PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICS: IS THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY DAMAGING THE HEALTH OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS PROFESSION?

Khor Yoke Lim[1]
Adnan Hussein[2]

In most parts of the world, public relations (PR) is seeking recognition as a profession. The path to gaining professional status hinges on its adherence to professional ethical standards. This paper argues that it is inappropriate for public relations practitioners to represent the tobacco industry because it is against the PR ethics of upholding truth and public interest. The paper cites historical tobacco industry documents to reveal that the industry would not hesitate to use unethical means to maximise profits.

INTRODUCTION

The issue of ethics is critical to public relations as the industry strives for recognition as a profession (Pratt, 1993; Harrison, 2004). For an occupation to be recognised as a profession suggests a certain level of expertise and moral status. The label *profession* denotes that the occupation possesses a body of theoretical and practical knowledge acquired through some years of training as well as a commitment to uphold public interest. Welie (2004) argued that being granted professional status is similar to entering into a "social contract" between the profession and the public. As such, he defined a profession as "a collection of expert service providers who have jointly and publicly committed to always give priority to the existential needs and interests

---

[1] Khor Yoke Lim is an Associate Professor of the School of Communication, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang. *ylkhor@ usm.my*

[2] Adnan Hussein is an Associate Professor and Dean of the School of Communication, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang.

of the public they serve above their own interests and in turn are trusted by the public to do so" (Welie, 2004: 532). Clearly, to serve in public interest is of primary value to professions and those that seek to be recognised as being in a profession.

In an age of growing public engagement and activism, obeying the law and making profits for shareholders are the minimum requirements of an organisation. Nowadays, organisations are judged "more on their social policies than their delivery of products and services" (Daugherty, 2001). Business corporations are not only economic entities but also social institutions. As social institutions, corporations are expected to contribute to the well-being of society. Activities that tarnish a company's reputation can affect the organisation's bottom line. It is the role of public relations practitioners to help corporations to be socially responsible. According to Ryan (1986), most public relations practitioners are of the opinion that being socially responsible enhances an organisation's credibility and strengthens its profit-making potential. It is time that public relations practitioners move beyond the technical role of promoting whatever the employer wants and adopt a more strategic managerial role of engaging with the public and defining the social role of the company. This paper aims first, to discuss the need for ethical based decision making and second, to use ethical theories to analyse the public relations' involvement with the tobacco industry.

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Many cases of ethically questionable practices have been highlighted in the mass media over the past two decades. Of direct relevance to public relations is the accusation that a multinational PR agency, Hill and Knowlton, hired by an organisation called *Citizens for a Free Kuwait*, had acted unethically as it coached and wrote the testimony of witnesses and produced other so-called evidence to lobby for the support of the United States' decision to go to war (Grunig, 1993). With reference to the 2003 Edelman's fourth semi-annual survey, Tobin (2004) said that only 20% of the public believe that paid communicators are credible, public relations has still a long way to go in earning professional status particularly in the area of public trust. One of the ways to gain public support is to incorporate ethics in corporate decision making (Bivins, 1993; Pratt, 1993; Hunt & Tirpok, 1993). However, the extent to which

public relations practitioners are able to raise business standards is contingent upon the corporate culture and ethical leadership of public relations.

An approach by public relations associations all over the world to address the ethical behaviour of practitioners is through ethics codes. Generally, a public relations code of ethics comprises 12 to 20 "rules" or principles on how the practitioner should behave ethically, typically to uphold truth, fairness, the privacy rights of the client and responsibility to the public. All the various codes are based on the Code of Athens developed by the International Public Relations Association. The Institute of Public Relations Malaysia (IPRM) Code of Professional Conduct has 14 principles, the first of which advocates that "a member shall conduct his professional activities with respect for the public interest" (Syed Arabi Idid, 2005). Although the word "shall" used in the principles denotes unconditional practice, the codes are not legally binding. Hence, while it is generally easy to accept these as guidelines, the difficulty is ensuring that members apply these principles as part of professional behaviour. As emphasised by Walle (2003), "For public relations it is also critical, as the industry will only win the struggle to salvage its own reputation if can clearly demonstrate not only a commitment to ethics, but also some means to enforce ethical standards".

In this paper, the two dominant codes that will be discussed and applied to the tobacco industry have to do with truth and public interest. Truthfulness, as described by Christians, Rotzell and Fackler (1987), is the opposite of deception which is a deliberate intention to mislead. Half-truths, lying and withholding information are various forms of deception. Schick (1994) argued that withholding information is in violation of the code as it "manipulates people by limiting the information available to them as they make choices. This is an assault on one's personal autonomy". In addition, if the half-truth information is printed in the media (and given that the public expects truth and accuracy from the media), it is also guilty of corrupting the channels of communication.

The code of public interest is of special significance to the professional status of public relations. Public service as mentioned by Bivins (1993) "has become the keystone among professional values, those commonly

held beliefs that serve to cement individual practitioners into a single profession". Commenting on the UK Institute of Public Relations charter, Tobin (2004) emphasised that "our members are not working just for our own interests but for the interests of the greater good".

However, Walle (2003) in analysing the ethics code of the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA), the Canadian Public Relations Society (CPRS), the Public Relations Institute of Australia (PRIA), the Public Relations Institute of New Zealand (PRINZ) and the Public Relations Institute of South Africa (PRISA), found that the codes are not clear on the duties of public relations practitioners towards their public and society. As mentioned by Walle (2003), all the codes analysed showed a lack of clarity on their stand on public interest particularly where "behaviour conflicts with the social good". The codes did not spell out the meaning of public interest or how a member should act "in accord with public interest". The fact that most of the ethics codes are silent on the commitment of practitioners to public interest is indeed of concern as it is the public service orientation that determines the professional status of the industry. It is certainly in the best interest of a profession to spell out clearly how a member should conduct himself/herself, in this case, on serving public interest and advocating on behalf of the client.

It is well known that public relations practitioners view their role primarily as advocates for a particular organisation/client/cause (Cutlip, Center & Broom 1994; Newson, Turk & Kruckberg, 2000). Bivins (1993) questioned the argument that public interest will be served when a practitioner acts in the best interest of the client. Given that not everyone has equal access to resources, it is difficult to see how serving private interest will automatically serve public interest. It is further argued that the obligation of public service cannot be served through individual actions such as *pro bono* work. It is the obligation of the profession as a whole to ensure that public service is served. To this end, Bivins (ibid) recommended that public relations as a profession can serve public interest if it improves the quality of debate over issues important to the public.

Hence, whilst it is ethical to be partial to their employer/client, professionals are not permitted to act in an unethical manner on their behalf. Baker (2002: 201) argued that "the loyalty of the public relations

professional to the client does not sanction promoting the client's interest to the direct sacrifice of the well-being of other members of the public". As such, the practitioner is not obliged to serve client interest in ways that are disreputable. As Martinson (2004: 4) reiterated,

> "Public relations students need to recognise that the public relations field has a very negative reputation among large segments of the American public not so much because practitioners engage in persuasive communication efforts on behalf of clients/organisation in their role defined capacity. The problem, rather, is related to the public perception that too many persons who call themselves public relations professionals do not respect the truth and do not respect those to whom particular communication efforts are directed".

Ethical Approaches

Ethical-based decision making frameworks are generally based on two classical ethical theories: teleology and deontology. Teleology holds that an action is ethical if its benefits for society are greater than its alternatives. The emphasis here is on the consequences of the actions which should promote human well-being for the most number of people. In other words, "a decision that promotes the greatest amount of these values for the greatest number of people is the most reasonable decision from an ethical point of view". (Hartman & Desjardins, 2008: 68). The problem with this type of reasoning is that firstly, in practice it is very difficult to make ethical decisions by comparing the consequences of alternative actions. Secondly, in teleology ethics, the end justifies the means. The end, however, does not always justify the means as certain duties and responsibilities, such as justice, fairness and respect, need to be followed regardless of the consequences.

Principle-based decision making, or deontology, deals primarily with the reasons for an action. Deontologists hold that certain actions are inherently right or wrong, no matter what the consequences. A rule that Kant, the best-known deontologist, argued the fundamental ethical principle is to respect the dignity of each individual. To treat every human being with respect is a "categorical imperative" (Pratt, 1994), namely, an end in itself and not a means to an end. One of the criteria of

categorical imperatives is the tenet of "universalisability", that whatever is right (wrong) in one situation is right (wrong) in any similar situations. One cannot justify, for instance, not telling the truth, to lie, to mislead, to steal or to take another's life in any similar situation (Jaksa and Pritchard, 1994). The principle of universalism implies that the rule would apply to all. In considering lying, the question to ask is whether rational beings would like to be lied to. The second criterion of categorical imperative is that we should treat all humans as ends in themselves and not as means to our ends. We must act in a way that respects the dignity of all humanity.

The objective of this paper is not to debate the strengths and shortcomings in applying both these ethical approaches but to apply both the ethical approaches and to evaluate the ethics stance of public relations in serving the interest of the tobacco industry.

Acceptance of the Client: The Tobacco Company

The first step is to question the morally problematic relationship between the tobacco industry and public relations. On one hand, tobacco is a legal product and on the other, the product is lethal and addictive. Tobacco smoking and tobacco smoke cause more than 40 lethal diseases (International Agency for Research on Cancer, 2002). Scientific research has shown that one in two long-term smokers will die prematurely (WHO, 2003). By WHO estimates (1999), tobacco causes a worldwide net economic loss of US$13.6 million per year. For the tobacco company, the more cigarettes it sells, the better it is for its shareholders. However, for society as a whole, the widespread use of the product contributes to social problems and premature deaths. Deontologically, it is wrong to sell a product that kills. Therefore, it is questionable as whether the tobacco industry can be a good corporate citizen when the product it produces is harmful to society. It is also morally questionable as to whether public relations should be involved with an industry that sells lethal products and attempts to blur the inherent contradiction between the products it sells and the image as a socially responsible corporate citizen.

The Public Relations Strategies of the Tobacco Industry

It is not only the tobacco product that is against public interest; the strategies used by the tobacco industry also contradict the public relations ethics of truth and public interest. Deontologists focus on the actions of the doer. Whether an action is ethical or otherwise is determined by the extent to which it is based on a sense of duty.

Targeting Children and Women

Below are a series of statements compiled by Hammond and Rowell (2001), based on disclosures from the internal documents of tobacco companies which were released as part of a settlement agreement between the tobacco industry and a consortium of 48 USA attorneys general. These disclosures reveal the unethical behaviour of the tobacco industry, namely (1) that they try to conceal that tobacco is addictive and harmful and (2), they continue to exploit and target the most vulnerable groups of society, namely, the children, women and the poor undeveloping nations.

(1) On the effects of nicotine:

> "We have, then, as our first premise, that the primary motivation for smoking is to obtain the pharmacological effect of nicotine" (Philip Morris, 1969).

> "Let's face facts: Cigarette smoke is biologically active. Nicotine is a potent pharmacological agent. Every toxicologist, physiologist, medical doctor and most chemists know that. It's not a secret" (Philip Morris, 1982).

> "Nicotine is addictive. We are, then, in the business of selling nicotine-an addictive drug effective in the release of stress mechanisms" (Brown & Williamson, 1963).

However, publicly, the industry argues that nicotine is for taste and is not addictive for to do so would contradict their argument that smoking is an individual choice:

> "The claim that cigarette smoking causes physical dependence is simply an unproven attempt to find some way to differentiate smoking from other behaviours. The claims that smokers are 'addictive' defy common sense and contradict the fact that people quit smoking every day" (Tobacco Institute, 1988).

(2) Children and women are certainly attractive targets for the industry, to replace the continuous depletion of smokers who die from premature deaths. Some evidence from the internal documents includes the following:

> "This is a market with tremendous potential. The rate of population growth is 2.2 percent each year, and 40 percent of the population is under 18" (Philip Morris Turkey, 1997).

> "Burson-Marsteller agreed to do a search of literature and studies to try and find an expert on the changing lifestyles of Asian women to show that smoking is part of a larger picture" (Philip Morris, 1989).

> "Evidence is now available to indicate that the 14–18 year old group is an increasing segment of the smoking population. RJR-T must soon establish a successful new brand in this market if our position in the industry is to be maintained over the long term" (R.J.Reynolds, 1976).

> "If we can frame proactive legislation or other kinds of action on the Youth Access issue…. we will be protecting our industry for decades to come" (Philip Morris, 1995).

Although the tobacco industry documents show that the tobacco industry targets youths in marketing their products, publicly they have tried to present the view that they are concerned about children and youth smoking. All the major cigarette manufacturers, such as BAT, Philip Morris and Japan Tobacco International, have been involved in implementing Youth Smoking Prevention programmes (Farrell et al., 2002). The aim of these initiatives is, however, questionable as the

campaigns position smoking as an adult activity, thereby increasing the youths' desire to smoke. The tobacco industry is well aware that young people want to be perceived as mature, cool and independence, as revealed by the internal documents (Hammond & Rowell, 2001).

False Advertising

Since the 1950s, when medical and scientific evidence on the health hazards of smoking began to accumulate, the tobacco industry embarked on a strategy to challenge the validity of these research findings. To this end, the major tobacco companies jointly engaged a public relations company in 1953 to conduct a massive pro-tobacco campaign. As a result, in the following year, the major tobacco companies took up a joint advertisement entitled "A Frank Statement to Cigarette Smokers" to reassure smokers that smoking is safe. The message in the advertisement was a blatant lie. The advertisement appeared in 448 newspapers, in 258 cities, reaching an estimated 43,245,000 people (Cummings et al., 2002). The advertisement pledged to provide evidence to refute research findings that smoking is a health hazard. To this day, the tobacco industry has not been able to fulfil its pledge to prove that smoking is safe.

Front Organisations

Due to the poor public image of the tobacco industry, several front organisations have been created to voice pro-tobacco views. This strategy is often preferred to create the impression that the public is supporting the tobacco industry. The public relations agency, Hill and Knowlton, was involved in setting up the Tobacco Industry Research Committee, later renamed the Council for Tobacco Research or CTR (Newsom, Turk & Kruckeberg, 2000). CTR and the Tobacco Institute, another organisation created for the same purposes of lobbying and manipulating research, widely used public relations to lobby against tobacco control legislations such as clean indoor air legislation, workplace smoking restrictions, cigarette excise tax increases, state allocations on health education programmes and restrictions on marketing and promotion. Another front organisation, named by WHO of attempting to sabotage tobacco control efforts, is the International Life Sciences Institute, supposedly funded by the food and drinks industry which is not surprising given that Philip Morris's parent group

Altria Group Inc. also owns Kraft Industry. Apart from targeting WHO to subvert tobacco control efforts, the tobacco industry has also used industry-funded organisations to lobby Ministers of Agriculture and Health, the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and other United Nations agencies such as UNCTAD and UNIDO.

A front organisation called Contributions Watch (CW) was formed in 1996 by the State Affairs Company (SAC), a Washington, D.C. front public relations company funded by a tobacco company. According to Stauber and Rampton (1996a). SAC partners were top executives from international public relations companies. CW was positioned as a leading public interest reform organisation to investigate and attack consumer movements such as the Consumer Union and the Consumer Federation of America, environment movements such as Greenpeace, the Environmental Defense Fund and Sierra Club as well as trial lawyers such as Trial Lawyers for Public Justice, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group and the Centre for the Study of Responsive Laws (Stauber & Rampton (1996b). CW's tactics would be to investigate and publicise information about financial and political ties to undermine the legitimacy of these reputable organisations.

The use of front organisations, created by public relations companies, seems to be a critical tactic that the industry has used over the last 40 years to keep ahead of the tobacco control activists. One of the largest is the well-funded National Smokers Alliance (NSA) which engaged a top public relations company to recruit millions of American smokers. The tobacco industry used front groups such as the NSA, to sign petitions, send letters and lobby against tobacco control policies.

Professional Lobbyists

As the number of smokers in developed countries decreases, a major strategy of the tobacco industry is to ensure that the developing countries do not have strong tobacco control activities. Again, the internal documents (Hammond & Rowell, 2001) show the workings of public relations in using front organisations to lobby high level officers within developing countries and international organisations:

> "We must try to stop the development towards a Third
> World commitment against tobacco. We must try to get

all or at least a substantial part of Third World countries committed to our cause. We must try to influence official FAO and UNCTAD policy to take a pro tobacco stand. We must try to mitigate the impact to WHO by pushing them into a more objective and neutral position" (BAT 1979).

A dominant strategy used especially to influence politicians and legislators is through the employment of skilled lobbyists, some of whom are public relations consultants. The tobacco lobby has developed strong political alliances with high level politicians and decision makers. Neuman, Bitton and Glantz (2002) showed how the tobacco industry was able to delay and eventually defeat the implementation of an European Community (EC) directive on tobacco advertising and sponsorship in the year 2000. Among the top tobacco industry allies named were heads of governments and ministers. Below is an internal document disclosure on the correspondence between Philip Morris and a British Secretary of State for Education and Science:

"I remain happily opposed to the advertising and sponsorship ban being proposed by the Commission. I will certainly do my best to ensure that our Government maintains its opposition." (Neuman, Bitton and Glantz: 1327).

Political Alliances

One of the legislations that the tobacco industry has strongly opposed is the Clean Air Act which restricts indoor smoking. The industry's defense is to promote accommodation and freedom of choice. In 1987, a front organisation, the Beverley Hills Restaurant Association (BHRA), created by a public relations firm, was used to oppose a clean indoor air ordinance in Beverley Hills. "Over the next several months, the BHRA loudly claimed that business was down 30% and eventually succeeded in getting the ordinance amended to create smoking and non-smoking sections. Sales tax data later revealed that there was no effect on business revenues" (Dearlove, Bialous & Glantz, 2002: 96). Based on internal documents, Dearlove, Bialous and Glantz (2002) revealed the list of existing and front hospitality organisations that received fundings from the Tobacco Institute to lobby against local clean indoor air

regulations. Since 1989, the tobacco industry has begun working with the hospitality industry worldwide, including in Asia, through the International Hotel Association (later renamed the International Hotel and Restaurant Association). With BHRA, the tobacco industry has worked to promote self-regulation through an accommodation programme called "Courtesy of Choice" to preempt restrictive legislation on smoking in restaurants and hotels. The programme requires businesses in the hospitality sector to install expensive ventilation equipment. Once the businesses have made these investments, they are more likely to strongly oppose any smoking restrictions, effectively becoming the tobacco industry's lobbying arm on clean indoor air.

The tobacco industry has forged alliances with various television and advertising agencies to oppose tobacco advertising and sponsorship in the European Community as well as tobacco growers' associations to fight the battle on behalf of the tobacco industry.

Involvement in Smuggling

Although publicly the tobacco companies have voiced their concern to governments about smuggling, particularly by relating cigarette tax increases with increased loss of taxes through contraband activities, privately, the internal documents of the tobacco industry have shown that the tobacco industry itself appears to be implicated in the global smuggling trade. As cited by Hammond and Rowell (2001),

> "Although we agreed to support the federal government's effort to reduce smuggling by limiting our exports to the USA, our competitors did not. Subsequently we have decided to remove the limits on exports to regain our share of Canadian smokers. To do otherwise would place the long-term welfare of our trademarks in the home market at great risk. Until the smuggling issue is resolved, an increasing volume of our domestic sales in Canada will be exported, then smuggled back for sale here" (BAT, 1993).

The internal documents also show that in the nineties, BAT used a twin-pronged approach in Vietnam, namely, to negotiate with the government for permission to manufacture international brands locally and to

continue smuggling contraband cigarettes (Tobacco Control, 2003: 119). Finally, in 1994, BAT obtained a licensing agreement to produce BAT cigarettes in Vietnam. However, the manufacture of international brands locally has not stopped smuggling activities. It is estimated that about 35% of 555 brands sold in Vietnam are smuggled. Some query that since cigarette packs have specific codes that allow tobacco companies to track where their products are sold, BAT should have known that SE 555 has continued to be sold illegally in Vietnam but the company has not stopped supplying these traders" (Tobacco Control, 2003).

CONCLUSION

The tobacco industry has manipulated public relations to suppress the hazardous nature of its products, increasing public acceptability of smoking. In order to replenish its customer base, the tobacco industry uses various deceptive and clandestine methods such as the deployment of front organisations, bribery, lobbying to block or weaken legislation, misleading and inaccurate advertising, smuggling, targeting the young and powerless as well as casting doubts over research evidence on the health hazards of smoking. Leoning (2004) reported in the Washington Post that a US Justice Department attorney called the conspiracy of the tobacco industry to undermine reports that link smoking to health hazards as "one of the most elaborate public relations schemes in history". Undoubtedly, such a deceptive use of public relations severely damages the credibility and reputation of the public relations profession. In fact, even if the tobacco industry uses ethical methods, it does not help as the product being promoted is unethical.

Essentially speaking, public relations performs the vital function of developing relationships with stakeholders as well as with the public. It should not be about disseminating misleading information to make an organisation or individual look good. Rather, public relations functions as a strategic management activity and advises management on developing, implementing and maintaining relationships with its public. Grunig (1993) further argued that a two-way symmetrical model of public relations is inherently ethical because it opens the question of right and wrong to dialogue, collaboration and compromise. However, it needs to be emphasised that to claim professional status, it is not about a few organisations endeavouring to serve public interest. Rather, it is

necessary for the profession as a whole to spell out and act on issues in public interest.

While the paper has used the deontological approach as a process of ethical reflection on the tobacco industry, it may well be in the interest of the public relations associations to institute a dialogical approach among their members to address ethical issues. This calls for an address on conflicting principles as well as setting clearer guidelines for the professional codes of ethics, including explicit explanations on the concepts, "Codes should include explicit directives placing social duty above client needs, fellow practitioner interests and self interest" (Walle, 2003).

REFERENCES:

Bivins, T.H., 1987, "Applying ethical theory to public relations", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 6: 195–200.

___, 1993, "Public relations, professionalism and public interest", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12: 117–126.

Bovet, S.F., 1993, "The burning question of ethics", *Public Relations Journal*, 49(11): 24–27.

Christians, C.G., Rotzell, K.B. and Fackler, M., 1987, *Media Ethics: Cases and Moral Reasoning,* 2nd Ed., NY: Longman, Inc.

Cutlip, S., Center, A. and Broom, G., 1985, *Effective Public Relations,* 6th Ed., Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cummings, K.M., Morley, C.P., Horan, J.K., Stegar, C. and Leavell, N.R., 2002, "Marketing to America's youth: Evidence from corporate documents", *Tobacco Control*, 11 (Suppl. I): 5–17.

Daugherty, E.L., 2001, "Public relations and social responsibility", in R.L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Relations,* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications .

Dearlove, J.V., Bialous, S.A. and Glantz, S.A., 2002, "Tobacco industry manipulation of the hospitality industry to maintain smoking in public places", *Tobacco Control*, 11: 94–104.

Farrell, M.C., Healton, C.G., Davis, K.C., Messeri, P., Hersey, J.C. and Haviland, M.L., 2002, "Getting to the truth: Evaluating national countermarketing campaigns", *American Journal of Public Health*, 92: 901–907.

Givel, M.S. and Glantz, S.A., 2001, "Tobacco lobby political influence on US state legislatures in the 1990s", *Tobacco Control*, 10: 124–134.

Grunig, J.E., 1993, "Public relations and international affairs: Effects, ethics and responsibility", *Journal of International Affairs*, 47(1): 137–163.

Hammond, R. and Rowell, A., 2001, "Trust us. We're the tobacco industry", http://www.tobaccofreekids.org/campaign/global/ Framework/docs/Trustus, accessed on 3 March 2006.

Harrison, J., 2004, "Conflicts of duty and virtues of Aristotle in public relations ethics: Continuing the conversation commenced by Monica Walle", *Prism 2*. http://praxis.massey.ac.nz, accessed on 9 June 2006.

Hartman, L.P. and Desjardins, J.R., 2008, *Business Ethics: Decision Making for Personal Integrity and Social Responsibility,* McGraw Hill: Irwin.

Hunt, T. and Tirpok, A., 1993, "Universal ethics code: An dea whose time has come", *Public Relations Review*, 19(1): 1–12.

International Agency for Research on Cancer, 2002, "Tobacco smoking and tobacco smoke: Summary of data reported and evaluation", *Monographs on the Evaluation of the Carcinogenic Risks to Humans*, Vol. 83.

Jaksa, J.A. and Pritchard, M.S., 1994, *Communication Ethics: Methods of Analysis*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Leoning, C.D., 2004, "US trial against tobacco open: Justice Department alleges conspired for decades", *The Washington Post,* 22 September.

Martinson, D.L., 2000, "Ethical decision-making in public relations: What would Aristotle say?", *Public Relations Quarterly*, 47(3): 18–39.

___, 2004, "An essential component in teaching public relations ethics", http://lamar.colostate.edu/~aejmcpr/64martinson.pdf, accessed on 10 June 2006.

Neuman, M., Bitton, A. and Glantz, S., 2002, "Tobacco industry strategies for influencing European Community tobacco advertising legislation", *The Lancet*, 359: 1323–1330.

Newsom, D., Turk, T.V. and Kruckeberg, D., 2000, *This is PR*, 7th Ed., Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Palazzo, G. and Richter, U., 2005, "CSR business as usual? The case of the tobacco industry", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 61: 381–401.

Parkinson, M., 2001, "The PRSA code of professional standards and member code of ethics: Why they are neither professional nor ethical", *Public Relations Quarterly*, 46(3): 27–31.

Pratt, C.B., 1993, "Critique of the classical theory of situational ethics in U.S. public relations", *Public Relations Review*, 19(3): 219–234.

___, 1997, "The 40-year tobacco wars: Giving public relations a black eye?", *Public Relations Quarterly*, 5–10.

Public Relations Society of America (PRSA), 2006, "Member code of ethics 2000", http://prsa.org/_About/ethics/index.asp, accessed on 9 June 2006.

Tobin, N., 2004, "Can the professionalism of the UK public relations industry make it more trustworthy?", *Journal of Communication Management*, 9(1): 56–64.

Schick, T.A., 1994, "Truth, accuracy (and withholding information)", *Public Relations Quarterly*, 39(4): 7–11.

Stauber, J. and Rampton, S., 1996a, "Wolves in sheep's clothing: 'Special-interest watchdog' exposed as tobacco industry front group", http://www.prwatch.org, accessed on 6 June 2006.

___, 1996b, "An open-ended attack on public interest", http://www.prwatch.org, accessed on 6 June 2006.

Syed Arabi Idid, 2005, *Institute of Public Relations Malaysia: A Historical Perspective,* Kuala Lumpur: Research Centre of the International Islamic University Malaysia.

Tobacco Control, 2003, "News analysis", 12 (2).

Walle, M., 2003, "Commentary: What happened to public responsibility? The lack of society in public relations codes of ethics", *Prism (1),* http://praxis.bond.edu.au/prism/papers/ commentary/ paper1. pdf, accessed on 9 June 2006.

Welie, J.V.M., 2004, "Is dentistry a profession? Part 1. Professionalism defined", *Journal of Canadian Dental Association*, 70(8): 529–532.

World Health Organization (WHO), 2003, *Tobacco industry and corporate responsibility*, Geneva: WHO.