

Our local governor has just proposed the construction of a new 30-mile expressway running through our state. The argument behind creating the expressway is that it will increase tourism by making our state more accessible to out-of-towners and provide jobs for our local road workers. However, while these are admirable motivations, the fact that the expressway will run through residential areas, thus displacing both local businesses and citizens, is reason to unwaveringly oppose our governor's plan under any circumstances. We should not sacrifice our citizens in the hopes of drawing visitors into our state.

*Write a response that identifies and explains the specific evidence required to determine whether the argument is reasonable. Discuss how that evidence would weaken or strengthen the argument.*

In this argument, the opposer/ opponent of new expressway recommends that in order to save both local businesses and citizens from displacing, the governor's proposal should be denied. To support this recommendation, he has not pointed out any cogent assumption. As a result, this argument rests on a series of unsubstantiated assumptions and is therefore unpersuasive as it stands.

To begin with, the argument unfairly assumes that owing to run a expressway through residential areas, it will sacrifice the citizens' lives. The author provides no evidence to substantiate this assumption. Lacking such evidence it is entirely that he actually does not consider the situation thoroughly. Opposing a new chance of a state without having a survey is not reasonable. Every assumption must be based on varied types of statistics in order to consider the situation from manifold aspects. Even if the governor's proposal was not credible, the argument cannot adequately respond to the concerns of an individual who asserts constructing of the mentioned expressway can add additional positive aspects to his life. The author should account for other alternative explanations in order to make his assertion sound.

On the other hand, the proposal of governor relies on vague information. He or she must consider other possible alternative to increase jobs' offers and tourism. Charts and survey must be held to ask citizens about this constructing. His claim must overlook the inevitable outcomes of this changes. Simply put, I cannot be convinced whether the accessibility of a state is the only factor for attracting tourism or there are other possibilities such as healthy places to accommodate or eating food. As a result, the proposal fails to substantiate this crucial assumptions.

More specifically, without establishing that all factors affecting the running of an expressway, we cannot rely on this limited anecdotal evidences of both parts of this argument. Displacing local businesses is not always worse, change will come with some benefits. There is a chance that with the money which they were paid for their former places they can invest in bigger and better market. Or the more tourists in a city, the more opportunities to earn money. If this recommendation was proposed to my state, I prefer to fill a questionnaire to consider vast majority of public's idea.

In conclusion, the argument is logically flawed and therefore unconvincing on both sides as it stands. To strengthen it, both the opposer/ opponent and defender must either modify the proposal to provide incentives for building a new highway in a state or provide better evidence that displacing citizens may ruin better options of living. Such evidence might include the following: statistics showing that

significant number of people who are against or in favor of this project, a survey to assert the negative and positive outcomes of this change and assurance from well-known local to provide more information.