

# Animal rights and wrongs



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Debates concentrate on whether we should stop animal testing or not. On one hand, conversationists argue that animal research and testing is crucial for our futures healthcare and that what they do can only be through animals. On the other hand, it is argued that like humans; animals have feelings and they don't deserve to be testes on. The two extracts 'Animal Rights and Wrongs' published by the Guardian, and 'Animal Experiments are Bad Science' published by Animal Aid, are both giving us some light on animal testing.

Similar topics they may be, one 'Animal Rights and wrongs' is balanced and gives two perspectives, why testing is good and bad. The Animal Aid leaflet is biased, its only there to persuade us to stop testing, by looking at its every negative points. Rarely does it mention the benefits, when it does it is followed by criticism. By looking at the sub-headings you can clarify the above. 'Animal Rights and Wrongs' is what we call a formal piece of text. The writer is like an encyclopaedia, no feelings, no opinions, only the facts.

The opinions that are included, are those made by us, the people, what the public has to say. The Animal Aid leaflet, if you read it you will know it is a persuasive piece of text. This can be clarifies by the use of rhetorical questions. It uses pictures of animals with strong human like expressions, especially the monkey. Looking at the monkey is like looking at our own primitive selves, this is also backed by Charles Darwin's theory, now there is even greater feeling in our hearts, if we think these are our long lost relatives as so to speak.

The 'Animal Rights and Wrongs' leaflet has a lot of pictures of domestic pets, phrases like 'Mans Best Friend' make feelings to the subject even greater. More persuasion comes from the fact that the Animal Aid leaflet is directly appealing to the reader with the use of 'we' and 'you', using such words they can manipulate us and what we don't and do take in. The 'Animal Rights and Wrongs' text is only to portray the truth, positive and negative, while letting we make up our own decisions. The text has sub-headings as questions against animal testing, but this is balanced out by the facts and in depth info it gives us.

The Animal Aid leaflet just talks about the negatives, giving us supposed and vague facts with no option what so ever, to even support animal testing. The people who writ it are very, or want the reader to be very close-minded. Like I said before they want to manipulate us. To conclude, the 'Animal Rights and Wrongs' article uses much more pictures than the Animal Aid leaflet, and it has lots of negative sub-headings all of which are balanced out by the facts it gives us, which in my opinion is very important in making a big decision.

The Animal Aid leaflet wants to feed us with the info of its own choice 'brain washing', it is also okay with the idea of getting support from carnivores, but its not okay with the idea of advancing on future healthcare and research via animals. Its true, the research and new medicine haven't paid in, but a lot of it has. The Animal Aid leaflets purpose is understandable; it is setting forward an argument, whereas the 'Animal Rights and Wrongs' article is there to inform.