

Reimagining Migration: Post humanism and Anthropogenic Praxis in Sonia Shah's *The Next Great Migration*

Akanksha Barthwal

Doon University, Kedarpuram, Mothorowala, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

Corresponding Author Email: barthwal.akansha7@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Sonia Shah's *The Next Great Migration* challenges conventional narratives that frame migration, both human and nonhuman, as a crisis. Through an interdisciplinary approach Shah posited migration as a fundamental life-sustaining process. This paper examines Shah's work through the lens of post humanism and the concept of Anthropocene. In doing so it argues that her narrative reframes migration as an adaptive and, interconnected phenomenon that transcends human exceptionalism. By critiquing anthropocentric ideologies and highlighting the agency of nonhuman actors. Shah advocated for a more inclusive and ecologically attuned understanding of migration in the context of global environmental change. The study conceptualizes migration not as an anomaly but as an adaptive response to environmental and climatic challenges, aligning with postcolonial critiques of borders, displacement, and belonging. Shah's narrative intersects with ecocritical discourse by highlighting the intricate connections between ecological systems and migration. Furthermore, this study examines how her work engages with Foucauldian biopolitics, particularly in its critique of state mechanisms that regulate movement and population through policies grounded in fear, exclusion, and control. By engaging with Shah's interdisciplinary narrative, this study advocates for a more comprehensive and inclusive framework. The understanding of migration as recognized both human and nonhuman forms of agency within the context of global environmental transformation. Furthermore, it aims to situate Shah's intervention within broader theoretical discussions. The paper will attempt to discuss environmental humanities, postcolonial studies, and contemporary debates on ecological justice.

Keywords: *Post Humanism, Anthropocene, Migration, Environmental Discourse, Ideologies, Postcolonial Literature*

INTRODUCTION

In the novel *The Next Great Migration* Sonia Shah challenges the widely held belief that migration is an anomaly or disaster. She challenges the static worldview that forms the basis of many modern geopolitical and ecological strategies by claiming that movement is essential to life on Earth. This paper examines how Shah's writings challenge anthropocentric viewpoints and are consistent with posthumanist theory. The study also provides an ecologically aware and nonhuman agency-inclusive view of migration. Posthumanism challenges the idea that humans are essential to comprehending the universe and promotes the idea that nonhuman beings have agency. Shah's story supports this viewpoint by showing how migration is a trait that all living things share, including plants, animals,

and people. The narrative of *The Next Great Migration* commences with the author situated in Southern California, engaged in the search for *Euphydryas editha* butterflies. At the outset of the first chapter Shah recounts the decline and climate-induced range shifts of this butterfly species, which notably highlighted in climate change literature. It is worth noting that the sources upon which this book relies are not always explicitly clear. Although there is a references section and numbered, chapter-specific notes, these do not consistently correspond to explicit citations within the text. By page 7, however, Shah transitions to her primary focus: human migrations and the biases against migrants. This subject is particularly pertinent in the United States and globally, and Shah dedicates the majority of the book to referencing scientists and others who have predicted various disasters resulting from human migration, subsequently revealing the inaccuracies and deliberate manipulations that often underpin such warnings, as well as the resultant suffering. Occasionally, she revisits biological and conservation issues, with both the butterfly and Dr. Parmesan reappearing later in the book. In a study, the editorial acknowledges systemic racism in science and publishing, pledges active anti-racist actions, and commits to amplifying Black voices and ensuring equity in research and academia (Floyd & Arbery, 2020). In another study, the essay reframes migration as a multispecies, planetary practice of co-dwelling that decentres human exceptionalism and embraces Earth's alterity, resisting anthropogenic regimes of control (Baishya & Kumar, 2022). Another study showcases the Contemporary Anthropocene narratives and counter-narratives oscillate between strong and weak anthropocentrism, with a truly post-anthropocentric vision emerging only through speculative, indigenous, and complex-systems perspectives that decenter human volition in favour of relational co-dwelling with the non-human (Biswas & Vangeest, 2024). The Special Issue foregrounds Indigenous and local communities' onto-epistemologies that challenge Eurocentric Anthropocene narratives by embracing posthumanist, more-than-human relationships with land, nature, and non-human beings (Dovchin, et al., 2024). In this paper, this study traces how colonial publishing norms persisted into the decolonial era while African authors tactically reshaped the field through inventive interventions that remain unrecognized in dominant Western frameworks. (Sandwith, 2021). This paper highlights the the unchecked spread of nonnative species reflects human negligence and ethical hazard, demanding a reimagined posthumanist praxis of responsibility, justice, and coexistence. (Perry et al., 2020). Another paper highlights the tension between animal rights advocates and conservationists, shaped by philosophical divides, selective information, and media polarization, underscores the need for posthumanist, collaborative approaches to species coexistence and environmental stewardship. (Perry et al., 2020). The critique of the sovereign subject by Foucault and Deleuze, while stressing dispersed power and the need to hear society's Other, ultimately re-centres the West as Subject by overlooking ideology and their own complicity (Spivak, 1988). Shah reframes migration not as an apocalyptic anomaly but as a fundamental, life-sustaining process—an adaptive strategy shared by humans and nonhumans alike, essential for biodiversity, resilience, and survival in the Anthropocene. (The Guardian, 2020). The book as a whole shows that the movement of species—whether through natural dispersal, human introduction, or ecological adaptation—undermines fixed ideas of nativeness and instead highlights migration as a continuous, transformative force shaping life and survival on Earth. (Thompson, 2014). The critique of the native/alien species binary, with its arbitrary, xenophobic, and ethically inconsistent foundations, underscores the need—echoing *Reimagining Migration: Posthumanism and Anthropogenic Praxis in Sonia Shah's The Next Great Migration*—for a shift towards frameworks that evaluate species by their ecological impacts rather than their origins. (Warren, 2007).

By connecting the origins of such ideas to 18th-century naturalists like Carl Linnaeus, as his work established the groundwork for race science and xenophobic policies. Shah challenges the historical construction of permanent human categories. She opposes the anthropocentric viewpoint that regards humans as apart from or superior to other species. By emphasizing on the interdependence of all life forms and their common migratory patterns. This method emphasizes how crucial it is to acknowledge nonhuman agency when talking about migration and environmental change. Shah offers a unique perspective on the often-stifling immigration debate, which is typically debated over by steadfast stalwarts on opposing sides or occasionally argued over by ambivalent centrists. More than one percent of the world's population is currently displaced, and as a result of the climate crisis and humankind's relentless progress, more animal species are fleeing to more hospitable places. Most people understand that half of the story: the world is changing. Its biological necessity, which Shah persuasively explains, is less frequently recognized. Shah writes, "Migration's ecological function extends beyond the survival of the migrant itself". She further writes, "Wild migrants build the botanical scaffolding of entire ecosystems." In addition to dispersing seeds and pollen, which are essential for many plants to survive, migrants also carry genes, which contributes to genetic diversity. Migration is a biological phenomenon as much as a human one. In the novel, Shah writes that, "the idea that certain people and species belong in certain fixed places has had a long history in Western culture," Shah writes, by its logic, "migration is by necessity a catastrophe, because it violates the natural order." "The so-called "natural order" is actually a construct that has been buoyed for millennia by a broad coalition of scientists, politicians, and other ideologically inflected cavillers. As for the word "migrant," it didn't even appear in the English language until the 17th century when it was coined by Thomas Browne and it took another hundred years before it was applied to humans. The Swedish naturalist Carl Linnaeus, who is most known for formalizing binomial nomenclature—the contemporary system of classifying organisms as, for example, *Homo sapiens* or *Canis lupus*—was one significant migrant-denialist, as Shah explains. Shah sheds light on Linnaeus's narrow-minded devotion to the prevailing narratives of the day, going beyond his contribution to taxonomy. In which is noteworthy in and of itself vulnerable to criticism, as author Anne Fadiman puts it when she calls it a "form of mental colonising and empire-building." More than simply following the crowd, he attempted to solidify the purported distinctions between human groups by crassly exaggerating characteristics of people with "red," "yellow," "black," or "white" complexion. He argued with rival theorists who were starting to put forward innovative theories at the time, such as the theory that all people originated in Africa and then moved there. He contributed to the dominant religious explanation for the world's existence by proposing the "Great Chain of Being," which ranked matter, plants, animals, peasants, clergy, noblemen, kings, and, lastly, God in ascending order. In order to bolster his arguments, Linnaeus travelled to northern Sweden and "studied" the native Sami people, while simultaneously griping about the unfavourable weather and the lack of Swedish among the locals. After stealing some of their traditional attire, he freely made up tales about their origins and customs. Later, he committed to the odd delusion that black women had extended labia minora, to which he called using the Latin word *sinus pudoris*, in an attempt to support the biological differences between Africans and Europeans.

Objective

The aim of this study is to conduct a critical analysis of Sonia Shah's *The Next Great Migration* through the theoretical lenses of posthumanism and the Anthropocene.

- The study aims to study and reinterpret migration as an adaptive, interconnected, and life-sustaining phenomenon. By emphasizing the agency of nonhuman actors and challenging anthropocentric ideologies.
- The study illustrates how Shah's narrative contributes to a more inclusive and ecologically informed discourse on migration.
- Furthermore, this study seeks to explore the intersections of Shah's work with postcolonial literature, ecocriticism, and Foucauldian biopolitics. To comprehend how the perspective complicates the traditional binaries of nature/culture, human/nonhuman, and mobility/stasis.
- The study also aims to examine how prevailing ideologies, particularly those rooted in anthropocentrism and colonial legacies; shape narratives of movement, displacement, and ecological crisis.

Through the critical lens, this paper seeks to interrogate how literature and theoretical discourse can reframe migration. As a multispecies adaptive phenomenon that challenges human exceptionalism and promotes a more inclusive understanding of agency, mobility, and ecological interconnectedness.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Postcolonial Theory: Studying the Theory and Praxis

While existing scholarship on *The Next Great Migration* has explored its ecological and historical insights. A critical gap persists in examining Shah's work through an integrated framework of posthumanism, postcolonial theory, and Anthropocene discourse. Prior studies have predominantly focused on human migration, often neglecting the significance of nonhuman agency and the destabilization of anthropocentric worldviews. Furthermore, although Homi Bhabha's and Edward Said's theories have been applied in postcolonial contexts, they have not been sufficiently extended to interrogate ecological narratives in contemporary nonfiction. Similarly, ecocriticism has addressed environmental nativism but has seldom bridged its analysis with the postcolonial legacies of migration and biopolitics. This study addresses this interdisciplinary gap by critically analysing how Shah challenges fixed notions of identity, borders, and ecological purity through a multispecies perspective. This study contributes to the current body of knowledge by offering a nuanced, transdisciplinary reading that connects migration studies, environmental humanities, and postcolonial ecocriticism, revealing the interconnected nature of species movement, environmental justice, and decolonial thought.

In studying the postcolonial theory of Homi K. Bhabha and Edward Said, it provides a critical outline for the interpretation of the novel ([Bhabha, 1994](#)). *The Next Great Migration* reveals the concept of fixed population and cultural purity as central to colonial and nationalist ideologies, as seen as fiction constructed to justify territorial and racial hierarchies. The accounts that Shah takes of human and animal migration divulges into the fluidity that challenges the severity of colonial borders. In the novel Shah discusses how the colonial powers have historically pathologized migration (e.g., by identifying migrants as disease carriers) as a tool of control in her work. In order to support the Western narrative of superiority, the "other" is built in static, essentialist terms, which is similar to Said's criticism in *Orientalism* ([Said, 1978](#)). The paper can be read in terms of what Bhabha refers to as a "third space". A location of transnational flows and hybrid identities subvert hegemonic narratives. By narrating the tales of migratory creatures, including humans who transcend state boundaries. In reading Shah's work, it challenges environmental nativism as demonstrated by ecocriticism. Especially in its second-wave version that prioritizes post humanism and environmental justice. Invasive species and human migrants are frequently portrayed as ecological

hazards in traditional environmental discourse. Shah addresses this issue by emphasizing on research demonstrating how migration fosters biodiversity and resilience. Shah's work interprets history through an ecocritical lens. She critiques the anthropocentric and nationalistic assumptions inherent in environmental discourse, which Shah argues both reflect and perpetuate xenophobia.

Ecocriticism and dark ecology (Morton)

Shah aligns with Timothy Morton's concept of "dark ecology," where the traditional binaries such as native/invasive and natural/unnatural are deconstructed. The author advocates for a global perspective over a local one, proposing an ethics of ecological interconnectedness rather than purity.

Biopolitics (Foucault) — migration as a tool for state control

Shah's work can also be seen as a critique of the modern state's regulation of bodies through migration policy, drawing on Michel Foucault's notion of biopolitics. Her analysis of governmental control over movement through legislation, surveillance, and geographical restrictions aligns with Foucault's concept of biopower which is the management of life and populations. She further illustrates how the state employs migration as a mechanism of power by recounting historical events such as the exclusion of Chinese migrants in 19th-century America and contemporary refugee detentions. By revealing these controls as political technologies rather than rational public health policies, her scientific counter-narrative challenges their justification ([Foucault, 1990](#)).

METHODOLOGY

The current study employs a qualitative research methodology rooted in literary analysis and critical theory. It aims to conduct a detailed textual examination of Sonia Shah's work. The analysis employs conceptual tools from postcolonial studies, ecocriticism, and Foucauldian biopolitics to investigate how Shah reconceptualises migration as an adaptive, life-sustaining process that transcends anthropocentric paradigms. The study adopted the following methodological steps:

Textual Analysis: A critical reading of Shah's text was performed to identify key narrative strategies, metaphors, and arguments that challenge prevailing ideologies regarding migration and ecological boundaries.

Comparative Theoretical Engagement: This paper positions Shah's work in dialogue with ideas from postcolonial literature and ecocriticism, examining how the narrative critiques the colonial legacies of border control, environmental extraction, and species hierarchies.

Ideological Critique: The study interrogates anthropocentric and nation-state-centred ideologies that construct migration as a crisis, employing discourse analysis to highlight Shah's counter-narrative of movement and ecological entanglement.

Contextual Interpretation: Migration is interpreted not only as a biological or ecological process but also as a political and cultural phenomenon, thus facilitating an integrated analysis that spans species, geographies, and systems of power.

RESULT

Reinterpretation of Migration in Shah's Work

Sonia Shah's *The Next Great Migration* reconceptualises migration not as a contemporary crisis but as an intrinsic, essential, and ecologically integrated phenomenon. She portrays migration as a vital movement encompassing both human and nonhuman species, positing it as a fundamental aspect of survival on a rapidly evolving planet. In doing so, Shah challenges prevailing narratives that depict mobility as chaotic or menacing.

Critique of Anthropocentrism

Adopting a posthumanist perspective, Shah critiques anthropocentric worldviews that interpret migration solely through political or social disruption lenses. She contends that such perspectives often advance political agendas rooted in fear and exclusion, particularly those advocating for stringent border policies. Shah questions the invocation of scientific authority to legitimize exclusionary migration controls, advocating for the recognition of nonhuman migration as equally valid and ecologically indispensable.

Analogy of Immune Systems

One of Shah's most persuasive metaphors likens anti-migration policies to immune system disorders. Just as autoimmune diseases cause the body to attack it, restrictive migration policies—especially those observed during the COVID-19 pandemic—can harm the societies they intend to protect. This analogy elucidates the self-destructive nature of xenophobe ideologies by linking biological and social systems through a shared logic of openness and adaptability to change.

Postcolonial Connections and Narrative Strategy

Shah's narrative also draws upon postcolonial thought, particularly her focus on how historical migration has been employed to justify conquest and domination. Similar to postcolonial writers, she integrates biography, journalism, science, and metaphor to resist singular historical narratives and amplify marginalized voices. Her inclusion of Indigenous knowledge systems and emotionally resonant storytelling challenges dominant knowledge paradigms that often prioritize detached, empirical science. This hybrid methodology serves as a form of resistance, offering a broader and more inclusive understanding of migration and belonging.

DISCUSSION

Sonia Shah's *The Next Great Migration* initiates a critical re-evaluation of migration, conceptualizing it not as a contemporary political crisis but as an evolutionary, life-sustaining process. In doing so, she challenges prevailing policy frameworks that perceive migration as a threat to national or ecological purity. This reconceptualization contests the binary logic of "purity versus contamination," which underlies much of the xenophobic rhetoric and restrictive environmental policies prevalent in contemporary geopolitics ([Shah, 2020](#)). Her analysis advocates for a transition from fear-based governance to one that acknowledges mobility as an essential component of resilience and adaptation to climate change.

Posthumanism and Ecological Ethics

Shah broadens the scope of migration discourse by incorporating the movement of nonhuman species—animals, plants, and microbes—thereby decentring human agency and aligning her work with posthumanist theory. This theoretical perspective reimagines agency as distributed across species and ecological systems rather than concentrated in human control. Particularly in the context of the

Anthropocene, where human activity is intertwined with planetary survival, Shah's emphasis on multispecies interconnectedness promotes an ethics of mutual survival. Her work critiques human exceptionalism and calls for an inclusive understanding of ecological relationships ([Braidotti, 2013](#); [Haraway, 2016](#)).

The Immune System Analogy: A Biopolitical Critique

A central metaphor in Shah's narrative is the comparison between immune system responses and societal reactions to migration. She equates rigid border controls and isolationist policies—especially during the COVID-19 era—to autoimmune disorders, wherein the body attacks itself. This analogy provides a compelling critique of governance based on fear and control, suggesting that such responses ultimately undermine societal resilience rather than protect it. By linking biology to politics, Shah illustrates how fear-driven policies can mirror pathological behaviors ([Shah, 2020](#); [Esposito, 2008](#)).

Narrative Resistance and Epistemic Critique

Shah's storytelling method—employing biography, metaphor, and journalistic anecdote—constitutes a counter-hegemonic form of knowledge. Her narrative challenges the dominance of positivist science, which often excludes Indigenous, emotional, and lived experiences from legitimate discourse. In this, Shah echoes Gayatri Spivak's call to “unlearn one's privilege” and aligns with postcolonial strategies that utilize hybrid and polyphonic texts to resist totalizing histories ([Spivak, 1994](#); [Said, 1993](#)). Her approach integrates empirical observation with affective resonance to construct a pluralistic and ethically engaged epistemology.

Implications for the Environmental Humanities

Shah's interdisciplinary approach enriches the environmental humanities by emphasizing how migration across species is central to ecological adaptation. Her work critiques the geopolitical ideologies that sustain borders and immobility, advocating instead for fluid, inclusive models of coexistence. By situating human and nonhuman migration within a shared ecological framework, Shah proposes an ethic of movement rooted in interdependence, adaptability, and a shared future. This vision suggests that sustainable policies must accommodate complexity and reject simplified, exclusionary responses to global change ([Shah, 2020](#); [Nixon, 2011](#)).

Migration in the Anthropocene: An Ecological Imperative

The present-day geological epoch, reframed as the Anthropocene, is characterized by the profound impact of human activity on the environment and climate. Shah theorizes migration within this context as an essential reworking of ecological changes, rather than a disruptive force. Shah advocates for policies that assist, rather than hinder, movement, drawing parallels between human migration and the movement of species in response to climate change. Shah's work underscores the essential role of migration in enhancing the resilience of ecosystems and societies. By migrating, humans and other species can adapt to changing habitats, thereby promoting ecological stability and biodiversity. This perspective aligns with the principles of the Anthropocene, which acknowledge human impact on the environment and reevaluate the relationship between humans and nature. Shah's narrative emphasizes the agency of nonhuman entities in migration processes, providing examples of how migratory behaviors are crucial for the survival of animals, plants, and even microorganisms, as well as for maintaining ecological balance.

This recognition of nonhuman agency challenges traditional human-centric narratives, in accordance with posthumanist philosophy, which seeks to decentre humans in favour of a more inclusive understanding of life on Earth. Shah emphasizes the interdependence of all life forms by recording the migratory patterns of different species and their reactions to environmental changes. A major topic of both Posthumanism and the Anthropocene is this interconnection, which highlights the necessity of taking a comprehensive approach to comprehending and resolving global issues. The cultural backdrop to his explanations and speculations was the generally held view that migration was an anomaly, and that people and animals lived where they belonged and belonged where they lived and always had. Deliberate, political, or just plain fundamental ignorance of the facts of animal migration even pushed scientists to develop a plethora of fantastical ideas to explain, for instance, the winter migration patterns of migratory birds. Aristotle was the first to offer the idea that some birds hibernated in lakes or hid in isolated caverns as an explanation for their periodic disappearance. Such presumptions were partly motivated by the notion of a steady, divinely-created "harmony of nature." The primary focus of the novel is on bias, racism, and the intolerance of human migration, with both deceased and contemporary biologists frequently implicated in the discussion. Chapter 3, titled "Linnaeus's Loathsome Harlotry," is named after the father of taxonomy. A significant portion of this chapter criticizes 18th-century European travellers for their claims of encountering and exhibiting in their museums "women touted as mermaids, Hottentots, and troglodytes" (p. 68–69). Unlike Buffon, who is depicted as his "rival," Linnaeus did not accept dispersal as a primary explanation for contemporary distributions. Instead of focusing on the significance of dispersal, as she effectively does later, Shah adopts an ad-hominem approach, portraying Linnaeus as a sex-obsessed failure and occasional fraud who refused "to admit that Europeans shared kinship with the foreigners they considered primitive and savage and possibly biologically alien" (p. 72). Linnaeus is accused of categorizing humanity into different species, although his text actually refers to them as subspecies, which is a crucial distinction.

Linnaeus reaffirmed his belief that animals lived in their particular climes and stayed there when some intellectuals started to doubt this fixed stability. In addition to not having moved from Africa, the implication for humans was that Africans, Asians, and Native Americans were biologically different from one another. This type of racial essentialism played a significant structural role in the development of eugenics or race science. Homo sapiens were classified by Linnaeus as follows: Homo sapiens europaeus (white, serious, strong), Homo sapiens asiaticus (yellow, melancholy, greedy), Homo sapiens americanus (red, ill-tempered, subjugated), and Homo sapiens afer (black, impassive, lazy). Homo caudatus (people who live in the Antarctic) and even Homo monstrosus (pygmies and Patagonian giants) were also distinguished.

Shah claims that scientific theories that portrayed migration as a type of disease were "theoretical ballast for today's generation of anti-immigration lobbyists and policy makers," rather than being arcane theoretical issues restricted to esoteric academic publications. Shah unearths other repulsive myths here, such as the late 17th-century Malpighian layer, which postulated that Africans possessed an additional layer of skin made of "a thick, fatty black liquid of unknown provenance." Although the Malpighian layer has been largely disregarded, these artificial distinctions between peoples still plague medical care: Black people are still thought to be able to handle more pain; hence it's perhaps not shocking that more Black women die during childbirth. "One of the organizing principles of conservation is the classification of species as either 'native' or 'alien,'" Shah says, citing 2007 scientific research published in *Progress in Human Geography*. Both humans and nonhumans suffer from the

ramifications of such binary classification, which also fosters xenophobia and white anthropomorphism. As an example, in 1963, the son of conservationist and author Aldo Leopold suggested that national parks in the United States "preserve, or where necessary [...] recreate the ecologic scene as viewed by the first European visitors." An ahistorical fallacy is assumed by the notion of a pure, pre-colonial past: that either no trace was left by humans and other species, or that those traces could be erased and the ecological landscape would return to a static Eden. In the Americas and Australia, for instance, the arrival of the first *Homo sapiens* signalled the rapid extinction of numerous native species, including woolly mammoths, giant sloths, saber-toothed tigers, camelops, and the dire wolf. However, many indigenous cultures do not disturb their surroundings as much. However, the desire to preserve endures.

Limitations

While Shah's posthumanist framework offers a novel and inclusive perspective on migration, its application has certain limitations. Post humanism's abstract and Universalist tendencies may overlook culturally specific experiences of migration, particularly in communities where spiritual or social constructs of human-nonhuman relations differ significantly. Moreover, the language of resilience and adaptability, while valuable, can sometimes obscure the structural violence and historical injustices that compel migration in the Global South.

CONCLUSION

In the concluding chapter of *The Next Great Migration*, entitled "The Wall," Shah presents a compelling analogy between migration and immune system responses. She acknowledges legitimate historical concerns. The dissemination of smallpox by Europeans in the America and, the transmission of malaria by the Roman Empire, while cautioning against the perils of overreaction. Shah relates xenophobia to a fever; it may initially serve as a protective mechanism but can escalate into self-destruction if unchecked. The COVID-19 pandemic, she contends, vividly illustrated this dynamic, with border closures and isolation mirroring a "cytokine storm"—a pathological overreaction that ultimately harms the host body. According to Shah, such policies are antithetical to biological and ecological resilience, particularly in the Anthropocene, where survival increasingly relies on adaptability and movement across all species.

Posthumanism and Migration Ethics

Viewing migration through a posthumanist lens, Shah challenges the anthropocentric frameworks that dominate migration discourse. She emphasizes the agency of nonhuman life forms—animals, plants, and microbes—whose migrations are crucial for ecological balance and evolutionary adaptation. In the context of accelerating climate change, she advocates for migration policies that promote mobility rather than restrict it. Her work aligns with posthumanist thinkers such as Donna Haraway and Rosi Braidotti in reimagining the boundaries of agency and ethical responsibility across species lines.

Narrative as Counter-Hegemonic Knowledge

Shah's interdisciplinary style—integrating science writing, biography, journalism, and metaphor—serves as a counterhegemonic narrative form. Her resistance to positivist scientific authority, which often excludes emotional, Indigenous, or anecdotal modes of knowledge, is a deliberate political gesture. In line with Gayatri Spivak's call to "unlearn one's privilege" and to "speak to" rather than

"for" the subaltern, Shah centres marginalized voices and plural epistemologies. This narrative strategy echoes the hybrid storytelling methods of postcolonial writers such as Salman Rushdie and Arundhati Roy, who blur fact and fiction to critique official histories and the power structures that produce them. Shah frames migration as both a biological necessity and a literary and ethical reality.

Future Scope

Future research could explore the applicability of Shah's ideas within localized contexts, such as environmental displacement in the Pacific Islands, internal migration in South Asia, or Indigenous migratory practices in Latin America. Additionally, integrating Shah's framework with empirical case studies would bolster the theoretical foundation of posthumanist migration studies. Further inquiry into how Indigenous cosmologies understand movement, borders, and ecological kinship could expand the scope of migration research beyond Western paradigms.

Conflict Of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper. All research activities and findings have been conducted and presented with full objectivity and academic integrity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher wishes to convey profound gratitude to their supervisor, whose guidance, insightful feedback, and unwavering support have been invaluable throughout this research endeavour. Sincere appreciation is also extended to the department for providing the academic environment and resources essential for the study. Additionally, the researcher is deeply grateful to their family and friends for their encouragement, patience, and belief, which have been a constant source of motivation during challenging times. Finally, acknowledgment is made to all the scholars and authors whose work has inspired and informed the research, contributing to the development of the researcher's thoughts with clarity and depth.

REFERENCES

- Baishya, A. R., & Kumar, P. (2022). Ends of worlds or the continuation of the planet? Postcolonial theory, the Anthropocene, and the nonhuman. *Postcolonial Studies*, 25(3), 305–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2022.2071724>
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Biswas Mellamphy, N., & Vangeest, J. (2024). Human, all too human? Anthropocene narratives, posthumanisms, and the problem of “post-anthropocentrism”. *The Anthropocene Review*, 11(3), 599-613. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20530196241237249>
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Polity Press.
- Dovchin, S., Dovchin, U., & Gower, G. (2024). The discourse of the Anthropocene and posthumanism: Indigenous peoples and local communities. *Ethnicities*, 24(4), 521-535. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687968231219778>

- Esposito, R. (2008). *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Floyd, B. T., & Arbery, A. (2020). Black lives matter in ecology and evolution. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 4(7), 893-894.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: Vol. 1: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1976)
- Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.
- Nixon, R. (2011). *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Harvard University Press.
- Perry, G., Curzer, H., Farmer, M., Gore, M. L., & Simberloff, D. (2020). Historical, ethical, and (extra) legal perspectives on culpability in accidental species introductions. *BioScience*, 70(1), 60-70.
- Perry, G., Sarge, M. A., & Perry, D. (2020). Alternative facts and alternative views: Scientists, managers, and animal rights activists. In *Problematic wildlife II: New conservation and management challenges in the human-wildlife interactions* (pp. 421-450). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Sandwith, C. (2021). Publishing African Literature: Towards a Transnational History. *ariel: A Review of International English Literature* 52(2), 95-130. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/ari.2021.0013>.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Vintage.
- Shah, Sonia. (2020). *The Next Great Migration: The beauty and terror of life on the move*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Macmillan.
- Spivak, G. C. (1994). *Can the Subaltern Speak?* Columbia University Press.
- The Guardian. (2020, June 26). *The Next Great Migration by Sonia Shah review – movement is central to human history*. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2020/jun/26/the-next-great-migration-by-sonia-shah-review-movement-is-central-to-human-history>
- Thompson, K. (2014). Where do camels belong. *The story and science of invasive species*, 47-48. Profile Books.
- Warren, C. R. (2007). Perspectives on the ‘alien’ versus ‘native’ species debate: A critique of concepts, language and practice. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(4), 427–446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132507079499>
and contemporary debates on ecological justice.