For all the animals who have lost their lives to this cruel industry…
I will never stop fighting for you.

Julia Nardi
1 May 2015

Animals ab**USED** for Entertainment

One of the most prevalent misconceptions in the world is that non-human animals are nothing more than a mere source of entertainment for humans. Every day, animals are captured from the wild, torn from their families, and forced into unnatural and unhealthy environments simply to please society. Recently, many animal rights activists have shifted their focus to animal entertainment, which has become one of today's largest controversies. Despite what many believe, the idea of animal rights is indeed plausible and represents a very new and important debate in our ongoing affairs with animals (Sunstein and Nussbaum 195). Although there were a few nineteenth-century thinkers who argued that animals have rights, the serious political movement for animal liberation is very young (Spring 1). While there is a long history of wild animals being kept in different forms of menageries, it was not until the mid-eighteenth century that the precursors of modem zoological parks which display imprisoned animals for public amusement emerged. The first established zoo in the world is thought to be Zoo Vienna, which opened in 1752. However, the Philadelphia Zoo, opened 1874, was the first public zoo in the United States. Within one year of opening, the Philadelphia Zoo received 228,000 visitors paying to observe the 813 animals they had already placed in confinement. As desire to visit zoological parks was spreading across the country, zoos began opening in every major city in America (Gruen 136). “Zoos are simply peep shows, the animals merely goods displayed to the public in return for hard cash” (Magel 121). Furthermore, the animals being kept in these early wildlife establishments were bound to a life of solitude in cramped cages and tanks with little or no access to fresh air and sunlight. As a result, captives rarely live long. In the unusual case they survive for longer periods of time, animals in captivity develop stereotypies such as rocking,

pacing, and hair-pulling. Then and now, very little is known about how to care for wild animals (Gruen 136). Unfortunately, we are still facing the same problems today- even with the widespread knowledge that keeping animals locked up is a cruel industry. Defining 'cruel treatment' as unwarranted behavior that inflicts unnecessary pain on a creature capable of suffering, then most would agree that cruel treatment (so defined) *always* violates the rights of the being treated as such; rights that cannot ever be justifiably withdrawn or nullified (Morris and Fox 60). Many animal advocates argue a utilitarian perspective, suggesting that our duty as humans is to perform the act that will bring the best consequences to all those affected by the outcome (Regan 15). Through extensive global research, it has been undeniably proven that holding animals captive for human pleasure is not only abusive, but also unethical, immoral, and illegal.

In 2014, 229 institutions accredited by the Association of Zoos and Aquariums attracted over 175 million visitors (Association of Zoos and Aquariums). However, what most zoo-goers don't realize, while enjoying their day watching exotic animals, is how unhappy the animals truly are. Peter Batten, former director of San Jose Zoological Gardens, studied 200 zoos in the United States and was disturbed by his findings. In his book, *Living Trophies*, he documented a great deal of neurotic and malnourished animals who were kept locked in cramped, cold cells being fed artificial food. Furthermore, many of the animals had deformed bodies due to their unsuitable living quarters (Spring 117). As David Hancock, an architect and zoo director for over thirty years, notes: Zoo managers and designers know "virtually nothing about the wild habitats of the animals or of their natural diets, their breeding habits, natural groupings or lifestyles" (Gruen 137). As it turns out, wildlife exhibits are designed strictly to amuse, amaze, and entertain visitors by making the animals easily accessible to the gaze of the zoo visitor (Gruen 137-8). No

animal would choose to live in full view of humans, but in a zoo, they have no choice (Kalof and Fitzgerald 219). Accordingly, permitting the subjects to live in greater spaces with natural features would allow the animals to escape the scope of zoo visitors (Gruen 137). The entire reason a patron visits a zoo is in the hope of interacting with uncommon animals. In order to achieve financial success, zoos go to great lengths to cater to this desire. How human amusement can justify humiliating animals in captivity is not quite clear (Spring 110). When humans observe other species, they demand to be acknowledged by that individual (Kalof and Fitzgerald 225). However, strangers are usually unable to make friendly eye-contact with the desired spectacle because the animals have been immunized to human encounter (Kalof and Fitzgerald 222). After all, they are stalked and patronized by crowds of humans every day. It is, therefore, no surprise that captives are known to act aggressively towards zookeepers and bystanders. In 2013, a documentary called *Blackfish* was released. This highly regarded documentary told the story of a captive whale located at SeaWorld in San Diego, California. This heartbreaking film, featuring Tilikum the Orca, caught the attention of millions of empathetic people worldwide. Animals in marine parks frequently demonstrate psychological disturbances and are often forced to perform degrading acts that conflict with their natural instincts (Born Free USA). Director and producer of *Blackfish*, Gabriela Cowperthwaite, reveals shocking footage and emotional interviews that analyze Tilikum's extraordinary nature, the species' inhumane treatment in captivity, and the lives lost as a result of Tilikum's viscous confinement operation (Cowperthwaite). Numerous animal deaths, in fact, are induced by frantic and frightened captives being administered high doses of sedative drugs. These excessive mortality rates are entirely preventable. Batten summarized his findings by saying, "The majority of American zoos are badly run, their direction incompetent, and animal husbandry inept and in some cases non-

existent" (Spring 117). Captive marine mammals have among the highest of death rates, which the guests at marine parks and oceanariums are not usually aware of. A famous pilot whale at one oceanarium was actually thirteen different pilot whales over time, each successive whale being introduced to visitors by the same name, pretending it was the same animal. Likewise, orcas, also known as killer whales, have a life expectancy as long humans; yet at Sea World in San Diego, the oceanarium best at keeping orcas alive, they only survive an average of eleven years (Pryor 82-3). The *Oxford Dictionary of Animal Behavior* notes: "It seems reasonable to allow that animals may be distressed by being unable to feed and drink, to move their limbs, to sleep, and to have social interaction with their fellows" (Kalof and Fitzgerald 97).

In 2002, Germany became the first European nation that voted to ensure the rights of non-human animals in its constitution, simply by adding the words “and animals” to a clause that obliges states to respect and protect the dignity of human beings (Sunstein and Nussbaum 4). Similarly, the famous argument of Jeremy Bentham for humane treatment of animals, which has received much deserved praise from humanitarians over the years, implies that the basis of our human duty to animals is the animal’s capacity to feel pain. More specifically, now that we know animals can indeed feel pain and suffer, it is our job to prevent them from experiencing it (Morris and Fox 63). The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals of the United States is committed to this basic approach (ASPCA). Animal rights advocates, as they're called, oppose any and all human "use" of animals, including exploiting animals in rodeos, circuses, zoos, aquariums, agriculture, hunting, and scientific experimentation (Sunstein and Nussbaum 5). Despite the existence of these organizations, wild animals can still be found being held in financially unstable, roadside attractions and non-accredited zoos (Gruen 158). While the owners of these run-down businesses defend their actions by arguing that they are preserving animal

species, it is unlikely that they are making progress in that area. If their primary reason behind holding exotic animals in captivity was indeed to preserve endangered species, they would instead support large-scale breeding centers rather than conventional zoos, which have neither the staff nor the facilities to run successful breeding programs (Spring 116). Zoo conservation efforts do not provide justification for keeping animals captive. There are countless organizations that support conservation efforts but do not hold animals captive (Gruen 139). Sanctuaries have been established all over the world to address these problems arising from orphaned, abused, abandoned, sick, aging, and unwanted captive animals (Gruen 159). The goal of true sanctuaries is to rescue, rehabilitate, nurture, and provide companionship for these animals while providing the best standard of care. Unlike prior captivity arrangements, animal sanctuaries provide spacious environments where rescued animals can express species-typical behaviors. Although the United States is generally accepted as being one of the most progressive nations in the world, we are far behind many other counties when it comes to animal rights. As Mahatma Ghandi once said, "The greatness of a nation can be judged by the way its animals are treated."

Animals were first trained to perform tricks in Ancient Rome, drawing in overflowing crowds with dancing bears, elephants standing on two feet, and other eccentric acts (Morris and Fox 8). Animals used in circuses are captives who are forced, by threat of punishment, to perform confusing, uncomfortable, repetitive, and often painful acts (PETA). San Diego Zoo, which is highly regarded, even has dancing bears and trained birds (Spring 110). Animal rights advocates hold that the essential criteria for moral consideration is subjecthood. To be a subject requires not only sentience, the capacity to feel pleasure and pain, but also the ability to retain propositional attitudes, emotions, will, and orientation to oneself and one's future (Regan 243). This more specific criteria draws the line of right bearers at least to include great apes, dolphins,

whales, dogs, pigs, and other highly intelligent mammals, and arguably all birds and mammals. "We already know that both apes and dolphins have this kind of social and emotional complexity" (Spring 61). Subjecthood also generates rights including freedom from boredom, freedom to exercise normal capabilities, freedom of movement, and the right to life. Therefore, animals with equivalent capacities deserve equal rights, regardless of species membership. According to deontological moral theories, those rights cannot be superseded by the interests of humans- or any other beings for that matter (Sunstein and Nussbaum 278). It is for these reasons that the government should work harder to regulate hunting, scientific experimentation, entertainment, and farming to prevent unnecessary animal suffering (Sunstein and Nussbaum 7). One of the most fundamental entitlements of every animal is the entitlement to a healthy life. When wild animals are directly under the control of humans, it is clear that we are unable or unwilling to accommodate space analogous to their wild habitats. There are existing laws in place which ban cruelty and neglect, forbid harsh treatment for working animals, and regulate zoos and aquariums, but they are not enforced (Sunstein and Nussbaum 315). Illustrated in the following example, Cass Sunstein and Martha Nussbaum present various problems with animals in entertainment:

> We use millions of animals for the sole purpose of providing entertainment. Animals are used in film and television. There are thousands of zoos, circuses, carnivals, race tracks, dolphin exhibits, and rodeos in the United States, and these and similar activities, such as bullfighting, also take place in other countries. Animals used in entertainment are often forced to endure lifelong incarceration and confinement, poor living conditions, extreme physical danger and hardship, and brutal treatment. Most animals used for entertainment

purposes are killed when no longer useful, or sold into research or as targets for shooting on commercial hunting preserves. (110)

A great deal of wild animals are even trained to perform in famous movies, commercials, and TV shows, all the while being sheltered in abandoned warehouses until they are no longer needed or commercially profitable (Gruen 158). "They have been trained to do everything from hauling timber to standing on their hind legs, wearing a petticoat, for the amusement of circus spectators" (Kalof and Fitzgerald 143). Believe it or not, animals are even trained to perform naturalistic behaviors. This means that circus trainers literally have to teach animals how they would normally act in the wilderness, which is the exact opposite of natural behavior (Gruen 140).

A large percentage of zoo animals were originally the subject of a back-alley-trade. In fact, many of the top zoos in America have a history of buying illegally imported reptiles. "The shipment was certainly inexcusable and probably illegal, and the animals were almost certainly bound for zoos" (Regan and Spring 243). Similar to how they are acquired illegally, the methods used to dispose of the animals are illegal as well. As these exotic pets grow older in the wrong settings, they become increasingly hostile and aggressive which is problematic for their keepers. Therefore, exotic pets are usually killed or dumped in parks and forests, which is extremely dangerous, or they have their teeth removed and other body modifications performed on them, which they cannot give consent for (Gruen 158). This is nothing out of the ordinary, though. Captive animals are often battered, mangled, and executed (Kalof and Fitzgerald 220). For example, when chimpanzees are captured from the wild by trappers, the usual procedure is to shoot the mother and kidnap the child. Generally, ten chimpanzees die for every one that is delivered alive to the United States (Spring 117).

"There is one kind of human duty toward animals...to preserve the whole species from extinction" (Morris and Fox 67). In the past few decades, there has been a large debate over the role that zoos play in saving endangered species from extinction. While the zoos themselves claim they help, few animals have been saved from extinction by zoos, "and some of them more providence than prudence" (Gruen 139). For instance, incalculable numbers of birds die while being captured and transported, and the birds who do make it to the zoo alive wither in captivity. With no room to fly, their lives are severely diminished. It is estimated that fifty birds are killed for every one that arrives to enhance a zoo's exhibit (Regan and Spring 244). Additionally, gorillas have been pushed closer to extinction as a result of zoos and circuses abducting them from their natural habitats, especially because, unfortunately, many do not survive the brutal capture or die in captivity before they are even displayed (Regan and Spring 242). Tiger habitat has also reached an all-time low, at only 3% remaining tigers in the world.

As of 2011, there were more than 800,000 animals in AZA-accredited facilities (Gruen 140), which is an unnecessary number of animals being held captive. Consequently, these zoos are full of crowded cages stacked up like shipping crates (Kalof and Fitzgerald 158). Zoos, however, are not the only culprit. There is an abundant extraction of freshwater and ocean organisms for the aquarium trade (Regan and Spring 243). However, even *if* evidence was to emerge that zoos and aquariums benefitted research and conservation efforts, it would also need to be proven that it is necessary to hold such a high number of innocent lives in confinement to make a difference (Gruen 140). It's also important to note that research carried out among animals in captivity cannot be accurate because the behavior of captive animals is quite different than the behavior of their wild counterparts. So, if anything is being learned, it is what an animal does in a completely alien environment. But, as Dale Jamieson logically puts it, "the fact that zoo

research contributes to improving conditions in zoos is not a reason for having them. If there were no zoos, there would be no need to improve them" (Gruen 138).

Contractarianism states, under the assumption that animals have no thought process, that because they are incapable of understanding justice, we therefore do not have direct duties to human beings who also do not have a sense of justice. In that case, young and mentally challenged humans are not entitled to rights. Yet, it seems certain that, were we to unlawfully imprison a young child or a mentally disabled elder for no reason, we would be doing something morally wrong. "And, since this is true in the case of these humans, we cannot rationally deny the same in the case of animals" (Regan and Spring 107-8). There is ample evidence, however, that mammals including great apes and dolphins possess intellectual, emotional. and receptive capacities *at least* equal to that of toddlers. Human toddlers have a moral right to have their needs for shelter, nourishment, and love provided directly by humans in society. It thus complies with arguments from marginal cases that each individual great ape and dolphin also reserves a moral right to have their needs directly fulfilled by humans while in human society (Sunstein and Nussbaum 283).

One of the most influential laws, still in place today, is derived from the work of John Locke. In the late 1600's, he wrote of "natural rights" to "life, liberty, and property." Animals surely have plausible claims against us in this noble triad. But, in order to decide definitively whether this pertains to non-human species, we must first clearly define these concepts. Homo sapiens express their liberties through their freedom from restraint, ability to control their actions, and absence of interference. Unfortunately, animals don't have a voice to speak, a voice that complains, or a voice that demands their rights, at least, not that humans are capable of interpreting. In his book *On Liberty*, John Stuart Mill states that "liberty consists in doing what

one desires" (Gruen 141). Similar to how prison cells deprive human beings of liberty, non-human animals in captivity are deprived of their liberty of movement. Although, even human criminals who have committed violent crimes are released from their cells for the majority of each day to exercise and socialize with other inmates. As Lori Gruen wrote, "When our options are constrained or when we are coerced to do one thing, like it or not, then our liberty is being violated." Simply put, it is generally problematic when liberties are refused to any living being (141).

Captive animals have no liberties adapt their lifestyles to accustom their lack of freedom. For instance, one may have altered desires that are cultivated in response to his/her oppressive or confined situation. Experts have compared hostage animals to subordinate 'happy housewives' who accept abuse and blame themselves, which leads to depression and helplessness (Gruen 143). Without room to wander, wild animals in captivity cannot flourish as wild. As a result, they are overly dependent on their abductors and become vulnerable to foreign conditions and diseases (Morris and Fox 60-62). More to the point, human respiratory infections are highly contagious to chimpanzees; which is yet another reason animals should not be relocated from their original habitats (Spring 116). A fundamental right that is equally undeniable and possessed by all creatures capable of suffering is the moral right to not be treated cruelly (Morris and Fox 57).

If, in contrast to reality, there was enough knowledge, money, and will to build facilities in which all captives had their needs met, keeping wild animals in confinement would be less of an atrocity. In other words, if animals were provided high quality food they enjoyed, safeguard from predators, acquaintances, adequate space, and a stable environment, some would argue that captivity is morally acceptable (Gruen 140). This fantasy is, however, exactly that: a fantasy.

Oftentimes, it is said that we as humans treat animals like objects, but a more accurate description would be to say we treat them like prisoners of war (Coetzee 58). This is, of course, derivative of wild animals frequently being imprisoned in decrepit roadside zoos or chained alone in private dwellings (Wise 6). Zoo life is also compared to circumstances in war in the following example taken from *The Animals Reader* by Linda Kalof and Amy Fitzgerald:

> There is no reason to suppose that zoo life is not a source of sadness to most animals imprisoned there, like displaced persons in wartime...Most take every possible opportunity to escape. Most will not breed. Probably they want to go home. Some captive animals die of grief when taken from the wild. Sometimes these deaths appear to be from disease, perhaps because an animal under great stress becomes vulnerable to illness. Others are quite obviously deaths from despair-near-suicides. Wild animals may refuse to eat, killing themselves in the only way open to them. (95)

When zoos were first opened to the public, the keepers had to protect the animals against attacks by the spectators. The spectators felt the animals were there to be insulted and abused, "like prisoners in a triumph" (Comzee 58). This feeling of superiority and dominance is still evident today in the way we conduct ourselves around other species. In his book *Setting Free the Bears*, John Irving describes a powerful scene in which the zoo animals are being publicly fed:

> I watched them feed the big cats. Everyone in the zoo seemed to have been waiting all day for that... First, this keeper came and flipped a horse steak through the bars to the lioness: the keeper flipped it right in a puddle of her pee. Everyone snickered... The keeper was more professional with the cheetah; he slid the meat in on a little tray, shook it off, and the cheetah pounced on it, snapping it around in his mouth... But the cheetah shook his meat too hard; a big hunk flew off and plopped on the ledge outside the bars.

> Everyone was hysterical. You see, the cheetah couldn't quite reach it, and being afraid someone would steal it, the poor animal set up this roar... Someone pranced in front of the cheetah, pretending to make a grab for the meat on the ledge. The cheetah, must have lost his mind, trying to jam his head between the bars. He ate up that meat in two terrible bites and swallows- not one bit of chewing- and sure enough, he gagged, finally spewing it all back up. And when I left the cat house, the cheetah was bolting down his vomit. (107-8)

Any rational human being would understand that the situation illustrated above is highly abusive to those helpless creatures. Animals in the wild eat without these obstacles, which is one of the many reasons wild animals should never be removed from their natural habitats. Up until a few years ago, zoos put no thought into the emotional needs of the animals in their facilities (Sunstein and Nussbaum 316). Even now, zoo managers tend to do what is most cost effective, even if that means poor living conditions for the animals.

Animals seek one another out more than biologists once presumed, in an effort to avoid feelings of sadness, loneliness, and sorrow. These feelings seem to take a sizable toll on animals who lived in social atmospheres before being uprooted and is absolutely one of the factors that leads to high death rates among captive animals. Lions are regularly spotted in zoos pacing restlessly back and forth in their cages in the stereotyped motions seen in so many captive animals. When an individual cannot express his or her capacities, frustration and misery overtakes them. Because wild animals are accustomed to using their natural abilities, it is logical that they miss using them. The majority of zoo animals, precisely the larger ones, have little or no opportunity to use their natural abilities. "Eagles have no rooms to fly, cheetahs have no room to run, goats have but a single boulder to climb" (Kalof and Fitzgerald 95).

A dolphin named Pauline brutally seized by researchers despaired for her life after being placed in a small water tank. She couldn't even hold herself upright and required constant support. Even though the researchers saw her suffering and heard her distress calls and frantic splashing, they would not let her go. After multiple days alone, a male dolphin was also captured and placed in the same tank, which drastically lifted her mood. The male helped her swim, even nudging her to the surface at times. Unfortunately, Pauline died two months later from a painful infection caused by the fishhook that was used to capture her. The male companion then refused to eat and died three days later from a gastric ulcer, initiated by his mournful fasting. Dying of grief, however, is not the only proof of love and affection in animals (Kalof and Fitzgerald 93). Chimpanzees can acknowledge sadness in humans and have even been documented wiping human tears away (Kalof and Fitzgerald 99). Also, in the Madgeburg Zoo, a father wildcat guarded his cubs day and night and, though normally peaceful, attacked the keeper if she approached his offspring. The father brought food to the den and protected them the best way he knew how. When his kittens played, he hissed at any zoo-goers that posed a threat to his kittens (Kalof and Fitzgerald 95). Captivity is especially detrimental to elephants because there are no zoo environments large enough to satisfy their need for space and companionship (Gruen 140). Non-human animals have even been widely observed sobbing and crying, with tears streaming from their eyes; identical to how humans portray sadness and distress (Kalof and Fitzgerald 99-100). Long ago, Charles Darwin investigated whether non-human animals shed emotional tears. He found that Indian elephants being captured "tied up and lying motionless on the ground, showed no other indication of suffering than the tears which suffused their eyes and flowed incessantly." Another elephant was described "uttering choking cries, with tears trickling down his cheeks." Over the years, elephants have been observed crying while being scolded and

weeping while giving children rides at the circus (Kalof and Fitzgerald 99). In a torture experiment, an elephant was shot repeatedly with a gun: "Large tears now trickled from his eyes, which he slowly shut and opened; his colossal frame quivered convulsively, and, falling on his side, he expired." With this knowledge, it should be incumbent that all animals are treated with the same respect as humans. Unsurprisingly, homo sapiens are the single species to run torture experiments on other species of animals (Kalof and Fitzgerald 100).

It is fairly certain that any human who is kidnapped and held hostage by another species, forced to perform unnatural acts under threat of punishment, and starved would cry too; especially if the conditions were similar to circus animals'- who are squeezed into cramped, filthy cages, starved, terrorized, and beaten, given only the minimal care that would make them presentable in the ring the following day (Sunstein and Nussbaum 300). An African elephant died in Chile's Santiago Zoo after numerous operations to remove plastic bags, nails, and other items from his stomach. Zoo workers stated that the patrons often gave the elephant lighted cigarettes as means of entertainment (Kalof and Fitzgerald 225). Similarly, a sick Lion cub named Labai also required surgery to remove latex, rocks, leather, and shoe laces from his intestines. His cage was filthy and due to starvation. he was forced to eat anything thrown at him. Unfortunately, Labai's bodily damage was too extensive and despite the effort of veterinarians, he ultimately died from an infection.

Just as we can experience good pleasures, such as enjoying a cold treat on a hot day, there are also bad pleasures, including some of the gratifications of the circus audience (Sunstein and Nussbaum 304). Spectators' desire to watch everything animals do resembles the power and pleasure that characterizes the disorder of voyeurism. Zoo spectatorship taps into subconscious cravings for voyeuristic arousal by tantalizing the helpless animals, which is an evil thing to find

pleasure in (Kalof and Fitzgerald 221). "People watch animals as a means of symbolically celebrating a desire to exert power over them more explicitly" (Kalof and Fitzgerald 222). Humans can even presume what these captives are thinking. In the following powerful poem *Baboon Babble* featured in *The Animals Reader,* Jose Emilio Pacheco narrated the ideas of zoo animals:

I live only to be stared at.

The throng they call people comes here.

They like to tease me.

They enjoy it when my rage rattles the bars. (220)

The leading argument against animal rights is that we owe our moral duties only to other human beings; but when animal rights opponents are asked why humans should be treated humanely but not animals, their only answer is because they are humans (Morris and Fox 58). This selfishness is an issue of justice, and an increasingly urgent one because more animals are being captured every day. It is important that humans remember we share this planet and its scarce resources with other intelligent beings. As the Kerala High Court demonstrates, there are other species worthy of a dignified existence. "Animals should not be caused gratuitous physical pain: their psychological well-being should not be diminished unnecessarily" (Kalof and Fitzgerald 26). At the end of the day, it is unacceptable to pluck animals from the wild and lock them behind bars so that the public can come and gawk at them (Spring 210). The rightness or wrongness of an action should be judged by its consequences. In the case of captive animals, the ratio of pain inflicted upon non-human creatures to human pleasure is too great to justify. Many animal rights activists wonder if it would be better for the beings imprisoned in these artificial environments of our design to never have been born at all. Denying liberty and depriving

someone of their freedom, which is what captivity does, makes life very poor for that individual (Gruen 141-142). "Ultimately, to deprive wild animals of their wilderness sanctuaries is to treat them cruelly, and for that reason, to violate their rights" (Morris and Fox 60-62). There is no obvious reason why these basic notions of justice cannot extend across the species barrier, as the Indian court boldly does (Sunstein and Nussbaum 300).

Zoos teach us a false sense of our place in the natural order. Means of confinement create a significant difference between humans and animals that do not actually exist in the natural world. In zoos and circuses, animals are there for our pleasure; to be used for our purposes. In contrast, animals in the wilderness do as they please and would even use humans as a means for food if given the chance. We need to learn to live as one species among many rather than one species over many. To do this, we must forget what we learn at zoos because what zoos teach us is false and dangerous, both humans and animals will be better off when they are abolished" (Gruen 140). The world is a much more peaceful place when animals are not being removed from their native habitats, transported great distances, and kept in foreign environments (Spring 109). Humans feel like the possessors of everything, but it is essential we learn to peacefully coexist and share Earth’s resources with the world’s other occupants. If we don't make the change, then who is going to do it? We destroyed this planet and now we have to repair it.

Works Cited

American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. "Animals in Entertainment." *ASPCA*. 2015. Web. Mar. 2015. http://www.aspca.org/fight-cruelty/animals-in-entertainment

Association of Zoos and Aquariums. 2015. Web. Mar.-Apr. 2015. http://www.aza.org/

Batten, Peter. *Living Trophies*. New York, NY: Crowell Publishing, 1976. Print.

Born Free USA. "Animals in Entertainment: Cruel Spectacles." *Campaigns and Programs*. 2015. Web. Mar. 2015. http://www.bornfreeusa.org/a1_entertainment.php

Coetzee, J. M., and Amy Gutmann. *The Lives of Animals*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1999. Print.

Cowperthwaite, Gabriela, Manuel V. Oteyza, Eli Despres, Jonathan Ingalls, Chris Towey, and Jeff Beal. *Blackfish.* Magnolia Pictures and CNN Films, 2013. Documentary.

Gruen, Lori. *Ethics and Animals: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2011. Print.

Irving, John. *Setting Free the Bears*. New York, NY: Random House Publishing, 1969. Print.

Kalof, Linda, and Amy J. Fitzgerald. *The Animals Reader: The Essential Classic and Contemporary Writings*. Oxford: Berg, 2007. Print.

Magel, Charles R. *Keyguide to Information Sources in Animal Rights*. London, England: Mansell Publishing, 1989. Print.

Morris, Richard Knowles., and Michael W. Fox. *On the Fifth Day: Animal Rights & Human Ethics*. Washington: Acropolis, 1978. Print.

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. "Animals Used for Entertainment." www.*PETA*.org. Web. Mar. 2015. http://www.peta.org/issues/animals-in-entertainment/

Pryor, Karen. *Lads before the Wind: Adventures in Porpoise Training*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1975. Print.

Regan, Tom. *Defending Animal Rights*. Urbana: U of Illinois, 2001. Print.

Regan, Tom, and Peter Singer. *Animal Rights and Human Obligations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1976. Print.

Singer, Peter. *In Defense of Animals*. New York, NY, USA: Blackwell, 1985. Print.

Sunstein, Cass R., and Martha Craven Nussbaum. *Animal Rights: Current Debates and New Directions*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Print.

Wise, Steven M. *Rattling the Cage: Toward Legal Rights or Animals*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing, 2000. Print.