

MY ARGUMENT: Scientists should not bring back extinct animals.

INTRODUCTION:

- **Background information (1-2 sentences):** Extinction has been a problem for many years. With recent technology and science research, it is now possible to bring back animals previously extinct. This process is known as de-extinction.
- **Concession/Counterargument (2 sentences):** Many people believe that we should bring back extinct animals because “it is possible to use biotechnology to create living individuals of species that have gone extinct” (Text 1, Lines 13-14) and because “It would be an incredible scientific accomplishment to be able to create organisms of a species that has been extinct for some time” (Text 1, Lines 18-19). Others claim that we should bring back extinct animals because “we humans were the ones who wiped them out, by hunting them, destroying their habitats, or spreading diseases” (Text 2, Lines 26-27) and because “cloning and genomic engineering technologies being developed for de-extinction could also help preserve endangered species” (Text 2, Line 40-41).
- **Thesis (1 sentence):** Although one might argue that people should bring back extinct species, it is clear that scientists should NOT bring back extinct animals.

BODY PARAGRAPH 1:

- **Topic sentence:** We should not support de-extinction for several reasons.
- **Chunk 1:** First of all, TEXT 3 suggests that “Those of us who attempt to reintroduce zoo-bred species that have gone extinct in the wild have one question at the top of our list: Where do we put them?” (Lines 18-20). This is important because if scientists succeed, there will be no place for the animals to live.
- **Chunk 2:** Furthermore, “Resurrected, previously benign organisms...might prove ideal reservoirs or vectors of nasty plagues” (TEXT 4, Lines 24-26). This is significant because bringing back these species could increase viruses and illnesses.
- **Chunk 3:** In addition, according to TEXT # 4, “It is much more sensible to put all the limited resources for science and conservation into preventing extinctions” (Lines 3-4). This is meaningful because we should focus on preventing future extinction, rather than focusing on bringing extinct species back.

BODY PARAGRAPH 2:

- **Chunk 1:** Not only YOUR ARGUMENT because REASON 1, REASON 2, and REASON 3, but TEXT # indicates that QUOTE/DETAIL 4. This is important because REASON 4.
- **Chunk 2:** Moreover, QUOTE/DETAIL 5 (TEXT #). This is significant because REASON 5.
- **Chunk 3:** Finally, according to TEXT #, QUOTE/DETAIL 6. This is critical because REASON 6.

CONCLUSION:

It is true that REASON 1, REASON 2, and REASON 3. It is also true that REASON 4, REASON 5, and REASON 6. Although many might argue that NOT YOUR ARGUMENT, it is clear that YOUR ARGUMENT.