



## ANIMAL

*We no longer need to have animals kept in zoos, so zoos should be closed. Do you agree or disagree?*

*Give reasons for your answer and include any relevant examples from your own knowledge or experience.*

There has long been an argument against maintaining zoos in which animals are **kept away from** their natural habitat, and there is strong evidence to suggest that technology has developed to a point where such institutions are no longer needed, as will now be argued.

Traditionally, the principal argument **voiced** by those who wish to retain zoos was that it allowed children and adults to see animals which they more than likely would not have had a chance to do if this had required visiting the creature's natural environment. Yet there are now online videos and websites where these animals can be seen in high definition, therefore no longer needing to go to **enclosures** to see the animals. This is clearly evident by the declining number of visitors in recent years.

In addition, there are many cases in which animals **held in captivity** are not well cared for and are used solely to exploit them for profit. In some rare cases, the animals can suffer from neglect or malnutrition, and rather than being kept healthy are simply replaced when they are no longer of any value. Granted, there are situations in which endangered species are protected and their numbers allowed to rebuild by housing them in the security of a zoo. However, in most cases the same effect is better achieved by using more open plan **wildlife parks** rather than traditional caged enclosures.

In sum, the factors which first led to the creation of zoos have been reduced by the ability of technology, so unless there is some advantage for the species itself, then the use of zoos should no longer be supported.



*Some people believe that it is wrong to keep animals in zoos, while others think that zoos are both entertaining and ecologically important. Discuss both views.*

In this modern world, perspectives of how to keep animals are varied among people. Some people think about **caging** them in zoos or forests while others think it is illogical to limit animals' movements. I am going to discuss these views

according to environmental, personal and economic perspectives. Keeping some animals in zoos will protect them against predators, bad weather, and **food inavailability**. Nevertheless, keeping animals free is more logical than isolating them because if we keep animals caged, they would not be able to have fresh air and chase other animals. Therefore, it is cruel keeping animals **confined** in small spaces. It is advisable to put our efforts into keeping our creatures in their natural habitats, in order to give them the opportunity to experience normal life. Keeping animals is essential because some animals are in fact becoming extinct. Although keeping these animals is costly, the profits made by keeping these animals are substantial. Take Indian lions for example; a wide range of people travel to India to see these animals in circuses in India. However, some people think that governments should invest the money in improving the infrastructure of their nations instead. Building new electrical power station, for instance, is more important than spending thousands of pounds to preserve certain creatures from extinction. Lastly, keeping animals is important for study and research whereas others think we have no right to use animals for entertainment and in labs.

To conclude, keeping animals in zoos might have values but it is **irrational** to keep these animals away from their natural habitat. The reasons are that besides they are not vulnerable creatures, they have the right to survive independently because of having feelings and emotions as human.

**(289 Words) Band 9**



## Các cụm từ cần nhớ

- cage(v): nhốt trong chuồng
- food inavailability: sự khan hiếm thức ăn
- confine(v): nhốt (trong một khu khép kín)
- irrational(adj): vô lý

*Nowadays animal experiments are widely used to develop new medicines and to test the safety of other products. Some people argue that these experiments should be banned because it is morally wrong to cause animals to suffer, while others are in favour of them because of their benefits to humanity.*

*Discuss both views and give your own opinion.*

It is true that medicines and other products are routinely tested on animals before they are cleared for human use. While I tend towards the viewpoint that animal testing is **morally wrong**, I would have to support a limited amount of **animal experimentation** for the development of medicines.

On the one hand, there are clear **ethical** arguments against animal experimentation. To use a common example of this practice, laboratory mice may be given an illness so that the effectiveness of a new drug can be measured. Opponents of such research argue that humans have no right to subject animals to this kind of trauma, and that the lives of all creatures should be respected. They believe that the benefits to humans do not **justify** the suffering caused, and that scientists should use alternative methods of research.

On the other hand, reliable alternatives to animal experimentation may not always be available. Supporters of the use of animals in medical research believe that a certain



amount of suffering on the part of mice or rats can be justified if human lives are saved. They argue that opponents of such research might feel differently if a member of their own families needed a medical treatment that had been developed through the use of animal experimentation. Personally, I agree with the **banning of animal testing for non-medical products**, and I feel that it may be a necessary evil where new drugs and medical procedures are concerned. In conclusion, it seems to me that it would be wrong to ban testing on animals for vital medical research until equally effective alternatives have been developed. (270 words)

### Các cụm từ cần nhớ

- morally wrong: sai trái về mặt đạo đức
- animal experimentation: sự thử nghiệm trên động vật
- ethical(adj): về mặt đạo đức
- justify(v): thanh minh cho điều gì
- banning of animal testing for non-medical products: việc cấm việc thử nghiệm các sản phẩm không thuộc y tế lên động vật

*Wild animals have no place in the 21st century, so protecting them is a waste of resources. To what extent do you agree or disagree?*

Some people argue that it is pointless to spend money **on the protection of wild animals** because we humans have no need for them. I completely disagree with this point of view.

In my opinion, it is absurd to argue that wild animals have no place in the 21st century. I do not believe that planet Earth exists only for the benefit of humans, and there is nothing special about this particular century that means that we suddenly have the right to allow or encourage the **extinction** of any species. Furthermore, there is no compelling reason



why we should let animals **die out**. We do not need to exploit or destroy every last square metre of land in order to feed or **accommodate** the world's population. There is plenty of room for us to exist side by side with wild animals, and this should be our aim.

I also disagree with the idea that protecting animals is a waste of resources. It is usually the protection of natural habitats that ensures the survival of wild animals, and most scientists agree that these habitats are also crucial for human survival. For example, rainforests produce oxygen, absorb carbon dioxide and stabilise the Earth's climate. If we destroyed these areas, the costs of managing the resulting changes to our planet would far outweigh the costs of conservation. By protecting wild animals and their habitats, we **maintain the natural balance of all life on Earth**.

In conclusion, we have no right to decide whether or not wild animals should exist, and I believe that we should do everything we can to protect them. **(269 words)**

### **Các cụm từ cần nhớ**

- the protection of wild animals: việc bảo vệ các động vật hoang dã  
extinction(n): sự tuyệt chủng
- die out(phrv): chết hết, tuyệt chủng
- accommodate(v): sắp đặt (địa điểm sinh sống)
- maintain the natural balance of all life on Earth: giữ gìn sự cân bằng tự nhiên của mọi sự sống trên Trái Đất.