

# We need a total ban on ivory sales

Level 2 | Intermediate

## Key Vocabulary

### Fill the gaps using these key words from the text:

endangered		moratorium	tusks	tnrives		
		ivory	conservationist	habitat		
1.	The two ve	ery long, pointed te	eth on an elephant are ca	lled		
2.		is the yellowish-white bone that tusks are made of.				
3.	A	is an officia	l agreement to stop an ac	ctivity for a temporary		
	period.					
4.	A	is someone	who hunts animals illega	ally.		
5.	A	is someone	who works to protect the	e environment from		
	damage or	destruction.				
6.	An	species is	one that may soon disapp	ear completely.		
7.	The type of place where an animal normally lives is called its					
8.	If something	าย	it is very successful.			

## What do you know?

#### Are these statements True or False?

- 1. The world's elephant population has fallen during the past 30 years.
- 2. Trade is the main reason for the destruction of animal species.
- 3. Apart from ivory, elephant hair and leather is also sold.
- 4. Most countries where elephants live are rich and politically stable.
- 5. Kenya now has more elephants than it had in 1970.
- 6. Many countries are now experiencing serious animal habitat destruction.

Now look in the text and check your answers





## We need a total ban on ivory sales

# Level 2 | Intermediate

### We need a total ban on ivory sales Richard Leakey

Fifteen years ago, Daniel arap Moi, Kenya's then president, and myself set fire to 2,000 elephant tusks. Pictures of this were shown on television around the world. If Kenya had sold these tusks, it would have earned millions of dollars. But I believed we had to show the real impact of the ivory trade, and to show that the only way to save Africa's elephants was to destroy the trade.

During the 1980s, ivory trading had cut the elephant population of Africa from 1.3 million to just 625,000. Kenya lost 80% of its elephants during this period. Most were killed by poachers. A few months after we burnt the tusks, the UN Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (Cites) put a ban on the ivory trade, and the killing of elephants was dramatically reduced. Recently Cites adopted an "action plan" that places further controls on the illegal ivory trade in Africa and calls on African countries with large elephant populations to prohibit unregulated domestic sales in ivory. But conservationists say the plan does not go far enough.

Conservation is only possible if a price is put on the heads of endangered species, and people in developing countries will stop killing endangered animals if they can see a financial reason for not killing them. But historically, trade has been the main reason for the destruction of many species, from tigers to cod. Opening up even a limited legal trade allows the illegal market to thrive.

It is not surprising that the ban on the ivory trade has not lasted. Cites agreed to allow countries that already had ivory stocks from before the ban to sell the ivory. This followed

pressure from a few southern African countries with protected elephant populations and not much poaching. Since then, poaching has increased again but some countries want to increase the trade in ivory. Namibia is asking Cites for an annual ivory export quota, as well as permission to trade in worked ivory and elephant hair and, with South Africa, in elephant leather.

These countries say they have the right to profit from their natural resources. This sounds reasonable until you remember that many poorer countries are campaigning against this. Kenya, supported by many other African states, is proposing a 20-year moratorium on ivory trade. The economics of the ivory trade do not make sense. Most countries where elephants live are poor and politically unstable, and the even a limited trade in ivory would cause problems. These countries are already having difficulties trying to protect their wildlife and allowing the ivory trade again would attract poachers to these countries.

As human populations grow, many countries are experiencing serious habitat destruction and human-wildlife conflict. I am the first to support efforts to compensate farming communities for destruction caused by animals. However, as Kenya now has only 20% of the elephants it had in 1970, this issue should be resolved by developing long-term land-use policies and not by exterminating wildlife.

Richard Leakey was director of the Kenya Wildlife Service until 1999

The Guardian Weekly 10/15/2004, page 13





# We need a total ban on ivory sales

Level 2 | Intermediate

## Comprehension check

### Choose the best answer

- 1. The author of the text and the president of Kenya set fire to 2,000 elephant tusks
- a. in order to stop them falling into the hands of poachers.
- b. to earn millions of dollars for Kenya.
- c. to show that the only way to save Africa's elephants was to destroy the ivory trade.
- 2. Most elephants are killed by
- a. legal hunters.
- b. tourists.
- c. poachers.
- 3. People will only stop killing endangered species
- a. if it is illegal to do so.
- b. if there is a financial reason for not killing them.
- c. if there is an illegal market.
- 4. According to the author, what is the best solution to the problem of habitat destruction?
- a. exterminating wildlife.
- b. developing long-term land use policies.
- c. allowing the ivory trade again.

# 4 Vocabulary - opposites

### What are the negative forms of these adjectives?

2. limited	
4. stable	
6. possible	
8. probable	
	4. stable 6. possible





## We need a total ban on ivory sales

Level 2 | Intermediate

## Vocabulary - word-building

### Complete the table:

	Verb	Noun	
1.	destroy		
2.	protect		
3.	compensate		
4.	reduce		
5.	conserve		
6.	agree		
7.	increase		
8.	permit		

## 6 Grammar focus

Look at this sentence from the text:

If Kenya had sold these tusks, it would have earned millions of dollars.

(But it didn't sell them and it didn't earn millions of dollars.)

Make sentences using the same structure from the following information:

- 1. Poachers killed elephants and Kenya lost 80% of its elephant population. (e.g. *If poachers hadn't killed elephants....*)
- 2. The author of the article and the Kenyan president burnt the tusks and Cites put a ban on the ivory trade.
- 3. Cites put a ban on the ivory trade and the trade fell.
- 4. Some countries asked Cites to remove the ban and poaching increased again.
- 5. Some countries protected their elephants and the amount of poaching fell.

## Discussion

Should a regulated ivory trade be allowed?





## We need a total ban on ivory sales

### Level 2 | Intermediate

#### **KEY**

### 1 Key Words

1. tusks 2. ivory 3. moratorium 4. poacher 5. conservationist 6. endangered 7. habitat 8. thrives

### What do you know?

1. T; 2. T; 3. T; 4. F; 5. F; 6. T

#### 3 Comprehension check

1. c; 2. c; 3. b; 4. b

### 4 Vocabulary 1 Opposites

1. illegal2. unlimited3. unreasonable4. unstable5. short-term6. impossible7. unsurprising8. improbable

### 5 Vocabulary 2 Word-building

1. destruction2. protection3. compensation4. reduction5. conservation6. agreement7. increase8. permission

#### 6 Grammar focus

- 1. If poachers hadn't killed elephants, Kenya wouldn't have lost 80% of its elephant population.
- 2. If the author of the article and the Kenyan president hadn't burnt the tusks, Cites wouldn't have put a ban on the ivory trade.
- 3. If Cites hadn't put a ban on the ivory trade, the trade wouldn't have fallen.
- 4. If some countries hadn't asked Cites to remove the ban, poaching would have increased again.
- 5. If some countries hadn't protected their elephants, the amount of poaching wouldn't have fallen.

