NEW YORK OFFICE
J. WALTER THOMPSON CO.
44-60 EAST 23RD ST.

June 20th, 1916

NEWS BULLETIN NO. 3.

Mr. A. M. Lewis,
New York Office.

Dear Mr. Lewis:

Our confidential letter of today contains some interesting news from our Chicago office, also an outline of a campaign we are getting out here for Arbuckles' Ariosa Coffee.

***************

DETOIT NOTES

Mr. Farnsworth makes a very interesting suggestion -- that we should make up a list of the "world's greatest" among our clients -- which would prove valuable material in getting new business. The Detroit office makes a fine showing with six. As soon as the other offices send in the list of the "world's greatest" among their clients, the full list will be sent around in the bulletin.

***************

Members of our organization wishing to travel between Detroit and Buffalo, Detroit and Cleveland, or from Detroit north to Mackinac, should not forget that the office has free transportation available on the D. & C. Navigation Company on account of our handling their magazine advertising. Requests for transportation should be made in ample time to secure tickets by addressing our Detroit office.

***************

The Detroit Graphite Company, manufacturers of paint and graphite, are now considering a schedule which will, for the first time, introduce them to the use of national magazines of general circulation. Since last November, when we first got the account, their efforts have been confined almost entirely to technical and semi-technical publications.

***************
CINCINNATI NOTES

The Cincinnati office has had an opportunity this summer to materially increase its experience on the question of window displays. The American Lithographic Company sold the Odorono Company on the idea of buying 10,000 window displays and making a window display campaign this summer. The Cincinnati office heartily endorsed this idea in general, but thought that 10,000 was too many for the Odorono Company to get out. They succeeded in getting the order reduced to 7,500, but it has proved to be a considerable task to successfully place even that number during the short Odorono season.

The first arrangement was made with the Bellringer Company, of New York City, by the Odorono Company, to secure windows and place these displays in about a dozen leading cities, at a cost of $2.50 per window for the Bellringer service. The Bellringer organization has done very well in New York City and one or two other Eastern cities, but has failed to deliver satisfactory service outside of these places.

In order to get the window display campaign carried out, it has been necessary for our Cincinnati office to take an active hand in it, and as a result, their Mr. Griffes and Mr. Hale are now in the South on a six weeks' trip selling Odorono, securing the best located windows, and putting in the displays. Neither of these young men had had any experience in this field before, but both are doing the work very successfully. They are selling enough goods to go a long way toward paying expenses, and are securing the very best locations. In Nashville, Tenn., for instance, out of seventeen centrally located stores, they secured displays in sixteen. When these men return, our Cincinnati office expects to have available a fund of practical experience on drug store window display work that will be very valuable.

***************

Our Boston office has been so busy with their very successful Lux campaign that they have not given us any news for this week's bulletin, but they have promised to let us have it soon.

***************
CHICAGO NOTES

Our Chicago office is engaged in preparing a campaign for Cream of Barley in the Philadelphia territory where satisfactory distribution has already been secured. The campaign will probably include newspapers, street cars, 1-sheet posters on elevated platforms and subway stations, besides some bill posting in the city proper and in outlying territory in order to reinforce the overflow of Philadelphia newspapers. The copy will be centered around the thought of "Cream of Barley, the Energy Food".

*********************

Editorial Co-operation

In connection with our Spring campaigns on O'Sullivan and Kayser Silk Gloves, we have secured some very valuable free editorial notice in the daily papers. The large Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Boston and Buffalo newspapers have inserted reading notices on O'Sullivan's Rubber Heels, covering space of 60 to 135 lines.

The Kayser news articles, sample of which we are sending to each office, appeared in a list of fifty papers. Last year, the free space secured for this account amounted to $5500.00. The advertising this Spring was cancelled because the advertiser was three or four months behind on orders. This interfered with our securing additional free editorial notice. We feel sure that had the campaign continued as planned, the amount secured would have exceeded that secured last year.

The articles inserted were in the form of news items on silk gloves, and were of such genuine news value that the editors of newspapers were glad to have them.

For the American Hard Rubber Company, the leading notion trade paper, "Notion and Novelty Review", reprinted as a news article, a consumer advertisement we had run, which covered two pages in their paper.

*********************
We will keep in our Statistical Department here, under such headings as window displays, sampling, house to house work, two in one offers, all definite data that we can collect on these subjects, and as soon as we get all this matter cross indexed, which will be within a few months, we will send each office a general index of subjects on which we are prepared to provide definite information.

*************

We hope to include in our letter next week, a summary of the returns on the Yuban Mitchell Letters in Chicago.

*************

With very best wishes,

Sincerely,

J. WALTER THOMPSON COMPANY,

Stanley Resor,

SBR-CER VICE PRESIDENT.
LEGALIZING MORALITY IN ADVERTISING

Unscrupulous advertising is made more perilous than ever by a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court. In the opinion which accompanies that decision the Court writes another chapter in its record of identifying good law and good morals. Substantial wrong-doing has often escaped punishment by pleading a technical defense. The reason why the Supreme Court has grown in popular confidence is that it has repeatedly shattered technical defense by directing against it a common-sense view of justice. This is particularly true of its decision and opinion in this advertising case.

A real estate company advertised the sale of lands in Florida by circulating prints, pamphlets, and other publications, as well as letters, in the United States mails. The corporation and certain individuals connected with it were indicted under United States statutes making it an offense to use the United States mails to defraud or to carry out a scheme to obtain money or property by means of false or fraudulent representations or promises. The grounds on which the allegations in the indictment were made charge the corporation and these individuals with making untrue representations concerning the land. These representations were certainly alluring. They alleged that the farms on this land were fertile, that they were divided into tracts, that roads and school-houses and fences were built, that there were no mosquitoes, that lumber was cheap, that there were telephone connections and hundreds of people had settled there, that prices had increased very greatly, that a family could make enough money on one farm during the first year for self-support besides saving money, and so on.

There was no denial in the indictment that the company owned the land or "that the land was worth fully as much as was to be obtained therefor." The lower court, therefore, held that the business was legitimate and that the Federal statute was not violated by "puffing" the qualities of the article sold. As the lower court expressed it, "raising the expectations of the purchaser, but giving that purchaser value received for his money, but not fulfilling those expectations," was not an offense against the statute.

It is this decision of the lower court that the Supreme Court has reversed.

In contrast to the more technical decision of the lower court, the United States Supreme Court holds that advertisers may be held guilty of fraudulent representation even when the goods that they deliver are worth the money they receive for them. "Mere puffing," says the United States Supreme Court — "that is, the mere exaggeration of the qualities which the article has"—might not come within the prohibition of the statute, though the Court does not express an opinion on that subject. But the Court adds: "When a proposed seller goes beyond that, assigns to the article qualities which it does not possess, does not simply magnify in opinion the advantages which it has, but invents advantages and falsely asserts their existence, he transcends the limits of 'puffing' and engages in false representations and pretenses." And the Supreme Court adds, in the words of Justice McKenna, who wrote this opinion: "An article alone is not necessarily the inducement and compensation for its purchase. It is in the use to which it may be put, the purpose it may serve; and there is deception and fraud when the article is not of the character or kind represented, and hence does not serve the purpose." The Court enumerated some of the representations made in this case, as, for instance, the fertility of the soil, the existence of hotels, roads, Pullman cars and other transportation facilities, and so on. And it comments: "We can entertain no doubt that those employing such representations, if they are false, have engaged in a scheme to defraud." Though this case deals only with real estate, and the opinion lays special emphasis on the greater attractiveness of inducements for purchasing small tracts for homes, the principle that the Court lays down is one which plainly applies to other kinds of articles.

Hereafter, advertisers who deliberately make false representations in their advertisements and utilize the United States mails for circulating those representations are in danger. Let unscrupulous advertisers take warning.
The "Auto-Kamp" Trailer

For a Day's Outing or Long Tour

It is quickly attached to any motor car and enables you to camp anywhere. Set up in seven minutes and gives a fully equipped sleeping and living tent. Saves hotel bills—garage expenses, etc.—pays for itself in one season—and increases the pleasure of touring.

A comfortable sleeping tent with two storm-proof windows giving ample ventilation—mosquito-proof—two large double beds—high and dry—with real sagless springs, comfortable, heavy mattresses, pillows and bedding—dining table, two-burner gasoline stove—icebox, cooking outfit, dishes and cutlery. Equipped with a dust-proof food compartment. It is water-proof, wind-proof and insect-proof. There is plenty of room in the Trailer for extra baggage—suitcases, hammock, folding camp chairs, etc., so that you can be just as comfortable in camp as at home. Curtain divides tent into two compartments, if desired. Rowboat can be carried on top of Trailer for fishing and hunting trips.

Write Today for Full Information, specifications, prices, etc.

The Auto-Kamp Trailer folds compactly like a Pullman berth and has a water-proof cover that keeps everything dry even in the hardest storm. It attaches by universal socket joints—adjustable for any car. No trouble—it's just as easy to drive with the Trailer as without it. It follows behind your car at any speed or over any kind of roads—and tracks perfectly around turns and corners. Camp equipment can be removed in a few minutes, giving a commercial trailer of 1,500 pounds capacity—44x72 inch body with spring end gate.

Take an Auto-Kamp Trailer with you—make your outings delightful camping trips.

AUTO-KAMP EQUIPMENT CO., 101 South Second St., Saginaw, Michigan
June 20th, 1916.

CONFIDENTIAL LETTER

Mr. J. W. Young,
Cincinnati Office.

Dear Jim:

NEWS FROM CHICAGO

On Page 1295 of the Literary Digest for May 6th, you will find a double column advertisement of the Auto-Kamp Trailer — the first of the try-out campaign which our Chicago office has prepared for this new account. They expected satisfactory inquiries, but were not prepared for the avalanche of inquiries which were received. Within the first week after the magazine was issued, over 3200 inquiries had been received. It is impossible to give the exact results, as their clerical force is completely swamped, and final checking will be postponed until they catch up.

We are sorry to report the transfer of the Jeffrey Automobile account from our Chicago office to Erwin & Wasey. Mr. Raymond writes that the net of the matter is that a new sales administration, in making a clean sweep of this matter, is, from its own point of view, placing itself where responsibility for better or less favorable service will be more easily determined.

Incidentally, Mr. Raymond says that Mr. Jeffrey, in giving the keynote of a little publication, called the "Jeffrey Circle", introduces the same with the following expression: "July 31st will mark the end of the most successful sales year ever enjoyed by the Jeffrey organization. With six weeks still to go, we have already doubled the Jeffrey output."

We are glad to say that the New York office is getting out a big campaign for Arbuckles' Ariosa.
Coffee. This is a cheap (25 cent) coffee in a paper package, sold in country districts, small towns and to the industrial classes in larger cities.

The advertising commences in September, and runs through October, November and December. The campaign is divided into two parts — the national, and the intensive work in four states, namely, Ohio, Kentucky, Kansas and Virginia. The national campaign includes 9 small town women's magazines, 7 sectional weeklies, 6 farm papers in the Southeast, 18 religious papers, and 322 county weeklies on the Kellogg and Western list. We are using full pages in color, half and quarter pages in the magazines, and 450 and 200 line advertisements in the papers.

The intensive work in the four states will include, in addition to newspaper work, couponing and direct mailing. We hope to be able to show very definite returns in these four states.

**************

Attached is an interesting article on a recent Supreme Court Decision on the subject of "Telling the Truth in Advertising", which appeared in the Outlook of June 7th, 1916.

**************

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

J. WALTER THOMPSON COMPANY,

Stanley Resor,

VICE PRESIDENT.
From left to right—
Verne W. Tucker
Harry P. Breitenbach
Gordon C. Eldredge
WORLD'S GREATEST

Packers  Swift & Company
Cameras  Libby, McNeill & Libby,
Corn-carrying Railroad  Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R.
Pancake Flour Maker  Aunt Jemima Mills Company
Farm Barn Equipment  Louden Machinery Company
Malted Milk  Horlick's Malted Milk Co.
Automatic Telephone  Automatic Electric Co.
Flows  Moline Manufacturing Co.
Refrigerators  McCray Refrigerator
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Unscrupulous advertising is made more perilous than ever by a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court. In the opinion which accompanies that decision the Court writes another chapter in its record of identifying good law and good morals. Substantial wrong-doing has often escaped punishment by pleading a technical defense. The reason why the Supreme Court has grown in popular confidence is that it has repeatedly shattered technical defense by directing against it a common-sense view of justice. This is particularly true of its decision and opinion in this advertising case.

A real estate company advertised the sale of lands in Florida by circulating prints, pamphlets, and other publications, as well as letters, in the United States mails. The corporation and certain individuals connected with it were indicted under United States statutes making it an offense to use the United States mails to defraud or to carry out a scheme to obtain money or property by means of false or fraudulent representations or promises. The grounds on which the allegations in the indictment were made charge the corporation and these individuals with making untrue representations concerning the land. These representations were certainly alluring. They alleged that the farms on this land were fertile, that they were divided into tracts, that roads and school-houses and fences were built, that there were no mosquitoes, that lumber was cheap, that there were telephone connections and hundreds of people had settled there, that prices had increased very greatly, that a family could make enough money on one farm during the first year for self-support besides saving money, and so on.

There was no denial in the indictment that the company owned the land or that the land was worth fully as much as was to be obtained therefor.” The lower court, therefore, held that the business was legitimate and that the Federal statute was not violated by “puffing” the qualities of the article sold. As the lower court expressed it, “raising the expectations of the purchaser, but giving that purchaser value received for his money, but not fulfilling those expectations,” was not an offense against the statute.

It is this decision of the lower court that the Supreme Court has reversed.

In contrast to the more technical decision of the lower court, the United States Supreme Court holds that advertisers may be held guilty of fraudulent representation even when the goods that they deliver are worth the money they receive for them. “Mere puffing,” says the United States Supreme Court—“that is, the mere exaggeration of the qualities which the article has”—might not come within the prohibition of the statute, though the Court does not express an opinion on that subject. But the Court adds: “When a proposed seller goes beyond that, assigns to the article qualities which it does not possess, does not simply magnify in opinion the advantages which it has, but invents advantages and falsely asserts their existence, he transcends the limits of ‘puffing’ and engages in false representations.
and pretenses." And the Supreme Court adds, in the words of Justice McKenna, who wrote this opinion: "An article alone is not necessarily the inducement and compensation for its purchase. It is in the use to which it may be put, the purpose it may serve; and there is deception and fraud when the article is not of the character or kind represented, and hence does not serve the purpose." The Court enumerated some of the representations made in this case, as, for instance, the fertility of the soil, the existence of hotels, roads, Pullman cars and other transportation facilities, and so on. And it comments: "We can entertain no doubt that those employing such representations, if they are false, have engaged in a scheme to defraud." Though this case deals only with real estate, and the opinion lays special emphasis on the greater attractiveness of inducements for purchasing small tracts for homes, the principle that the Court lays down is one which plainly applies to other kinds of articles.

Hereafter, advertisers who deliberately make false representations in their advertisements and utilize the United States mails for circulating those representations are in danger. Let unscrupulous advertisers take warning.