

박세준

전제적으로 앞문장과 뒷문장의 흐름을 잡아서 "연결어"가
없음.

he professor explains why the causes of mass extinction that are mentioned in the textbook are not plausible for the following reasons.

First, the textbook explains that the fluctuation of the sea level could have caused mass extinction because if the sea level changes, animals that fed on coastal species cannot get enough food. However, the professor explains that the changes in sea level occur very gradually. So, the animals that live in the coastal area would have plenty of time to adapt. Therefore, it is unlikely that they all died suddenly.

The second possible cause is SO_2 particles from the volcanic eruption. The textbook states that these particles block the sunlight and cause global cooling. In contrast, the professor argues that this cannot happen because SO_2 does not remain in the atmosphere for long. Instead, it reacts with water and oxygen and becomes acid rain. As a result, these particles fall on the ground rather than staying in the atmosphere. They may remain there for a short time, but cannot stay long enough to cause global cooling.

The last cause of mass extinction mentioned in the textbook is large asteroids. When they hit the surface, debris blocks the sunlight, killing plants through global darkness, eventually leading to the extinction of animals. However, the professor claims this is incorrect because there is no evidence of asteroid collision. There is only one crater that has been found, and even this crater does not match the date of the mass extinction.

To conclude, the textbook presents three theories of mass extinction: a drop in sea level, global cooling from volcanic eruptions, and the impact of large asteroids. The professor disagrees with these ideas because sea levels change gradually, SO_2 becomes acid rain and falls, and there is no evidence of asteroids. He disputes theories about the cause of mass extinction, claiming that the evidence is insufficient.

In my opinion, the government should focus on the environment rather than health issues. Most people nowadays are interested in the environment and try to make it better in the future. For example, they are aware of global warming and try to decrease their carbon footprint. However, these efforts are not enough to change the future environment.

Therefore?
 Governments should develop solutions that can genuinely improve the environment because they can accomplish much more than individuals can. Some may say that health issues are more important because the purpose of government is to help its citizens live better lives and improve their health. However, if the environment is destroyed, people's health is no longer a major concern. These are the reasons why I think governments should make greater efforts to help the environment rather than focus primarily on public health.