"A Smoker's Plea." Stephen Miller | Opinion Column | April 9, 2007, *The Chronicle* (Duke University Student Newspaper) http://www.dukechronicle.com/article/2007/04/smokers-plea

As you may have heard, the University, under pressure from the Medical Center, may stop selling cigarettes on campus next year. The University has already banned smoking in indoor locations, and I think it's likely it won't be too long before Duke joins the growing collegiate trend (and its own Medical Center) and bans smoking on campus altogether. This would be a grievous error.

With countless dollars and the awesome force of political correctness behind it, the anti-smoking crusade is nearly impervious to truth or reason. But I shall nonetheless make an effort to dismantle a few of the major lies that have brought our society to its knees before the unrelenting health fascists. So let's begin.

A study in the British Medical Journal reports that men who quit smoking before the age of 30 live just as long as those who never smoked. Indeed, it is safer for college kids to smoke than to drive.

 But what of the people who don't quit? As the renowned Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank, reports, even if one uses the government's own dubious figures, the majority of smoking deaths occur at age 70 or above. Moreover, almost half occur at age 75 or above and almost 20 percent occur at age 85 or above. A great many smokers who die of tobacco-related causes are still outliving non-smokers.

Again, the actual figures are probably even more optimistic for smokers because the anti-smoking studies are so biased. In these studies, smoking-related deaths are defined as anything that kills smokers at a higher rate than non-smokers, even if negligibly so. Thus, a smoker whose obesity kills him through heart disease still gets tallied as a smoking death. Even deaths by fire are counted as smoking-related. I kid you not.

In "Lies, Damned Lies, and 400,000 Smoking Related Deaths," the authors show that if one even lightly firms up the standards for smoking-related deaths, the number immediately drops by 65 percent. And get this-if one applies the same methodology the Centers for Disease Control uses to calculate smoking-related deaths to lack-of-exercise related deaths, failure to exercise kills over 100,000 more people than smoking. And bad dietary habits? Over 200,000 more people. Using the CDC's standards, smoking is healthier than getting too little exercise or eating poorly. So is the University going to shut down McDonald's?

In fact, if one compares smokers who live a healthy lifestyle to non-smokers who live a very unhealthy lifestyle, smokers will in fact turn out to be "healthier and die less often by a factor of three than the never-smokers." And what of second-hand smoking, you say? Even if the risk of smoking is grossly exaggerated, don't non-smokers have a right to avoid the grave hazards of second-hand smoking? They would, if only second-hand smoking were in fact a grave hazard.

As the Cato Institute Reports in "The Case Against Smoking Bans," a forgotten study from the New England Journal of Medicine in 1975 found that, "one would have to breathe smoke-filled air for 4,000 hours in order to inhale as much tobacco smoke as a smoker inhales in a single cigarette."

How does this translate to cancer risks? A 2003 study of 35,000 never-smoking Californians who were married to smokers, based on data collected for 39 years, found "no heightened lung cancer risk among study subjects." And that's people living with smokers-not those who happen to dine in a restaurant or walk on a boulevard where someone is lighting up.

What does this all mean? First and foremost, second-hand smoking cannot be used to justify efforts to restrict and ban smoking. Secondly, smoking, while risky and potentially lethal, is not nearly as dangerous as special interest groups and their cohorts in government have made it out to be. It is instead an issue with tremendous political capital that preys on people's fears.

 The real risks are the fascistic tendencies that prohibit smoking in even private establishments, violating our liberties and setting the groundwork for a future where any personal habit can be regulated when it is politically expedient. So, to all smokers and people who value their freedom, I say it is time to draw a line in the ash and defend our right to light up. Washington Duke wouldn't have it any other way.

## Smoking ban diminishes on-campus diversity

By Simon Shieh, Daily Aztec, January 29, 2014.

http://www.thedailyaztec.com/47214/opinion/smoking-ban-diminishes-on-campus-diversity/

## 

I smoked my first cigarette when I was 18 years old living in a remote mountain village in southern China. I was offered one almost every day and finally tried it out of curiosity. It made me nauseous and I didn't smoke again. The people who lived in the village either didn't know, chose to ignore, or had simply forgot that smoking is bad for your health. However, it held no connotations and nearly everyone did it. [quote]Living there, I learned that my healthy lifestyle was neither right nor better, but completely arbitrary.[/quote] San Diego State's recent move toward a smoke-free campus limits diversity in our community, restricts what some consider a social event and a coping mechanism and projects a misrepresented image of our student body.

The issue of secondhand smoke was probably the forefront decision to restrict smoking on campus, and although I agree that it's a serious issue, I don't believe that secondhand smoke outdoors in an isolated area would have a significant effect on the non-smoking population at SDSU. In a study done by the California Environmental Protection Agency, nicotine concentration from secondhand smoke was measured various indoor and outdoor locations. The results showed that the concentration of nicotine in the outdoor campus setting would be  $0.051\mu g/m3$  (microgram/cubic meter). Compared to the concentration of nicotine in secondhand smoke indoors, which is  $29.2~\mu g/m3$ , that number is miniscule. Even with the previous outdoor smoking areas on campus, the effects on non-smokers were minimal. By further isolating the smoking areas, the effects could easily be eliminated altogether. When looked at this way, the benefits of isolated outdoor smoking areas outweigh the negative effects that this kind of controlled smoking would have on the general student population.

 Smoking is a social event, a chance to escape outdoors and share a calming activity with friends. Those who feel anxious around others, and often avoid social situations, suddenly have a reason to join a group of smokers. They ask for a lighter and let themselves get swallowed into a group wherein their cigarette is physical proof of membership. Smokers share experiences and an identity just by smoking. They exhale an amiable nonchalance about the frailty of their lives, letting their vice permeate their day-to-day lives in a physically destructive, emotionally liberating recesses, while banded together in spite of, but not against, the grimaces of passers-by. For me, a non-smoker, seeing the groups of people clustered around a bench or a walkway talking and laughing with a cigarette is always a comforting sight.

Smoking is not just a social experience, it's also a coping mechanism. We all have them, but we like to categorize and judge others based on their dependence and their effects. On the spectrum of coping mechanisms, smoking is probably on the "bad" end because of its adverse effects on health, and its shameless ability to cause addiction. [quote]While I'm a strong advocate for health, I'm also an advocate for doing what makes you happy.[/quote] Of coarse, there's a line to be drawn here, but the way I see it, cigarettes fall short of that line. College is stressful and some personalities are better equipped to handle that stress than others. It's unfair to take away what some people consider their form of stress relief in the place they probably need it most. While it's unfair to compare SDSU to a Chinese village, I admire the uninhibitedness of the latter. A campus that promotes a homogenous lifestyle is sacrificing an element of diversity and freedom. Students should be free to smoke on campus as long as they are not affecting the health of others, regardless of how they affect others' sensibilities. Having a smoke-free campus misrepresents the diversity of the characters that make up our student body. The student plagued with anxiety is as much a part of our community as the confident and collected student; while one craves the stimulation of class work and deadlines, the other just needs to step outside and smoke a cigarette. Any student here is made well aware of the effects of cigarettes on his or her health, so I see no reason why isolated smoking should be prohibited on campus.

## Op-Ed: E-cigs are a risk to everyone, not just the user

108 By Diona Shelbourne, The Daily Aztec, February 10, 2016.

http://www.thedailvaztec.com/74200/opinion/op-ed-e-cigs-are-a-risk-to-everyone-not-just-the-user/

109 110

106 107

- 111 I thought it was my right to smoke. When people would pass by me and cover their mouths and make a face, I would get irritated. There was enough air for everyone, why were people judging me based on my personal 112 113 choice?
- 114 I continued this way for 10 long years.

115 116

117

118

Little did I know that my lungs were becoming dangerously fragile. So fragile that one day when I was cleaning, the combination of bleach fumes and a decade of smoking caught up to me. My lung collapsed. I was rushed to the hospital and remained in the ICU for three weeks where I was unable to breathe without the help of a bypass machine.

119 120

121 I was only 33 years old at the time.

122

- 123 The doctors told me I would die if I smoked again and at that moment, my life changed. I wanted to take action. 124 Currently I am enrolled as a student at CSU East Bay, which like many CSU campuses, private colleges and
- community colleges, it is not smoke-free. Secondhand smoke is dangerous, but it is especially harmful to 125
- 126 students like me, who have severe lung conditions.

127

- 128 Because of my lungs, I can't be exposed to smoke, even smelling smoke can be potentially life threatening. There have even been days I have had to miss class entirely because I wasn't able to make it to across campus 129
- without coming in contact with smoke. 130

131

- 132 To make matters worse, cigarettes aren't the only tobacco-related problem on campus anymore. E-cigarettes are becoming extremely popular and come in a variety of flavors that appeal to young adults. Because they don't 133
- 134 smell like traditional cigarettes, people assume that they are harmless.

135

136 Unfortunately, this isn't the case.

137

- 138 While e-cigarettes may be less harmful than traditional cigarettes, they aren't safe or harmless, as they are often
- marketed. Many contain nicotine and a variety of other harmful chemicals. It's not harmless water vapor either. 139
- E-cigarettes emit an aerosol, which contains toxins like lead, formaldehyde and nickel, which not only pose 140 health risks to those who use them, but to people around them as well. 141

142 143

144

- Many people think that vaping threatens Big Tobacco, and that using e-cigs is a way to reduce dependence on tobacco. What they don't realize is that Big Tobacco owns many of the top selling e-cig brands, and profit
- 145 immensely from their sales. 146

147 148 This makes me feel as if once again tobacco is targeting our schools and our students. This feels personal since I know firsthand how deadly tobacco products can be.

149

150 Unfortunately, though Cal State East Bay has had a no smoking policy in place for over a decade, these rules don't include e-cigarettes. I have even seen people 'vaping' in class. 151

152

153 Ultimately, I believe it is every student's right to have equal access to education and the ability to attend classes without putting their health at risk, just as I believe students who smoke and vape should know and understand 154 155 the true risks involved.

156

- 157 We all have the power to decide what to do with our own bodies and health, but we have to stand together to ensure that we are protecting all students from the health risks posed by tobacco in all forms.
- 158