

这篇文章结构是大家需要学习的重点，但是正如我们上课讲到的，逻辑是大家需要提升的重点，所以我们会找出文章中所有的逻辑有点和缺点

54、Humans arrived in the Kaliko Islands about 7,000 years ago, and within 3,000 years most of the large mammal species that had lived in the forests of the Kaliko Islands had become extinct. Yet humans cannot have been a factor in the species' extinctions, because there is no evidence that the humans had any significant contact with the mammals. Further, archaeologists have discovered numerous sites where the bones of fish had been discarded, but they found no such areas containing the bones of large mammals, so the humans cannot have hunted the mammals. Therefore, some climate change or other environmental factor must have caused the species' extinctions.

introduction部分
有这两句话就够了

In this argument the speaker concludes that humans could not have been a factor in the extinction of large mammal species in the Kaliko islands 3,000 years ago. To justify this conclusion, the speaker points out that no evidence exists that humans hunted or had other significant contact with these mammals. The speaker also points out that while archeologists have found bones of discarded fish in the islands, they have not found any discarded mammal bones there. For three reasons, this evidence lends little credibility to the speaker's argument.

First, the argument concludes too hastily that humans could not have had any significant contact with these mammals. In relying on the lack of physical evidence such as bones, the speaker overlooks the possibility that humans exported mammals--particularly their bones--during this time period. Without ruling out this alternative explanation for the disappearance of these species from the islands, the speaker cannot justify the conclusion that humans were not a factor in their extinction from the islands.

这段的攻击不够清晰
作者其实想攻击的是因果关系 因为猎杀，所以没有关系

Secondly, the argument relies on the assumption that without significant contact with these other species humans could not have been a factor in their extinction. But the speaker provides no evidence that this is the case. Moreover, perhaps humans drove these other species away from their natural habitat not by significant contact but merely by intruding on their territory. Or perhaps humans consumed the plants and animals on which these species relied for their subsistence. Either scenario would explain how humans could have been a factor in the extinction of these species despite a lack of significant contact.

这段是攻击偷换概念，没有明显的联系，不代表没有联系

这两个理由都比较合理

这个是因果错误
鱼骨头不一定是人丢弃的，所以没有找到大型哺乳动物的骨头说明不了任何问题

Thirdly, the speaker assumes that the bones of fish that archeologists have found discarded on the island were discarded by humans, and not by some other large mammal. However, the speaker provides no evidence to substantiate this assumption. Given other possible explanations for these discarded fish bones, this evidence in itself lends little credible support to the speaker's theory about the extinction of large species of mammals.

In conclusion, the argument is unconvincing as it stands. To strengthen it, the speaker must rule out the possibility that humans exported the bones of these other species. To better evaluate the argument, we would need more information about the diet of humans and of the now-extinct mammals during that time period; particularly, we would need to know whether those other mammals also fed on the fish whose discarded bones have been found on the islands.

文章整体语言表达流畅

但是对逻辑错误的攻击不是特别到位 - 建议大家要从两个细节上来证明作者的逻辑不够清晰

同时，对逻辑错误的选择也不是最优的，与其攻击鱼骨头的来源，不如攻击鱼骨头和大型哺乳动物的比较错误：由于骨头特点的不一样，所以人们可能会丢弃鱼骨头，但是会拿大型动物的骨头做武器，或盖房子，所以找不到