

Kicking butt and taking names assignment



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

We looked at two considerations with this policy, Utilitarianism – greatest overall amount of good or happiness and deontology – rightness or wrongness of the actions themselves, not the consequences of those actions. We discussed several issues involved with Initiative 901, the moral implications of this policy and the ramifications of this decision on the business owners throughout New York. Finally, I suggested that this ban was morally justified and should be adopted nationally to ensure that the greatest amount of good could be produced.

This was a valid concern for New York and should be addressed by our lawmakers in our country. KICKING Butt... And taking names!! On March 26, 2003, “ New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg proposed a ban for smoking in bars, restaurants and offices, critics issued dire warnings of mass opposition and labeled the ban a disaster waiting to happen. New York Post even published a headline “ Bar Humbug. ” But the gloomy predictions failed to materialize.

Bars and restaurants saw business increase in the first year of the ban, while a survey found 90 percent of people reporting they ate out as often as or more often than before the ban. Between 2002 and 2006 the last year for which figures are available the number of smokers in the city fell by some 240, 000 to around one million. The number of smoking-related deaths meanwhile fell more than 11 percent from 8, 722 to 7, 744 during the same period.

Of particular note, fewer kids were taking up the habit, with the number of smokers among New York high school students falling by 50 percent, from

18 percent of the school population to less than one in ten between 2001 and 2007. ” [1] In today’s society ones rights are infringed upon daily, right to privacy (Government Wire tapping), right to free speech and even patients rights are often violated with a key stroke. With this being said lets try to answer the following question... “ Do you agree with New York’s ban on smoking in bars and restaurants? Lets TALK KICK at Annihilative YOU (I YOU), Ana teen KICK at ten unloosens AT utilitarian’s and Demonology considerations to answer our case assignment. “ Initiative 901 would prohibit smoking in buildings and vehicles open to the public and places of employment, including areas within 25 feet of doorways and ventilation openings unless a lesser distance is approved. The official ballot summary on Initiative 901 reads, “ This measure would prohibit smoking in public places and in laces of employment.

Current laws allowing designation of certain smoking areas would be repealed, including current provisions allowing designation of an entire restaurant, bar, tavern, bowling alley, skating rink, or tobacco shop as a smoking area. The prohibition would include areas within 25 feet of entrances, exits, opening windows and ventilation intakes, unless shorter distances are approved by the director of the local health department. ” [2] Definition of Utilitarianism and Demonology considerations Utilitarianism-Balance what is good for the greatest number of personnel

Utilitarianism means you should always act in a way that produces the greatest overall amount of good or happiness. [3] This is a broad term and I do not want to spend an over abundance of time due to the lack of space in this paper but suffice it to say. When one looks at making a decision you <https://assignbuster.com/kicking-butt-and-taking-names-assignment/>

should look at all factors and who is involved... Weigh both sides of the story and pick the decision that helps or makes the most people happy. An example of this is the restriction off website by an employer to reduce the number of attacks from the network. The needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few or the one. " [4] Now let's look at Demonology, its definition and the comparison of the two. Demonology – Rights and duties Demonology is an approach to ethics that focuses on the rightness or wrongness of the actions themselves, as opposed to the rightness or wrongness of the consequences of those actions. [5] If you have the right to something, someone else has a duty to ensure you get it. An example of this is you have the right to a safe working environment your employer has the duty to ensure that your place of employment is safe. K, we have looked at two considerations or theological approaches to right and wrong; (Utilitarianism and demonology) and we learned a little about Initiative 901, now let's take what we've learned and examine the case study. As stated earlier the case study asks this question... " Do you agree with New Work's ban on smoking in bars and restaurants? " For a quick background let's discuss the main reason for 1-901. It was established for the " protection of workers, in particular, from the harmful effects of second-hand smoke, which include an increased risk of heart disease, cancer, emphysema and other chronic and acute

Leases. Laws Implementing Dana on Indoor smoking have Eden Introduced Day many countries in various forms over the years, with legislators citing scientific evidence that shows tobacco smoking is often harmful to the smokers themselves and to those inhaling second-hand smoke. In addition,

such laws may affect health care costs, improve work productivity and lower the overall cost of labor in a community, thus making a community more attractive for bringing new jobs into the area and keeping current jobs and employers in an area.

In Indiana for example, the state's economic development agency wrote into its 2006 plan for acceleration of economic growth that it encourages cities and towns to adopt local smoke-free workplace laws as a means of promoting job growth in communities. " [6] k, back to the question... " Do you agree with New York's ban on smoking in bars and restaurants? " I want to start off and say miss" I agree with Mayor Bloomberg when he stated, " I'm an optimist, but I'm also a realist. " All the money in the world will never eradicate tobacco," he added. " But this partnership with Mr.. Bill Gates underscores how much the tide is turning against this deadly epidemic. [7] " I want to highlight the enormity of this problem and catalyze a global movement of governments and civil society to stop the tobacco epidemic," said Bloomberg. " We challenge governments to show leadership by implementing tobacco control measures, as an increasing number's are doing, and to increase funding for these efforts. Let me briefly explain a bit farther my thoughts concerning this subject. Smoking is not inherently wrong, one has the right to smoke but when that right to smoke can adversely affect another especially their health then it should be controlled. Understandable, employees that work in a bar inherently take on reasonable risks in the performance of their duties, but should they be needlessly subjected to cancer causing agents like tobacco and second hand smoke? I say no... Let's look at the case study; New York's Anti-Smoking Law!

Who is this going to hurt? Certainly, the people who smoke would be inconvenienced and possibly store/ bar owners might lose initial profits during the change in policies. Let's look at the evidence to see if these two assumptions are accurate; " In one of the first studies to see the effectiveness of New York's smoke-free workplace law in reducing the exposure of bar and restaurant workers to secondhand smoke, those taking part in the study reported an 85 percent decrease in their work-related exposure.

These findings, published in the August issue of the international Journal Tobacco Control, indicate that an amendment to the New York Clean Indoor Air Act that went into effect July 24, 2003, had its intended effect of protecting hospitality workers from exposure to secondhand smoke within three months of implementation. The amendment prohibited smoking in virtually all places of employment, including restaurants, bars, bingo and bowling facilities. The study, conducted by ART' International in Research Triangle Park, N.

C. , also found that one year after implementation compliance with the law continued to increase. " These findings indicate that restrictions such as the anti-smoking provision of the New York Clean Indoor Air Act are effective tools for governments to protect hospitality workers within tenet constituencies," said Matthew Farrell, PhD , the study's principal investigator at ART'. The results clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of smoke-free laws in preventing employee exposure to secondhand smoke. The study combined data from telephone interviews with saliva specimens from study participants who were non-smoking employees of restaurants,

<https://assignbuster.com/kicking-butt-and-taking-names-assignment/>

bars and bowling facilities in areas of New York not covered by local smoke-free workplace laws. They were recruited through newspaper ads, flyers and radio announcements. Twelve months after the smoke-free law was passed, exposure to secondhand smoke at work had declined to 14 percent from 91 percent before the law went into effect. The data indicate that the majority of this change occurred in the first three months.

Similarly, values of cytokine, an indicator of exposure to nicotine, found in saliva decreased significantly at the three-month follow up. ” [8] Who is this going to help or be good for? Anyone who is around a smoker when they light up in a public place and the families of those involved. In this paper, we looked at New York Clean Indoor Air Act, Initiative 901 (1-901) and discussed the utilitarian and deontological considerations of this policy. We broke apart the arguments for and against this policy, discussed its merits ND finally we looked at the ramifications of this policy on the American people.