

I believe that De-extinction should not occur. The reason I say this is because it could be potentially dangerous. Lines 24-27 in "Text 4" explain that sickness could be a huge factor and I agree. If the animal had some sort of disease that was present, say, 10,000 years ago, how would we treat or cure it? Humans would probably start to become extinct as well! Lines 4-6 in "Text 3" explain that to sustain a single dinosaur you would need thousands of extinct trees as well. A Wooly Mammoth, or dinosaur isn't just going to survive off of the tiny vegetation we have now. Lines 31-39 in "Text 2" give the point that our climate is way different than it was tens of thousands of years ago. Even if we did clone a Wooly mammoth, what would he eat? where would he live, and survive? These are the questions that make me feel like the whole cloning idea could not work out. So many factors are present that could potentially ruin millions of dollars of work, for no reason. We would have to be prepared, and I don't think would ever take so much time to prepare that kind of return. It's just too much.

I think we should fix the problems we have here, on Earth, before we decide we want Wooly Mammoths to walk the Earth. So once again, no, I do not believe de-extinction should occur. Although it could help the environment, I'm sure we can find less risky, and less expensive ways of doing so. Lines 12-16 in (Text 4) also explain, in order to stop extinction a second time, we would have to clone way more than just 1 of the animal. That costs time, money, and could be potentially dangerous as well. You wouldn't just

---

## **Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 3 – A**

---

be able to clone 1 bird, you'd have to clone millions. That's the highly unrealistic, price heavy, and scary part. Although de-extinction would be cool, the concerns outweigh the benefits for me.

---

### **Anchor Level 3–A**

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*I believe that De-extinction should not occur. The reason I say this is because it could be potentially dangerous*). The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*So many factors are present that could potentially ruin millions of dollars of work, for no reason*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Although it could help the environment, I'm sure we can find less risky, and less expensive ways of doing so*). The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*If the animal had some sort of disease that was present, say, 10,000 years ago, how would we treat or cure it? and in order to stop extinction a second time, we would have to clone way more than just 1 of the animal*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material [*Lines 24-27 in “Text 4” and Lines 12-16 in (Text 4)*]. The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay. The essay begins by introducing the claim, then provides reasons to support the claim, including a brief reference to a counterclaim, and concludes by reiterating the original claim that de-extinction is *highly unrealistic, price heavy, and scary*, reaffirming that *the concerns outweigh the benefits*. The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language (*our climate is way different than it and de-extinction would be cool*) and structure with no delineation of paragraphs. The essay demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors (*eat,? where; think would; enviroment*) that do not hinder comprehension.

Should extinct species be brought back to life?  
I believe they should be brought back. Species that are newly extinct should be brought back because most likely humans are the cause of their extinction. De-extinction is becoming possible, and should be done. It uses biotechnology to recreate the DNA in stem cells, allow us to bring back species that are completely wiped out.

In text one it says "extinction is forever," that is not true with the technology we have today. This would be able to right some of our wrongs. Also this would help us save species from becoming extinct. Some of the species brought back could help the environment and be used for medicinal purposes.

In text 2 they say that de-extinction is would be able to bring back plants for medicine. Also it would be near impossible to bring back dinosaurs like the T-rex. That is good because, if brought back and they got loose or in the wrong hands they'd be very dangerous.

In text 4 they say that de-extinction is bad, that is false. They say that it would increase greenhouse emissions. The thing is, we could bring back plants that would reduce them. It also says that it would be a waste of money, but if we use the money for de-extinction we would be able to bring back species that are beneficial to us.

---

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 3 – B

---

We should use de-extinction to benefit us.  
in the long run. It can be used in many ways  
such as medicine. This would be great for society.

### Anchor Level 3–B

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*Species that are newly extinct should be brought back because most likely humans are the cause of their extinction*). The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*Some of the species brought back could help the environment and be used for medicinal purposes*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*they say that de-extinction is bad, that is false and It also says that it would be a waste of money*). The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*Also it would be near impossible to bring back dinosaurs like the T-rex*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, only introducing each paragraph with the text from which it is summarized (*In text one it says*). The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay. The essay has an introductory paragraph that states the claim that extinct species should be brought back. Two subsequent paragraphs briefly support the claim while a third addresses the counterclaim. The conclusion is brief and general, moving slightly away from the original claim (*We should use de-extinction to benefit us in the long run*). The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style (*In text 2 they say that de-extinction would be able to bring back plants for medicine*), using primarily basic language and structure (*this would help us save species and The thing is we could bring back plants*). The essay demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors (*it says “extinction is forever,”; possible, and should; allow us; that is not true; greenhouse immitions; bring back plants the would reduce them*) that hinder comprehension.

Extinct species should not be brought back into existence. There are many reasons for this. These animals would not fit into today's society. They would really not be able to adapt to the new surroundings. The fact that before, there were no buildings or such, and now, it's very scarce that you'll find a place with no buildings or any industrial structures. There really would just be so much anarchy for an extinct species in today's setting. The text and readings support this thesis.

In text I, "SQS: The Ethics of Species' De-Extinction," they talk about scientist coming close to being able to clone extinct species. Already, that is a bad idea besides the fact that some animals and species can be beneficial towards us. In the reading, there is no factual evidence that there will be any benefit whatsoever to this, the scientists just want to do this for the reason that it would be a step forward in science and cloning. Simply with the fact that nothing positive will come from these advances for the reason they intend is preposterous. Of course if further down the road in research, they clone essential animals such as bald eagles, in which this great nation relies on for it is the essential animal that is the symbol of the white house and America. This is the only reason along with beneficial animals that anyone would support cloning.

In Text II, "Bringing them Back To Life," the author of the article talks about Fernández-Arias and how he has been waiting for this moment for a long time now. Would it really affect this man if they could clone? ~~It would affect~~ His daily life wouldn't be affected, other than different animals, but this doesn't benefit him. Also, later in the article, they talk about how it would be cool to see a Tyrannosaurus Rex again. This is all childsplay in the reasoning for cloning. These creatures don't benefit us and will literally kill us. No one wants to fight for their lives on the daily. That would not be beneficial to our daily lives. This is no reason to clone.

In Text III, "The Case Against De-Extinction: It's a Fascinating but Dumb Idea," they make some good points. Yes, it would ~~be~~ be stupid to spend thousands, even millions of dollars on this, not being able to compensate the loss of these species. This whole thing is financially problematic, just like the article says, and this article makes the most sense "smart-decision" wise.

Overall, cloning would be a cool idea.

---

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 3 – C

---

but waste so much money for nothing  
in particular borders furthering the  
studies in science and cloning.  
No benefits have been said and this  
would be a stupid idea if there  
is no benefits, therefore cloning is a waste  
of money.

---

### Anchor Level 3-C

The essay introduces a reasonable claim, as directed by the task (*Extinct species should not be brought back into existence. There are many reasons for this*). The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*These creatures don't benefit us and will literally kill us*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*the scientists just want to do this for the reason that it would be a step forward in science and cloning*). The essay presents ideas inconsistently and inaccurately, in an attempt to support analysis (*His daily life wouldn't be affected, other than different animals, but this doesn't benefit him*), making use of some evidence that may be irrelevant (*if further down the road in research, they clone essential animals such as bald eagles*). The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, identifying each text at the beginning of the relevant paragraph. The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay. The essay has a general introduction, establishing the claim against bringing extinct species back into existence because of changes in surroundings, and three supporting paragraphs that include confused or irrelevant information. The conclusion focuses primarily on ideas from the third supporting paragraph (*Overall, cloning would be a cool idea but waste so much money*) and is brief. The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style (*Already, that is a bad idea besides the fact that some animals and species can be beneficial towards us*), using primarily basic language and structure (*is proposterous, in which this grand nation relies on, this would be a stupid idea*). The essay demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors (*now, its very scarce; to this, the scientists just want to do this; their lives on the daily; not being able to compensate the loss of these species*) that hinder comprehension.

I agree with the idea about de-extinction is a good one. I believe we should only revive some species like the passenger pigeon.

In lines 12-21 of Text 4 it states bringing back extinct animals may or may not work. The habitat of the pigeon has already change. So if you bring it back one of the biggest questions is if we do revive them, were would we set it free? It would be a waste of time because there would be to many of them.

Extinction is a slow process that will eventually happen to every living species, humans sometimes make the process even faster. Yeah it would be cool to see a animal that lived hundreds or even thousands of years ago to be alive, but it might disturb the balance between species. The world changed from thousands of years. How will a feature survive in a climate its not use to?

I think we should let nature do its thing unless we can save pigeons and the others. Who says extinction is a bad thing?

#### Anchor Level 2-A

The essay introduces a claim (*I believe we should only revive some species like the passenger pigeon*). The essay demonstrates a confused and unclear analysis of the texts, failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*Yeah it would be cool to see a animal that lived hundreds or even thousands of years ago to be alive*). The essay presents ideas inconsistently and inaccurately, in an attempt to support analysis (*In lines 12-21 of Text 4 it states bringing back extinct animals may or may not work*), making use of some evidence that is irrelevant. The essay demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, using only one in-line reference (*In lines 12-21 of Text 4*). The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay, shifting the focus of discussion from reviving *some species like the passenger pigeon* to presenting reasons why that idea is not workable (*it might disturb the balance between species*). The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is inappropriate and imprecise (*Yeah it would be cool and we should let nature do 'its' thing*). The essay demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors (*believe; pigeon already change; pigeon ... it ... them; were would; species, humans; a animal; its not use to*) that hinder comprehension.

Scientists have been studying to bring back extinct species to the world. For an animal to be extinct is to no longer live, your entire species. Knowing scientists they could only go back only a few years not ~~10~~ Animals from a long time ago. Bringing back species most people don't even know about is a good idea. ~~If~~ the scientist can clone a pair and breed them to bring back that type of species, then we could know more on that type of animal. If scientist were to bring back an extinct species eventually humans would drive them back to extinction, because of what we do to get that type of animal, we use them for food and clothing so either way the extinction would be brought back. In two of these articles they talk about Jurassic Park and what's the movie trying to show, it shows how they bring the dinosaur back and the trees that are needed for these animals. They should bring back these animals but I don't think the dinosaurs should be brought back what if they destroy our human kind then there would only be animals on the planet, but we did take over the extinct gradually because they were here first but then got ~~wiped~~ wiped out.

## **Anchor Level 2–B**

The essay introduces a claim (*Bringing back species Most people dont even know about is a good Idea*). The essay demonstrates unclear analysis of the texts (*Knowing scientists they could only go back only a few years not Animals from a long time ago*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims. The essay presents ideas inconsistently and inaccurately (*So either way the extinction would be brought back and they Should bring back these animals but I dont think the dinosaurs Should be brought back*), in an attempt to support analysis, making use of some evidence that is irrelevant (*we did take over the extinct animals because they were here here first*). The essay demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material. The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay, first arguing that *Bringing back species ... is a good Idea*, but then shifting to the opposite idea (*if Scientist were to bring back an extinct Species eventually humans would drive them back to extinction*). The response lacks a formal writing style, using some language that is imprecise (*For an animal to be extinct is to no longer live, your entire species and whats the Movie trying to show*). The essay demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors (*Knowing scientists they; a few years not; dont; species, then; Scientist were; Species eventually; animal, we; whats the Movie; animals. they; back What; kind then*) that make comprehension difficult.

The extinct species have been thinking about coming back into our existence. As either people see this as a help for others or bad or environment and many other reason why they want wants to.

The reasons why most people work on de-extinction are for scientific and technologic challenges involved in it. Scientist see it as an accomplishment to be able to create organisms of species that's been extinct for a short period of times, such as passenger pigeon or mammoth. In certain points there's always a point why certain animals go extinct and many scientist can't even prove that the results or harms ~~are~~ of de-extinction will cause. I think there's a reason for everything, keeping the environment stable like how it is, is a better choice than bringing back something that was bad.

Anchor Level 2-C

The essay introduces a claim (*Keeping the environment stable like how it is, is a better choice than bringing back something that was bad*). The essay demonstrates unclear analysis of the texts (*its either people see this as a help for others or bad or environment and many other reason why they would want to*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims. The essay presents little evidence from the texts (*Scientist see it as an accomplishment to be able to create organisms of species that's been extinct for a short period of times, such as passenger pigeon or mammoth*). The essay does not make use of citations. The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, simply stringing together statements which are often vague (*In certain points there's always a point why certain animals go extinct*), failing to create a coherent essay. The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is imprecise (*The extinct species have been thinking about coming back into our existance*). The essay demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors (*existance, its; other reason; Scientist see; species thats; period of times; many scientist; harms of De-extinction; Theres*) that make comprehension difficult.

## Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 1 – A

There are many different opinions on if extinct animals should come back or not. Although this may be impossible, I think that they should, because you can study the organisms, and find out new and different things about them that nobody has ever realized. This could be a rare thing to do, and nearly impossible. Artifacts show things and organisms in the past with little that they know, but they don't know much about how they have evolved. ~~Even though~~ There are organisms today that people don't know about. Once they ~~found out~~ discover the organisms they can't find out their ancestry, because ~~not~~ there aren't much artifacts or things that you can see in the past endangered or extinct creatures to study from. So if the past creatures came back to life, both male and female from every species. Scientist should do research to see how they became extinct or endangered, and also they can see mutated animals that come from the same species or DNA make up. As you can see, this would be important to look at, if the extinct species came back to life.

### Anchor Level 1-A

The essay introduces a claim (*Although this may be impossible, I think that they should*) but does not demonstrate analysis of the texts. The essay presents no evidence from the texts and does not make use of citations. The essay is a personal response about *organisms*. The essay exhibits some organization of ideas but lacks a formal style (*Once they discover the organisms they can't find out their ancestry, because there aren't much artifacts or things that you can see in the past endangered or extinct creatures to study from*). The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors (*should, because; organisms, and find; do, and; specie. Scientist Should*) that do not hinder comprehension. The essay is a personal response, making little or no reference to the task or texts and, therefore, can be scored no higher than a 1.

---

**Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 1 – B**

---

The thought of "De-extinction" that has been argued in the recent years shows that we should go with it. "De-extinction" has shown promise as a good way to help humans. ways it helps humans, is with pharmaceutical drugs to help people.

**Anchor Level 1-B**

The essay introduces a claim (*we should go with it*) but does not demonstrate analysis of the texts. The essay presents no evidence from the texts and does not make use of citations. The essay, consisting of three general statements about "De-extinction," exhibits little organization of ideas and information. The essay is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.

With today's advances in technology, the process of de-extinction is nearly within reach. With this new ability to revive species from extinction, a new question is proposed: Should this actually be done? As it is with ~~most~~ everything in life, with every action ~~follows~~ follows a reaction. Some conservative biologists believe that this could be one of the greatest achievements of man kind, while others believe that it ~~should not be~~ is a power not to be tampered with, for the negative affects are too great. However, the positive effects of de-extinction are ~~too~~ too great to ignore, and they outnumber the negative affects as well.

As it is mentioned above, there are drawbacks to such an action as de-extinction. Let us remember that these organisms went extinct for a reason. They were not suitable for their environment and, as a result, were removed permanently. They might not even survive this "resurrection." Also, as it is stated in Text 4 lines 22-26, the revival of such organisms could propose a threat to existing ones and could even harbour dangerous diseases that could affect biodiversity in a negative way. However, these reasons are off hypothetical and would not necessarily happen. The positive side affects, on the other hand, are guaranteed to happen.

There are many more substantial and beneficial affects that follow the actions of de-extinction. For example, by bringing these creatures back to life, scientists can study living examples; their behaviors, anatomy, and all their biological information can be accounted for. The huge gaps left in evolutionary history can finally be filled <sup>(Text 1 lines 22-24)</sup>. Also, it is proven that by introducing the original inhabitants of a natural environment, their presence can actually be beneficial to the land and populations around them. By re-introducing mammoths to the tundras (Text 2 lines 36-38), they will be able to fertilize the ground with their manure, thus creating new plant life which will greatly improve the biodiversity of the near tundra nearly devoid of life. Additionally, these ~~recently~~ revived plant and animal species could possess natural immunities to diseases present today. From them, we can cultivate this genetic information and process it so that humans may use it to gain immunity to these diseases as well.

As it is clear to see, de-extinction is an ability that must be taken advantage of. The good far outweighs the bad. Ignoring this revolutionary idea could be the biggest mistake that mankind could ever make.

Today In the present species have had provided a lot since the past. Most species are known like dog, cat, and other types of animals. Back in the past nobody has ever seen what they use to be like before, cause most of the past species are extinct. Now in the present scientists has made a de extinction device that can clone extinct species. I think that they should Bring Back the Extinct Species.

Text 2 tells you that De-extinction consider that the cloning and genomic engineering techniques being developed for de extinction could also help preserve endangered species, especially ones that don't breed easily in captivity. It would be an incredible scientific accomplishment to be able to create organisms of a species that has been extinct for sometime, such as the passenger pigeon or mammoth. There is also a desire on the part of many people to see living examples of extinct animals, particularly charismatic or culturally valued like the ivory-billed woodpecker or thylacine.

Some say that the de extinction is something that ~~can~~ can never happen. It can be true a little bit, for reason that to copy organism that decay ~~within~~ thousand's years ago. De extinction was only accomplished in the movie Jurassic Park according text 3 of the passage. De extinction is hard thing to process even for scientist.

Over the millennia that animals have lived on this earth many have become extinct, some due to natural reasons but most are due to human interference. Now there may be an opportunity to bring these extinct animals back through a process known as de-extinction. Some argue that by re-introducing extinct animals back into the world's ecosystems, biodiversity would increase and the world would be better; however this is untrue. De-extinction would cause more harm than good in the long run and the money used for de-extinction would be better spent to prevent further extinctions.

Every animal has a specific food source and habitat that it needs in order to survive. For example through de-extinction, scientists hope to bring back passenger pigeons. These birds eat American chestnuts which are extinct themselves. So the real question is what would the pigeons eat? (Text 4, lines 16-18) There is a rule in nature known as survival of the fittest. The birds that have survived are now better equipped so they will cause the passenger pigeon to quickly become extinct once again. This natural law applies to all other species that would be brought back from extinction.

This brings up another reason why de-extinction is not a good idea. Humans now live in many areas that were once grass and forest. Shopping malls have replaced space that extinct animals lived. Pollution

from industries have polluted water sources. So if science brings back species and there is no food source, no habitation, no protection from predators, this is a crime against the de-extinct animals and a huge waste of money.

Perhaps the most important reason scientists should not invest in de-extinction is "moral hazard." (Text 4, line 27) Moral hazard is the belief that future generations will take care of current problem we create. In a way, then, we, or scientists are not responsible for the consequences of their actions. This belief would increase people's indifference to the consequences of bringing back extinct animals. "Erosion of biodiversity" would continue (Text 4 line 37) pollution, negative climate changes would increase because there is always tomorrow to deal with today's problems!

Text 3 raises another objection: "research priorities." (line 38) The author strongly states the social needs of the "very poor people in Africa, Brazil and Madagascar" (lines 38-39) must be more important than de-extinction research. "Conservation is about finding alternative, sustainable futures for peoples, for forests, and for wetlands" (Text 3, lines 48-49)

Despite these obvious reasons against de-extinction, many people believe it will help the environment. For example, Siberia would benefit greatly if the

mammoth was brought back. Now, Siberia is only a "moss-dominated tundra" but the mammoth would create "an area of grassy steppes" (Text 2, line 34). But, even though extinct animals once helped ancient ecosystems, there is no proof they could survive long enough to actually change an environment and in fact they would definitely disturb species that are now thriving in the tundra.

Others believe humans can "make up for the wrong of extinction" (Text 1, lines 25-26). Yes, de-extinction might initially right some of those wrongs, but it will increase the crimes against nature because now species are replaceable. Some others believe, on a selfish level, "there is a desire, on the part of many people, to see living examples of extinct animals (or plants), particularly charismatic ones." (Text 1, lines 22-23)

De-extinction is setting us up for failure on many different levels. We should focus our skill research and money on preserving all the species already on this earth and creating an earth free of pollution and social justice for all people.

In recent years the concept of bringing back extinct animals, a process called de-extinction has been discussed. The process has many flaws and will provide more problems for the environment than actually help it. However, ~~some~~ scientists feel strongly either way on the subject.

Some scientists believe de-extinction is a good idea to undo how humans destroyed species in the past. However, the issue present is if a ~~@@~~ species is re-introduced to an environment how will it effect the other ~~@@~~ animals and plants.

Those opposed to de-extinction ~~@@~~ counter that, "efforts to bring back species are a colossal waste" (Text 3, Line 27). The environmental issues involved out-weigh the ability to "see living examples of extinct animals" (Text 1, Lines 22-23) It is also argued that efforts to implement de-extinction are virtually impossible to sustain a population, "The passenger pigeon's previous habitat is utterly transformed..." (Text 4, Line 18). In order to make de-extinction plausible, the causes of extinction would have to be solved first, "habitat destruction, climate change, pollution, and extraction." (Text 1, Line 33).

To remove these environmental threats to species is impossible, and thus, so is de-extinction. ~~Species should not be done~~

Species should not be brought back into existence because as Text 3 and 4 illustrates, more harm to the environment would result than

benefits. Another issue is that a reintroduced animal needs a food source that most likely is extinct, or almost extinct. De-extinction would result in a massive cycle of reintroducing species to accommodate other reintroduced species. Not only are food sources a question, but also a habitat for the species. "Those of us who attempt to reintroduce zoos-bred species that have gone extinct in the wild have one question at the top of our list, where do we put them?" (Text 3, Line 18-20). Putting ~~them~~<sup>species</sup> back in their original habitat, which may or may not exist anymore as well as providing them a food supply that does not interfere with pre-existing species, would be a challenge. Also the species could be a rare and expensive meal, proved Text 3, "it will become the most expensive cabrito ever eaten." (Text 3 Line 26).

Overall, the benefit of observing extinct species and to de-extinct them because humans resulted in their original extinction is proven to be not worth it. The downsides out-weigh the positives on the matter of de-extinction. It would be impossible to reintroduce a species without throwing off the balance of an environment. Extinct species should not be brought back into existence.

Over the years ~~people~~ scientist have been trying to find a way to ~~make~~ make animals that have been existent come back to life. In my opinion these animals should ~~be~~ not be able to be brought back. In these texts "the ethics of species 'de-extinction'; "Bringing them back to life" "The case against Species revival" & "The case against 'de-extinction': It's fascinating but dumb idea" all show why ~~these~~ animals shouldn't be brought back.

In the ~~text~~ text "The ethics of species 'de-extinction'" it tells of the amazing ~~and~~ outcome that will happen when using this technique. Scientist say it would be a great "scientific accomplishment" if we were to bring back animals from many years ago such as the passenger pigeon or the mammoth. Yes, it would be a great accomplishment to bring them back but there is a lot of political ~~and~~ reasons that mess it up.

There is nothing involving the real world that helps this & there are many poor countries that cannot ~~afford~~ afford to research in these terms, which was explained told in "The case ~~of~~"

against species revival.

In the text "The Case against 'de-extinction'" it ~~tells~~ tells of many reasons why there ~~shouldn't~~ shouldn't be able to bring back animals. In the past Passenger Pigeons ~~would have~~ supplied people with meat & would cause Lyme disease. The habitats in which those birds ~~would~~ once stood in are partly gone & the source of food in which they eat are extinct. Financially & problematic it wouldn't be able to happen because ~~everyday~~ everyday this plant is ~~falling~~ changing by ~~humans~~ human. Another ~~bad~~ bad cause for this happening would be that the climates would ~~be~~ be disrupted.

Animals such as the Passenger Pigeon & mammoth should not be brought back from extinction. The habitats ~~are~~ & food source they once had are no longer existing for them to have a stable home. ~~Also~~ Financially & politically there is no way it would be a great idea. The bringing back of animals would be great but it's a horrible idea all together.

**Practice Paper A – Score Level 4**

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 4.

**Practice Paper B – Score Level 2**

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 2.

**Practice Paper C – Score Level 5**

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 5.

**Practice Paper D – Score Level 4**

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 4.

**Practice Paper E – Score Level 3**

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 3.