In the lecture, the professor argued the points mentioned in the passage. Her main reasons are summarized as following.

First of all, urban growth does not lead to destroy of birds' natural habitats as the passage suggested. The professor mentioned that based on evidence, urban development may prevent the growth of populations of some certain kinds of bird, but it also help to expand the population growth for other kinds of bird. So the effects are not all devastating.

Second, the influences of agricultural activities are not like what suggested in the passage. The professor mentioned that we now have more advanced seeds used for major crops. Both the production and efficiency of agriculture are highly improved. It is not necessary to destroy birds' habitats to grow enough food.

Last but not least, the professor suggested that we now have new and less toxic pesticides compared to the past. These newly developed pesticides will not be as influential as the passaged indicated. Furthermore, we now have genetically modified seeds that can not only resist pests attack but also are not harmful to birds at all. For these reasons, the concern mentioned in the passage may not be happening.