The reading passage and the lecture discuss methods for solving the issue of reducing the frog population. The writer points out three theories about the problem, but the speaker disagrees with the represented ideas.

First, the writer mentions that pesticides used by farmers spread from farms to neighboring frog’s habitat, and harm the frogs. Therefore, farmers should reduce using pesticides to protect frogs. However, the lecture argues that it is not the fair solution for solving the problem, because if there was an obligation on the farmers whose farms are near the wetland and frog’s habitat that they should use pesticides, the crops of their farms would be reduced and they could not compete by other farmers.

Secondly, the author claims that the disease resulted from the fungus is a reason of decreasing the population of frogs and suggests some special treatment for curing the frogs. Conversely, the professor has an opposite view and argues that the represented solution is not appropriate, because it is very expensive and they should use special treatment for different types of frogs. In addition, the illness comes from the fungus pass easily from the parents to the children, and they should use the treatment for each generation.

Finally, the text believes that frog’s habitats including wetlands and marshes should be protected from excessive water use and development. On the other hand, the man in the lecture asserts that although it is a good idea, human activities such as water use or draining of the wetland is not the main reason for harming the wetlands in the ground. He believes that global warming is the main point.