

The Vaping Advocate's Rules For Campaigning

Countering oppression: the ecig community's fight plan

PDF v1.5

page 1 – Introduction
page 4 – Outline points
page 8 – Expanded strategy explanation
page 27 - Notes
29 pages in total

Introduction

Here is a blueprint for establishing community resistance to industry / government moves to restrict or ban e-cigarette use. It outlines an action plan for how the community can remain ex-smokers in the face of overwhelming pressure to force them back to smoking.

People have rights, but those rights are denied to those who will not fight for them. Ex-smokers appear to be the last legally-oppressed minority in the developed world, and community activists are still at the initial stages of organising their campaigns to protect people's right to health and a normal lifespan.

The advice here starts at Day 1, when there is no coordinated campaign and even no group to organise it. The principles can be used throughout the campaign as they are evergreen.

Similar principles exist elsewhere for related purposes (such as Alinsky's Rules), but the points below are specifically tailored to our fight. Do not ever believe it is anything other than a fight: they want your money and they want you to die early. You have a right not to have expensive, dangerous products forced on you, you have a right to health, you have a right not to be forced to require expensive drugs for treating illness forced on you, and you have a right to a normal lifespan.

You won't get any of it unless you fight for it.

What's it all about?

These are the basic facts of the situation:

- All laws, regulations and restrictions on vaping or ecig products are based on the need to protect cigarette sales, as smoking is one of the world's biggest gravy trains at \$1 trillion a year plus - we call this the smoking economy, as it has a life and a power of its own
- Tobacco is a government business, which should be obvious since they make far more money out of it than anyone else; because it is ring-fenced with laws that prevent it being banned; and because it is robustly protected from any real threat
- They want you to keep smoking, and they will attempt to force you to keep smoking
- They want you to pay a fortune in taxes, use expensive pharmaceuticals, and then die young to save on old-age costs
- Smokers are the last minority who can be oppressed legally, and the right to oppress them devolves to ex-smokers as well: they can be forced to resume smoking by removing the means they use to avoid smoking
- Be quite clear about this: the minority can be taxed unjustly, forced into illness, forced to buy expensive drugs as a result, and killed early before they get old and expensive to support
- They can be legally exploited and a normal old age refused to them
- Clearly this is unjust, as we don't treat any other minority like this; in fact it depends on corruption, since in a free vote the exploiters would lose
- There is no free vote here, the incredible sums of money available for 'lobbying' see to that
- But: you cannot mention corruption in politics as it is a taboo word – so other ways of pointing out the injustice and oppression have to be used
- THR is expressly banned as it is a serious threat to government and industry revenues, since in practice it is the only real threat to smoking
- Ex-smokers have no rights and apparently do not even exist
- You are not allowed to derive any pleasure from smoking, or from vaping or Snus consumption – indeed, pleasure is not even a recognised benefit
- They say there are no medical benefits to nicotine - in fact there are no benefits to nicotine consumption at all, according to them
- You are not allowed to have any medical need for nicotine - unless you get a prescription for this ordinary dietary supplement and therefore pay them for the privilege
- You can quit by using their products, if you insist, although the 9 out of 10 chance of failure or worse with pharmacotherapies means you have an extremely thin chance of success; they win either way since you will probably get into a quit – relapse – smoke – quit – relapse cycle, using their expensive meds
- You will have to organise exceptionally well to counter their power and immense wealth
- They need to steer the debate into the health arena and away from the fact they are all paid by smoking-generated funds

- They own the health arena, and can simply ignore any/all evidence that is not their own self-created junk science
- They run the biggest and most expensive propaganda campaign the world has ever seen – and it works
- They will always say there is not enough research, even when there are 10,000 studies; there is never enough research and there never will be enough
- No amount of research will ever be sufficient to enable unchallenged and unhindered availability of genuinely effective ecig products; the entire point of the regulatory process is to ban almost all products and leave the 0.01% made by the cigarette trade
- They want you to pay for more research in order to sidetrack you and bankrupt you, and all of which they will continue to ignore anyway
- There are a lot of mistakes you could make here – beginners, those who have no experience of combat and the politically naïve can easily fail
- If you think that the era of exploitation and oppression of minorities is over in the developed world, you clearly have a lot to learn

And if you think it's got anything at all to do with health – just pack up and go home now, you're wasting our time. It's all about the money and only about money. There are plenty of the perspicacity-challenged on both sides who think this is about health, but a trillion-dollar business is a machine with no sentiment, no need to bother with trivialities like health, and no need to worry about anything except eliminating threats. Vaping is a threat to the machine, and the first genuine one for a very long time.

You can't argue with a machine, so don't try. You can't persuade the machine's minions as (a) they have already been bought at a cost of tens of millions, or (b) they are mindless zealots who are simply puppets of the real beneficiaries. You can, though, fight back against their propaganda and you can fight them in court. If you lose, then you can resign yourself to 20 years of a black market before the new technology kills off the old system (as it always does). They probably realise they are fighting a rearguard action as this is one of the most common themes in history - we've had 10 years of vaping and the new tech often takes 30 years to win out. However if they can hold off the new technology for another 20 years, as is quite common in these battles, then they make 20 x \$1 trillion: \$20 trillion dollars.

Perhaps now you see exactly what they are fighting for – an unimaginably vast amount of money.

A brief outline with numbered points, on the next page, is followed by a detailed expansion of each point.

The Vaping Advocate's Rules For Campaigning – outline points in brief –

1. Support from public health

Have senior public health officials back your case and promote ecig use over smoking. Very difficult to achieve as they have a very clear need to protect and expand their jobs, and are mostly paid by the machine; honesty does not predominate in modern public health debate.

2. Convince a legislator

Convince individual legislators of the validity of your case. Occasionally possible, especially at local level where the money hasn't yet percolated down to.

3. Journalists control public perception

The media is key, so find journalists who vape or who are not subject to editorial pressure to knock THR, and persuade them that they need to do their bit or see ecigs banned. You'll need a consumer association first though, as they want a single point of contact with some kind of a label.

4. Doctors are the voice of authority

Useful when it can be achieved (and it always will be, with enough effort or time): find a doctor or doctors who will speak favourably. Sensible and intelligent people can usually see the future to some extent, after all, no matter what their establishments tell them.

5. Defenders eventually lose

A useful point to remember is that in any battle a person who always defends will almost certainly lose, sooner or later - you have to attack at some point.

6. Weapons of attack

First, be clear about what is happening – since without clarity you'll lose. Battles aren't usually won by someone stumbling around in a fog when the opponent has a razor-sharp well-funded attack plan.

7. Know your enemy

The anti-THR protectors of the smoking economy have a playbook and you need to know it, at least in outline. This is basic combat: in order to defend well, you need some idea of how your opponent will attack.

Above all, be clear their plan has a very strong element of misdirection – so what you initially think is the best plan for defence might not be a good idea.

8. Against ecigs = pro cigarettes

Anyone working against ecigs is working to protect cigarette sales. This is best used in parody form: ignorant public health staff who attack THR are in effect working for the cigarette companies.

9. Ridicule, a good weapon for the unfunded

Satire, humour and especially ridicule are very useful weapons for those fighting oppression with very little money, and up against powerful forces with enormous funds.

10. Why you can't mention corruption

The word is toxic and has to be tiptoed around carefully. Nobody is interested in the reality, the game has to be played by a set of rules that deliberately ignore the central reason why there is a problem. The topic of corruption is in itself poisonous, in politics, as the implications of admitting its presence or doing anything about it are too painful to consider; thus, we have to find other ways of addressing the central cause of the public health disaster caused by blocking THR.

Two crucial and related points are that:

11. You must have a consumer group

The local community must form a consumer association to coordinate the defence. It also provides a contact point for the media, who need a single point of contact they can easily attach a label to.

And:

12. There must be a trade group

The local vendors need to form a trade group to coordinate their defence.

Because the vaping community is always more proactive than the trade, it

often requires consumers to organise first, as the consumer group will often need to exert pressure on the trade to get them to move.

13. Funding will be needed

Initially this will be limited to the costs of forming a community association and setting up a web presence, which is vital. Crowdsourcing and trade donations can be used.

14. Internet and social media

A good web and social media presence is crucial today. It acts as a central point for coordinating the campaign. News, updates, policies are presented. The media can find resources here.

15. The media like a fight

And they want you to lose. *Therefore, in radio and TV interviews, expect that they will set you up.* Never expect that you have been invited along to present your views in a favourable climate - the opposite is far more likely to be true, and they will fix it so the odds are against you.

Who in their right mind organises a fair fight? We call that a sport, and this is not a sport: it's about a vast amount of money, around \$1 trillion a year to be precise.

Be prepared.

16. It's never about health

The reason they oppose us is to protect the *status quo*. By definition this means they must protect cigarette sales, as that is the foundation of the *status quo*: it pays the bills. Our job is to expose the gross hypocrisy and defeat the corruptly-obtained laws. They have a \$1 trillion a year empire and will do *anything* to protect it for the final 20 years they have left until the old system is killed off by the new technology.

17. The black market

This issue is crucial in reality although often ignored in the fantasy palace of a legislative assembly. If laws prevent people obtaining a product, the black market takes over the supply. This is going to be interesting if, for the first time in history, the public have to go *en masse* to the black market in order to stay healthy. It's already happening in some countries and is scheduled to start

up in the EU by 2016.

Almost all vendors will have to shut down or move some/all of their products to the black market at some point, eventually, unless some major factors change – because regulated markets in this area are closed to all except the giants.

The giants here are principally the cigarette corporations, and this situation obviously suits everyone perfectly: ecig sales can be strangled in one way or another, and the painful fall in cigarette sales caused by vaping can be stopped and reversed; and a painful fall in drug sales for treating smoking-related disease can be prevented; and the incredible cost to the state of millions living about 8 years longer than if they had smoked can be prevented. That is what the resistance to THR is all about, so you can see the amount of money involved and whose pockets it will come from. Those are the people blocking THR.

Finally and most important of all:

18. Every movement needs a leader, especially at first

That leader may sometimes work by motivating others. Without a determined prime mover, you have nothing. In some cases, such a person can start the ball rolling by locating others who will perform the duties needed in a strong, motivated, and well-organised person or group.

This concludes the outline points. The full detail follows on the next page.

The Vaping Advocate's Rules For Campaigning

- the detailed explanation -

We have found that there are only two really effective ways to counter the pressure to ban or restrict ecigs unjustly, both very difficult indeed to establish unless circumstances are unusually favourable for you:

1. Support from public health

Have senior public health officials back your case and promote ecig use over smoking.

And:

2. Convince a legislator

Convince individual legislators of the validity of your case.

Point #1 has only been possible to any great extent in the UK, as for some reason the senior figures there have been amenable to the facts; to some extent it also applies in France and Italy. These are the only places where it appears public health has not been totally subverted (there are still some holdouts in the UK, but because their seniors and peers are on our side, their position is not respected). Elsewhere, the public health industry is often owned by commercial interests, and universally and strongly opposed to ecigs.

Point #2 has occurred in several individual States and cities in the USA, and has been beneficial in some places where new laws or regulations were being debated. Some of the legislators holding power have been convinced of the validity of our argument; or perhaps, more simply, our opponents had forgotten to pay everyone.

3. Journalists control public perception

One method that is highly effective due to its weight on public opinion: find journalists who vape and persuade them that they need to do their bit or see ecigs banned. Establishing a consumer association, below, is important here as journalists need a point of contact - without a voice then the consumer has no representation, and the media (journalists, radio, TV) always want a single point of contact and eventually a spokesperson. They want to be able to present a spokesperson with a label, so oblige them.

The time comes - because some professions naturally have more smokers than others, journalists and nurses for example, and because a percentage of smokers become vapers - when some journalists will start to see the light and

will start to write favourably. This may take too long, though; and editorial policy may initially be unfavourable. If you can find some way to expedite this process, it helps.

The biggest problem here is that editorial pressure will almost always be against you:

1. Major advertisers call the tune, and that's pharma
2. The press like to knock anything new or different because that's the way the public behave and what they want to see in the papers
3. If it can be made to look like bad news, or a threat to children, then that doubles the attraction

So don't be surprised when a journalist rejects your story; and if they do print it, you can expect them to distort it and invent some negatives as well. Good news doesn't sell papers or attract a large readership; and it certainly won't please their advertisers.

4. Doctors are the voice of authority

Useful when it can be achieved (and it always will be, with enough effort): find a doctor or doctors who will speak favourably. Sensible and intelligent people can usually see the future to some extent, after all, no matter what their establishments tell them.

Initially they may be a little reticent, but with time and research comes familiarity with the topic; and with some media practice, they will improve. Eventually some may, justifiably, become invested in the movement, and this is welcome.

As an example the BMA, the UK doctors' union, are famous for lying extensively about ecigs; but this has not stopped numerous UK doctors and professors of medicine and public health from strongly supporting ecigs.

5. Defenders eventually lose

A useful point to remember is that in any battle a combatant who always defends will almost always lose eventually - you have to attack at some point. Unless there is some kind of impregnable defence that in addition harms the opponent, or the contest is short for some external reason, then a defender must fight back at some point or lose. It means that you must attack, or face defeat. Doing nothing is not an option.

Be very careful how you counter-attack: it's probably not going to be where you think the battleground is at first. For example, it certainly isn't about research.

6. Weapons of attack

First, be clear about what is happening:

1. The war is about who owns the health of the public: government finance departments, transnational industries and their lobbyists, or the public
2. It's about whether your health can be sold for tax revenue, then corporate profits for the cigarette and pharmaceutical industries, then savings on expenditure in your old age by preventing you having one – or if you have any right to normal health and a normal lifespan
3. Don't get distracted from that
4. The most important battles are fought in the media and the courts
5. The legislators and regulators are bought and paid for, you can't (and won't) match the tens of millions on offer to them [1]
6. The profits are in the billions, so a few tens of millions to buy laws is small change for your opponents
7. Your opponents major on the use of propaganda to legitimise their operation, and on misdirection to defeat you - their money buys them all the laws they need and nothing will change that
8. Your task is to counter the propaganda and have enough funds for a very strong legal challenge
9. The research issue is a money-draining sideline – we have enough already, and you can't fight a trillion-dollar machine with a couple of clinical studies

[1] It was revealed that the EU Health Commissioner's personal fee requested for favourable legislation starts at €10 million.

The campaign principles

- Countering the propaganda is task #1 – don't let the media poison the water unopposed
- Make absolutely sure the media have a clear vision of our rights: the right to choose how we avoid smoking, the right to choose successful methods as against those proven to have a 9 out of 10 failure rate, the right to choose nicotine supplementation for medical and personal reasons if we need it [2], and the right to choose safer consumer products not a pharmaceutical solution or combusted tobacco.
- Get your resources organised so that you fully understand all the issues and can provide references and referrals to scientists who support THR
- More research is not needed unless there is a specific gap that could be filled at reasonable cost in a reasonable timeframe
- Never forget this debate is not about health in any case – it's about protecting the smoking economy; public health puppets who don't understand this are simply working to protect cigarette sales (it's why we call them the 'useful idiots')
- Try to educate them if you can – there are plenty of their peers and seniors who will assist
- You can't change the views of the public health industry's criminally

corrupt millionaires, paid fantastic sums to protect the smoking economy, so don't waste any effort trying

[2] In multiple large-scale clinical trials it has been shown that everyone tests positive for nicotine, because everyone consumes nicotine in the diet. No person has ever tested negative for nicotine in any of these trials. It is a normal ingredient in the diet, an active ingredient, and everyone has the right to supplement it in whatever way they choose. Forcing people by law to choose combusted tobacco or pharmaceutical products to supplement their diet is a gross injustice and a violation of basic rights.

The weapons

- a. Opponents are always paid, and we aren't
- b. All the science needs to be evaluated as a whole, not just the cherry-picked junk research that opponents themselves created
- c. Counter the propaganda, or even the courts might start to believe it
- d. The final battle is always in court, because you can't stop legislators and regulators being paid vast sums to eliminate you – so line up the evidence in advance; this shows you where the holes are; fortunately it's hard to buy courts, and they prefer facts not propaganda
- e. A badly organised, poorly resourced and poorly funded legal challenge that fails is worse than useless, it sets case law – **do not** attempt it on your own

There are 1,001 good arguments for THR, and literally none at all against, when the history and practice of THR are honestly evaluated. Our problem is quite simple: dishonesty is the trade mark of THR denialists, but since they run the largest propaganda campaign the world has ever seen, it makes convincing others of the veracity of our position very difficult. When everything people think they know about ecigs, Snus and nicotine is almost certainly a lie then you will begin to realise that the propaganda should have been countered at a much earlier stage.

Clarity is required

A sustainable policy is better than just flailing away in the dark. These points are key:

- Our opponents are all paid
- The community advocates are all unpaid, and need to take the lead
- Opponents lie about everything, or distort the truth so far that in effect it is lying
- They refuse to recognise all the research, and cherry-pick as needed, which runs counter to any scientific method
- They refuse to recognise the success of THR anywhere
- They prefer to claim that Sweden does not exist
- They cannot point to any failures of THR
- They hide the fact smoking prevalence reduction has stalled for years in many places, nearly always in the countries they are based in
- They hide the fact that no country is an exception to the 20% Prevalence Rule once it operates

- This is a propaganda war because public perception, media presentation, and legislator opinion and pressure holds the key to success or failure
- It certainly isn't about research, there is enough to stretch to the moon and back, all of it ignored except the cherry-picked junk science made to order
- In the end you cannot prevent corrupt laws being enacted, as the weight of money on the other side is stupendous
- As a result, it means the final battle is in court

What you have to do is simple:

1. Get your ducks in a row
2. This means counter the propaganda, organise the research properly, identify any possible holes in your defence, ensure real health experts are correctly informed, and conserve funds ready for the big court battles
3. Make absolutely sure to conserve funds and plan a strong legal challenge to the inevitable corruptly-obtained laws and regulations
4. Don't make the mistake of mounting a legal challenge by yourself, you need assistance and there is plenty available
5. You cannot prevent corruption at national / federal / international level, so don't wear yourself out trying to fight it
6. You might succeed at local level, with luck, as opponents may not have reached out to them yet
7. Don't get sidetracked by irrelevancies – it's all about the propaganda and the inevitable legal challenges you will have to mount
8. Above all do not be confused by misdirection – there is no alternative to this plan, no matter how attractive you might think other options appear to be
9. You cannot defeat our opponents by any other method, so don't get sidetracked into money-wasting skirmishes that they control
10. It isn't about health, or about research – but they are skilled in misdirection and will make you believe it is
11. Their finest skill is in being so good at misdirection that you will believe you thought of it first
12. You don't control the topic areas you think you do, they just made you believe that to degrade your capacity to fight (in other words to drain your funds)
13. You face the biggest governments (desperate to protect their fragile economies), the biggest transnational corporations, the biggest transnational commercial lobbying organisations and the most skilled propagandists, all backed by unlimited funds. Do you honestly think you can defeat all of those forces with a few clinical studies? Wake up!
14. This is a propaganda war, followed by a pile of corrupt legislation, which will be followed by a series of giant court battles.
15. Failure will result in a 20-year black market until the new technology finally ousts the old machine.

Countering propaganda

The principal weapons here are very simple indeed because they are always

true:

- 1) It is obvious who gains from selling out public health in order to protect cigarette sales. The monumentally corrupt (such as the State of California) cannot hide their true motivation.
- 2) Opponents are always paid whereas vaping advocates are almost exclusively unpaid community members; and other pro-ecig advocates often come from within the opponents' camp.

Importantly, opponents' salaries and funding almost always depend on cigarette sales (as they are funded by government, and often via anti-smoking initiatives, which are usually funded via tobacco taxes or other tobacco-related sources such as MSA funds), or they come from commercial opponents such as the pharmaceutical industry, who by definition need to protect smoking and kill off ecigs or see significant losses in their overall revenues. Therefore, opponents are in effect paid to protect smoking: without it, they have no job. Add to this, such jobs are always extremely well-paid, with no solid targets that must be achieved annually, and with little or nothing in the way of alternatives for such job-holders (especially zero-result employment alternatives), so that their holders will defend their job tenure aggressively.

Opponents come from several main classes and several sub-groups:

1. Spokespersons for industry:
 - a. Industry staff
 - b. Researchers paid directly by industry, who will create junk studies to order
 - c. Government staff whose funding is dependent on an industry that depends on smoking: usually regulators, who in effect speak directly for industry
2. Spokespersons for government:
 - a. Staff who respond to pressure from the treasury or from industry to protect cigarette sales – typically in the health department/s
 - b. Regulators, as above (see 'regulatory capture' below)
3. Public Health industry staff:
 - a. Senior staff whose massive salaries depend on maintaining the status quo, and who are well aware that THR is the only real threat to cigarette sales
 - b. Junior staff who somehow genuinely believe they are working against the tobacco industry
 - c. Researchers paid to create agenda-based junk science funded through PH industry channels
4. Media:
 - a. Journalists working for publications that have huge pharma advertising revenues that cannot be risked by neutral or pro-THR reporting, and who will create knocking copy to order
 - b. Stupid journalists who believe the propaganda, and who do no fact-checking at all
5. Academia:
 - a. Staff working for universities that are in essence owned by the pharmaceutical industry

- b. Researchers funded by such universities, whose funding depends on creating junk science to order
- 6. The medical establishment:
 - a. Organisations that receive funding from pharma and/or whose members are paid for pharma-based smoking cessation services
 - b. Doctors who are themselves victims of the propaganda [1].
- 7. Assorted crackpots and propaganda victims

These are the people who are trying to force the public back to buying government tobacco, and who you must counter. There are a lot of them, as you can see. They have virtually unlimited funds that will be applied to any method that looks as if it will help to force you back into smoking.

Real research

A basic scientific principle is that all the evidence needs to be looked at, not just the evidence that suits a particular perspective. Once that is done, our opponents' argument is shown to be valueless, as the facts are obvious once the whole picture is looked at. However, they control the debate, and will never allow science to get in the way of their agenda.

Our principal mistake would be, then:

- a) To think that the science is relevant
- b) That we can move the debate onto our strong area
- c) That anyone will take any notice anyway

They need to keep the debate centred around a few junk science studies they cooked up themselves, and we have to insist that all the evidence is looked at and not just whatever suits a particular faction. In fact we don't have to do as they do and just use a few favourable studies to the exclusion of all else – we can simply ask that all the evidence is considered, because it is overwhelmingly in our favour.

This doesn't normally affect laws and regulations as these are pre-purchased.

Overall policy

It is usually a mistake to make the debate all about the science, because it then becomes easy for opponents to move the battlefield onto their territory and defeat you. For example, a regulator will determine what 'science' is admissible and what isn't, and their partners will provide that 'research'.

It is better to point out they are all liars, who without exception depend on protecting the *status quo*, and prove it. You must be able to prove what you say: they can't prove what they say, which is why they are liars. Make sure you only state what you can provide solid evidence for.

(Incidentally, there is no proof in human sciences, only strong evidence.)

[1] Doctors are as likely to be victims of propaganda as anyone else. For example:

a. In a recent survey, 44% of British doctors replied that they believed nicotine to be associated with cancer, which is the opposite of the facts: nicotine has no association with cancer. Indeed, many appear unaware of their official instructions from the national clinical guidance authority, NICE, which makes it quite clear that nicotine has no association with cancer (NICE PH45).

b. Doctors are quite likely to tell you that 'nicotine is addictive'; but it is impossible to clinically demonstrate any potential for dependence. Multiple clinical trials have shown that it doesn't matter how much pure nicotine is administered daily to never-smokers (even as much as the equivalent of 15 cigarettes a day), or for how long (even for six months), or to however many (several hundred, so far): no person has ever shown any sign of withdrawal symptoms, reinforcement, dependence, or continuation subsequently. So it is now obvious that smoking causes dependence, probably due to the synergy created by some of the other 9,600 compounds identified to date [2], such as the MAOIs, that multiply the effects by many orders of magnitude.

[2] Rodgman, Perfetti 2013

7. Know your enemy

The propaganda channels are your first-wave opponent, followed by the second wave who comprise the big players who gain from protecting cigarette sales and forcing ex-smokers back to smoking. Most of the visible opposition comes from the first wave; the second wave are the main winners from smoking, who reveal themselves when they go too far: Reynolds attempting to get vaping products banned, California attempting to outlaw vaping.

Note that the propagandists mostly come from within the Public Health industry [1], which is a transnational industry with its own agenda: own all aspects of non-clinical health and exploit the financial benefits. Public Health personnel are typically a wealthy urban socialist elite who need to force their agenda onto everyone else in order to control the sources of revenue. Their principal attack methods are:

- 1) Remove the primary stakeholders from the debate
- 2) Poison the public perception of the issue with a torrent of propaganda
- 3) Attempt to create an illusion that is the direct opposite of the truth, and make that the media, public and political view.

There are no poor people at the top of the public health industry: they are enormously wealthy, and deserve every penny they get from funders and sponsors. They make billions for government and the transnationals, and are suitably rewarded. The footsoldiers are another matter entirely: poor zealots who have no idea whose pockets they are really filling. So the problem for the public health czars is twofold: how to fool the world, and how to fool their staff. Life can be tough for a socialist millionaire. Their principal skill is fooling people, though, and always has been; the opponent changes over time but never the first principle of the Public Health industry: make sure the funder

stays in control of the revenue stream no matter what the cost to others.

[1] The term 'Public Health' is capitalised here because it is a discrete industry with its own agenda, resources, methods, revenue sources, language, influence, and hold on power.

The anti-vaping playbook

The anti-THR, smoking economy protectionists have a playbook and you need to know it, at least in outline. This is basic combat: in order to defend successfully, it helps to have some idea of how your opponent will attack. The better you know their plays, the better you can defend and counter. The expert attacks first of course, bypassing and negating the opponent's attack; defend and counter is a slow process and a risky strategy, by definition. The most successful fighters defend as little as possible unless they have an almost impregnable defence – they attack hard and relentlessly. (The simplest way to succeed in any combat is with simple moves, well-practised, delivered relentlessly and placing unrelenting pressure on the opponent.) Even those with a near-impregnable defence only succeed when that defence also harms the opponent and penalises them for attacking.

The smoking protectionists' moves are repeated again and again, so it isn't hard to anticipate them; nevertheless, weaker advocates on our side are repeatedly defeated by the same move. There is something of a lesson here. Above all, be clear their plan has a strong element of misdirection – so what you initially think is the best plan for defence might not be a good idea.

They have a number of plays they constantly use, over and over, in recycled form or new combinations. Learn them. They depend on the basic principles of winning a propaganda war leading to commercial superiority:

1. Misdirection
2. Lies
3. Application of money and pressure

By this means the media, public, and politicians are won over and controlled; the legislatures produce the right laws; the regulators are owned; the opponents are swept aside.

Of all the methods they use, *misdirection* is by far the most successful (as it always is in war). Classic examples of misdirection are:

- Convince an opponent you will fight at point A
- Defeat them by then attacking points, B, C and D

This means to make sure they first think you are fighting about X, but then make it about Z and beat them before they can regroup.

And:

- Draw the enemy onto your ground by concealing the fact you control it
- The most successful way of doing this is to convince them that in fact

- they own it
- Degrade their ability to fight
- Destroy them when they are weak enough

This process is also termed the 3D's:

- Distract–Deflect–Divert
- Distract–Degrade–Destroy

In the battle to protect cigarette sales, it is used as follows:

- They talk extensively about research
- They know you think you have better research
- They intensify the research debate until you think that is all that matters, because you absolutely believe that (a) you have better research, and (b) that they can be easily defeated on this ground – in other words, you think it is your ground and you control it
- They force it even harder, and compel you to spend every last cent you have on research and on presenting your research and on relying on it to the exclusion of all else, as surely it is the key
- After years of this game (in which you had every chance to wake up, but sleepwalked over the edge of the cliff), you go bankrupt (if a medium-size business) or cannot generate another cent from your supporters (if a community group) – or both
- At this point you finally realise their bought legislators and regulators ignore all the research, always have, and always will – they vote and rule and regulate according to instructions from their paymasters – it was never about research at all
- Research was all but irrelevant from the start, but you were easily misdirected
- You lose

A regulated market is perfect for these evergreen combat principles – they work like magic here. A win is often assured because opponents are complete beginners; it's like taking candy from a baby.

People who have never experienced any kind of combat are useless deadweight in this game. The rules of war are constant, but unless you know them you're dead. Employing beginners is not a good start; they'll have to learn on the job, and they are up against masters backed by hundreds of millions of dollars in funding.

There are all kinds of ways of fighting a battle, but going in as a beginner in the game or wearing a blindfold is not usually a winning strategy.

8. Against ecigs = pro cigarettes

Anyone working against ecigs is rather obviously working to protect cigarette sales. There is a smear tactic here that some may use in defence, although it is better used in parody form: public health staff who attack ecigs are in effect

working for the cigarette companies.

Although a direct accusation has never been used successfully, the unintended consequence angle can be effectively used: obviously, if ecigs were invented and are sold with the intention of destroying cigarette sales by taking the market - as they were and are - and if widespread ecig use will result in 1% or less of the death and disease due to smoking - as it will - then anyone against ecigs must by definition be pro cigarette sales and pro disease and pro cancer. Cancer drugs are very profitable indeed.

As far as we know, no one has ever discovered a money trail here from tobacco firms to anti-vaping protagonists, so it cannot be used as a direct accusation since there is no evidence for it. Clearly, though, tobacco giants such as Reynolds are doing everything (and always have done) to kill off or restrict vaping, and lately to protect the market for themselves where they have bought in; so it would perhaps be a little naive to think 'Big Tobacco' does not still apply some funds to anti-ecig initiatives in some way. The aims of the tobacco industry and the pharmaceutical industry coincide precisely here, after all - and with the economic goals of government too, since the loss of tobacco tax revenues and any associated funds would generally be either very painful or even a disaster for government, added to which is the massive increase in costs: a big increase in pension payments, costs for care of the elderly, and healthcare costs: for millions of lives extended by 8 years or so. If the state's costs are calculated for support of the elderly, for millions of lives extended by 8 years, the sums involved are stupendous; it becomes very clear this is a major factor in the fight against THR, and as a consequence this is an economic war and has nothing to do with improving the health of the public - indeed, it is the exact opposite.

9. Ridicule, a good weapon for the unfunded

To expand on the satire point: satire, humour and especially ridicule are very useful weapons for those fighting oppression with very little money, and up against against powerful forces with enormous funds. This is a definition of our campaign: the community vs government and industry - fighting for our health, and with very little in the way of resources.

Find a good cartoonist or two as they are worth their weight in gold. Example of cartoon: a brutal government bully forces heroin (cigarettes) on the oppressed population, who don't want it and prefer the healthier ecigs; death and disease in the background.

10. Why you can't mention corruption

The word is toxic and has to be tiptoed around carefully. Nobody is interested in reality, the game has to be played by a set of rules that deliberately ignore the central reason why there is a problem.

Regulatory capture

This is the process by which industry eventually comes to own a government agency that was originally set up to regulate and control it. The process is enabled by multiple methods such as the revolving door, the consultancy fee purchase, the promise of future highly-paid employment, and the non-exec ploy.

- a. The 'revolving door' is where staff move between industry and regulator. The regulator is staffed by industry personnel, and regulators move on to work in the industry. The staff are, in effect, the same.
- b. The consultancy fee loyalty arrangement is used to pay senior academics who advise the government agency. They ensure that industry values are upheld.
- c. The promise of future employment is used to ensure regulatory staff comply with industry requirements – otherwise their future job prospects disappear.
- d. Senior regulators will be offered a directorship. This can be with a company or a foundation, or a third party controlled by the pharmaceutical company involved. A useful tool is the offer of a non-executive directorship, which means the ex-government employee draws a regular fee for no work.

These methods are all used to buy the right policy and decisions. They are clearly based on corruption and are the principal methods used by the pharmaceutical industry to control its regulators. Government does nothing about this due to the problems it is unwilling to face: for example, preventing staff from moving to future employment in the industry would require salary increases to compensate them; and preventing corruption requires regular forensic accountancy investigations of all staff – a tricky measure to implement. The result is that subverted government agencies and corrupted staff will work to remove any threats to their associated industry. It is of course gold-plated corruption, but under weak governments nothing can be done about it.

Why pharma needs to keep you smoking

A significant percentage of the pharmaceutical industry's gross revenue is generated by smoking. The effect of any form of THR on this revenue is as follows:

- Firstly, in the short term, smoking cessation meds sales plunge;
- Secondly, in the medium term, the very significant overall boost to many drug sales falls, as smoker numbers fall and illness plummets (diabetes, blood pressure, bronchitis, cholesterol meds are just a few of the drug markets that are significantly boosted by smoking);
- Thirdly, in the long term, the expensive and profitable drugs used for the treatment of serious smoking-related illness are not needed: chemotherapy drugs, COPD drugs, CVD drugs for example.

Thus, opposition to ecigs is almost always both funded and coordinated by government and industry working together to eliminate an economic threat. It is never, ever, under any circumstances at all, about health (obviously). This is

their weak point and it must be exploited fully.

They will try to make it about health, since the real reasons cannot be used: voters do not react favourably to being told that it's OK to oppress, exploit, force illness on and eventually kill off minorities for cash. This is why virtually everything they say and everything they use and every point they make is a lie in some form: it has to be.

So: all genuine health arguments are on our side, and we are unpaid; they are purely working toward economic goals and are paid, but successfully camouflage their motives by the skilful use of propaganda. The propaganda has to be strongly countered, otherwise it does its job: it creates a climate of belief that is the direct opposite of the facts, and this must be very strongly opposed otherwise the basis is there to impose bans or restrictions. In short, the opposition is lying for commercial reasons, and this needs to be illuminated effectively.

Their spokespersons however are not often government figures or commercial representatives, as this might be a negative for them: they use unscrupulous or weak and easily-swayed academics, who can be convinced somehow (and money is usually involved in some way) that something that was invented and is sold to destroy smoking and its diseases and deaths is the opposite, and another form of tobacco industry income generator that will somehow create more smoking – even if this is a good definition of lunacy.

How the cash is delivered

Pharmaceutical industry funds are sometimes given direct to the public health industry, or alternatively 'greenwashed': laundered by a third party or even a distribution chain. Typically this would be a pharmaceutical corporation paying a foundation, a foundation paying a university, and a university paying an academic to speak for the industry. Thus, a professor or researcher's job, funding and future prospects depend on an anti-ecig position, since pharma in effect owns the university.

Therefore it is often possible to show who is paying for an anti-vaping spokesperson's opinion; it is virtually always tobacco taxes and/or related funds (MSA funds for example) or pharma funds, both of which would disappear if/when vaping kills off smoking.

Following the money trail is not easy since it requires research, sometimes skilled. It is an important defence, though, since when Prof X, with a public health tenure of some kind, declaims against ecigs and it is pointed out that his job, mortgage and future prospects depend on (for example) PharmaGiant Corp, and they are clearly doing their best elsewhere to kill off ecigs for commercial reasons, then such a clear conflict of interest should require the Prof to recuse themselves from the debate. Actually such a clear COI is corruption, but this is not normally a useful attack since the C-word is toxic.

Corruption

Where someone has a duty of care to the public, or is paid to protect the public interest, then taking money or favour to work against the public interest is corruption. As stated, though, this has never been a successful attack for various reasons, partly because of the toxic nature of this accusation: everyone is afraid of the cost and consequences of a witch-hunt; and proof is very hard to establish in any case. The accusation can backfire as all will be against it, therefore more subtle ways of expressing this argument need to be used.

In cases where the proof is readily available, such as with the ex-EU Health Commissioner John Dalli, who was sacked for corruption after establishing a directive that would in effect have banned vaping in the EU (the TPD rewrite), the facts are inescapable. Dalli's error was to become too greedy, and when he started to ask a minimum of €10 million up front for successful legislation, his days were numbered. Even so, nobody wants to hear about it: the word corruption is taboo and best avoided.

Ecig bans are enacted for financial reasons and usually depend on corruption in some form, since no one kills on a grand scale for free. However, this area is sensitive and has to be handled delicately - many in authority have something to lose here, so another approach normally works better. Reality here is that corruption is behind all anti-ecig moves; but reality is taboo, and a gentler way of illustrating the point has to be employed. Don't mention the C-word or you risk losing the argument.

Still want to fight back? It can be done – but as you will appreciate, it requires iron determination and a battle plan. They have all the money (our money) – but there are around 25 million of us globally (Q2 2105) and we demand our rights.

Don't worry: the new technology always wins in the end because you can't put the genie back in the bottle; our job is to reduce the normal timespan this takes, down from the commonly-seen 30 years to a more manageable 20 or so in total - so that you have a chance of living to see the day...

Ecigs have been sold now for 10 years, so in the usual 30-year lag that elapses while a new technology kills off the old system, we have about 20 years or so remaining. Our job is to shorten-up the remaining 20 year expected survival time for the smoking economy by assisting its early exit. There's always a lot of money at stake in these wars between old and new; especially here, as the old system is basically a license to print money. Unfortunately, the new technology cannot provide even a tenth of the financial value as it doesn't appear to be going to make any significant number of people ill. Don't forget that the power of the smoking economy is based on the sickness it creates, as that is the key to its extraordinary value:

- Smoking can be taxed extensively as it causes harm
- It generates substantial revenues for the pharmaceutical industry – probably more than 10% of their gross and quite likely 15%
- It chops years off smokers' lifespans, so they're not around to claim

- expensive pensions, healthcare and other benefits for the elderly
- In the USA it generates enormous penalty fees payable to the individual States, called the MSA funds

All that will vaporise when ecigs take over the market. That's where the problem lies.

Two crucial and related points are that:

11. You must have a consumer group

The local community must form a consumer association to coordinate the defence. It also acts as a single point of contact for the media, with the added advantage they can put a label on it. They need both, so help them.

And:

12. There must be a trade group

The local vendors need to form a trade group to coordinate their defence.

Because the vaping community is always more proactive than the trade, it often requires consumers to organise first, as the consumer group will often need to exert pressure on the trade to get them to move.

13. Funding will be needed

Initially this will be limited to the costs of forming a community association and setting up a web presence, which is vital. Crowdsourcing and trade donations can be used. If the skill is there, a foundation can be set up to accept, hold and distribute funds. This is exactly what our principal opponents, the pharmaceutical industry, do - so it would be hard to use as a successful weapon against us. To get an idea of how many foundations pharma uses as a front for greenwashing toxic funds, google <tobaccofreekids sourcewatch> and look at their funding sources.

14. Internet and social media

A good web and social media presence is crucial today. It acts as a central point for coordinating the campaign. News, updates, policies are presented. The media can find resources here.

Set up a good website. Get someone who likes the social media angle to work with Twitter, Facebook etc. Get an app made for mobiles: it should display the the latest updates for your region.

15. The media like a fight

Remember that the media like controversy, argument, and bad news. Good news never makes the papers, or if it does, it's on page 93. Bad news makes the front page: "If it bleeds, it leads". They are also on the side of big business as that's who pays their bills (via advertising revenue); or failing that, they are on the side of that version of public perception where the majority denigrate anything new.

Therefore, in radio and TV interviews, expect that they will set you up.

Never expect that you have been invited along to present your views in a favourable climate - the opposite is far more likely to be true. They want to see you squirm in an adversarial environment. They have big-money advertisers who they need to please, and you don't count; and they want to knock you over, as that's what they do. Therefore you will be set up to fail.

They are likely to put you up against an expert liar, in an environment where the presenter favours your opponent, and together they will try to make you fail. You could get the 2 onto 1 treatment: against you will be two opponents, perhaps one from academia and one from government, and this is designed to make you fail badly. Either way, your opponents will quote all sorts of spurious and even inaccurate statistics, studies and papers; the old favourite lies will be used; new ways of combining these lies with new distortions will appear.

The defence here is specific and is located elsewhere in private materials available from us, but the principle is universal and very simple indeed: *be prepared*.

Really, it's simple, because everything they say is either a lie or a clever distortion of the facts to make it an almost-lie. It has to be, because they cannot argue based on why they are really there (they're being paid for it) or on real public health issues (there are no facts that support their case), so by deduction everything any anti-THR pro-pharma cigarette-protectionist says must be a lie. Sometimes, the trick is to work out how and why it is a lie, because the most skilled opponents are multi-millionaires who did not accumulate that wealth by being easily beaten in debate: they are masters of the lying game. They are especially good at multi-layered lies that appear truthful at first glance, but conceal a core untruth.

16. It's never about health

Although the opposition argue based on health issues, the facts and evidence are always against them and therefore they have no basis on which to found a legitimate campaign to eradicate ecigs. Their problem is that they are working purely for commercial reasons but that is a negative for them, so they must hide behind pseudo-health argument and easily-bought puppets in the Public Health industry.

Our job is to expose that by making sure all the research is used, not just the cherry-picked examples of junk science they themselves created; and by exposing COIs where possible. They have used these tactics before, since the protagonists are likely to be the same people in the tobacco control industry who have a job for life opposing the tobacco industry. Or, they did have a job for life, until the ecig community put their weight behind THR and threatened their tenure. Of course, smoking will never be banned as it is such a monster money-maker for government and pharma (smoking is ring-fenced by laws in all developed economies for that reason).

"There is not enough research."

It's never about research, either, despite the fact the opposition will try to pull you onto their territory here. There is enough ecig-related research to stretch to the moon and back, but apparently that is 'not enough'. It's never enough.

- A search of just one resource, PubMed, reveals over 350 references.
- There are at least 100 studies that can be inspected.
- There are hundreds of research reports on subjects like e-liquid and vapour analyses.
- There is enough research to enable a Cochrane Review, the gold standard for medical reviews. This will be updated as further relevant research is published.

There's enough.

A really good combat tactic is to draw your opponent onto your ground and then degrade his ability to fight, and that is exactly what is being used here. If they can get us to believe there is not enough research, and to wait until there is enough (which is never), or to spend huge amounts on more research (that will be ignored as always), or to focus on research as the key to achieving permitted consumer product status (which is a bad joke since the regulators are paid to ignore anything other than speculative junk) – *then they win*.

- Research is extremely expensive, and an excellent tactic to exclude small business is to require lots of it: it either excludes them or cripples them.
- Even if they can afford it, the regulator keeps asking for more; this eventually cripples everyone except the giant tobacco and pharmaceutical firms who are the designed beneficiaries of the system.
- Once a medium-size firm has exhausted all its cash resources in a chase after ever more research (all of it useless since it will never be considered anyway), they are finished.
- The regulator is uninterested in research – even in the very unlikely event of them not being bought and paid for, they are mainly interested in reducing the field to a manageable number of participants.
- Regulators cannot deal with 10,000 players – they want 10.

The regulators will ask for ever more and more research, and enough is never enough. The propagandists back them up by claiming there is none or not

enough. It becomes an echo chamber, where a listener is led to believe there is hardly any research – when exactly the opposite is the case.

It is not about research, and by believing it has any relevance, the opponents draw us willingly into a minefield where there is no escape. There is already enough ecig research to last for decades of inspection if it were all to be utilised.

It is a propaganda war, not some kind of research war or health debate. Countering the propaganda is key, and there is plenty enough research already to do that with.

17. The black market

This issue is crucial in reality although often ignored in the fantasy palace of a legislative assembly. If laws prevent people obtaining a product, the black market takes over the supply. Prohibition does nothing except put up prices and hand a legitimate business over to criminals or even crime syndicates (although there are other knock-on effects such as a fall in quality and therefore safety, apart from the donation of more revenue channels to crime syndicates). For example if coffee were to be banned or taxed excessively, the black market would take over supply, and would be enthusiastically supported by all, and would be used by most; quality would fall; and criminals would make a lot of money and increase their networks and influence; and people would still drink coffee.

Unjust, corrupt laws are not just a waste of time, they are injurious, corrosive, and destroy society – and this is a definition of restrictions on vaping.

Here - probably uniquely - we are talking about people obtaining a product that is much safer than the government-backed product in order that they can live a healthier life. The anomalous nature of such a new type of black market - the opposite of the usual situation – means that people will have to go to the black market to stay healthy, perhaps for the first time in history. We might even call it the health market as that's what people will be buying illegally.

A general rule for the oppressed is that satire (or any form of ridiculing the oppressors) is a powerful weapon - and there looks to be a rich mine for it here.

Regulated markets

Most vendors will have to shut down or move to the black market at some point, eventually, unless some major factors change – because regulated markets here are closed to all except the giants. This area is a vendor concern but clearly it impacts the community severely (as it is designed to do).

Regulated markets have their own set of rules. It helps to know them.

1. The big players own the market.
2. The big players own the regulator.
3. The big players own the law.
4. The regulator is never impartial.
5. The regulator cannot and will not deal with thousands of players - they want a handful of players, and will structure everything to ensure that.
6. Entry will be offered you, provided you comply. The offer is designed to remove you by bankrupting you or degrading your capacity to mount a strong legal challenge.
7. Anyone who survives the entry 'offer' is by definition worthy of a seat at the table; and by definition a large business with massive resources.
8. The cost of entry ranges from immense to stratospheric, so don't bother even considering it unless you are a big player.
9. A new regulated market is only different in that some aspects may be open to legal challenge at an early stage. If you wait too long, the players invested in the market will combine with government to defeat you.
10. Regulated markets are designed to shut out competition from smaller, more agile, more efficient players with better, cheaper products brought to market faster (i.e. all vape businesses except the monoliths).
11. Regulated markets are designed to exclude anyone except the great, lumbering giants. Unless you are a whale, don't make the mistake of thinking you have any real chance of a seat: this deception is all part of the game.

Finally and most important of all:

18. Every movement needs a leader, especially at first

That leader may sometimes work by motivating others. Without a determined prime mover, you have nothing. In some cases, such a person can start the ball rolling by locating others who will perform the duties needed in a strong, motivated, and well-organised person or group.

Any resistance needs a centre. If that is a single person as against a group, then that person does not have to be the spokesperson, although they must have a good communication channel with the person who the press see as the contact point.

A spokesperson does not have to be a main mover in the community action, although they can be. Ideally that person uses radio interviews well, and - since they will inevitably end up on TV - needs to be able to perform well in front of a camera. This is so important, these days, that the community may well task a less prominent member with this job if they do well to camera, as long as inter-person communications are good.

So: it generally needs one person to start the ball rolling. That person needs motivation more than anything else. A group will be formed as a result. The originator may then withdraw, as long as others have taken up the baton.

Notes

THR works - but don't expect that to be welcome

In fact, THR is fabulously effective, and not only that: it works when nothing else does.

Unfortunately, a classic mistake beginners make here is to assume that if millions of lives can be saved (or to be more accurate: millions of preventable deaths are averted), then everyone will be happy and all will be grateful.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

If you think that a huge benefit to public health will be welcome in the tobacco-related area, you probably need to go back around to the start and begin again, repeating constantly to yourself: "It's all about the money, it's never about health, it's only ever about the money". Repeat until you begin to understand this.

The threat from new technology

What happens when an established network of industries faces extinction? When it is a dinosaur, an anachronism, a blight on the human race, has branches everywhere, is closely integrated with government, owns the legislative process, pays off thousands of people in policy-making and regulatory positions, and pays inflated salaries to its senior personnel and associates, who are well aware they are finished unless they can block the threat?

The answer is obvious: they fight back ferociously, assisted by all their dependents.

This is what happens when any new technology threatens the established order. It's why the tobacco control section of the public health industry are fighting so hard to block THR: it is the only thing that threatens smoking, and therefore it is the only thing that can (and will) remove their jobs.

Tobacco control is all but redundant in Sweden, and they are desperate to stop that scenario spreading. The Swedish model shows that THR works when all else fails (also see the 20% Prevalence Rule). In the only country it has ever been freely allowed, Sweden, THR is destroying smoking: smoking prevalence is moving toward a zero point - at least, for men.

Sweden has the lowest smoking-related death rate of any developed country by a wide margin; Sweden is the world leader in reducing smoking prevalence;

Sweden is the world leader in reducing tobacco-related mortality; Sweden is the world leader in reducing tobacco-related morbidity.

Sweden will have reduced male smoking prevalence to 5% by around 2016, since it falls by 1% per year, a world-beating drop (and has done since 2003). Sweden has the lowest male lung cancer and oral cancer rate in the EU.

The THR product used there, Snus, is an oral tobacco with most of the carcinogens removed. Because of the incredible level of lies and propaganda from the bought Public Health industry about Snus, the fact it has no reliably identifiable health impact has been cleverly obscured: smokers who quit totally or who switch to Snus have the same health outcomes. Nobody wants you to know that, and the question is why.

We know why.

How many people does the Snus ban kill?

The Snus ban must be responsible for at least 10% of UK smoker deaths: which is 10,000 out of the 100,000 a year; and 10% of the EU total of 700,000, so 70,000 across the EU. This is the absolute minimum possible (Prof Rodu has indicated the number is likely to be considerably higher). Nobody wants you to know that, but we know why: because denying Snus to millions of smokers makes an absolute fortune for governments, the pharmaceutical industry, the cigarette trade, and their front groups.

Never forget that the people who oppose us include some of the wealthiest and most murderously corrupt liars on the planet. Unfortunately, few can comprehend this, as in essence it threatens their world view: if the public health establishment are facilitating millions of deaths for profit, and the government are complicit in the arrangement, and major industry profits extensively from your ill-health with the blessing of government, and government deliberately ensures that as many people as possible are denied their rightful but expensive old age - then where does that leave a person who sincerely believes government and all its agencies are there to protect and support them? They live in a fantasy world, unfortunately, and the last thing you should do is try and jerk them out of it: you simply won't be believed.

Once they become THR product users, people gradually start to realise how the world works. Until then, you cannot confront them with reality, as the realisation they are just there to be ruthlessly exploited is simply too much for them. They will get around to it in their own good time, or perhaps they will never connect the dots; hurrying it up is a recipe for failure. Children believe in Father Christmas, and adults believe government is there to serve and protect them. That's just the way it is.

Tobacco is a government business

The tobacco business is a government business: they make a lot more from

smoking than anybody else. That's why protecting it is a government priority and that's why smoking is ring-fenced by laws and that's why any real threat to smoking is smothered; but don't try and tell anyone that or they'll laugh in your face. You have to wait till they become an ex-smoker and a vaper or Snuser.

Gradually, then, the opposite then becomes more likely: vapers are very hard to convince that government ever really works in the public interest, as they have seen the reality: exploitation and oppression, and a total disregard for their health. They know their health was sold off to the highest bidder, and government colluded to reduce the costs of their old age by deliberately reducing the number of claimants.

You cannot tell people this, they have to find it out for themselves.