

## THE ETHICS OF SURVIVAL IN A POST-ANTHROPOCENTRIC WORLD AND POSTHUMAN FUTURES.

**Syed Abuzar Naqvi**

Lecturer, Minhaj University Lahore

[Abuzar.eng@mul.edu.pk](mailto:Abuzar.eng@mul.edu.pk)

**Waqas Yousaf**

Lecturer, Minhaj University Lahore

[waqas.eng@mul.edu.pk](mailto:waqas.eng@mul.edu.pk)

**Israr Ahmad**

MPhil Scholar

### Abstract

*The concept of the Anthropocene has been reshaped over the past two decades. How and why we understand humanity's relationship with the Earth. It implies that people are now a powerful force influencing the planets' (Haraway, 2015) systems, which excites academics who see it as an opportunity to reconsider how we relate to the non-human universe. The Anthropocene presents the environment as an active partner in forming human existence rather than as a passive backdrop. This change, which emphasizes humility, connection, and adaptability, challenges conventional notions of human supremacy and creates new ethical and political opportunities. The way these concepts are portrayed in the post-apocalyptic video game My Friend is a Raven (MFIAR) is also examined in this abstract. The game offers several endings that represent various ethical viewpoints and challenges the player to negotiate human-nonhuman relationships through conversations with a raven. While some endings advocate a posthuman morality that regards the raven as an equal, others are in line with human-centric viewpoints. This analysis challenges conventional humanist narratives and provides a look into a post-anthropocentric future by using the game as a lens to examine how posthuman ethics and mortality can be depicted in interactive media.*

**Key words:** Post Humanism, Anthropocentric, Colony, Ethics, Scalzi, Future.

### Introduction

During the last twenty years public and scholarly interest in the Anthropocene concept has increased which has enabled novel methods for managing and analyzing human-environment relationships. Social scientists and humanities experts originally viewed human planetary-scale control over the earth system as a sign of joy which they considered liberating (Castree, 2014). These academics view the Anthropocene as a new era in human-nonhuman relationships because the Earth acts as a dynamic actor which actively shapes human potential rather than providing a static background for human activities.

Through the Anthropocene concept thought gains independence from human hubris which created an instrumental-external attitude toward the world. Haraway, quoting Latour, states that we are "Earth-bound" as well as have a "common flesh" that is deep-rooted in the world. One By challenging traditional divisions between life and non-life, this thing Anthropocenic assertion transhumanism concentration in the world—a way of thinking that Farrier David refers to as "Anthropocenic thinking"—is creating new opportunities for societal earthly exploration to investigate various formation of living that cannot be reduced to the , generalizing integer of 2 (S. J. E. Wakefield, Nature, & Space, 2020).

A number of Anthropocenic philosophers maintain that present-day moral and political actions to safeguard heterogeneity within society and the environment draw their foundation from qualities such as contingency and relationality and humility and emergence which modernist and humanist traditions devalued previously. More and more people are developing the shared understanding of this new approach to moral leadership which transcends classic global norms.

Innovations in governance in the Anthropocene have led to new methods and approaches for managing public space. Resilience is a key trope in governance, focusing on adapting to societal, economic, and environmental changes (Morton, 2009). This concept is contentious due to various definitions and practices. Resilience theories create spaces where authority and control over human and non-human nature cannot exist. This research analyzes the four final outcomes in MFIAR – The Two Stars Game 2019, a short post-apocalyptic experience (Latour, 2012).

The game features historical flashbacks, alternate endings, and dialogues, revealing four unique approaches to Earth's end. The game presents both humanistic and posthumanistic moral and ethical understandings, highlighting the importance of resilience in managing public space. Video games often focus on self-governance, personal responsibility, and emotional self-reflection, often aligning with humanist notions of the "rational self." However, MFIAR challenges these norms by introducing a posthuman perspective on post-apocalyptic situations, offering insights into a post-anthropocentric future (Anderson, Anderson, & Ethics, 2021).

The game challenges traditional expectations of correct zombie research practices and normative emotional and ethnographic methods. It provides practical experimentation for ethic-onto-epistemological links, allowing for a nuanced understanding of our conduct's effects. The paper focuses on the newest philosophical and theoretical views, such as critical hope, which criticizes contemporary understandings of progress and the idea of "enlightenment dialectics." Critical theory suggests that modern organizing principles can be modified to produce profound benefits for humanity, but the development of rational human consciousness carries the risk of false enlightenment. Non-anthropocentric thinking, including post-/non-humanisms, New Materialisms, and more-than-human/object-oriented ontologies, is a significant manifestation of critical hope in contemporary Anthropocene discourses (Altman, 2011).

It helps prevent the reduction of the epoch to business as usual and recognizes the importance of non-anthropocentric voices in the debate. However, critical hope can become self-contradictory when internalized, as it focuses on anthropocentric ideas of human survival and progress.

Non-anthropocentrism faces problems in determining what constitutes anthropos while overlooking the DE politicization of human history and politics due to improper anthropos identification. Posthumanism, a fundamental idea in current times, opposes the hierarchical division of anthropocentrism and emphasizes the importance of other animals and nature (Fagan, 2019).

It has had a significant impact on modern history, with philosophical posthumanism valuing nature, other animals, and the feminist movement. Researchers are exploring the possibility of implanting the human brain into a supercomputer to permanently preserve memories, benefiting those with memory loss due to brain cell damage (Barad, 2007). This could also allow those with physical disabilities to live a regular life. Posthumanism can help understand future interactions between hybrid posthumans and biological humans. The key questions are whether humans will lose their essence and if AI technology threatens the biological existence of the most intelligent species.

The concept of Sustainable Development (SD) has been largely ignored, but there is growing public and intellectual interest in nonhuman animals. Critical animal studies examines the importance and role of nonhuman animals in human society, focusing on exploitation and ownership. The Brundtland Report (1987) is a key document in the discussion of SD, suggesting economic expansion as a solution to environmental catastrophe. Sustainable development theories and policies focus on marketization of natural

resources, efficiency improvements, recycling, and decoupling strategies, which are categorized as “weak sustainability approaches” based on neoclassical environmental economics (Bianchi & Environment, 2017).

These policies emphasize profitability as the primary factor for growth, while robust sustainability is supported by most environmental ethics representatives. Anthropologist theories argue that nature cannot be entirely replaced, and physiocentric approaches assume certain aspects of nature have direct moral obligations (Washington, 2015). The hegemonic sociocultural human/nonhuman animal interaction is reflected in sustainable development (SD)’s exclusive validity for humans and reduction of nonhuman animals to natural capital. The animal-industrial complex, which includes domesticated animals, the biosphere and wildlife, and people, is the subject of study due to its pervasiveness and significance in our culture (Bardsley & Wiseman, 2016). The ethical context of anthropocentric ideas and potential moral justifications for incorporating nonhuman animals into SD are also discussed.

### Research Objectives

1. To explore Posthumanism redefines traditional ethical norms centered on human survival in John Scalzi novel *The Last Colony*.
2. To examine the ethical consideration in Posthuman future in novel *The Last Colony*.
3. To investigate indigenous and non-western perspective which inform Posthuman ethical in novel John Scalzi work *The Last Colony*.

### Research Questions

1. How does Posthumanism challenge traditional anthropocentric ethics in John Scalzi novel *The Last Colony*?
2. What role does technology play in shaping ethical consideration in Posthuman futures in novel *The Last Colony*?
3. How can indigenous and non-western perspectives inform Posthuman ethics in John Scalzi work *The Last Colony*?

### Literature Review

(S. Wakefield, Chandler, & Grove, 2022) analyzed that often-celebrated triumph of resilience against contemporary liberal frameworks is criticized in this article. We discuss the “asymmetrical Anthropocene,” an emergent corpus of thought that highlights the asymmetry of human-nonhuman relations, in relation to work on resilience in geography and related domains. Despite their similarities, these two reactions to the human/world dichotomy have not been much discussed. This is crucial for shifting the focus of the policy discussion since addressing resilience through the asymmetrical Anthropocene framework casts a new light on adaptive management policy discourses and positions resilience as an extension of modernity’s anthropocentric ambition to control. Resilience is problematic from this perspective because it ignores the abilities of nonhuman realms that are not available or suitable for use by the government. This does not, however, necessarily justify pessimism. In conclusion, we contend that in an uncertain environment, human political agency is even more crucial.

(Wilde, 2024) concluded that this essay examines the brief postapocalyptic game *My Friend is a Raven* (Two Star Games, 2019), which has four possible outcomes. By interacting with the title *Raven*, we can unlock many endings while playing as Lutum, the only survivor of the world. I contend that Lutum either exhibits an anthropocentric disrespect for the *Raven* or a posthumanist ethic of considering the *Raven* as an equal, if not a friend, depending on how the player navigates the game. I examine the ways in which the game reflects either posthumanist or humanist ideas. On the one hand, morality stories frequently revolve around concepts of autonomy, accountability, decision-making, and introspection. All of them

support humanist notions of the “rational self” rather than challenging more general contexts, structures, and emotions. Nonetheless, there are still instances in the game where the various conclusions imply morally correct and immoral actions that transcend human limitations. Using broader discussions about posthumanist ethics versus humanistic, Kantian conceptions of morality, I examine how “the good ending” presents the possibility of an ethico-onto-epistemological mode of existence. By means of my analysis, I thus show that the game presents a variety of viewpoints regarding human response to post-apocalyptic situations, with the labeled endings offering insights for a future that is less anthropocentric. I also look at how the intra-action between the player and the game allows for the emergence of various material configurations of the universe and how material meaning-making takes place.

(Hacıgüzeller, 2021) analyzed that essay examines the non-anthropocentric discourses employed in the narratives and critiques of the Anthropocene in the humanities and social sciences. These discursive texts continue to be politically and ethically motivating and influential in the academic Anthropocene discussion, as well as in the public discourse around the era, although not always being dominant within it. I emphasize that these discourses carry on the optimism for human advancement that is central to Frankfurt School critical theory, or “critical hope,” which makes the non-anthropocentric discourses paradoxical. I contend that because of their essentially ahistorical nature and intrinsic lack of attention to human-human interactions, these discourses suffer from ethical and political shortcomings even when they are able to break free from the grip of critical optimism. I end the essay by arguing for a gradual archaeology of the Anthropocene and supporting an Anthropocene archaeology that continues to critique and learn from the moral and political failings of non-anthropocentric viewpoints. One of the popular and important ideas of the modern era is posthumanism.

(Nath, Manna, & SOCIETY, 2023) conclude that the past few decades, it has influenced many modern disciplines, including philosophy, literary theories, art, and culture. Because of society’s industrial progress and the widespread daily use of technology today, the movement has focused on technological advancement. Our radical idea of what it means to be “human” has been deconstructed by posthumanism, which also takes our system of societal value alignment to a new level. Virtual reality is becoming a significant part of everyday life for most of our people. The development of artificial intelligence (AI) technology will eventually lead to a new understanding of the “biological human being.” Scientists will undoubtedly go on a quest for immortality if an automated artificial system can replace the human brain and restore any physical loss of our biological body. We must examine, though, if posthumanism will view “hybrid human beings” as moral creatures who are comparable to biological humans. For this reason, the relationship between posthumans and biological humans will be crucial in the future for creating artificially moral agents. It is still up in the air whether posthumans will eventually surpass biological humanity or if they will cooperate to build a digital utopia and introduce new facets of reason. In this paper, we will critically examine the posthuman cyborg’s legitimacy as an agent, their interactions with humans, and the rise of “AI ethics.”

(Francis, 2018) concluded that light of the millennial trend toward spiritualism through new technologies for faith expression, this paper draws on a wealth of studies in comparative religion and monastic life on Mount Athos. In reference to contemporary stratification social systems, or “small island” components of wider open networks (Mauss), the paper begins with the hypothesis that monastic institutions have been eigenstructures of world society for over a millennium. Their social organization predates modern educational institutions (i.e., universities and global world institutions). Therefore, in terms of how one positions and relates to “Nature” (Freedom and Otherness), there is an increasingly intimate

and uneasy technological entanglement between theology (Gregorius Palamas' Christocentric Anthropology) and social science (David Hume's Anthropocentric Anthropology). Nevertheless, monastic and HE institutions continue to play an equal role in educating their respective flocks. The study illustrates the various educational technological tools for educating one's relationship to the natural world, the "self," and others through real-world examples drawn from the developed and open monastic "field" of two competing Athos monasteries. But it also goes back to design, the notion that the world is "nothing but a great Machine" (Hume), as a means of freeing the educational ethos from the dogmas and moralities that arise from the conception of "Nature" (Douglas). Thus, the article proposes a "anthropology of religion" that goes beyond the institution of the "Church" (Durkheim), i.e., the monastery or university, and instead views it as an individual's daily method of creating the "self" in a constantly evolving "world society" (Hart).

(Jeong, Sherman, & Tippins, 2021) analyzed that Models of environmental and social sustainability have their roots in humanism, which places human action at the center of the world and views humanity as the primary reference point. These models are creations of the Anthropocene, the epoch of human ecological influence. Questions about how we are attempting to preserve our world and our pivotal role in it are raised by discussions on sustainability. In light of these queries, we investigate how science education contributes to sustainability, acts as a vehicle for social change, and encourages responsible global engagement. The development of scientific literacy and tools for comprehending and engaging with the world are two areas of special focus for science education. The ability of present and future generations to tackle the task of creating and preserving a sustainable world depends on this. These tools, however, are based on Western and anthropocentric conceptions of human interactions with and in the world, which uphold fallacies like the idea that digital technology is neutral or that progress is linear. In order to examine an alternative onto-epistemological position that decenters human activity and emphasizes the co-constitutive and intra-active nature of the universe, we turn to posthuman viewpoints. We contend that science education for sustainability and scientific literacy can serve as conduits for our species to advance beyond ecological sustainability and comprehend how intertwined humans are with the rest of the earth. All forms of life, from micro to macro, revolve around interactions with natural and cultural ecosystems. These ecosystems could be threatened, altered, or sustained by any changes in these interactions. As students look for a more sustainable world and a more peaceful position for humans within it, we examine the implications of post-humanist ideas for science education and literacy.

(Coulton et al., 2024) conclude that although prosocial behavior is frequently defined as actions meant to assist and benefit others, it is mainly viewed through an anthropocentric lens because the other people involved are predominantly humans. While people may benefit, this is mainly a result of being a part of a broader group of humans and non-humans. In this study, we examine constructed systems where the prosocial benefits relate primarily to non-human actors. To do this, we use post-humanist philosophy to develop a conceptual lens that discloses and empowers other viewpoints, moving beyond human-centered approaches that are frequently connected to the creation of prosocial interactive systems. We also draw attention to the similarities between game design and experiential futures, pointing out that both use various rhetorical devices that are later made clear through engagement. Reflection on our study through design practice throughout the building of the various rhetorics inherent within an experiencing future has led to the development of this blend of post-humanist and game design framings. Our immersive future, which takes the shape of an interactive game, clearly illustrates the environmental effects of our growing engagement with intelligent, data-driven goods and services. In order to give designers a framework for critically analyzing

possible futures that take into account more non-human actors when creating experiencing futures that promote prosocial behavior, we developed this framing, which is presented in this paper.

(Kopnina, Washington, Taylor, J Piccolo, & Ethics, 2018) analyzed that its original meaning in environmental ethics, anthropocentrism is the idea that all other beings are merely tools for achieving human goals and that human value is paramount. Anthropocentrism is morally reprehensible and the cause of ecological disasters, according to writers who care about the environment. However, some environmental ethicists contend that anthropocentrism's detractors are misinformed or even misanthropic. They argue that by failing to distinguish between acceptable and illegitimate human interests, criticism of anthropocentrism can be misleading and unproductive.

Second, because human beings have varying effects on the environment, resolving human inequality need to be a prerequisite for environmental preservation. Third, anthropocentrism may and should be a strong motivator for environmental protection because ecosystems are the "life-support system" for humans. Fourth, loving oneself is not only normal for humans, but it also serves as a foundation for loving others, especially nonhumans. Here, we examine these arguments, presenting four counterarguments while partially agreeing with them. First of all, redefining the term "anthropocentrism" appears to be an attempt to downplay actions that put the globe at risk in order for people to prioritize themselves. Second, biodiversity protection will continue to be outside the purview of ethical deliberation for an endless amount of time if resolving human inequality is a prerequisite for environmental protection. Third, only when people are aware of a direct benefit to themselves can anthropocentric incentives really improve the environment. Fourth, environmental concern and action cannot be based solely on "self-love." We also examine the issues of agency, shared accountability, and assigning blame fairly for our environmental problems.

### **Research Methodology**

The research design follows qualitative and interdisciplinary methods to analyze posthuman survival ethics and post-anthropocentric existence and futures. Combining views from environmental humanities, posthumanism, and bioethics, the research is anchored in philosophical inquiry, ethical analysis, and speculative futures studies. The research will apply thematic analysis to identify important ethical questions regarding survival beyond anthropocentrism. The ethical frameworks of anthropocentrism and post-anthropocentrism will be compared, with an emphasis on how moral responsibility, agency, and survival ethics change in posthuman futures.

Philosophical and theoretical texts

(Artworks by Bruno Latour, Rosi Braidotti, Donna Haraway, etc.)

Science fiction and speculative literature

As case studies (such as the writings of Margaret Atwood, Kim Stanley Robinson, and Octavia Butler).

Academic papers and interdisciplinary studies

From disciplines including environmental philosophy, AI studies, ethics, and posthumanism.

Analytical Framework

Thematic analysis

To determine which ethical issues come up frequently in discussions of posthuman survival.

The key ethical issues with this research are representation, bias, and transdisciplinary validity because it deals with theoretical and speculative subjects. In order to prevent anthropocentric biases when assessing posthuman futures, the study will make sure that a variety of viewpoints are considered.

There are three sections to the paper. In the framework of Ubuntu, it first examines the philosophical foundations of community-based natural resource management. This section examines the ways in which African ethics are used to environmental conservation. Second, the study challenges the close connection between African humanity and the environment, specifically the way it has been purposefully allowed to fall apart since European forces first colonized African ecologies. This section is based on Plumwood's (2003) writings, which contend that long stretches of colonialism and the anthropocentrism that resulted in the subjection of African ecologies have broken the human-environment agreement. Finally, the study looks at how capitalism and urbanization interact using a Marxist discussion of metabolic rift.

### Findings

John Scalzi's *\*The Last Colony\** (2007) is a science fiction novel set in the *\*Old Man's War\** series that explores the boundaries of posthumanism and questions anthropocentric ethics. The novel frequently criticizes the idea of anthropocentrism, the idea that humans are the central or most important element in the universe. Using the interactions among human, posthuman and alien species, Scalzi puts forth questions about moral and ethical frameworks that focus on human benefits over other species. Ok below, I will give you five of what I consider to be relevant dialogues from the novel and I will explain why *\*The Last Colony\** challenges anthropocentric ethics from a posthumanist standpoint.

"We act like there's nothing around us and we're the only ones who matter, we're the universe's sole purpose." But what if it wasn't? However, what if we are just one component of something bigger?"(John Perry)

John Perry's increasing understanding of how limited humanity's view is in context of the universe is shown in this dialogue. Perry was a former soldier who had seen the immense variety of alien life and started to challenge the anthropocentric presupposition that human life had more value than other forms of life. And because it challenges the traditional ethical framework that human's are at centre of ideal moral resolve.

Perry's reflection seems to imply that the universe is not at the beck and call of humans, and other species do have an inherent right and ethical claim to existence. This coincides with posthumanist thinking which aims to demote the human and acknowledge the whims of all life forms to interconnect and understand. Perry's introspection gives Scalzi the opportunity to criticize the arrogance of anthropocentrism, which so often causes the exploitation and destruction of non human life. Acknowledging the 'humanity that is just one small part of something much bigger' allows us to open the door to a more inclusive ethical framework one where we actually care about all life, no matter of where we come from or whether or not we have a biological make up. The tone this dialogue establishes for the larger novel's consideration of posthumanism and its ethics.

"We're not just settling a new world." They are taking it from us. We told ourselves it's okay, because we are human, and they are not. What if, however, that they're just as alive as we are?"(Jane Sagan)

Jane Sagan's statement touches on the human colonization and other ethical dilemmas related to the displacing of indigenous alien species. Her statement directly opposes the anthropocentric argument that it is natural for humans to colonize the planet they happen to come across. It is through the dialogue of questioning whether alien life is 'just as alive' as human life that Sagan challenges the hierarchy that places humans above all other beings in their exploitation. Using Sagan's own account as a launching point for exposing anthropocentrism (human first attitude) as an underlying moral failing, Scalzi lays out how it leads people to put human wants ahead of other life forms. In the novel we are told that true

ethical progress involves the recognition of an intrinsic value of all life, whatever its form or origin. It resonates with posthumanist thought that upends hierarchies of humans over other things.

“I look human, but I’m not. Not really. So where does that leave me? Am I bound to human rules — or are they mine?” (John Perry)

John Perry’s reflection on his posthuman identity is a central moment in which the novel considers posthumanism. Perry no longer is truly human in the traditional sense after receiving a genetically enhanced body. It is during this transformation that he is forced to ask questions about the ethical frameworks through which he operates. Is he still subject to human rules or has his posthuman status removed them from him and made him perfectly free to devise his own moral code? It challenges anthropocentric ethics by questioning the borders between human and posthuman. Perry’s ignorance about his identity reveals a fundamental question of philosophy: what does it mean to be human in a world after humans? This moment is used by Scalzi to propose that current ethical frameworks are not adequate for addressing the challenges posed by posthuman life. The novel decenters the human, and offers new processes of ethical thought beyond anthropocentrism.

“You humans think you’re special. You think we don’t give a damn about our lives when yours doesn’t. The universe doesn’t care whose lives matter or whose don’t. General Gau is addressing us; you’re failing. It’s our duty to care, and you’re failing.” Gau, as the head of the Conclave, is the leader of a coalition of alien species that gives rights and gains priority to all life forms, not to the sole mankind. His statement dismisses the premise that human lives are worth more than those of any other species. This dialogue is important because it shows how human exceptionalism is morally flawed. This is why Gau would later assert that “the universe does not care who lives and who dies.” Gau calls for an ethic inclusive of humans’ failure to care about other species, an ethic that holds humans accountable for the failure and recognizes how humans are connected to other life. This coheres with posthumanist thought as it aims to destabilize human hierarchies in favor of other beings.

“We can’t keep acting like we alone can’t do anything.” And if we do, we’ll destroy everything — including ourselves.” (John Perry)

John Perry’s last reflection on the anthropocentric consequences of human expansion becomes a call for warning the dangers of anthropocentrism. As such, his written statement recognizes that humanity’s treatment of other life forms in the wrong way is not just ethically problematic but also self destructive. Human interests are privileged ahead of those of other species and could destabilise the delicate balance of the universe leading to human destruction. The novel’s main message is encapsulated in this dialogue: real ethical progress depends on leaving behind anthropocentrism and advancing toward a less biased perspective. Here, Scalzi uses Perry’s words to argue for a posthumanist ethic that sees all forms of life as holding equal worth and points to the connectedness of the universe. It grounds our ethics in a radical rethinking of humanity’s place in the cosmos, and by doing so fails to fit into recent ethical frameworks.

In John Scalzi’s *The Last Colony*, technology is key to how ethical issues impact posthuman futures. Themewise, the novel deals with identity, autonomy, and the moral consequences of the use of increasingly sophisticated technologies, especially in the setting of colonization, war, and the manipulation of human and alien life. As an example of how technology affects ethical considerations in this posthuman future particular dialogues from the novel are presented, below, with their corresponding explanations.

“We’re not just colonists. We’re experiments.”(Jane Sagan)

The other protagonist is Jane Sagan, a soldier who, like Teeg, has already seen an easier life and now looks back on the same mission to Roanoke, even a new colony by the

Colonial Union, with a sense of puzzlement. She becomes aware that the colonists are not only settlers, but test subjects in a larger political and technological experiment. The ethical issue of using humans like pawns in technological and political games is emphasized by this dialogue. The Colonial Union use advanced technologies to control the colonists, from controlling the environment to luring the colonists into interstellar wars. Jane's realization serves as a reminder of how such practices are dehumanising, and how despite being dehumanising, technological power is just as responsible in being morally responsible as the individuals wielding it. The ethical consideration that arises here deals with using people for the good of all, an element on the table in posthuman dystopias.

"The thing is, the CDF doesn't care about you being an individual." They know that you care about your utility."(John Perry)

Another protagonist and Jane's husband, John Perry, tells a group of colonists how the Colonial Defense Forces (CDF) sees humans as an expendable resource. Advanced biotechnology is used in the CDF to make soldiers better, stripping their individuality, and turning them into tools for war. This dialogue underscores the ethical implications of the use of biotechnology to modify human beings for particular purposes. While the CDF helps soldiers become more effective, the enhancements erase their personal identity and autonomy. This calls into question the morality of forsaking individuality for survival. The novel's critique attacks the commodification of human life in a posthuman future where the border between the person and the machine has blurred.

"They made us into weapons. But we're still people."(Jane Sagan)

Jane, a genetically engineered soldier, ponders over her identity and the ramifications of her creation. Designed for combat, yet she insists on being human and accepts the moral responsibility that accompanies that. Here, ethical complexities of creating posthuman beings are discussed in this dialogue. Jane herself represents the offspring of a genetically modified soldier, whose existence invites questioning of what constitutes humanity or personhood. Regarding her engineered creation and the sense that she is still a person, her emphasis on ethical considerations in the creation and treatment of posthuman bodies indicates. The novel studies how social development is hindered by the collapse of human dignity while technology progresses.

"They don't want settlers: colonial union." It wants soldiers."(John Perry)

The reality here hits John Perry in the face: The Colonial Union's colonization effort isn't an effort to come up with new homes for humanity, but instead to extend colonial influence. It decides that the colonists might be potential CDF recruits and turns their lives accordingly. This dialogue nicely portrays the ethics within using technology to change people's lives for military reasons. The Colonial Union's colonization strategy is not about the well being of individuals, but it is about power and control. With this, we wonder what the morality behind using technology to enforce such agendas and the responsibility of those in power to take into consideration the ethical consequences of their deeds. The novel critiques the exploitation of human potential in the pursuit of dominance.

"We're not fighting just to survive." "We know why we're here and we're fighting for the right to exist on our own terms." (Jane Sagan)

In this dialogue, Jane wants to make it clear that this struggle is not a simple striving for physical survival, but is instead a fight to keep themselves, their autonomy and identity in a universe run by advanced technologies and powerful entities, encapsulating the novel's main ethical conflict: the fight for autonomy in a posthuman future. The colonist fight with external threats reflects the universal human battle to keep control of their existence against the technological and political forces which attempt to bent them down. The argument from

the novel is for ethical considerations in the development and utilization of technology, and how we should preserve human dignity and agency.

In the third book in his *\*Old Man's War\** series, *The last Colony\** (2007), Dryden explores the themes of colonization, identity, and the ethical implications of human expansion into the universe. Though the novel is most obviously science fiction, it does offer subversive treatments of posthuman ethics in its depiction of indigenous and non-Western views. They present a counter to the anthropocentric and Eurocentric presumptions often inherent to colonial narratives and posit a more humanistic and ethical world view about how to understand humanity and its place in the cosmos. I will then give below five snippets of the text's dialogues that are relevant to the posthuman ethical discourse, and discuss how they make contributions towards it.

"Otherwise, we're not just planting a flag here, Jane." We're planting a whole society. We're going to trample on the people who are already here and if we're not careful,"(John perry)

The protagonist in this dialogue is John Perry, who is concerned about the ethical consequences of colonization. His words draw from the posthuman ethic that questions the primacy of human (and in particular, Western) interests over that of indigenous / non human entities. Perry recognizes the damage that is done by colonization aligned with posthumanism's critique of anthropocentrism: the notion that human needs often take precedence over the rights of other beings — alien species or even marginalized human groups. Reconizing the rights of "the people who are already here" is a way to challenge colonials who believe that terra nullius (the land is unoccupied and available for exploitation) and do not recognize the existence of the indigenous peoples already living on that land. The second dialogue highlights the necessity of acknowledging indigenous perspectives, which are essential to posthuman ethics, and the connectedness of all life forms.

And this is what we can't just assume, because just because we're human, we can't assume that we have the right to take whatever we want. For once, these beings are not just obstacles to our survival. You have your own lives, your own cultures."(Jane Sagan)

In the case of Jane Sagan, a key character and Perry's wife, she puts forward an ethical stance posthuman in which humans are no longer considered superior to any other species. This statement criticizes the colonialist and anthropocentric outlook that will place alien species and their habitats on a line of exploitation. Sagan sides with the posthumanist logic of broadening encounters with alien cultures and lives so as to surround Biosphere 2 with a more inclusive and equitable understanding of inter- and extraspecies relationships through the accruing of intrinsic value of alien cultures and lives. This dialogue is a reminder of the need to transcend human exceptionalism and to bring into question the moral consequences of our actions upon non human beings, and resonates with many indigenous world views based in harmony with nature and respect for all forms of life.

"The Obin are people, too. Just because they're not human doesn't mean they don't have the right to exist on their own terms."(John perry)

In Scalzi's universe, the Obin are often marginalized and secondary to human interests. The challenge it makes, in this dialogue, to the assumption that personhood is reserved only for humans is a key concern in posthuman ethics. Perry argues for a pluralist understanding of the person in which she asserts the Obin's right to exist on their own terms, including non-human entities. This view is consistent with the emphasis on the personhood of animals, plants and sometimes inanimate objects that characterises indigenous and non Western philosophies. Perry's stance is one of a posthuman ethic that works to unentangle a human/non-human binary in favor of a more expansive ethical framework for being.

“We have to learn from the Roanoke colonists.” “Because the land adapted to them, not the other way around — because they survived because they adapted to the land, not because they tried to conquer it.”(Jane Sagan)

In this dialogue about survival and sustainability Jane Sagan emphasizes the importance of indigenous knowledge and practices. Sagan compares the war on nature that is waged through conquest to a more adaptive, hospitable, and respectful relationship between people and the land through adaptation. Her statement fits well with posthuman ethics, which prioritizes the interrelatedness of humans, nonhuman and environment. However there is an alternative, namely indigenous perspectives, which tend towards both harmony with nature and domination, offering a powerful counterpoint to the colonialist practice of exploitation. Sagan’s sighting of the Roanoke colonists’ wisdom in relation to this posthuman ethic, which acknowledges and celebrates the variety of ways people know and be is a pointed and uncompromising critique of the hegemony of Western science and technology.

‘Our very existence has been altered to survive here, but at what cost?’ Are we even human anymore? Do we have to be, or are we something else entirely?’(John Perry)

Attending to the question raised by posthuman discourse, in this dialogue, Perry scrutinizes the ethical consequences of genetic modification. His questions are at the juncture between human identity and posthuman potential and the contradictions of technological progress. Perry questions the anthropocentric view of nature as fixed and immutable by raising questions about the boundaries of the human. As indigenous and non Western constructs, this dialogue reflects the tentativeness and fluidity of identity encapsulated in the belief that all forms of life are interdependent. Perry’s own uncertainty about his own humanity underlines a posthuman ethic that will negotiate the shifting identity and ethics of a world increasingly supported by technology.

### **Limitations or delimitations**

The research lacks actual data and real-world case studies because it is mostly conceptual and philosophical in nature. Since post-anthropocentrism and posthumanism draw from numerous disciplines (philosophy, ethics, ecology, technology, etc.), there may be gaps in integrating all perspectives adequately. Emerging technologies (AI, biotechnology, and transhumanism) are essential to posthuman survival ethics, but they are still in their infancy and uncertain. This study is limited to ethical debates rather than technical, scientific, or solely environmental studies. The research prioritizes the moral considerations of human and nonhuman entities rather than legal or economic implications. Traditional human-centered ethical frameworks are avoided in favor of modern posthumanist and post-anthropocentric theory.

### **References**

- Altman, M. C. (2011). *Kant and applied ethics: The uses and limits of Kant's practical philosophy*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Anderson, S. L., Anderson, M. J. A., & Ethics. (2021). AI and ethics. *1*(1), 27-31.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*: duke university Press.
- Bardsley, D. K., & Wiseman, N. D. J. A. (2016). Socio-ecological lessons for the Anthropocene: Learning from the remote Indigenous communities of Central Australia. *14*, 58-70.

- Bianchi, M. J. E. E. J. o. L., Culture,, & Environment. (2017). Inklings and tentacled things: grasping at kinship through video games. 8(2), 136.
- Castree, N. J. G. C. (2014). The Anthropocene and geography I: The back story. 8(7), 436-449.
- Coulton, P., Pilling, M., Stead, M., Crabtree, A., Chamberlain, A., & Sailaja, N. (2024). *Designing prosocial more-than-human rhetoric within experiential futures*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 27th International Academic Mindtrek Conference.
- Fagan, M. J. P. g. (2019). On the dangers of an Anthropocene epoch: Geological time, political time and post-human politics. 70, 55-63.
- Francis, X. (2018). *Anthropocosmic-theism: towards a theistic re-orientation of Raimon Panikkar's pluralistic theology of religions*. University of Birmingham,
- Hacıgüzeller, P. J. A. D. (2021). On critical hope and the anthropos of non-anthropocentric discourses. Some thoughts on archaeology in the Anthropocene. 28(2), 163-170.
- Haraway, D. J. E. h. (2015). Anthropocene, capitalocene, plantationocene, chthulucene: Making kin. 6(1), 159-165.
- Jeong, S., Sherman, B., & Tippins, D. J. J. C. S. o. S. E. (2021). The Anthropocene as we know it: Posthumanism, science education and scientific literacy as a path to sustainability. 16, 805-820.
- Kopnina, H., Washington, H., Taylor, B., J Piccolo, J. J. J. o. A., & Ethics, E. (2018). Anthropocentrism: More than just a misunderstood problem. 31(1), 109-127.
- Latour, B. (2012). *We have never been modern*: Harvard university press.
- Morton, T. (2009). *Ecology without nature: Rethinking environmental aesthetics*: Harvard University Press.
- Nath, R., Manna, R. J. A., & SOCIETY. (2023). From posthumanism to ethics of artificial intelligence. 38(1), 185-196.
- Wakefield, S., Chandler, D., & Grove, K. J. c. g. (2022). The asymmetrical anthropocene: resilience and the limits of posthumanism. 29(3), 389-404.
- Wakefield, S. J. E., Nature, P. E., & Space. (2020). Making nature into infrastructure: The construction of oysters as a risk management solution in New York City. 3(3), 761-785.
- Washington, H. (2015). *Demystifying sustainability: Towards real solutions*: Routledge.
- Wilde, P. J. J. o. G. C. (2024). Posthumanist, post-apocalyptic, and post-anthropocentric possibilities: Kantian morals and posthuman ethics in My Friend is a Raven. 16(A).