry. The military was not a passive bystander, but actively helped create marketing that may still reverberate in the idea that smoking and tobacco use are part of military service.\textsuperscript{1} The support of MWR programs through tobacco sales further embeds support for tobacco use in military culture.

Although tobacco-brand event sponsorship is no longer occurring on military bases, it illustrates several issues for military tobacco control. First, vigilance may be required to ensure that policies are not revoked or undermined. Directive 1010.10 was released with much fanfare; its promotion restrictions were eased so quietly that even Philip Morris was not aware of it for some months. Furthermore, the new policy announcement purported only to reinterpret a directive
about “Operational Policies for MWR Activities,” and made no reference to its effect on Directive 1010.10. Thus, even individuals alert to changes in health policy could have missed it.

Second, tobacco control policies must be framed so that they are supported by all personnel. It appears that many who were responsible for MWR programs did not perceive tobacco promotion to conflict with their mission of providing recreational activities. Similarly, military store personnel were interested in maintaining good business relationships with tobacco companies, not in tobacco control. Conflicting priorities led to a lack of support for the policy. Because tobacco use and sales are embedded in multiple military systems, policy must be defined as pertinent to everyone.

Finally, it should be noted that event sponsorship ceased only because of the MSA, not because of military policy change. The military should promulgate its own policies, both as a defense against external politics (e.g., the MSA benefited the military, but the military had no input into its negotiation) and to invite a sense of ownership by military personnel and thus contribute to an enhanced tobacco control climate.

Although some current military policies support prevention and cessation, others encourage tobacco use; for example, tobacco sales on base1 and the custom of “smoke breaks.”127 Such mixed messages are unlikely to be powerful enough to achieve desired reductions in tobacco use prevalence in the military. The elimination of a culture of military tobacco will require as much effort as its creation did. Given the now-established negative impact of tobacco use on military personnel even in the short term, and considering its previous role in creating a military culture that encouraged smoking, the DOD now has an obligation to take aggressive measures to make tobacco use unacceptable for military personnel.
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