

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? A zoo has no useful purpose. Use specific reasons and examples to explain your answer.

I think that the question about whether a zoo has no useful purpose is the one that is open for debate. It is a topical question nowadays. Some people believe that a zoo has an essential and cognitive purpose. However, other people believe that a zoo has no useful purpose and people should observe wild animals in their nature. Personally, I think that both options have their advantages. In the following paragraphs I will analyse these points and present my own view in favour of people who think that animals should not be kept in a zoo.

From the one side, a zoo has many benefits for people. First of all, children can learn about animals not only from books and TV programs but from actually watching them alive. They can see animals, touch them and even feed them. I think it is an amazing experience for a child. He gains more knowledge and experience from this "communication" with an animal. Second of all, a zoo is a perfect place for adults to see many animals that people are not able to see in their lives.

However, from the other side, I keep asking myself "What kind of benefits wild animals have from a zoo?" Unfortunately, I cannot find any of them. I think that wild animals should live in their nature environment. Moreover, I think that we should observe them through TV programs sitting in our favourite chairs, or people who like danger should try to observe them in the native environment. I think that animals are not toys. I know that most zoos try to keep their animals in the environment which is close to their native, but they cannot give them as much freedom as animals want to.

To sum up, I think that wild animals should not be kept in a zoo. Personally, I enjoy more watching "Discovery Channel" than watching a black bear who does not know where to hide from the scorching sun in a Texas zoo.