**Writing 2: Analytic/Persuasive**

**Two letters to a local newspaper on the topic of animal experimentation.**

Address

The Editor,

The Western Times,

39, Haverford Street,

Cardiff.

22nd November 2015

Dear Sir,

I am a member of an Animal Help group and I have recently read an article published in your

newspaper by The Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry. The advertisement argued that

animal testing is a vital part in research and must be carried out. The article did not consider the

consequences that are endured by the animals involved and totally rejected the rights that they should

have. I completely disagree with this argument, as I believe that animals have rights just as people do.

The argument put forward by the article included a suggestion that although we have

treatments for many diseases and illnesses further research is needed to provide cures for them.

However, for years scientists have spent millions of pounds on torturing and killing animals for the

benefit of research without coming up with any cures or conclusions. I also disagree that it is right that

we use these animals to provide us with treatments for illnesses caused by our own vices, smoking for

example,

The advertisement claimed that scientists care about the animals used and not only does the

research provide us with solutions and aids to our illnesses but it also provides animals with treatments

for theirs. If scientists and researchers really care about these animals they would not put them through

such torture and endurance. It is also ridiculous to say that research and testing on animals helps them

too. Killing one animal to save another makes no sense at all. We do not kill one human being to save

another.

The article also claimed that we are now able to live well into our seventies and eighties

because of treatments provided by animal research for polio, tuberculosis etc. It forgot to mention,

however, that this is largely the result of improvements in sanitation and personal hygiene over the

years.

The article summed up its argument by saying that it is a matter of animal rights or human ills.

This is not necessarily the case. If we did not indulge ourselves with cigarettes, alcohol and other such

vices there would be no need to test on anything, as many illnesses that need animal torture to provide

cures would not exist. I don't see why animals should suffer for our benefit and I will never agree with

such animal research.

Yours sincerely,

Miss …………..

Address

The Editor,

The Western Times,

39, Haverford Street,

Cardiff.

22nd November 2015

Dear Sir,

I am a member of the Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry and I have recently

read a leaflet that you published written by an organisation that called themselves "Animal Help". The

leaflet argued against vivisection and totally rejected the idea of animal research without taking into

account the facts about the testing and the benefits that the research provides. It is for this reason that

I am writing to you a letter of complaint.

The leaflet argued that thousands of pounds are spent each year on animal testing that is yet to

produce any cures for illness. I admit that scientists who use animals for research purposes are yet to

find cures for diseases such as cancer, for example. However, the testing so far has produced us with

treatments for many of these illnesses and now allows millions of people who suffer with them to lead

normal, everyday lives. I regret that animals often die as a result of this testing but I also believe that

the fact that we have not yet found cures for these deadly diseases gives all the more reason to

continue with the testing.

The "Animal Help" advertisement also said that the drugs produced with the help of animal

research produce side effects that often cause more people to become ill. I would like to point out that

very often those people in hospital with illnesses triggered by the side effects of drugs have often been

taking the drugs for many years and in doing so have lengthened their lives. I would also like to

mention that there is only usually a small amount of people who suffer the side effects of treatments.

Many do not react at all to the drugs.

The advertisement also suggested that scientists and researchers are only interested in money

and profits. They argued that no conclusions have been made and still the government and huge

tobacco companies are employing scientists to do nothing but con the public into believing that they

care about people's health. They said, "If they really care, they would not make cigarettes!" I believe

that this is a very unfair judgement that is coming from people who have no idea of what is involved in

research. It is not the tobacco companies’ fault if the public want to weaken their health by smoking.

Warnings are clearly printed on cigarette packets and it is entirely the choice of the purchaser whether

to smoke cigarettes. It is not only lung cancer, which is mainly caused by those who indulge

themselves in smoking, which is researched. Scientists do not waste their time and money finding a

cure for nothing. They are working to provide cures for those who are ill, through no choice of their

own, with things such as breast cancer, diabetes and asthma not those who pathetically indulge in

cigarettes.

I think that organisations such as "Animal Help" have no right to argue on matters that they do

not have facts to back up their arguments with. If there were any alternatives to animal testing they

would be used. Scientists do not enjoy using animals for research but they have no other choice if they

want to succeed in finding cures for deadly diseases that will save millions of lives.

Yours sincerely,

Miss ……….