The reading and the lecture are both about decline in people’s inclination for literature. The author believes that this phenomenon has disastrous consequences on future of culture and literature. The lecturer casts doubt on the claims made in article. She thinks that there are many other kind of non-written materials as mush valuable for culture as literature is.

First of all, the author claims that only literature can foster people’s imagination and stimulate them intellectually. She adds up since people are reading less than they used to, the functionalities of literature are being missed out. The point is challenged by the lecturer. She says that there are many other kinds of books that are as well-written as novels do . She elaborates on this by mentioning that although science writing history or political analysis are not literature, have high quality and some of them not only can be as creative but also as stimulative as literature is.

Secondly, the author states that people are spending their time in lower level entertainments, say watching TV, rather than reading books that has resulted in lower level of societies’ culture. The lecturer rebuts this. She suggests that culture is changed and argues on this by asserting that in today’s world there are many new valuable forms of non-written materials involving in culture other than novels and poems. She claims that spending time in such contents like movies or music does not mean wasting time.

Finally, the author mentions that publishers have less tendency to invest on talented writers which is an unfortunate subsequence of lack of audience for rich written literature. The lecturer on the other hand states that even if people are less interested in reading, they should not be blamed. She puts forth idea that a large number of today’s written books are hardly understandable.