PROLOGUE

It was 1970, and I was sixteen and a junior at Southwest High School in Kansas City. All the students were called into the auditorium to hear a guy from the tobacco industry tell us how bad it was for us to smoke. I don't remember much about the man, except that he was young and groovily dressed, with a striped shirt and white shoes. But his message was clear: smoking is not for children. "An adult choice" is what sticks in my mind. Smoking was like driving or drinking or having sex—things we weren't even supposed to be thinking about. We were supposed to wait.

I think of that guy whenever I hear people fret over "youth smoking," and I marvel at how Big Tobacco manages to keep a step or two ahead of everyone else. Mr. White Shoes's message was delicious advertising, merging the best of reverse psychology with the time-honored trick of tempting by forbidding fruit. Marketers know that no one smokes to look younger and that kids want what they cannot have, especially if it's "for adults"—which is also why school programs urging kids not to smoke tend to fail. Teenagers don't like to be infantilized or patronized, a fact the companies have long understood far better than their critics.

The tobacco makers are notorious masters of deception; they know how to manufacture ignorance and to rewrite history. They know the power of images and how to twist these to violate common sense and pulmonary civility. They also know how to engineer desire, and, of course, they'd like us to believe they don't want youngsters to smoke. Health advocates have a good rule of thumb: ask cigarette makers what should be done (say, to curb youth smoking), and whatever they say, do the opposite.

Time, though, has been surprisingly good to Big T. Cigarettes remain the world's single largest preventable cause of death—dwarfing all others—and most of that

mortality lies in the future. Tobacco killed only about a hundred million people in the twentieth century, compared with the billion we can anticipate in the twenty-first—if things continue as they have in the past. Tobacco now kills about six million people every year, more than AIDS, malaria, and traffic accidents combined. Heart disease claims the largest number, but close behind are emphysema and lung cancer, followed by premature birth, gangrene, and cancers of the human bladder, pancreas, and cervix. Tobacco-induced fires kill a few tens of thousands—paltry when compared to the cardiopulmonary toll but still a lot compared with mortality from, say, plane crashes or terrorist attacks. Cigarette death in the United States alone is like two jumbo jets crashing *every day;* the global toll would be an entire fleet. Half of all lifelong smokers will die from their habit, and every cigarette takes seven minutes off a smoker's life.

But what do these numbers really mean? How much worse is it that tobacco kills six million per year rather than, say, six thousand?

"One death is a tragedy, a million is a statistic." Those are words attributed to Stalin, but they might as well be from the sellers of *Nicotiana.* Statistics certainly has its detractors but none with deeper pockets than the cigaretteers. The industry's archives, forced open by litigation, are full of jokes about how smoking is "the major cause of statistics" or how "sleep is to be avoided since most heart attacks occur then." More serious are charges that nico-nazis and tobacco fascists want to jackboot us into a world where no one has any fun. Tobacco prevention is made to look like the priggish obsession of nanny-state naysayers, a backwater of the meddling, have-no-fun puritanical crowd. Smoking in the 1980s—when the hazards of secondhand smoke were finally nailed down—was actually declared a form of free speech, complete with threats of smokers becoming second-class citizens or stigmatized minorities. Brown & Williamson even whined about cigarettes being "brought to trial by lynch law."

Part of the industry's success must be traced to its mastery of the illustrated word and airwaves. "Be the media" was the plan in 1990, when Philip Morris pondered acquiring an entire news service, like Knight-Ridder or United Press International, to carry its message. Another goal, though, has been a kind of *invisibility*: to turn the tobacco story into "old news," basically dog-bites-man. Tobacco is imagined as a solved problem, a vanishing anachronism from our distant past. A great deal of effort has gone into having such nonsense fill our newspapers and magazines, while most of the industry's manufacturing remains invisible. *Incognito ergo sum.* The Herculean machines that drive today's cigarette mega-factories are kept far from public view, rendering the bowels (and brains) of the enterprise harder to access than even the Pentagon or the CIA.

The effect is a kind of mass blindness. Most people know that the industry's behavior has been less than honorable, but how many know that cigarette smoke contains arsenic, cyanide, and radioactive isotopes? How many know that 90 percent

of the world's licorice ends up in tobacco, or that cigarettes are freebased with ammonia to turn them into a kind of crack nicotine? How many know that only about two-thirds of what goes into a cigarette is actually tobacco, with much of the rest being a witches' brew of added sugars, burn accelerants, freebasing agents, bronchial dilators, and moisteners like glycerine or diethylene glycol, the antifreeze contaminating all those deadly Chinese tubes of toothpaste? How many know about the *filth* sometimes found in cigarettes—dirt and mold, of course, but also worms, wire, and insect excrement?

There's an old saying in the world of smoke: a cigarette is no more tobacco than the *New York Times* is a pine tree. The fact is that America's famous blends are more juiced up and candified—and filthied up with nitrosamine stank—than what much of the rest of the world smokes. But the rest of the world is catching up. With very few exceptions, tobacco almost everywhere is essentially unregulated. French cigarettes must contain at least 85 percent tobacco, and Germans don't allow nicotine to be freebased with ammonia, but most of the rest is the Wild West. Dog food has been more tightly regulated; the stockyards in Upton Sinclair's *Jungle* were clean by comparison. Try to imagine the inside of a cigarette factory, and if you can't, think about why that might be so.

Almost as invisible is the political influence wielded by the tobacco lobby. Readers may be surprised to learn that President Lyndon Johnson refused to take on Big Tobacco, fearing his party's loss of the presidency. Or that tobacco was a sizable part of the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe. I also don't think it's widely known that farmers in the United States are still paid *not* to grow tobacco or that tobacco industry moles helped draft the 1964 Surgeon General's report. Less surprising perhaps, but significant nonetheless, is the fact that global warming denialists cut their teeth on tobacco tactics, fighting science with science, creating doubt, fostering ignorance. The industry looks out onto the world as if through a one-way mirror; we see only the final product and the marketeer's bluster, but the industry itself—its behemoth factories and closely guarded formulas—remains cloaked, clandestine, opaque.

Then there is the cigarette itself, in the mind-boggling gargantuan aggregate. Six trillion—that's 6,000,000,000,000—are smoked every year, enough to make a continuous chain from the earth to the sun and back, with enough left over for a couple of round trips to Mars (when the planet is in a near-earth orbit). Imagined as one long rod, that would be a cigarette more than 300 million miles long. Cigarettes are being extruded—and therefore smoked—at a breathtaking rate of over 300 million miles per year, which is about thirty-four thousand miles per hour, twenty-four hours a day. Picture a never-ending shaft of cigarettes shooting out at fifty times the speed of sound, faster even than the rate at which satellites orbit the earth.

Cigarette design doesn't get much attention, but we're talking about one of the most carefully (and craftily) designed objects on the planet—and a bigger cause of global death than bullets. Billions of dollars have been poured into the black arts

of cigarette science: "several tens of billions of dollars" in the United States alone by one industry estimate. Legions of chemists have crafted a kind of slow-motion killing machine, with the coup de grâce administered by the smoker him- or, increasingly, herself.

Self-administration is one of the hallmarks of modern torture—think of the wired Christ of Abu Ghraib—but it is also the sine qua non of modern addiction. A great deal of talent has gone into making the cigarette an instrument of chemical dependence: by artfully crafting its physical character and chemistry, industry scientists have managed to create an optimally addictive drug delivery device, one that virtually sells itself. "It costs a penny to make. Sell it for a dollar. It's addictive"—those are the words of the billionaire investment guru (and onetime Reynolds board member) Warren Buffett. Advertising bans make it easier for brand leaders to maintain their margins, and the same advantage can accrue from timid governmental regulation—which is one reason Philip Morris was so eager to obtain the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA's) blessing. The tobacco giant pushed for the passage of the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act, signed into law by President Barack Obama in June of 2009. After a century of resisting, the Marlboro men figured they could solidify their market dominance by agreeing to submit to (limited) federal oversight.

Cigarettes will now be regulated in the United States, though it remains to be seen with how much urgency and how much courage. The industry has long been expert in turning lemons into lemonade, and regulation may prove yet another victory for the cigarette makers, depending on whether certain key steps are taken. The FDA's new powers are limited—it cannot ban cigarettes, for example, or reduce their nicotine content to zero—but even within this narrow frame there is much that could be done. More than anything else, the newly empowered FDA should *reduce the maximum allowable nicotine content of cigarettes* and *require that no cigarette produce smoke with a pH lower than 8.* Lowering the nicotine content (not delivery!) of cigarettes will eliminate their addictive grip, and raising cigarette smoke pH to make it uninhalable will prevent most of the lung cancers caused by smoking. These two steps alone would probably do more to improve human health than any other single policy in the history of human civilization. What is astonishing is that simple steps such as these have never been taken seriously.

· · ·

This is a book about the history of cigarette design, cigarette rhetoric, and cigarette science. My goal is to treat the cigarette as part of the ordinary history of technology—and a deeply political (and fraudulent) artifact. Our tour will be through secret archives, clandestine operations, and carefully lawyered marketing and chemical manipulations. It is also, though, a story of how smoking became not just sexy and "adult" (meaning "for kids") but also routine and *banal*. The banalization of

smoking is one of the oddest aspects of modern history. How did we come into this world, where millions perish from smoking and most of those in power turn a blind eye? How did tobacco manage to capture the love of governments and the high rhetorical ground of liberty, leaving the lesser virtues of longevity to its critics? And what can we do to strengthen movements now afoot to prevent tobacco death?

Think again about the numbers: in the United States alone, 400,000 babies are born every year to mothers who smoke during pregnancy. Smoking is estimated to cause more than 20,000 spontaneous abortions—and perhaps as many as seven times that. Seven hundred Americans are killed every year by cigarette fires, and 150 million Chinese alive today will die from cigarette smoking. Tens of thousands of acres of tropical forest are destroyed every year to grow the leaves required to forge the nicotine bond.

If it is true that large numbers numb, that is only because we have allowed ourselves to think like Stalin. Likewise, if we believe that smoking really is a kind of "freedom," this is partly because the cigaretteers have spent billions to make us think this way. The propaganda machine is powerful and operates on so many levels—science, law, government, sports, entertainment—that it is hard to think outside the pack. Governments are entranced, hooked by the bounty of taxes brought in by selling cigarettes. (No single commodity brings in higher revenues.) The mainstream media are often inattentive, partly because the tobacco story is spun as "old news." So we are brainwashed, nicotinized, confused into equating fumery with freedom.

Healthy people tend to forget how crucial health is for other kinds of freedom. The tobacco industry wants us to think about smoking as an inalienable right of all free people, but how free is the amputee suffering from Buerger's disease, the cigarette-induced circulatory disorder expressed as gangrene of the feet? How free was my beloved grandmother, the once-lively South Texas flapper, rendered wheezing and immobile on her deathbed from the emphysema scarring her lungs? Health so deprived is surely a kind of violation, a slow robbery of the spirit to which the strong and healthy will never bear first-person witness. The industry sells this slow asphyxiation—and the unwary buy into it.

The smoke folk want us to believe that smoking is a "free choice," and it is true that no one puts a gun to your head. Sellers cannot sell without buyers. But cigarettes are addictive, and most people find it very hard to quit, often excruciatingly so. Nicotine rewires the brain, creating a pharmacologic dependency as strong as that from heroin or opium. The result for most users is a profound inability to quit—which is why some victims end up smoking through holes punched in their throats. Surveys show that most smokers *want* to quit and regret having ever started: tobacco is *not a recreational drug,* which makes it different from alcohol or even marijuana in this respect. Very few people who drink are addicted—only about 3 percent, compared with the 80 to 90 percent of smokers of cigarettes. Few people who have a beer or a glass of wine hate this part of their lives; they enjoy drinking. Cig-

arettes are different. Smokers usually dislike their habit and wish they could escape it. People who actually like smoking are so rare that the industry calls them "enjoyers." That is also why the comparison to 1920s-style Prohibition falls flat. Prohibition failed because most people who drink actually like it and can do so responsibly, whereas virtually all tobacco use is abuse. There is no "safe" smoking, and few users escape addiction.

Which brings us to two additional problems with the freedom argument. The first stems from the fact that smokers typically begin when they are thirteen or fourteen. Indeed it is rare for anyone to start smoking after their teen years: people become smokers as children, when they cannot make "an adult choice." Whatever choice they do make is then compromised by the grip of addiction. The freedom defense is further weakened by the fact that nonsmokers often suffer exposure to "second-" and even "thirdhand" smoke (*fumée passif* and *ultra passif* are the marvelous French expressions). An estimated fifty thousand Americans die from exposure to secondhand smoke every year, which is more even than from auto accidents. The global toll is unknown, but it must be upwards of half a million souls.

The hopeful fact is that we may well have already passed the point of "peak tobacco." Global consumption seems to have peaked at about six trillion cigarettes per year around the turn of the new millennium and may well have fallen somewhat since. And may keep on falling, once governments recognize the toll not just to human life but also to economic prosperity and environmental well-being. Smoking is a significant cause of world poverty and a nontrivial cause of global climate change (mainly from fires, deforestation for planting and curing, and heavy use of petrochemicals in growing and manufacturing). When people come to realize and act on this, the slide away from smoking will accelerate. What remains of the habit will have a ritual or furtive character as against the mass mindless fumery of today.

This hopeful glimmer of a downturn has lots of different causes, including the smoke-free legislation now spreading throughout the world. Bans on indoor and even outdoor smoking will likely render smoking an increasingly marginal behavior, bordering on the antisocial. Calls for additional restrictions are also prominent in the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, the world's first public health treaty, adopted by the World Health Assembly in May 2003. As of 2011 some 174 nations had ratified this treaty, which commits member nations to reducing tobacco use via taxation, graphic warnings, bans on advertising, and policies to establish smoke-free public places. Article 5.3 requires that manufacturers be excluded from all decision-making aspects of tobacco control, and progress is being made to limit cross-border smuggling.

The Framework Convention does not as yet have strong means of enforcement, which helps explain why we have not yet seen a mass flight from fumery. More effective in the long run may be local acts of organized resistance, as citizens recog-

nize their right to breathe clean air. Many cities, states, and entire nations are now going smoke-free, with outdoor air also coming under scrutiny. More than a hundred miles of California beaches are now smoke-free, and metropolitan centers such as New York are pondering smoke-free public parks. In some cities smoking has been banned in private apartments, to prevent smoke from traveling from one dwelling to another. These tend to be "ratchet laws"—they are rarely reversed—and we may soon start to see cascade effects whereby, once sufficiently marginalized, mass tobacco use could rapidly disintegrate. Few things are as consequential in the realm of public health: Do we all have a right to breathe clean air? Or do smokers have a more fundamental right to pollute?

Talk of "rights" may not be appropriate in many parts of the world, where preference may be given to talk of health, purity, or some other civic or moral virtue. The biggest political obstacle to change has been that governments still stuff their coffers from cigarette taxes. But even that is changing, as tobacco taxes account for diminishing fractions of total revenues. Governments are also starting to realize how much tobacco robs from public treasuries in the form of health care costs. Another hopeful change could come from a renewed appreciation of the value of the lives of our elderly. The fact that most people who die from smoking are older makes it easier to trivialize cigarette mortality: that is what old people do, they die, and young people may not appreciate the value of a life lived well to eighty or ninety over against a life lived sickly to sixty or seventy. Here we need a rethink, since it's not as if smoking strikes only the healthy elderly, who just suddenly drop dead. Smokers age prematurely—think wrinkles and sexual dysfunction—quite apart from cancer and cardiac arrest.

We also need to rethink the environmental costs of tobacco. Global warming may well become the final straw leading to smoke-free societies, once we realize how the manufacture of cigarettes contributes to global climate change. Cigarettes are a major resource hog and a significant cause of forest fires and deforestation.

Which leads me to a prediction: There will come a time, I am convinced, when people will no longer smoke tobacco, or at least not in the routine and obsessive manner of the present. Public smoking will come to be seen in the same way we now regard, say, the use of the spittoon or public urination. And as smoking is progressively denormalized, or even rendered anathema, global consumption will fall into the hundreds of billions of sticks per year and thence into the tens of billions—compared with the trillions of today. Readers of this book may some day even find it hard to believe that smoking was ever as widespread as it is and as deeply embedded in popular culture. The ubiquitous smoking in films, organized for over half a century by the industry, will become an amusing oddity. It is already strange to recall how recently smoking was allowed on buses, planes, and trains—and in elevators and doctors' offices—while kids made ashtrays in schools and scholars wel-

comed collaborations with the industry. Change will only come, though, when we properly honor our dead and realize that the world in which we live is not the world in which we have to live.

. . .

My goal, then, is to explore the cigarette as a cultural artifact, craftily designed, unloved by most smokers, and deadlier even than they need to be. As with other books I have written, my hope is to historicize the cigarette, making the familiar seem strange and the strange familiar. The presentation has four parts.

Part I traces the origins of the modern cigarette, including the deadly invention of flue-curing and the enabling roles of matches, mechanization, militarization, and mass marketing. Flue-curing, as we'll see, made cigarette smoke inhalable, matches made fire mobile, mechanization made cigarettes cheap, and mass marketing made them desirable. Also examined is the crucial role of wars in promoting (and sometimes curbing) tobacco use and how governments got hooked on cigarettes via the lure of taxes. Here also is traced the astonishing range of gimmicks used by the industry to sell cigarettes, from skywriting and comic books to fancy-sounding filters and richly funded sponsorship of sports, music, and the arts. And movie implants and medical endorsements and the curious case of candy cigarettes, characterized by one tobacco bigwig as "not too bad an advertisement" for youngsters learning the gestures of smoking. New media tricks also come into focus here ("Tobacco 2.0"), along with cultural exotica such as smoking porn.

Part II treats how tobacco cancer hazards were discovered, including the oft-neglected role of European scholars. Highlighted here are studies conducted during the Nazi era, including those showing Germans were the first to discover and nail down the lung cancer link. Here also, though, manufacturers in the Third Reich were powerful enough to resist the demands of public health authorities. We also encounter previously unknown studies conducted in secret by tobacco companies in the United States that give an even bigger lie to their early claims of innocence. We then look at what it means to say a "consensus" is established that cigarettes are killing large numbers of people, especially when powerful political forces have been trying to create and sustain ignorance.

Part III explores how tobacco tycoons in the United States organized a global conspiracy to hide the hazards of smoking. The conspiracy begins with a series of meetings at the Plaza Hotel in Manhattan in December of 1953 and is perfected through the establishment of bodies such as the Tobacco Industry Research Committee, which provided the industry with a "stable" of expertise and a facade through which they could call for endlessly more research. We then turn to some of the methods used by the industry to maintain ignorance—including techniques deliberately designed to keep the truth from its own labor force. Here we also open up the guts of the cigarette itself, exploring the many different ways cigarettes are supposed to

have been made safer, from "toasting," "king sizing," and mentholation to filters, low tars, and lights—all of which are either frauds or follies. The point here is that duplicity has been built into the cigarette itself: filters don't really filter, for example, and the holes punched into the mouth ends of nearly all modern cigarettes (aka "ventilation") give falsely low tar and nicotine readings when measured on standardized smoking robots. We shall also see that "light" and "low tar" cigarettes turn out to be no less lethal than the regulars sold half a century ago; indeed on a gram-per-gram basis they are significantly *more* deadly. For all their talk of "improvements," cigarette manufacturers have really just managed to squeeze more death and disease from any given gram of tobacco—and ever more money. The companies make about a penny from each cigarette sold, and since one tobacco death results from every million smoked, this means that a human life is worth about $10,000 to your average cigarette maker. The companies talk a lot about "choice," and theirs is clearly that they'd rather make $10,000 in profits than save the life of one of their customers.

Part IV proposes certain paths of redemption. I look at the history of filth in cigarettes, from pesticides and flavorants to worm feces and insect parts. Radioactive polonium is a focus, along with arsenic and cyanide. I argue that the modern cigarette is deeply defective and should not be sold or manufactured; I also argue, though, that people should be free to grow and smoke whatever they like, so long as this is for personal use and does not contaminate others. Tobacco is not a vice or a sign of weak moral fiber; it is just too dangerous to be made for sale. But if people want to grow and cure their own for personal use, the state should have no say in this. I also argue that even short of a ban there are simple steps that can be taken by regulatory agencies to reduce the dangers of addiction, cancer, and heart disease.

On a methodologic note: There is a vast historiography of tobacco, most of which sings the praises of the golden leaf. Fortunately there is also a growing body of more critical work, including Richard Kluger's *Ashes to Ashes* (on Philip Morris) and Allan Brandt's *Cigarette Century*. The present text is different in taking more of a global view (even if America remains the centerpiece) but also by virtue of being almost entirely based on the industry's formerly secret archives, now (and only recently) available online in full-text searchable form. In this sense the book represents a new kind of historiography: history based on optical character recognition, allowing a rapid "combing" of the archives for historical gems (and fleas). Searching by optical character recognition works like a powerful magnet, allowing anyone with an Internet connection to pull out rhetorical needles from large and formidable document haystacks. (Try it—you need only go to http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu, and enter whatever search term you might fancy.) The Internet posting of documents in this form presents us with research opportunities that are largely unprobed. The advantage is largely one of speed, but it also means that entirely new kinds of topics can now be investigated—the history of single words or turns of phrase, for ex-

ample. It is hard to say how this will transform historical writing, but we are likely to find new paths opening up that we have not even imagined.

In addition to novel source access methods, this book differs from previous works in its parting animus. Allan Brandt in his *Cigarette Century* writes that the tobacco industry "is here to stay." But we don't have to be so fatalistic. There is nothing timeless about cigarettes; they had a beginning and will have an end, as was true for lead paint and asbestos insulation. I believe that the manufacture and sale of cigarettes will eventually come to an end—and not just for health or even environmental reasons. Cigarettes will be snuffed out because smokers themselves don't like the fact they smoke. Most smokers come to abhor their addiction and will be happy to have help escaping from it.

So here are some key points, or "theses," that I would like the reader to come to appreciate in the course of reading this book:

1. Cigarettes are the *deadliest* artifacts in the history of human civilization. Most of these deaths lie in the future.
2. Cigarettes are *defective* in the legal sense, meaning designed in such a way that they end up killing far more people than they need to.
3. Cigarettes would kill far fewer people if manufacturers would simply raise the pH (alkalinity) of cigarette smoke back up to 8 or above, making the resulting smoke uninhalable.
4. Cigarettes would also kill fewer people if they were not *designed to create and sustain addiction.* Tobacco addiction could be largely eliminated if cigarettes were required by law to contain no more than one-tenth of one percent (by weight) of nicotine—meaning content in the actual rod.
5. Cigarettes are *environmentally unsustainable.* Cigarettes are a significant cause of resource depletion, fires, and global warming—not to mention poverty— and these will likely prove a factor in their prohibition.
6. Cigarettes are *not a recreational drug.* Most smokers dislike the fact that they smoke and regret having started. This means that many (if not most) smokers will welcome their disappearance.
7. Commercial cigarette manufacturing should be abolished, but people should be free to grow, cure, and smoke whatever kinds of substances they like, for personal or noncommercial use.
8. Globally the point of "peak cigarettes" is already passed—albeit only in recent years. That downhill slide will continue, until the cigarette exists only as a curiosity and an object of distant memory of a more foolish time.

A NOTE ON THE TITLE

I use the term *holocaust* with caution, primarily to draw attention to the magnitude of the tobacco catastrophe. Obviously there are significant differences between the murder of six million Jews at the hands of the Nazis and the sufferings of smokers. In both instances, though, we face a calamity of epic proportions, with too many willing to turn a blind eye, too many willing to let the horror unfold without intervention. Apathy rules.

I should also note that there is a long history of using this term with reference to cigarettes. Alan Blum in his 1985 *Cigarette Underworld* describes the tobacco toll as a holocaust, following a 1971 report by Britain's Royal College of Physicians denouncing "the present holocaust—a reasonable word to describe the annual death toll" from cigarettes. A *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* editorial from 1986 deplored the "tobaccoism holocaust," and Michael Rabinoff in his 2006 book, *Ending the Tobacco Holocaust,* highlights tobacco's unparalleled carnage while deploring complacency: "and yet we do nothing." Similar expressions can be found prior even to the Second World War, as when Max MacLevy in his 1916 *Tobacco Habit Easily Conquered* pointed to news reports of "fresh holocausts on the altar of the nicotine devil," referring to the many lives lost from fires caused by cigarettes (the Triangle Shirtwaist conflagration in New York City, just to name one example). The word *holocaust* means literally "total burning," with the added implication of catastrophe, malfeasance, and crimes against humanity. The death of one innocent is sometimes said to be the death of all humanity—and there is great truth in this—but *the* Holocaust also teaches us that ethics often has much to do with scale. And for sheer magnitude, it would be hard to exaggerate the misery caused by tobacco's energetic merchants of death. In polite society we tend to trade in euphemisms, but when the truth itself is outrageous, weak words can falsify the realities of needless, outrageous sufferings.