



PRE-COPYEDITED VERSION — PUBLISHED AS

Dennis, Simone 2018. Analysing Smokefree: Notes on Senses, Smoke and Violence, *Anthropological Forum*, 28(2): 171-182.

Downloaded from <http://www.anthropologicalforum.net>

COPYRIGHT

All rights held by DENNIS, Simone. You need to get the author's permission for uses other than teaching and personal research.

Analysing Smokefree: Notes on Senses, Smoke and Violence

Simone Dennis

College of Arts and Social Sciences, Australian National University

Abstract: Throughout my fifteen-years-long exploration of tobacco smoking in Australia, I have analysed the practice and the legislation pertaining to it using sensory tools. Ten years distant from the beginning of my engagement with smoking, I can appreciate that a striking feature of the sensory analyses I have made is what they reveal of violence. Included here is (not only) the violence done to the smoker's own body – by the biotechnology of cigarettes themselves, and by the state; the violence she does to nonsmoking others with her dangerous exhalations; and a kind of violence conducted against a critical anthropology by, precisely, a veraciously interventionist form of medical anthropology. In what follows I reveal some of these violences. In this paper, I use key examples that have featured in my published work before to make the related points that (a) sensory analyses are good for thinking about and revealing powerful relations and (b) that it really matters what kind of sensory analysis we do; some kinds, I suggest, might actually work to shore up the powerful conditions under which a topic, an issue or a problem has emerged. Others might lay those conditions bare and make plain their violent operations.

Keywords: Smoke; Violence; Touch; Senses; Smokefree.

Introduction

In this paper, I explore the violence that characterises the sensory analyses I have made of smoking practice and its (state) regulation in Australia over the past decade. I certainly do not claim to have covered every kind of sensory analysis that might be made of smoking herein, and indeed I intend to conduct considerably more and different sensory work on smoking in the future. However, having conducted at least cursory sensory analysis across a multiply of registers, I do think it timely to take stock, and to speak to one of the dominant features of my analytic yield: violence.

It has been the analytic of touch in particular that has brought violence to the fore of my thinking and has permitted me to appreciate its role in the other of the sensory analyses I have conducted. Touch became an important analytic tool for me when the thirdhand smoke menace came to my attention (see Dennis 2016b). I'll say more about this terrifying prospect later, suffice it to say now that thirdhand smoke is smoke you can touch, and that is toxic to touch and so my analytic antennae attuned themselves to haptic relations. Beyond permitting access to the practices of touch in and through which smoking practice and smoking relations are sustained, thinking with touch alerted me to the limitations of understanding smoking relations through smell: the primary way in which anthropologists have thought about smoke in its contemporary toxic modality.

Touch is a far less obvious sensory-analytic route into (tobacco) smoking than smell; indeed, the utilisation of touch might seem unsympathetic with the wafting omnitude of smoke, something difficult to grasp and hold. If we take touch to be the sense of things being in contact, of things coming up against us (see Connor 2011)¹, however, we might well begin to appreciate how useful it is for thinking through and with smoke. This broadly constituted version of touch includes an appreciation of smoke that penetrates us, sticks and stays on and in us, and for the violent capacity it can thus bring to smoking and non-smoking bodies. That anthropologists do not routinely use touch to think tobacco smoke has obscured some important and quietly violent interactions between smokers and (public and private) institutions. Below, I give a sensory profile of tobacco smoke – a profile that reflects the failure of anthropological thinking to get beyond the symbolic violence that attends relations with tobacco smoke – a point upon which I shall conclude.

Sensing smoking: Olfaction

In the contemporary context of tobacco denormalisation¹, anthropologists have analysed relations with tobacco smoke primarily through *smell*. 'Denormalisation' is the term used by

¹ Connor describes the *unspecificity* of touch this way:

touch seems to have no unique channel or identifying frequency-band. Vision, for example, responds almost exclusively to the luminous portion of the electro-magnetic spectrum, hearing almost exclusively to oscillations of air-pressure at much lower frequencies. Touch has no such exclusive frequency, being definable no more precisely than the sense of things being in contact, of things coming up against us. Thus thermoception, the sense of traction, the sense of gravity or equilibrium, and even coenaesthesia, the sense of mine-ness or me-ness that is supposed to adhere to all my sense perceptions, have all been represented as modalities of touch (2011, np).

the Australian government to describe the purposeful change in the interpretation of smoking from ‘a widely practised and socially acceptable behaviour to one which is increasingly typified as destructive, dirty, and anti-social’ (Scollo & Winstanley 2012, np). Olfactory analyses have been particularly good at showing how the offensive odour of tobacco smoke has been fundamental to the success of tobacco denormalisation, highlighting as they do the relationship between the capacity of smoke to breach bodily boundaries and theories of pollution.

Anthropological attention has been paid, for example, to how tobacco smoke is described by governments. Three sorts of tobacco smoke are produced in the course of having a cigarette: mainstream smoke (the smoke directly inhaled into the smoker’s lungs through the burning cigarette); exhaled mainstream smoke (the smoke breathed out by the smoker from their lungs); and side stream smoke (the smoke that drifts from the smouldering tip of the cigarette). Exhaled mainstream smoke and sidestream smoke can be described as ‘environmental tobacco smoke’, or ‘tobacco smoke pollution’, but they are not so called in any Australian government production. ‘Secondhand smoke’ is the preferred government term (see Dennis, 2016a, 113). Only this term captures the repulsive idea that the smoke a bystander breathes in has been *used before* (Brandt 1998:168). It is not only that this air is secondhand; as the graphic antismoking advertisement ‘Lung’, developed as part of the Australian National Tobacco Campaign (1997-2000) and communicated to television audiences throughout the first decade of the 2000s, the air expelled by a smoker has circulated around the foul matter of her rotting lungs. ‘No wonder smokers feel short of breath; their lungs are rotting’, proclaims the advertisement’s voice over, as the smoker exhales smoke into the camera (see Quitnow 2012).

It is even less of a wonder that during my own decade-long study into how Australian smokers have experienced denormalisation (begun in 2004) I frequently encountered non-smokers who drew up their collars and pinched their nostrils together as they passed by designated smoking areas. As one man yelled at one of my informants, Rosie, on encountering some of her exhaled smoke in the street: ‘Hey, don’t blow that stinking shit on me! I don’t want your cancer. It’s a contagious disease, spread by selfish idiots like you’ (Dennis, 2016:125).

Although the air interconnects all breathers – what is exhaled by one will be breathed in by another – respiratory interconnection is backgrounded in the course of ordinary respiration. A smoker’s odiferous exhalations make revoltingly clear this interconnection. As Borthwick (2000) notes, interconnection is fundamental to the workings of odour detection. In order to emit sense-able odour, an object must break down. Its emissions are detected with our sensory equipment after they have penetrated bodily parameters. Some redolent breaches are welcome and precede welcome future penetrations – novelists from different genres make use of such ideas when they use scent to signal imminent sexual encounters, as sci-fi icon Douglas Adams did when he placed Arthur and Fenchurch in a night-time context ‘already dangerously on the sweet and fragrant side’ in his *The Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy* (1986, 539), and as Judith Krantz did when she preceded the sexual encounter between Francesca and Stash with Francesca’s appreciation for the smell of her lover’s sweat on their

first meeting in her *Princess Daisy* (1980, 13). And, for some former smokers, tobacco smoke odour may well be wistfully agreeable. In the era of tobacco denormalisation, though, the foul stench of tobacco smoke is an unwelcome invasion. Bell (2014, 158) argues that it is this unwelcome invasive capacity of smell that has been critical to claims of otherwise unverified *thirdhand* smoke danger.

According to the Mayo Clinic, thirdhand smoke is:

residual nicotine and other chemicals left on a variety of indoor surfaces by tobacco smoke. This residue is thought to react with common indoor pollutants to create a toxic mix.... Studies show that thirdhand smoke clings to hair, skin, clothes, furniture, drapes, walls, bedding, carpets, dust, vehicles and other surfaces, even long after smoking has stopped. Infants, children and non-smoking adults may be at risk of tobacco related health problems when they inhale, ingest or touch substances containing thirdhand smoke. ... Thirdhand smoke residue builds up on surfaces over time and resists normal cleaning. Thirdhand smoke can't be eliminated by airing out rooms, opening windows, using fans or air conditioners ... The only way to protect non-smokers from thirdhand smoke is to create a smokefree environment, whether that's your private home or vehicle, or in public places, such as hotels and restaurants. (2014, np)

Claims of great danger are made for both second and thirdhand smoke in respect of how each jeopardises the health of non-smokers. For instance, while secondhand smoke *is* verifiably dangerous to inhale in the indoors, it is not nearly so hazardous in the outdoors. As Australian scientists Stafford, Daube and Franklin (2010) note,

In contrast to indoor smoking ... SHS dissipates soon after smoking ceases outdoors. The concentration of outdoor SHS is a product of the density and distribution of smokers, wind direction and speed, and the stability of the atmosphere. High outdoor SHS concentrations are generated by high smoker density, low wind velocities and stable atmospheric conditions. (2010, 100).

But, as is the case for thirdhand smoke, the semiotic power of the smell of smoke has proved more than enough to create the embodied sense that secondhand smoke *is* unequivocally dangerous; something evidenced by the frequency with which its odour is referenced in media and public health contributions (Bell 2014, 158). Bell notes,

the smell of smoke – like smoke itself – creates a material connection between the smoker and the bystander. ... Moreover, this connection is entirely involuntary. ... The smell of stale cigarette smoke is marginal matter in Douglas' sense of the term: in its refusal to respect boundaries, it is dangerous and polluting...[it] destroys the boundaries between what is 'me' and what is 'not me'. (2014, 165)

Now, one can easily see how an analysis founded on smell might play directly into the hands of a cessationist agenda. If smoke is a boundary crosser – irrespective of whether or not it

actually constitutes a health hazard – smoke becomes offensive to one’s right to maintain bodily integrity, to repel invasion. That is entirely congruous with the Australian state’s claims for the danger of smoky exhalations; where the state’s emphasis was once on the danger that cigarette smoke posed to the body of the smoker herself, it is now firmly on the danger it poses to non-smoking others. Anthropological insights into olfaction have, albeit usefully, drawn attention to the violence that cigarette smoke exhalations are taken to do to others. This congruity bears inspection, in the name of a critical anthropology prepared to examine its own relations to the politics of health.

Auditory analysis

Listening to changes in breathing

It’s certainly the case that auditory analyses of smoking are uncommon. While I know of no analyses specific to tobacco smoking, the respiratory rhythm of smoking in the period of denormalisation *is* evident to the acoustically attuned ethnographer. I heard it distinctly while listening back over audio-recorded interviews with smokers about the difficulties of smoking in public. One was with Natalia, a 47 years old office worker. As I listened I recalled how when she drew in on her cigarette, Natalia’s smoke emerged around her words. ‘It’s hard’, she said. I feel like it’s shameful because...’ she stopped, and it sounded like she stopped breathing out. In fact, she *had* ceased exhaling, just for a moment. After a brief but noticeable pause, Natalia continued talking, and breathing out. ‘Because people really look down on it, and judge you. Harshly’. Natalia’s abrupt cessation of speech and exhalation had been provoked by a passerby, who had happened by the smoking spot. She had looked briefly across at the group, coughed loudly, and hurried past. Natalia had held her breath, and her speech, until the woman had passed. That recording prompted me to check back over the dozens I had made. It was audibly evident; people getting halfway through sentences, or drawing smoke in and not letting it out in a natural rhythm of exhalation.

One consequence of denormalisation has been the emergence of a prescription for the exhalation of cigarette smoke in public; smokers now exhale *in congruence* with the idea that it is dangerous to exhale into the respiratory right-of-way of non-smoking others in public. Holding smoke in until passers-by pass, the respiratory rhythm of smoking has changed; over the course of my fieldwork, spent in the main with smokers in public designated smoking areas, I *actually heard* smokers attending to the timing of their breaths so as not to exhale into the path of a passing inhaler. This is a subtle set of sounds, not nearly as loud as the shouts to which Rosie was subjected when she got that respiratory timing fundamentally wrong. But perhaps it is still violence, or at least the result of a violent politics conducted at the microlevel. Such acute attendance to the waft of the air, and to the respiratory right of way of nonsmokers in the era of smokefree, speaks powerfully to the political dimensions of the air itself. The habitual, necessary intertwinement we must all have with the air itself is abruptly pulled up; the quality of exhaled air, and who encounters it, must be considered as the (classed) politics of smoking vest themselves in the lungs of the smoker, that oft marginalised figure who typically hangs around the lowest rungs of the socioeconomic ladder.

Taste Analyses: taste and Taste

The sensory analytic of *taste* provides us with insight into the context of denormalisation in which sensations resulting from tobacco consumption are experienced. Plain packaging laws introduced in Australia in 2011 that called for uniform olive-brown cigarette packs devoid of brand insignia made some smokers feel that their cigarettes tasted much worse than they had in branded packs. This phenomenon was claimed by tobacco control interest groups as a clear indication of the body's sensory registration of the real danger of cigarettes, apparent to the smoker only after the deceptive buffer of slick advertising had been removed (Wynne 2012, np; Dennis 2016a, 160).

Cigarette advertising has been explored for the role it once accorded taste, a role played out in concert with *vision*. This sensory multiply is evident on an old packet of Peter Stuyvesant Lights I have retained from before the time at which plain packaging was introduced into Australia, upon which is to be found the following message:

Mild choice tobacco plus the Modern Filter make Peter Stuyvesant the International
Passport to Smoking Pleasure!

The connection between 'smoking pleasure' and 'passport' – two things that don't ostensibly relate – depends upon the inextricable entailment of vision and taste, each animated by movement. As the philosopher Michel Serres is fond of pointing out, the term 'visit' and the verb 'to visit' mean at first 'seeing'; 'they add to it the idea of itinerary – the one who visits goes to see' -- the body goes to visit with what is seen (1998, 334 my emphasis; see also Connor 1999, 6). What is seen in this case, smoke, is also on the move. Moving outbound via our own breath, made visible with smoke, we travel, and cigarette companies were shrewd to imagine for us several appealing destinations. We can visit, Flavour Country, or the lush tropical islands of the Menthol Group. This makes a sensory logic of passports, and begins to explain why travel was such an overwhelmingly constant feature of cigarette advertising, but it makes more sense when *taste* is added to the sensory analysis.

Travel to tropical islands or flavour country is made in accordance with our own taste (and our own Tastefulness – although the difference between smoking high end cigarettes or a budget brand like Holiday are no longer visually marked). Serres (1998) suggests that taste belongs in a different sensory category than vision: that which is seen need not be dissolved in order to be seen. But that which is tasted (like that which is smelled) must interact with the body and be dissolved by it in order to be tasted at all (see Borthwick 2000, 133). The consistent use of travel in cigarette advertising gives us pause to consider how the different sensory registers of *vision and taste* combine in a sensual knot that enables us to entertain the notion of visiting Flavour Country. In the first instance, inbound breath takes the smoke down into the lungs, and we can *see* it as it emerges outbound. The smoke that goes in is not the same as the smoke that comes out; *tasting* smoke makes the smoky air part of us, and makes us part of the smoky air, so that it is *my* breath going to Flavour Country. To see is to visit (country), and to taste is to have become part of (flavour). Now, part of the smoke I see, I

make personal journeys outbound to Flavour Country (see Dennis, 2016a, 155; Dennis 2006). But of course this version of taste has been replaced with Taste. The once proffered invitation to visit someplace lovely, like St Moritz, or to visit someplace lovely and cheap – like Longbeach – are no longer made, and smokers cannot demonstrate their classiness or otherwise in and through the cigarettes they choose. The quiet, gold refinement of Benson and Hedges packaging is indistinguishable from the cheap and cheerful colours of the cheaper brands; they're all olive brown now. And, the only place one is invited to attend is a destination most undesirable. Packets invite smokers to attend the innards of the body, to dwell upon the condition of the vessels of the eye, the congestion of the arteries, the rotted state of the lungs. Deliberately violent, confronting packet graphics have even, according to some smokers, changed how their contents taste (see Dennis, 2016b). Again, the minutest of bodily actions, that between object and tongue, are targeted.

Haptics: Some Touching Analyses

Even though some of the sensory examples I have given above give insight into the violence that can (re)organise bodily relations in the period of tobacco denormalisation, none gets us as near as an analysis conducted via *touch*. I have utilised touch before, to explore how smoking can extend a person's reach in the world (see Dennis 2006; Dennis 2011). Megan, an informant I interviewed before smoking was banned in bars in Australia, reached out to touch and incorporate the physicality of cigarettes, in particular their length, to accomplish her aim of looking 'sexy and elegant' as she smoked:

Megan said: 'I always smoke long cigarettes, Super Kings, and lately, I have been considering using a cigarette holder' ... she looked disapprovingly at her hands. 'My hands are really pudgy, and my fingers are short and squat,' she complained. 'When I hold a cigarette, like this', she said, holding up her 'smoking fingers', my whole arm looks longer, and I feel more elegant. It's like wearing false eyelashes, for that illusion of length'. The holding of cigarette object in the short fingers of the pudgy hand effectively extended these shortcomings into the longer reach of Megan, as the cigarette became part of fingers, the fingers part of cigarette. Megan had her longer hand. Megan also talked about what she did with the smoke that she expelled if she happened to be flirting with someone while she smoked with lengthy elegance: 'If I'm interested', she said, 'I like to blow my smoke up around the side of his face, like a caress.' She touched the side of my face in an upward motion, to show me what she meant. She indicated with her fingers that the smoke trailed up beyond the face and whispered away. I asked her if it worked. 'They get the message,' she replied. 'How about if you want them to leave you alone?' I asked, intrigued. 'Then I blow it straight in their face, into their eyes,' she said, grinning maliciously. 'It's like giving someone a smelly slap in the face, without getting charged with assault' (Dennis 2006, 45).

The violence of these touches is made visible with smoky air. Years later, and much farther down the road of smoking denormalisation, I wondered whether the smoky air (or its absence) could make evident the violent touches made by institutions to smokers' bodies.

Where, as Stafford et al (2010) point out, (outdoors) secondhand smoke contamination requires spatial and temporal proximity to and sufficient duration with combusting tobacco to cause harm, thirdhand smoke depends on neither. The Mayo Clinic notes that because 'thirdhand smoke is a relatively new concept, and researchers are still studying its possible dangers' nobody yet knows what duration of exposure is dangerous, and so the precautionary position of 'any contact is harmful contact' has been taken (2014, np). Even those intending a brief hotel stay are alerted to incalculable thirdhand danger by warning signs that have begun to appear in the lobbies of hotels in which smoking was once permitted, to warn patrons that smoky residue might 'offgas' even when the soft furnishings have been replaced and the rooms repainted (Dennis, 2016b:163). While the shortest exposure time is assumed to cause harm, the longest duration is assumed in terms of how long thirdhand smoke remains present in the things it has penetrated. In 2011, thirdhand smoke researcher and staunch antismoking advocate George Matt and colleagues reported on how long thirdhand smoke might remain in the home, concluding that even after being vacant for two months and being prepared for new residents, with new carpeting and paint, thirdhand residue remained detectable (see Matt et al. 2011). Its lingering presence, though, is substantially different from a scientifically voracious claim of demonstrable harm (see Bell 2014, 158).

Thirdhand smoke is thus endowed with dangerous longevity normally denied smoke, which is usually thought of as a fleeting presence. Thirdhand smoke also does something else that we do not normally think of smoke being able to do: it assumes a solid form, as a lodgement in the objects it infiltrates. From these objects it also offgasses, and so thirdhand smoke is simultaneously sited and solid and, smoke like, outbound and wafting. This profile means a doubled danger to which one might be initially alerted by smoky odour, but this dissipates or is masked by other smells. As Lara Gundel, a thirdhand smoke researcher at University of California Los Angeles, warned on the University's *Prime Cuts* television program that showcases cutting edge UCLA research, thirdhand smoke is not only 'what you smell when you go into a hotel room where people have been smoking', but equally '*what rubs off on your skin if you touch a wall*, or if you visit somebody's house and they've been smoking. So that means it's not only there in the air, but it is coming out of the surfaces', including human surfaces, like skin and hair from which residue cannot be expunged for who knows how long (UCTV, 2012).

As the Mayo Clinic's description of thirdhand smoke indicates, infants and children are considered particularly susceptible to thirdhand contamination; toddlers touch surfaces like carpets and sofas with more of their bodies, more often than do adults, and infants are held against hair and skin and clothing that might have been contaminated. It was therefore of no surprise to me to find that parenting sites across the UK, US and Australia have begun dispensing advice to parents about regulating contact between baby and family members who smoke. Replicated on the thirty websites I visited was the advice that smokers should be instructed to remove the clothing they smoked in, wash their hands and face, and rinse their mouths before being permitted to touch a baby.

One New Mother poster to the Australian 'What to Expect' site (see whattoexpect.com 2012), expressed great trepidation about telling her smoking Father in Law about the

conditions under which he would be permitted to touch her newborn Baby Girl. Posters with grievances about or concerns relating to relations between family members and children were invariably talking about their affinal relatives whose habits — including not washing their hands after visiting the bathroom — were incongruous with those of the complainants (typically mothers). Differences in bodily habits seemed particularly irksome to the new mothers who had just completed thoroughgoing reflexive inspections of their own *techniques du corps* to check them for safety-of-use with their infants. One new mother told how she modified the force of her touch to baby's head, as she was terrified of injuring the delicate fontanel. Another shared how long it had taken her to learn how to settle her baby to sleep by administering just the right rhythmic touch to its back. Such reflections on haptic relations indicate that some people — typically mothers if these sites are anything to go by — have 'the touch'; a particular kind of haptic finesse that means that she will be the only one careful enough to wash the baby's head, and the only one who can pat it to sleep. Here, mothers' expertise includes a diminution or remission of touch so that it becomes gently precautionary.

As literary theorists are fond of pointing out, the shrinking away from a blunt touch might be called 'tact'. Until the eighteenth century, the word meant simply the sense of touch, but under French influence it denoted especially sensitive kinds of touch, and thus came to stand metaphorically for 'refined expertise in social relations' (see Connor 2011, np). Respondents to New Mother recommended that she should not be refined when communicating the conditions for touching Baby Girl. One respondent's post typified a recommended *tactlessness* for dealing with him:

Why on earth couldn't you say something? If some dirty smoker stuck their finger in my baby's mouth, their life wouldn't be worth living. Isn't standing up for the health and well-being of your baby more important than upsetting your Father in Law?

Father in Law's life may well not be worth living, if the also-recommended admonition 'do not let him touch the baby' was indeed enacted by New Mother. Its consequences would be severe, as touch is the very sensory foundation upon which the institution of family is constructed. Like other institutions, family is premised on and defined by fleshy (inter)relations. Lyon and Barbalet (1994) argue that the specific partial deployment of one body relationally to the specific part(s) of another best characterises how institutions like the military, the factory floor in late capitalism, and the family work. They note how in the case of the family, emotion organises bodily interactions: it is with feeling that a father's lips are brought to the foreheads of children, and feeling propels parental palms to slap the legs of a disobedient child. It is the repetitive utilisation of specific body *parts* that creates and maintains the social body of the family. As Collins (1981, 988) suggests, the maintenance of social institutions is tethered to the 'distinct engagements of aspects of bodily disposition which pertain to them,' in the case of the family, '[t]he most repetitive behaviours that make up family structure are the facts that ... [somewhat heteronormatively] the same men and women sleep in the same beds, that the children are kissed, spanked and fed'; *they are*

touched and themselves touch, within, and according to particular registers that we recognise as familial (see Lyon & Barbalet, 1994, 56).

These are touches that conform to the corporeal codes that are immediately understood as the space and time a body should occupy in the family or, more properly, within a given family, which might do more spanking than kissing, or which might stand even more starkly incongruously with how touch is codified in and signified by our legal system. Codified touches appear as a 'natural' body politic, even as we sometimes reflect upon the validity of some sorts of familial touch, like smacking. The current debate over whether smacking is a valid familial touch or simply assault demonstrates how haptic familial relations reflect broader discourse about parenting and corporeal punishment. As Manning (2007, 57) argues, conforming to particular codes for touch alert us both to the violence that might emerge from touch were it not to be coded, and the violence to which bodies are subjected when they are made to conform to institutional codes for touch. Both are illustrated in the touching relations prescribed by tobacco denormalisation discourse. Father in Law must regulate his own potentially violent touch, lest it cause harm to Baby Girl, but he too is subject to a potent violence powerful enough to thrust him out from the very foundations of familial participation.

However unsubstantiated, claims for the danger of thirdhand smoke shape relations of touch outside the family, with just as significant implications. The executive director of Action on Health and Smoking (ASH) has already foreshadowed the legal possibility that people 'with a family history of cancer may be entitled to smokefree places – restaurants, workplaces and *any places they frequent*'.² This entitlement would require smokefree staff; given that thirdhand contamination would emanate from them as offgas, and remain on them as material lodgement, a smoker (even a former smoker, assuming the longevity of thirdhand smoke) would violate it. The legal veracity of a smokefree place entitlement for the vulnerable has already been tested. As Tobacco.org reported in June 2009, a U.S. Federal Court forced a university to

protect a woman and her unborn child whose health was threatened by thirdhand smoke residue on the clothing of an officemate. One doctor providing a statement to the court submitted that the woman's sensitivity was 'to the tobacco smoke residue on the person or clothing of a smoker, not just smoke in the air. Therefore, to protect her health, especially during her pregnancy, she should not be assigned to an office with someone who smokes (see Tobacco.org 2009, np).

The decision indicates that thirdhand smoke can reach out to touch others via offgas moving outbound from the smoker, or can be touched in the form of sited residue on the smoker's clothes or hair, should you touch them, or they touch you. The ASH website discusses the dangerousness of having smokers around at all, irrespective of whether they have a cigarette in hand: 'Smokers' breath can be harmful to health', it claims. 'Protect Your Family, Don't

² Full details of this case are available on the Tobacco Free Arizona website, at <https://tobaccofreeaz.wordpress.com/2010/03/17/those-with-cancer-in-family-history-must-avoid-smokers/>

become complacent!’ ‘Most Nonsmokers ARE Exposed!’³ As they circulate among us, smokers have become, as Matt has dubbed them, ‘mobile tobacco contamination packages’ (Peeples 2011, np), almost magically able to touch without physical contact via offgas, and able to contaminate when non-smokers make contact with the toxic residue left on their bodies, cars, homes and possessions. The codification in the offing here is that smokers are, quite literally, *not to be touched, and you should not let them touch you*.

This emergent coding for touch is highly consequential for our definitions of ‘the public’. Already across the western world, smokers – increasingly located on the lowest rungs of the socioeconomic ladder, have been prevented from practicing a legal activity in public space by legislative force, on the false basis that it presents extreme danger to others. Resultantly, those already marginalised bear the additional burden of relegation to public land, where smoking is still legally permissible. Public land is marginal space, comprised of interstitial road edges, vacant lots, and curbs. Smokefree public space legislation has profoundly changed how and which people can participate in public and as Brandt (1998) reminds us, shares much with prior attempts to segregate one group of people considered polluting and dangerous from a dominant group erroneously considered to be at risk from their presence – as Brandt controversially put it, rather like the Jim Crow era in the American south. But the purported danger of thirdhand smoke is not to be contained by means of spatial segregation. It is instead to be controlled by excluding the person to whom residue sticks and from whom offgas emits, for who knows how long, lest they endanger ‘us’ all. They may well become *untouchables*.

Conclusion

A consideration of smoke through the sensory lens, most especially that afforded by a focus on touch, permits us insight into violence; the potential and existing exclusions of bodies from familial, public and workplace participation in and through the articulation of second and thirdhand smoke dangers certainly qualify. The fact that anthropologists have not attended to these relations of violence also reveals another kind of violence, a disciplinary kind that anthropology might visit upon itself: the constriction of its own bounds of enquiry. Anthropologists have found that it is extremely difficult to attend to the relations forged via the absence and presence of tobacco smoke without appearing critical of laudable attempts to alleviate the damaging consequences of smoking (including the exploitative relations between Big Tobacco and often sick and dying smokers). Such attempts have been met with accusations of alignment with the tobacco industry (Bell & Dennis 2013) to the extent that tobacco research is more appropriately described as tobacco *control* research (Mair and Kierans 2007). Anthropology has, consequently, relinquished one of its most important potential contributions to the field: remaining critical of even admirable institutional and political intentions. Investigating tobacco relations using an analytic of touch forces anthropologists to confront the consequences of instrumentalist research – in this case, exclusions of already marginalised smokers from the workplace, the public. These

³ for full details, visit <https://tobaccofreeaz.wordpress.com/2010/03/17/those-with-cancer-in-family-history-must-avoid-smokers/>

dimensions must be included with the others already explored within the agenda of tobacco control research to produce a thoroughgoing investigation of the touching relations made in and through smoke.

References

- Adams, D. 1986. *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy: A Trilogy in Four Parts* London: Pan Books.
- Bell, K. & S. Dennis 2013. Editor's Introduction: Towards a Critical Anthropology of Smoking: Exploring the Consequences of Tobacco Control, *Contemporary Drug Problems* 40 (1): 3–20.
- Bell, K. 2014. Science, Policy and the Rise of “Thirdhand Smoke” as a Public Health Issue. *Health, Risk and Society*, 16 (1):154–170.
- Borthwick, F. 2000. Olfaction and Taste: Invasive Odours and Disappearing Objects, *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 11 (3): 127–40.
- Brandt, A. 1998. Blow Some My Way: Passive Smoking, Risk and American Culture', *Daedalus* 199: 115–76.
- Collins, R. 1981. On the Microfoundations of Macrosociology. *American Journal of Sociology* 86: 984–1014.
- Connor, S. 2011 Intact: A lecture given at the Fruitmarket Gallery, Edinburgh, as part of Embodied Values: Bringing the Senses Back to the Environment, the *John E. Sawyer Seminar Series* at the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities (IASH), University of Edinburgh, 20 May 2011. Available online: <http://www.stevenconnor.com/intact/intact.pdf>
- Connor, S. 1999. Michel Serres' Five Senses: Paper given at the *Michel Serres Conference*, Birbeck College, 10 May 1999. Available online: <http://www.bbk.ac.uk/eh/eng/skc/5senses.htm>.
- Dennis, S. 2016a. *Smokefree: A Social, Moral and Political Atmosphere*. London: Bloomsbury
- Dennis, S. 2016b A Touching Analysis. *Contemporary Drug Problems* 43(2) 154-168.
- Dennis, S. 2011. Smoking causes creative responses: on state antismoking policy and resilient habits' *Critical Public Health* 21 (1): 25–35.
- Dennis, 2006. Four Milligrams of Phenomenology: An AnthroPhenomenological Exploration of Smoking Cigarettes. *Popular Culture Review* 17 (1): 41–57. Krantz, J. 1980 *Princess Daisy* New York: Bantam Books.
- Lyon, M., & Barbalet, J. M. 1994. Society's body: Emotion and the “somatization” of social theory. In T. Csordas (Ed.), *Embodiment and experience: The existential grounds of culture and self* (pp. 48–66). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mair, M. & C. Kearins 2007. Critical Reflections on the Field of Tobacco Research: The Role of Tobacco Control in Defining the Tobacco Research Agenda', *Critical Public Health* 17 (2): 103–12.
- Manning, E. 2007. *Politics of touch: Sense, movement, sovereignty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Matt, G., Quintana, P., Zakarian, J., Fortmann, A., Chatfield, D., Hoh, E. & Hovell, M. 2011. When smokers move out and non-smokers move in: Residential thirdhand smoke pollution and exposure. *Tobacco Control* 20, 1–3.
- Mayo Clinic 2014. Mayo clinic website. <http://www.mayoclinic.org/healthy-living/adult-health/expert-answers/third-hand-smoke/faq-20057791>.
- Peeples, L. 2011. Your nose knows: The invisible threat of “thirdhand smoke. *The Huffington Post*, August 26, 2011 Available online: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/08/26/thirdhand-smoke-smokingrisks_n_938241.html
- Quitnow 2012. Quitnow Website. Available online: <http://www.quitnow.gov.au/internet/quitnow/publishing.nsf/content/smokescreen-lp>
- Scollo, M. and M. Winstanley, Eds., 2012. *Tobacco in Australia: Facts and Issues*, 4th edn Melbourne: Cancer Council Victoria. Available online: www.TobaccoInAustralia.org.au
- Serres, M. 1998. *Les Sinq Sens* Paris: Hachette.
- Stafford, J., Daube, M., & Franklin, P. 2010. Second hand smoke in Alfresco areas. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*, 21, 99–105.
- Tobacco.org 2009. Law Protects Against “Third Hand Smoke” as well as Second Hand Tobacco Smoke, available online: <http://archive.tobacco.org/news/276822.html>
- UCTV Prime Cuts. (2012). Clearing the air of thirdhand smoke, 18 October 2012. Available online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4G2vIk_b6UyE
- What to expect.com 2012. What To Expect Parenting Website. Available online: <http://www.whattoexpect.com/forums/australian-parents/archives/third-hand-smoke-141.html>
- Wynne, E. (2012), ‘Smokers are reporting plain packaged cigarettes taste worse than branded’ ABC Radio Perth website, 30 November, 2012. Available online: <http://www.abc.net.au/local/stories/2012/11/30/3645022.htm>