



LISTENING TO MUTE VOICES: ECO-AESTHETIC VIEW OF HUMAN AND NON-HUMAN ANIMALS

Dr. SHUBHANKU KOCHAR¹, DIVITA SHARMA²

¹Assistant Professor, English Department, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University
(New Delhi)

Email : shubhankukochar@gmail.com

²Independent Researcher

Email : divita093@gmail.com



Article Received:09/08/2020

Article Accepted: 18/09/2020

Published online:24/09/2020

DOI: [10.33329/rjelal.8.3.317](https://doi.org/10.33329/rjelal.8.3.317)

Abstract

Literature is a way to express beliefs and perceptions that exhibit human conscience. It generally explores man's actions and thoughts in relation to his environment. But, a question that arrives from depth of a thoughtful mind asks, "Is it necessary that every single being/ habitat / nature /environment should exist in the context of homo-sapiens/humans?"

The above contemplation is supported by Charles Darwin's treatise "to ennoble and humanize animals." It establishes man as superior race and has evolved from primitive species of apes and monkeys. It then questions man's existence as "humane, benevolent and affectionate "co- companions. The dichotomy brings forth the utilitarian and anthropocentric sensibility of Victorian Age. But our stance goes deep to investigate the unanimous disposition of man in 21st century that works on pragmatics of scientific, logical and utilitarian approach. Representation of non – humans as proxy to humans is not only limited to human actions. It extends itself to literary narratives and language structures. The "othering" found in the term "non- human/ animals" is critiqued by Josphine Donavon. To paraphrase Donavan's stance one may point out animal representation in various texts in which animal bears burden of man or either becomes scapegoat for his sins. These activities blur the preaching's of the East that propagates the notion of "Vasu Dev Kutumbakam(world as family)". It then points out:

What is the aesthetic definition of "the world"? Does it provide any space to non-humans?

The selection of primary readings rests upon the ground of representation of animals in literary narrative. It contemplates how muted voices are translated into humanistic structures. Human advocates of animals problematize structures in which animals are used as "animate furnishings" to augment human contexts of expression, feelings and psyche.

Key words: Animals, Environment, Human, Non-Human, Nature

Presence of a muted voice and a deliberate act of providing it a meaning is a show of social

amicability. We, humans, possess a unique feature that has made us 'indistinguishable' from other

species. The ability to use signs and symbols has eventually complicated relations between natural and anthropogenic species. The creativity and restlessness of human psyche predates all human manifestations and actions that led to construction of “anthropomorphic hegemony”. It is an urge to create ‘human friendly environment’ with an emergence of a space wherein man can escape evolutionary developments whilst forcing the same on ‘others’.

Literature is a way to express beliefs and perception that exhibits human conscience. It generally explores man’s actions and thoughts in relation to his environment. But, a question that arrives from depth of a thoughtful mind asks,

“Is it necessary that every single being/habitat / nature /environment should exist in the context of homo-sapiens/humans?”

The nuances of this anticipation shall become basis of our views. Henceforth, the paper would try to build a structure in which humans and non-humans would be juxtaposed. The aim of the endeavor shall be to enlist the spaces of conflict, parallels and intersection between two species. The discourse of ‘postcolonial criticism’ and ‘animal studies’ would be studied in context of each other in order to underline as well as to foreground the internalizations of human psyche. The texts taken in this context belong to three different genres i.e. novel, poetry and a movie. All these texts belong to contemporary 21st century society. They would try to portray aesthetics of animal symbols and linguistic superstructure built and interpreted in today’s mass culture. The motif of the chapter depicts an urgent requirement for benevolent disposition in purview of ecological sensibility against eco-hostile behavioral patterns.

The nexus between postcolonial criticism and animal studies can be understood through an instance from “*Paradise Lost*” in which God tells Adam that he is “master of creation” and holds dominion over Earth, Air and Water and creatures who exist on this planet.

The breath of life; in his own image he

Created thee, in the image of God

.....

Be fruitful, multiply, and fill the Earth;
Subdue it, and throughout dominion hold
Over fish of the sea, and fowl of the air,
And every living thing that moves on the
Earth.

Wherever thus created, for no place
Is yet distinct by name, thence, as thou
knowest, (Milton 154)

The above quote from a renowned work of literature depicts relationship between man, nature and culture problematic in the sense that God gives man the power to usurp and exploit nature. The above argument is apparent through Lynn White Jr. critique that states

... Implications of Christianity ... conquest of nature would emerge in western atmosphere...but the physical symbols of God’s communication with man...was based on how creation operates... science and technology grown out from belief to “post Christian”. (White Jr.5)

The critic tries to depict the dichotomy between nature, culture and science. The nexus is important to understand in order to comprehend the lacunae’s of human consciousness that has excluded animals from rational sphere.

The othering of animals and ignorance of nature as an integral part of ecology elaborates the “anthropomorphic power” that human being assumes as well as executes. The narrative of execution of anthropomorphic power can be understood more clearly through Elizabeth Kolbert’s depiction of homo -sapiens:

“... Homo sapiens , as it has come to call itself ... vast forests are razed ... they shift organisms from one continent to another , reassembling the biosphere...no creature has altered life on the planet in this way before ... the planet has undergone change so wrenching that diversity of life has been plummeted” (Kolbert 260)

The above lines by Kolbert embody horror of human fancies and endeavors. The author clearly critiques extravagant desires of man and its dire

consequences. These lines can be regarded as an omniscient expression of anthropomorphic power imperative in human disposition. Furthermore, Randy Malamud in his essay "Poetic Animals and Animal Souls" discusses psychological and social conditioning that man has constructed in his inability to sync with other species. The endeavor of refusal to acknowledge animals as companions can be regarded as a conscious distance of emotions and inability to comprehend relations with non-humans.

According to Malamud:

"...how we come to know, respect, cherish, or love an animal is comparable to how we come to bond with a person since in both cases imagination is required. One can no more absolutely know another person than one can with certainty know the will of an animal. When a person chooses to bond with an animal she does so to extend her sense of self by granting, creating, or recognizing the selfhood of another that would otherwise remain unrealized" (Malamud 3)

The above statement expresses the not-so-expressed relationship of humans and non-humans. Nevertheless, humans since ages have regarded non-human as his companion or a confidante in some cases but never has he left his throne of power to be in sync or in a paradigm away from being a master. The essentialization of master and a servant relationship who work together as parallel or a team gives a horrific chill when tables are turned. The character of "Tyger" in Blake's poem expresses fear of man from a ferocious and barbaric animal. Gloom of the poet about creation of ferocious brain and uncertainty of creator's happiness clearly expresses inability to feel emotions and language unexpressed.

What the hammer? what the chain,

In what furnace was thy brain?

....Did he smile his work to see?

(Blake 132)

The categorical type created for animals as either docile, timid and vulnerable or ferocious, barbaric and raw expresses the social conditioning constructed in order to subdue the non-human by slaughtering or excising power for protection in defense. The sheer hypocrisy of the above argument can be understood through Darwin's *Origin of Species*:

"...to enoble and humanize animals" as co-companions. (Darwin 102)

My stance here lucidly depicts my concern about behavior of man towards animals. The utilitarian and anthropocentric sensibility of man is represented through views of Sir Charles Darwin, a Victorian Scientist and Social Thinker. He expresses his views that establishes man as superior race and has evolved from primitive species of apes and monkeys, thus, known to be "Homo sapiens. But, the concept that man is the only intelligent and civilized creature existing on this planet was soon challenged by *Descent of Man* in 1871. The book declares that there are traces through which primitive members of human race can be traced, thus, challenging the entire project of man carrying the 'burden of civilizing mission'. According to Elizabeth Kolbert,

"... some skulls of high antiquity , such as famous one of Neartherthal represent foil for ourselves...challenging predominance of artistic and religious sensibilities and capacity of human abstract that was regarded of as bestial kind ...walked upright and would recognize more or less of our own". (Kolbert 241)

The juxtaposition of both the texts i.e. the *Origin of Species* and *Descent of Man* foreshadows ambiguity about human existence and his evolution. But apparent divisions between humans and non-humans can be regarded as precarious. The question that arrives to a thoughtful mind asks,

"Why was othering and creation of divisions between human and non-human was an important part of human evolutionary history and literature"?

The representation of non – humans as proxy to humans is not only limited to human actions. It extends itself to literary narratives and language structures. The use of pronoun “IT” for all animals categorizes them as “other” from humans. It does not provide an enough space of classification as either male or female. Also, animal representations in various texts in which animal bears burden of man or either becomes scapegoat for his sins. These activities blur the preaching’s of the religious scriptures where man and nature were regarded as complements to each other. The nucleus of the above argument lies deep in construction of a “Logos”/Language structure for animals created only for convenience of homo-sapiens.

Many post –colonial authors have regarded amnesia of culture, language and history as an essential feature of colonialism. It requires an act of deliberate removal or an act of not providing an identity as a ‘space of consensus’ or rather executing power in disguise. The poem “Sea is history” although talks about colonialization of tribal men but can also be used as an un-thought manifesto for expressions of pain and identity. Like Walcott who sees his Caribbean heritage as a set of collected values reminds him of his traditions and culture. In the same vein, anthropocentrism can be regarded as an another brand of self-centeredness through which man expresses his whims and fancies by constructing structures, identities and meanings for animals and their natural habitat.

The political, cultural and economic transformation of the world in 19 and 20th century altered the power relations, thus, impacting bio-social, cultural and ecological paradigms. An era governed by reason, rationality and urbanization led to creation of “mono-humanist sphere”. As according to Amit S.Bashiya, the conceptualization of violence and exploitation as part of normative lifestyle and animal studies as a space of multivalent readings of cruelty and hostility can be rendered only with sympathy and pity. It raises questions about “construction of humaneness and created signified categories of animals as non-human”.

The need to provide icons to an animal is a way of categorizing as well as enlisting them as a trope whose physical features and natural habitat is endowed with a tale of historicizing, shifting and evolving. It is an emblem that confirms to pragmatic image of co-habitat in a biosphere wherein animals are only social symbols. The existence of non-humans is very important to provide foil to man’s cultural, social and political contexts.

According to Mahesh Rangarajan,

“In mobilizing people around the project of creating boundaries by remaking landscapes , animals and their natural surroundings appropriates animals who embody qualities that are politically and culturally vital for those who appropriate them...The power and hold of such icons...implicitly if not explicitly questioned iconic animal as a metaphor for royal , imperial or republican power... ideas of nature and nation are enmeshed (as to when) an entity is considered as alien or belonging to a particular clan or society”.
(Rangarajan 77)

Rangarajan’s argument provides a vantage point to contemplate where do “origins and indiginity for original state of nature lie ... how far back in time one ought to go to draw a line between human presence as evolutionary drama and nature as part of tabula rasa”. The above argument can be regarded as a prologue for assessing pristine features of nature present at the backdrop of creating history as well as social identity for non-humans and their natural habitat. A glamor and pomp created around an animal can be juxtaposed with an act of knowing, observing and describing emblems as products inclusive in cultural context and exclusive in human/non-human relationship.

Ironically, imperialism as a project was started with an attempt to monopolize nature and denote cultural moorings to wildlife and forests as a belonging. But, urban landscapes and national boundaries created a space of coexistence wherein nature and culture only combine to penetrate in

biosocial arena. Man needs nature to establish and embellish his cultural representations that stimulates his sanctity of sustainability. Otherwise, behaviorist patterns of hunting for pleasure and extravagant questions about creation of hunting weapons and traditional beliefs towards non-humans by judging them only on the basis of human laws and sanctioned normative beliefs. Elizabeth Kolbert in her book *The Sixth Extinction* creates restlessness in reader's conscience by imposing a deliberate silence behind the mass extinction of various species who were once present on this planet. The sudden disappearance of various species creates a space for broader context of man's hostility and dangers that human poses to other species.

According to Kolbert,

" ... modernity in its fullest expression possesses the quality of changing events... the world changes species adapt ... current extinctions could be averted if people cared more ... understand the possibility of things undone that has led to ecological transformation." (Kolbert 260)

The Pulitzer Prize winning book *The Sixth Extinction* brings forth the irony of self-centered human mind in which mass killings are done for pleasure and animal taming is as an adventurous activity taking place in an imaginary tale written by an author. As according to William Ruckert, literature is a "stored energy, a formal turbulence and swirl in the flow...all energy comes from creative imagination" that constructs a paradigm based on views present in the collective consciousness of mankind. The appropriation, taming and killing of animals were not only physical in nature but also had literary and metaphorical representations in various literary narratives. For example, Herman Melville's *Moby Dick* in which the entire plot focuses on killing of white whales by sailors. Also, *Old Man and The Sea* discusses killing of marlins. *Death in the Afternoon* expresses cruelty towards bulls as key representation. These texts are few in the long list of classics like *Aesop Fables*, *The Raven*, Shelley's *Ode to Skylark*, Coleridge's *The*

Rime Of The Ancient Mariner , Rabbit Trilogy so on and so forth .

The increasing misbehavior and cruelty towards animals led to formation of animal studies as a branch of Literary Criticism. The prominent critics like Gary Snyder, Phillip Armstrong, Cary Wolfe, Susan Mc Clugh advocate about rights of animals to be free in their habitats. The representation of animals as literary agents, metaphors, symbols, proverbs and similes can be rendered problematic. Susan Mc Clugh in her essay "*Literary Animal Agents*" cite examples from Percy Shelley's and John Keats poems where the poet uses literary animal values as a model for thinking outside cultural contexts away from human meanings of expression innate in animal agency. Cary Wolfe, another animal right critic expresses that human subjectivity should not repudiate animals from their contexts to suit the spaces of literary narratives that imposes voice of humans over non – humans who are obviously ontologically and biologically different. The critic points out the duplicity of "speaking for animals" as animals are capable of expressing their pain through their different voices and modes of expression, but, not to be understood by humans. The critic ,thus, foregrounds need for reviewing ways of man that hurts animals based on the notions of benevolence and compassion and not on anthropocentric approach that places man as superior to animals / non- humans . The critic uses Derrida's essay to affirm the symbiosis between humans and non – humans as rudimentary predicate present since origin of human life. Jacques Derrida, one of the prominent Literary critics, through the essay "The Animal That Therefore I Am "encompasses "we" as not only limited to humans but as a larger paradigm of non- negotiable of presence of man as 'only one of the species'.

The "othering" to be found in very term "non- human/ animals" is critically rebutted by Josphine Donovan that foregrounds various spaces in which man's innate superiority is propagated. To paraphrase Donovan's stance, one may point out animal representation in various texts in which animals bear burden of man or either becomes scapegoat for sins of human beings. Thus, they

voicelessly bear the pains and sufferings of homo-sapiens. The lacunae that critic talks about finds its reference in the general scene of horses bearing weights of man on their backs. To substantiate her argument, the critic uses Elizabeth Costello's point of view that discusses "aestheticization of animal cruelty". Animal cruelty is clearly expressed through the imposition of role of proxy over animals for pains and sufferings of human race or of a protagonist of any literary text. The contention of the critic is not only limited to animals as bearers but also commodification of meats of animals consumed by humans. The premise above does not ignore maintenance of food chain but foregrounds the standpoint that reckless killing of animals has led to extinction of various species that has an impact on ecosystem. The critic insists for "ontological re conception" of animals as members of planet Earth.

However, the entanglement in relation of human and non- human cannot be simplified as hierarchal arrangement between the two. But it appears to enter into deep framework in which humaneness and materiality of animals is based on representation of meanings in "speciesism" and appropriation in human/ non -human complexity of meanings and materiality.

The construction of colonized/colonizer nexus embodies cultural production of anthropomorphism by creating modes of interaction, communication and signification of evolutionary history based on closed domains of rationality. Humans have coevolved with various forms of materiality which are "not humane" and yet nevertheless made the human what he is. The areas of exploitation and social conditioning of animalized disposition foregrounds the bio-centric idea of human species based on Eurocentric notions of civilization and civilized beings.

As according to Suvadip Sinha and Amit .S .Bashiya

"... It forces us..." and "But it also insists..." above enjoins us to both decenter standard "human" ways of knowing and being, while also acknowledging the specificity of the human as a coevolved prosthetic it seeks to

transcend particular modes of post-humanist thinking... the evocation of the grammar of animality should not be viewed only as a production of bare animalized life, as if the image of the "human" preexists with the reduction to animality being a "fall" from it... animal studies often occlude the discursive constructions and linkages between race and species". (Sinha & Bashiya 2)

The critics further refer to Michael Lundbald's argument in which they advocate human and animal relations in a text as an "affective state that signifies quotidian relations" in postcolonial cultural texts based on disgust and indifference. Suvadip Sinha and Amit S Bashiya quote Lundbald in order to espouse on radical erasure by humans of non- humans as a methodology of appropriation and representation. As according to Lundbald,

"...In literary and cultural studies, the focus of animality studies would be on "texts and discourses with humans likened to animals, or humans with animal characteristics, or humans oppressed like animals, or animals signifying humans" (Sinha & Bashiya 7)

Thereby, they can no longer used, abused and commoditized as an individual property. The argument appears convincing from the purview of human/ non-human relationship. Animal Studies remain as an offshoot of Eco Criticism but only explores its cultural context in human society. It propagates about rights of animals and their sufferings but does not guide man to mend his ways. Critical stance by Randy Malamud expresses the same statement "How do animals perceive humans"?

Eco criticism perceives a set of criteria which interrogates the prejudices, behaviors and transgressions as a punishable offence. Eco Criticism appears to be more dialogic process in which a critic aims to engage in acquiring knowledge of 'why birds chirp' and 'what does their chirping' convey to their fellow members. Eco-criticism clearly augments the fundamental

question of man as companion or 'usurper' of the beautiful natural habitat.

Apparently, these disciplines clearly destabilize the dominance of humans over other species. It clearly challenges capitalistic urges of human interests. The connotations of animalistic disposition in context of humanism foregrounds anthropocentric conscience of mankind as pernicious. It also brings forth animal as a created construct with prejudices innate in the word. The notion of "animals to be ennobled and humanized" can be clearly dismissed by acknowledging difference between animals and humans. The difference between animal and human species is constructed by nature for sustenance of eco system.

The development of "Bioregionalism" propounded by Michael Balely exhibits essential connections between humans with other species not based on hierarchical positioning of human as 'superior'. The ground of representation of animals in a literary narrative largely represents the cognizance of muted voices translated in humanistic structures. Animals are an essential entity in human lives yet distanced from fundamental rights and benevolent behavior. The arguments of animal sensitive entities blur the boundaries of representation by problematizing the emblematic meanings given to animals as "inanimate furnishings" to augment human contexts of expression, feelings and psyche.

The above argument can be understood through a text that obliterates dichotomy of human/ non – human relationship. *Animal's People* by Indra Sinha explore pains and sufferings of humans in animalistic dispositions. The novel is a fictional reworking of Bhopal Gas Tragedy through a fictional city of Khaufpur. The novel does not explore the narrative of an animal in a normative sense but makes animal as humane and human as animal. The blurring of boundaries between animals and humans deconstructs the entire paradigm of master/ slave relationship. The text provides a holistic paradigm to foreground human relations with animals. It essentially locates or

dislocates the constructed spaces of man vis-à-vis animals. The quote from the text

"I used to be human once. So I'm told ...but people who knew me when I was small say I used to walk on two feet just like a human being..." (Sinha 27)

In context of above lines, one may say that nature of humanity has become obscure due to gleaming punch of interests of the few that shatters the persona of a man. It exposes scatological and crude aspect of mankind in comparison to benevolence and humanity. The necessary gaps that the author leaves deliberately become stoppages for comprehending and re-defining humanity.

"...If I'm upright human, I would be one of millions... I am an Animal, fierce and free ... in all the world none like me... We are people of Apokalis..." (Sinha 366)

As according to a critic, the plight of the powerless has seldom been conveyed more powerfully, while "Animal is destined to be one of fiction's immortals". The expression of subduing the power of so called master cordon's off the layers of complex icons constructed as to 'what is human and what is non-human'. Ironically, the disability of Zafar, the protagonist happens due to a man -made disaster "The Bhopal Gas Tragedy" that led to twisted spine of the protagonist, thus forcing him to find a solitude in 'an animalistic disposition'. The solace found in the animalistic disposition becomes universal mouthpiece for expression of fear of alienation and up-rootedness that problematizes bubble of stability, rootedness and sustainability.

As according to Rini Dwvedi and Anu Shukla:

"...the study of humankind cannot be conducted separately from biological processes ...that we inhabit ... the aesthetics of connectedness and humility becomes a goal of bioregionalism". (Dwvedi & Shukla 17)

The statement by the critic imbues idea of connectedness and benevolence that is, although,

not achieved by urban consciousness and colonial mentality but appears to create fanciful ideas/fantasies in nursery tales and popular mass cultural production.

The movie "Dr Dolittle" by Stephen Gaghan is an American fantasy adventure film that depicts Dr John Dolittle as a veterinarian doctor who can understand the language and emotions of animals. The director appears to create a utopic world in which animals are not merely portrayed as co companions but are benevolent, understanding and humane. The movie dilutes the incompetency of expression and barbarity that although appeared to be synonymous with wildlife and its inhabitants. The movie showcases the competency of Dr Dolittle to understand animals and their emotions as a god gift which also helped him in his difficult times. The human names provided to animal characters make them an identical creature only different in physical and racial features. Interestingly, the movie uses Birmingham Palace during Victorian Era, as a location to catalyze the adventure and to re-new the relationship between human/non- human. The fantasy tale can be regarded as a new testament to establish amiable and humble relationship with the ecosystem and its co-inhabitants. The adventures of Dr Dolittle with his naïve friends in an unknown arena of a dragon in order to get "fruit of Eden" impinges on ethos of Christianity and rational cadre of British armed forces. The main protagonist is a surgeon who removes a bagpipe from stomach of the dragon that caused pain to the gigantic animal and attains his friendship, thus, achieving his reward "the fruit of Eden". The fantastical world of protagonist and his naïve friends also builds a pipe dream of love between different species by deliberately erasing the indifference, disgust and hierarchical consciousness. The fantastical world remains as an alternative and a possibility but unfortunately never appears to become part of reality.

The fantastical idea of the movie can be understood more clearly in complement with Margaret Atwood's poem *Dream of the Animals* in which poet explores the nature of animals "dreams" and forces readers to reexamine their ideas about what distinguishes humans from

animals. One may say that Atwood through her poem tries to obliterate traditional beliefs about their mental and intellectual limitations. The poet tries to juxtapose the idyllic dreams of animals for survival and food to nightmarish setting of a laboratory in which they are kept as prisoners. It raises questions about what constitutes a difference between human disposition and an animalistic behavior. The animals do not possess any memory of their natural habitat and appear to find comfort only in their dreams. The lines

"Mostly animals dream/ of other animals of their kindIn the pet shop window on St. Catherine Street

Crested, royal eyed ruling it's kingdom of water dish and sawdust" (Atwood 1)

The imprisonment of animals away from their natural habitats questions the rationality of anthropomorphic characters who regard animals as an "inanimate objects". The poet tries to deconstruct the idea of 'exoticism' associated with animals by focusing on animal's captivity and their feelings. The irony exhibits humans as monsters in the somber animal dreams as they exploit notions of love and affection for material gain. The reader can feel the trauma and aimlessness that an animal feels in their subconscious minds as he possesses fear in "the caged armadillo" and gloom about absence of beautiful natural surroundings. The contrast between Atwood's poem *The Dream of Animals* and the movie *Dr Dolittle* foregrounds the nuances attached to the terms like exoticism, wilderness and freedom. A closed analysis of all three texts in the context of human / non-human relationship tries to question the normative patterns of behaviors and beliefs created by anthropomorphic society. *Animals People* embodies depths of man's vested interests and depiction of a post catastrophic society. The novel depicts human and animal exchange of roles at the backdrop of an extravagant civilization heedless of man-made disaster. The juxtaposition between the poem and the movie explores a holistic view of fantasies and horrors in which creatures enjoy their spaces and habitats only in a fairy tale. Atwood's poem thus provides spice of reality to utopian love

of man and his naïve friends. The reader may imagine Dr Dolittle and his friends in a civilized society in which their expressions are no longer present in a comfortable space of adventures, affection and care but are captivated as 'statutes' devoid of benevolence and feelings.

The notion of "Protect, Preserve and Perish" is a manifesto for decolonizing the icon of "non" in non-humans. It is a space for new aesthetic grounds of love and affection. The necessity to understand the emotions and pains of co-inhabitants becomes a way of building a culture that provides social checks and holistic balance to restore the colonizer/colonized relationship. The environmentalist's ecological problems are only limited to sustainable development, scarcity of natural resource. But, one may say that the purview of human relation with his co habitants must be understood on the basis of "Oneness in Biosphere" by harmoniously blurring the created significations of grotesque and brute disposition. As according to Jacques Derrida in an essay "The Animal therefore I am". The critic regards animal as contained term that is misidentified with barbarity and inexpression. It rather expostulates the fraudulent grounds on which humans has been defined in opposition of animals. Derrida brings forth concept of "hetero-affection" in order to de colonize the usurped/neglected zones through "bios" i.e. the meanings humans give to themselves in order to claim superiority.

One may agree with Derrida's notion of "innate habitations" shared by human and non-human as an empirical similarity. But at the same time assertion of ethical distance to be maintained in absence of empathetic expression of love, benevolence and affection as expressed by Dr Dolittle.

The movie thus becomes a highpoint of empathetic and ethical human stance. The text expresses the need to renew and rethink about human and non- human as grotesque and barbarous.

The context of decolonizing ideas cannot be finished without "Gandhian Philosophy" of non – violence. The power of Satyagraha by Mahatma

Gandhi brought a challenge to "eco-hostile, consumerist and self-destructive" western culture. The first book by Mahatma Gandhi "*Hind Swaraj*" is a major proponent of distaste for industrial civilization and urbanization. He rather affirmed the need to remodel Eurocentric views based on "civilizing mission" and destruction of earth's ecosphere. The revolutionary saint urges to build delicate and sensitive conceptions of inclusive human disposition and utopian perception based on love and benevolence. Thus, ludicrous and mono-humanist thought of self- centeredness created a space for individual expression on behalf of other inhabitants. The presumption of superiority in the Eurocentric civilizing mission and its execution has shattered the notions of "Vasudev Kutumbkam". The need of an hour has arrived to build a holistic and humble environment based on fantastic ideas of Dr Dolittle, as empathetic and affectionate human who shares and communicates his love to his innocent friends. The ideas of Dr Dolittle can also be found in Alexander Pope's poem *Essay on Man*

"All are but parts of stupendous whole,

Whose body nature is, and God the soul".

(Pope 163)

Otherwise, the vicissitudes build on the basis of eco-hostility would shatter created notions of humanity. The necessity of human benevolence is an only option for sustenance of biosphere. The scrapping off "civilizing mission" provides a hope for developing a sharing and caring ambience based on the notion of 'to look far and ahead of times: in wholeness'. The notion espouses from the concept of "Bodhisattva" that is modeled on a cooperative and an ecologically sensible society. It propagates the trend of humanitarian values and ethics amidst technological and urban growth by condemning misanthropic and selfish behavioral traits and beliefs.

Works Cited

Atwood, Margaret. *Selected Poetry 1965-1995*.

Virago P. 2010

Blake, William. *The Complete Poems*. Penguin

Classics. 1977

- Donovan, Josephine. "Aestheticizing Animal Cruelty." *College Literature*, vol. 38, no. 4, 2011, pp. 202- 217. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/41302895. Accessed 12 Sept 2020.
- Dr Dolittle*. Directed by Stephen Ghaghan, Universal Pictures, 2020.
- Glotfelty, Cheryll and Harold Fromm eds. *The Ecocriticism Reader*. U of Georgia P. 1996.
- McHugh, Susan. "Literary Animal Agents." *PMLA*, vol. 124, no. 2, 2009, pp. 487-495. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/25614289. Accessed 12 Sept 2020.
- Kolbert, Elizabeth. *The Sixth Extinction: An Unnatural History*. Bloomsbury P. 2014.
- Kumar, Arvind & Aditya Pratap Singh, editors. *Gandhian Approach to Ecology and Environment*. Agri Horthi Press. 2018.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Penguin Classics. 2003.
- Pope, Alexander. *The Major Works*. OUP. 2008.
- Rangarajan, Mahesh. *Nature and Nation: Essays in Environmental History*. Oriental Black Swan. 2015.
- Shukla, Anu &, Rini Dwivedi, editors. *Ecoaesthetic and Ecocritical Probings*. Sarup Book Publishers. 2009.
- Sinha, Suvadip & Amit. S. Baishya editors. *Postcolonial Animalities*. Taylor & Francis. 2020
- Sinha, Indra. *Animal's People*. Simon & Schuster UK Ltd. 2007
- Westling, Loius. *The Cambridge Companion to Animal Studies*. Cambridge UP. 2013.