

## Listening script:

The passage claims that there will be fewer and fewer birds, but the arguments used to support this claim are **unconvincing**.

First, it's true that **urban growth** has been **bad for some types of birds**, but urban development actually provides better and larger habitats for **other types**, so much so that city and suburban dwellers often complain about increased birds' populations, **seagulls** at landfills, **pigeons** on the streets and so on. Even birds like **hawks** and **falcons** can now be found in cities, where they prey on the increasing populations of pigeons and rodents. So it's not going to be a story of uniform decline of bird populations in the future. **Some populations may shrink, but others will grow.**

As for agriculture, it's true that it too will increase in the future, but not in the way assumed by the reading passage. The truth is, in the United States, **less and less land** is being used for agriculture every year. Increasing in agricultural production have resulted from and will continue to result from the introduction of **new, more productive varieties of crops**. These new crops produce **more food per unit of land**, and as a result, there's no need to **destroy wilderness areas**.

And third, while it's certainly true that traditional pesticides have been destructive to birds, it's incorrect to project this history into the future. Now that people are aware of the possible consequences of traditional pesticides, two changes have occurred. **First**, new and **much less toxic pesticides** have been developed, and that's important. **Second**, and perhaps more importantly there is a growing trend to develop **more pest resistant crops**, crops that are genetically designed to be unattractive to pests. Pest resistant crops greatly reduce the need for chemical pesticides. And best of all, pest resistant crops don't harm birds at all.

**Rejection:**

**Counter.. 1:**

**Counter.. 2:**

**Counter.. 3:**



## Introduction

1. The reading passage and lecture both discuss bird populations in the United States.
2. The reading passage states that the number of birds in the past century has decreased and will continue to decrease in the U.S. and brings in three reasons to justify the claim.
3. However, the lecture rejects the claim made in the reading, casting doubt on all the three reasons presented in the passage.

## Body Paragraph 1

1. First, the passage asserts that the increase in human populations and settlements will turn the natural habitats of birds, such as wetlands and grasslands, into places occupied by homes, offices, malls and so on.
2. According to the reading, when birds lose their natural habitats, their numbers gradually decrease.
3. Nevertheless, the lecture puts forward the counterargument that some bird populations may decrease, but some others will increase. There are now birds, such as pigeons and rodents, that live in cities. Some other birds that prey on such birds, that is, hawks and falcons, are on the increase

1. **Next, the passage mentions that** to feed the growing human population, people are changing more of birds' natural habitats to land for agriculture.
2. **As declared by the passage,** this kind of decrease in bird habitats results in the subsequent decline in their numbers in rural areas.
3. **The lecture, however, states that** the use of new productive variety of crops has enabled us to produce more food per unit of land, making it unnecessary to convert wilderness areas to agricultural land as claimed in the reading.

1. **The passage finally argues that** to guarantee the safety of their agricultural products, humans need to utilize pesticides.
2. **As stated by the passage,** the pesticides get into birds' water source and their food chain and kill them or prevent them from reproducing when they drink contaminated water or poisoned insects, leading to the continued decline in their population
3. **Rejecting this final measure explained in the reading, the lecture argues that** pesticides are not going to kill birds because now less toxic pesticides, different from traditional chemical ones, are being used. Furthermore, we are using pest-resistant crops, which has obviated any need to use pesticides to protect agricultural products.

The reading passage and lecture both discuss bird populations in the United States. The reading passage states that the number of birds in the past century has decreased and will continue to decrease in the U.S. and brings in three reasons to justify the claim. However, the lecture rejects the claim made in the reading, casting doubt on all the three reasons presented in the passage.

First, the passage asserts that the increase in human populations and settlements will turn the natural habitats of birds, such as wetlands and grasslands, into places occupied by homes, offices, malls and so on. According to the reading, when birds lose their natural habitats, their numbers gradually decrease. Nevertheless, the lecture puts forward the counterargument that some bird populations may decrease, but some others will increase. There are now birds, such as pigeons and rodents, that live in cities. Some other birds that prey on such birds, that is, hawks and falcons, are on the increase too.

Next, the passage mentions that to feed the grown human population, people are changing more of birds' natural habitats to land for agriculture. As declared by the passage, this kind of decrease in bird habitats results in the subsequent decline in their numbers in rural areas. The lecture, however, states that the use of new productive variety of crops has enabled us to produce more food per unit of land, making it unnecessary to convert wilderness areas to agricultural land, as claimed in the reading.

The passage finally argues that to guarantee the safety of their agricultural products, humans need to utilize pesticides. As stated by the passage, the pesticides get into birds' water source and their food chain and kill them or prevent them from reproducing when they drink contaminated water or poisoned insects, leading to the continued decline in their population. Rejecting this final measure explained in the reading, the lecture argues that pesticides are not going to kill birds because now less toxic pesticides, instead of traditional chemical ones, are being used. Furthermore, we are using pest-resistant crops, which has obviated any need to use pesticides to protect agricultural products.