**Benefit Nuisance Ratio**

“*Cigarette smoking is injurious to health"* a warning issued in the interest of the smokers in particular and public in general. Is this warning a rational one? I think, it is veg, since it is a very vast and ambiguous statement. I think there should be a need of some other sort of warning. It shall be very specific and the consumers of a cigarette should think twice before smoking. The warning should be such that out of 100% smokers’ minimum 50% should throw the same after purchasing it. About 50% shall just smoke up to half of its length, i.e, consume 50% only out of fear and danger and then throw half of its part for the fear or threat to life.

I have seen few smokers in AC compartments of a train while smoking they generally found standing near the train door and then smoke or otherwise find a suitable non public space. They seem to be very much addicted and certainly ignore the warning. I once talked to such a passenger who had just smoke and then entered in the AC compartment. Since, he was my neighbor, I took him into confidence and while chatting, informally, collected information regarding his smoking habits. After I could gain his confidence, I asked him about the benefit he has got by smoking a cigarette. He replied negatively. I again asked, how much he has lost by consuming a cigarette? He said nothing. I again asked him the nuisance a cigarette has created, he said all nuisances. He was somewhat ashamed.

After our discussions was over, I was thinking about the push and pull factor that compels him to smoke. Even though there was no absolute benefit and all that was only nuisance. It was a direct harm to a health of an individual.

Another incident was a traditional pre-matrimonial event of looking at a prospective bride at a big village of a Nagpur district. The bride’s father was a renowned farmer and was famous for producing seedless lemons. The talk was going on in between prospective groom and brides party in a marriage fixing event. There was a lot of discussion on lemon, its verities, market and prices etc. the prospective bride entered in the hall and sat down on a little table. In rural parlance it is called as “*chaurang*”. At the same time the drink was served by the servant and it was coca-cola. Almost all have enjoyed the chilled soft drink, since it was the hot days of the summer.

After the procedure was over, the prospective bride went inside and again general rural type discussion reopened. I very curiously asked to a senior guy from bride’s side about the taste of coca-cola. He was criticizing the drink after its consumption by him. He said there was no alternative to lemon juice. I could relate the same to cigarette smoking with no more benefit but nuisance. On every such commodities there should be a warning as benefit to nuisance printed on the wrapper. It shall be in the numerical term. On cigarette it should be benefit to nuisance ratio as 0:100, on Coco-Cola bottle it should be like 50:100 Or 1:2. i.e, there is double the nuisance then it’s benefit. Instead, if it a soya juice then it should be 1:0. Such warnings are very difficult to be marked, however, there is a need to have a deliberation on the same.

I personally think that there is a direct need to impart fear in the minds of the consumers. Specific warnings shall be heart touching than general one. If it is so, then I hope the environmental friendly and natural products shall be consumed in more quantity. It will be a great cause for improving the health of the consumers. This nuisance is limited to a consumer, similarly there can be a nuisance to the environment also for e.g. one drinks a bottle of say ‘*bisleri’* and throws it away somewhere and this material of bottle is non-degradable and non-decomposable, it is a nuisance to the environment, may be negligible but certainly having an harm to the environment in long term which is against the concept what we call it as sustainable development.

Every organization or company should see that there should be a minimum nuisance to the health of the individual or to the environment. So, I think there is a need of specific warning in the form of ratio of benefit to nuisance than general warnings. However, it is difficult to calculate the same in exact numerical ratio but the concept shall certainly ignite the spark in every one’s mind to think for a noble cause of health in specific and environment conservation in particular.
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