

Argument 44、Over the past year, the Crust Copper Company (CCC) has purchased over 10,000 square miles of land in the tropical nation of West Fredonia. Mining copper on this land will inevitably result in pollution and, since West Fredonia is the home of several endangered animal species, in environmental disaster. But such disasters can be prevented if consumers simply refuse to purchase products that are made with CCC's copper unless the company abandons its mining plans.

The author of this newsletter excerpt concludes that if consumers refuse to buy products made with Consolidated Copper Company (CCC) copper the company will eventually abandon its mining plans in the nation of West Fredonia, thereby preventing pollution and an "environmental disaster" in that country. To justify this conclusion the author points out that CCC has recently bought more than a million square miles of land in West Fredonia, and that West Fredonia is home to several endangered animal species. I find this argument

似是而非的 ← specious on several grounds.

First, the author provides no evidence that the West Fredonia land that CCC has acquired amounts to a significant portion of land inhabited by endangered animal species, or that CCC's land is inhabited by endangered animal species at all. Nor does the author provide clear evidence that CCC's mining activities are of the type that might cause pollution, the extinction of animal species, or any other environmental damage. Lacking such evidence the author simply cannot convince me that CCC must abandon its plans in order that such damage be prevented.

这个点抓的很好
可以做条件错误
来攻击
即使开采了,也不
一定会导致环境破坏

这里的攻击不够到位
可以说开采的方式比较环保
也可以说开采的能源和当地环境关系不大,不会在当地生产,没有waste的产生

Secondly, even assuming CCC's planned mining activities in West Fredonia will cause pollution and will endanger several animal species, it is nevertheless impossible to assess the author's broader contention that CCC's activities will result in "environmental disaster," at least without an agreed-upon definition of that term. If by "environmental disaster" the author simply means some pollution and the extinction of several animal species, then the claim would have merit; otherwise, it would not. Absent either a clear definition of the term or clear evidence that CCC's activities would carry grave environmental consequences by any reasonable definition, the author's contention that CCC's activities will result in environmental disaster is simply unjustified.

这段话是对上一段的递进,可以不写

Thirdly, the author's position that environmental disaster is "inevitable" absent the prescribed boycott precludes the possibility that other measures can be taken to prevent CCC from carrying out its plans, or to offset any harm that CCC causes should it carry out its plans. Yet the author fails to provide assurances that no other means of preventing the predicted disaster are available. Lacking such evidence the author cannot reasonably conclude that the proposed boycott is needed to prevent that disaster.

Finally, even if the prescribed boycott is needed to prevent pollution and environmental disaster in West Fredonia, the author assumes too hastily that the boycott will suffice for these purposes. Perhaps additional measures would be required as well. For instance, perhaps consumers would also need to boycott other companies that pollute West Fredonia's environment. In short, without any evidence that the recommended course of action will be enough to prevent the predicted problems, the author's conclusion remains dubious at best.

这两段其实说的点是一样的
都是在讨论other solutions

我们还可以攻击可行性 -- 我们真的可以抵制吗?
所有人都愿意吗?
相关产品会不会太多?

In sum, as it stands the argument is wholly unpersuasive. To bolster it the author must show that CCC's planned mining activities on its newly acquired land will pollute and will

threaten endangered animal species. The author must also define "environmental disaster" and show that the inevitable results of CCC's activities, absent the proposed boycott, would meet that definition. To better assess the argument it would be useful to know what other means are available for preventing CCC from mining in West Fredonia or, in the alternative, for mitigating the environmental impact of those mining activities. Also useful would be any information about the likelihood that the boycott would be effective in accomplishing its intended objectives.

整体评价：

1. 整篇文章作者的语言表达并没有很经验，但是贵在表意清晰
2. 在攻击细节方面，有两段中心段落的攻击内容是类似的，这个在考试中要尽量避免
3. 中心句在文章中至关重要，我们在写作的过程中要在中心句中清晰描述我们想要攻击的逻辑错误