

Margrethe Montanares  
 Kilpatrick/ English 1010  
 Annotated bibliography

### How Do Smoking Bans Affect Both Smokers and Nonsmokers?

Studies have shown the effects of smoking on children and now we need to find a way to protect the children. There has been a lot of discussion on how smoking bans affect both smokers and nonsmokers. Ben Johns says that smoking bans are taking away part of a person's freedom to choose. Instead of the person choosing to smoke, the ban is choosing for them and simply saying not to. On the other hand, Michelle Sims believes smoking bans are good because they're helping both the nonsmokers and the smokers' health. Tyler Holloway will argue against bans being a good thing because bans decrease revenue for bars and other businesses that attract smokers. So how do you protect the ones who choose not to smoke without negatively hurting the others? There is a fine line that needs to be found.

Barlow, Kevin. "In 4th year, new friction over indoor smoking ban." *Pantagraph, The* (Bloomington, IL) 2 Jan. 2011. EBSCO. Web. 9 Mar. 2011.

Illinois has now had a statewide smoking ban in public places for four years and small business owners are not happy. The ban doesn't really affect businesses like retailers but for casinos and bars revenues have dropped 25-30% and for some even 40-50%. The new state senator thinks the law should be unconstitutional and thinks that the owners should be able to choose if they want to let people smoke inside their businesses. Some say there is a fine line between the government and the people and the government might have just crossed it.

This article's primary appeal is logical. It has a lot of statistics in it and talks a lot about laws and the constitution. It also appeals to emotion because it takes into consideration the small business and not just the monopolies that control most of the things that go on in their category. The lawmakers are trying to come up with a new law that will be fair to most businesses instead of just casinos that have the power and recourses to fight the law in their favor.

Although the article isn't an opinion based article, it has lots of opinions in it which helped me see various opinions next to each other and made it easier to distinguish what the opinions on this topic are. I see now that small businesses hardly stand a chance when politicians are making laws because they lack the resources to fight for right or for the law to be made in their favor. I usually don't care much for small businesses but after reading this article I have some sympathy for them.

Cortez, Marjorie. "Weber State University Student Leaders Seek State's First Smoking Ban at Public College or University." *Deseret News*. 3 Feb 2011. Web. 18 Mar 2011.

Student Government leaders at Weber State University are trying to ban smoking on all of campus. This article says that all public universities in Pennsylvania have banned smoking on campus, which lets Weber State know it is possible. Student senator Ben Johns is afraid that the ban might be stepping on the students' choices and thinks it would be fairer if the school would set aside a place for smokers on campus. Another suggestion was to have the band but to also offer classes on how to quit smoking and to help people with the process of quitting.

This news article appeals to emotion because it shows the student leaders trying to come up with the fairest way to please everyone. They are researching this topic nationwide, not just in Utah and are checking laws before the student council vote on it and take it to the administration which makes them seem like they are credible. The students interviewed also used a big range of vocabulary which shows that they are intelligent, this makes it easier to trust in them as well.

I didn't really think that smoking bans could be seen as infringing upon a person's choice or right to do something, but after reading this article I can see how a smoker could see it as if part of his right to choose is taken away. The article also helped me to come up with a question for my overall topic. I had a few questions in mind, but I felt like the questions weren't broad enough and I didn't know what I was missing, now I know I needed to include how the smokers felt about it.

Currie, Donya. "Study finds city-wide smoking ban reduces risks of preterm birth." *Nation's Health* 40.10 (2011): 12.EBSCO. Web. 9 Mar. 2011.

Research shows that smoking bans reduce the risk of preterm birth. The lead study author also said that the smoking bans reduce the possibility of mothers smoking while pregnant. In the surrounding cities of the ban there were no signs of a decrease in smoking. He also said that this study shows that it is important to study mothers and their fetuses when it comes to smoking bans.

The article is a study but because they added their conclusion it has a perspective and therefore makes it an opinion. This article appeals to both logic and emotion. It is logical because it is a study and has lots of statistics and percentages. The emotional appeal comes from the fact that it states the danger of preterm births and the danger for children in general.

I had no idea preterm births were so common in the United States before reading this 2article and the dangers that come with it. If smoking bans can reduce that risk than I think we should try to enforce these laws better. It also got me to think of all of the lives of little children lost that could have been prevented if we would've known about these risks before.

Laurance, Jeremy. "Warning: The Nanny State Can Seriously Improve Your Health." *The Independent*. 9 Jun 2010: 18. SIRS Researcher. Web. 9 Mar 2011.

The title “Warning: The Nanny State Can Seriously Improve Your Health” is exactly what this article talks about. John Reid, the health secretary in 2004 was afraid that if they set a ban for smoking he would lose smokers’ votes and wasn’t in favor of the ban. Michelle Sims, the lead investigator on the study of the effects when smoking bans are introduced is in favor of the ban and said that any number of reductions have important benefits. The study says that after the first year of the ban there were 1,200 heart attack admissions prevented in England. More than 400,000 people quit smoking once the ban was enacted, researchers predict that will prevent 40,000 deaths over ten years from lung cancer, heart disease and other smoking-related diseases.

This news article uses information from studies and shows the studies’ conclusion which makes it an opinion article. The primary appeal is a logical one. It uses lots of numbers and statistics and the fact that the primary source is a study makes it appeal to logic even more. An appeal to kairos and emotion is also shown because people care about their health without really realizing that they do. By using numbers to show the positive effects smoking bans have on your health people will be more concerned. It also takes advantage of the time and place, this is the time everyone is concerned about all the effects of smoking and secondhand smoke.

The study really helped me realize the long term effects smoking bans really have. Most of the articles I’ve read talk more about how the bans affect us right now. Knowing how the bans affect us all in the long run gives me new perspectives on smoking bans and bans in general that are made for the sake of our health. It makes it easier to accept bans and even laws that are being made because although you can’t see the results right away there are hidden benefits.

Szabo, Liz. "Sad data' on secondhand smoke, kids." *USA Today*. n.d.EBSCO. Web. 9 Mar. 2011.

The World Health Organization researched and made a study that shows that every year about 5.7 million people worldwide die from tobacco and that 5.1 million of them die from their own smoking. After the first year of a smoking ban, heart attack rates drop 10-20%. The study also shows that bans encourage smokers to quit smoking and to make their homes smoke-free, which would drastically reduce the amount of secondhand smoke that children are exposed to.

This study is an opinion because they added their perspective on smoking bans. The article uses an appeal to logic because it is a study and they backup their research with percentages and statistics. It also appeals to kairos because now is the right time to do a study and come out with it. A few years ago there weren’t any laws on smoking in public and this study probably wouldn’t have gotten much attention, but now that people know the dangers of smoking and secondhand smoke bans are starting to be made everywhere.

The study done by the WHO really got me thinking about everyone in the world and not just about the people in Utah or in the United States. I didn’t know there were so many people that die from tobacco every year. This study really made me dislike smokers

because I saw the number of people dying from secondhand smoke and I don't think it is fair that people die from other people's choice to smoke.

Tautou, Annabel. "FDA Reviews Menthol Cigarette Ban." *French Tribune.com*. 21 Mar 2011. Web. 28 Mar 2011.

The Food and Drug Administration are conducting a further research on menthol ban. The research might make it so there will be marketing restrictions which would make it harder for younger consumers to get a hold of. If it's harder for people to buy there won't be as many people smoking it and everyone's health will be in a better condition. Leading tobacco companies disagree that smoking bans will not benefit the public health and instead believe that it will just create a black market.

The FDA is a very powerful administration that everyone has heard of, this makes it a very credible source. The article is very opinionated from both sides making it an opinion article instead of a news one. It also uses a logical appeal by stating statistics. Smoking costs \$100 billion for medical care a year and also takes the lives of 443,000 people. Another appeal used by both the tobacco companies and the FDA is an appeal to pathos. The Tobacco companies use the emotion of fear, saying that bans will create a black market. The FDA uses the phrase "younger consumers" which automatically makes the reader think of their children.

The tobacco companies' use of pathos in striking fear really worked for me. Before reading this article I really believed there weren't any cons to smoking bans, but if smoking bans are too strict there actually might be a black market for it. This article really helped me get a different point of view. Even though tobacco companies are always trying to make smoking seem like it's not a big deal and I never care about what they say, they made my research a lot better by looking into what they had to say.

Ben Johns, student senator at Weber State University believes smoking bans are taking smokers' freedom to choose, in other words the bans are choosing for them. Researchers such as Michelle Sims see the bans as benefiting the public's health. A decrease in heart attacks and other smoking related illnesses have been shown after the bans have been placed. Tobacco companies disagree and argue that the bans will create a black market and could possibly make things worse instead of making things better. There are lots of opinions out there on smoking bans, but not very many from smokers. I want to know how smokers feel about all these new bans on smoking. Barlow, Cortez and Laurance's articles are the three perspectives I will be going into more detail. They all have great points and they are all different which is what this research is about.

## Issue Summary

### How Do Smoking Bans Affect Both Smokers and Nonsmokers?

There has been a lot of discussion on what the effects of smoking bans have on smokers and nonsmokers after studies showing the effects of smoking and secondhand smoke on children. Smoking bans are important because everyone in some way is affected by the bans. Ben Johns, the student senator of Weber State University says that smoking bans are taking part of a person's right to choose. He believes if a campus-wide ban is made, the ban will be choosing for the person not to smoke instead of the person making that decision. Johns also worries about the fact that some international students might be offended by the ban. Tyler Holloway, the president of Bloomington Downtown Bar Association agrees that smoking bans are bad because they decrease revenue for businesses that attract smokers. Michelle Sims however, comes from a health related background as a lead investigator for researches and disagrees with both and argues that smoking bans are good because they're helping both the nonsmokers and the smokers' health.

In "Weber State University Student Leaders Seek State's First Smoking Ban at Public College or University" the author, Marjorie Cortez interviewed the student senators of Weber State. The campus doesn't enforce the laws for smoking now and having it all over campus would just be stepping on people's freedom to choose and there would still probably be smokers on campus, said the student senator Ben Johns. He doesn't think the campus-wide ban is a good idea. Johns is also afraid that the school will lose a lot of their international students because the students could think that the school doesn't tolerate smokers or they might get offended by the campus-wide ban.

Michelle Sims, the lead investigator of a study on the effects when smoking bans are introduced in Jeremy Laurance's "Warning: The Nanny State Can Seriously Improve Your Health" is in favor of the bans. Laurance states that after 30 min of being exposed to smoke it can lead to blood clots, triggering heart attacks. Sims says that even if there is just a small reduction in health issues, those reductions have important benefits. After the first year, the study says there were more than 1,200 heart attack admissions prevented in England. Just think of how many heart attacks could be prevented in Utah or in the world if that many were prevented in just one country. The study also found that more than 400,000 people quit smoking once the ban took place. These numbers may not seem very big compared to how many people there are in the world, but small numbers can make a big difference.

In the article "In 4<sup>th</sup> Year, New Friction over Indoor Smoking Ban" Kevin Barlow writes about the effects from the statewide smoking ban. Barlow's main focus is on the effects the ban has had on a business perspective. Bar owners and other businesses that attract smokers are completely against the ban. Some business owners acknowledge that the ban has decreased health problems but it has also decreased revenue. According to Tyler Holloway, the president of the Bloomington Downtown Bar Association, after the first year of the ban, bars and other related businesses saw a 25-30% decrease in revenue and some even reported a 40-50% drop. A decrease in revenue gave casinos in Illinois determination to try and fight the law and make it so that casinos can have a place designated for smokers so they can start to see a surplus again. The lawmakers of Illinois are seriously considering this proposal since the state itself is losing money because the surrounding states don't have such strict smoking bans therefore, attracting more smokers

than Illinois. This new consideration isn't pleasing everyone though, the bar associations aren't happy because the new law might not include bars, private clubs, and other related businesses. If the state of Illinois can come up with a way to set smoking bans in place to decrease health issues but still see a surplus as a state, other states including Utah may have a chance at seeing the same benefits in their own state.

Tyler Holloway, Michelle Sims, and Ben Johns all come from different point of views. Holloway looks at the smoking ban from a business view and only sees negatives instead of dollar signs. Sims comes from a health related background and is as positive as anyone can be about the smoking bans and the more she hears that another one will be made the more excited she gets. The student council at Weber State University however, is coming from a more political view and is in favor of the people and doesn't want students to lose their freedom to choose and for them to feel that the bans are taking that right away from them. Although they all come from different backgrounds there is at least one thing they can all agree on and that is the benefit of decreasing everyone's health problems related to smoking.

All three perspectives agree that the smoking bans have at least somewhat helped health issues, but Ben Johns and Tyler Holloway see more negative affects than positive ones. Johns and Holloway both don't want to lose any people. Ben Johns is afraid that a campus-wide ban will make the school lose students because a lot of students smoke especially international ones and Holloway doesn't want to lose any more customers because they aren't allowed to smoke inside the bar. Michelle Sims however, believes that the health benefits outweigh the negative affects. She does understand where Holloway and Johns are coming from because everyone needs money to survive, but she

believes that after a few years of having these bans there will be fewer smokers and in this case bars and schools will start to get more customers or students again.

Weber State University's student council agrees with Sims that the smoking bans benefit the general public's health, but they also believe that if smoking bans are going to be made there should also be programs to help people quit smoking. The bans are indirectly telling smokers that they need to stop smoking, but the bans aren't telling them how to. So instead of just telling smokers to quit, Justin Neville, legislative vice-president at Weber State University believes there should be a program to go along with the ban to help those who want to quit smoking.

Being at a college or university campus exposes you to lots of things and one of those things being smokers. Laurance says that after being exposed to cigarette smoke, you can have an increase in blood pressure triggering heart attacks due to blood clots. This is part of the reason why all three perspectives can agree that there is one great benefit to having smoking bans. Although Johns and Holloway believe there are lots of negative affects from the bans, they both agree with Sims that there is an increase in everyone's health once a ban is put in place and they are both appreciative of that.

There are lots of opinions about smoking bans affecting individuals in both positive and negative ways, but the effects are there whether you believe they are beneficial or not. While some argue that smoking bans have a positive effect on the health of both smokers and non-smokers alike, others argue the negative financial impact the bans cause outweigh the positive impact. Finally, Weber State University's student council argues that a person's right to choose for him or herself to smoke or not is limited by a smoking ban. These three perspectives may not agree on everything but it lets you

know that there is more than just a “yes” or a “no” to each debate going on. The perspectives were helpful in finding my own point of view and to figure out where I stand in the debate. There needs to be smoking bans in place so that the nonsmokers’ health can be protected. Some may say that the positive effects don’t add up to the negative effects, but I disagree with them and believe that there are far more benefits from smoking bans than there are negative. I feel like the public should be more informed about smoking bans and the various perspectives so I am going to write an opinion article.

Works cited

Barlow, Kevin. "In 4th year, new friction over indoor smoking ban." *Pantagraph, The* (Bloomington, IL) 02 Jan. 2011. EBSCO. Web. 9 Mar. 2011.

Cortez, Marjorie. "Weber State University Student Leaders Seek State's First Smoking Ban at Public College or University." *Deseret News*. 3 Feb 2011. Web. 18 Mar 2011.

Laurance, Jeremy. "Warning: The Nanny State Can Seriously Improve Your Health." *The Independent*. 9 Jun 2010: 18. SIRS Researcher. Web. 09 Mar 2011.

## How Do Smoking Bans Affect Both Smokers and Nonsmokers?

By Margrethe Montanares

After having studies coming out and showing how non smokers are being affected by secondhand smoke there have been lots of smoking bans put in place. A debate on whether the effects of smoking bans are good or bad for both smokers and nonsmokers lead me to find my own perspective on it. You need to look at other people's perspective in order to know where you stand against the others. The main three perspectives that I have may all differ but they have one thing in common, they all helped me establish what my opinion is and to know where I stand in the debate.

In Marjorie Cortez's "Weber State University Student Leaders Seek State's First Smoking Ban at Public

College or University" student senator Ben Johns believes that a campus-wide ban can be beneficial to the health but can also be infringing upon people's right to choose. In Jeremy Laurance's "Warning: The Nanny State Can Seriously Improve Your Health" Michelle Sims however, says that even the smallest numbers can make a huge impact on the public's health and wants the smoking bans to continue to spring up in other cities as well. On the other hand, Tyler Holloway in "In 4<sup>th</sup> Year, New Friction over Indoor Smoking Ban" written by Kevin Barlow states that the smoking bans are having a negative effect because the bans are decreasing revenue for bar owners and other related businesses.

There is more than just one perspective to anything and these articles

helped me to realize what my perspective is. I agree with all three perspectives to some degree. Johns is right about the bans seeming like they are taking away the freedom to choose, but to what extent are people free to choose? There needs to be a line drawn where people have the right to choose and where innocent people are being hurt by that person's right to decide for themselves. As Sims points out, any number showing an improvement on the public's health is a positive thing, but we need to consider how the children are being affected by all of this. Yes, even a small amount of improvement can have a huge impact on the public's health however, if that number is small it will take longer for that impact to show. We need to find a way to get those numbers to start to rise quickly.

I also agree with Holloway about smoking bans not being fair when it

comes do decreasing revenue for businesses that attract smokers, but it also isn't fair for the nonsmokers who are getting illnesses and dying because someone else chose to smoke. Overall, I believe that we need to keep smoking bans intact to protect the general public and especially to protect the children. Children are innocent victims and it isn't fair that they are being exposed to secondhand smoke and getting very sick from it or even dying from someone else's decision. Although I believe we need to keep smoking bans, I do agree with Johns that if the bans are too strict it will be restricting a person's right to choose. There should be bans to protect children and nonsmokers and a designated place for smokers or even a designated building just for smokers and for those who choose for themselves to be exposed to the smoke.