

Angel Ortiz

APES

1/21/14

Final

APES Final

Believe it or not, zoos have been a part of human history for centuries now. Although these knowledge filled animal inhabited parks are good fun for tourists and families, they are surely a thing of the past in my opinion. Now a days, all around the world we are depleting the natural habitats of most animals found in zoos. While most people would consider putting animals with decreasing habitats in captivity a good thing; they would be wrong. Putting these animals in captivity is not only ruining their wild lifestyles, but also ruining or corrupting the biodiversity of their natural habitats or the ecosystems in which they live. In most of these ecosystems, life will struggle to go on if you take a piece of the puzzle away. For example at the Brookefield Zoo the presenter told us it was like taking a gear out of an old time clock; The clock would still work but not how it would've originally, it would always be off. Considering that animals are the only life that live in the zoo itself. You'd think that their needs for comfortable living would come first; you would be wrong if that's what you think. As most zoos pay more attention to the theatrical display of the enclosures than the actual behavioral needs of the animal in them. A good example of this would be in the article we read about *the future and ethics of zoos*. A major American zoo hired a curator as an advisor for a new jaguar enclosure they were installing, the zoo acquired 25 square meters for the enclosure. The curator advised them that this small area would cause the jaguar to partake in excessive stereotypic behavior, the zoo however insisted that the area was sufficient enough for the jaguar and went on and built the enclosure. (Animal needs come first) I just think zoos aren't here for the right reasons, they are here for the entertainment purposes more than the educational purposes.

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural resources (IUCN), is who decides what species are worthy of saving. The IUCN is made up of the collective efforts of the world's leading conservation groups. They publish annual *Red List*, which has become the world's standard for listing the world most endangered species. According to the book *Living in the Environment*, in 2007 the

list included roughly 16,000 plants and animals which was 60% higher than what the list showed in 1995. (Page , 186) That is only a difference of 12 years, that's a huge jump for such a relatively small amount of time.

Lets say for example you buy a house and its not in the best shape. You are now the owner of this house, therefor you have an obligation to take care of the house and fix what needs to be fixed in order for your life in that specific house to go on. I use this analogy because planet earth is that house, we as its inhabitants are responsible for the care of the planet. It seems that all the mammals and organisms found in the wild are the only ones doing what they need to do correctly. Humans are ruining the natural flow of what is going on in the world. We demolish the habitats of organisms that are sometimes endemic to that area or region. This falls on our shoulders as humans, everyone of the planet. Of coarse there is going to be some finger pointing but the fact of the matter all human beings should be held equally responsible for the turnout of the planet. According to the article *Why Preserve Biodiversity*, All species have the right to exist. Also Human culture must be built on a profound respect for nature. This is giving me an apparent perspective on how we tell everyone that we mean well. When in fact most of the time these are just cover up stories. We say all species have a right to exist, yet we destroy their natural habitats which plays a direct roll in the decreasing numbers of endangered animals. We also claim that our culture must be built on a profound respect for nature, yet we show very minimal respect for nature in everyday life. I mean we show more respect for nature on a television and a piece of paper than we do in real life.

This is a very simple answer, all environmental issues are evaluated on the direct and indirect ways in which they benefit humans. Says the article *Why Preserve Biodiversity*. Lets say that the world only had two surviving species of frogs, one could be used for medicinal reasons and the other simply does nothing but eat flies. Which one do you think the world is going to take care of more, the one with medicinal purposes of coarse. (An ethical basis for preserving biodiversity)

There is a fair amount of ethical issues that are addressed when speaking of species conservation. Perhaps the most important is that the world is an interdependent whole made up of natural and human communities. (planet in peril) The well-being and health of any one part depends on the well-being of other parts. This according to *Why Preserve Biodiversity*. Which means that in order for one part to do well the other needs to be doing well as well. Humanity is part of nature as well as any other known or unknown species is. This tells me we should do more when taking these ethical

issues into account. The world needs to be a sustainable place for all species known or unknown have the equal right to flourish and be more.