**31) Society should make efforts to save endangered species only if the potential extinction of those species is the result of human activities.**

Write a response in which you discuss your views on the policy and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider the possible consequences of implementing the policy and explain how these consequences shape your position.

1. 确实，因果上 ，人类活动危 害野生动物物种 的灭绝与濒危 和人类的活动 有着直接的 联系。森林的消失导致 habitat 的锐减，污染和人类的对其他动物的捕杀切断了食物链 food chain，渡渡鸟(dodo bird)曾有几十亿只，殖民者开发美州 100 多年，最终这种 鸟杀绝了，于是靠这种鸟进食种子排出后才能发芽的树，再也不能发芽 ，濒临灭绝。太 平洋小岛上的鼻行动物，由于秘密核试验，永远的灭绝了;我希望 ，未来的孩子们问起 大熊猫长什么样的时候，我们可以带他们到动物园去看而不是仅仅在电视或书本上。人类活动的影响有直接的也有间接的。对于直接的影响，比如：野生动物的过度扑杀，开发建设活动导致栖息地的丧失，人类是应该担起责任的。endangered species 不仅包括动物，还有很多植物。

2. 财力有限，要投入发展，尤其是对于发展中国家，当人们的基本要求(basic needs)不 能满足时 。对动物的严格保护必将造成巨大的财政负担 (financial burden)；举例，Zambia a few cultivated lands all-year-round draught low yield of crops suffer from robbery burglary rape prostitute orphan from vicious circle

2. 物种灭绝若是人类影响，而人类的影响又非常复杂，还是自然灭绝(natural s selection)，很难区分；即使可以区分，有些物种灭绝，可能是自然选择的结果，人类其实没有必要干涉，举例，

Is that true that human activities cause some species become extinct? … society should be responsible to save those endangered species? … ’duty’ ‘competition’ … regard preserving endangered species as the human duty, especially for those potential extinction as the result of human activities. Meanwhile, … assert it’s useless to protect them since those species can’t adapt to the environment… society should consider both the expense of protecting endangered species and the value of those species.

According to IUCN reports, the rate of species extinction is on average of 5%-20% for the world in past centry. And the major reason leads to unprecedented high extinction rate is natural resources overexploitation by massive large scale human activities. 在过去的400年中,全世界共灭绝哺乳动物58种,大约每7年就灭绝一个种,这个速度较正常化石记录高7～70倍；在本世纪的100年中,全世界共灭绝哺乳动物23种,大约每4 年灭绝一个种,这个速度较正常化石记录高13～135倍…… For the past 400 years, … Human should take its full responsity for the wrong doing and save the remaining rare, endangered, species at the best as we can. Otherwise ,”their fate is our future. “( XXX some people). Nevertheless, when a place where hunger is the major threats to living, the society should set its priority to allievate its people for starving, and then, to deal with conservation. Lastly, I have to admitted that, ecosystem provides human with plenty food, and shelter. The insationable tapping into natural resources triggered the balance to fall which leads to the natural hazardours.

… when an animal goes extinct, it is impossible to bring it back. Nature is beautiful, and that aesthetic value is a reason to keep it, just as we preserve artistic masterpieces like the Mona Lisa or Angkor Wat. Moreover, even if people do not yet know the direct benefits a certain species offers, it is important to preserve that species to allow for further research. Some endangered species maintain gene pools that help to protect biodiversity -- the "web of life," and provide natural laboratories for research. Last but not least, the food chain is important to produce the healthy vegetation and adequate water supplies, which humans rely on. If one species is lost, it can create a domino effect in the animal kingdom. Ultimately, species are now going extinct far faster than they used to, and human seem to be to blame; it is consequential to protect endangered species.

However, strict conservation regulations may put a heavy burden on the government’s financial which is likely to exacerbate the extinction of endangered species. We might reluctantly compromise on the environmental protection budget while health and education is in urgent need of government investment. It’s particularly true in developing or underdeveloped countries where biodiversity is amazing and habitat loss is alarming. That scenario is real in in China African country Zambia. a small country with an average annual income below $1000, way below the poverty line defined by United Naiton. Because they have tiny populations, the states cannot allocate big pot of money on endangered speices, We can’t require them to take the conservation as an affluent, large country. Zambia has XX species, Besides, Zambia faces a generalized HIV epidemic, with an estimated prevalence rate of 12.3% among adults (ages 15–49) in 2015–2016 and the mortality rate ad per 100,000 births for Zambia is 470. Why should we spend all that money on wildlife when we could spend it to stop people dying of starvation or disease? In short, it’s unfair to require all nations protecting the old buildings.

For China, a huge developing country, with a population over 1.6billion. The biodiversity is high . It is a biodiversity hotspots. As IUCN (international Unioin for conservation of nature) reports state, China is one of 17 mega diverse countries, it has over 34,687 known species of animals and plants, making it the third-most biodiverse country in the world. But, the rate of extinction and habitate loss is startling, it is as twice as the world average. The nations also face great challenges in poverty reduction and health issues. If the total of government funds is limited, it is suggested to put it in the place to satistify basic living requirements.

…there's an inherent tradeoff between economic prosperity and strong environmental protection. An analysis (published in the International Journal of Biodiversity in 2014) of more than a dozen studies considering the dollar value (or consumer surplus) of endangered species recreation calculated an average of $84 per person per day (in 2013 dollars). Using that figure and an estimate of some 10.1 million visits in 2012 to the National Biodiversity Preservation System, the study suggested endangered species might translate to $850 million or so in yearly use values. Besides the revenue generated by wilderness visits that can flow into local "gateway" communities-from money spent by the endangered species user directly (on gas, groceries, and other supplies) to profits spent locally by wilderness guides and outfitters-there are many other monetary benefits. Ultimately, wilderness areas protect the environment and positively impact local economies-and the national economy.

**63) There is little justification for society to make extraordinary efforts—especially at a great cost in money and jobs—to save endangered animal or plant species.**

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider ways in which the statement might or might not hold true and explain how these considerations shape your position.

**67) Some people believe that society should try to save every plant and animal species, despite the expense to humans in effort, time, and financial well-being. Others believe that society need not make extraordinary efforts, especially at a great cost in money and jobs, to save endangered species.**

Write a response in which you discuss which view more closely aligns with your own position and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should address both of the views presented.