

Dangers of unnecessary smoking bans

On the 23th of May 2011 a smoking ban took place in New York City, forbidding smoking in the city's parks, beaches and plazas, further ^{expanding} restricting the previous smoking ban, which was ^{limited} restricted only to indoors areas. Before the ban took place professor Michael B. Siegel stated that the new ban was not legitimate and could undermine the basic goals of the antismoking movement. I would like to elaborate on some of his arguments.

The "ban" wasn't restricted, it was "expanded". Previously it had been "limited" to...

Professor Siegel argued that although second hand smoking is a serious scientifically proven health risk while being indoors, the case is not as sound outdoors. I personally can not judge whether or not there is a lack of evidence, since I am not an expert in the field as he is. But I can state that the ban in its core forces smokers to gather near the park entrances and similar places, where people can not avoid them as easily as if they were spread out through ^{at} the bigger area, therefore increasing the exposure to second hand smoking for non-smoking residents.

In addition he mentioned that forcing the narrative that even a slightest exposure to second hand smoking is a deadly hazard, could result in loss of scientific credibility. This is in my opinion a serious issue. Since the public's overall trust in science ^{has been} is dwindling in recent years, this could tip the scales and hinder the process of banning ^{proven} indoor smoking in other states.

To conclude I mostly agree with professor Siegel's arguments, and I would add, that if the ban is to stay or even continue to expand to the streets, there should be dedicated places for smokers not to endanger any unwilling bypassers.

letter here would be: "promoting a narrative"

(present perfect)

Nicely developed!
Good language!
Some comments above -
Thanks!

or you could use 'restrict' as an adjective: "restrictive" + say the ban become even "more restrictive".