Argument versus description

Law

Editorial Essay: " Argument versus Section Difference Between and Argument The first argument noted in the article was that Mexico argues that the sale of marijuana " fuels the country's vicious cartels and smugglers" (Longmire par. 1). As defined by Epstein, an argument is an attempt to convince someone (or the readers in this article) that a particular claim (the sale of marijuana injecting profits to cartels in Mexico) called the conclusion, is true. This statement is an argument because the contention needs to be validated and supported by facts before it could be proven to be true. From the rest of the article, apparently, cartels in Mexico have delved into other sources of income ranging from kidnapping, oil theft, pirated goods, and extortion, among others. Another argument is the chemical company's (BASF) purchasing petroleum products allegedly stolen from Pemex by a Mexican cartel but the source was never acknowledged to be known. This is also an argument because the facts are not verifiable and the chemical company is arguing that their claim that they do not know the source of the petroleum is questionable given the amount of sale ($2 million) involved.

The description in the editorial provides objective information as indicated in the portion where it was stipulated that " legalization would deliver a significant short-term hit to the cartels — if drug trafficking were the only activity they were engaged in. But cartels derive a growing slice of their income from other illegal activities" (Longmire par. 5). The details of succeeding illegal activities are likewise description of the kind and types (of illegal activities) that cartels are delving into to fuel their economic endeavors.

Section 2: Whether One Agrees or Disagrees with the Writer's Argument

Longmire actually argues that legalization of marijuana would not kill the cartels and actually aver that " legalization would move that trade into the open market, driving down the price and undermining the cartels' power and influence" (Longmire par. 1). I agree to her contention that legalization of marijuana would not significantly impact or lessen the source of income for cartels as she described other illegal activities that the cartels have actually pursued.

However, her supporting statements to validate the initial argument were weak in terms of focusing on other illegal activities as the source of other income for the cartels without expounding on the implications of how legalization of marijuana would not kill the cartels. The writer is commended for initially determining the percentage of cartels' profits being generated from the sale of marijuana, revealed at 60%. The next supporting statement should have focused on determining how much of the 60% profit would be reduced if the sale for marijuana is legalized: would it decrease to 30%?; and any statistical information should be backed by authoritative sources from credible agencies and research practitioners on the field (drug agencies, law enforcement, among others). Likewise, the potential response or reaction of cartels on the legalization of marijuana should have been presented.

The conclusion was likewise weak as she stated that " this is not to say that drug legalization shouldn't be considered for other reasons... what it won't do, though, is stop the violence in Mexico" (Longmire par. 13) which is not supportive of her thesis statement and in fact contradicts the argument; thereby rendering it bad.

Works Cited

Epstein, Richard. " Critical Thinking." Wadsworth Publishing, 2005. Print.

Longmire, Sylvia. Legalization Won't Kill the Cartels. 18 June 2011. Web. 27

June 2011

.

Longmire, Sylvia. Legalization Won't Kill the Cartels. 18 June 2011. Web. 27