

/\*  
\* Name: Jakub Komarek /2 1017  
\*/

Task 1  
=====

- I would never do anything that could \*jeopardize\* my friendship with you.
- I decided to \*run the risk\* of getting caught and I broke the window.
- My mother suffers from a \*chronic\* disease.
- John told everyone that I had killed a man to \*undermine\* my authority. (? unclear)
- We just kept sitting in the grass, enjoying the \*transient\* moment while we could.

*/not a common collocation  
"transient moment."*

Task 2  
=====

+ PRO	- CON
nonsmokers shouldn't <u>have to</u> inhale smoke	smoke quickly disperses in the open air
even short exposure <u>to</u> smoke can cause severe health problems	outside you have a way to escape the smoke
	brief exposure isn't long enough to cause cancer
	park entrances <u>could</u> get crowded by smokers
	people against <u>smoking</u> in public will lose credibility

# Should parks become smoke-free?

D17 By Jakub Komárek / 3

The New York City Council had decided to ban smoking in public parks and on public beaches. As a result, people wanting to smoke now have to choose between taking their cigarette outside of the outlined area or not smoking at all. Similarly to other controversial political decisions, the ban has many opponents and critics, who believe that smoking should only be restricted in indoor spaces.

better:  
"restricted area"  
doesn't  
collocate

Some people say that nothing can ruin a nice family picnic in the park better than a smoker right next to it. Parks are often attractive ~~to their visitors~~ due to their calm atmosphere. Having to watch out for smokers or needing to find a new bench to sit on can significantly worsen the park experience for anyone more sensitive to smoke. Consequently, next time these people might reconsider ~~going out and~~ invest <sup>my free</sup> their time in an indoor activity instead. That could, in an extreme case, lead to people spending less time outdoors, which is bad for public health.

(not necessary)

"going out" + "indoor" activity doesn't really work...  
better just to say:  
"... might consider investing their free time in an..."

On the other hand, some might argue that there are, aside <sup>for</sup> of smoking, many other annoying things people are allowed to do in public without running the risk of being penalized. Gum chewing, shouting or whistling in public, for example, are often frowned upon as well. Therefore, it may seem unreasonable to only outlaw smoking, when it is just a single part of the general problem.

phrase:  
"aside for"

The vocal non-smoker community certainly has some valid arguments to be taken into consideration. Nonetheless, banning smoking in a majority of outdoor public places (noticably discriminates smokers against non-smokers). That kind of human right violation ought to be supported with a strong health-related or otherwise significant case. Even in states where smoking in parks still doesn't earn you a fine, smokers, however, should not abuse their privilege. The same rule of thumb as in many situations applies: if you want to smoke, make sure you are not bothering anyone around you.

this phrase doesn't work.  
perhaps: ...  
"... places is noticeably discriminatory towards non-smokers."

Good work!  
Good intro... good development

Thanks, J -