

Some people say that animals should not be exploited for the benefit of human beings unless there is evidence that the animals do not suffer in any way. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

Essay:

Limiting the exploitation of animals for human benefits is a contentious issue that often provokes diverging opinions. While some argue that any usage causing potential animal suffering is wrong, others incline towards their usage, emphasizing the importance of human well-being.

On one side of the argument is the belief that inflicting suffering on animals through experiments, particularly cosmetic testing, is utterly inhumane. There are inflexibly stern animal rights activists who staunchly denounce all forms of animal utilization, citing instances such as stringent bans on animal testing in the EU and the UK cannot be overlooked.

Contrastingly, there are those who advocate the selective and regulated use of animal testing, particularly when it pertains to the betterment of human and animal health alike. Considering that such experiments are instrumental in advancing medical knowledge, their outright dismissal seems unwise. For instance, countless vital breakthroughs in medication have been made possible thanks to animal testing. It's important to note that minimizing animal suffering during such tests is a strong objective of conscientious researchers.

In conclusion, while it's crucial to mitigate unwarranted animal suffering, the categorical rejection of animal testing seems impractical given its considerable contribution towards medical advancements.

Word count: 195

Essay translated in Korean:

가

. 가 ,

.

가 ,

. EU UK

.

,

.

. ,

가

가

.

.

,

,

.

Good expressions:

1. Mitigate unwarranted animal suffering -
2. Inflexibly stern animal rights activists -
3. Betterment of human and animal health alike -
4. Its considerable contribution towards medical advancements -