

such respects, **the author cannot justifiably conclude that** a high-iron diet is the primary cause, or even a contributing cause, of heart disease.

**Similarly, a correlation between** a diet that includes large amounts of red meat and heart disease **does not necessarily infer a causal relationship.** **Lacking evidence to the contrary,** it is possible that red-meat eaters are comparatively likely to incur heart disease due to factors that have nothing to do with the amount of red meat in their diet. Perhaps red-meat eaters are the same people who generally overeat, and it is obesity rather the consumption of red meat specifically that causes heart attacks. **The author must consider and eliminate this and other possible reasons** why red-meat eaters are more likely than other people to suffer from heart disease. **Otherwise, I cannot accept the author's implicit claim that** eating red meat is any more likely to cause heart disease than eating other foods.

**Even assuming that** a high-iron diet, including a diet high in red meat, promotes heart disease, **the author cannot reasonably conclude that** this causal relationship fully explains the study's results. **The author overlooks the possibility that** other foods are also high in iron, and that the study's participants ate these other foods as well as, or instead of, red meat. **Without accounting for this possibility the author cannot convincingly conclude from the study that** red meat is the chief cause of heart disease.

**In conclusion, the argument unfairly assumes that correlation is tantamount to causation.** To strengthen the argument, **the author must provide clear evidence that** a high-iron diet contributes to heart disease. **The author must also provide clear evidence that** people who eat red meat are more likely to incur heart disease because of the amount of red meat in their diet, rather than some other factor. **To better evaluate the reliability of the study upon which the author's conclusion depends, I would need more information about** the size and makeup of the study's sample. **I would also need to know** whether other foods are also high in iron and, if so, which high-iron foods the study's participants ate on a regular basis.

### 【参考译文】

在本文论证中,作者引用了一项讨论一个人的饮食中所含铁质的量与这个人患心脏病的几率之间的关系的的研究。作者还引用了一个已经被确认的联系,即食物中包括大量铁含量很高的牛羊肉类与心脏病患病率之间的联系。作者就此断定,该研究所观察到的相互关系是牛羊肉类和心脏病之间的相互关系的作用。这个论证做了一系列拙劣的假定,以致出现了现在完全没有说服力的状况。

首先,作者没有提供证据证明这项研究的结果在统计上是可靠的。为了确定一个令人信服的关于饮食中的铁和心脏病之间的联系,这个研究必须抽取足够数量的样本,并且抽取的样本能代表心脏病患者这个群体。缺乏一个具有充分代表性的抽样调查作证据,作者无论如何也不可能依赖这个研究合理地做出任何结论。

即使假设该研究在统计上是可靠的,含铁量高的饮食和心脏病之间的直接联系也不一定就能证明前者必定导致后者。尽管两者间的高度相关可作为因果关系的有力证据,但其本身还不足以确定它们间的因果关系。作者还必须考虑所有其他可能导致心脏病的因素,如遗传倾向、运动量等等。缺乏证据证明该研究所观察的心脏病患者在所有这些方面都是相似的,作者就不能合理地断定含铁量高的饮食就是导致心脏病的主要原因,甚至是起作用的原因。

同理,包含大量牛羊肉类的饮食和心脏病之间有关系并不一定就意味着它们之间必有因果关系。缺乏证据证明情况正好与之相反,那么就有可能出现这样的情况,即吃牛羊肉类的人患心

脏病也相当可能是出于其他与他们的饮食中所含牛羊肉类的量毫无关系的因素。或许正好那些吃牛羊肉类的人都是平时总是暴食的人，而导致心脏病的确切原因是肥胖而不是食用牛羊肉类的量。作者必须考虑并排除能够说明为什么吃牛羊肉类的人比其他入患心脏病的几率要高的各种可能的原因。否则，作者含蓄地声称吃牛羊肉类比吃其他食物更容易导致心脏病的观点是我所不能接受的。

即使假设含铁量高的饮食，包括含大量牛羊肉类的饮食，确实会提高心脏病的发病率，作者也不能合理断定这种因果关系就能完整地解释该研究的结果。作者忽略了这么一种情况，即其他食物含铁量也很高，该研究的参与者可能既吃牛羊肉类，同时也吃其他食物，或者干脆吃其他食物代替牛羊肉类。没有解释这种可能性，作者就不能令人信服地断定牛羊肉类是导致心脏病的主要原因。

总之，本文不合理地认为相关性就等价于因果关系。为了使本文更加有力，作者必须提供明确的证据证明含铁量高的饮食导致人们患心脏病。作者还必须提供明确的证据证明吃牛羊肉类的人更容易得心脏病确实是因为他们饮食中所含牛羊肉类的量，而不是因为其他因素所导致。为了更好的评价作者做结论所依赖的研究的可靠性，我需要更多有关该研究的抽样调查的规模和组成的信息。我还需要知道是否有其他食品含铁量也很高，如果是，那么该研究的参与者定期吃了哪种含铁量高的食物。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的四处缺陷：

1. 指出作者所引用的调查对于调查对象的描述不够清晰，因而其样本的代表性值得怀疑。
2. 含铁量高的饮食与心脏病之间有相关性，但这并不能用来证明两者之间的因果关系。
3. 同样，过多食用牛羊肉与心脏病之间也仅仅具有相关性而不一定是前者导致后者。
4. 作者没有考虑导致心脏病的其他食品和其他因素。

- 思路提示：把相关性混同为因果关系的错误：有些事件之间只有相关性，也就是它们之间是有关联的，但是相关性不能作为证明两者间有因果关系的证据。有相关性的两件事可能都是由某种第三事件共同导致，也可能仅仅是巧合。本文攻击了两处相关性混同为因果性的错误，很多句式和语言值得学习。

### 【论证展开】

对调查样本的质疑方式：本文第一点攻击的就是作者引用的调查样本值得怀疑。但仔细观察原题我们可以发现，在题目中几乎对于调查所采取的样本没有做任何说明。有些同学觉得无法攻击，但实际上正好是一个有机可乘的突破口。本文在论证这一点时几乎全部使用抽象的逻辑描述语言进行攻击，首先指出调查结果并不一定可信，然后用一句抽象笼统的语言指出调查对象必须具备一定的数量和代表性，最后说在缺乏充分代表性的证据的情况下，作者不能简单依据这些调查来得出结论。这些语言既可单独使用，也可整体组成论证，稍加改动和变化即可同样用于其他没有具体指出调查样本的题目。

### 【语言提示】

- 用于攻击调查样本未必有代表性的句式：(1) The author provides no evidence that the study's results are statistically reliable. (2) In order to establish a strong correlation between ..., the study's sample must be sufficient in size and representative of ... (3) Lacking evidence of a sufficiently representative sample, the author cannot justifiably rely on the study to draw any conclusion whatsoever.
- 用于攻击相关性混同为因果性错误的句式：(1) A direct correlation between ... does not

necessarily prove that the former causes the latter. (2) While a high correlation is strong evidence of a causal relationship, in itself it is not sufficient. (3) The author must also account for all other possible factors leading . . . , such as . . . (4) A correlation between . . . does not necessarily infer a causal relationship.

- 其他句式: The author must consider and eliminate this and other possible reasons why . . . Otherwise, I cannot accept the author's implicit claim that . . .
- 结尾句式: (1) In conclusion, the argument unfairly assumes that correlation is tantamount to causation. (2) To better evaluate the reliability of the study upon which the author's conclusion depends, I would need more information about the size and makeup of the study's sample. I would also need to know . . .

### Argument 144 Rates of charitable donations

According to a poll of 200 charitable organizations, donations of money to nonprofit groups increased by nearly 25 percent last year, though not all charities gained equally. Religious groups gained the most (30 percent), followed by environmental groups (23 percent), whereas educational institutions experienced only a very small increase in donations (3 percent). This poll indicates that more people are willing and able to give money to charities but that funding for education is not a priority for most people. These differences in donation rates must result from the perception that educational institutions are less in need of donations than are other kinds of institutions.

**【参考译文】**根据一项针对 200 个慈善组织的调查, 去年对于非赢利团体的捐款上升了将近 25%, 而并不是所有组织都获得了同样的增幅。宗教团体增幅最大 (30%), 其次为环保组织 (23%), 而教育机构所获捐款仅有少量增长 (3%)。这一调查说明有更多的人愿意而且有能力为慈善组织捐款, 但资助教育并不是大多数人的首选。这种捐款比率上的差异一定是由于人们认为教育机构没有其他组织更需要资助的观念而导致的。

**In this argument the author cites a poll showing that the amount of charitable donations increased last year, but that the increase to educational institutions was far less than to either religious or environmental groups. Based on this evidence the author concludes that more people are willing and able to make charitable donations, but that education is not a priority for most people. The author also concludes that the discrepancy among donation rates is the result of a general perception that educational institutions are in less need of money than other institutions are. This argument depends on several unsubstantiated assumptions and is therefore unpersuasive as it stands.**

First of all, the author's conclusions about people's willingness to donate to the three types of charities listed depend on the assumption that the poll results are statistically reliable. Yet, the author offers no evidence to substantiate this assumption. The author must show that the 200 charitable organizations polled constitute a sufficiently large sample of religious, environmental, and educational charities, and that this sample is representative of all such charities. Otherwise, the author cannot confidently draw any general conclusions about the willingness of people to donate to these three types of institutions, or about general perceptions regarding the needs of any such institutions.

Similarly, the author's sweeping claim that "more people are willing and able to give money to charities" depends on the assumption that the poll results are sufficiently representative of charitable

giving in general. Yet, the author offers no evidence to substantiate this assumption. The author must show that the 25 % total increase in the rate of donations to the three types of institutions polled is representative of the increase in donations to all types of charities. The author must also show that the total number of donors actually increased last year; as it stands the argument leaves open the possibility that the total number of donors decreased last year while the average amount given by each donor increased. Absent evidence to support these assumptions, the author's broad conclusion that "more people are willing and able" to make charitable donations is dubious at best.

Additionally, the author provides no evidence whatsoever for the claim that educational institutions are perceived as less needy than other institutions, or that this perception explains the lower donation rate to educational institutions. Lacking such evidence, there are many other possible explanations for the discrepancy in donation rates. Perhaps people's perception is that educational institutions are more likely than the other types to squander or misuse donated money; or perhaps most donors are simply more interested in advocating religions or environmental protection than in subsidizing education. For that matter, perhaps among all charitable organizations educational institutions ranked third last year in terms of gifts received—bettered only by religious and environmental charities. Such evidence would serve to undermine the author's claim that funding for education is "not a priority for most people."

In conclusion, the argument is indefensible as it stands. To strengthen it the author must assure me that the poll results accurately reflect donation rates not only to all religious, environmental, and educational institutions but also to the broader group of all charitable institutions. The author must also provide clear evidence for the claimed perception about the need of educational institutions and that this perception, and not some other factor, explains the comparatively low donation rate to these institutions.

#### 【参考译文】

在这篇论证中，作者引用了一次民意调查，显示去年的慈善捐款数量增加了，然而给教育机构的捐款增长率远比不上给宗教或环保组织的。根据这一现象，作者推断越来越多的人愿意并且有能力进行慈善捐款，但是对大多数人来说给教育捐款不是首选。作者还推断，人们普遍认为教育机构不像其他机构那么需要钱，这种观念导致了给不同机构的慈善捐款增长率率的差异。这篇论证建立在若干个没有确实根据的假设上，以致就目前情况看，本文不具说服力。

首先，只有先假设民意调查的结果是经过统计可以信赖的，作者才能做出人们更愿意给所列的三类慈善机构中的哪种捐款的结论。然而，作者没有提供任何证据证明这一假设。作者必须说明被调查的200个慈善团体分成宗教、环保和教育慈善机构三类，组成一个规模足够大的样本，而这个样本必须能代表所有这些慈善机构。否则，作者不能可信地做出任何有关人们更愿意给这三种机构中的哪种捐款，或者人们普遍认为哪种机构更需要钱的结论。

与此类似，作者的空泛声明“越来越多的人愿意并且有能力进行慈善捐款”有赖于民意调查的结果足以代表普遍的慈善捐赠的假定。然而，作者没有提供证据证明这个假定。作者必须证明给这三种参与调查的机构其捐款的25%的总增长率可以代表给所有类型慈善机构捐款的增长。作者还必须证明去年捐赠人的总数确实增加了；然而事实是这篇论证忽略了这种可能性，即去年的捐赠人总数减少了，而每个捐赠人平均捐赠的款数却增加了。缺乏证据支持这些假设，作者就妄断“越来越多的人愿意并且有能力进行慈善捐款”，这个结论无论如何都是值得怀疑的。

另外，作者声称人们认为教育机构不像其他机构那么需要钱，及人们的这种观念解释了为

什么给教育机构的捐款增长率比较低,但是对这两个推断作者没有提供任何证据来证明。缺乏这些证据,我们就可能有许多其他理由来解释捐款增长率的差异。或许人们觉得教育机构比其他类机构更可能浪费或者滥用捐款;又或许与资助教育相比,大多数的捐赠人只是对宣扬宗教或者提倡环境保护更感兴趣。而且,在去年所有慈善团体所得的捐赠多寡方面,教育机构可能位居第三,仅次于宗教和环保机构。这样的证据就能削弱作者做的关于教育经费捐赠“对大多数人来说不是首选”的论断的力度。

总之,就目前情况看,这篇论证的论点是站不住脚的。为了加强其力度,作者必须保证,民意调查的结果精确地反映的不仅是所有宗教、环保和教育机构所得捐款的增长率,还包括所有慈善机构组成的更广泛的组织。作者还必须提供明确的证据证明,他所声称的人们对教育机构的需求的普遍观念属实,以及正是这种观念而不是其他因素导致这些机构的捐款增长率较低。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷:

1. 对于慈善组织捐款数额的调查样本的代表性值得怀疑。
2. 对于文中所提到的三种慈善组织的捐款并不能表明人们对于所有慈善团体总体的态度,也不能说明“有更多的人”愿意捐款。
3. 未必是人们关于教育组织不如其他组织需要捐款的观念导致了捐款数额的差异。

● 思路提示:本文攻击的前两点仍然是调查取样代表性的问题,对于没有指出具体调查对象的题目攻击样本代表性一般只用一个段落就可以了,对于本题我们还可以攻击数据模糊性的缺陷。题目中提到每个组织所收到捐款的增幅时,仅仅提到百分比的数值。而很多时候仅有增幅比例是不够的,我们必须知道这些增幅的基数才能判断各机构真正的增幅大小。比如,如果教育组织在前一年所获得的捐款是1000万,那么今年的增幅就是 $1000 \text{ 万} \times 3\% = 30 \text{ 万}$ ,这并不是一个小数目;同样,宗教和环保组织虽然增幅比例比较大,但结合基数来看就有可能是很小的增长。

### 【开头方式】

开头段落复述论据和结论的语言语序都是可以发挥、变化的,比如可以像本文一样,先用In this argument the author cites a poll showing that ...的句式来引述原文论据,然后进一步用Based on this evidence the author concludes that ...的句式来引导结论,过渡自然、联系紧密,同学们可以在此基础上做一些变化和发挥来形成自己的、有特色的开头模式。

### 【论证展开】

指出作者所做假设的语言:在指出作者的推论所基于的假设时,既可以直接用the author assumes that ...之类的简单句式来引导,也可以学习使用本文的方式:用the author's conclusions about ... depend on the assumption that ... Yet, the author offers no evidence to substantiate this assumption这样的句式结构来复述假设并引出论证。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式:(1) In this argument the author cites a poll showing that ... Based on this evidence the author concludes that ... (2) This argument depends on several unsubstantiated assumptions and is therefore unpersuasive as it stands.
- 用于攻击调查样本代表性的句式:(1) The author's conclusions about ... depend on the assumption that the poll results are statistically reliable. (2) The author must show that ... Otherwise, the author cannot confidently draw any general conclusions about ...
- 其他句式:(1) The author must also show that ...; as it stands the argument leaves open the

possibility that ... (2) Absent evidence to support these assumptions, the author's broad conclusion that ... is dubious at best. (3) Lacking such evidence, there are many other possible explanations for ... (4) Such evidence would serve to undermine the author's claim that ...

- 结尾段句式: (1) In conclusion, the argument is indefensible as it stands. (2) To strengthen it the author must assure me that ... (3) The author must also provide clear evidence for the claimed perception about ...

### Argument 148 Monroetown's election between Brown and Greene

The following appeared in the editorial section of Monroetown's local newspaper.

"Mayor Brown was recently re-elected by a clear majority of 52 percent of Monroetown's voters. Her re-election, however, does not show that most people in our town favored Mayor Brown's proposal for tax reduction over that of her opponent, Mr. Greene, who proposed raising taxes to improve education. It has been shown that voters nationwide tend to re-elect people already in office, regardless of candidates' proposals. In fact, a local survey after the election showed most people in Monroetown disagreed with Mayor Brown's proposal. Clearly most people in Monroetown favor improving education and therefore approve of Mr. Greene's proposal despite the fact that they did not vote for him."

【参考译文】布朗市长最近获得了门罗镇全体选民52%的明显多数票而再次当选市长。然而，她的再次当选并不表明我们城市的多数市民更喜欢布朗提出的减税提案，而不是其竞争对手格林先生提出的增加税收以促进教育的提案。已有证据表明，全国的选民都倾向于再次选举那些已经在位的官员，不论候选人的竞选提案是什么。实际上，这次选举后的一次地方调查显示，门罗镇的多数市民不赞同布朗市长的提案。显然，门罗镇的多数市民赞同改善教育，从而支持格林的提案，尽管他们并没有投他的票。

**The author of this editorial concludes that** most Monroetown residents favor Greene's proposal to raise taxes in order to improve education over Brown's proposal to cut taxes, even though incumbent Brown defeated Greene by way of a 52% majority vote in a recent mayoral election. **To support this conclusion the author points out** a nationwide tendency to reelect incumbent candidates regardless of their positions. **The author also points out that** a survey taken after the election showed that most Monroetown residents oppose Brown's proposal. **As the following discussion shows, the author's argument is not well supported by the evidence.**

**First of all, the author unfairly assumes that** the nationwide tendency applies specifically to Monroetown residents. **Lacking evidence that** Monroetown voters reflect this general tendency, **it is entirely possible that** Monroetown residents vote strictly according to their position on the issues. **For that matter, it is possible that** Monroetown voters tend strongly to vote against incumbents, **in which case the author's claim that** Monroetown residents oppose Brown's proposal would more flagrantly fly in the face of the election results.

**Secondly, the author fails to indicate** when the statistics showing this nationwide tendency were collected. The longer the time period between the collection of these statistics and the election, the greater the possibility that the tendency has changed over this time span, and the less justifiable the

author's reliance on these statistics to support the claim that Monroetown residents oppose Brown's proposal.

**Thirdly, the author fails to indicate** how much time passed between the Brown-Greene election and the survey showing that most Monroetown residents oppose her proposal. If the survey was conducted immediately after the election, **then the fact that** the election results conflict with the survey results would cast considerable doubt on the reliability of either to indicate what proposals Monroetown residents truly support. However, if the survey occurred long after the election, then the conflict can readily be explained by changing opinions and demographics over time. **In either case, it is impossible to weigh the evidence without more specific information about percentages.** The larger the percentage of Monroetown residents participating in the election, the greater the extent to which the election results would cast doubt on the survey results. By the same token, the larger the percentage of Monroetown residents shown by the survey to oppose Brown's proposal the more clearly this evidence would support the author's argument.

**Finally, the argument suffers from "either-or" reasoning.** Based on the fact that Monroetown residents are opposed to Brown's proposed tax cut, **the author unfairly concludes that** they must be in favor of Greene's proposal. However, **the author overlooks the possibility that** Monroetown residents are not in favor of either proposal.

**In sum, the author's argument that** Monroetown residents oppose Brown's proposal and are in favor of the proposals set forth by Greene **is unconvincing.** To strengthen the argument the author must provide clear evidence that Monroetown residents voted contrary to their own positions on the issues when they reelected Brown. **To better evaluate the argument I would need to know** how much time passed between the collection of the statistics showing the national tendency cited by the author and the election. **I would also need to know** how much time passed between the election and the survey showing that Monroetown residents oppose Brown's proposal. **Finally, I would need to know** what portion of Monroetown's residents voted in the election, and what portion of these residents were shown by the survey to oppose Brown's policies.

### 【参考译文】

这篇社论的作者断言，比起布朗的减税建议，大多数门罗镇的居民会更支持格林提出的为了推进教育发展而提税的建议，尽管现任的布朗在一次新近的市长选举里以 52% 的多数票战胜了格林。为了支持这个结论，这个作者指出一种全国性的趋势，即全国的选民都倾向于再次选举那些已经在位的官员，不论候选人的立场是什么。作者还指出，一项在选举结束后所做的调查显示大多数门罗镇居民反对布朗的提议。正如以下的讨论显示的，作者的论证没有得到很好的支持。

首先，作者想当然地认为全国性的趋势也具体地适用于门罗镇的居民。缺乏证据证明门罗镇选民的情况也反映这种普遍的趋势，那么便完全有可能出现这种情况，门罗镇的居民在投票时是严格遵照他们对各种问题的立场做出决定。同样，也有可能门罗镇的居民强烈地倾向于不投现任者的票，这样的话，作者所做的关于门罗镇的居民反对布朗的提议的断言就会更明显地与选举结果大相径庭。

第二，作者未能表明显示这个全国性趋势的统计数据是什么时候被收集起来的。这些统计数据的收集和这次选举之间相隔的时间越久，这个趋势经过时间变换而产生变化的可能性就越大，作者就更没有正当理由利用这些统计数据来支持他所做的关于门罗镇的居民反对布朗的提

议的断言。

第三,作者未能表明布朗—格林的竞选和那个表明大多数门罗镇居民反对布朗的提议的调查之间隔了多长的时间。如果该调查是在选举之后立即进行的,那么选举结果与调查结果互相冲突的事实会使人们对作者到底要表明门罗镇居民真正支持的提议是什么产生相当的怀疑。但是,如果调查是在选举结束很久之后才进行的,那么我们就可以用人们想法的改变和人口统计数据的变化来解释这个冲突。无论发生的是哪种情况,都不可能在没有更多有关比率的具体信息的情况下去估量这个证据。有更大比率的门罗镇居民参与在这次选举中的话,这次的选举结果会使人对调查结果产生更深的怀疑。同理,调查所显示的反对布朗的提议的门罗镇居民的比率越大,这个证据就会越忠实地支持作者的论证。

最后,这个论证犯了非此即彼的逻辑错误。基于门罗镇居民反对布朗提议的减税的事实,作者想当然地断定他们一定赞成格林的提议。然而,作者忽略了门罗镇居民对两个提议中的任一一个都不赞成的可能性。

总之,作者所提出的关于门罗镇居民反对布朗的提议而赞成格林的提议的论点是不能使人信服的。为了加强这个论证,作者必须提供明确的证据证明门罗镇居民在重选布朗的时候确实是违背他们自己在各种问题上的立场进行投票的。为了更好地评价这个论证,我有必要知道收集作者提及的表明全国趋势的数据和竞选之间相隔多长时间。我还需要知道在这次竞选和证明门罗镇居民反对布朗的提议的调查之间相隔了多长时间。最后,我还有必要知道门罗镇居民中有多少人参加了这次选举的投票,以及这些居民中有多少人如调查所示反对布朗的政策。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的四处缺陷:

1. 全国性的选举行为倾向并不说明门罗镇的居民也是如此投票选举的(以整体推部分的差异范围草率推广)。
2. 作者没有指出文中提到的全国性倾向的发生时间,因而未必支持结论(信息时效性的问题)。
3. 作者也没有指出选举后进行的全国性调查与选举的时间间隔,因此两者可能并不矛盾。
4. 门罗镇的居民反对布朗的减税提案并不说明他们一定支持格林的增税方针(非此即彼的错误)。

- 逻辑思路提示:非此即彼的错误。这是一种作者的思维过于简单化的错误,作者把一个本来有很多种可能和解释的事件简单认为只存在两种截然对立的可能,比如在本题中,作者看到群众反对布朗的提案,马上就认为他们肯定支持格林的提案,就是这种错误的典型体现。这一情况可能有很多其他可能,也许门罗镇的居民两个提案都不支持,也许他们更倾向于除了布朗和格林以外的其他候选人的提案。因此当看到作者简单地认为某事件只有非此即彼的两种可能的时候就可以攻击这种错误。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式:As the following discussion shows, the author's argument is not well supported by the evidence.
- 论证句式:(1)In either case, it is impossible to weigh the evidence without more specific information about ... (2)Based on the fact that ..., the author unfairly concludes that ...

## Argument 150 Yosemite's amphibian decline

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 of amphibians in the park, and there were abundant numbers of each 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 on 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."

**【参考译文】**全球两栖动物数量的下降清楚地说明全球空气和水质的污染。在加州约塞米提国家公园对于两栖动物所进行的两次研究证实了我的结论。1915年,公园中有七种两栖动物,每种的数量都很丰富。然而到了1992年,在公园中只观察到四种两栖动物,并且每种动物的数量都显著下降。约塞米提公园两栖动物数量的下降一直被归因于始于1920年的在公园水域引入鲑鱼的行为(我们知道鲑鱼捕食两栖动物的卵)。但鲑鱼的引入不会是约塞米提两栖动物数量下降的真正原因,因为它并不能解释全球范围的数量下降。

**The author of this letter concludes that a worldwide decline in the number of amphibians is an indication, or result, of global air and water pollution. To support this assertion the author first notes a decline in amphibians in Yosemite Park between 1915 and 1992, and acknowledges that trout, which eat amphibian eggs, were introduced there in 1925. But, the author then claims that the introduction of trout cannot be the reason for the decline in Yosemite because the introduction of trout in Yosemite does not explain the worldwide decline. I find this argument logically unconvincing in three critical respects.**

**First, the author fails to provide any evidence to refute the strong inference that the amphibian decline in Yosemite was indeed caused by trout. Because the author provides no affirmative evidence that pollution—or some other phenomenon—was instead the reason for the decline, the author's broad assertion that a worldwide decline in amphibians indicates global pollution is entirely unconvincing.**

**Secondly, even if I were to concede that the introduction of trout was not the cause of Yosemite's amphibian decline, the author provides no evidence that the decline was caused by pollution—rather than some other phenomenon. Perhaps some other environmental factor was instead the cause. Without ruling out all other possible explanations the author cannot convince me that pollution is the cause of the worldwide amphibian decline—or even the decline in Yosemite alone.**

**Thirdly, even if I were to concede that pollution caused Yosemite's amphibian decline, this single sample is insufficient to draw any general conclusion about the reason for a worldwide amphibian decline. It is entirely possible that the cause-and-effect relationships in Yosemite are not typical of the world in general. Without additional samples from diverse geographic locations, I cannot accept the author's sweeping generalization about the decline of amphibians and global pollution.**

**In sum, the scant evidence the author cites proves nothing about the reason for the general decline of amphibians worldwide; in fact, this evidence only serves to refute the author's own argument. To strengthen the argument the author should examine all changes occurring in Yosemite between 1915 and 1992 and show that air and water pollution have at least contributed to the park's amphibian decline. In any event, the author must provide data about amphibian population changes and pollution at**

diverse geographical locations; and this data must show a strong inverse correlation between levels of air and water pollution and amphibian populations worldwide.

### 【参考译文】

这封信的作者断定，世界范围内的两栖动物数量减少是全球空气和水质污染的一个反映或者结果。为证明其断言，作者首先特别提到了约塞米提国家公园的两栖动物的数量从1915年到1992年有所减少，并承认该公园于1925年引进了吃两栖动物下的卵的鲑鱼。不过，作者然后声称鲑鱼的引进不可能是约塞米提国家公园的两栖动物数量减少的原因，因为约塞米提国家公园引进鲑鱼无法解释全世界的两栖动物数量减少的原因。我认为这篇论证有三个关键方面在逻辑上不可信。

首先，作者未能提供任何证据来反驳约塞米提国家公园的两栖动物数量减少确实是由鲑鱼引起的这一有力的推断。因为作者没有提供有力的证据证明污染或者一些其他的现象才是引起数量减少的原因，所以作者宽泛地声明世界范围内的两栖动物数量减少表明全球遭污染是完全没有说服力的。

第二，即使我承认鲑鱼的引进不是约塞米提国家公园两栖动物数量减少的原因，作者也没有提供任何证据证明这次锐减是由污染而不是一些其他的现象引起的。原因也可能是其他的一些环境因素。没有排除所有其他可能的解释，作者就不能使我相信全世界的两栖动物数量减少，或者甚至是约塞米提国家公园方面的减少，是由污染引起的。

第三，即使我相信约塞米提国家公园的两栖动物数量减少是由污染引起的，由这个个例也不足以得出任何关于全世界的两栖动物数量锐减的原因的笼统结论。约塞米提国家公园出现的因果关系完全可能不代表世界的普遍现象。没有来自不同的地理位置的其他样例，我不能接受作者有关两栖动物数量减少和全球污染的笼统的论断。

总之，作者所引用的证据太少，根本不能证明全世界的两栖动物数量减少的原因是什么。实际上，他提供的证据反倒为别人反驳自己的论点提供了便利。为加强这篇论证的力度，作者应该调查分析1915~1992年间发生在约塞米提国家公园的所有变化，并证明空气和水质污染起码对公园两栖动物数量减少产生了影响。不论是哪种情况，作者必须提供有关不同的地理位置的两栖动物数量变动和所受污染的数据；并且这些数据必须显示空气和水质污染程度和全世界两栖动物的数量之间的强烈反差关系。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 作者没有排除鲑鱼导致两栖动物数量下降的可能性。
2. 即使鲑鱼不是导致两栖动物数量下降的罪魁祸首，作者也没能证实就是污染而不是别的什么因素造成了这一数量的下降。
3. 即使在约塞米提公园确实是污染导致了两栖动物数量的下降，这也不能用于证实全球范围的数量下降都是因为污染而导致的。

● 逻辑思路提示：以少推多的差异范围草率推广：本文攻击的第三点就是以少推多，以偏概全，以部分推整体的草率推广。前面我们介绍过不能从整体现象推知局部特征，即不能以多推少，同样，也不能以少推多。当作者仅就某些个体的、特殊的现象推出整体的、更大范围的现象和趋势时，就犯了这种错误。

### 【开头方式】

列举论据的语言。本文作者用了两个句子来列举原文论据：

To support this assertion the author first notes ..., and acknowledges that ...

### 【论证展开】

对于以少推多的草率推广的论证：对于这类错误，我们往往可以先做一个让步，指出作者的结论对于一些个体或局部可能确实是成立的有效的，然后再转折指出不能把这一结论草率推广到更大的概念范畴。本文使用了 even if ..., this single sample is insufficient to draw any general conclusion about ... 这样的句式来表达这种论证关系，我们也可以用其他句型来引导让步，比如 although it is true that ... / although it is true in some cases / granted that ... 等等。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式：(1) To support this assertion the author first notes ..., and acknowledges that ... (2) I find this argument logically unconvincing in three critical respects.
- 描述以少推多的草率推广的句式：(1) The author's broad assertion that ... is entirely unconvincing. (2) This single sample is insufficient to draw any general conclusion about ... (3) Without additional samples from diverse geographic locations, I cannot accept the author's sweeping generalization about ...
- 其他句式：(1) Because the author provides no affirmative evidence that ... (2) Without ruling out all other possible explanations the author cannot convince me that ...
- 结尾句式：(1) In sum, the scant evidence the author cites proves nothing about ... (2) In fact, this evidence only serves to refute the author's own argument. (3) To strengthen the argument the author should examine ... (4) In any event, the author must provide data about ...

## Argument 152 Saving Tria's beach sand and its tourist industry

The following is a letter to the head of the tourism bureau on the island of Tria.

"Erosion of beach sand along the shores of Tria Island is a serious threat to our island and our tourist industry. In order to stop the erosion, we should charge people for using the beaches. Although this solution may annoy a few tourists in the short term, it will reduce the number of people using the beaches and will raise money for replenishing the sand. Replenishing the sand, as was done to protect buildings on the nearby island of Batia, will help protect buildings along our shores, thereby reducing these buildings' risk of additional damage from severe storms. And since the areas along the shore will be more attractive as a result, the beaches will be preserved and the area's tourist industry will improve over the long term."

【参考译文】特蒂亚岛海岸沙滩的侵蚀对于我们岛和我们的旅游业是个严重的威胁。为阻止侵蚀，我们应该对使用海滩的人收费。尽管这一解决方案会在短期内触怒少量游客，它将会减少使用海滩的人数并增加补充沙子的资金。像邻近的巴蒂亚岛为了保护岛上的房子一样补充沙子将会有助于对我们沿岸建筑的保护，从而减少这些房屋在大风暴中受损的危险。并且由于这会导致沿岸地区更具吸引力，海滩将会受到保护，本地区的旅游业将会在长远得到发展。

This letter's author recommends charging fees for public access to Tria's beaches as an effective means of raising funds for the purpose of saving Tria's tourist industry. The author reasons that beach-access fees would reduce the number of beachgoers while providing revenue for replenishing beach sand needed to protect nearby buildings, thereby enhancing the area's attractiveness to

tourists. **To support this argument the author points out that beach sand was replenished on the nearby island of Batia, thereby reducing the risk of storm damage to buildings there. I find the argument unconvincing for several reasons.**

**First of all, the author makes certain dubious assumptions about the impact of beach-access fees.** On the one hand, the author ignores the possibility that charging fees might deter so many tourists that Tria would be worse off overall. **On the other hand, perhaps** the vast majority of Tria's tourists and residents alike would happily pay for beach access, in which case Tria's beaches would continue to be no less crowded than they are now. **Under either scenario, adopting the author's proposal might harm, rather than benefit, Tria's tourist industry in the long run.**

**Secondly, the mere fact that on nearby Batia replenishing beach sand has served to protect shore-line buildings is scant evidence that Tria would achieve its goals by following Batia's example. Perhaps** the same course of action would be ineffective on Tria **due to geological differences between the two islands. Or perhaps** Batia is in a far better position than Tria financially to replenish its sand on a continual basis. **In short, lacking evidence that conditions on the two islands are relevantly similar, the author cannot convince me on the basis of Batia's experience that the proposed course of action would be effective in attaining Tria's goals.**

**Thirdly, even if replenishing Tria's beach sand is financially feasible and would protect nearby buildings, the author provides no evidence that Tria's tourist industry would be saved thereby. Perhaps** Tria's tourist appeal has little to do with the beach and nearby buildings; for that matter, perhaps Tria's tourist appeal would be greater with fewer buildings along the coast. **Since the author provides no firm evidence that replenishing sand and protecting nearby buildings would be more beneficial to Tria's tourist industry than allowing nature to take its course, I do not find the author's argument the least bit compelling.**

**In sum, the argument is unconvincing as it stands. To strengthen it the author must show that charging beach-access fees would reduce the number of beachgoers, but not to the extent of undermining the goal of raising sufficient funds to maintain an attractive coastal area. The author must also provide better evidence that replenishing sand would indeed protect nearby buildings, and that the net result would be the enhancement of Tria's tourist industry.**

#### 【参考译文】

这封信的作者建议在公众进入海滩时要收取海滩使用费，这可以作为有效的方法来为挽救特蒂亚的旅游业筹款。作者推论道海滩进入费将减少去海滩的人的数量，与此同时，所提供的收入用于补充保护附近大楼所需要的海滩沙，从而提高该地区对游客的吸引力。为了支持这一论点，作者指出附近巴蒂亚岛的海滩沙得以补充，因此那里风暴对大楼的损害的危险程度得以降低。我认为这一论点由于以下几个原因不足以令人信服。

首先，作者做出了关于收取海滩使用费影响的不确定的假定。一方面，收费可能阻止很多游客而使特蒂亚总的情况恶化，而这一可能性被作者所忽视。另一方面，也许大多数特蒂亚的游客和居民会愉快地支付海滩使用费，在这种情况下，特蒂亚海滩将仍旧如同现在一样拥挤。在其中任何一种情况下，采用作者的提议归根结底可能损害特蒂亚的旅游业，而不是有益于特蒂亚的旅游业。

其次，本文仅提出在附近巴蒂亚岛上补充海滩沙对保护海岸沿线大楼有用的极个别事实，而缺乏足够的证据能够证明特蒂亚通过效仿巴蒂亚，也可以达到这样的目的。或许由于在这两

座岛之间的地质差别，相同的行动对于特蒂亚将是无效的。或者，在持续提供海滩沙方面，巴蒂亚比特蒂亚在经济上处于更好的处境。简而言之，缺乏证据表明这两座岛的条件有很大程度上相似，作者不能使我信服根据巴蒂亚的经验提议的行动方针将对特蒂亚达到目的有效。

第三，即使补充特蒂亚海滩沙在财政上可行并且能够保护附近大楼，作者并没有提供证据表明特蒂亚的旅游业将会因此而得到挽救。或许，特蒂亚对游客的吸引力与海滩和海滩附近的大楼没有什么相关性；而且也许随着海岸大楼的减少，特蒂亚游客的兴趣反而更高。因为作者没有提供强有力的证据表明，比起顺其自然，补充海滩沙并且保护附近大楼将更有利于特蒂亚的旅游业，我认为作者的论断一点儿也不能令人信服。

总之，就目前情况看，论点并不令人信服。为了加强说服力，作者必须说明收取海滩使用费将减少海滩游客的数量，但以不影响筹集足够的资金来维持一个有吸引力的沿海地区为限。作者也必须提供更好的证据证明补充海滩沙确实能够保护附近的大楼，并且最终结果是特蒂亚的旅游业得以发展。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 海滩收费政策可能会带来意想不到的恶果（攻击后果）。
2. 在特蒂亚照搬巴蒂亚的经验未必同样有效（错误类比）。
3. 作者所做的关于补充沙子的措施一定能够带来旅游业繁荣的假设是可疑的。

● 思路提示：错误类比的错误：这是 Argument 题目中又一类出现频率很高的缺陷，其特征是作者在用 A 事物的情况类比类推 B 事物时，只看到 A 和 B 表层的相似性，而忽略了它们之间可能存在的其他深层次差异。本文所攻击的第二点就是特蒂亚和巴蒂亚之间错误类比的错误。

对于错误类比，最基本的论证展开套路就是指出作者进行类比的双方有哪些可能不一样的地方；比如本文在论证时就列举了地质特征、补充沙子的方便程度等可能的不同点。

### 【论证展开】

● 对错误类比的论证展开：对于错误类比的错误，我们可以用以下套路进行论证：

- 1) 用 Topic Sentence 指出错误类比。
- 2) 用推测法和列举法指出作者进行类比的双方有什么可能的差异。
- 3) 用小总结句型作段落结尾。

● 推测法展开的其他语言方式：用推测法展开论证除了使用最基本的 perhaps、possibly、it is possible that 等句式外，也可以学习参考本文所用的“一方面……另一方面”的句型。

### 【语言提示】

- 指出作者所做假设不可靠的：The author makes certain dubious assumptions about ...
- 引导推测法的句式：On the one hand, the author ignores the possibility that ... On the other hand, perhaps ...
- 用于攻击错误类比的句式：In short, lacking evidence that conditions on the two islands are relevantly similar, the author cannot convince me on the basis of Batia's experience that ...
- 其他句式：Under either scenario, adopting the author's proposal might ...

## Argument 155 Learning to read by listening to books on tape

The following appeared in a letter to the editor of a local newspaper.

"Too much emphasis is placed on the development of reading skills in elementary school. Many

students who are discouraged by the lonely activity of reading turn away from schoolwork merely because they are poor readers. But books recorded on audiocassette tape provide an important alternative for students at this crucial stage in their education, one the school board should not reject merely because of the expense involved. After all, many studies attest to the value of allowing students to hear books read aloud; there is even evidence that students whose parents read to them are even more likely to become able readers. Thus, hearing books on tape can only make students more eager to read and to learn. Therefore, the school board should encourage schools to buy books on tape and to use them in elementary education."

**【参考译文】**小学教育过分强调了对于阅读能力的培养。很多对单调的阅读活动不感兴趣的学生仅仅因为他们阅读能力欠佳而放弃学习。但录制在盒式磁带上的教材为学生在教育的关键阶段提供了重要的补充，地方教育董事会不应该仅仅因为其所需的花费而拒绝它。无论如何，很多研究证实了让学生听大声朗读的教材的作用；甚至还有证据表明，那些由家长为他们朗读的学生阅读能力更容易提高。因此，听录制教材只会让学生更乐意阅读和学习。所以，地方教育董事会应该鼓励学校购买录制的教材，并把它们用于小学教育。

**This editorial concludes that the school board should invest in audiocassettes because listening to audiocassettes makes elementary students more eager to learn and to read. To support this conclusion the editorial cites studies showing the value of listening to someone else read. However, close scrutiny of this evidence and of the editorial's line of reasoning reveals that they provide little credible support for the editorial's conclusion.**

**To begin with, the argument claims that for a poor reader the isolation of reading will provide a general disincentive to do schoolwork. However, the author provides no evidence to support this claim. It is just as possible that a child who has difficulty reading might excel at other subjects that do not require much reading, such as mathematics or music. Besides, this argument assumes that learning to read must be an isolated activity. Experience informs us, however, that this is not the case, especially for elementary school students who typically learn to read in a group environment.**

**The editorial goes on to cite studies which "attest to the value" of allowing students to hear books read aloud. However, as it stands this evidence is far too vague to support the editorial's conclusion; we are not informed whether the "value" relates specifically to reading skills. Common sense tells me that while audiocassettes can help any person learn facts and understand concepts, a skill such as reading can only be learned by practicing the skill itself.**

**Nor are we informed about the manner in which books were read aloud in the study; were they read directly by parents or were they recorded on audiocassettes? Absent additional information about the cited studies, these studies lend no credible support to the conclusion that audiocassettes will help elementary school students to read and to learn.**

**The editorial continues by claiming that listening to audiocassettes will make children better readers because when parents read aloud to their children these children become better readers. This argument by analogy is wholly unpersuasive. The latter allows for interaction between parent and child, while the former does not. The latter allows for the child to view written words as the parent reads—that is, to read—while the former does not. Besides, common sense and experience tell us that audiocassettes, which provide for passive listening, are likely to serve as crutches that dissuade children**

from active reading—instead of encouraging them to read.

**In conclusion, the editorial is unconvincing as it stands. To strengthen the argument, the editorial's author must provide more compelling evidence that listening to audiocassettes will actually help and encourage elementary school students to read, not just to learn in general. In order to better evaluate the argument, we would need more information about whether the cited studies refer specifically to the value of audiocassettes and specifically to their value in terms of the reading and learning processes.**

### 【参考译文】

这篇社论做出结论：地方教育董事会应该投资盒式录音磁带，因为听盒式录音磁带将使小学生更渴望学习和阅读。为了支持这个结论，社论引用了几项研究。这些研究显示听别人朗读的价值。但是，对于论据及推理过程的详细审查，发现它们对社论的结论提供了不可信的支持。

首先，论点声称，对于阅读能力差的学生，阅读的孤立性通常将阻碍他做学校作业。然而，作者并没有为此提供证据。很可能一个孩子在阅读方面有困难，却可能擅长于不要求大量阅读的科目，例如数学或者音乐。此外，这个论点假定学习阅读一定是一项孤立的活动。然而，经验告诉我们情况并不是如此，特别是对于通常在集体环境中学习阅读的小学生。

社论接着引用研究“证明”允许学生听大声朗读的书的“价值”。但是，如它所述，这个证据太含糊而不能支持社论的结论；我们没被告知是否该“价值”明确地与阅读技能相关。常识告诉我，盒式录音磁带能帮助任何人了解事实并且理解概念，但一项技能，如阅读，只能从实践该项技能中习得。

同样，我们也没被告知在研究中，书被以高声朗读的方式是由父母直接读的，还是被录在盒式录音磁带上的？缺少关于所引用研究的附加说明，这些研究没有给予可信的证据证明盒式录音磁带将帮助小学生阅读和学习。

社论继而声称，通过听盒式录音磁带将使孩子成为更好的读者，因为当父母高声读给他们的孩子听时，这些孩子成了更好的读者。这个基于类比提出的论点是完全没有说服力的。后者考虑到父母和孩子之间的相互作用，而前者却没有。后者使孩子可以看到父母读的字词——换句话说，他们可以阅读——而前者却没有。而且，常识和经验告诉我们，盒式录音磁带是为被动的听而做准备的，很可能成为阻碍孩子不去主动阅读的工具，而不是鼓励他们阅读。

总之，就目前情况看，社论并不能使人信服。为了加强说服力，社论的作者必须提供更强有力的证据证明听盒式录音磁带实际上将帮助并且鼓励小学生阅读，而不仅仅是为了一般性的学习。为了更好地评价论点，我们将需要更多的信息。这些信息包括被引用的研究是否明确地与盒式录音磁带的价值有关，以及明确地与它们在阅读和学习过程中的价值有关。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的四处缺陷：

1. 阅读能力欠佳的学生未必对学校学业不感兴趣，他们可能在不需要阅读的学科另有所长。
2. 原文所提供的关于磁带教学的研究信息不能表明其价值就在于促进阅读能力。
3. 由于信息的缺乏，我们不知道文中所提到的研究中大声朗读文章的形式，也就无法判断这一信息对结论的支持作用。
4. 听父母朗读和听磁带是两种不同的形式，不能进行类比。

● 思路提示：本文攻击的主要错误主要还是常见的两类——调查信息不完整和错误类比。

- 1) 文中所提到的研究调查结果的叙述过于模糊不够具体，我们既没有被告知研究所得

的听磁带的“价值”对于提高阅读能力的作用，也不知道研究中朗读的具体形式，这种模糊的数据是无法给予结论以有力支持的。

- 2) 听父母朗读和听磁带的过程有很大的差异，前者对儿童提高阅读能力有益的事实不能说明后者也同样可以促进学生的阅读能力。

### 【论证展开】

论证段落中的小转折：在进行论证段落的论述时，我们既可以一上来就以 Topic sentence 直接指出作者所犯的错误，也可以先用 the argument claims that... 这类的句型引述想要批判的论据或假设，然后再转折，用 However, the author provides no evidence to support this claim 这样的句型引出批判的内容。

可用于转折的词汇：

however / but / yet / nevertheless / nonetheless / unfortunately

### 【语言提示】

- 用于开头段的句式：However, close scrutiny of this evidence and of the editorial's line of reasoning reveals that they provide little credible support for the editorial's conclusion.
- 用于攻击信息不完整的句式：(1) As it stands this evidence is far too vague to support the editorial's conclusion. (2) Absent additional information about the cited studies, these studies lend no credible support to the conclusion that ...
- 用于攻击错误类比的句式：This argument by analogy is wholly unpersuasive.
- 其他句式：Experience informs us, however, that this is not the case, especially for ...

## Argument 156 Dickens Academy's interpersonal-skills seminars

The following is taken from an advertisement placed in a weekly business magazine by the Dickens Academy.

"We distributed a survey to senior management at International Mega-Publishing, Inc. The result of the survey clearly indicates that many employees were well prepared in business knowledge and computer skills, but lacked interpersonal skills to interact gracefully with customers. International Mega-Publishing decided to improve customer satisfaction by sending their newly hired employees to our one-day seminars. Since taking advantage of our program, International Mega-Publishing has seen a sharp increase in sales, an indication that the number of their disgruntled customers has declined significantly. Your company should hire Dickens and let us turn every employee into an ambassador for your company."

【参考译文】我们对米加国际出版公司的高层管理人员进行了一次调查。调查结果清楚地显示很多员工在商业知识和计算机技能方面准备充足，但是缺乏与客户得体沟通的人际交往能力。米加国际出版公司决定通过让他们的新员工参加我们为期一天的研讨会来提高客户满意度。在参加了我们的课程之后，米加国际出版公司的销量急剧上升，这表明不满意的顾客数量显著下降。你们公司应该聘用 Dickens，来让我们把每名员工变成你们公司的大使。

**This Dickens Academy ad claims that** any company wanting to improve customer relations will benefit from enrolling its employees in Dickens' one-day seminars. **To support this claim the ad cites** Mega-Publishing's improved sales after its new employees attended Dickens' seminar **as an indication of improved customer relations. As it stands the ad rests on a series of dubious assumptions, and is**



therefore unconvincing.

In the first place, the ad relies on the unsubstantiated assumption that the Mega employees attending the seminar are positioned to influence Mega's sales and its customer relations. Perhaps these new employees were hired for production, editorial, or personnel positions that have nothing to do with customer relations and that have only an indirect and negligible impact on sales. Without providing evidence that these new employees directly influence Mega's customer relations and sales, I cannot accept the argument that the Dickens seminar was responsible for any of Mega's sales or customer-relations improvements subsequent to the seminar.

Even if Mega's seminar attendees are involved in sales and customer relations, the ad unfairly assumes that the improvement in Mega's sales must be attributable to the seminar. Perhaps the improvement in sales was the result of increasing product demand, new pricing policies, decreased competition, or any one of a myriad of other possible developments. For that matter, perhaps Mega's new employees as a group already possessed exceptional interpersonal skills, and therefore Mega's sales and customer relations would have improved during the ensuing months regardless of the seminar. Since the ad fails to consider and rule out these and other alternative explanations for the improvements at Mega, I find the ad's claim that the Dickens seminar should receive credit unconvincing.

Even if the Dickens seminar was responsible for improved sales and customer relations at Mega, the ad's claim that all other businesses would benefit similarly from a Dickens seminar is unjustified. It is entirely possible that the techniques and skills that participants in Dickens' seminars learn are effective for the kind of business in which Mega engages, but not for other types of businesses. Although it is possible that Dickens' training methods would be equally effective for other types of businesses, since Dickens has not provided evidence that this is the case I remain unconvinced by the ad's claim.

In sum, this ad fails to provide key evidence needed to support its claim. To strengthen that claim Dickens must show that Mega's seminar attendees—and not other employees or other occurrences—were indeed responsible for the subsequent improvement in sales, and that customer relations also improved as a result of their attending the seminar. Dickens must also provide additional success stories—about other types of businesses—to convince me that Dickens' training methods will work for any business.

### 【参考译文】

这个狄更斯学校的广告声称想要改进顾客关系的任何公司将受益于雇员在狄更斯的为期一天的研究班的学习。为了支持这一论断，广告引用了一个例子，在米加出版社的新雇员参加狄更斯的讨论会之后，销售额提高，而这可以作为一个顾客关系改进的迹象。就目前情况来看，广告以一系列可疑的假定为基础，因此不能让人信服。

首先，广告建立在无确实根据的假定上。这个假定是参加讨论会的雇员所处的职位会影响米加的销售额及其顾客关系。或许这些新雇员受雇于生产、编辑或者人力资源部门，而与顾客关系无关，对销售额只有间接和可以忽略的影响。在没有提供证据证明这些新雇员直接影响米加的顾客关系和销售额的情况下，我不能接受狄更斯讨论会是随后米加的销售额增加或者顾客关系改进的原因的观点。

即使米加的讨论会参加者涉及销售和顾客关系，广告不公平地认为米加销售额的增加一定可归因于讨论会。或许，销售额的增加是由于产品需求增加、新定价政策出台、竞争减少，或者

其他无数原因中的任何一个。除此之外，或许米加的新雇员作为一个团队已经拥有非同寻常的人际关系技能，因此不管是否有这个讨论会，米加的销售和顾客关系都可能在接下来的几个月内改进。因为关于米加的改进，这个广告没有考虑和排除这些和其他的可供选择的解释，我认为这一广告声称狄更斯讨论会有功劳是不足以使人信服的。

即使米加销售和顾客关系的改进源于狄更斯讨论会，广告声称所有其他公司将会同样受益于狄更斯讨论会是不合理的。完全可能狄更斯讨论会的参与者所习得的那些技术和技能对于米加所从事的那种工作是有效的，但对于其他类型的公司却是无效的。尽管狄更斯的训练方法对于其他类型的公司可能同样有效，但因为狄更斯并未提供证据证明情况确实如此，我仍然不能相信广告所宣称的。

总之，这个广告没有成功地提供关键证据来支持它的论断。为了加强此论断，狄更斯必须说明随后销售的改进是因为米加的讨论会参与者，而不是因为其他的雇员或者其他事件所导致的，并且顾客关系的改进也是他们参加讨论会的结果。狄更斯也必须提供一些附加的关于其他类型的公司成功的例子，使我确信狄更斯的训练方法将适合任何公司。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 没有证据表明是参加了狄更斯培训的米加雇员促进了公司销量和客户满意度，因而参加培训与销量增加之间未必有因果关系。
2. 米加的销量增加可能由其他原因导致，比如市场需求增加、新的价格政策等等。
3. 即便承认米加确实从狄更斯的培训课程受益，我们也不能草率认为其他公司也能从培训中获得同样的好处。

● 思路提示：本文攻击的第一点和第二点从本质上说是同一个问题，即狄更斯的培训与米加业绩的上升之间不一定存在因果关系，但作者从两个不同角度进行展开：第一段作者论述的是原文的论据和信息不够充分，没有提出直接证据证实就是狄更斯的培训导致了业绩上升；第二段作者又从业绩上升可能有其他原因的角度展开批驳。如果有些题目中的逻辑缺陷实在太少，写的时候担心攻击的出发点不够多的话，也可以学习本文的方法，针对同一个问题从不同的角度展开论证。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式：As it stands the ad rests on a series of dubious assumptions, and is therefore unconvincing.
- 论证段句式：(1) the ad relies on the unsubstantiated assumption that ... (2) since Dickens has not provided evidence that this is the case I remain unconvinced by the ad's claim.
- 结尾段句式：(1) In sum, this ad fails to provide key evidence needed to support its claim. (2) Dickens must also provide ... to convince me that ...

## Argument 158 Garbage sites and the health of nearby residents

The Trash-Site Safety Council has recently conducted a statewide study of possible harmful effects of garbage sites on the health of people living near the sites. A total of five sites and 300 people were examined. The study revealed, on average, only a small statistical correlation between the proximity of homes to garbage sites and the incidence of unexplained rashes among people living in these homes. Furthermore, although it is true that people living near the largest trash sites had a slightly higher incidence of the rashes, there was otherwise no correlation between the size of the garbage

sites and people's health. Therefore, the council is pleased to announce that the current system of garbage sites does not pose a significant health hazard. We see no need to restrict the size of such sites in our state or to place any restrictions on the number of homes built near the sites.

**【参考译文】**垃圾场安全委员会最近就垃圾场对住在附近的居民的健康可能造成的危害进行了一次调查。调查一共检测了五个垃圾场，调查了 300 位居民。研究发现，平均而言，在垃圾场附近居住和这些居民中未查明原因的皮炎的发病率之间只有很小的相关性。而且，尽管住在最大的垃圾场附近的居民患皮炎的比例确实要高一些，但是除此之外，垃圾场的规模和人们的健康之间是没有关联的。因此，委员会会很高兴地宣布，现有的垃圾场系统不会对健康产生严重的危害。我们认为没有必要限制本州这类垃圾场的规模，或对于在垃圾场周围建造的住宅的数量加以任何限制。

**The Trash-Site Safety Council concludes here that there is no public-health reason to restrict the size of trash sites or their proximity to homes. The Council cites its recent statewide study involving five sites and 300 people; in the study the Council observed only a small correlation between the residents' proximity to a trash site and unexplained rashes, and only a "slightly higher incidence" of rashes among people living near larger sites. The study suffers from certain statistical and other problems, which render the Council's argument based upon it unpersuasive.**

**First, the Council has not convinced me that** the five sites in the survey are representative of trash sites in general throughout the state—in terms of their impact on the health of nearby residents. Admittedly, the study was a "statewide" one. Nevertheless, **it is entirely possible that** the five sites studied are characterized by certain environmental conditions that are not typical of most sites in the state and that render nearby residents either more or less susceptible to rashes and other health problems.

Secondly, the 300 people in the study are not necessarily representative of the state's general population—in terms of their susceptibility to health problems. **For example, perhaps** nearly all of these people are adults, while most of the health problems associated with trash sites occur among children. **Or perhaps** preventative healthcare programs in these particular communities are unusually effective in preventing health problems. **In short, lacking evidence that** these 300 people are typical in terms of their vulnerability to health problems **the Council cannot convince me that** no statewide trash-site regulations are needed.

**Thirdly, the Council's conclusion that** the five sites studied pose no serious health hazards to nearby residents **seems premature**. Common sense informs me that a serious health problem might become apparent only after a long period of exposure to the environmental cause of the problem. **The Council fails to take into account** the length of time these residents have been exposed to the conditions created by the trash sites; and **in any event, one "recent" study amounts to scant evidence that** the sites pose no significant long-term public-health hazards.

**In sum, the Council's argument is unconvincing as it stands. To strengthen it the Council must provide better evidence that** the environmental conditions at the five sites studied represent conditions at trash sites throughout the state, and that the 300 people studied are representative of state residents generally in terms of vulnerability to health problems. **To better assess the argument I would need more information** comparing the health of the 300 people studied before and after continual exposure to the environmental conditions associated with the trash sites. **I would also need to know** the length of the

study to determine whether it adequately accounted for latent health problems.

### 【参考译文】

垃圾场安全委员会在这里做出结论：没有公共健康理由去限制垃圾场的大小或者与居民住所的接近程度。委员会引用了其新近在全州范围内的研究，此次研究涉及五个垃圾场和 300 个人；在研究中，委员会注意到居民毗邻垃圾场和未查明原因的发疹之间只有微小的相互关系，以及居住在大垃圾场周围的居民“稍微有点高的发疹率”。研究由于一些统计和其他问题的缘故，致使委员会的论断没有说服力。

首先，委员会没能使我确信，就它们对附近居民的健康的影响而言，调查中的五个地点可以代表整个州的垃圾场。研究确实是“全州范围”的，但尽管如此，完全可能研究的五个地点存在某些环境特点，而这些环境特点在全州的大多数地方不是典型的，并且致使附近居民或多或少容易感染皮疹或其他健康问题。

其次，研究中的 300 人就易患疾病性而言，不一定就是州内一般人的代表。例如，也许这 300 人都是成年人，而大多数与垃圾场相关的健康问题都发生在儿童之中。或者也许在这些特定的社区里，预防保健方案防止健康问题异常有效。简而言之，在缺乏证据表明这 300 人在疾病的易感性方面具有典型性的情况下，委员会不能使我信服不需要在全州范围内制定有关垃圾场的规定。

再次，委员会关于研究的五个地点不会对附近居民的健康造成严重危害的结论下得为时过早。常识告诉我，环境原因所引起的严重的健康问题只能在很长一段长时间后才可能变得明显。委员会没有考虑到这些居民暴露于由垃圾场所造成的环境下的时间的长短；无论如何，一项“新近”的研究缺少证据表明垃圾场不会造成显著的长期的公众健康危害。

总之，就目前情况看，委员会的论点并不能使人信服。为了使之加强，委员会必须提供更好的证据，即研究的五个地点的环境状况可代表整个州的垃圾场的环境状况，并且在疾病易感性方面所研究的 300 人可代表全州居民。为了更好地评价这一论断，我需要更多的信息。这些信息是关于所研究的 300 人长期暴露于与垃圾场相关的环境状况下之前和之后的健康状况的比较。我也需要知道研究的时间长度，来确定它是否能充分地解释潜在的健康问题。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 由于不知道文中所提到调查的取样过程，被调查的五个垃圾场未必能代表整个州垃圾场的总体情况。
2. 同样，调查所研究的居民从年龄、体质、生活环境等方面也未必能代表整个州的情况。
3. 有些疾病和危害是需要一定时间才能显现的，因而委员会基于最近的一次调查就断言垃圾场没有危害过于草率。

● 思路提示：本文攻击的前两点都是调查取样代表性的问题，就这道题来说这确实是一个比较主要的缺陷，但在同一篇文章中用两个段落论证这一问题不是很恰当，而且文章攻击的第三点的论证也有些差强人意，原文所说的“recent study”只是表达调查是最近进行的，而不能由此认为调查周期一定不够。要想把本文论述改进得更完善，我们可以把第一、二点也就是调查样本的代表性问题归在一段里进行论述，第二段可以论证调查本身的意义问题：委员会所做的调查仅仅研究了 rashes 这样一种无关痛痒的小毛病，却就此认为现有垃圾场不会导致任何重大健康危害，显然调查内容对于所要说明的结论并没有直接的支持意义。另外，就算承认 rashes 的研究足以体现垃圾场的健康危害，原

文所提供的调查结果也正好说明垃圾场规模和人们的发病率是成正比的，可以用反证法来对这一问题展开论述。

**【语言提示】**

- 开头段句式: The study suffers from certain statistical and other problems, which render the Council's argument based upon it unpersuasive.
- 论证句式: (1) the Council's conclusion that ... seems premature. (2) in any event, ... amounts to scant evidence that ...

### **Argument 160 Improving learning and memory**

As people grow older, an enzyme known as PEP increasingly breaks down the neuropeptide chemicals involved in learning and memory. But now, researchers have found compounds that prevent PEP from breaking neuropeptides apart. In tests, these compounds almost completely restored lost memory in rats. The use of these compounds should be extended to students who have poor memory and difficulty in concentrating—and therefore serious problems in school performance. Science finally has a solution for problems neither parents nor teachers could solve.

**【参考译文】**随着人们的衰老，一种叫做 PEP 的酶不断地分解与学习和记忆有关的神经肽化学物质。但现在研究人员已经发现了一些阻止 PEP 分解神经肽的化合物。在试验中，这些化合物几乎完全恢复了老鼠失去的记忆。这些化合物的使用可以扩展到那些因记忆力较差和注意力不能集中而在学习中存在严重问题的学生。科学最终能够解决家长和教师都无法解决的问题。

**This argument concludes that** certain compounds should be administered to students with poor memory and concentration to improve their performance in school. **The argument cites an experiment involving rats in which** the same compounds prevented the enzyme PEP from breaking down chemicals involved in learning and memory. **The argument suffers from several flaws, which render it unconvincing.**

**A threshold problem with the argument is that it assumes that** what improves memory and learning in rats will also improve memory and learning in humans. **Although this is entirely possible, the argument provides no evidence to support this assumption. Without such evidence the argument can be rejected out of hand.**

**A second problem involves the fact that** PEP increasingly breaks down the chemicals needed for learning and memory as humans age—as the argument points out. **Yet the argument seems to claim that** inhibiting PEP will be effective in improving learning and memory in young people. (The argument refers to students' "parents," implying that proposed human subjects are young people rather than adults.) Thus, the effectiveness of the compounds is likely to be far less significant than it would be for older people.

**A third problem with the argument is that it assumes that** learning and memory are the only significant factors affecting performance in school. **Common sense and experience tells us this is not the case, and that a variety of other factors, such as** motivation and natural ability, also play major roles. Thus, the compounds might very well turn out to be largely ineffective.

**A final problem with the argument is that it asserts that** the compounds will improve concentration, yet it makes no claim that the same compounds improved concentration in rats—only that they im-

proved the rats' learning and memory. Thus, the argument's conclusion is indefensible to this extent.

In sum, the argument is weak on several grounds. To strengthen it the argument's proponent must provide clear evidence that the same compounds that improved learning and memory in rats will do so in young humans. Moreover, the argument's proponent must show that poor academic performance is due primarily to learning and memory problems, rather than to poor concentration, motivation, or other factors.

### 【参考译文】

这篇论证断定应该给予那些记忆力和注意力比较差的学生某些化合物，使其在学校内的表现得以改善。此篇论证引用了在老鼠身上做的一个实验，实验证明相同的化合物会防止 PEP 酶分解学习和记忆所需的化学物质。论证存在若干缺陷，使其不能令人信服。

此论证的第一个问题是假定能改进老鼠的记忆和学习的方式和物质也可以改进人类的记忆和学习。虽然这是完全可能的，但此论证并未提供证据来支持这一假定。如果没有这样的证据，此论证可以被立即否决。

第二个问题涉及作者所引用的事实，即 PEP 酶是在人类衰老的情况下日益分解学习和记忆所需的化学物质——如同此论证所指出的那样。然而此论证似乎主张抑制 PEP 酶对于年轻人改进学习和记忆将是有效的（论断谈到学生的“父母”，暗示被建议的对象是青年人而不是成年人）。因此，化合物的效力很可能远不及对老年人那样显著。

此论证的第三个问题是它假定学习和记忆是影响学校里表现的惟一重要因素。常识和经验告诉我们情况并不是如此，事实上有多种其他因素，例如积极性和天生的能力也起了主要的作用。因此，化合物可能在很大程度上会被证明是无效的。

此论证的最后一个问题是它断言化合物将改善注意力，然而，此论断并没有确定指出相同的化合物改善了老鼠的注意力——它仅仅改善了老鼠的学习和记忆。因此，在这个范围内，论断的结论是站不住脚的。

总之，论断在这几点上很薄弱。为了使之加强，论断的支持者必须提供更好的证据来表明改善老鼠学习和记忆的化合物也能改善年轻人的学习和记忆。而且，论证的支持者必须说明学业成绩较差主要是由于学习和记忆的问题，而不是由于注意力不集中、能动性或者其他因素。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的四处缺陷：

1. 用 PEP 对于老鼠的试验效果来类推对人类的效果不一定可行，错误类比。
2. 原文的信息只表明 PEP 在人们衰老时起作用，因而它对于青少年的作用有待进一步证实。
3. 作者简单假定学习和记忆是决定在校表现的惟一因素。
4. 原文没有提供任何证据来表明所提到的化合物能够起到集中注意力的作用。

● 逻辑思路提示：信息和证据缺乏的错误：有些题目的作者会在结论中提出一些根本没有论据支持的观点，比如本题，本来在论据的信息中提到的都是化合物以及 PEP 对于学习和记忆的作用，但作者却在结论中又突然提到抑制 PEP 的这种化合物也能起到集中注意力的作用，这是没有依据的。这类错误往往比较隐蔽而且容易被忽视，因此在读题时一定要对一些细节留有足够的警惕。

### 【论证展开】

本文用了一系列引导句式来引导四个论证段落：(1) A threshold problem with the argument is that it ... (2) A second problem involves the fact that ... (3) A third problem with the argument is

that ... (4) A final problem with the argument is that ...

这些句式可以学习，但另一方面，最好注意一下语言的变化，比如最后一个段落我们可以用 Last but not least 或是 the last problem worth considering is that 等其他引导句型来增加语言的多样性。

- 引导推测法的句式：在本文论证第二、三个问题时，作者使用了 Although this is entirely possible, the argument provides no evidence to support this assumption. Common sense and experience tells us this is not the case, and that a variety of other factors, such as ..., also play major roles. 这样的句型来引导推测。在具体展开推测、假设、列举之前，我们也可以使用类似的句式来把推测的内容统领起来。
- 本文的论证段落每段都没有做具体展开，仅仅使用一些抽象的逻辑描述句式来指出错误，这是行文的缺陷，在自己练习写作时要注意保证每个论证段的完整性和丰满度。

#### 【语言提示】

- 引导论证段的句式：(1) A threshold problem with the argument is that it ... (2) A second problem involves the fact that ... (3) A third problem with the argument is that ... (4) A final problem with the argument is that ...
- 引导推测法的句式：(1) Although this is entirely possible, the argument provides no evidence to support this assumption. (2) Common sense and experience tells us this is not the case, and that a variety of other factors, such as ..., also play major roles.
- 论证小总结句式：(1) Without such evidence the argument can be rejected out of hand. (2) Thus, the argument's conclusion is indefensible to this extent.

### Argument 161 The reading habits of Leeville citizens

In a study of reading habits of Leeville citizens conducted by the University of Leeville, most respondents said they preferred literary classics as reading material. However, a follow-up study conducted by the same researchers found that the type of book most frequently checked out of each of the public libraries in Leeville was the mystery novel. Therefore, it can be concluded that the respondents in the first study had misrepresented their reading habits.

【参考译文】在一次由利维勒大学所举行的关于利维勒居民阅读习惯的调查中，多数被访者说他们倾向于阅读古典文学。然而，由相同的研究人员进行的跟踪调查发现利维勒所有公共图书馆中最经常被借阅的书是神秘小说。因此，我们可以得出结论，第一次调查的被访者错误地表达了他们的阅读习惯。

**This argument concludes that** in a certain study about reading habits Leeville citizens misrepresented their true reading habits. **To justify this conclusion, the argument points out** an apparent discrepancy between their representations and the results of a follow-up study showing that a different type of book is the one most frequently checked out from Leeville's public libraries. **However, the argument fails to account for several other possible explanations for this apparent discrepancy.**

**First of all, the argument does not indicate** how much time passed between the two studies. During a sufficiently long interim period the demographic makeup of Leeville might have changed, or the reading habits of the first study's respondents might have changed. In other words, the longer the time between studies the less reliable the conclusion that respondents in the first study misrepresented

their reading habits.

**Secondly, the argument fails to account for the possibility that** the respondents in the first study constitute a different population than public library patrons. Admittedly, both groups are comprised of Leeville citizens. **However, it is entirely possible that** more highly educated citizens who frequent the University library rather than public libraries, or who purchase books rather than borrow them, are the ones who responded to the first study.

**Thirdly, the argument fails to account for the possibility that** literary classics, the book type that the first study's respondents indicated they preferred, are not readily available at Leeville's public libraries—or at least not as readily available as mystery novels. Experience informs me that this is likely, because mystery novels are in greater supply and are cheaper for libraries to acquire than literary classics. **If this is the case, it provides an alternative explanation for the fact that** more mystery novels than literary classics are checked out from Leeville's public libraries.

**Finally, the reliability of the first study rests on its statistical integrity. The argument fails to indicate** what portion of the people surveyed actually responded; the smaller this portion, the less reliable the results. **Nor does the argument indicate** how many people were surveyed, or whether the sample was representative of Leeville's general population. Again, the smaller the sample, the less reliable the results.

**In conclusion, the assertion that** respondents in the first study misrepresented their reading habits **is untenable, in light of a variety of alternative explanations for the apparent discrepancy between the two studies. To strengthen the argument, its proponent must show that** the respondents in the first study are representative of Leeville citizens generally, and that both groups are equally likely to check out books from Leeville's public libraries. **To better evaluate the argument, we would need to know** the length of time between the two studies, and whether any significant demographic changes occurred during this time. **We would also need to know** the availability of literary classics compared to mystery novels at Leeville's public libraries.

#### 【参考译文】

这篇论证断定,在某次关于读书习惯的研究中,利维勒居民没有如实叙述他们真实的读书习惯。为了证明这个结论是正确的,论证指出了他们的表述与后续的一个研究的结果之间有一处明显的差异。后续的研究显示利维勒公共图书馆里查阅频率最高的书是和调查结果不同的另外一类。但是,对于这处明显的差异,论证没能说明其他几种可能的解释。

首先,论证没有表明两项研究之间的时间间隔。在足够长的过渡期内,利维勒的人口结构可能改变,或者第一项研究的回答者的读书习惯可能改变。换句话说,两项研究之间的时间间隔越长,回答者在第一个研究里不如实地叙述了他们的读书习惯的结论的可信度就越低。

第二,论证没能解释与公共图书馆的光顾者相比较,在第一个研究里的那些回答者组成了不同人群的可能性。不可否认,两组都是由利维勒居民组成的。但是,完全可能教育程度更高的居民经常去大学图书馆而不是公共图书馆,或者购买书籍而不是借阅书籍,而这些人是在第一个研究中做出回答的人。

第三,论证没能解释文学经典作品,即第一项研究的回答者表明他们所喜欢的这种类型的图书,在利维勒公共图书馆可能是不容易获得的,或者至少不像神秘小说一样容易获得。经验告诉我这是可能的,因为神秘小说供应量更大,并且对于图书馆来说,比获得文学经典作品更便宜一些。如果情况如此,它也能解释为什么图书馆中被借阅的神秘小说比文学经典作品要多。



最后，第一个研究的可靠性建立在其统计完整的基础上。论证没能表明有多少比例的受访者实际回答了问卷；这个比例越小，结果越不可靠。论证也没能表明多少人被调查，或者所取样本是否能够代表利维勒的一般人口。这个样本越小，结果越不可靠。

总之，由于存在多种对这两项研究之间明显差异的其他解释，关于第一个研究中的回答者没有如实叙述他们的读书习惯的断言是站不住脚的。为了加强论证，它的支持者必须表明在第一个研究里的那些回答者是利维勒居民的典型代表，并且这两组被访者都同样可能从利维勒的公共图书馆办理借书手续。为了更好地评价论证，我们需要知道两项研究之间的时间间隔，并且这段时间内，是否有任何显著的人口统计的变化发生。我们也需要知道在利维勒的公共图书馆里文学经典作品与神秘小说相比是否同样容易获得。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的四处缺陷：

1. 作者没有考虑两次调查之间的时间间隔，因而在此期间人们的阅读习惯可能发生变化（没有与时俱进的错误）。
2. 作者没有指出参加第一次调查的对象具体情况，因而其调查结果未必有代表性。
3. 作者没有具体分析第二次调查的结果，因而公共图书馆借出的书的类型未必能代表市民的阅读倾向性。
4. 作者没有指出回答调查的人占有调查者的比例，因而样本未必有代表性。

- 逻辑思路提示：本文的论据就是两个调查，因而本文的论证也完全围绕调查所需要注意的方方面面展开。其中攻击的第二、第四点是样本的代表性的问题，指出看古典文学的人群和看神秘小说的人群可能不是同一群体；以及样本的大小和比例的问题。对于第四点要想进一步展开，我们还可以借鉴以前介绍过的思路和语言，指出那些对古典文学感兴趣的人可能更倾向于回应调查从而导致调查结果的局限性。

### 【论证展开】

攻击因果关系错误段落的小总结：If this is the case, it provides an alternative explanation for the fact that ... 我们说过对于因果关系的错误，最基本的论证思路是指出结果的产生可能有其他原因。在这些段落，我们就可以用上面所列的句型作为段落小总结。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式：However, the argument fails to account for several other possible explanations for this apparent discrepancy.
- 论证段句式：(1) If this is the case, it provides an alternative explanation for the fact that ... (2) Finally, the reliability of the first study rests on its statistical integrity. (3) The argument fails to indicate what portion of the people surveyed actually responded; the smaller this portion, the less reliable the results. (4) Nor does the argument indicate ...
- 结尾段句式：In conclusion, the assertion that ... is untenable, in light of a variety of alternative explanations for the apparent discrepancy between the two studies.

## Argument 162 Eating soy to prevent fatigue and depression

A recent study shows that people living on the continent of North America suffer 9 times more chronic fatigue and 31 times more chronic depression than do people living on the continent of Asia. Interestingly, Asians, on average, eat 20 grams of soy per day, whereas North Americans eat virtually none. It turns out that soy contains phytochemicals called isoflavones, which have been found to pos-

sess disease-preventing properties. Thus, North Americans should consider eating soy on a regular basis as a way of preventing fatigue and depression.

**【参考译文】**最近一次研究显示,居住在北美大陆的人患慢性疲劳和慢性抑郁症的数量分别为居住在亚洲大陆居民的9倍和31倍。有趣的是,亚洲人平均每天食用20克大豆,而北美几乎不吃。原来大豆含有一种植物化合物异黄酮,人们发现它具有抗病功效。因此,北美应该考虑经常食用大豆,把它作为预防疲劳和抑郁的一种方法。

**This argument concludes that** North Americans should eat soy on a regular basis as a means of preventing fatigue and depression. **The argument cites a recent study showing that** North Americans suffer far greater from these problems than people in Asia do, that Asians eat soy regularly whereas North Americans do not, and that soy is known to possess disease preventing properties. **The argument relies on several doubtful assumptions, and is therefore unconvincing.**

**First, the argument assumes that** depression and fatigue are just as readily diagnosed in Asia as in North America. **However, it is entirely possible that** Asians suffering from these problems do not complain about them or otherwise admit them. **For that matter, perhaps** Asian medical doctors view certain symptoms that North Americans would consider signs of fatigue and depression as signs of some other problem.

**Secondly, the argument assumes that** the difference in soy consumption is the only possible explanation for this disparity in the occurrence of fatigue and depression. **Yet the argument fails to substantiate this assumption.** Common sense informs me that any one of a myriad of other differences—environmental, dietary, and genetic—might explain why North Americans suffer from these problems to a greater extent than Asians do. **Without considering and ruling out alternative reasons for this disparity, the argument's conclusion that** soy is the key to the disparity is indefensible.

**Thirdly, the argument unfairly infers from the fact that** soy is known to possess disease-preventing properties that these properties help prevent fatigue and depression specifically. **The argument supplies no evidence to substantiate this assumption.** Moreover, whether fatigue and depression are appropriately classified as diseases in the first place is questionable.

**Finally, even if the properties in soy can be shown to prevent fatigue and depression, the argument unfairly assumes that** eating soy is the only means of ingesting the key substances. **It is entirely possible that** these same properties are found in other forms, and therefore that North Americans need not increase soy consumption to help prevent fatigue and depression.

**In sum, the argument is dubious at best. Before I can accept its conclusion, the argument's proponent must provide better evidence that** people in Asia in fact suffer less from fatigue and depression than North Americans do. **To better evaluate the argument I would need to know** what kinds of diseases the properties of soy are known to help prevent, and whether they relate at all to fatigue and depression. **I would also need to know what** other foods contain the same properties as soy—to determine what alternatives, if any, are available for preventing fatigue and depression.

#### **【参考译文】**

这篇论证断定北美应该经常吃大豆,把它作为防止疲劳和抑郁的一种方法。论证引用了一个新近的研究,该研究显示北美比亚洲人存在更多这类健康问题,而亚洲人经常吃大豆,但北

美人没有这样做；并且人们知道大豆拥有防止疾病的性质。该论证基于几个可疑的假定，从而导致它缺乏可信度。

首先，论证假定抑郁和疲劳在亚洲如同在北美洲那样容易诊断。但是完全可能存在这些问题的亚洲人不抱怨这些问题或者不以其他方式承认这些问题。而且，或许对于某些北美人会认为是疲劳和抑郁征兆的现象，亚洲的医生只会看成是一些其他问题的征兆。

第二，论证假定食用大豆的差别是对疲劳和抑郁发生率差异的惟一的可能解释。然而论证没能证实这个假定。常识告诉我，很多其他的差别，例如环境、饮食、遗传，都可以解释为什么北美人比亚洲人在更大程度上存在这些问题。如果没有考虑到并排除其他可能的原因，大豆是导致患病率差异的原因的结论是站不住脚的。

第三，众所周知，大豆拥有防止疾病的性质，但论证不公平地以此事实为依据推断出这些性质也能帮助防止疲劳和抑郁。论证没有提供证据证明这个假定。而且，疲劳和抑郁是否可以恰当地归类为疾病是可疑的。

最后，即使大豆的这些性质可以防止疲劳和抑郁，该论证还不公平地假定吃大豆是摄取这些关键物质的惟一方法。完全可能同类物质可以通过其他形式得到，因此北美人不必增加大豆消费量来帮助防止疲劳和抑郁。

总之，本文论证充其量是可疑的。在我能接受它的结论之前，论证的支持者必须提供更好的证据证明在亚洲的人们确实比北美人较少忍受疲劳和抑郁之苦。为了更好地评价论证，我需要知道，大豆那种为人所知的所含的物质可以帮助防止哪种疾病，它们是否确实与疲劳和抑郁相关。我也需要知道和大豆一样含有这一物质的其他食品——来确定如果有可选择的食品的话，哪些食品可以防止疲劳和抑郁。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的四处缺陷：

1. 亚洲地区对于抑郁和疲劳的定义及诊断可能和北美不一样，从而导致两地区患病人数的差异（另有其他原因的攻击方式）。
2. 作者没有考虑导致抑郁和疲劳的其他诱因（仍然是另有其他原因的本质）。
3. 文中信息不能说明大豆中所含的抗病物质就能用于防止疲劳和抑郁。
4. 即使承认大豆中所含的物质可以防止疲劳和抑郁，作者也没有考虑其他同样能够获取此类物质的食物和方式。

● 逻辑思路提示：这道题目的论证过程即使用了类比又做了因果关系的假设，因而在范文中作者把攻击错误类比与攻击因果关系的方式结合使用：一方面指出北美居民和亚洲居民有什么其他可能差异，诸如对于疾病的诊断和定义、基因、环境等，这是攻击错误类比的典型方式；另一方面指出这些可能差异也同样会导致患病人数的差异这一结果，这是指出有其他原因来攻击因果关系的典型方式。从这道题我们可以看到，逻辑错误之间并不是泾渭分明的，有时会结合出现，这时就需要同学们综合运用针对不同错误的论证方式展开论证。

### 【论证展开】

the argument assumes that ... is the only possible explanation for ... 作者攻击第一个错误时所用的这个句型是指出因果关系错误的典型句式，接下来我们就可以自然而然地使用推测法、列举法展开论证，指出作者忽略了哪些其他可能的解释。这个句式可以和我们在 Argument 161 中介绍过的另一句式 If this is the case, it provides an alternative explanation for the fact that ... 结合使用，作为这个段落的小总结。

## 【语言提示】

- 论证段句式: the argument assumes that ... is the only possible explanation for ...
- 结尾段句式: Before I can accept its conclusion, the argument's proponent must provide better evidence that ...

**Argument 166 Comparing cold medications**

The following appeared in a local newspaper.

"People should not be misled by the advertising competition between Coldex and Cold-Away, both popular over-the-counter cold medications that anyone can purchase without a doctor's prescription. Each brand is accusing the other of causing some well-known, unwanted side effect: Coldex is known to contribute to existing high blood pressure and Cold-Away is known to cause drowsiness. But the choice should be clear for most health-conscious people: Cold-Away has been on the market for much longer and is used by more hospitals than is Coldex. Clearly, Cold-Away is more effective."

【参考译文】人们不应该被两类非处方类感冒药 Coldex 和 Cold-Away 之间的广告战所误导。每个牌子都指责另一种药会导致某种众所周知的不良副作用: Coldex 导致血压升高, 而 Cold-Away 导致嗜睡。但对于多数关心健康的人来说, 选择是明显的: Cold-Away 比 Coldex 上市时间更长, 而且被更多的医院所使用。显然, Cold-Away 效果更好。

**This argument concludes that** Cold-Away is a more effective non-prescription cold medication than Coldex. **The argument points out that** each one has a distinct unwanted side effect: Cold-Away causes drowsiness, while Coldex contributes to existing high blood pressure. **To support its conclusion, the argument points out that** Cold-Away has been on the market considerably longer, and that it is used by more hospitals than Coldex. **I find the argument unconvincing for three reasons.**

**First, the mere fact that** Cold-Away has been on the market longer than Coldex **is scant evidence of** their comparative effectiveness. Well-established products are not necessarily better than newer ones. **Moreover,** in my observation newer medicines often make use of newer pharmaceutical developments than competing products; **thus it can be argued that** since Cold-Away has been on the market longer than Coldex it is likely to be less, not more, effective than Coldex.

**Secondly, the argument unfairly assumes that** hospitals prefer Cold-Away because of its comparative effectiveness as a cold medication. **It is entirely possible that** hospitals do not consider drowsiness an undesirable side effect for their patients. **For that matter, perhaps** hospitals use Cold Away primarily for this effect rather than as a cold medication.

**A third problem with the argument involves** Coldex's side effect: high blood pressure. **Admittedly,** people who already have a serious blood pressure problem would probably be well advised to use Cold-Away instead. **However,** only those people are susceptible to this side effect. Thus, for all other people—the vast majority of cold-medicine users—Coldex's side effect is irrelevant in choosing between the two products. **Moreover, if** a person without high blood pressure wishes to avoid drowsiness, Coldex would seem to be the preferable medication.

**In sum, the argument is unconvincing as it stands. To strengthen it, the argument's proponent must provide clear evidence that** hospitals prefer Cold-Away because of its effectiveness in treating colds. **To better assess the argument, I would need better evidence** comparing the effectiveness of the

two products—perhaps through clinical studies or reliable surveys of the general population.

### 【参考译文】

这个论证断定 Cold-Away 是一种比 Coldex 更为有效的非处方感冒药。该论证指出, 以上两种感冒药都伴随明显的不良副作用。Cold-Away 会导致昏睡, 而 Coldex 则使已经有高血压更加严重。为支持这个结论, 该论证指出 Cold-Away 上市的时间要长得多, 并比 Coldex 被更多的医院使用。我认为这个论证由于三个原因不能使人信服。

首先, Cold-Away 比 Coldex 的上市时间要长这一事实无法作为比较它们之间的药效的充分证据。已经占据市场的产品并不一定就比新产品要好。而且, 据我的观察, 新出的药品经常都比竞争产品更好地利用更新的医学发展成果; 因此, 这倒可能表明 Cold-Away 并不比 Coldex 更有效, 而是效果更差, 因为它的上市时间比 Coldex 长。

第二, 该论证还理所当然地认为医院更喜欢用 Cold-Away, 是因为作为感冒药, 它的效果比较好。医院完全有可能不把昏睡作为他们的病人的一种不良的副作用来考虑。同样, 也有可能医院用 Cold-Away 就是要利用它的这种效果, 而不是把它作为一种感冒药来用的。

这个论证的第三个问题与 Coldex 的副作用高血压有关。无可否认, 对于已经患有严重的高血压的人, 可能最好还是建议他们使用 Cold-Away。然而, 也只有那些人才容易受这种副作用的影响。因此, 对于其他所有人——广大感冒药服用者——在从两种产品中做选择的时候, Coldex 的副作用是毫无关系的。而且, 如果一个没有高血压的人想要避免昏睡, Coldex 看来会是更好的药物。

总之, 就目前情况看, 这个论证不能使人信服。为了加强它, 这个论证的支持者必须提供明确的证据证明医院是因为 Cold-Away 治疗感冒的效果才更喜欢 Cold-Away。为了更好地评价这个论证, 我需要更多的证据比较两种产品的效果——也许可以通过对普通人的临床研究或者可靠调查得到。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷:

1. 上市时间长的药品未必疗效更好, 新的药可能会采用一些新的有效成分、配方和加工工艺从而更加有效。
2. 医院采用 Cold-Away 未必是因为它作为感冒药疗效更好, 而可能看重它的其他方面。
3. Coldex 的不良副作用对于血压正常的患者来说不成问题, 而且那些想避免嗜睡的患者刚好可以选择 Coldex。

● 逻辑思路提示: 本题是一道不太容易展开的题目, 其最主要的问题就集中在最后一条论据: Cold-Away 上市时间更长且被很多医院采用。对于这条论据可以参考本文攻击的头两点展开论证。

### 【论证展开】

Moreover, in my observation... 在 argument 的论证中, 最好避免出现此类句子和词汇。因为个人的观察、观点和经验不免带有主观性和片面性, 从而论证的力度并不很强。这里我们可以用诸如 as we know, we all know that... 之类的句式来代替。

## Argument 167 Lavender as a cure for insomnia

A folk remedy\* for insomnia, the scent in lavender flowers, has now been proved effective. In a recent study, 30 volunteers with chronic insomnia slept each night for three weeks on lavender-scent-

ed pillows in a controlled room where their sleep was monitored. During the first week, volunteers continued to take their usual sleeping medication. They slept soundly but wakened feeling tired. During the second week, the volunteers discontinued their medication. As a result, they slept less soundly than the previous week and felt even more tired. During the third week, the volunteers slept longer and more soundly than in the previous two weeks. This shows that over a short period of time lavender cures insomnia.

A folk remedy is usually a plant-based form of treatment common to traditional forms of medicine, ones that developed before the advent of modern medical services and technology.

**【参考译文】**一种治疗失眠的偏方\*——薰衣草花香, 现在被证明是有效的。在一次最近的调查中, 30名患有慢性失眠的志愿者在三周之内每晚都在一个受监视的控制室内睡在带薰衣草花香的枕头上。在第一周, 志愿者继续服用他们常用的安眠药。他们睡得很沉, 但醒来时很累。在第二周, 他们不服用药物。结果与前一周相比, 他们睡得不那么沉, 并且感觉更累。在第三周, 他们睡得比前两周时间长, 而且睡眠效果更好。这表明薰衣草在短时间内治愈了失眠。

\* 偏方通常是一种在传统医药中常见的以植物为基础的治疗形式, 这些传统医药是在现代医药服务和科技出现之前发展起来的。

**The speaker concludes that the scent of lavender provides an effective short-term cure for insomnia. To support this conclusion the speaker cites a three-week experiment in which researchers monitored the apparent effects of lavender on 30 insomniacs, who slept on lavender-scented pillows each night of the experiment. The speaker's account of the experiment reveals several critical problems with it. Together, these problems serve to undermine the speaker's argument.**

**A threshold problem involves the definition of insomnia. The speaker fails to define this critical term. If insomnia is defined as an inability to fall asleep, then how soundly or long a person sleeps, or how tired a person feels after sleep, is irrelevant to whether the person suffers from insomnia. In short, without a clear definition of insomnia it is impossible to assess the strength of the argument.**

**Another fundamental problem is that the speaker omits to inform us about the test subjects' sleep patterns just prior to the experiment. It is impossible to conclude with any confidence that the subjects benefited from sleeping on lavender-scented pillows without comparing how they slept with the pillows to how they sleep without them.**

**Yet another problem involves the fact that subjects slept more soundly and awakened less tired the first week than the second, and that they used their regular sleep medication the first week but not the second. This evidence tends to show only that the subjects' other sleep medications were effective; it proves nothing about the effectiveness of lavender.**

**A fourth problem involves the speaker's account of the experiment's third week, during which the speaker reports only that the subjects slept longer and more soundly than in the previous two weeks. We are not informed whether the subjects took any medication during the third week. Assuming they did not, any one of a variety of factors other than the lavender-scented pillows might explain the third week's results. Perhaps the subjects were simply making up for sleep they lost the previous week when they discontinued their regular medication. Or perhaps the subjects were finally becoming accustomed to the lavender-scented pillows, which actually disturbed sleep initially. In short, without ruling out other explanations for the third week's results, the speaker cannot confidently identify what**

caused the subjects to sleep longer and more soundly that week.

**Two final problems with the argument involve the experimental process. The experiment's results are reliable only if all other factors that might affect sleep patterns remained constant during the three-week period, and if the number of experimental subjects is statistically significant. Without evidence of the experiment's methodological and statistical reliability, the speaker's conclusion is unjustifiable.**

**In conclusion, the argument is unconvincing as it stands. To strengthen the assertion that lavender-scented pillows provide a short-term cure for insomnia, the author must provide evidence that the test subjects' insomnia was worse just prior to the experiment than at the conclusion of the experiment, and that the number of subjects is statistically sufficient to warrant the conclusion. To better assess the argument, we would need a clear definition of insomnia, as well as more information about whether the researchers conducted the experiment in a controlled environment.**

### 【参考译文】

这位发言者断定薰衣草的气味对于有效地治疗失眠可以起到短期的作用。发言者引用了一个为期三周的实验来证实这个结论。在实验期间的每个夜晚, 30 名失眠症患者都睡在带有薰衣草香味的枕头上。在这个过程中, 研究人员严密监视着薰衣草对这些人的显著影响。发言者对这个实验的解释暴露出该实验的若干个严重的问题。正是这些问题一起削弱了发言者的论证。

最开始的问题出在失眠的定义上。对这个关键的术语, 发言者没有做解释。如果将失眠定义为无法入睡, 那么一个人睡多久或者多么久, 以及这个人睡醒之后感觉多累, 都与这个人是否受到失眠的困扰毫无关系。简而言之, 不对失眠下一个确切的定义, 是不可能评价这个论证的力度的。

另一个重要的问题是发言者由于疏忽, 没有告诉我们那些实验对象在参加这个实验之前都是采取何种方式睡觉的。这样, 研究人员就无法比较实验对象枕与不枕薰衣草枕头的睡眠状况, 也便不能可信地断定实验对象使用带薰衣草香味的枕头后一定是有效的。

而另一个问题涉及这么一个事实, 即实验对象第一周比第二周睡得更香, 醒后没有那么累, 而这些人在第一周服用了他们一直在用的安眠药, 但在第二周没有服用。这个证据只能表明实验对象使用的其他药物治疗很有效; 这对于证明薰衣草的效用一点儿作用也没有。

第四个问题与发言者对实验进行到第三周的情况叙述有关, 发言者只是报道了这期间实验对象比前两周的睡眠时间更长, 睡得也更香了。发言者没有告诉我们在第三周实验对象是否服用了任何药物。假如他们没有, 那么不用带薰衣草香味的枕头, 而是随便从各种因素中挑一个就可以解释第三周的实验结果。或许那些实验对象由于前一周停止服用他们一直用的药物而导致睡眠不足, 所以这周他们只是在弥补他们上周的睡眠时间。又或许带薰衣草香味的枕头实际上一开始是干扰睡眠的, 但实验对象最终开始习惯了。简而言之, 没有排除其他可能导致第三周的实验结果的因素, 发言者不能有把握地确定是什么导致实验对象在那周睡得更长、更香。

这个论述的最后两个问题与实验过程有关。只有当可能影响睡眠方式的所有其他因素在这三周的时间里保持不变, 并且实验对象的人数具有统计意义时, 这个实验的结果才具有可信性。没有证据证明该实验具有方法学和统计学上的可靠性, 发言者的结论就不能被认为是合理的。

总之, 就目前情况看, 这个论证不能使人信服。要证实其带薰衣草香味的枕头对治疗失眠有短期作用的声明, 作者必须提供证据证明, 在参加实验之前, 实验对象的失眠症比参加完实验之后要糟糕得多; 另外, 实验对象的人数从统计学角度来说足够证明这个结论。为了更好地评价这个论证, 我们需要对失眠下一个明确的定义, 同时需要掌握更多信息, 了解研究人员是不是在一个受控的环境里进行这个实验的。

**【逻辑问题提纲】**

本文作者一共攻击了原文的五处缺陷：

1. 作者并没有明确“失眠”一词的确切定义，因而试验中所观察到的现象是否与治疗失眠有关仍然值得怀疑（差异概念）。
2. 作者没有告诉我们参加试验的失眠者在试验之前的睡眠情况，因而无法判断试验结果是否真的有效（信息缺乏的错误 / 缺乏比较）。
3. 试验对象在第二周的睡眠情况恰恰说明薰衣草影响了他们的睡眠。
4. 作者没有告诉我们试验对象在第三周是否继续服用安眠药，如果不服，则可能有其他因素导致他们的睡眠改善。
5. 作者没有提供证据表明在试验中其他影响睡眠的因素是保持不变的。

● 逻辑思路提示：

- 1) 对比试验：在科学研究中，经常使用对比试验的形式来验证两个事件间是否存在因果关系。比如要想验证 A 因素是否导致 B 结果，那么就取两组试验对比参照物（称之为 counterparts），使其中一组受到 A 的影响，另一组不受，然后观察两组试验参照物 B 结果的产生情况，通过对比来验证 A 与 B 之间是否存在因果关系。对比试验结果的有效性基于两个主要前提：a) 进行试验的两组参照物在受试前情况应该是相同的；b) 试验过程中除了 A 因素外，其他条件和情况没有发生变化。
- 2) 缺乏比较的错误：本题的主要论据就是一个试验，而这个试验本身从科学角度来讲是非常不严密的。要验证薰衣草是否真的对治疗失眠有效，最科学的办法是做一个对比试验，取两组病情相似的失眠人群，让其中一组人睡在有薰衣草花香的枕头上，另一组人睡普通枕头，一段时间后再去对比两组人的睡眠状况，这样才能比较可信地确定薰衣草对失眠的作用；原文作者并没有做这样的对比，因而其试验并不具有说服力，此是其一；第二，即使作者的试验方法和步骤是可行的，他也没有提供给我们失眠者参加试验之前的初始睡眠情况，因而我们无从判断试验结果的意义，这就是上文论证的第二点；第三，作者也没有提供证据保证在试验中除了薰衣草和安眠药以外，其他影响睡眠的因素都保持不变，这是上文论证的第五点，这一点在别的题目中也会遇到，我们可以借鉴本文攻击这一问题的语言：The experiment's results are reliable only if all other factors that might affect ... remained constant during the experiment, and if the number of experimental subjects is statistically significant. 来描述对比试验所必需的这一前提。

**【论证展开】**

- 攻击词汇定义的方式：有时作者对某一关键词汇定义不清，或根本没有定义，从而导致偷换概念的错误。这时我们可以参考本文攻击第一点所用的论证结构：先用 A threshold problem involves the definition of A, the speaker fails to define this critical term. 这样的句型指出作者对 A 概念的定义不清；然后用 If A is defined as ..., then ... is irrelevant to whether ... 这类句式展开论证和推测，最后用 In short, without a clear definition of A it is impossible to assess the strength of the argument. 来做段落小总结。
- 攻击缺乏对比的方式：攻击作者没有提供试验前的初始状态从而缺乏对比的错误时，我们可以先用 Another fundamental problem is that the speaker omits to inform us about the test subjects' ... (initial condition) just prior to the experiment. 指出这个错误，然后用 It is impossible to conclude with any confidence that ... without any information about the initial



condition before the experiment . 之类的句型展开论述。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式: The speaker's argument reveals several critical problems with it. Together, these problems serve to undermine the speaker's argument.
- 论证段句式: 攻击关键词汇定义不清: (1) In short, without a clear definition of insomnia it is impossible to assess the strength of the argument ... (2) It is impossible to conclude with any confidence that ... (3) The experiment's results are reliable only if all other factors that might affect ... remained constant during the experiment, and if the number of experimental subjects is statistically significant. (4) Without evidence of the experiment's methodological and statistical reliability, the speaker's conclusion is unjustifiable.

## Argument 168 Vitamin D, calcium, and bone mass in older people

Typically, as people age, their bone mass decreases, making them more vulnerable to bone fractures. A recent study concludes that the most effective way to reduce the risk of fractures in later life is to take twice the recommended dose of vitamin D and calcium daily. The three-year study followed a group of French women in their eighties who were nursing-home residents. The women were given daily supplements of twice the recommended dose of vitamin D and calcium. In addition, the women participated in a light weightlifting program. After three years, these women showed a much lower rate of hip fractures than is average for their age.

【参考译文】通常当人们衰老的时候, 他们的骨质减少, 使他们容易骨折。最近一项研究认为, 在老年减少骨折危险的最好办法就是每天加倍服用推荐用量的维生素 D 和钙。这项为期三年的研究跟踪了一组在养老院生活的 80 多岁的法国妇女。她们每天被给予两倍于推荐用量的维生素 D 和钙。而且, 这些妇女参加了轻微的举重活动。三年之后, 这些妇女髋关节骨折的发生率低于同龄人的平均水平。

**This argument concludes that elderly people should take twice the recommended dosage of vitamin D and calcium in order to minimize loss of bone mass, and therefore the risk of bone fractures. To support this conclusion the argument's proponent cites a 3-year study involving a group of French female nursing-home residents in their eighties. After three years of weight training, along with taking the indicated dosages of vitamin D and calcium, these women as a group were observed to suffer far fewer hip fractures than is average for their age. This argument suffers from several critical flaws and is therefore unconvincing.**

First and foremost, the argument assumes unfairly that the additional vitamin D and calcium, rather than the weight training, were responsible for the lower-than-average incidence of hip fractures among this group of women. It is entirely possible that the weight training, not the supplements, was responsible for preserving bone mass. Also, weight training is known to improve muscular strength, coordination, and flexibility, which in turn might reduce the likelihood of accidental falls and other injuries. Thus, the weight training could also have been responsible in this respect.

The argument also overlooks many other possible explanations for the comparatively low incidence of hip fractures among this group of women. For example, perhaps these women were more physically fit than average to begin with. Or perhaps the nursing homes where the group resided provided special

safeguards against accidental injuries that are not ordinarily available for most elderly people. Or perhaps French people are less susceptible to bone loss than other people are—due perhaps to cultural dietary habits or genetic predisposition. For that matter, perhaps women are genetically less disposed to lose bone mass than men are. Any of these scenarios, if true, would undermine the conclusion that the lower incidence of hip fractures was attributable to the additional vitamin D and calcium.

Finally, even if we accept that taking twice the recommended dosages of vitamin D and calcium significantly reduces the risk of bone fractures for older people, the argument ignores the possibility that some other dosage—perhaps three times the recommended dosage—would reduce the risk of bone fractures even more. Without ruling out this possibility, the argument's proponent cannot justifiably conclude that twice the recommended dosage provides the optimal reduction of risk.

In sum, this is a weak argument. To strengthen it, the argument's proponent must consider and eliminate all other possible explanations for the comparatively low incidence of hip fractures among this group of women. The proponent must also provide evidence that this group of women are representative of older people generally in ways that might affect the incidence of hip fractures—aside from their vitamin D and calcium intake. To better assess the argument, I would need more information about other means of preventing bone loss in older adults, and whether such other means are more or less effective than taking twice the recommended dosage of vitamin D and calcium.

#### 【参考译文】

这个论述做出了一个结论：为了最大限度地减少老人体内的骨质流失及因此而导致骨折的危险，老人应该服用双倍于一般建议的维生素 D 和钙的剂量。为证实这个结论，该论点的支持者引用了一个针对一群住在疗养院里的 80 多岁的法国女性做的为期三年的研究。经过三年的举重锻炼并服用上面所说剂量的维生素 D 和钙后，据观察发现，这群妇女患髋骨骨折的几率比她们的同龄人要少。这个论点存在着几处缺陷，因此不能使人信服。

首先，论证不合理地假设造成这群妇女比同龄人患髋骨骨折几率小的原因是那些额外的维生素 D 和钙，而不是举重锻炼。其实完全有可能是举重锻炼而不是那些增补剂起了保持骨质含量的作用。此外，众所周知，举重锻炼可以加强肌肉力量，提高协调性和灵活性，这些反过来可以降低意外跌倒和其他创伤的可能性。因此，举重锻炼也可以在这方面做出解释。

这个论证还忽视了许多其他可能可以用来解释这群妇女患髋骨骨折的几率比较小的原因。例如，也许一开始这些妇女的身体就比她们的同龄人要结实。或者也许这群人所住的疗养院提供了特殊保障以防意外受伤，而大多数老人通常是得不到这种特殊待遇的。又或者可能因为饮食文化习惯或遗传体质的不同，法国人不像其他人那么容易患骨质流失。同理，也有可能妇女本身就比较男人不容易患骨质流失。如果以上任何假设成立的话，将削弱那个结论，即髋骨骨折几率的降低归功于添加的维生素 D 和钙。

最后，即使我们同意加倍服用建议剂量的维生素 D 和钙对降低老人骨折的危险效果显著，本文忽视了这样一种可能，即某些其他剂量——或许三倍于一般建议服用的剂量——更能降低骨折的危险。没有排除这种可能性，论点的支持者就不能无可非议地断定加倍服用一般建议的剂量能达到降低危险的最佳效果。

总之，这是一个没有力度的论证。为了加强其效力，论点的支持者必须考虑到所有其他可能解释这群妇女患骨折的几率相对较低的因素，并对它们进行排除。支持者还必须提供证据证明，除了她们服用维生素 D 和钙的剂量以外，在可能影响髋骨骨折发病率的其他方面，这群妇女可以代表一般的老年人。为了更好地评价这个论证，我需要了解更多其他可以防止老年人骨质流失

的方法的信息, 以及这些其他的方法和加倍服用一般建议的维生素 D 和钙的剂量相比效果如何。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷:

1. 试验结果未必说明是 Vd 和钙导致骨折发生率的减少, 也有可能是举重活动产生了效果。
2. 作者没有考虑试验对象在其他方面诸如饮食、体质、基因等的差异。
3. 作者没有考虑除了文中所推荐的治疗方案以外的其他可能更有效减少骨折的方法。

● 逻辑思路提示: 本文所依据的论据又是一个典型的对比试验, 试验者通过让一组法国妇女服用大剂量的 Vd 和钙来验证这种方法是否能预防骨折。如上一题所述, 这一试验结果的有效性基于两条前提:

- 1) 试验的对比参照物初始状态相同, 或没有其他差别, 也就是这些法国妇女在参加试验前的身体状况应该和一般人群没有显著差异, 但很明显这一前提不一定能保证, 比如有可能这些妇女的体质本来就好于一般水平因而本来就不容易骨折, 本文论证的第二点就是从这一前提出发, 指出可能是这些妇女的基因、饮食, 以及养老院的安全措施导致骨折发生率低。
- 2) 试验过程中除了要验证的因素以外, 其他条件没有发生变化。但本文试验很明显不能保证这一前提, 因为试验对象在服用 Vd 和钙的同时, 还参加举重运动, 因而我们也无从判断到底是 Vd 和钙还是举重导致骨折减少, 这是本文论证的第一点。

本文的试验还有一个缺陷就是试验对象只有女性, 因而文中所提到的预防骨折的方法对于男性是否有效是值得怀疑的。

## Argument 172 The Mozart School of Music

The Mozart School of Music should obviously be the first choice of any music student aware of its reputation. First of all, the Mozart School stresses intensive practice and training, so that students typically begin their training at a very young age. Second, the school has ample facilities and up-to-date professional equipment, and its faculty includes some of the most distinguished music teachers in the world. Finally, many Mozart graduates have gone on to be the best known and most highly paid musicians in the nation.

【参考译文】莫扎特音乐学校显然应该是所有知道其声誉的学音乐学生的第一选择。首先, 莫扎特学校强调强化的练习和训练, 因而学生通常在很小的时候就开始接受训练。其次, 学校拥有充足的设备和最先进的专业器具, 其员工包括一些全球最著名的音乐教师。最后, 很多莫扎特学校的毕业生已经成为全国最有名而且收入最高的音乐家。

**This argument concludes that the Mozart School should be the first choice of any music student aware of its reputation for (1) its intensive practice requirements for students of all ages; (2) its outstanding facilities, up-to-date equipment, and distinguished faculty; and (3) the accomplishments of its graduates. Although the evidence provided strongly suggests that this school would be an excellent choice for certain prospective students, the conclusion that it should be the first choice for any prospective music student is indefensible—in three respects.**

**First, the fact that the Mozart School is known for its intensive practice and training regimen for even the youngest students suggests that the school might be suitable for certain child proteges, but**

perhaps not for children for whom a more balanced education would be more prudent. For that matter, many older students with other interests and activities would no doubt find the intensity and time commitment that the Mozart program requires unfeasible or undesirable.

Secondly, in all likelihood the outstanding facilities, equipment, and faculty come at a considerable price to students—in the form of high tuition. Thus, the argument seems to assume that for all prospective music students money is no object when it comes to musical training. Yet common sense informs me that many students would place a higher priority on affordable training than on the specific features that the argument touts.

Thirdly, although the fact that many famous performers and highly-paid performers are among the school's graduates might be relevant to students with the requisite natural talent and motivation to attain these lofty goals, for others this feature would not be relevant. For example, some prospective students would no doubt wish to focus their study on musicology, theory, composition, or even performance—not to become famous or highly-paid performers but rather to prepare for careers in music education. Other prospective students might not aspire to make music their eventual vocation at all. Thus, some other school—one with a less rigorous performance-oriented approach—might be a better choice for less-gifted students and for those with other aspirations.

In sum, the Mozart School's features do not justify the argument's sweeping conclusion that the school should be the first choice for every music student. To strengthen the argument, its proponent must show at the very least that the school would be affordable to any prospective student. To better assess the argument I would need more information about what non-performance music programs the school offers, and whether Mozart students of various ages have any choice in how intensely they are required to practice and train.

#### 【参考译文】

这篇论证断定莫扎特学校应该是任何知道其声誉的学音乐的学生的首选，因为：(1) 对各个年龄段的学生的强化练习的要求；(2) 先进的设备、最新式的器材和卓越的教职工；以及 (3) 毕业生的成就。虽然所提供的证据能够证明这所学校将是某些未来的学生的极佳选择，但是它将是任何未来的学音乐的学生的第一选择的结论在三个方面是站不住脚的。

首先，莫扎特学校以其强化练习和常规训练而闻名，对于最小的学生也是如此。这暗示了这所学校适于某些受保护的儿童，但是，对于一些想得到更加均衡的教育的孩子来讲，这所学校也许并不适合。而且有其他兴趣和活动的很多更年长的学生无疑将发现莫扎特课程所要求的强度和时间承诺是不现实的或不受欢迎的。

第二，很可能先进的设备、器材和教职工是一笔相当大的花费，并且以高额学费的形式平摊到了学生头上。因此，这篇论证似乎假定当涉及音乐训练时，对于所有未来的学音乐的学生来讲，金钱是不成问题的。然而常识告诉我很多学生把可承受的学费放在首位，而不是论证所吹捧的具体的特征。

第三，虽然很多著名表演者和高额收入的表演者是这个学校的毕业生这一事实可能对于一些学生来说是有重要意义的，这些学生具备必不可少的自然禀赋和取得极高目标的动机，但对于其他人来讲这个事实并没有意义。例如，一些未来的学生可能想把他们的研究集中于音乐学、理论、作曲，甚至是表演，他们并不希望成为著名表演者或有着高额收入的表演者，而是希望为音乐教育工作做准备。其他未来的学生可能根本就没有立志将音乐作为他们最终的职业。因此，一些其他在表演教学方面不那么严格的学校可能是那些天分低一些和那些有其他目标学生的更

好选择。

总之，莫扎特学校的这些特征没有有力支持莫扎特学校应该是每个学音乐学生的第一选择的结论。为了加强此论证，它的支持者必须至少说明学校学费对于任何未来的学生都是可承受的。为了更好地评价此论证，我需要更多的信息，包括学校提供了哪些非表演性的音乐课程，以及莫扎特学校各年龄段的学生是否可以选择他们练习和训练的强度。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 莫扎特学校在音乐方面进行强化训练的事实对于那些希望在其他学科也全面发展的学生来说并没有吸引力。
2. 学校的先进设备和师资有可能导致高昂的学费，从而使很多学生无法负担。
3. 该学校很多毕业生成为知名演奏家的事实对于那些希望成为作曲家、音乐教育家的学生来说同样没有吸引力。

- 逻辑思路提示：原题目的论证表面上看无懈可击，作者提出的论据似乎确实说明莫扎特学校是一流的音乐学校，但当我们把这些看似有力的论据和他的结论结合起来的时候就能发现其中的问题。这篇范文所攻击的三点究其根本是从题目第一句话结论的一个绝对化词汇 **any** 展开的。确实莫扎特学校可能在音乐教育方面有一些独到之处，但不能草率认为所有学生都应该选择它，因为每个学生的目标、经济状况可能不一样。本题还有一个可以攻击的点是最后一句论据，这里暗含了一个因果关系错误，即作者没有证据表明是莫扎特学校的音乐教育导致了这些知名演奏家的成功，而可能有其他因素，比如天分、机遇等造成了他们的出名。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式：Although the evidence provided strongly suggests that ..., the conclusion that ... is indefensible.
- 论证段句式：Thirdly, although the fact that ... might be relevant to ..., for others this feature would not be relevant.
- 结尾段句式：In sum, ... do not justify the argument's sweeping conclusion that ...

## Argument 173 International cover stories and magazine sales

The following is a memorandum issued by the publisher of a newsmagazine, Newsbeat, in the country of Dinn.

"Our poorest-selling magazine issues over the past three years were those that featured international news stories on their front covers. Over the same period, competing news-magazines have significantly decreased the number of cover stories that they devote to international news. Moreover, the cost of maintaining our foreign bureaus to report on international news is increasing. Therefore, we should decrease our emphasis on international news and refrain from displaying such stories on our magazine covers."

【参考译文】过去三年中，我们销量最低的几期杂志是在封面上刊登了国际新闻报道的那几期。在同一时期，与我们竞争的几种新闻刊物显著减少了与国际新闻有关的封面文章的数量。而且，我们用于维持国外报道国际新闻的费用正在增加。因此，我们应该降低对于国际新闻的强调程度，并且避免把这类消息刊登在杂志封面上。

In this memo, the publisher of the magazine *Newsbeat* claims that to maximize sales the magazine should decrease its emphasis on international news and refrain from displaying such stories on its covers. To support this conclusion the publisher points out that the magazine's poorest-selling issues during the last three years have been those with cover stories about international events, and that during this same period the number of international cover stories appearing in other news magazines has decreased. On several grounds, this evidence lends little credible support for the memo's conclusion.

First of all, the fact that the magazine's poorest-selling issues were the ones with international cover stories might be explained by a variety of factors. Perhaps international events themselves were not as interesting during those periods. If so, it might be a mistake to refrain from emphasizing international events when those events are interesting enough to stimulate sales. Or perhaps the news magazine business is seasonal, or cyclical, and those particular issues would have sold more poorly regardless of the cover story. In short, without ruling out other possible explanations for the relatively poor sales of those particular issues the publisher cannot justifiably conclude that international cover stories were the cause of the relatively poor sales.

Secondly, the memo fails to indicate whether other magazines experienced an increase or a decrease in sales by reducing their emphasis on international news. It is possible, for instance, that the other magazines experienced declining sales even for issues focusing only on domestic news. If so, then the publisher's recommendation would make little sense. On the other hand, if other magazines experienced the same correlation between cover story and sales volume, this fact would lend considerable support to the publisher's conclusion that international cover stories were responsible for poor sales.

Thirdly, the memo cites increasing costs of maintaining international news bureaus as an additional reason to de-emphasize international news. While this fact does lend support to the publisher's suggestion, the publisher overlooks the possibility that if other news magazines de-emphasize international coverage due to increasing bureau costs, *Newsbeat* might turn out to be the only magazine covering international news, which in turn might actually stimulate sales. It would be hasty to implement the publisher's suggestion without acknowledging and exploring this possible scenario.

In conclusion, the memo is unconvincing as it stands. To strengthen the argument, the publisher must show that it was the international covers of *Newsbeat*, and not some other factor, that were responsible for the relatively poor sales of issues with those covers. To better assess the publisher's recommendation that *Newsbeat* should de-emphasize international news, we would need to know what changes in sales volume other news magazines experienced by de-emphasizing international news. We would also need more information about the impact that increasing bureau costs will have on magazines presently competing with *Newsbeat* in the area of international news.

#### 【参考译文】

在这份备忘录里,《新闻采访区》杂志的出版商声称,为了使销售量最大化,杂志应该降低对国际新闻的重视度,并且避免在封面上刊登此类报道。为了支持这个结论,出版商指出在过去三年期间,杂志销售额最低的几期是那些以国际事件为封面的几期,在同一时期里,其他新闻杂志里出现国际封面报道的数量已经减少。由于以下几个理由,此证据给予备忘录结论的支持缺乏可信度。

首先, 杂志销售额最低的几期是以国际事件为封面的那几期这个事实可以由多种因素解释。或许在那段时期国际事件本身就不是那么有趣。如果是这样的话, 当那些事件变得有趣并足以刺激销售时, 不关注国际事件可能是一个错误。或者也许新闻杂志的销售是季节性的, 或是周期性的, 并且不管封面报道如何, 那特别的几期可能更不好出售。简而言之, 如果没有排除对这特别的几期销售额相对较低的其他可能的解释, 出版商不能无可辩驳地断定国际性的封面报道是导致销售额相对较低的原因。

第二, 备忘录没能指出其他杂志是否通过降低对国际新闻的关注度, 使得销售额增多或减少。例如, 很可能其他杂志仅仅关注国内新闻的那几期的销售额也下降了。如果是这样的话, 那么出版商的建议就没有多大的意义了。另一方面, 如果其他杂志的封面报道和销售量之间也有同样的相互关系, 这个事实将给予出版商的结论相当大的支持, 即国际性封面报道是低销售额的起因。

第三, 备忘录把维持国外部所需的逐渐增长的开销作为减少对国际新闻的关注度的另外一个原因。这个事实确实一定程度上支持出版商的建议, 但出版商忽视了一个可能性, 即如果其他新闻杂志由于办公费的增加而减少国际报道范围, 《新闻采访区》可能最终是报道国际新闻的惟一的一份杂志, 这反过来实际上可能刺激销路。如果没有考虑和研究这种可能的情况, 执行出版商的建议将是草率的。

总之, 就目前情况看, 备忘录不能令人信服。为了加强此论证, 出版商必须说明是由于新闻独家报道的国际封面, 而非其他一些因素, 使得有着这些封面的那几期杂志销售额相对较低。为了更好地评价出版商关于《新闻采访区》应降低对国际新闻的关注度的建议, 我们需要知道其他新闻杂志降低对国际新闻的关注度后销售额有何变化。我们也需要更多的信息, 了解逐渐增长的办公费用对目前在国际新闻领域与《新闻采访区》相竞争的其他杂志的影响。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷:

1. 文中所提到的杂志销量下降有可能是其他方面原因导致的, 而并非因为在封面刊登了国际新闻(把同时性混淆为因果性的错误)。
2. 作者没有指出那些减少了以国际新闻为封面的杂志销量的变化(缺乏比较的错误)。
3. 作者没有考虑到保留国际新闻可能带来的好处。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式: On several grounds, this evidence lends little credible support for the memo's conclusion.
- 论证段句式: (1) If so, then the publisher's recommendation would make little sense. (2) While this fact does lend support to the publisher's suggestion, the publisher overlooks the possibility that ... (3) It would be hasty to implement the publisher's suggestion without acknowledging and exploring this possible scenario.

## Argument 174 Should Grove College adopt a coeducational policy?

The following recommendation was made by the president and administrative staff of Grove College, a private institution, to the college's governing committee.

"We recommend that Grove College preserve its century-old tradition of all-female education rather than admit men into its programs. It is true that a majority of faculty members voted in favor of coeducation, arguing that it would encourage more students to apply to Grove. But eighty percent of

the students responding to a survey conducted by the student government wanted the school to remain all female, and over half of the alumni who answered a separate survey also opposed coeducation. Keeping the college all-female, therefore, will improve morale among students and convince alumni to keep supporting the college financially."

【参考译文】我们建议格罗夫学院保留其已有百年历史的女校传统，而不是允许录取男性。确实有大部分教职工投票赞成男女同校，认为这会使更多的学生申请格罗夫。但由学生自治会所组织的一次调查中，有80%给予反馈的学生要求学校维持女校形式，并且在回应了一次单独调查的校友中超过一半的人也反对男女同校。因此，维持女校形式将促进学生的精神状态，并且让校友继续对学院进行财政资助。

In this memo, Grove College's administration recommends preserving its tradition of admitting only female students. The administration admits that most faculty members are in favor of a co-educational policy as a means of encouraging more students to apply to Grove. But the administration defends its recommendation by citing a student government survey in which 80% of student respondents and more than 50% of alumni respondents reported that they favor the status quo. The administration reasons that preserving the status quo would improve student morale and help ensure continued alumni donations to Grove. This argument is flawed in several critical respects.

First, the memo provides no evidence that the results of either of the two surveys are statistically reliable. For example, suppose newer students tend to be content with the all-female policy while students who have attended Grove for a longer time would prefer a co-educational policy. If a disproportionate number of the survey's respondents were newer students, then the survey results would distort the student body's opinion as a group. With respect to the alumni survey, perhaps fewer alumni who donate substantial sums to Grove responded to the survey than other alumni did. If so, then the survey results would distort the comparison between the total amount of future donations under the two scenarios. Besides, the memo provides no information about what percentage of Grove's students and alumni responded to the surveys; the lower the percentages, the less reliable the results of the surveys.

Secondly, the administration hastily assumes that Grove's alumni as a group would be less inclined to donate money merely if Grove begins admitting male students. This aspect of Grove's admission policy is only one of many factors that might affect alumni donations. For example, since Grove's faculty are generally in favor of changing the policy, perhaps the change would improve faculty morale and therefore the quality of instruction, in turn having a positive impact on alumni donations. And, if the particular alumni who are in a position to make the largest contributions recognize faculty morale as important, an increase in donations by these individuals might very well offset a decline in smaller donations by other alumni.

Finally, the administration's argument that student morale would improve under the status quo is logically unsound in two respects. First, the administration provides no reason why morale would improve, as opposed to remaining at its current level, if the status quo is simply maintained. Second, the administration cannot logically determine how the morale of the student body would be affected under a co-educational policy until it implements that policy and takes into account the morale of the new male students along with that of all female students.

In sum, the administration has failed to convince me that maintaining Grove's all-female policy



would be more likely to improve student morale and help ensure continued alumni donations than moving to a co-educational policy. **To better assess the argument I would need detailed information about the two surveys to determine whether the respondents as groups were representative of their respective populations. To bolster its recommendation the administration must provide better evidence—**perhaps by way of a reliable alumni survey that takes into account respondents' financial status and history of donations—**that prospective donor alumni would be strongly opposed to a co-educational policy and would be less inclined to donate money were Grove to implement such a policy.**

### 【参考译文】

在这篇备忘录里，格罗夫学院的管理部门建议保留只接纳女学生的传统。管理部门承认大多数教职工赞成把男女同校的政策作为鼓励更多的学生申请格罗夫的方法。但是管理部门通过引用学生自治会的调查为它的建议辩护，该调查表明 80% 做出回答的学生和超过 50% 做出回答的校友表示他们喜欢维持现状。管理部门推论道，保留现状可以提高学生的士气，并且有助于保证校友对格罗夫进行源源不断的捐款。这篇论证在以下几个关键的方面有缺陷。

首先，备忘录没有提供证据证明这两次调查的结果根据统计是可靠的。例如，假定新学生倾向于满足纯女子学校的政策，而已入学很久的学生更喜欢男女同校的政策。如果调查的回答者中新生的比例较多，那么调查结果将可能歪曲学生作为一个整体的意见。对于文中提到的校友调查，或许比起其他校友，给格罗夫大量捐款的校友中对此调查做出反应的人要少一些。如果是这样的话，调查结果将会使这两种情况下捐款总量之间的比较不符合现实。而且，备忘录没有提供关于回答调查的格罗夫的学生和校友的百分比的信息；百分比越低，调查的结果就越不可靠。

第二，管理部门轻率地假定要是格罗夫开始招收男学生，格罗夫的校友作为一个整体将不太倾向于对其捐款。格罗夫的招生政策只是可以影响校友捐款的很多因素之一。例如，也许因为格罗夫的教员大多数赞成改变政策，这一变化将提高教员的士气，并且教育质量因此得以提高，转而对校友捐款产生积极的影响。并且，如果某些能提供最多捐款的校友认为教员的士气很重要，那么这些个人捐款的增加就可能弥补其他校友的小笔捐款的减少。

最后，管理部门关于维持现状学生的士气将提高的论点在以下两方面在逻辑上没有根据。首先，管理部门没有提供论据说明如果仅仅保持现状的话，为什么士气将会提高，而不是维持现有水平。第二，管理部门在贯彻那个政策并且连同新入校男生的士气一起考虑之前，不能合乎逻辑地确定学生整体的士气将会受到怎样的影响。

总之，管理部门没能使我确信与实行男女同校的政策相比较，保留格罗夫学院的纯女子学校的政策将可能提高学生的士气，并且有助于保证校友继续捐款。为了更好地评价这篇论证，我需要关于这两次调查的详细信息，以确定那些回答者作为整体是否能代表他们各自的群体。为了支持这篇论证，管理部门应当提供更好的证据——也许通过可靠的考虑了回答者的经济状况和捐赠历史的校友调查——来证明那些有望捐款的校友将强烈反对男女同校政策，并且当格罗夫学院贯彻此项政策时，更加不愿捐款。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 文中提到的两次调查的代表性值得怀疑。
2. Grove 的校友不一定会仅仅因为男女同校这一政策变化而减少资助。
3. 作者没有提出证据说明维持现有状态将会促进学生的精神状态。

● 逻辑思路提示：本题的论据中出现了两个调查，但这两个调查的样本都有疑问：首先，

在第一个调查中作者并没有指出被访学生的范围,因而他们的观点未必有代表性;其次,在第二个调查中又出现了调查对象的经典质疑:完全有可能是那些反对同校政策的校友更愿意回答问卷,因而其结果仍不一定具有代表性,另外,作者也没有调查那些反对同校政策的校友所提供的财政资助的数额,或者那些提供资助较多的校友对于同校政策的态度,因而同校政策会影响资助的看法是站不住脚的。本文还有一个可以攻击的错误是没有全面理性衡量一个行为措施的正负得失,即没有考虑男女同校所可能带来的好处,比如使学生更加活跃,在各方面能够更全面地发展等。

### 【论证展开】

攻击调查样本代表性的方式:在攻击样本数量不一定足够,调查结果不一定有代表性的时候,我们可以使用本文的论证语言:先用 **First, the memo provides no evidence that the results of either of the two surveys are statistically reliable** 指出样本的缺陷,然后用 **the memo provides no information about what percentage of ... responded to the surveys; the lower the percentages, the less reliable the results of the surveys** 指出作者没有告诉我们样本是否有覆盖面、代表性和随机性,接着可以用推测法展开。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式: **the administration defends its recommendation by citing ...**
- 论证段句式: (1) **First, the memo provides no evidence that the results of either of the two surveys are statistically reliable.** (2) **Besides, the memo provides no information about what percentage of ... responded to the surveys; the lower the percentages, the less reliable the results of the surveys.** (3) **... is only one of many factors that might affect ...**

## Argument 176 The health benefits of Venadial

The following is a memorandum from the sales director to the president of the Healthy-and-Good food company.

"A recent study indicates that Venadial, a new margarine currently produced only in the country of Alta, actually reduces cholesterol levels. Derived from the resin of pine trees, Venadial works by activating a metabolic response that is not yet well understood. However, cholesterol levels fell ten to fifteen percent among participants in the study who consumed Venadial daily, and the risk of heart attack by one-third. In addition, the new margarine is so popular that stores in Alta are unable to keep it on their shelves. Therefore, if our company obtains the exclusive right to sell Venadial internationally, our profits are sure to increase substantially within a very short time."

【参考译文】最近一次研究表明,当前仅在阿尔塔生产的新的人造黄油维纳戴尔实际可以降低胆固醇指标。维纳戴尔从松树树脂中提炼而来,它通过激活一种现在还未完全明确的代谢反应发生作用。然而,在那些每天食用维纳戴尔的研究对象中,胆固醇指标下降了10~15%,心脏病发病率下降了三分之一。而且,这种新的人造黄油非常受欢迎,以至于在阿尔塔的商店中往往一抢而光。因此,如果本公司取得维纳戴尔的全球独家代理权,我们的利润肯定能够在很短的时间内显著增长。

In this memo, the sales director of Healthy-and-Good food company recommends obtaining the exclusive right to sell the new margarine Venadial internationally in order to increase company profits substantially and quickly. To support this recommendation the director points out that, in a recent

study, participants who consumed Venadial daily experienced a decrease in their cholesterol level and in their risk of heart attack. **The director also points out that** in Alta, the only country where Venadial is currently produced, this margarine is extremely popular among consumers. **This argument contains several critical flaws, which render it unpersuasive.**

**First of all, the memo lacks sufficient information about how the study was conducted to determine what conclusions, if any, can be drawn from it.** Unless all other conditions potentially affecting cholesterol level and heart-attack risk remained constant during the study, and unless the study included a statistically significant number of participants, **any conclusions from the study are simply unreliable.** **Moreover, the memo fails to indicate** whether the study also included a distinct group of participants who did not consume Venadial daily. **If it did, then the comparison of cholesterol levels and heart attacks between the two groups would help us to assess the strength of the memo's claims about the health benefits of Venadial.**

**Secondly, the memo unfairly assumes that** since Venadial is popular in Alta it will also be popular in other countries. Consumer tastes in foods like margarine, as well as concerns about health matters such as cholesterol level, vary widely from country to country. **It is quite possible that** consumers in Alta enjoy the taste of Venadial more than other consumers would, or that consumers in Alta are more concerned than the average person about cholesterol level and heart attacks. **Since the memo provides no evidence that** tastes and health concerns of Alta consumers are representative of those of people generally, **the sales director's conclusion that** Venadial will be popular elsewhere **is unjustifiable,** at least based on the memo.

**Thirdly, even if** Venadial is shown conclusively to carry the touted health benefits and to be popular worldwide, Healthy-and-Good will not necessarily earn a substantial profit by acquiring international rights to sell Venadial. **The memo provides no information about** the costs involved in manufacturing and distributing Venadial—only that it is derived from pine-tree resin and has been produced only in Alta. **Perhaps** Venadial can be derived only from certain pine trees located in Alta and surrounding regions. **If so,** then the costs of procuring Venadial might prevent the company from earning a profit. **In short, without more information about supply, demand, and production costs, it is impossible to determine whether the company can earn a profit from acquiring international rights to sell Venadial.**

**In sum, the memo's recommendation is not well supported. Before I can accept it, the sales director must supply clearer evidence that** (1) Venadial contributes to lower cholesterol level and decreased heart-attack risk, (2) consumers outside of Alta would prefer Venadial over alternative products, and (3) the revenue from sales of Venadial would significantly outweigh the costs of producing and distributing the product.

### 【参考译文】

在这个备忘录里,康好食品公司(Healthy-and-Good food company)的销售主管建议公司购买新产品维纳戴尔(Venadial)人造黄油在国际市场上的专销权,这样可以显著并迅速地增加公司的利润。为了支持这个建议,主管指出,一项新近的研究发现,参与该研究的每天都食用维纳戴尔的人的胆固醇含量减少了,心脏病发作的几率也降低了。这个主管还指出,在阿尔塔这个目前惟一一个生产维纳戴尔的国家里,这种人造黄油在消费者中极其受欢迎。这个论证包含几处严重错误,导致它没有说服力。

首先,这个备忘录缺乏足够的关于那个研究是怎么进行的信息,以确定可以从中总结出什

么结论，如果有的话。除非所有其他可能影响胆固醇含量和心脏病发作危险的潜在条件在研究进行期间都保持不变，并且该研究包括有统计学意义的参加者的数量，否则根据这个研究得出的任何结论都是不可靠的。而且，备忘录也没有表明该研究是否也包括另外一组人，这些人没有每天食用维纳戴尔。如果有的话，那么在两个组中进行胆固醇含量和心脏病发作危险的比较，将有助于我们确定备忘录的关于维纳戴尔对健康的好处的断言的说服力。

第二，这个备忘录还想当然地认为，维纳戴尔既然在阿尔塔受欢迎，那么它在其他国家也将受欢迎。消费者对人造黄油等食物的口味，以及对胆固醇含量等健康问题的关注度，都会因国家不同而有很大的差异。有可能阿尔塔的消费者比其他国家的消费者要喜欢维纳戴尔的味道，或者阿尔塔的消费者比普通人要关心胆固醇含量和心脏病发作危险。因为这个备忘录没有提供任何证据证明阿尔塔的消费者的口味及对健康的关心度可以代表普通人，所以该销售主管所做的关于维纳戴尔在别的地方也会受欢迎的结论就是不合理的，至少根据这个备忘录上的东西做出这个结论是不合理的。

第三，即使事实最终证明维纳戴尔确实如销售主管所说对健康有好处，并且确实在世界范围内广受欢迎，康好食品公司就算得到了维纳戴尔在国际市场上的专销权，也不一定就可以赚到相当可观的利润。这个备忘录没有提供有关生产和配送维纳戴尔所需成本的信息——仅提到这种人造黄油来源于松树的树脂，并且只在阿尔塔生产。或许维纳戴尔只能从位于阿尔塔和周边地区的某种松树中提取。这样的话，为获得维纳戴尔而支出的费用可能会妨碍公司挣得利润。简而言之，如果没有更多有关产品的供应、需求以及生产成本的信息，那么就不可能确定该公司获得维纳戴尔在国际市场上的专销权后是否能够赢利。

总之，该主管没有很好地运用证据支持这个备忘录里写的建议。要使我接受它，这个销售主管必须提供如下更加详实的证据：(1) 维纳戴尔有助于降低胆固醇含量以及减少心脏病发作危险；(2) 与其他同类产品相比，阿尔塔之外的其他国家的消费者会更喜欢维纳戴尔；(3) 销售维纳戴尔的收入会明显地多于生产和配送这种产品的费用。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 作者没有告诉我们文中提到的调查的具体过程，因而其结果是否有效值得怀疑；另外作者也没有把食用维纳戴尔和不食用的人群做相应的比较来确定吃这种黄油和降低发病率之间的关系。

2. 由于口味和对健康的关注点不同，维纳戴尔在阿尔塔受欢迎未必保证它在其他地方也有很大销量。

3. 作者没有考虑维纳戴尔的生产和分销成本，过高的成本可能导致公司无利可图。

#### ● 逻辑思路提示：

本文作者所攻击的是三个最经典、最常见的 Argument 论证点：

1) 调查的过程与样本代表性问题，以及在建立两事物间因果联系时缺乏相应的对比的错误。

2) 以特殊推一般，以局部推整体的差异范围的草率推广。

3) 没有全面衡量某措施的正负得失，没有比较成本与收益。

### 【论证展开】

论证作者没有全面衡量投入与产出的语言。我们可以参照本文攻击第三点的语言来论述其他题目中出现的类似问题：首先用 *A will not necessarily earn a substantial profit by ...* 的句型指出作者所说的措施未必为 A 带来巨额利润，然后用 *The memo provides no information about the costs*

involved in ...来引导具体分析, 用推测和列举法指出该措施可能需要那些额外成本, 接着指出 If so, then the costs of ... might prevent the company from earning a profit. 最后用 In short, without more information about supply, demand, and production costs, it is impossible to determine whether the company can earn a profit from ...来作为段落小总结。

**【语言提示】**

- 论证段句式: (1) First of all, the memo lacks sufficient information about how the study was conducted to determine what conclusions, if any, can be drawn from it. (2) Unless all other conditions potentially affecting ... remained constant during the study, and unless the study included a statistically significant number of participants, any conclusions from the study are simply unreliable. (3) If it did, then the comparison of ... would help us to assess the strength of the memo's claims about ... (4) In short, without more information about supply, demand, and production costs, it is impossible to determine whether the company can earn a profit from ...
- 结尾段句式: Before I can accept it, the sales director must supply clearer evidence that ...

### **Argument 178 Employee compensation at National Brush Company**

The following appeared in the annual report from the president of the National Brush Company.

"In order to save money, we at the National Brush Company have decided to pay our employees for each brush they produce instead of for the time they spend producing brushes. We believe that this policy will lead to the production of more and better brushes, will allow us to reduce our staff size, and will enable the company factories to operate for fewer hours—resulting in savings on electricity and security costs. These changes will ensure that the best workers keep their jobs and that the company will earn a profit in the coming year."

**【参考译文】**为节省开支, 我们国家刷子公司决定不再按员工生产刷子的工时支付工资, 而是按他们生产刷子的数量来支付。我们相信这一政策将会导致刷子产量和质量提高, 将会减少我们的员工数量, 并将会使工厂能够减少运营时间从而导致电费和保安费用的节省。这些改革将保证那些最好的工人留在这里工作, 公司将会在来年有赢利。

**In this report, the president of National Brush Company (NBC) concludes that** the best way to ensure that NBC will earn a profit next year is for the company to pay its workers according to the number of brushes they produce—rather than hourly. **To support this conclusion, the president claims that** the new policy will result in the production of more and better brushes, which in turn will allow NBC to reduce its staff size and operating hours, thereby cutting expenses. **This argument is fraught with dubious assumptions, which render it entirely unconvincing.**

**First of all, the argument relies on the unsubstantiated assumption that** the new policy will motivate workers to produce brushes more quickly. Whether this is the case will depend, of course, on the amount earned per brush and the rate at which workers can produce brushes. It will also depend on the extent to which NBC workers are content with their current income level. **Lacking evidence that** the new policy would result in the production of more brushes, **the president cannot convince me that** this policy would be an effective means to ensure a profit for NBC in the coming year.

**Even if** the new policy does motivate NBC workers to produce more brushes, **the president's ar-**

gument depends on the additional assumption that producing brushes more quickly can be accomplished without sacrificing quality. In fact, the president goes further by predicting an increase in quality. Yet, common sense informs me that, if the production process otherwise remains the same, quicker production is likely to reduce quality—and in any event certainly not increase it. And a decline in quality might serve to diminish the value of NBC's brushes in the marketplace. Thus, the ultimate result of the new policy might be to reduce NBC's revenue and, in turn, profits.

Even assuming that as the result of the new policy NBC's current workforce produces more brushes without sacrificing quality, reducing the size of the workforce and the number of operating hours would serve to offset those production gains. Admittedly, by keeping the most efficient employees NBC would minimize the extent of this offset. Nevertheless, the president provides no evidence that the result would be a net gain in production. Without any such evidence the president's argument that the new policy will help ensure profitability is highly suspect.

In sum, the president has failed to provide adequate evidence to support his claim that the new policy would serve to ensure a profit for NBC in the coming year. To strengthen the argument, NBC should conduct a survey or other study to demonstrate not only its workers' willingness to work more quickly but also their ability to maintain quality at a quicker pace. To better assess the argument I would need detailed financial projections comparing current payroll and other operating costs with projected costs under the new policy—in order to determine whether NBC is likely to be more profitable under the proposed scheme.

#### 【参考译文】

在这份报告里，国家刷子公司（NBC）的总裁断定要保证公司明年将赢利的最好方法就是改变支付公司工人的标准，即把原来以工作小时为标准变为根据他们所生产的刷子的数量为标准。为了支持这个结论，总裁声称这个新政策将导致刷子的产量增多、质量提高，而这反过来也将使国家刷子公司（NBC）能够裁减员工、减少工作时间，并因此削减支出。这个论证充满了可疑假定，致使它完全不能使人信服。

首先，这个论证依赖于一个无确实根据的假定，即新政策将激励工人更迅速地生产刷子。事实是否如此当然取决于从每把刷子上可挣得多少钱，以及工人生产刷子的效率；还将取决于国家刷子公司（NBC）的工人对他们目前的收入水平的满意度。在缺乏证据证实新政策会导致刷子产量增多的情况下，这位总裁不能让我相信这个政策是保证国家刷子公司（NBC）来年赢利的一个有效的方法。

即使新政策确实可以激励国家刷子公司（NBC）的工人生产更多的刷子，这位总裁的论证还依据另一个假定，即达到更加迅速地生产刷子的目标的同时不会以牺牲质量为代价。实际上，这位总裁进一步预测刷子质量会提高。然而，常识告诉我，如果生产程序等其他因素保持不变的话，那么加快生产速度就很可能降低质量——总之无论如何是不会提高质量的。而质量下降可能致使国家刷子公司（NBC）的刷子的市场价值削减。因此，这个新政策的最终结果可能就是降低国家刷子公司（NBC）的收入，进而减少利润。

即使假设新政策的结果是导致国家刷子公司（NBC）现有的劳动力在没有牺牲质量的同时生产了更多的刷子，但是削减劳动力数量和减少工作小时则将抵消那些生产所得。不可否认，国家刷子公司（NBC）通过保留生产效率最高的雇员就可以使这种抵消的程度减到最小。虽然如此，那位总裁也并没有提供任何证据证明结果将是生产的净增长。如果没有任何这种证据，那么该总裁所做的关于新政策将保证获得利润的论证就非常值得怀疑。

总之，这位总裁未能提供足够的证据来支持他的断言，即新政策可以保证国家刷子公司（NBC）来年会赢利。为了加强论证的力度，国家刷子公司（NBC）应该进行一次调查来证明公司的工人不仅愿意提高工作速度，而且也具备在提高速度的同时保证质量的能力。为了更好地评价这个论证，我需要一份详细的财务预算，比较现在的薪水总额和其他运营成本以及在新政策实施后的预测成本——以确定国家刷子公司（NBC）在实行该总裁提议的方案后赢利是否可能更多。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 新的政策未必带来更大的产量。
2. 单个工人产量的增加往往伴随着质量的下降，从而导致 NBC 利润的下降。
3. 减少员工人数和工作时间的措施尽管能够节约成本，但也同时导致总产量以及利润的下降，与所节约的成本相抵消。

● 思路提示：本文攻击的第一点的论述实际上并不很具有说服力，一般来说如果采取计件付酬的形式肯定会导致产量的增加，无论员工以前的收入情况如何以及单件工资是多少。但这样做一般会带来质量的下降，在论证时可以把重点放在这一问题上。

本文另一可以攻击的缺陷是在最后一句话，作者认为这种措施能使最好的工人留下而淘汰能力差一些的，但这是没有根据的。如果作者对于好员工的定义是产量高的员工的话，这一结论还可以成立，但显然我们不能仅仅考虑产量，还需要考虑产品的质量等因素。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式：This argument is fraught with dubious assumptions, which render it entirely unconvincing.
- 论证段句式：(1) In fact, the president goes further by predicting ... (2) Without any such evidence the president's argument that ... is highly suspect.
- 结尾段句式：(1) In sum, the president has failed to provide adequate evidence to support his claim that ... (2) To strengthen the argument, NBC should conduct a survey or other study to demonstrate ...

## Argument 181 Sleep and academic performance

From a letter to the editor of a city newspaper.

"One recent research study has indicated that many adolescents need more sleep than they are getting, and another study has shown that many high school students in our city are actually dissatisfied with their own academic performance. As a way of combating these problems, the high schools in our city should begin classes at 8:30 A.M. instead of 7:30 A.M., and end the school day an hour later. This arrangement will give students an extra hour of sleep in the morning, thereby making them more alert and more productive. Consequently, the students will perform better on tests and other assignments, and their academic skills will improve significantly."

【参考译文】最近一项研究表明，很多青少年需要更多的睡眠，另外一项研究表明，我们市很多中学生对于自己的学习成绩不满意。作为解决这些问题的途径，我市的中学应该在早上 8:30 开始上课，而不是 7:30，并且推迟一小时放学。这种安排将允许学生在早上多睡一个小时，从而使他们更加清醒和高效。因此，学生在测验和其他作业中将表现得更好，他们的学习能力将会显

著提高。

**This letter concludes that** the academic performance of local high school students would improve if the daily school schedule were to begin and end one hour later. **To support this recommendation the letter's author cites** two studies, one showing that adolescents generally do not get enough sleep, the other showing that many local high school students are dissatisfied with their academic performance. **The recommendation relies on a series of unsubstantiated assumptions about** the habits of high school students and about the studies themselves. **As a result, the letter is not convincing.**

**First of all, the letter's recommendation depends on the doubtful assumption that** by beginning classes one hour later students will sleep one hour longer each night. **Experience tells us, however, that this will not necessarily be the case.** Just as likely, students will adjust to the new schedule by falling asleep one hour later. **Moreover,** by staying up one hour later at night students might very well engage in the sort of late-night social or even delinquent activities that would disrupt their productivity at school.

**Secondly, the letter's conclusion relies on the assumption that** one additional hour of sleep would in fact result in improved academic performance. **While this might be the case, the letter provides no evidence to substantiate this assumption.** It is entirely possible that one hour of additional sleep would not suffice. **Moreover, the letter provides no evidence that** the students who are dissatisfied with their academic performance are also the ones who would benefit from the new schedule. **It is entirely possible that** these particular students already sleep longer than most other students, or that their academic performance is already optimal. **Conversely, it is entirely possible that** those students whose academic performance could stand the greatest improvement would be unmotivated to become better students regardless of how much they sleep each night.

**A final problem with the argument involves** the two studies themselves. **The letter provides no information about** how either study was conducted. **Without knowing whether the sample of** adolescents studied **was representative of the overall high school population** in the city, **it is impossible to confidently apply the studies' results to that population.** **Moreover,** we are not informed about the size of the sample in either study; the smaller the sample, the less reliable the study's conclusion.

**In conclusion, this letter's recommendation** for beginning and ending the high school day one hour later **is not well justified.** **To strengthen the argument, the author must provide clear evidence that** adjusting the schedule will in fact result in the students' sleeping longer each night, and that this additional sleep will in fact improve their academic performance. **To better assess the author's recommendation, we would need more information about** the sampling method used in the two studies.

#### 【参考译文】

这封信断定如果学校每日的时间表整个往后推移一个小时的话,那么当地中学生的学习成绩将提高。为了支持这个建议,这封信的作者引用了两项研究,一项研究显示青少年普遍睡眠不足,另一项研究显示很多当地中学生都对他们的学习成绩感到不满。这个建议依赖于一系列有关中学生的习惯和这两项研究本身的无确实根据的假定。因此,这封信不能令人信服。

首先,这封信的建议依据这么一个值得怀疑的假定,即晚一个小时开始上课,学生每天晚上将多睡一个小时。然而,经验告诉我们,事实并不一定就是这样的。学生同样可能根据这个新的时间表调整自己的习惯,而晚一个小时睡觉。而且,晚一个小时睡觉,学生可能参与一些在夜里



进行的交际甚至是违法活动，而这些活动将妨碍他们在学校的学习效率。

第二，这封信的结论还建立在这个假设的基础上，即多睡一个小时确实将导致学习成绩的提高。虽然事实也有可能是这样的，但是这封信并没有提供任何证据来证明这个假设。多一个小时的睡眠时间完全可能还是不够。而且，这封信也没有提供证据证明那些对自己的学习成绩不满意的学生就是那些会因为这个新的时间表而受益的学生。完全有可能出现这种情况，也就是上面说到的这些学生已经比大部分其他学生的睡眠时间都要长，或者他们的学习成绩其实已经是他们的最佳成绩了。相反，对于那些学习成绩可能得到最大程度的提高的学生们，不管他们每天晚上睡多少个小时，都无法促使他们变成更好的学生。

这个论证的最后一个问题与两项研究本身有关。这封信没有提供任何有关这两项研究中的任何一项如何进行的信息。不知道参与研究的青少年是否能够代表城市里的整个中学生群体，我们就不可能自信地把这两个研究的结果应用于那个群体。而且，信里也没告诉我们两个研究中任何一个的样本规模；样本规模越小，研究结果的可信度就越小。

总之，这封信里关于把中学的时间表整个往后推移一个小时的建议没有得到很好的论证。为了加强这个论证的力度，作者必须提供坚实的证据证明调整时间表确实可以导致学生每晚的睡眠时间延长，并且延长了睡眠时间后他们的学习成绩确实会提高。为了更好地评价作者的建议，我们还需要了解更多有关这两项研究进行取样的方法的信息。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 文中提到的作息制度的改变未必保证学生有更多的睡眠，而可能使他们在晚间推迟入睡时间。
2. 增加睡眠时间未必能带来学习成绩的提高。
3. 文中提到的调查信息过于模糊，关于样本的数量和代表性都无法确认。

● 逻辑思路提示：对于本文所攻击的第二点我们也可以从因果关系的角度进行论证，即有些学生成绩不够满意未必是由于睡眠不足而导致，而是可能有其他原因。或者换句话说，作者没有直接证据能够证实延长睡眠时间对于提高学习成绩是有帮助的。

### 【论证展开】

论证调查样本代表性问题的语言：在阐述某些样本的情况不能推广到整体时，可以使用本文的 Without knowing whether the sample studied was representative of the overall group, it is impossible to confidently apply the studies' results to that population. 以及 we are not informed about the size of the sample in either study; the smaller the sample, the less reliable the study's conclusion. 这样的句型来进行描述，指出调查对象不一定有代表性，以及样本的数量不确定。

### 【语言提示】

- 开头段句式：The recommendation relies on a series of unsubstantiated assumptions about ... and as a result, the letter is not convincing.
- 论证段句式：(1) Experience tells us, however, that this will not necessarily be the case. (2) While this might be the case, the letter provides no evidence to substantiate this assumption. (3) Without knowing whether the sample studied was representative of the overall population, it is impossible to confidently apply the results to that population. (4) Moreover, we are not informed about the size of the sample in either study; the smaller the sample, the less reliable the study's conclusion.

### Argument 186 Automobile factory workers age and productivity

The following is a recommendation from the director of personnel to the president of Professional Printing Company.

“In a recent telephone survey of automobile factory workers, older employees were less likely to report that having a supervisor present increases their productivity. Among workers aged 18 to 29, 27 percent said that they are more productive in the presence of their immediate supervisor, compared to 12 percent for those aged 30 or over, and only 8 percent for those aged 50 or over. Clearly, if our printing company hires mainly older employees, we will increase productivity and save money because of the reduced need for supervisors.”

**【参考译文】**在最近一次对汽车工厂工人的电话调查中，年纪大一些的员工更少报告说有管理员在场会提高他们的生产效率。在18~29岁的员工中，27%的人说，当他们的顶头上司在场时，他们更有效率，相比之下，30岁及以上的工人只有12%，50岁及以上的工人只有8%这样认为。显然，如果我们印刷公司主要雇用年纪大一些的员工的话，我们的劳动生产率将会提高，并且将会节省开支，因为对于管理员的需求将会减少。

**In this argument, the personnel director of Professional Printing Company (PPC) recommends hiring older workers in order to increase productivity, as well as to save money by reducing costs of supervision. To support this recommendation, the director cites an auto-industry telephone survey ostensibly showing that older workers are generally less productive under close supervision than otherwise, whereas younger workers are generally more productive under close supervision than otherwise. This argument is flawed in several critical respects.**

**A threshold problem with the argument involves the statistical reliability of the survey. The director provides no evidence that the number of respondents is statistically significant or that the respondents were representative of auto workers in general. Lacking information about the randomness and size of the survey's sample, the director cannot make a convincing argument based on that survey.**

**Even if the survey's respondents are representative of the entire population of auto workers, the argument relies on the assumption that the responses themselves are reliable. Yet the director ignores the possibility that a young, inexperienced worker is less likely to be forthright about the value of supervision—for fear of retaliation by that supervisor. For that matter, younger workers might not have enough experience working without supervision to determine when they are most productive. Lacking evidence that the respondents' reports were both truthful and meaningful, the director cannot confidently draw any conclusions about worker productivity from them.**

**Even assuming that the survey data accurately reflect the auto industry, the argument unfairly assumes that supervision affects worker productivity similarly at PPC. Perhaps PPC employs certain unique equipment or processes that require close worker supervision—even for older, more experienced workers. For that matter, perhaps youth or inexperience is an advantage in working productively at PPC, whereas in the auto industry either is a disadvantage. In short, without accounting for possible differences between PPC and auto manufacturers the director cannot convince me that his recommendation for PPC is sound.**

**The argument also assumes that older people are more experienced, and thus less likely to benefit from supervision, than younger people. Although this assumption might generally be sound, it never-**

theless might not hold true for workers at PPC specifically. In other words, despite their age many younger PPC workers might be more experienced at their jobs, and therefore more productive without supervision, than many older PPC workers.

Finally, even if hiring older workers will reduce the need for supervision, the director concludes too hastily that PPC will save money as a result. It is possible that older workers command a higher wage than younger workers do. If so, these higher wages might offset production gains and payroll savings accruing from reduced supervision.

In sum, the survey's statistical reliability and its relevance to PPC is questionable. To strengthen the recommendation the director must provide clear evidence that in the printing industry, and especially at PPC, older workers are more experienced or otherwise can work more productively without supervision than younger workers. To better assess the argument, I would need a detailed cost-benefit analysis that accounts not only for gains in productivity but also for the possible impact of hiring only older workers on total payroll costs.

### 【参考译文】

在这个论述中，专业印刷公司（PPC）的人事主管建议公司聘用年龄较长的工人以提高生产率，同时可以通过减少管理费用来节约资金。为了支持这个建议，该主管引用了一个有关汽车工业的电话调查。这个调查从表面上显示，年长的工人在比较严格的监督下普遍比用不同的方式管理时生产效率要低；与此相反，年轻的工人在严格的监督下普遍比用不同的方式管理时生产效率要高。这个论述在几个关键的方面存在着缺陷。

这个论证里首先出现的问题涉及这个调查在统计意义上的可靠性。该主管没有提供任何证据证明回应者的人数达到统计学要求的足够数量，并且那些回应者能代表汽车工业的全体工人。缺乏关于这个调查的样本的随机性和规模的任何信息，该主管就无法基于那个调查做出令人信服的论证。

即使调查的回答者是整个汽车工人群体的代表，这个论证也依赖于这么一个假设，即调查的回答本身是可信的。然而该主管忽视了这个可能性，就是缺乏经验的年轻工人因生怕监督人的报复，所以在评价监督的价值时就很可能不够直截了当。同样，年轻的工人可能缺少关于在没有监督的情况下工作的足够的经验，不能确定他们在什么时候工作效率最高。在缺乏证据证实回答者的回答都是真实而有意义的情况下，该主管就不能自信地从这些回答中做出任何有关工人的生产效率的结论来。

即使假设调查数据确实准确地反映了汽车工业的状况，该论证就此认为监督对专业印刷公司（PPC）的工人生产效率也有类似的影响是不合理的。可能专业印刷公司（PPC）采用了某些要求对工人进行严格监督的独特的设备或者过程——即使对经验丰富的年长工人也是如此。同样，也有可能专业印刷公司（PPC）年轻或者缺乏经验对高效地工作都是一种优势，尽管在汽车工业里它们中的任何一个都是一种不足。简而言之，在没有说明专业印刷公司（PPC）和汽车制造厂商之间可能存在的不同之前，该主管就不能使我确信他对专业印刷公司（PPC）的建议是合理的。

该论证还认为年长的人更有经验，因此与年轻人相比，就不太可能受益于监督。虽然这种假定在一般情况下都可能是合理的，但是仍有可能偏偏不适用于专业印刷公司（PPC）的工人。换句话说，尽管他们的年龄不大，但是许多年轻的专业印刷公司（PPC）工人可能在工作上更加熟练，因此在没有监督的情况下，生产效率比许多年长的专业印刷公司（PPC）工人更高。

最后，即使雇用年长的工人将降低对监督的需要，主管断定专业印刷公司（PPC）一定会因

此而节约资金也太轻率了。可能年长的工人所索求的工资会比年轻的工人要高。如果是这样的话,那么更高的工资就可能正好抵消了增加生产所得的利润,以及因为减少监督而节省下来的薪金存款。

总之,这个调查在统计学意义上的可靠性和它与专业印刷公司(PPC)的关联性是可疑的。为了加强这个建议的说服力,该主管必须提供明确的证据证实在印刷工业领域,特别是在专业印刷公司(PPC),年长的工人经验确实更丰富,或者说在没有监督的时候比年轻的工人工作效率更高。为了更好地评价这个论证,我需要一个详细的成本效益分析,分析里不仅应该说明从生产效率上所得的利润,还应该包括只雇用年长的工人对应发的工资总额可能造成的影响。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的五处缺陷:

1. 文中所提到的调查的样本大小、代表性与随机性都没有保证,因而无法判断其对于结论的意义。
2. 年轻员工对于管理人员的作用可能的看法可能有偏差,从而导致调查结果不可信。
3. 汽车工业的情况未必能同样用于印刷出版业(错误类比的错误)。
4. 年纪大的员工一定更有经验、劳动生产率更高的假设不一定站得住脚。
5. 老员工所要求的薪酬往往也较高,因而雇用老员工未必达到作者所设想的减少成本的目的。

- 逻辑思路提示:攻击原因与攻击后果:某一事件的发生往往符合以下因果关系的联系:  
cause→FACT→result,即一件事既有其原因,又会造成一定后果。在Argument的论述中,对于作者所提出的事实、现象我们既可以攻击作者所认为的原因,也可以攻击作者基于某事实、某措施而推测预见的后果。攻击原因时即可使用我们以前提到过的用推测法、列举法列举其他可能原因的论证思路;而攻击后果时往往使用推理法、演绎法来推导出作者所没有预见到的可能后果,比如Argument 185中对于减少水压可能导致的恶果的推理,本题中对于雇用老员工对成本的影响的推理都属于这一论证方式,请大家学习使用。

### 【论证展开】

- 攻击调查样本与过程:本文攻击的第一点几乎完全用抽象的语言攻击调查,这类语言我们在前面也总结过一些,这里我们再来看看还有哪些语言形式可以使用:(1) A threshold problem with the argument involves the statistical reliability of the survey. 指出调查的可信度值得怀疑;(2) The director provides no evidence that the number of respondents is statistically significant or that the respondents were representative of ... in general. 指出作者没有提供关于样本数量和代表性的保证;(3) Lacking information about the randomness and size of the survey's sample, the director cannot make a convincing argument based on that survey. 段落小总结,指出在不知道调查样本的数量与随机性的情况下,作者的结论是不可靠的。
- 攻击调查结果真实性:有时调查对象对于调查问题的回答是否反映真实情况也是一个可以质疑的点。在本题中,年轻员工对于管理人员的作用的看法就值得怀疑,可能出于某种原因这些员工没有表达真实看法,或者他们对于自己的 productivity 的判断有偏差。我们可以用本文中的 Even if the survey's respondents are representative of the entire population of ..., the argument relies on the assumption that the responses themselves are reliable. 来指出这类错误,再用推测法指出调查对象在哪些方面的回答可能出现问题的,最后用 Lacking evidence that the respondents' reports were both truthful and meaningful, the di-

rector cannot confidently draw any conclusions about ... from them. 来做段落小总结。

- 攻击错误类比的方式：本文攻击的第三点是错误类比，它为我们攻击此类错误的语言又提出了一些参考：首先用 Even assuming that the survey data accurately reflect A, the argument unfairly assumes that the situation at A is similar at B. 指出 A 的情况未必能够用于类推 B；然后用推测法或列举法指出 A 与 B 之间的可能差异；最后用 In short, without accounting for possible differences between A and B the director cannot convince me that his recommendation for B is sound. 来做段落小总结。

#### 【语言提示】

- 论证段句式：(1) A threshold problem with the argument involves the statistical reliability of the survey. (2) The director provides no evidence that ... (3) Lacking information about ... (4) Lacking evidence that ..., the director cannot confidently draw any conclusions about ... from them. (5) Even assuming that the survey data accurately reflect ..., the argument unfairly assumes that ... (6) In short, without accounting for possible differences between ... and ... the director cannot convince me that his recommendation for ... is sound. (7) Although this assumption might generally be sound, it nevertheless might not hold true for ...
- 结尾段句式：In sum, the survey's statistical reliability and its relevance to ... is questionable.

### Argument 188 The effectiveness of pain medication

A new report suggests that men and women experience pain very differently from one another, and that doctors should consider these differences when prescribing pain medications. When researchers administered the same dosage of kappa opioids—a painkiller—to 28 men and 20 women who were having their wisdom teeth extracted, the women reported feeling much less pain than the men, and the easing of pain lasted considerably longer in women. This research suggests that kappa opioids should be prescribed for women whenever pain medication is required, whereas men should be given other kinds of pain medication. In addition, researchers should reevaluate the effects of all medications on men versus women.

【参考译文】一项新报告表明，男性和女性对于疼痛的感受是有显著差异的，医生在开止痛药方的时候应该考虑到这种差异。当研究者把相同剂量的卡帕麻醉药——一种止痛药——分发给智齿刚刚被拔除的 28 名男子和 20 名女子的时候，女性报告她们感受的痛楚要比男性小得多，而且止痛的时间更长。这一研究说明当需要止痛药时，应该给女性服用卡帕麻醉药，而应该给男性服用其他的止痛药。而且，研究人员应该重新评估所有药品对于男性以及女性的效用。

**This argument concludes that the pain medication kappa opioids (KO) should be prescribed for women but not for men. To support this conclusion the speaker cites a recent study involving 28 men and 20 women who took KO when having wisdom teeth removed; according to these patients' reports, the women felt less pain than the men, and for the women the easing of pain lasted longer. The argument is flawed in several important respects.**

One problem with the argument is that since the study involved only 48 people it is impossible to confidently draw any conclusions about the general population from it. Specifically, the argument overlooks other possible reasons why these particular women reported less pain than the men did. The

women in the study might have a higher-than-average pain threshold; conversely, the men in the study might have a lower-than-average pain threshold. **Or perhaps** this group of women are less prone to complain about pain than this group of men—due to their unusually stoical nature or their experience with painful medical procedures.

**Another problem with the argument is that it overlooks other factors that might have contributed to the amount of pain these patients experienced. Perhaps** the women's wisdom teeth were not as impacted as the men's teeth generally, so that for the women the surgery was not as invasive and painful. **Perhaps** some of the women took other medications as well to help relieve the pain. **For that matter**, some of the men might have taken certain foods or medications that counteracted the effects of KO. **In short, unless the experiment was conducted in a controlled environment in which all factors were the same for the men as for the women, it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions about the comparative effectiveness of KO for the two sexes.**

**Even if KO is more effective for women than for men, the argument's conclusion that men should take another pain medication instead is unwarranted. It is entirely possible that KO is still the most effective pain medication for men. Without** comparing the effectiveness of KO to that of other pain medications, **the speaker simply cannot justify his recommendation that men avoid KO.**

**In sum, the argument has not convinced me that men should take a medication other than KO for pain. To strengthen the argument the speaker must assure me that** the men and women in the study are representative of men and women generally—in terms of their dental profile, experience in handling pain, and willingness to recognize and report pain. **The speaker must also assure me that the study was performed in a controlled environment where all other factors possibly affecting pain remained constant. To better assess the argument I would need to know** how effective KO is compared to other medications in reducing pain for men.

### 【参考译文】

这个论证断定，医生在给病人开止痛药卡帕麻醉药（KO）时，应该只给妇女开而不应该给男人开。为了支持这个结论，发言者引用了一项最近对在拔智齿时服用了 KO 的 28 个男士和 20 个女士进行的研究；根据这些病人的报告，女士比男士所感觉到的疼痛要轻，并且止痛的时间也长。这个论证在几个重要的方面犯了错误。

这个论证中出现的一个问题是既然这个研究只涉及 48 个人，那么就不可能从中得出任何有关全体人口的可靠结论来，尤其是这个论证忽略了其他可能导致这些女士比男士感觉到疼痛要小得多的原因。这个研究中的女士可能具有比普通人要高的疼痛忍受阈限；相反，这个研究中的男士的疼痛忍受阈限比普通人要低。又或者可能比起那些男士，这群妇女更少抱怨疼痛——因为她们平常本性坚忍，或者对使人疼痛的医疗过程有经验。

这个论证的另一个问题是它忽略了其他可能影响这些病人所受痛苦的程度的因素：或许妇女的智齿所受的挤压力一般没有男人的牙齿那么重，因此对那些妇女来说手术没有那么大、那么痛。又或许这些妇女中的某些人还服用了其他的药物来帮助缓解疼痛。同样，也有可能是这些男人中的某些人吃了某些会削弱 KO 的药效的食物或者药物。简而言之，除非实验是在一个对于这些男人和女人所有因素都是一样的受控环境中进行的，否则就不可能总结出任何有关 KO 对两性的相对效果的强有力的结论来。

即使 KO 的效果确实对女人比对男人更显著，这篇论证也没有理由做出让男人服用其他止痛药来代替 KO 的结论。对于男人，KO 完全可能仍然是效果最好的止痛药。没有比较 KO 和其他止

痛药的药效，发言者就绝对不能证明他建议男人别用 KO 是正确的。

总之，这个论证没能使我确信男人应该服用其他止痛药来代替 KO。为了加强这个论证的力度，发言者必须保证这个研究中的男人和妇女可以代表广大的男性和女性——在牙齿的情况、止痛经历及是否愿意承认并报告疼痛等方面。发言者还必须保证该研究是在一个所有其他可能影响疼痛的因素都保持不变的受控环境中进行的。为了更好地评价这个论证，我需要知道在缓解男性所受的疼痛上，KO 和其他的药物相比效果如何。

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 文中调查的样本数量太少，未必有代表性；而且参加试验的女性可能在性格、体质等某些方面与男性参加者不同。
2. 可能有其他因素导致女性感到的痛楚较少，而作者没有考虑这些因素。
3. 由于没有做和其他止痛药止痛效果的比较，KO 仍然有可能是对于男性来说最有效的止痛药。

#### ● 逻辑思路提示：

- 1) 样本的数量 (the quantity of the sample)：在很多题目中我们都攻击过样本数量的问题。作为调查，样本必须有代表性，而保证代表性的首要因素就是一定要保证足够的样本数量。本题明确指出作者只调查了 48 个样本，这对于一般性的调查显然是不充分的。
- 2) 本题还可以有以下攻击出发点：
  - a. 拔牙所带来的痛楚的感觉和一般意义的 pain 可能是有差异的，因而 KO 对于拔牙后疼痛的作用未必能够表明它在其他情况下的疗效（差异概念的草率推广）。
  - b. 对于女性应该使用 KO 作为止痛药的结论，作者也没有进行相应的比较，也许其他的药物对于女性疼痛比 KO 更加有效（缺乏比较的错误）。
  - c. 最后一句结论中“我们应该重新评估所有药物”中的绝对化词汇 all 值得怀疑。就算 KO 对于男女的效果是不同的，我们也没有理由认为其他所有药品都存在这种差异（差异范围的草率推广）。

### 【论证展开】

- 攻击调查样本数量不足的方式：在指出样本数量太少不足以代表整体时，我们可以用文中的句型：Since the study involved only N samples, it is impossible to confidently draw any conclusions about the general population from it. 或者把它改换成 It is impossible to draw any conclusion about the general subject from the study because the sample is too limited.
- 攻击对比试验的缺陷的方式：本题所用的试验形式是对比试验 (controlled experiment)，对于对比试验，我们一定要保证除了想要验证的试验因素以外的所有其他条件都是确定不变的。在攻击这一点时我们可以用这样的句型来描述：In short, unless the experiment was conducted in a controlled environment in which all factors were the same for A as for B, it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions about the comparative effectiveness of ... for the two counterparts. 或者 The speaker must also assure me that the study was performed in a controlled environment where all other factors possibly affecting ... remained constant.

### 【语言提示】

#### ● 论证句式：

One problem with the argument is that since the study involved only ... it is impossible

to confidently draw any conclusions about the general population from it.

Another problem with the argument is that it overlooks other factors that might have contributed to ...

In short, unless the experiment was conducted in a controlled environment in which all factors were the same for ... as for..., it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions about ...

Without ..., the speaker simply cannot justify his recommendation that ...

The speaker must also assure me that the study was performed in a controlled environment where all other factors possibly affecting ... remained constant.

### Argument 192 The benefits of merging two townships

The following is a letter to the editor of the Roseville Gazette.

"Despite opposition from some residents of West Roseville, the arguments in favor of merging the townships of Roseville and West Roseville are overwhelming. First, residents in both townships are confused about which authority to contact when they need a service; for example, the police department in Roseville receives many calls from residents of West Roseville. This sort of confusion would be eliminated with the merger. Second, the savings in administrative costs would be enormous, since services would no longer be duplicated: we would have only one fire chief, one tax department, one mayor, and so on. And no jobs in city government would be lost—employees could simply be reassigned. Most importantly, the merger will undoubtedly attract business investments as it did when the townships of Hamden and North Hamden merged ten years ago."

**【参考译文】** 尽管西罗斯维尔的一些居民持反对意见，支持合并罗斯维尔和西罗斯维尔的呼声还是占了上风。首先，两地区的居民经常搞不清在需要服务的时候应该和哪个机关联系；举例来说，罗斯维尔的警署接到过很多西罗斯维尔居民的电话。这种混乱可以通过合并来消除。其次，管理开支将会得到很大节省，因为服务性机构不再重复设置：我们将只有一个消防局局长、一个税务局、一个市长等等。在市政府的工作并不会失去，雇员可以被重新委任。最重要的是，合并无疑会吸引更多的商务投资，就像哈姆丹和北哈姆丹在十年前合并时所发生的那样。

**This editorial recommends the merger of Roseville and West Roseville. The author claims that the merger would (1) eliminate confusion among both townships' residents about which authority to call for services, (2) reduce aggregate administrative costs by eliminating duplicative jobs and services, and (3) attract business investment as did the merger of Hamden and North Hamden ten years ago. The author claims further that the merger would result in certain job reassignments but not in the loss of any jobs for current municipal employees. I find these claims problematic in several respects.**

**First, although a merger might be necessary to eliminate current confusion about which authority to contact for services, the editorial overlooks the possibility that the merger will not in itself suffice to eliminate this confusion. Specifically, until the residents of both communities are apprised of the change and learn how to respond appropriately, confusion will continue—and perhaps even increase in the short term. Thus, some measure of community awareness and responsiveness might also be required for the elimination of confusion.**

**Secondly, the editorial seems to make two irreconcilable claims. One is that the merger will result**



in the elimination of certain duplicative jobs; **the other is that** no current municipal employee will become unemployed as a result of the merger. **The editorial fails to consider that** eliminating duplicative jobs would decrease the aggregate number of current municipal employees unless enough new jobs are created to offset the decrease, and that new jobs would in turn add to administrative costs. **Thus, as it stands the argument is self-contradictory, and the author must either modify it by** choosing between two competing objectives—preserving current employment levels and cutting costs—**or somehow reconcile these two objectives.**

**Thirdly, the author's claim that** the merger will attract business investment **relies on the hasty assumption that** the newly merged Roseville would be similar to Hamden in every way, affecting their attractiveness to business investment. **Perhaps** Hamden's business tax rates, labor pool, or even climate are more attractive than the newly merged Roseville's would be. **If so, then** the proposed merger in itself might accomplish little toward attracting business investment to Roseville. **In other words, without evidence that** Hamden and the newly merged Roseville would be equally attractive to business investments **I cannot accept the author's conclusion that** a merger will carry the same result for Roseville as for Hamden.

**In sum, the editorial not only is logically unsound but also relies on several doubtful assumptions. To strengthen the argument the author must modify the recommendation to account for other measures needed to** eliminate the confusion mentioned in the editorial. **The author must also provide a cost-benefit analysis that accounts for** the costs of creating new jobs to offset the elimination of duplicative jobs. **Finally, the author must show that** the new Roseville would be just as attractive to business investment as the new Hamden has been.

### 【参考译文】

这篇社论建议将罗斯维尔 (Roseville) 和西罗斯维尔 (West Roseville) 合并。作者声称合并将：(1) 消除两镇居民在需要政府服务时不知道要找哪个机关的混乱；(2) 通过削减重复的工作和服务来降低总的行政支出；(3) 就像十年前合并的哈姆丹 (Hamden) 和北哈姆丹 (North Hamden) 一样吸引商业投资。作者更进一步声称，这次合并将导致某些工作重新分配，但并不会导致现在的政府雇员失业。我认为这些断言在几个方面很值得怀疑。

首先，虽然合并可能对消除在寻求哪个机关来服务时产生的困惑是必需的，但是这篇社论忽略了光凭这个合并本身并不足以消除这种混乱的可能性。尤其是要等到两个镇区的居民都被告知了这个变化并且已经学会如何适当地响应，这种混乱才会消除——否则，混乱甚至可能在短期内还会加重。因此，为了消除混乱，公众需要对变化有一定程度的认识和反应。

第二，这篇社论好像做了两个互相矛盾的声音。一是合并将导致某些重复的工作的消除；另一个是现在的政府雇员不会因合并而失业。社论没有考虑到削减重复的工作必然减少现在政府雇员的总需求数，除非设置足够的新工作岗位来抵消这种减少，然而增加新职位必然反过来增加行政支出。因此，就此看来，这个论证是自相矛盾的。作者必须对这个论证进行修改，可以从两个互相抵触的目标（保留现有的雇用水平或者削减开支）中选择其一——或者采用任何可行办法来调解这两个目标的矛盾。

第三，作者做出的合并将吸引商业投资的断言依赖于这个草率的假设，即在影响商业投资吸引力的每一个方面，那个新合并的罗斯维尔都将和哈姆丹相似。或许哈姆丹的商业税率、劳动力资源或者甚至是气候都要比新合并的罗斯维尔更加吸引人。如果是这样的话，那么所提议的合并本身很难实现吸引商业投资到罗斯维尔的目标。换句话说，没有证据证明哈姆丹和新合并

后的罗斯维尔在吸引商业投资上魅力相当的话，我无法接受作者所做的关于合并会给罗斯维尔带来和哈姆丹一样的结果的结论。

总之，这篇社论不仅逻辑上没有根据，而且所依赖的好几个假设都很可疑。为了加强这篇论证的力度，作者必须修改这个建议，说明其他用于消除社论中提到的混乱所需的措施。作者还必须提供一个成本效益分析，解释为了抵消削减重复职位而设置新职位所需的花费。最后，作者必须证明在吸引商业投资上，新成立后的罗斯维尔将会和刚成立时的哈姆丹一样具有诱惑力

### 【逻辑问题提纲】

本文作者一共攻击了原文的三处缺陷：

1. 合并政府只是消除混乱的必要条件，而不是充分条件（攻击后果）。
2. 作者所描述的合并所带来的管理成本下降与就业岗位的稳定两个后果是自相矛盾的（攻击后果）。
3. Hamden 与 Roseville 地区的情况可能有所不同，因而合并给 Hamden 带来的良好后果未必在 Roseville 同样发生（错误类比）。

- 思路提示：本文作者的主要思路是攻击作者在文中提出的建议的可能后果。对于本题还有一个后果可以攻击，那就是合并以后可能会给居民带来极大的不便。假如 Roseville 和 West Roseville 的地域比较广阔，距离比较远的话，作者所描述的消防局、税务局等单位不论设于哪一地区，对于另外一个地区而言都将是不方便的。

### 【论证展开】

- 必要而非充分条件：有些措施对于实现某种结果是必要的，但仅有这一措施本身并不足以保证这种结果的发生。这时我们把这一措施称为实现这一结果的必要而非充分条件，换言之，除了该措施之外，我们还需要其他条件同时作用才能保证某结果的发生。要攻击这种错误，我们可以借鉴本文的句型：the editorial overlooks the possibility that the measure will not in itself suffice to ... 其中 in itself：就其本身而言，仅有该措施的情况下。介词 in / by + 反身代词一般都是就其本身而言的意思。  
或者也可以用以下句型描述：
  - (1) The argument proceeds as if a condition which by itself is enough to guarantee a certain result is the only condition under which the result would occur.
  - (2) The reasoning is flawed in that the argument treats evidence that a factor is necessary to bring about an event as if it were evidence that the factor is sufficient to bring about that event.
  - (3) The argument takes a factor that might contribute to an explanation of the observed difference as a sufficient explanation for that difference.
- 自相矛盾的错误：有时作者在题目中提出的某些现象和假设是自相矛盾的，即两个条件或结果不可能同时保证。对于这类错误我们可以用本文的论证方式来加以攻击：先用 ... the editorial seems to make two irreconcilable claims. One is that ...; the other is that ... 来指出作者自相矛盾的两条观点，然后用 The editorial fails to consider that ... 来指出作者有哪些情况没有考虑到，最后用 Thus, as it stands the argument is self-contradictory, and the author must either modify it by ..., or somehow reconcile these two objectives. 来做段落小总结。

### 【语言提示】

- 论证段句式：(1) The editorial seems to make two irreconcilable claims, one is that ...; the

other is that ... (2) Thus, as it stands the argument is self-contradictory, and the author must either modify it by ... or somehow reconcile these two objectives. (3) The author's claim that ... relies on the hasty assumption that ... (4) In other words, without evidence that ... I cannot accept the author's conclusion that ...

- 结尾段句式: (1) In sum, the editorial not only is logically unsound but also relies on several doubtful assumptions. (2) To strengthen the argument the author must modify the recommendation to account for other measures needed to ... mentioned in the editorial. (3) The author must also provide a cost-benefit analysis that accounts for ...

### Argument 194 Left-handed people and success in business

A recent study suggests that people who are left-handed are more likely to succeed in business than are right-handed people. Researchers studied photographs of 1,000 prominent business executives and found that 21 percent of these executives wrote with their left hand. So the percentage of prominent business executives who are left-handed (21 percent) is almost twice the percentage of people in the general population who are left-handed (11 percent). Thus, people who are left-handed would be well advised to pursue a career in business, whereas people who are right-handed would be well advised to imitate the business practices exhibited by left-handers.

**【参考译文】**最近一项研究发现左撇子比右撇子更可能在商业活动中取得成功。研究者研究了1000名著名商业管理者的照片,发现这些管理者有21%的人用左手写字。因而著名商业管理者中左撇子比例(21%)几乎是总体人群中左撇子比例(11%)的两倍。因此,左撇子应该被建议寻求商业方面的职业,而右撇子应该被建议模仿左撇子的商业行为。

**This argument recommends** the all left-handed people should pursue a career in business and that right-handed people should learn to imitate the business practices of left-handed people. **To support this recommendation the speaker cites a study** of 1,000 prominent business executives, among whom 21 percent were photographed while writing with their left hand. **The speaker then points out that** only 11 percent of the general population is left-handed. **The argument suffers from several logical flaws and is therefore unconvincing.**

**First of all, the study amounts to scant evidence of the speaker's implicit conclusion that** left-handedness contributes to business success. **Just because** photographs show a person writing with his or her left hand **does not necessarily mean that** the person is left-handed; many people are ambidextrous—using either hand to write or using one hand to write while using the other hand for other tasks. **Besides, the 1,000 executives from the study are not necessarily representative of the overall population of prominent business executives. Moreover, many prominent executives might have risen to their status not by way of their achievements or business acumen but through other means—such as familial relationships. In short, the photographs in themselves prove little about the causal relationship between left-handedness and the ability to succeed in business.**

**Even if** left-handed people are more likely to have an innate ability to succeed in business than right-handed people are, **the author's conclusion that** all left-handed people should pursue business careers **unfairly assumes that** all left-handed people are similar in terms of their talents, interests, and motivations. **Common sense informs me that** the best vocational choice for any person **depends on a va-**

riety of factors. Thus, without clearer evidence that left-handed people tend to be successful in business but unsuccessful in other vocations the speaker cannot justify such a sweeping recommendation for left-handed people.

Even if most left-handed people would be well advised to pursue business careers, the speaker's recommendation for right-handed people is unwarranted. Common sense informs me that any innate business acumen with which left-handed people might be endowed cannot be imitated. Moreover, the speaker assumes without substantiation that the way in which left-handed people conduct business is the only way to succeed in business. It is entirely possible that right-handed people have certain natural ways of thinking that lend themselves better to other business approaches. Without considering and ruling out this possibility the speaker cannot convince me that right-handed people should imitate the business practices of left-handed people.

In sum, the argument is logically unsound. To strengthen it the speaker must show that the 1,000 executives in the photos were in fact using their dominant hand, that they are representative of all prominent executives, and that prominence in business is generally the result of an executive's business practices. To better assess the argument I would need to compare the percentage of left-handed people who succeed in business with those who succeed in other vocations. I would also need more information about the business practices of left-handed people to determine whether they employ similar practices, and whether right-handed people who have succeeded in business employ different practices.

#### 【参考译文】

这个论证建议所有左撇子应该以经商为职业，而惯用右手的人应该学习并模仿左撇子的经商之道。为支持这个建议，发言者引用了一个对 1000 名杰出商业管理者所做的研究，在这 1000 人中有 21% 的人在用左手写字的时候被拍了下来。发言者随后指出全体人口中只有 11% 的人是左撇子。这个论证有几处犯了逻辑上的错误，因此不能服人。

首先，发言者所引用的研究实际上无力证明他所做的左撇子有助于商业成功的暗示。光凭几张照片没有用，照片上的那个人用他或她的左手在写字并不一定就意味着那个人是左撇子；有许多人双手都很灵巧，有的两只手都可以写字，也有的可以一只手用来写字，而另一只手去做别的事。此外，研究中的那 1000 位管理者并不一定可以代表整体的杰出商业管理者群体。而且，有很多杰出的管理者达到今天的地位并不是通过他们个人的成就或者商业头脑，而是通过其他方式——比如家族关系。简而言之，照片本身并不能证明左撇子和赢得商业成功的能力之间存在着因果关系。

即使左撇子的人比惯用右手的人更可能天生具有通往商业成功的能力，那作者所做的关于所有左撇子都应该从商的结论也是在不合理地认为所有左撇子在天资、兴趣和动机上都是相似的。常识使我明白任何人的最好的职业选择都取决于各种各样的因素。因此，如果没有更确切的证据证明左撇子比较容易在商业上取得成功，而在其他职业领域就不容易成功的话，那么发言者就不能证明他给左撇子所提的那个笼统的建议是正确的。

即使让大多数左撇子去从商是一个好建议，但发言者给惯用右手的人提的建议也是毫无根据的。常识告诉我赋予左撇子的与生俱来的商业头脑是无法被模仿的。而且，发言者毫无证据地认为左撇子经商的方法是在商业领域取得成功的惟一方式。惯用右手的人完全有可能通过某些自然的思维方式更好地帮助自己找到其他经商之道。没有考虑到并排除这种可能性，发言者就不能使我确信惯用右手的人们应该模仿左撇子的经商之道。