
Tekst 7

Smoke without fire

- 1 BACK in the 1950s, when the dangers of smoking were becoming clear and the tobacco industry was panicked, cigarette-makers came up with a wheeze: safer smokes. Filter-tipped, low-tar and "light" cigarettes were the result.
- 2 In reality, those cigarettes were not safer at all. Smokers inhaled more deeply or smoked more. 25. Internal documents later revealed that they cynically promoted safer cigarettes to discourage people from quitting.
- 3 Given this history of smoke and mirrors, you should be suspicious when a tobacco company announces that it is investing in a "reduced risk" cigarette. In December, British American Tobacco (BAT) bought a company called CN Creative, which makes "electronic cigarettes". It is now planning to ask the UK authorities to recognise one of its products as a smoking-cessation medicine.
- 4 26 ? Probably not. There is mounting evidence that e-cigarettes are safer than smoking and really can help addicts cut down or quit. They seem especially useful for hard-core smokers who have failed to quit or who don't even want to try.¹⁾
- 5 The anti-tobacco group Action on Smoking and Health (ASH) has given a qualified backing to e-cigarettes for harm reduction. ASH sensibly points out that e-cigarettes are clearly safer than inhaling tobacco smoke, and says there is little evidence that they will attract non-smokers or make smoking acceptable again.
- 6 Don't hold your breath, though. A similar argument has been made for "snus", a form of oral tobacco mainly used in Sweden. There is evidence that it can help smokers quit and that it is safer than smoking. Sweden has the lowest rates of smoking and lung cancer in Europe, which is often attributed to the use of snus. If Sweden's snus habit was replicated across the EU it would prevent thousands of lung cancer deaths, and yet it remains illegal. Outside Sweden it is condemned as a carcinogen and a potential gateway to smoking. The lesson? Harm reduction is a tough sell.
- 7 It may be distasteful to watch a tobacco company spearhead a campaign for cigarette harm reduction. But action is sorely needed. If the evidence stacks up, they should be given the benefit of the doubt – for now.



NewScientist, 2013

noot 1 According to more recent findings this claim is controversial.

Tekst 7 Smoke without fire

- 1p 24 How is the topic of this text introduced in paragraph 1?
A by explaining why a certain product was developed
B by presenting well-known facts as if they were new
C by revealing shocking information to the readers
D by supporting outdated views on the subject matter
- 1p 25 Which of the following fits the gap in paragraph 2?
A And the industry knew it
B But the industry was kept ignorant
C So the industry needed publicity
D Yet the industry thrived
- 1p 26 Which of the following fits the gap in paragraph 4?
A Basic knowledge
B History repeating
C Logical development
D Mission accomplished
E New policy
F Realistic plan
- 1p 27 What is the function of paragraph 5?
A to counterbalance the claim made in paragraph 4
B to present support for the claim made in paragraph 4
C to question the claim made in paragraph 4
D to view the claim made in paragraph 4 from a medical perspective
- 2p 28 “Harm reduction is a tough sell.” (einde alinea 6)
Geef van elk van de volgende citaten aan of het wel of niet deze conclusie ondersteunt.
1 “Smokers inhaled more deeply or smoked more.” (alinea 2)
2 “you should be suspicious when a tobacco company announces that it is investing in a “reduced risk” cigarette” (alinea 3)
3 “If Sweden’s snus habit was replicated across the EU it would prevent thousands of lung cancer deaths, and yet it remains illegal.” (alinea 6)
4 “If the evidence stacks up, they should be given the benefit of the doubt – for now.” (alinea 7)
Noteer het nummer van elk citaat, gevolgd door “wel” of “niet”.