

Self-evaluation global
climate changes are
manmade



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Overall Argument - That human beings are responsible for internal and external changes which lead to global warming. Underlying conclusion Climate researchers have been able to link recent aspects of extreme weather to human activities. In this case, the premise that is used to support the conclusion are that Texas farmers have experienced extreme weather events, which resulted in cases of blight diseases that destroyed crop yields. In this case, the premise does not support the conclusion, because it is relying on anecdote alone to support the conclusion. Moreover, there could be any number of explanations for this particular weather pattern, which is another reason why this premise does not support the conclusion. Therefore, this argument is not valid.

How I would make this argument valid would be to cite more broad-based examples of extreme weather pattern which are linked to human activities. In this case, the case of the Texas farmers who have experienced extreme weather events is too narrow of an example, because the extreme weather events experienced by the Texas farmers could be due to any number of causes(Crook, 1999). Presenting examples which are broader based, more tied to the issue of global warming, and are less likely to have any number of causes for these observed phenomenon, would be a better way of illustrating this point.

Conclusion #2 - that the industrial revolution influenced the world in significant ways. First of all, this conclusion is poorly written, because, as written, this conclusion does not support the overall argument of the paper, which is that human beings are responsible for internal and external changes in weather. A better way of writing this conclusion so that it is more

supportive of the overall argument would be to write the following: " The <https://assignbuster.com/self-evaluation-global-climate-changes-are-manmade/>

emergence of the industrial revolution, in the 19th Century, accelerated the global warming process in different ways.”

As for the premises to support the conclusion – one of the premises is that the industrial activities, such as the burning of fossil fuel and coal, and the utilization of natural gas and oil, led to large emissions of toxic gases into the atmosphere. This particular premise is sound, because it links the activities in the industrial revolution directly with the conclusion that the industrial revolution contributes to greenhouse gases. However, the next argument, that the energy sector contributes to 20 percent of methane and 75 percent of carbon dioxide emissions, does not support the conclusion. The conclusion relates specifically to the industrial revolution, which is a specific period of time. The above premise regarding today’s emissions does not support the argument regarding the industrial revolution, because we are no longer considered to be experiencing the industrial revolution. The best way to write this argument would be to use a transition, such as – “ while the industrial revolution’s emissions contributed towards global warming, the effects are still felt today, as today’s energy sector....”

Conclusion #3 – That the use of fossil fuels, agriculture and land use are the human activities which contribute to the increase in natural gases in the air. In reading the premises that support this conclusion, I note that I did not use any evidence to support the conclusion that fossil fuels contribute to an increase in natural gases. Therefore, to make my argument more logically consistent, I plan either to not mention fossil fuels as a contributor to natural gases, or to introduce evidence regarding fossil fuels.

Moreover, I introduced a premise that has nothing to do with my overall conclusion. This is the argument that solar radiations are not causing current
<https://assignbuster.com/self-evaluation-global-climate-changes-are-manmade/>

global warming. Therefore, since this premise does not support my conclusion, and is a non sequiter, I would either eliminate this paragraph entirely, or put it into the introduction, because it does support the overall argument. It just does not support the argument that agriculture and land use increase natural gases.

Other than this non sequiter, the premises in the paragraphs supporting the conclusion that agriculture and land use contribute to the increase in natural gas in the air do support the conclusion. One premise is that mobile animals loosen soil particles, as so the use of machinery, which leads to the release of carbon dioxide into the air, which leads to global warming. However, I would take out the arguments related to flooding, as this does not support the overall conclusion, and flooding is not central to the overall topic. This is therefore another non sequiter which should probably be removed (Shaughnessy et al., 1994). The other premise is that agricultural activities, such as forest burning and deforestation contribute to excess carbon dioxide in the air. The third premise is that animal husbandry contributes to excess carbon dioxide because cows release methane into the air. Rice cultivation also contributes because of the fertilizer used releases nitrous oxide into the air.

The next conclusion is that human can address climate change. This does not support the overall argument that humans are responsible for climate change, because it does not address specific ways that humans are responsible, but, rather, solutions. However, the premises that I made in this paragraph does support the conclusion that humans can address climate change. I wrote that humans may address climate change by afforestation, and by concentrating on organic farming and alternative fuels. These are all <https://assignbuster.com/self-evaluation-global-climate-changes-are-manmade/>

ways that humans may address climate change, so these premises support the conclusion of this argument.

Bibliography

Crook, L., Dean, M. (1999) " Logical fallacies and ethical breaches," Ethics and Behavior, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 61-68.

Shaugnessy, A., Slawson, D. & Bennett, J. (1996) " Separating the wheat from the chaff: Identifying fallacies in pharmaceutical promotion," Journal of General Internal Medicine, vol. 9, no. 10, pp. 563-568.