

# Analysis of an Argument

Authors: Trajkov Marko and Smiljković Aleksandar

markostrajkov@gmail.com , aleksandarsmiljkovic@gmail.com

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Mathematics

The following is a letter to the editor of an environmental magazine:

“The decline in the numbers of amphibians worldwide clearly indicates the global pollution of water and air. Two studies of amphibians in Yosemite National Park in California confirm my conclusion. In 1915 there were seven species. However, in 1992 there were only four species of amphibians observed in the park, and the numbers of each species were drastically reduced. The decline in Yosemite has been blamed in the introduction of trout into the park’s waters, which began in 1920 (trout are known to eat amphibian eggs). But the introduction of trout cannot be the real reason for the Yosemite decline because it does not explain the worldwide decline.”

( Source: <http://www.esf.edu/students/success/SUNY-ESF GRE.pdf>)

## Essay

This argument concludes that global pollution of water and air indicates the decline in the number of amphibians worldwide but does not explain on a proper way that conclusion. The author fails to give appropriate reasons for such a conclusion and because of that the conclusion is not valid.

First of all, the author focuses on specific place in the world, Yosemite National Park in California, and because of that he cannot say nothing about other places of the world. To give such the conclusion there must be taken in consideration other places too, not only one. One specific location cannot be used to evaluate others and that fact can be misleading to the global conclusion. So the author should take in consideration some other places and then see if that indicates a global pollution of water and air.

Secondly, two studies happened in two different times, 77 years one after another. This is very long period and author cannot say that two studies are comparable. On the other hand, science has much more progress and techniques too, the instruments is much more precise and better 77 years later. An other thing, people who did that studies are not the same, we don’t know who did that studies, were they students or some scientists who have much more experience and knowledge. So this two studies are not comparable at all.

Thirdly, author notice that introduction of trout cannot be the real reason for the Yosemite decline because it does not explain the worldwide decline. So he says that trout is not a reason for the Yosemite decline and concluded that global pollution of water and air are responsible for decline in the number of amphibians. He dismissed the fact that trout are responsible for decline in the number of amphibians but that fact cannot be simply dismissed in that way. So, his conclusion is given without proper arguments and because of that cannot be valid.

Author fails to give appropriate relationship between local and global decline in the number of amphibians, his evidences are weak and meaningless and conclusion is based only on two studies happened on the same place in two different times. For stronger argument author should give stronger evidences associated with other parts of the world and they should be correctly given.