APEX ACADEMIA PRESS
ELEGANCE ON EVERY RESEARCH

International Journal of Global Humanities and Management Insights
ISSN: 3070-6916 / Open Access / IJGHMI_Y1F2A003
Apex Academia Press / https://doi.org/10.63665/ijghmi-y1f2a003

Original Article

Narratives of the Non-Human: Reframing Anthropocentrism in Ecocritical Philosophy and Indigenous Worldviews

Dr. Arvind Kumar

Associate Professor, Department of Environmental Humanities, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

Abstract

In an era marked by ecological instability and environmental degradation, the need to investigate the human-cantered discourses that converge to constitute modern thought has never been more urgent. This paper is a critique of how ecocritical philosophy and Indigenous ontologies transform the human relationship with nature by interrogating the assumptions of anthropocentrism. While Western modernity has traditionally positioned humanity as rational trotter and ultimate measure of value, ecocritical theory and Indigenous philosophies introduce more relational, interdependent arrangements of being. Drawing on the theory of scholars such as Timothy Morton, Stacy Alaimo, and Jane Bennett, this essay explores how ecocritical theory decentres human agency through an acceptance of the vitality, agency, and connectivity of non-human beings—animals, plants, materials, and ecosystems. Concurrently, the inquiry turns to Indigenous knowledges that for a very long time have articulated an environmental understanding in relational terms of kin-based ontologies, oral traditions, and spiritualities. These cultures imagine land, water, and animal life not as resources to be owned but as living relatives that exist within networks of reciprocity and respect. In comparing these two intellectual traditions, the paper shows that there is indeed a shared ethical horizon: both call for the deconstruction of rigid separations between human and non-human worlds and a gratitude for interdependence in the web of life. In summary, the essay argues that these alternative histories necessitate a radical rethinking of ethics, identity, and belonging. In the entwining of ecocritical and Indigenous perspectives, it propounds a shift from dominance toward coexistence—a creative and ethical reimagining that foresees the Earth as an active coauthor in the emergent story of life rather than a passive backdrop for human activity.

Keywords

Ecocriticism, Indigenous Worldviews, Anthropocentrism, Posthumanism, Relational Ontology, Non-Human Agency, Environmental Ethics, Storytelling, Reciprocity, Ecological Philosophy.

Article History

Received: 27.04.2025

Accepted: 29.05.2025

Published: 11.06.2025

1. Introduction

A. The Ecological Crisis and the Limits of Human-Cantered Thinking

The environmental crises we are encountering—global warming, altered climate regimes, depleted fisheries, rampant habitat destruction, and accelerating extinctions—are not just issues of technology or policy; they are also consequences of deep-seated patterns of thought about the world. Throughout much of history, numerous societies, particularly under the dominance of Western paradigmatic frames, have viewed nature as something to be quantified, controlled, and used for human purposes. This anthropocentric worldview supposes that human interests and values occupy the pinnacle of a moral and epistemic hierarchy, and it has allowed for economic systems, legal codes, and habits of daily life that externalize ecological expense.

The implications of this orientation become apparent when ecosystem services collapse—when pollinators disappear, waters become polluted, soils erode—because these losses make visible dependence that truncated human vision had kept hidden. Meanwhile, anthropocentrism warps ethical imagination: it constricts who is a moral subject and what sorts of obligation are imaginable. Briefly, the ecological crisis compels us to realize that technical solutions will be insufficient; unless the cultural values and stories that legitimize treating the living world as an infinite resource change, attempts at mitigation and conservation will be piecemeal and unstable. Awareness of this

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

intellectual deficit is the beginning of reimagining governance, education, and mundane practices so they include interdependence rather than assume mastery.

B. Introducing The "Non-Human" As A Concept

When academics refer to the "non-human" they are referring to a wide variety of beings and agencies—animals, plants, microbes, rivers, mountains, weather patterns, soils, and even material objects or technologies—that have traditionally been relegated to the background of human affairs. But the term does more than enumerate the non-human; it is a thought tool that disrupts the tidy binary between a sovereign human subject and a passive natural world. In philosophy and cultural theory, to think with the non-human is to be reminded to pay attention to other modes of agency, temporalities, and modes of knowing that don't easily fit human categories. In literary terms, non-human views occur when stories give precedence to the experience or agency of a landscape, an animal, or a storm, which in turn widen the circle of narrative subjectivity. Cultural studies invoke the term to question how cultural meanings are enacted in and through relations between human and non-human actors—how technologies, infrastructures, and environments condition behaviours and values. Of particular significance, however, is that invoking the non-human does not equal anthropomorphizing nature; it instead encourages us to cultivate vocabularies that are capable of articulating influence, responsiveness, and ethical import in ways that are true to the specificity of other forms of existence. This shift in thinking unlocks methodological possibilities—multispecies ethnography, material ecocriticism, and posthumanism theory—that emphasize relationality over hierarchy.

C. Purpose of The Paper: Bringing Ecocritical Thought and Indigenous Worldviews into Dialogue

This essay seeks to follow the path of how two complementary resources—Indigenous ways of knowing and ecocritical philosophy—problemist anthropocentrism and provide alternative systems for living among the more-than-human world. Ecocritical philosophy offers the conceptual tools with which to think through the ways that literature, culture, and materiality condition human relations to environments; it foregrounds concepts like entanglement, material agency, and distributed responsibility. Indigenous epistemologies, which are rooted in place-specific practice and extended histories of intercultural and ecological care, introduce living models of reciprocal ethics, ritual responsibility, and governance practices that place human life within webs of kinship that encompass non-human relatives. This is not an exercise aimed at collapsing these traditions into one or another or appropriating Indigenous knowledge into the abstractions of theory, but rather to set the stage for a cautious, respectful comparison that is mindful of points of contact and divergence. Methodologically, the article relies on close readings of texts, observation of oral and ritual practices, and critical sensitivity to power relationships—particularly to honour Indigenous sovereignty and jurisdiction over their knowledge. Through comparing conceptual analysis against grounded, lived practice, the research attempts to transition from criticism to positive possibilities: to envision ethical directions and institutional reforms—educational, legal, and cultural—that more honour interdependence and responsibility.

D. Thesis Statement and Implications

This essay contends that a persistent interaction with Indigenous ecological stories in conjunction with posthumanism ecocritical theory can replace narrow humanist accounts of moral value and bring forth more relational, reciprocal patterns of living on the Earth. Such interaction does not simply correct philosophical categories; it reconfigures how we conceptualize rights, duties, and belonging. If humans are understood as participants in dynamic networks of life rather than sovereign owners of a passive world, then obligations broaden: rivers, forests, and animal communities become entities whose flourishing matters for human well-being and moral imagination alike. The thesis has policy and practical implications—place- and reciprocity-cantered education, legal rights to ecological interests, co-stewardship preferred models of governance—and philosophical implications: humility regarding human knowledge, readiness to share moral standing with other non-humans, and a deeper richer ethics attuned to long-term relational flourishing. By unsettling the human/non-human binary, the argument goes, we create room for narratives and policies that enhance coexistence instead of domination.

2. The Problem of Anthropocentrism

A. Define Anthropocentrism

Anthropocentrism is the theory and practice that puts human beings in the centre of the universe as moral, intellectual, and political priority—putting human needs, interests, and values as the first criterion for the standards

of the world. Anything less than a descriptive neutral, anthropocentrism works as an organizing principle: it specifies whose lives count, whose lives are readable as morally relevant, and whose kinds of knowledge are assumed to be authoritative. In practical terms this stance locates exceptions of the centre of human thriving and reduces living things and ecological processes such as resources or means to human ends. The effect is not abstract only; anthropocentrism shows up in legal codes that safeguard private property and economic progress at the outset, in scientific processes that treat ecosystems as data points or inputs, and in everyday usage and practice that naturalizes human life as separate and superior. It also supports species hierarchy—the premise that human existence is inherently more valuable than other existence—so that it becomes more justifiable to justify injuring animals, plants, and environments when such injuries advance human activities.

B. Historical Roots in Western Philosophy: From Enlightenment Humanism to Industrial Modernity

The intellectual heritage of anthropocentrism is multifaceted, but many strands of Western thought came particularly powerful in its contemporary version. Religious interpretations of books addressing human "dominion" over the world set early standards for human exceptionalism; the classical and medieval authors constructed hierarchies of being those rank human beings above plants and animals; and the Scientific Revolution and Enlightenment converted theological hierarchy into a secular idiom of mastery. Cartesian dualism, with its clear demarcation of thinking subject and mechanistic object, provided it intellectually easy to consider nature dead matter to be dominated. Baconian and Enlightenment projects perceived nature as workshop to be mastered for the sake of human advance, and political-economic interests—principally the expansion of market capitalism and industrialization—built on these ideas by expanding them through mass extraction, commodification, and transmutation of environmental systems. Colonialism subsequently transported anthropocentric practices across continents, integrating the lexicon of improvement with legal and political institutions that dispossessed Indigenous peoples and rendered planetary-scale exploitation of land and non-human life a norm. Briefly put, what originated as a set of intellectual stratagems solidified into institutions, technologies, and economic incentives that rendered anthropocentrism a utilitarian, planetary force.

C. How Anthropocentrism Has Propelled Environmental Degradation and Extractive Relationships

The cosmology that prioritizes human interests over all other life has indirectly informed degrading practices and the displacement of non-human societies. As ecosystems are first perceived as resources, choices about rivers, forests, soils, and species become transactions instead of relations; timber is tallied for profit, wetlands are drained for immediate agricultural value, and mineral landscapes are accessed by mines without consideration of long-term ecological process. This instrumental reason promotes monoculture farming, industrial aquaculture, factory farming, and intense fossil fuel use—systems geared towards human production but catastrophic to biodiversity and ecosystem services. Anthropocentrism is also prone to export the environment's costs: pollution, habitat destruction, and global warming are acceptable as collateral damage to prosperity since their victims—non-human species, remote communities, future human generations—do not enter into politics. The outcome is cascading damage: species extinctions on a scale, soil degradation, disrupted water cycles, and climatic instability that all mutually challenge human security. Moreover, species hierarchies enabled by anthropocentric assumptions legitimize behaviour—such as systematic slaughter, indiscriminate control of invasive species, and large-scale animal confinement—where human convenience and advantage are privileged over other modes of sentient flourishing.

D. Philosophical and Cultural Implications of Privileging Human Reason and Agency

Placing a premium on human agency and reason reconstrues policy, economy, and the imagination of societies regarding knowledge, ethics, and identity. Philosophically, a focus on human rationality has generated ethical schemes that ground moral value in ableness such as abstractness, autonomy, or language—conditions excluding many animals, plants, and collective ecological activities from moral consideration. This constraint is the source of epistemic injustice: body-based, place-based, or ritual and speech-based knowledge transmission (typically typical of Indigenous people) is pushed to the periphery in favour of abstractions, so-called universal knowledge claims. It is anthropocentrically generating stories of mastery and progress celebrating technological fixes and managerial fixes and degrading humility, restraint, and long-term stewardship. Psychologically and sociologically, it promotes a sense of isolation from the more-than-human world—alienation which is likely to decrease empathy and lower conservation motivation. Finally, prioritizing human agency makes it harder for law and institutions to recognize ecological interests: it is difficult to pass legislation on behalf of rivers or forests, or to build forms of governance that

give non-human objects the status of stakeholders, when the moral grammar behind it suggests humans are the only proper bearers of rights and targets of responsibility. These cultural and philosophical ramifications thereby perpetuate the same practices that had generated the environmental degradation, establishing a vicious circle which a departure from anthropocentrism has to reverse.

3. Ecocritical Philosophy and the Decentring of the Human

A. Ecocriticism as A Theoretical Response to Environmental and Ethical Concerns

Ecocriticism began as a way to read literature and culture with the environment in view, insisting that stories, images, and cultural practices do not merely reflect attitudes toward nature but actively shape them. Over time it grew from a literary-critical project into a broad interdisciplinary conversation—drawing on philosophy, history, anthropology, science and technology studies, feminist theory, and the environmental sciences—because environmental problems themselves are not confined to one discipline. At its core ecocriticism asks how language and representation make certain lives visible or invisible, how cultural narratives normalize particular uses of land and species, and how aesthetic forms either sustain or unsettle the human–nature divide. More recently, ecocritical work has moved beyond critique to propose positive reorientations: it treats texts and cultural practices as sites where alternative relations to the more-than-human might be imagined and rehearsed. In doing so, ecocriticism shifts from asking "what does this text say about nature?" to asking "how does this text participate in the networks of causation, value, and responsibility that connect human and non-human lives?" This turn makes ecocriticism simultaneously an ethical practice and a conceptual toolbox for thinking about agency, materiality, and interdependence.

B. Key Thinkers and Their Contributions: Timothy Morton, Serenella Iovino, Stacy Alaimo

Several contemporary theorists have been especially influential in moving ecocriticism toward posthuman or more-than-human frameworks. Timothy Morton has pushed readers to think of ecological problems as structural and strange, developing concepts that foreground distributed networks and temporal scales that exceed individual perception; his work insists on the radical entanglement of human and non-human realities and the ethical implications of recognizing that entanglement. Serenella Iovino's writings have helped anchor a strand of ecocriticism that pays rigorous attention to materiality—how texts, objects, and environments co-shape one another—and to methods that link narrative analysis with material studies; her approach emphasizes how cultural forms and physical matter are mutually constitutive. Stacy Alaimo brings feminist philosophy into the discussion by articulating how bodies and environments are porous and mutually formative; her notion of trans-corporeality highlights the everyday flows—chemical, microbial, atmospheric—through which humans are physically entangled with their environments. Together these thinkers move ecocriticism from a purely representational critique to a theory of relations: one that recognizes distributed agency, the ethical stakes of material entwinement, and the need to reconfigure how humans understand their own bodily and political boundaries.

C. Concepts: Ecological Entanglement, Vibrant Matter, And Material Agency

A few key concepts organize much of this work. "Ecological entanglement" captures the idea that organisms, objects, processes, and human systems are woven together in networks of mutual influence that do not reduce to simple cause-and-effect chains; entanglement highlights contingency, feedback loops, and relational histories that make isolated analysis misleading. "Vibrant matter," a phrase that has circulated widely in the environmental humanities, names the liveliness of things often treated as inert—showing that matter can have capacities to affect and be affected, to produce consequences at scales both minute and vast. "Material agency" names the related claim that non-human entities participate in shaping events: rivers carve political boundaries, microbes alter human health and policy, machines restructure social life. None of these concepts implies that rocks or rivers think like humans; rather, they insist that agency should be thought beyond anthropocentric models that locate intention and moral worth exclusively in human minds. Taken together, these ideas demand ethical attention to how actions reverberate through assemblages of human and non-human actors and urge modes of responsibility that are attuned to webs of consequence rather than isolated actors.

D. Reimagining Agency in Literature and Philosophy: Animals, Landscapes, And Ecosystems as Narrative Participants

When literature and philosophy adopt the presuppositions outlined above, they begin to craft works in which animals, landscapes, and ecosystems are not mere backdrops but active participants in narrative and conceptual

development. Literary techniques that reassign focalization to non-human perspectives, that slow narrative time to accommodate ecological rhythms, or that distribute voice across species invite readers to experience causality and moral relevance differently. Philosophical writing that takes material agency seriously likewise reframes ethical questions: responsibility becomes collective and relational, extending to those whose modes of existence differ from human cognition. Importantly, reimagining agency in these ways does not simply anthropomorphize nature; it cultivates forms of imaginative attention that learn to register different registers of influence—seasonal cycles, microbial transformations, geological persistence—and to treat them as meaningful contributors to history and ethics. Such narrative and philosophical practices enlarge the circle of moral concern and train readers and citizens to think in terms of interdependence, contingency, and long-term care rather than unilateral control.

4. Indigenous Epistemologies as Living Webs of Relation

Indigenous epistemologies more often start from a different starting point than many Western philosophical frameworks: instead of positioning the human as an independent knower standing over against a passive environment, they view knowledge itself as arising in continuing relations between people, animals, plants, places, and ancestors. In such worldviews, means of knowing are irremovable from the practices that support them—hunting and gathering regulations, seasonal calendars, ceremonies, caretaking responsibilities, and ongoing attention to the signs the land presents. Knowledge is thus embodied, communal, and situated: it builds up through long-term, repeated interaction with a specific location and through the social institutions that encode what needs to be known and what needs to be done. Because humans are never born as solitary agents but as part of intricate webs of dependence, ethical responsibilities flow outward as well as inward; to know, in many Indigenous models, is to be responsible to non-human relatives and to behave in ways that maintain relational balance. This ontological stance—visioning the world as a living web—transcends the terrain of inquiry from abstract universals to lived responsibilities, and it generates norms and practices that work to maintain the health of the whole rather than to maximize short-term human benefit.

A. Examples of Place-Based Kinship: Native American, Māori, And Aboriginal Traditions

In various Indigenous societies one encounters persistent modes of thinking and behaving that make kinship with land and other animals a practical and ethical fact. In many Native American societies, for example, plants and animals are named and treated as kin whose lives are integrated into human social webs; hunting and gathering are contextualized by protocol and appreciation rather than simply extraction. Māori understandings of Kotahitanga (guardianship) and whakapapa (genealogical relation) position individuals as descended from and stewards of the health of specific rivers, forests, and species; land is not passive commodity but an ancestor to be respected and heeded. Aboriginal Australian connections to "Country" similarly intertwine ecological, spiritual, and historical knowledge: place is brought to life by ancestral spirits, and tending Country is inextricable from cultural persistence and identity. While vocabularies and institutions vary in every cultural situation, what is shared in these examples is an ongoing resistance to commodify land, water, and animals; rather, they become embedded in human life as kin whose thriving is significant morally, legally, and cosmologically.

B. Oral Traditions, Storytelling, and Ritual as Ecological Knowledge Systems

In Indigenous societies, ritual, oral tradition, and storytelling are not decorative but core technologies for communicating ecological information intergenerationally. Stories place seasonal calendars, migration paths, weather signs, and directives on sustainable use in memorable and morally loaded forms; songs and ceremonial performance locate these lessons within communal identity and responsibility. Rituals perform mutual relations—giving thanks, providing portions of a harvest, following prohibitions during breeding times—which both convey and reproduce the social norms that safeguard ecosystems. What is particularly significant about these practices is that they do not dichotomize "data" from "meaning": ecological facts are learned along with the ethical stories that make restraint understandable and attractive. Since they are situated in social life, oral and ritual forms are flexible and adaptable: elders, hunters, and custodians reinterpret stories based on new observations so that knowledge stays alive and sensitive to change in the environment. The outcome is a strong, morally charged ecology of knowledge connecting practical survival practices with profound commitments to care and stewardship.

C. How Indigenous Thought Resists Anthropocentrism: Reciprocity and Respect

Indigenous worldviews oppose anthropocentric hierarchies not merely by positing the moral value of non-human entities in the abstract but by institutionalizing practices of reciprocity that tangibly curb human entitlements on other lives. Reciprocity—giving back and forth, restraining oneself, and ritualized recognition—serves as the ethical bond of numerous Indigenous ecologies: humans take but also give back, and they are bound to keep things in balance for the well-being of kin and place. Respect is ingrained in language (naming customs that index kinship), in law (traditional norms that regulate use), and in governance (joint stewardship and decision-making that involve non-human interests indirectly through human custodians). Since moral standing is relational and not categorical, obligations do not hinge on whether a being reflects human cognition; they emerge from the fact of relationship itself. In practice this results in tangible restraints on exploitation—harvest limits, spatial protocols, seasonal closures, and ceremonial taboos—that maintain populations and environments generationally. By establishing respectful reciprocity as the default mode of human–non-human relation, Indigenous thought presents a living counter to hierarchies that rank beings according to their usefulness to humans and, in their place, places continuity, mutual flourishing, and accountability at the centre.

D. Synthesis: Practical Ethics from Ontology

Together, Indigenous epistemologies and practices demonstrate how an ontology of relation becomes practical ethics that organize everyday life, governance, and long-term survival. When land, water, and species are relatives, ethical and legal systems occur that treat conservation as not some outside policy but as the performance of kinship obligation: stewardship is everyday practice, and ecological limits are policed through shared norms and ritual memory. This framing also has political weight: demands for land rights, co-management, and legal rights tend to be premised on the thesis that Indigenous peoples perform a unique and indispensable moral economy in relation to the more-than-human world. In short, Indigenous relational ontologies not only offer a critique of anthropocentrism but a functioning alternative model—one that inducts responsibility into mundane institutions and culture, so that reciprocity and respect become the conditions of both ecological and social flourishing.

5. Comparative Reading: Ecocritical and Indigenous Narratives

A. Points of Convergence: Relationality, Agency, And Ethics

Posthumanism ecocriticism and Indigenous ecological philosophy come together in their mutual understanding of relationality, distributed agency, and ethical responsibility beyond human beings. Both frameworks acknowledge that human beings are located within webbed systems of living and that non-human agents—animals, plants, rivers, landscapes, and even material forces—have a degree of agency that produces effects in ways that humans are not always able to determine. In posthumanism ecocriticism, such conditions are speculated about using concepts like ecological entanglement and material agency, which describe how human activity has a ripple effect through non-human networks. Indigenous ecological philosophy, however, realizes these principles in praxis: humans are positioned as kin within ecological communities, and responsibilities are realized in rituals, hunting protocol, and custodial practice. The intersection is in the acknowledgment that ethical life is not just limited to human interests but rather that the thriving of human societies cannot be reduced to the wellness and vibrancy of the more-than-human world. Both views necessitate reflective, responsive thinking and practice that de-centres anthropocentric hierarchies and fosters care, reciprocity, and co-existence.

B. Tensions: Appropriation And Contextual Misreading

Despite these spaces of convergence, tensions between Western ecocritical theory and Indigenous knowledges are substantial. One great risk is appropriation: when Western scholars appropriate Indigenous concepts of relationality, kinship, or stewardship from their cultural, historical, and political situations, they invite the reduction of rich traditions to oversimplistic theory. For example, conceptualizations of land as relative or animal moral agency are gesturally outlined in theoretical models with no concern for particular ceremonies, forms of governance, and histories of oppression that lend these concepts punch. This kind of borrowing can undermine Indigenous practice's ethical punch and distort the political facts—colonial dispossession, environmental injustice, legal marginalization—that necessitate such models in the first place. In addition, Western posthumanism theory at times universalizes relational understanding or environmental ethics in a manner of presumptions of sameness in different cultures, obliterating difference and moving to one side the jurisdiction of Indigenous peoples over their own knowledge.

C. The Ethical Imperative: Dialogue Rather Than Assimilation

With these dangers in mind, the ethical imperative of comparative reading is dialogue and not assimilation. Invoking ecocritical theory and Indigenous speech together does not necessitate the uptake of Indigenous knowledge into pre-existing Western frameworks. Rather, dialogue entails listening, education, and co-construction of intellectual space where the two knowledges mutually inform without the erasure of either's specificity. This is a question of recognizing historical and continued differences, valuing Indigenous epistemic sovereignty, and locating knowledge in its lived and territorial site. Ethical encounter is ongoing engagement and not superficial adoption, and therefore it challenges Western scholarship to consider its own position, obligations, and borders in testifying to the ongoing vitality and salience of Indigenous knowledge. It is only through such dialogical meeting that the confluence of posthumanism and Indigenous Eco philosophy can yield both intellectually creative and socially just perspectives.

D. Literary and Cultural Examples of Intersection

Some books model the fertile intersection of these models by foregrounding the agency of the more-than-human and taking up Indigenous ethical and cosmological models. Linda Hogan's Solar Storms places human characters within an expanded ecological and spiritual landscape, featuring rivers, animals, and landscapes as morally and narratively engaged beings. Leslie Marmon Silko's Ceremony weaves together Native American cosmology and ecological awareness in imagining healing as inextricable from balancing with land, water, and animals. Margaret Atwood's environmental fiction, though not Indigenous in authorship, also critiques the entanglement of human and non-human life with a focus on the effects of breaking natural and ethical webs. In every instance, literature accomplishes what ecocritical theory and Indigenous consciousness affirm in theory: it overturns the primacy of human experience, illustrates the moral importance of non-human actors, and encourages readers to step into a world where human beings are co-occupants, not owners. Such texts show the possibility of ethical imagination to be fostered by narrative, whereby relational awareness and reciprocity are not abstractions in theory but bodily, fleshly, and concrete possibilities.

6. Toward a Non-Human Ethics

A. Conceptual Foundations of Non-Human Ethics

Non-human ethics stems from the realization that moral consideration should not only be reserved for the human species but for other living beings, ecosystems, and even non-living environmental agencies such as rivers, mountains, and soils. This idea prohibits traditional ethical frameworks predicated upon the dominance of human rights and interests. In practice, non-human ethics is an issue of: how do human beings act when their decisions impact other beings and ecosystems, and what responsibilities emerge through relational interdependence? This method, taking inspiration from ecocritical philosophy and Indigenous knowledges, emphasises reciprocity, responsibility, and co-existence. For instance, recognition of a river as a moral agent in its own right and with its own rights, such as has been enshrined into law in New Zealand for the Whanganui River, encapsulates the notion that human flourishing is not possible to disconnect from ecological thriving. Philosophically speaking, non-human ethics goes beyond utilitarian exploitation and respects non-human agency and a sustainable vision of log-term thinking and relational responsibility.

B. Principles of a Non-Human Ethical Framework

A non-human moral framework can be structured around a couple of core principles:

(a) Interdependence

Interdependence emphasizes that human beings are not solitary agents but exist in complex webs of life, in which each action has far-reaching effects across ecosystems. Moral decisions, in this sense, cannot be narrowed down to human needs; they must take into account the well-being of other species, their habitats, and ecological processes. For example, deforestation for agriculture is not merely felling trees—it affects soil health, water currents, animal populations, and even local climate. Interdependence gives rise to humans considering more than just individual ramifications, so they evolve habits that promote ecosystem balance. This is exemplified in indigenous cosmologies, where people are understood to be co-participants in ongoing ecological processes where survival and flourishing are co-created with animals, plants, and land.

(b) Reciprocity

Reciprocity is the law of human beings to give back something to non-human entities and compensate for whatever is inflicted. It is not just an ethical suggestion but a relational obligation, reminiscent of practices of respect, thanks, and care-taking. In many cultures of the world, when a hunt is initiated, offerings or rituals are performed in order to pay respect to the life that has been hunted and to regain balance in the environment. Similarly, plant or fish harvest is also under time, quantity, and means restrictions so that the non-human world continues to thrive. Reciprocity turns around ethical interaction from unilateral human privilege to an evened, two-way relationship that reaffirms that humans are answerable to more-than-human kin.

(c) Agency Recognition

Agency recognition insists that non-human others are active agents in forming ecosystems, narratives, and social life. Rivers carve out landscapes, animals roam and fashion flora, and forests temper microclimates, all of which lie outside human capacity to command. The page and folklore attest to this perspective: in Leslie Marmon Silko's Ceremony, for instance, animals and landscapes influence human decision, mirroring the ethical and utilitarian significance of their existence. Comprehending agency brings ethics from domination to cooperation: human choice must consider the intention, will, and impact of non-human agents as it decides, acknowledging that life is an ever-changing flow of many active powers.

(d) Sustainability

Sustainability requires that human decisions prioritize long-term ecological health over short-term profit. This ethic realizes that ecosystems have limits and that violating these limits harms not only non-human living things but also human beings. Sustainable practices include protecting water and soil, biodiversity conservation, and respecting seasonal cycles in fisheries or agriculture. Traditional knowledge systems give us wise examples to learn from: rotational agriculture, seasonal picking, and ritual land use guarantee ecological connections are preserved and resources recycled. In modern policy, sustainability translates to legislation, rules, and community programs to preserve ecological integrity for coming generations, translating the lessons of relational ethics into living policymaking and daily life.

C. Practices in Non-Human Ethics

Practicing non-human ethics translates into concrete activities in the domains of culture, law, and environment. A few examples are:

(a) Legal Recognition

Legal personhood of non-human entities is a nascent practice that seeks to formalize the ethical and environmental value of rivers, forests, and animals by granting them legal rights, similar to rights traditionally reserved for people or corporations. It is rooted in the argument that ecosystems and species have value and agency in themselves; that they are not commodities to be utilized by humans. For instance, in New Zealand, a legal status of personhood has been awarded to the Whanganui River, having been recognized as an ancestor and as a living being having rights. This personhood in law obliges human beings, through government and local governments, to care for and protect the river as a relational entity rather than merely as an object of use. Likewise, in India, the Ganges and Yamuna rivers have been declared persons in law, reflecting efforts to protect these sacred and ecologically important water bodies. These cases demonstrate how law institutionalizes relational ethics, creating institutions that impose stewardship, prevent exploitation, and in still ecological responsibility upon human society. Legal personhood renders ethical philosophy into enforceable obligation, such that human behaviour is under the force of the rights and interests of non-human societies.

(b) Cultural Rituals

Ecological ethics is typically ingrained in rituals, ceremonies, and oral storytelling by indigenous peoples, which are pragmatic and symbolic ways of maintaining relationships with the more-than-human world. These rituals give assurances that environmental knowledge, sustainable ways of living, and ethical obligations are being handed down from one generation to the next. For American Indians, for example, ceremonies precede and follow hunting or harvesting, e.g., thanking the plant or animal being harvested and reaffirming commitments to maintaining ecological balance. Similarly, Aboriginal Australian ceremonies incorporate "Caring for Country," where country, water, and animals are taken as kin and rituals safeguard human stewardship over them. Oral telling is significant

too: animal, river, or family histories embody ecological insight, seasons' cycles, and ethical lessons within rich, situated narratives. These are not symbolic performances; they constitute embodied habits of ethical regard, limiting action and community norms that preserve and protect ecosystems across a large number of generations.

(c) Literary and Artistic Representation

Literary and artistic representation provide strong places for creating ethical responsiveness to non-human animals. Ecocritical literature often presents animals, landscapes, and ecosystems as characters in the narrative rather than passive backdrops. For example, Leslie Marmon Silko's Ceremony places land, water, and animals at the centre of human ethical and emotional experience and illustrates how ecological balance is related to cultural and personal healing. Similarly, Linda Hogan's Solar Storms focuses on rivers, animals, and landscape as agents with agency, revealing the consequences of human interference on environmental dynamics. Performances by the arts—visual, narrative, or stage—are also likely to elicit the sympathy of viewers toward non-human actors, raising moral questions and imaginative comprehension of interdependency. Positioning humans in webs of life, literature and art teach for moral responsibility and relational thinking in emotively engaging and culturally relevant ways.

(d) Environmental Policy and Education

Environmental policies guided by relational ethic promote sustainable urban planning, conservation initiatives, and ecosystem management that enhance human and non-human interests. For example, wetland, forest, or wildlife corridor conservation is not only framed as environmental protection but also as protecting the rights and autonomy of non-human societies. Education is a complementary intervention: instruction on ecological interdependence, Indigenous ecological knowledge, and ethics of sustainability prepares students to think relationally and act ethically. Experiential environmental projects, nature education, and cultural narrative can be brought into schools to inculcate ethical sensitivity in life. Policy and education collectively establish relational ethics institutionally and socially so that ecological responsibility is learned and enforced and not merely something abstractly philosophical.

D. Ethical Implications for Literature and Culture

Non-human ethics also reconfigures literary interpretation, cultural storytelling, and human creativity. Narratives that place rivers, animals, or geography as agents of agency overturn anthropocentric biases and enable readers to conceptualize morality outside of human groups. For instance:

- In Leslie Marmon Silko's Ceremony, land and animals are central to healing and moral obligation and show interdependence between human and environment.
- In Linda Hogan's Solar Storms, landscapes, animals, and water are agents whose health has a direct impact on human existence.
- Margaret Atwood's ecological fiction habitually illustrates the effects of human interference on environments and encourages readers to acknowledge moral duties towards the non-human.

Table 1: Examples of Non-Human Ethics in Literature

Author	Work	Non-Human Entities Highlighted	Ethical Focus
Leslie Marmon Silko	Ceremony	Land, animals, water	Healing through interdependence
Linda Hogan	Solar Storms	Rivers, animals, landscapes	Reciprocity and agency
Margaret Atwood	Oryx and Crake	Ecosystems, species	Sustainability and consequences

E. Toward Integrated Relational Practice

Lastly, non-human ethics calls for the translation of ecocritical theory, Indigenous knowledge, and practical ethics into daily decision-making. In policy, community practice, and individual choices, humans are being called to take into account the wider implications of their actions and to engage in networks of care. For scholars and students, this entails not just responding to environmental issues as technical issues but as relational and ethical ones: each activity, from consumption and teaching to city planning and writing, has a ripple effect on the more-than-human world. Through emphasizing relational responsibility, non-human ethics opens up a space for imaginative, responsible, and sustainable living that brings humans back to their ecological and moral communities.

7. Conclusion

A. Summarizing Key Arguments: Decentring the Human and Embracing Relational Ontologies

Throughout this essay, analysis has been drawn on the imperative of breaking away from anthropocentric paradigms that place the human as the final arbiter of moral, ecological, and cultural value. Through a historical genealogy of anthropocentrism, it has been found that human-centred thought has resulted in environmental degradation, species orders, and exploitative encounters with the Earth. In contrast, both ecocritical thought and Indigenous knowledges offer powerful models for decentring the human, emphasizing relational ontologies that recognize the presence of humans within broader ecological communities. Posthumanism ecocriticism introduces conceptual models such as ecological entanglement, material agency, and vibrant matter, which illustrate how non-human actants play active roles in structuring environments, narratives, and ethical landscapes. Indigenous epistemologies stretch this perspective further by situating human beings in living webs of kinship where rivers, animals, forest, and land are relational companions whose flourishing is not distinct from human flourishing. In combination, these frameworks struggle over a fundamental transformation: seeing existence as something other than a pyramid with humans at the apex, but as a system of deeply entangled relationships that requires hearing, responsibility, and ethical engagement within and between species and ecosystems.

B. Pathways to Ethical Reimagining: Ecocritical and Indigenous Insights

Ecocritical philosophy and Indigenous philosophy both offer concrete avenues to reimagine ethical human life. Literature, ritual, oral cultures, and ecological practice provide models for learning to distinguish the agency and value of non-human things. The ethics lessons are irresistible: sustainability, reciprocity, and respect are not distant ideals but habits of everyday life written in stories, governance, and memory. By stepping into these structures, humans are invited to cultivate moral responsibility that transcends proximate self-interest, reconciling the integrity and health of ecological systems with human interests. This transformation requires reflection and action, invoking societies to integrate knowledge from literature, philosophy, science, and Indigenous practice in developing comprehensive strategies for thriving in the more-than-human world.

C. Reflective Note: Moral Responsibility and Living With, Not Above, the World

The conclusion ultimately reiterates a moral and philosophical call to action: humans must learn again how to coexist with the Earth and not master it. It means embracing interdependence, humility, and fostering practices that conserve ecological and cultural balance. It is a call to ethical attention, wherein all human decision-making—everything from consumer culture to environmental policy—is gauged by the relational effects of these decisions on the non-human. To unlearn to live in this manner is not just essential to ecological living, but to the building of a more just, caring, and interconnected human community. By internalizing knowledge of both ecocritical theory and Indigenous relational ontologies, we can begin to envision a future in which human life is brought closer into accord with the larger webs of life, in which flourishing is not defined by dominance but by the well-being and resilience of shared ecological and moral communities.

8. References

[1] Alaimo, S. (2010). Bodily natures: Science, environment, and the material self. Indiana University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1xp3m2

[2] Berkes, F. (2018). Sacred ecology (4th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315104257

[3] Cronon, W. (1996). The trouble with wilderness; or, getting back to the wrong nature. In W. Cronon (Ed.), Uncommon ground: Rethinking the human place in nature (pp. 69–90). W. W. Norton & Company.

[4] Haraway, D. J. (2016). Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11cw3sn

[5] Hogan, L. (1998). Solar storms. W. W. Norton & Company.

[6] Iovino, S., & Oppermann, S. (Eds.). (2014). Material ecocriticism. Indiana University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt16gz2cs

[7] Latour, B. (2004). Politics of nature: How to bring the sciences into democracy. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674030666

[8] Morton, T. (2010). The ecological thought. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674062461

[9] Plumwood, V. (1993). Feminism and the mastery of nature. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203424297

[10] Silko, L. M. (1977). Ceremony. Viking Press.

[11] Tsing, A. L. (2015). The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400887700

[12] Whyte, K. P. (2017). Indigenous climate change studies: Indigenizing futures, decolonizing the Anthropocene. English Language Notes, 55(1–2), 153–162. https://doi.org/10.1215/00138282-55.1-2.153

[13] Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge, and the teachings of plants. Milkweed Editions.

[14] Atwood, M. (2009). The year of the flood. Nan A. Talese.

[15] Deloria, V. (2003). God is red: A Native view of religion. Fulcrum Publishing.