Burning Both Ends: A Community Discussion on Regulating Smoking
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A Note About This Book
Burning Both Ends:  
A Community Discussion on Regulating Smoking

Introduction
Smoking is a divisive issue in American society. Many citizens and policy-makers want to regulate smoking, but others feel that any regulations threaten privacy and property rights.

Approach 1: It’s About Public Health
Smoking is a public health issue. The government must intervene to ensure the health of both smokers and nonsmokers.

Approach 2: It’s About the Pocketbook
It is most important to address the economic impact of smoking. Supporters favor business-led solutions with minimal government involvement.

Approach 3: It’s About Personal Decision
Smoking is a personal decision. The government should not be involved in regulating private lives or businesses.

Comparing Approaches

Bibliography

Questionnaire
Regulate Smoking or Not?

On any given day, quickly flipping through the array of 24-hour news channels confirms what most people instinctively know: our society faces many issues of public concern, from poverty and homelessness to the minimum wage and AIDS. Yet, many people do not feel the impact of these issues in their daily lives. One issue, though, impacts virtually every citizen, cutting across socioeconomic, geographic, racial, and religious differences: smoking and other forms of tobacco use.

Over 40% of American adults are current or former smokers. Almost everyone who does not smoke knows someone who does. Even if they do not know a smoker, every American encounters secondhand smoke in public places, and many are impacted by higher insurance and health care costs that result from the burden of smoking related illness and disease.

The Facts About Smoking in America

Cigarette smoking affects the lives of a vast majority of people, both smokers and nonsmokers alike. According to the most recent data from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 20.9% of American adults smoked cigarettes in 2005, with an additional 5% either smoking cigars or using smokeless tobacco. Among high school students, the percentage of cigarette smokers increased from 21.9% in 2003 to 23% in 2005. According to the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, “every day in the United States, more than 1,000 kids become regular smokers.”

Scientists, along with most of the public, now know beyond a doubt that smoking and tobacco use cause extensive damage to the body. In fact, tobacco use is the leading preventable cause of death in the United States. The National Institute on Drug Abuse reports that “tobacco use kills nearly half a million Americans each year, with one in every six U.S. deaths the result of smoking.”

Many people also know that smoking affects the health of nonsmokers. According to a 2006 Surgeon General’s report, there is no safe level of exposure to secondhand smoke. Children and infants are particularly vulnerable to health problems as a result of secondhand smoke, and...
more children in the United States are exposed to secondhand smoke than adults. The Surgeon General estimates that 22 million (60%) of children aged 3–11 years and 18 million youth aged 12–19 years were exposed to secondhand smoke in the United States in 2000. In the workplace, 30% of all workers are not covered by smoke-free policies. The situation in the restaurant industry is worse, though, with only 28% of wait staff and 13% of bartenders in America working in smoke-free environments.

Not only does smoking threaten the health of the public, it takes an enormous economic toll on our society. According to the National Institutes of Health, “[M]ore than $75 billion of total U.S. health care costs each year is attributable directly to smoking. [...] In addition to health care costs, the costs of lost productivity due to smoking effects are estimated at $82 billion per year, bringing a conservative estimate of the economic burden of smoking to more than $150 billion per year.”

The Debate About Regulating Smoking

Over the past three decades, scientists, governmental health and environmental agencies, and the general public have become increasingly aware of the serious health problems caused by smoking. Health warnings have been placed on tobacco products; smoking in public places has become increasingly restricted; and smoking prevention and cessation programs have proliferated. As of 2006, fourteen states have regulations making almost all workplaces smoke free. Many businesses across the country have also begun refusing to hire people who smoke.

Despite a national consensus on the dangers of smoking, there remains significant disagreement about the best response to these dangers. This book presents three main points of view held by the public about how we as a society should deal with smoking. Each perspective presents specific actions and policies that people should take in regard to smoking. Each approach has advantages and disadvantages, which are outlined in the “In Support/In Opposition” charts at the end of each section. By presenting each of these approaches to smoking side by side in this book, you, the reader, can compare the main points of each perspective and consider how these views correspond to your own. This book serves as a tool for facilitating productive discussions between citizens about the issue of smoking in our society. When we know what others believe about the issue, we can have reasoned, civil discourse about how to best meet the needs of our society.

In Approach One, people feel that smoking is fundamentally a public health issue and should be addressed as such. They think the government must do everything possible to protect its citizens’ health from the harms of smoking by regulating smoking in public places to minimize exposure to harmful secondhand smoke, by funding prevention and cessation initiatives, and by helping smokers quit successfully. Specific policy initiatives advocated by this Approach include increasing cigarette taxes and using some of the funds for a national telephone quit-line, Medicaid and Medicare coverage of therapies to quit smoking, and national media and educational campaigns to prevent smoking.

“In addition to health care costs, the costs of lost productivity due to smoking effects are estimated at $82 billion per year, bringing a conservative estimate of the economic burden of smoking to more than $150 billion per year.”

National Institutes of Health

Supporters of Approach Two believe that more education about the health problems of smoking would fall on deaf ears. Instead, this second category of people seeks to minimize the financial costs to our society. This Approach places most of the responsibility for discouraging smoking on businesses.

Finally, Approach Three holds that smoking and patronizing smoking establishments is fundamentally a personal decision and that government should not be involved in regulating where people can smoke. Supporters of this Approach believe we must protect private property rights and that, just as smoking is a personal choice, patronizing smoking establishments is a choice and should not be regulated by the government. Prohibiting smoking in businesses should be a choice left to individual business owners based on what customers want. This Approach promotes personal responsibility and personal freedom in promoting smoking.
Although the use of cigarettes and other tobacco products is legal in the United States for people over the age of 18, extensive scientific research shows that these products are never safe. In fact, cigarettes and other tobacco products are perhaps the only legal commodities that are lethal when used as directed. Cigarettes and other tobacco products pose significant health risks both for the people who use them and for people who are exposed to secondhand smoke. Furthermore, the addictive nature of nicotine and other chemicals in tobacco products make it very difficult for people to stop smoking even if they want to.

Many people view smoking as a public health problem and are concerned about its health effects on both smokers and nonsmokers. While the main concern of this Approach is eliminating the health risk to the general public, supporters do not necessarily advocate making tobacco products illegal. Rather, they advocate government involvement in the expansion of educational anti-smoking curricula, programs designed to help people quit smoking, and full bans on smoking in all public areas.

**Educate Smokers**

It is undeniable that tobacco products can cause severe, life-threatening health problems...
for the people who use them. According to the American Cancer Society, tobacco use causes up to 400,000 deaths in America every year. Smoking adds to the severity of pneumonia and asthma, increases the chance of a heart attack or stroke, and can cause emphysema, chronic bronchitis, aneurysms, or cancer. Smoking is the major cause of cancers of the lung, larynx (voice box), oral cavity, throat, esophagus, and bladder, and is a contributing cause in the development of cancers of the pancreas, cervix, kidney, stomach, and also some types of leukemia.

In order to prevent the spread of cigarette use, more educational programs are needed in our public school systems that are designed to teach students about the dangers and risks of smoking. Proponents of this Approach point to research that suggests anti-smoking education programs in schools over the last twenty years have contributed to a steady decline in the onset and level of youth smoking. More needs to be done, though, to make smoking prevention effective for more students and in the long term.

Not all schools have funding to provide anti-smoking programs, and many schools have focused prevention efforts only on elementary and middle school students. Advocates for the well-being of public health want tobacco companies and the government to develop anti-smoking programs that are effective for all youth and to fund long-term implementation of these programs in all public schools. Additionally, research suggests that efforts to prevent youth smoking are more effective when school-based education initiatives are paired with community and home-based interventions. Public health proponents urge the development of anti-smoking education programs that combine ideas for a more effective, comprehensive approach.

What Can Be Done?

**Supporters of Approach One** generally favor the following measures:

- Government-initiated measures and programs can be implemented to address the multitude of health risks posed by smoking.
- Start government-funded initiatives to help smokers quit, e.g. nation-wide telephone helpline, national media campaign, etc.
- Citizens can lobby for legislation to prevent smoking and eliminate public exposure.

The Addiction of Nicotine

According to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, “[I]t is well documented that most smokers identify tobacco use as harmful and express a desire to reduce or stop using it, and nearly 35 million of them want to quit each year. Unfortunately, only about 6 percent of people who try to quit are successful for more than a month.” Since the success rate of quitting smoking is so low, supporters of Approach One say that a crucial part of addressing the public health crisis of smoking is helping more people quit smoking and not start again. Because of the highly addictive nature of nicotine and the damage caused by fulfilling the addiction, public health advocates believe that smoking cessation programs similar to drug rehabilitation clinics should be established. Public information campaigns promoting smoking cessation programs and tools should be increased to reach a wider audience.

Even though most smokers know the dangers of smoking, nicotine is such a highly addictive drug that most people find it almost impossible to stop.
smoking once they have started. Nicotine, when inhaled in cigarette smoke, reaches the brain faster than drugs that enter the body intravenously. The effects of nicotine are short lasting, so people who are addicted to it begin experiencing withdrawal symptoms within a few hours after their last cigarette. Withdrawal quickly drives many people back to smoking.

Public health proponents believe it is the responsibility of the government and medical practitioners to help curb the smoking health crisis in America by promoting the tools to help citizens rid themselves of this deadly habit. Some people believe the government can increase the number of citizens who quit smoking successfully by funding smoking cessation programs. For instance, the Bush Administration proposed a national initiative to fund these programs by raising the cost of a pack of cigarettes by $2.00. The proposed initiative would offer a national telephone quit-line offering support, national smoking cessation media campaigns, and Medicaid and Medicare coverage of therapies to quit smoking. Supporters of Approach One believe that smokers should not have to live as slaves to nicotine if they want to quit, and that it is in the public’s best interest for the government to provide as much aid as possible to maximize the number of smokers who quit successfully.

Secondhand Smoke

One of the most concerning public health aspects of smoking is the harm that secondhand smoke causes to nonsmokers. Smokers and users of other tobacco products make a conscious personal choice to expose themselves to chemicals known to be carcinogenic. However, when smoking indoors, the smoker does harm not only to him/herself but to all the other people exposed to the smoke. Science has proven secondhand smoke causes disease and other health problems. Thus, supporters of this Approach argue that the government, businesses, and parents must do everything possible to protect nonsmokers, especially children, whose respiratory systems are particularly vulnerable to exposure from the toxic secondhand smoke of cigarettes. These supporters believe prohibiting smoking indoors in public places and educating parents about the risks of secondhand smoke to their children are the best ways to ensure that nonsmokers are protected.

Many of the deadly chemicals in cigarettes are present in the smoke that is exhaled into the air. The California Environmental Protection Agency estimated that secondhand smoke causes approximately 3,400 lung cancer deaths and 22,700-69,600 heart disease deaths in adult nonsmokers in the United States each year. The most recent Surgeon General’s report indicates that there is no safe level of exposure to secondhand smoke, and short-term exposure can cause serious health problems. Supporters of Approach One say that, above all else, we must protect nonsmokers from these harmful effects of secondhand smoke.
In Support

- Smoking is a highly addictive habit and, like any other drug or alcohol addiction, poses a significant threat to the well-being of the people addicted to it.

- Smoking is not only dangerous for people who use tobacco products, but smoking is a significant health threat to nonsmokers through secondhand smoke.

- While the Surgeon General and the government clearly acknowledge the dangers of smoking, more needs to be done to combat the problem.

- Smoking addictions can be broken with the right treatments and proper levels of help.

In Opposition

- This Approach requires government involvement in the control of a legal substance. People may be opposed to government intervention in their personal decisions, even when their health is at risk.

- The implementation of educational and rehabilitation programs across the country would be very costly.

- Private businesses may oppose the regulation of smoking in their establishments.

- A restriction on smoking could lead to bans on other unhealthy substances, such as trans-fat or high-cholesterol foods.

The U.S. Surgeon General says there is no safe level of exposure to secondhand smoke, and short-term exposure can cause serious health problems.
It’s About the Pocketbook

Approach Two focuses on the economic impacts of smoking. People who approach the issue of smoking from this point of view are most concerned with the significant financial toll that smoking takes on our country, including citizens and businesses. While supporters of this Approach have varied solutions to the financial drain associated with smoking, the bottom line in this Approach is economics.

Supporters are concerned with the health-related costs of smoking and the possible financial impact of government regulations. But, they also identify potential financial benefits for businesses that voluntarily choose to limit smoking in the workplaces. Supporters of this Approach suggest that instead of adopting sweeping civil regulations against smoking, the government could encourage the implementation of business-initiated smoking policies by offering financial incentives like tax breaks.

The Financial Impacts of Smoking

Supporters of Approach Two want the public to address the financial costs of smoking on individuals, businesses, and the nation.

Personal Costs:

For individuals, the most immediate cost of smoking is the price of buying cigarettes. A smoker...
who smokes an average of one pack of cigarettes a day will spend nearly $2,000 a year on cigarettes. Also, smokers increase their risk of developing costly illnesses. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that the annual health-related costs for a smoker total $3,750. These costs drain the pocketbooks of millions of Americans.

**Business Costs:**

Beyond costs to individuals, businesses also face financial drawbacks from smoking. For businesses that provide health insurance to employees, premiums for smokers will cost an average of $300 a year more than for nonsmokers. Due to the health-related costs associated with secondhand smoke, businesses that permit indoor smoking can expect to pay higher insurance premiums for all employees.

**National Costs:**

In 2005, the CDC found that the United States loses nearly $167 billion each year due to health costs related to smoking. It is not just smokers that cost our nation this money. According to the American Academy of Actuaries, “an estimated $2.6 billion was spent on the medical care of nonsmokers suffering from lung cancer or heart disease caused by exposure to secondhand smoke” in 2005. Additionally, the national economic costs of nonsmokers who go on disability or die prematurely from lung cancer or heart disease totaled $3.2 billion in 2004.

**The Economic Impact of Smoking Bans**

While supporters of Approach Two are concerned with the economic impacts of smoking, they also recognize the potential financial impact of smoking bans on those who own and operate businesses. Specifically, they fear that smoking bans could result in the loss of revenue to businesses through decreased patronage. Therefore, supporters of Approach Two seek solutions that reduce the costs of smoking while avoiding the negative financial impact of bans.

---

**What Can Be Done?**

**Supporters of Approach Two**

generally favor the following measures:

- Encourage business-led solutions to limit smoking.
- Offer government incentives such as tax breaks for businesses that voluntarily limit smoking.

There is evidence to support the fears of business owners that they might lose clientele because of smoking bans. A 2004 study prepared for the Empire State Restaurant and Tavern Association concluded that the New York City ban on smoking cost the industry 2,650 jobs (over 10 percent of their total employment), approximately $50 million in labor earnings, and $71.5 million in gross state product. For bar and restaurant owners in particular, this represents a sizable portion of their business.

“An estimated $2.6 billion was spent on the medical care of nonsmokers suffering from lung cancer or heart disease caused by exposure to secondhand smoke.”

**American Academy of Actuaries**

Advocates of this Approach suggest that smoking bans could also have a negative impact on our national economy. Tobacco companies employ about 200,000 people and generate significant revenue. If community smoking bans take hold, some fear this could negatively impact the $86 billion in annual cigarette sales. An even bigger fear is that reduced cigarette sales could put that...
industry and its jobs in jeopardy. The effects could also be felt elsewhere. For instance, if tobacco companies were forced to reduce their costs, they might reduce their advertising, which represents a $15 billion share of the U.S. advertising market, second only to automotive advertising. This loss of revenue could be felt by advertising companies and their advertising venues, particularly magazines.

**Regulating Smoking in an Economically Beneficial Way**

Supporters of Approach Two understand that it can benefit businesses either to limit or to allow smoking. Approach Two advocates favor actions that limit government’s role in regulating smoking while providing the greatest flexibility to businesses to act in their own best financial interest.

Supporters of this Approach understand that some businesses would decide to not limit smoking; however, these supporters feel certain actions can be taken to reduce the financial costs of smoking without unduly hindering profits.

This Approach relies on the premise that some businesses will limit smoking on their own. Two independent factors support this conclusion. First, businesses will act to lower their costs whenever they reasonably can. Second, businesses will find it is in their own best interest to lower the high financial costs associated with smoking. As a result, businesses would act in their own best interest to reduce smoking amongst their employees and in their work environment. This could take the form of a restaurant banning smoking or even an office banning smoking from their building. This Approach does not rule out a role for government in reducing the cost of smoking. Local, state, and the national
government should offer incentives for businesses that limit smoking. These incentives could include tax breaks, subsidized health insurance, or other financial benefits. This Approach allows communities to take action toward lowering the costs associated with smoking while reducing the economic fall-out of a community-wide ban. Ultimately, Approach Two relies on placing the decision to limit smoking in the hands of businesses, which will base their decisions on concerns for the bottom line.

**In Support**

- Smoking has economic implications for individuals, businesses, and the nation.
- Government-imposed smoking regulations will adversely affect local businesses.
- Profitable businesses are crucial to maintaining vital communities.
- Smoking bans could impact industries that are important to the national economy.
- Supporters believe that government should not intrude upon private businesses.

**In Opposition**

- This Approach privileges the economic impacts of cigarette smoking over the health harms.
- The government has an obligation to ensure the health of its citizens, even if it means regulating businesses.
- Many studies have concluded that smoking regulations do not have a negative impact on business profitability.
- Business-led solutions will result in an array of inconsistent policies across communities.
Colleen and Rodger Sauve of Golden, Colorado, cannot smoke in their own condominium. The Heritage Hills #1 Condominium Homeowners Association recently won a court judgment which allowed them to prohibit smoking in private residences. Despite the Sauve’s use of insulation, air purifiers, and air filters to mitigate the presence of smoke, the Homeowners Association says that they must leave their property before lighting a cigarette.

The Heritage Hills Homeowners Association says it decided to ban smoking after receiving numerous complaints from other residents of the complex who say that cigarette smoke causes and/or aggravates health problems. The judge who ruled in favor of the Homeowners Association explains that since the air above the ceilings is shared by all the condominiums, the cigarette smoke is able to travel beyond the confines of the smokers’ home into other condominiums and that smoking is, therefore, a public nuisance.

Supporters of Approach Three, like the Sauves, argue that smoking is a personal choice, and that the government infringes on personal freedom and property rights by limiting the free exercise of that choice. They fear that banning smoking on private property is the first step on a slippery slope to erode other personal freedoms and business and property rights. Supporters of this Approach
believe businesses and private property owners, not the government, should be left to make the personal choice whether or not to allow smoking in a particular location.

Additionally, just as people make a choice to smoke, other people make a choice to patronize businesses and public places where smoking is allowed. If someone does not want to be exposed to smoke, that person should take personal responsibility and choose to go to a non-smoking establishment or petition the business owner to change policies.

**Less Big Government**

Supporters of Approach Three believe that our country was founded on the protection of individual rights. By regulating private lives and dictating where people can and cannot smoke, supporters of this Approach believe that the American government is eroding the personal freedoms that our nation has fought so hard to win and protect.

Supporters of Approach Three fear that smoking bans and other regulations limiting smoking allow the government to increase its control over individuals and to restrict legal actions in their private lives. Through smoking bans, the government disregards personal choice and personal responsibility by making the decision for its citizens as to where they can smoke and dictates parenting choices that should be left to the individual.

Additionally, supporters of this Approach are wary of states’ periodic increases in tobacco taxes, which they believe penalize individuals who make a personal choice to purchase a legal commodity.

**Self-Regulation by Business**

Supporters of Approach Three want the ability to decide how they use their own personal property. They believe individual businesses and private property owners should be able to decide whether they want to allow smoking or not. Letting businesses decide whether or not to allow smoking respects the rights of private property owners to make decisions that meet their individual needs. It also allows businesses to respond to natural market forces instead of government-dictated regulation.

Supporters of this Approach demand that the government respect the rights of personal property.

Our country was founded on the protection of individual rights. Government regulation of smoking erodes those personal freedoms.

Supporters of Approach Three argue that many businesses stand to lose significant revenue as a result of smoking bans. Some restaurants and bars fear patrons would choose to stay at home where they can smoke rather than spend money at a place where they cannot smoke.

In South Dakota, voters decided to raise taxes on cigarettes by a dollar to generate an

---

**What Can Be Done?**

Supporters of Approach Three generally favor the following measures:

- Respect the freedom of personal choice and the decision by individuals as to where and when they smoke.
- Decrease government involvement in smoking regulations, leaving it as an individual decision.
- Encourage businesses to post smoking policies in easily identifiable places to allow individuals to make informed choices about where they can smoke.
additional $40 million for state programs to help people to quit smoking. However, the immediate effect has been to cause South Dakotans to travel to Wyoming to purchase cigarettes. This is another way in which supporters of Approach Three fear that government regulation of smoking unfairly burdens businesses by restricting free enterprise. They feel the outcome of such regulations will not achieve its goal of deterring smoking, but will instead be an inconvenience and invasion on personal rights of individuals and will hurt businesses that rely on tobacco sales.

**We Choose Where We Do Business**

Supporters of Approach Three contend that just as smokers have the right to make the personal decision to smoke, nonsmokers have the freedom to choose whether or not they patronize a particular establishment based on its smoking policy. Minnesota Representative Tom Emmer, like other advocates of this Approach, feels that government regulation of smoking ignores this freedom of choice and implies that “Big Brother has got to take care of us because we are too dumb or too lazy to care for ourselves.” Representative Emmer and others believe Americans need to take personal responsibility and make the effort to choose to patronize non-smoking establishments if they want a non-smoking environment, rather than imposing their wishes on private business owners and people who choose to smoke.

In order to make the choice to avoid businesses that allow smoking, the public needs to know which businesses offer smoke-free environments. Supporters of this Approach suggest that restaurants and other public businesses be required to clearly and visibly post their smoking policies at their entrances so that patrons can make an informed decision about whether or not to enter. Supporters of Approach Three feel that this type of notification allows people the freedom to make an educated, free choice about whether or not to be exposed to secondhand smoke without violating the rights of...
In Support

✓ This Approach places decisions in the consumers’ hands. Ultimately, they have to decide what type of health risks they are willing to take and what precautions are necessary to preserve their health.

✓ Smoking bans are rarely enforced. Many bans across the nation are not strictly enforced and allow numerous exceptions.

✓ It is important to protect individuals who smoke, which is a legal activity.

✓ This Approach minimizes the government’s involvement in citizens’ private lives.

✓ Businesses should make their own smoking policies. Owners can decide what would be best for their business and their customers.

In Opposition

✗ These policies infringe on the right to breathe and work in a clean environment.

✗ The Approach limits job options for individuals allergic or unwilling to be exposed to cigarette smoke.

✗ Nonsmokers are forced to avoid certain businesses if they do not wish to be around smokers. This unfairly favors the personal rights of smokers over nonsmokers.

✗ Uniform smoking policies cannot be developed for an entire community.

✗ This Approach neglects the duty of the government to protect the welfare of its citizens.
Comparing the Approaches

Banning smoking is a controversial subject, but one that can be resolved through community dialogue. The following tables summarize the three approaches presented in this book and are a quick reference guide for participants.

**Approach One**

**It’s About Public Health**
This Approach focuses on the effects smoking has on public health. While supporters of this Approach recognize that people have the right to use tobacco products, they feel that the need to protect public health overrides the importance of individual choice.

**What Can Be Done?**
- Government-initiated measures and programs can be implemented to address the multitude of health risks posed by smoking.
- Start government-funded initiatives to help smokers quit, e.g. nation-wide telephone helpline, national media campaign, etc.
- Citizens can lobby for legislation to prevent smoking and eliminate public exposure.

**In Support**
- Smoking is a highly addictive habit and poses a significant threat to the well-being of the people addicted to it.
- Smoking is a significant health threat to nonsmokers because of secondhand smoke.

**In Opposition**
- People may be opposed to government intervention in their personal decisions, even when their health is at risk.
- Businesses might oppose the regulation of smoking in their establishments.
### Approach Two

**It’s About the Pocketbook**

This Approach focuses on the economic issues surrounding smoking bans. Approach Two relies on placing the decision to limit smoking in the hands of businesses that will base their decisions on concerns for the bottom line.

**What Can Be Done?**

- Educate business owners about the financial impacts of smoking.
- Encourage business-led solutions to limit smoking.
- Offer government incentives such as tax breaks for businesses that voluntarily limit smoking.
- Acknowledge the financial costs of smoking bans to businesses.

**In Support**

- Supporters believe that the government should not intrude upon private businesses.
- Government-imposed smoking regulations could adversely affect businesses.

**In Opposition**

- This Approach privileges economic concerns over health concerns.
- This Approach does not provide uniform solutions.

### Approach Three

**It’s About Personal Decision**

This Approach focuses on the importance of individual decisions as they relate to smoking. Supporters of this Approach argue that smoking is a personal choice, and that the government infringes on personal freedom by limiting the free-exercise of that choice.

**What Can Be Done?**

- Respect the freedom of personal choice and the decision by individuals as to where and when they smoke.
- Decrease government involvement in smoking regulations, leaving it as an individual decision.
- Encourage businesses to post smoking policies in easily identifiable places to allow individuals to make informed choices about where they can smoke.

**In Support**

- Decisions about smoking and second hand smoke should be left up to individual consumers.
- This Approach protects individuals who are smokers, which is a legal activity.

**In Opposition**

- This Approach infringes on the right to breathe and work in a clean environment.
- It forces nonsmokers to avoid certain businesses if they do not wish to be around smokers.
It’s About Public Health


It’s About the Pocketbook


It’s About Personal Choice

The following survey is your evaluation of this event. Your individual responses will be kept completely confidential and only a summary of the responses from the participants will be provided to the event organizers. Your responses are important as they will be used to improve future forum events. By completing this survey, you are acknowledging your informed consent to participate in this evaluation. If you feel any question unduly invades your privacy, please feel free to omit it.

Below are a series of statements. Please indicate your level of agreement by circling one number for each statement. Key for the 4-point numeric scale: 1 = strongly agree; 4 = strongly disagree

1. The civic discourse event (Burning Both Ends) increased my knowledge about this issue.  
2. The moderated discussion increased my understanding of good civic discourse.  
3. I was given the opportunity to contribute to the discussion.  
4. Many different perspectives were presented during the discussion.  
5. I believe the moderator valued the comments of all participants.  
6. Participants were treated with respect.  
7. The moderator encouraged diverse viewpoints in the discussion.  
8. The discussion focused on the issues rather than personalities.  
9. I felt comfortable making comments during the discussion.  
10. As a result of this experience, I would be willing to participate in a similar event.  
11. The video provided a good focus for the moderated discussion that followed.
12. Please take a few minutes to reflect on other challenging issues of our time—issues you hear and read about in the news. Which issues would you like to have addressed in a future forum?

13. What three things would you tell a friend about participating in this event? Please list them below.

1.

2.

3.

Thank you for taking time to provide us with feedback.
Please return all evaluation forms to:
Erika Mason-Imbody, ICDD Project Coordinator, 202 Ahearn Fieldhouse,
Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506
ICDD Principles of Civic Discourse

- Provide framework for dialogue. (Establish ground rules; recognize any cultural differences.)
- Provide all with voice. (Create safe rhetorical space.)
- Focus on issues rather than personalities.
- Invite/encourage a variety of perspectives.
- Value evidence variety.
- Seek common ground.
- Avoid personal attacks.
- Avoid ideological sloganeering.
- The goal is to understand rather than persuade.
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