

De-extinction is when scientist clone ~~recreate~~ ^{extinct} species using biotechnology and DNA samples from the ancient past. Over the years many animals have become extinct or endangered due to humans hunting them or destroying their habitats. Now, scientist found a way to bring these extinct animals back by using de-extinction. This is ~~not a good idea because~~ ^{put reasoning for claim at end} ~~the world won't~~ ^{people won't} ~~money~~ ^{rely on scientists} ~~would start~~ ^{to bring the animals back and won't take care of them.} Many people believe that since it is our fault that most of the animals are extinct due to humans, that we have to bring them back, but this won't work because we will just go back to hunting ~~at~~ ^{and rely on scientists to bring them back instead of taking care of them} them.

Some people incorrectly believe that de-extinction is a good thing. ~~Text 2 (lines 25-27),~~ ^{remove parts of quotation that are not needed} & states ~~that~~ "And especially in recent years we humans were the ones who wiped them out, by hunting them, destroying their habitats, or spreading ~~the~~ diseases. This suggests another reason for bring them back." This means that its our ~~own~~ ^{fault} that ~~the~~ these animals are extinct. So we feel that its our responsibility.

to bring them back. This ^{is} wrong because if we bring ~~these~~ these animals back, we will just hunt ~~and~~ and kill them all over again. Which lead to them ~~going~~ going extinct ~~one~~ once a gain. ~~The~~ Text 1 (lines 26-28) ~~says~~ ^{says}, "Finally, it may be that the biotechnologies and techniques involved can be used to help conservation biologist in their efforts to preserve highly endangered species." This means that these new techniques ~~might~~ may also be used to help endangered animals. This is wrong ~~because~~ because no matter how many animals we bring back we will still need food or other resource that we take by hunting them or destroying their habitats. The animals will continue to ~~die~~ go extinct and die.

rephrase
Over all it becomes clear that de-extinction is a bad thing. ~~The~~ Text 3 (lines 36-37) says, "Why ~~worry~~ ~~worry~~ worry about endangered species? We can ~~so~~ simply keep their DNA and put them back in the wild later." This means that no one will care about taking care of the extinct animals because they think scientists can just bring them back. This proves that de-extinction ~~will~~ will cause ~~to~~ people to become careless ^{with} ~~and~~ ~~won't~~ take care of the lives of animals.

Text 4 (Lines 33-36) says, "We are already seeing species ~~extinction~~ extinction occurring at a rate at least an order of magnitude above prehistoric 'background' rates (those outside of the past five mass extinction events), and that gives weight to the extreme seriousness of the current population extinction crisis." This ^{also shows} ~~proves~~ that ~~people~~ because people think scientist ~~will~~ will fix everything, they won't do anything. This ~~also~~ proves that de-extinction makes people careless with the environment.

not what this means

Text 1 (Lines 34-36) states, "~~De-extinction does not do this~~, it is important that it not ~~not~~ divert resources from efforts to conserve currently existing species." This means that scientist ~~are~~ are ~~spending~~ spending ^{and time} too much money ~~on~~ on de-extinction instead of protecting ~~many~~ animals that are alive. This proves that de-extinction ~~is~~ take away from ~~the~~ living animals which leads to more animals going endangered. closing sentence?

~~De-extinction is not a good idea~~ It is clear that we ~~don't~~ don't ^{benefit from} benefit from ~~de-extinction~~ de-extinction.

It causes people to ^{be} careless about what happens to the animals because they ^{start to} rely on the scientist to bring them back. Now,

instead ~~of~~ of trying to bring back animals that
are dead. We ~~is~~ should be trying to take care
of the animals that are alive. ✓

Evidence

Positive

Negative

- "Finally, it may be that the biotechnologies... to preserve highly endangered ~~spe~~ species." (Text 1, line 26) ②
 - "And especially in recent Strongest Evidence years we humans were the ones who wiped... some bringing them back." (Text 2, line 25) ①
 - "Some extinct animals also ... might benefit from their return" (Text 2, line 31) ③
- "We are already ... of the ~~current~~ ^{current} population extinction crisis." (Text 4, line 33) ②
 - "De-extinction can only be ... a thousand times their natural rate." (Text 3, line 8) ⑤
 - "Why worry about ... put them back in the wild later" (Text 3, line 36) ① Strongest Evidence
 - "Many otherwise prominent... can ~~at~~ only perpetuate that trend." (Text 3, line 43) ③
 - "The only way to do ... conserve currently existing species." (Text 1, line 32) ④

- 3) • spending too much time on ~~an~~ extinct animals instead of endangered ~~an~~ animals
- 2) • The animals will keep ~~and~~ ~~die~~ dying anyway
- 1) • If we bring them back will ~~we~~ rely on that and ~~we~~ won't take care of them.



Benefit from their return.
Humans destroy habitats.

Even if we do bring them back we are still going to hunt and destroy their habitats so it won't make ~~any~~ sense to bring them back.

Text 3

Case Against Species Revival

In the movie *Jurassic Park*, a tree extinct for millions of years delights the paleobotanist. Then a sauropod eats its leaves. This movie later shows us how to re-create the dinosaur but not how to grow the tree, which at that size would be perhaps a hundred or more years old, or how to do so metaphorically overnight. To sustain even a single dinosaur, one would need thousands of trees, probably of many species, as well as their pollinators and perhaps their essential symbiotic fungi.

De-extinction intends to resurrect single, charismatic species, yet millions of species are at risk of extinction. De-extinction can only be an infinitesimal part of solving the crisis that now sees species of animals (some large but most tiny), plants, fungi, and microbes going extinct at a thousand times their natural rates. "But wait"—claim de-extinction's proponents. "We want to resurrect passenger pigeons and Pyrenean ibex, not dinosaurs. Surely, the plants on which these animals depend still survive, so there is no need to resurrect them as well!" Indeed, botanic gardens worldwide have living collections of an impressively large fraction of the world's plants, some extinct in the wild, others soon to be so. Their absence from the wild is more easily fixed than the absence of animals, for which de-extinction is usually touted.

Perhaps so, but other practical problems abound: A resurrected Pyrenean ibex will need a safe home, not just its food plants. Those of us who attempt to reintroduce zoo-bred species that have gone extinct in the wild have one question at the top of our list: Where do we put them? Hunters ate this wild goat to extinction. Reintroduce a resurrected ibex to the area where it belongs and it will become the most expensive *cabrito* ever eaten. If this seems cynical, then consider the cautionary tale of the Arabian oryx, returned to Oman from a captive breeding program. Their numbers have declined so much that their home, designated as a UNESCO World Heritage site, was summarily removed from the register. ...

In every case, without an answer to "where do we put them?"—and to the further question, "what changed in their original habitat that may have contributed to their extinction in the first place?"—efforts to bring back species are a colossal waste.

De-extinction is much worse than a waste: By setting up the expectation that biotechnology can repair the damage we're doing to the planet's biodiversity, it's extremely harmful for two kinds of political reasons.

Fantasies of reclaiming extinct species are always seductive. It is a fantasy that real scientists—those wearing white lab coats—are using fancy machines with knobs and digital readouts to save the planet from humanity's excesses. In this fantasy, there is none of the messy interaction with people, politics, and economics that characterizes my world. There is nothing involving the real-world realities of habitat destruction, of the inherent conflict between growing human populations and wildlife survival. Why worry about endangered species? We can simply keep their DNA and put them back in the wild later. ...

The second political problem involves research priorities. I work with very poor people in Africa, Brazil, and Madagascar. Rich only in the diversity of life amid which they eke out their living, they generate no money for my university. Too many other universities equate excellence with funds generated, not with societal needs met. Over my career, molecular biologists flourished as university administrators drooled over their large grants and their expensive labs. Field-based biology withered. Many otherwise prominent universities have no schools of the environment, no ecology departments, no professors of conservation. It was all too easy to equate "biology" with molecules and strip faculty positions and facilities from those who worked in the field. De-extinction efforts can only perpetuate that trend.

If you bring back something that is extinct, you would need to bring back what they eat.

If you have the fantasy that you can kill all the animals because the scientist can just bring them back.

Taking away money from other things.