

Reflection - reduced harm tobacco



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The topic of the article is corporate social responsibility on tobacco companies. It particularly looks at the snus which is an alternative to the mainstream tobacco products. This tobacco product has a lot of implications as it is not smoked so that it is not that harmful to the environment or human health as cigarettes. However, snus is considered illegal in some countries and the article makes this as a starting point in the critic of the seemingly twisted logic of making this less harmful tobacco product outlawed while the more hazardous smoked tobacco is marketed everywhere globally. Furthermore, the article contextualizes this lieu of the progress of corporate social responsibility and product harm reduction of tobacco companies, or lack thereof.

Corporate social responsibility among tobacco companies is very much like a paradox; basically tobacco companies are like giving a poison to their consumers so that they can kill themselves. If we were to apply the logic of corporate social responsibility to the tobacco companies, we are presented with a situation that simply contradicts itself: if a tobacco company becomes a socially responsible corporation, it would be as if they will offer a slower poison to their consumers so that they will not die as fast as before.

The addition of the snus in the tobacco industry may be seen as the slower poison. It is not smoked so that there is a significant reduction in the risks of having diseases that are more likely to be acquired when smoking cigarettes. However as the article has pointed out, even with the existence of this less harmful tobacco product, it is not supported by legislation bodies and no tobacco companies are making an effort to pursue its development or more importantly, reducing the harm in their products.

This is the point where corporate social responsibility among tobacco

<https://assignbuster.com/reflection-reduced-harm-tobacco/>

companies hits a dead end. Tobacco companies may be aware of this contradiction and that is why most of them are not making any efforts to reduce the harm in their products. Another contradiction in this situation that the article points out is how governments demonize tobacco companies while providing them a legal status. This is counter-intuitive to corporate social responsibility since it simply does nothing to affect the market demand that is fueling tobacco companies. As a result, there is no motivation for them to develop a less harmful tobacco product since their killer product rakes in the profit, and in the end that is all that matters for them.

This article also points out the improbability of governments banning tobacco products and concludes by asserting that an initiative by a tobacco company in creating a reduced harm product that is attractive to smokers could be a huge step that can cause repercussions in the industry. While there is nothing wrong with hoping for the best, it is hard to imagine an industry that has thrived on selling products that kill their customers to start making products that are less harmful but is also potentially less profitable. A strong government intervention in the form of incentives or sanctions may be what is needed for these tobacco companies to play ball in the realm of corporate social responsibility.

Source:

CSR News - Reduced harm tobacco - is it just smoke and mirrors? (2008, February 3). Business Respect - The corporate social responsibility website. Retrieved November 10, 2010, from http://www.businessrespect.net/page.php?Story_ID=1996