SHOULD TOBACCO BE BANNED?

The rapid spread of tobacco products and users all over the world is new-causing momentous concern_that has. It has new-become an international challenge. The leaders and lawmakers of different countries are now expressing their concern about the continuously growingrapidly increasing number of smoking-related deaths associated with smoking. Recent reports show-reveal that approximatelyround 4.9 million deaths worldwide every year. This number is expected to rise to a notable 10 million deaths by 2030, if new-strong policies on tobacco control are notwill_be implemented worldwide. TNow, tobacco_-smoking is currently considered_as the second major cause of death. Dlt-is-not-only-deaths caused bythrough smoking alone-itself are not the only ones that is causing the concern. Based on statistics from the late 1990's, more-than 3,000 of-out-of-the-400,000 smoking-related-U-S- deaths related-to-smokingin the-US, more-than 3,000 is-are actually caused by secondhand smokeing. One can only imagine just-how much larger those numbers_must-have grown over the past few years.

As tobacco use continues to rise —, with the total number of users worldwide is rapidly now reachingapproaching the billion mark —, it is becoming obvious to leaders and policy-makers are beginning to realize that the regulations on smoking are not working. With the problem growing worse by the minute, more and morea larger number of people are pursuing a more aggressive course of action such as a tobacco ban to counter the negative effects of smoking, in the form of a tobacco ban. —. Some brave nations are pursuing this path, partially, if not completely. For example, the small nation of Bhutan chose to take the road less traveled. The small nation by constitutingted a complete total tobacco ban that penalizes anyone who smokes or sellseld tobacco within the country.

Some countries, however, are pursuing a milder course of action; they are choosing to, limiting the ban to just public areasplaces and workplaces. In addition, these bans are also only applicable to tobacco use; while selling tobacco products is still completely

legal. The most recent effort was <u>undertakenshown</u> by England, when the <u>countryy</u> declared all their virtually enclosed public <u>places_areas_and</u> workplaces smoke-free. As countries <u>begin tostart</u> declared a—war against tobacco, anti-smoking advocates and health organizations <u>are-saluteing</u> their efforts.

On the other hand, pro-tobacco advocates are criticizing their efforts.

In fact, pPro-tobacco advocates even go so far as to ridicule these efforts. According to these individualsm, a tobacco ban will only cause an increase in thea tobacco black market to rise. They claim that Keeping preventing people from smoking is virtually impossible. They say. Just as the governments are having experience difficulties prohibiting the use of drugs that have always been illegal, they will definitely find banning tobacco an even more challenging task. There will always be tobacco manufacturers will always look for ways to smoke, and there will always be tobacco manufacturers will always exist, even with laws in place to prohibit smoking and tobacco.

As anti-smoking advocates continue to beremain hopeful that their cause will prevail, tobacco advocates take on a different note. They are also advocateing the freedom of choice for of people who wishant to smoke. Asmoking, according to them, smoking is an personindividual's own choice based on his or her preferred lifestyle. People freely choose to smoke even whenif they realizeknow the associated health risks associated with smoking. They are legal, responsible adults who make the decision to continue still smokinge as legal and responsible adultsand who have the capacity to think and decide on their own. Tobacco manufacturers are banking on the argument that people know and understand the health risks when they choose to take athat puff. They are not discounting the fact that tobacco indeed kills. However, but they claim that they are honest to their customers about what the consequences of smoking by displaying very are through the largeenormous health warnings on every pack of cigarettes. Although they are Knowing full well aware that tobacco indeed is dangerous to public health, these companiesy are simply fighting to retainkeep the old regulations in place and to avoid a completefor tobacco not to be entirely bannedban.

Comment [T1]: Please confirm if this is what you meant

Health organizations and anti-smoking campaigners may call the manufacturers selfish for only taking into consideration their own vested interests in the continuous cultivation and commercialization of tobacco. However, tobacco manufacturers and the leaders of the tobacco industry claim that that the tobacco trade ir industry contributes millions per year to a country's revenue because of tobacco trade. The stipulated amount of contribution can be translated to almost 16 billion sticks of tobacco per year. Such a huge amount of tobacco consumption definitely has definite economic advantages; itand also benefits the government as well through tax earnings gained from the tobacco trade. They also say that claim that they are not the only ones who benefit from the sale and consumption of tobacco consumption and sale. There are also the tobacco farmers and the employees working at the tobacco companies also benefit. The tobacco industry is indeed on the said industry for their most basic survival. These people are economically dependent on their jobs at the tobacco companies, and they willill definitely suffer a huge blow when if tobacco is banned.

It seems, however, that the arguments used by the pro-tobacco advocates are becoming more and more increasingly faulty. Compared to the many disadvantages of tobacco and smoking, not only to the smokers, but also to the entire public as well, the abovementioned reasons are heavily far outweighed. The medical and dental health risks related to of smoking are causing a worldwide stir in the medical world. Smoking is often times likened to "a slow march to death,", and several campaigns have been released warning, saying that every stick of tobacco smoked takes away a day from areduces the life of a smoker by one day's life. Even if the effects of smoking on athe smokers' health are not immediate, this should not be a reason to death and the growing health risks.

Smoking is a <u>commonpopular</u> cause of cancer, asthma, chronic lung diseases, and heart diseases. It is also a well-known cause of dental problems such as tooth decay,

tooth loss, and periodontal disease. The effects of smoking also impede the <u>ability of the gums</u> and teeth's <u>ability</u> to respond to dental treatments against these said problems <u>whichs</u>, thus causesing even bigger problems. <u>AThe anti-smoking campaigners are using these facts</u> to counter the arguments that tobacco companies are contributeing to their countryies in terms of revenues. According to studies conducted in different countries, <u>any the revenues brought in byfrom the</u> tobacco trade are quickly offset by the medical expenses <u>incurred by that the smokers</u>, their families, and <u>the governments'</u> public health departments are incurring due to diseases caused by smoking. The cost of a heart surgery alone is already <u>humongousincredibly high</u>; <u>further coupledwhen you couple this cost</u> with the risk <u>toen</u> the patient's life and the possibility of death, the price becomes far too high.

There is also the issue of secondhand smokeing, which is also causesing concern, not only to anti-smoking advocates, but also to every single non-smoking person and to environmentalists—as well.— They are now also—pursuing their right to freedom and protection from exposure to dangerous carcinogens. Tobacco use should definitely be more strongly regulated, ilf only for the sake of these people who consciously choose to live a lifeves free from the any smoking-related health risks brought about by smoking. Tobacco use should definitely be more strongly regulated. In a nutshell, the anti-smoking advocates state that the tobacco companies continue earning, but the revenues that the governments incur immediately dwindle as public health calls for necessary actions. The worse part Even worse is the fact yet is that the tobacco companies are immune to any consequences that can be caused by smoking. It is the smokers, their families, and the land that ultimately suffer.

Using Containing chemicalsontent that are proven carcinogens, tobacco can be considered a dangerous weapon. Aand anti-smoking supporters are stateing that this substance the should be banned just as dangerous weapons are banned. There is no way to hide the fact that tobacco is very dangerous to a-smokers. The substance contains 69 known carcinogens, two of which are benzopyrene and polonium 210. To falsify the arguments made by Semokers maintain on their right to choose their lifestyle and

decide whether they want to smoke or not. However, —the opposing side answers refutes their arguments based on some certain leaked documents leaked from the tobacco industry. These documents supposedly that are said to prove an even greatermore—nicotine concentration and the inclusion of additional other materials in tobacco products to make them more addictive. Even if people choosedecide to smoke on their own, they do so under the subtle influences of theby tobacco companies. The mere availability of tobacco, prevalence of the tobacco advertisements, and the addictive content of tobacco products all influence the smokers. Therefore, anti-smoking advocates the claim that the argument that smoking it is a "free choice" is not valid, says the anti-smoking advocates.

The debate continues to heat up, as both sides show no signs of relenting. However, the final answer lies inon the governments that rule over-the different nations. Even if this problem has is already become a worldwide challenge, the decision whether to ban er not to ban tobacco depends one each individual country. Some countries are taking an active stand. Some are even declaring May 31st as "a-World No-Tobacco Day.". During the late 1990's, lin an effort to launch a worldwide campaign during the late 1990s, the World Health Organization also-released the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control to restrict the spread of tobacco and tobacco products. However, it is still a fact-wellknown to manyfact that a complete total legal ban is not entirely feasible. This is ; especially true in developing countries and countries with larger populations where the number of smokers is also higher. If the current restrictions are not working, medical and environmental campaigns are the next best thing. Forcing people to stop smoking may not solve the problem. In fact, it and may merelyonly leadgive way to even more problems. Consequently, hHealth organizations and anti-smoking advocates are instead focusing their efforts on encouraging people not to smoke. If it is a person's conscious decision to smoke, it should also be this individual'shis conscious decision to guit.

REFERENCES

- 1. "UK Ministers Urged to Ban Tobacco", BBC News, Dec 2005
- 2. www.wikipedia.org/Smoking_ban

3.—"Tobacco Cessation in Dentistry", Utah Tobacco Prevention and Control Program

3.