

# Why smoking should be banned from public places

[Literature](#), [Russian Literature](#)



Why Smoking Should be Banned from Public places To give a choice to the non-smokers to not to inhale the smoke This argument is based on two premises; a) one is of a personal choice and the other is that b) second hand smoking or passive smoking is equally or rather more harmful than smoking directly.

#### Counter Argument 1

Why the above argument may not be valid

1. a) There is always a choice that the non-smokers can move out or request the smokers to move away. This can be arrangement on a one on one basis, and with mutual agreement. There is no need to force a ban and prevent the smokers from exercising their freedom and expressing their personal choice.

b) There have been no conclusive researches as to the detrimental effects of smoking even for the smokers, let alone the non-smokers inhaling smoke passively.

#### Counter Counter Argument 1

1. a) In deciding the extents and limits of personal freedom, a guiding factor is that one persons freedom should not trespass the rights of the other. By the same logic, the argument that smokers should be allowed the freedom of expression and choice does not hold ground in the above scenario where the rights of the non-smokers come into play. If the smokers are given the freedom to T in the public places, where the non-smokers may also be present, it will contradict with non-smokers' right to avoid smoke.

b) There have been ample research to establish the positive correlation

between smoking and cancer.

## Argument 2

2. To prevent youngsters from emulating

## Argument

Public places may have people of all ages, and these places should not be allowed to contribute to the unnecessary exposure of impressionable minds to smoking and smoking behavior.

Explanation - This is a valid point in favor of banning smoking from all such places where it may be witnessed by youngsters and encourage them to its trial and adoption. The very same logic is used when diverse governments enact a ban on showing smoking in media and broadcasting, both in the form of content-part or as advertisements.

## Counter Argument

There are already several initiatives in place aimed at preventing underage smoking. These include not selling tobacco products to youngsters and children, and educating them about the effects that smoking may have. As such, it does not make much sense to also ban smoking in public places – this may only cause inconvenience to those who smoke, while do nothing to prevent smoking among or educating the youngsters. We should be able to accept smoking as a reality and that children too should be aware that it is normal behavior and a matter of choice. Trying to restrict exposure, it may only cause misinformation and generate more eagerness in the youngsters to try to smoke.

Moreover, children are already be exposed to smoking at home if their parents or relatives smoke. By banning smoking in public places will not be

effective if the child is already witness to regular smoking in private places.

### Argument 3

#### 3. To reduce pollution

Argument: Smoking in public places ads to the release of harmful and noxious particles (refrence) and vapors in the atmosphere. This pollution becomes more dense and magnified if smoking is carried out in confined public places.

Counter Argument: Atmospheric Pollution is defined as (reference). It is in no way related to tobacco smoke.

#### Counter Counter Argument

It may be possible that tobacco smoke ay not strictly be categorized under the definition of chemical pollution. However, there is no denying of the fact that cigarette smoke leads to the addition of x, y z in the air. The harmful effects of these components have been established in numerous research and studies. (reference) In addition to the increase of these particles, it leads to a distinct smell and heaviness in he air. This itself is a considerable source of discomfort for the part of the population that is non smoking.