CAPHRA
COALITION OF ASIA PACIFIC
TOBACCO HARM REDUCTION ADVOCATES

Balancing Integrity and Influence: Conflict of Interest Standards in Public Health

Introduction

The intent of public health policy is to serve and protect the well-being of populations, grounded firmly in scientific evidence and ethical integrity. A critical component of this is the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (WHO FCTC) and particularly Article 5.3, designed to prevent undue influence from the tobacco industry on health policy. However, an increasing body of evidence and observation suggests that the application of this principle has been selectively enforced. Many public health officials, from the WHO FCTC Secretariat to national and local agencies, have paradoxically shielded themselves from scrutiny while accusing consumer advocates of conflicts of interest. This stance, at best, reflects inconsistency; at worst, it is blatant and troubling hypocrisy.

Selective Application of Article 5.3

Article 5.3 was crafted to create a firewall between tobacco industry influence and health policymaking. It has, however, been opportunistically broadened by some public health officials to label consumer advocates—including grassroots harm reduction groups—as de facto industry proxies. This tactic not only silences important consumer voices but conveniently deflects attention from the growing and under-examined influence of pharmaceutical corporations and philanthropic entities on public health policies.

Pharmaceutical companies and aligned philanthropies have long influenced research agendas and policy decisions related to smoking cessation and alternative nicotine products. Their funding and lobbying often go unchallenged by the same officials who aggressively criticize any engagement between consumer advocates and independent producers of harm-reduction alternatives such as vaping products or nicotine pouches. This double standard not only undermines the credibility of the public health institutions, but also obstructs open, evidence-based dialogue.

Funding and the Hypocrisy of Influence

Many leading researchers and institutions within public health are themselves recipients of funding from pharmaceutical companies—whose products directly compete with consumer-driven alternatives—and from government grants funded through tobacco taxes. The irony is palpable: while governments claim to want to reduce smoking rates, their revenue models remain partially dependent on the continued consumption of tobacco products. At the same time, they obstruct consumer-accessible products, resisting the very innovations that could accelerate smoking cessation.

CAPHRA
COALITION OF ASIA PACIFIC
TOBACCO HARM REDUCTION ADVOCATES

Blocking access to alternative nicotine delivery systems under the pretense of long-term uncertainty, while simultaneously advocating for cessation products with far less consumer uptake, sends a mixed and unprofessional message. Such a position does not align with the stated goal of reducing harm and improving population health. If the same rigid, overly cautious approach had been applied to the development and deployment of life-saving vaccines during the COVID-19 pandemic, the global death toll would have been exponentially worse.

The Call for Higher Standards

Public health officials are rightly held to a high standard of professionalism. However, this standard must be applied uniformly. It is unprofessional and ethically questionable to condemn others for perceived conflicts of interest while ignoring or rationalizing their own affiliations and dependencies. Public trust is eroded when officials appear to "say one thing and do another," particularly when such behavior stifles progress and innovation in public health.

The primary duty of public health officials is to serve the public interest—not their personal biases, career ambitions, or the agendas of funding bodies. This means engaging with all credible evidence, not selectively citing research that reinforces existing myopic views. It follows as well to listen to those directly affected, especially consumers, whose lived experiences and grassroots advocacy offer indispensable insights into harm reduction.

Conclusion

Consumer advocates deserve respect and a seat at the policymaking table. Their lived experience and dedication to harm reduction provide valuable insights that public health officials cannot afford to ignore. Dismissing their contributions under a distorted interpretation of Article 5.3 only perpetuates harm, delays innovation, and undermines the very goals public health institutions are sworn to uphold.

It is imperative that public health returns to its core mandate: evidence-based policy, transparency, and unwavering accountability to the people it serves. Only by applying consistent ethical standards to all stakeholders—including themselves—can public health officials truly lead the fight against smoking and related harms with integrity and public confidence.

Public health can only lead with integrity when it applies its ethical standards equally—starting with itself.

C.Y. Virgino - clarisse@caphraorg.net
N.E. Loucas - neloucas@caphraorg.net