

Public health efforts at discouraging smoking have had to contend with the enormous economic and political power of the tobacco industry. Congress, which still provides subsidies to tobacco growers, has been very reluctant to pass legislation opposed by the industry. However, the 1964 surgeon general's report carried great credibility, and its publication led to a number of government actions aimed at restricting cigarette marketing. These included Federal Trade Commission requirements that cigarette pack-ages contain warning labels and a Federal Communications Commission mandate that radio and television advertisements for cigarette be balanced by public service announcements about their harmful effects. The latter requirement, called the Fairness Doctrine, was so effective in terring the tobacco companies' ads, as seen in the drop in cigaret consumption shown in Figure 15-2, that in 1971 the industry submitted to a total ban on cigarette advertising on radio and television. In return, the public service announcements ceased. The tobacco companies shifted their advertising efforts to magazines, newspapers, billboards, produ give-aways, and sponsorship of sporting and cultural events. —Over the past three decades, new awareness of the harm caused b “second-hand smoke” has led to some of the most effective actions against smoking. Studies began to show that exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused some of the same health problems as active smoking. For example, the nonsmoking spouses of smokers have an increased risk of lung cancer and heart disease, and children of parents who smoke are more likely to suffer from asthma, respiratory infections, and sudden infant death syndrome. In 1992, the Environmental Protection Agency issued a report that declared environmental tobacco smoke to be a carcinogen, causing 3,000 lung cancer deaths a year. Evidence of the harm caused by passive smoking inspired the nonsmokers rights movement, which largely bypassed the Congress and focused political pressure on state and local governments. In 1974 Connecticut was the first state to enact restrictions on smoking in restaurants. Minnesota passed a comprehensive statewide clean indoor air law in 1975. In 1983, San Francisco passed a restrictive law against smoking in the workplace, including private workplaces. The clean indoor air movement blossomed. At the state level, laws were passed that restricted smoking on public transit and in elevators, cultural and recreational facilities, schools, and libraries. Over the objections of the tobacco industry, a ban on smoking on all domestic airline flights was passed by Congress in 1989. Restrictions on indoor smoking became more widespread in the 1990s. By the end of 2003, five states had banned smoking in all public places, including work sites, restaurants, and bars. More than 1,600 counties and municipalities have passed legislation to promote clean indoor air. The effectiveness of the nonsmokers' rights movements stems from its success in transforming smoking into a socially unacceptable activity. Bans in so many public places force smokers to refrain for extended periods and to segregate themselves when they wish to smoke, often by going outdoors. By making smoking inconvenient, bans encourage people to quit. As Figure 15-2 shows, cigarette consumption has declined steadily since the nonsmokers rights movement began.