© October 2025| IJIRT | Volume 12 Issue 5 | ISSN: 2349-6002

The Anthropocene Algorithm: Navigating the Ethical Responsibilities of AI in Human-Nature Co-existence

Damaraju Pradeep Kumar[1], Dr. K. Rajbir Kumar[2]
[1]*Research Scholar in Law, Shri Venkateswara University, Gajraula, U.P.*
[2]*Professor, Shri Venkateswara University, Gajraula, U.P.*

Abstract- The Anthropocene foregrounds an era in which human actions profoundly reshape ecological systems, demanding new frameworks to understand the role of technology in sustaining life on Earth. This paper theorizes the "Anthropocene Algorithm" as both a conceptual tool and an ethical challenge for artificial intelligence (AI), emphasizing how algorithmic systems mediate the relationship between human progress and ecological resilience. Rather than treating AI as a neutral innovation, the study frames it as an active participant in the reconfiguration of human-nature relations, with responsibilities that extend beyond anthropocentric priorities.

The paper examines the paradoxical position of AI in the Anthropocene, where algorithmic infrastructures contribute significantly to environmental degradation through resource extraction, data intensification, and energy consumption, while simultaneously offering critical means for ecological monitoring, climate mitigation, and sustainable resource governance. This ambivalence calls for a recalibration of AI ethics that situates environmental sustainability as integral to technological design and deployment, expanding existing discussions that focus narrowly on human-centered values.

Engaging with environmental ethics, posthumanist scholarship, and critical algorithm studies, the analysis establishes the Anthropocene Algorithm as a framework for embedding ecological awareness within AI governance. It demonstrates how ethical principles such as precaution, accountability, sustainability, and intergenerational justice can be operationalized within computational systems, fostering technologies that acknowledge ecological limits and responsibilities. This approach highlights the necessity of interdisciplinary collaboration, drawing insights from law, philosophy, data science, and environmental studies to guide value-sensitive innovation.

Ultimately, the study argues that a genuinely ethical AI for the Anthropocene requires a move beyond anthropocentric paradigms toward ecocentric and relational models of coexistence. By incorporating indigenous knowledge systems, non-Western philosophies, and pluralistic forms of ecological wisdom, the Anthropocene Algorithm provides a normative framework for aligning technological futures with planetary well-being. This perspective underscores the role of AI not merely as a symptom of the Anthropocene but as a transformative site where more just and sustainable modes of existence may be cultivated.

Keywords: Anthropocene, Artificial Intelligence, Environmental Ethics, Human-Nature Relations, Algorithmic Governance, Ecocentrism, Sustainability, Posthumanism

INTRODUCTION

The Anthropocene stands as a pivotal epoch, characterized by the profound and often irreversible impact that human activity has unleashed upon Earth's ecological systems. Within this context, artificial intelligence is rapidly becoming both an agent and a mirror of human priorities, amplifying the ways in which societal, economic, and environmental systems interact. As AI is embedded ever more deeply into systems ranging from climate modeling to resource management, its influence transcends mere computation—AI systems now orchestrate large-scale decisions that can reshape landscapes, determine patterns of consumption and conservation, and mediate the complex web of human–nature relations.

However, the promise of AI—its efficiency, predictive power, and adaptive capacity—arrives entwined with new ethical dilemmas. These span from the environmental costs of developing and deploying advanced algorithms (such as energy expenditure and electronic waste), to questions of justice, agency, and intergenerational equity. The challenge is not simply technical; it demands a re-examination of the philosophical and normative assumptions underpinning the very design and deployment of AI. Does AI simply serve as an instrument of human will, or can it be conceived as a participant in an entangled, more-than-human community? How can AI be held accountable for its environmental and social impacts, and what frameworks are necessary to guide its ethical development in the Anthropocene?

Exploring these questions necessitates moving beyond anthropocentrism to consider AI's place within a broader ecological and moral landscape. The critical inquiry foregrounds a vision of AI not as a tool of dominion, but as a partner in fostering sustainable coexistence—one capable of embracing indigenous, ecological, and justice-centered perspectives.

RESEARCH METHODS

The study employs a qualitative, interpretive, and interdisciplinary methodological framework. The focus is not on AI's technical architecture in isolation but on its socio-ethical implications within the Anthropocene. The following approaches are adopted:

i. Conceptual Analysis: Tracing the evolving definitions of the "Anthropocene" and "algorithm" to examine the symbolic and material intersections of human and technological agency over nature.

ii. Critical Legal and Ethical Inquiry: Assessing the normative responsibilities of AI through legal-philosophical frameworks, including environmental law, human rights principles, and ethics of care, to evaluate accountability mechanisms in ecological decision-making.

iii. Discourse Analysis: Examining narratives in policy documents, sustainability frameworks, and AI ethics guidelines to identify recurring assumptions, silences, and anthropocentric biases.

iv. Case Illustrations: Engaging with select examples where AI is applied in environmental governance—such as climate modelling, biodiversity monitoring, and extractive industries—to analyze how ethical responsibility is conceptualized or neglected.

v. Interdisciplinary Synthesis: Bridging literature from philosophy of technology, environmental studies, and indigenous epistemologies to articulate alternative models of AI that extend beyond techno-solutionism toward more-than-human perspectives.

This methodology allows for a layered engagement with AI as both a technological system and a cultural artefact of the Anthropocene. By situating AI within broader ethical, ecological, and legal debates, the research seeks to reveal not only how algorithms shape human–nature interactions, but also how they might be recalibrated to foster coexistence rather than domination.

THEMATIC ANALYSIS

1. Reframing Nature in the Age of AI

The emergence of artificial intelligence as a defining technological force in the Anthropocene compels a fundamental reframing of how nature is perceived, represented, and engaged. Traditionally, nature has often been understood through an anthropocentric lens, where it is positioned as an object for human use, control, or aesthetic appreciation. However, AI systems—through their data-driven modeling, algorithmic interpretations, and decision-making—have the power both to reinforce these dominant perspectives and to subvert them by expanding new epistemologies of human-nature relations.

At the core of this reframing is the recognition that AI's "view" of nature is historically and culturally mediated by the data it is trained on, predominantly generated by human activities and biases. This embedded anthropocentrism can lead to AI systems reproducing reductive or utilitarian attitudes toward nature, privileging human interests and marginalizing more holistic, eco-centric, or relational worldviews. For example, AI image captioning or language generation often highlights human presence or agency in natural environments, subtly rendering non-human elements as secondary or passive.

Yet, the Anthropocene also opens a critical window to challenge and transcend these limits. By critically interrogating how AI algorithms process and communicate about nature, it becomes possible to surface and disrupt these biases. Experiments in co-creative human-AI interactions grounded in direct experiences of natural places have shown potential in de-anthropocentring perceptions, promoting narratives that decenter human dominance and cultivate empathy, respect, and reciprocity with more-than-human beings.

Moreover, the integration of indigenous knowledge systems and ecologically-grounded epistemologies into AI design and data curation offers pathways to reimagine AI not as a top-down controller of nature but as a participant in entangled ecosystems. This reframing urges a shift from viewing AI as a detached, instrumental tool toward recognizing it as entwined within social-ecological networks that include humans, non-humans, and environments.

Finally, this shift also invites ethical reflection on AI's role in shaping collective imaginaries about nature's value and agency in an era of environmental crisis. Can AI foster awareness of interdependence and planetary stewardship, or will it merely reproduce the status quo of exploitation and estrangement? Answering this calls for an expanded ethical framework that situates AI within the lived realities of ecological precarity and justice, making visible the stakes of representing and acting upon nature in the Digital Age.

2. Key Ethical Dilemmas

The key ethical dilemma revolves around managing the tension between AI-driven technological innovation and the imperative to preserve ecological integrity within the Anthropocene epoch. This era marks unprecedented human impact on the planet, creating complex environmental crises where AI systems—shaped primarily by human data and biases—risk reinforcing anthropocentric perspectives that prioritize human benefits at nature's expense.

A primary challenge is that while AI offers powerful tools for environmental monitoring, resource management, and climate mitigation, its underlying biases can obscure or undervalue ecological concerns, leading to decisions that endanger natural systems. The dilemma is to evolve AI beyond anthropocentric frameworks toward an eco-centric stance that balances human needs with the health of ecosystems. This involves several intertwined ethical issues:

a. Bias and Representation: AI models often reflect anthropocentric and utilitarian views embedded in their training data, limiting their ability to equitably consider non-human species and ecological processes, which challenges genuinely balanced human-nature co-existence.

b. Transparency and Accountability: The complexity and opacity of AI decision-making complicate oversight, especially when AI impacts environmental governance. Ensuring responsible deployment requires accountability mechanisms that address unintended ecological harms.

c. Technological Risks vs. Opportunities: Emerging high-stakes technologies (e.g., geo-engineering, AI-driven environmental interventions) present opportunities for climate and biodiversity management but carry unknown long-term risks affecting planetary health, making precautionary ethical governance crucial.

d. Equity and Justice: There are disparities in who benefits from and who bears environmental risks related to AI and technological advancements. Vulnerable populations and ecosystems may disproportionately suffer, raising concerns over environmental justice and fair access to technology.

e. Governance Gaps: Rapid technological progress in AI outpaces international legal and regulatory frameworks, highlighting the need for adaptive, enforceable policies that integrate ethical principles like the precautionary principle and sustainable development.

To address these dilemmas, scholars advocate for de-anthropocentring AI, i.e., designing AI systems and narratives that adopt eco-centric perspectives, enabling more ethical engagement with nature. This includes fostering multi-stakeholder cooperation, embedding environmental ethics into AI development, and ensuring that technological innovation does not undermine long-term planetary sustainability or global justice. Balancing innovation with ecological preservation and equity remains the core ethical responsibility in leveraging AI within the Anthropocene.

3. Current Governance Models

The current governance models revolve around evolving frameworks that integrate ecological complexity and ethical AI use in the Anthropocene era. The key approaches include:

a. Earth System Governance Paradigm

This model arises from the recognition that humanity's impact has altered earth systems beyond natural variability, ushering in the Anthropocene epoch—an era demanding radical shifts in global environmental politics. Frank Biermann, a leading scholar in global sustainability governance, advocates for an "earth system governance" approach that transcends traditional state-centric models. This entails five core dimensions:

i. Agency Beyond States: Inclusion of diverse actors such as civil society, scientific communities, indigenous peoples, and private entities, not merely nation-states.

ii. Architecture of Multi-Level Governance: A governance structure that operates from local to global levels flexibly and integratively.

iii. Accountability and Legitimacy: Embedding transparent decision-making, ensuring all stakeholders have representation and voice.

iv. Equitable Resource Allocation: Fair distribution of environmental costs and benefits across populations and generations.

v. Adaptiveness: Governance frameworks resilient and responsive to dynamic planetary transformations and scientific knowledge updates.

Biermann further proposes institutional reforms like establishing a World Environment Organization, a UN Sustainable Development Council, introducing qualified majority voting in environmental negotiations, and creating spaces for stakeholder representation to protect vulnerable communities impacted by environmental shifts. This model champions a normative shift toward global political collaboration on ecological stewardship amplified by inclusive, democratic governance processes.

b. Eco-Centric AI Governance with Rights of Nature

A groundbreaking recent framework integrates AI governance ethics with the philosophy and legal doctrine of the Rights of Nature. Unlike traditional AI ethics grounded in human rights, this eco-centric model posits ecosystems themselves as legal and ethical subjects—co-constitutive stakeholders in AI governance.

i. Principle of Environmental Reciprocity: AI systems must operate within ecological thresholds, respecting nature's rights and contributing to planetary health.

ii. Nature as Rights-Bearing Subject: Nature acquires legal-ethical status, granting it protections that AI governance must uphold.

iii. Embedding Ecological Complexity in AI Ethics: AI governance frameworks must intertwine with ecological realities rather than remain human-centered abstractions.

iv. Planetary Alignment in AI Design: AI development and deployment should align with sustaining earth system integrity and ecological balance.

This paradigm introduces practical guidelines emphasizing AI's responsibility for environmental impacts and proposes regulatory strategies where AI supports ecological protection, monitors biodiversity, and enforces sustainability goals while honoring natural entities' rights. This shifts governance away from anthropocentrism toward a more holistic and inclusive stance recognizing humans as part of larger ecological systems.

c. Environmental data and knowledge commons governance: Governance models recognizing the importance of datafication and AI's role in handling global environmental data as a common good. There is advocacy for safeguarding environmental knowledge as a global commons against private capture by data capitalists, ensuring democratic governance of ecological data and AI-driven environmental management.

d. New institutional and policy proposals: Suggestions include revitalizing international organizations (e.g., UN Sustainable Development Council, World Environment Organization), introducing qualified majority voting in environmental negotiations, and creating mechanisms that integrate civil society and scientific representation to govern AI and environmental interactions effectively in the Anthropocene.

e. Combined Implications

Together, these governance models envision a future where AI is developed and governed with a dual lens: as a technological force embedded in, and accountable to, earth system processes and ecological entities with rights. Governance thus requires multi-actor collaboration, global institutional innovation, and ethical expansion from human rights to ecological rights, forming a cohesive approach to navigating the ethical responsibilities of AI in human-nature coexistence within the Anthropocene epoch.

These insights provide foundational frameworks currently being debated and developed in academia and policy arenas, laying the groundwork for operationalizing ethical AI governance aligned with planetary sustainability.

4. The Challenge of Assigning Responsibility

The challenge of assigning responsibility centers on several key ethical and practical issues. These include the difficulty of clearly attributing responsibility among varied actors such as AI developers, users, corporate entities, and governments; addressing the collective and global impact of AI on ecological systems; managing anthropocentric biases embedded in AI systems; and dealing with the complex trade-offs between technological innovation and sustainability. The governance of AI in the Anthropocene context also struggles with reconciling legal, ethical, and social responsibilities while ensuring transparency, fairness, and environmental justice in human-nature-AI interactions. Further complexity arises from the need to guard against corporate domination, ensure human autonomy, and mitigate AI's environmental footprint, all within a framework that respects both individual and collective rights in the face of planetary-scale challenges. The key points in addressing this challenge include:

a. Ethical Frameworks and Responsibility Diffusion

AI development and deployment in the Anthropocene confront diffuse responsibility. Ethical frameworks emphasize principles such as beneficence (promoting well-being), non-maleficence (avoiding harm), autonomy (respecting human decision-making), justice (fairness and equity), and explicability (transparency and accountability). However, responsibilities are distributed among multiple stakeholders, including developers, corporations, users, regulators, and civil society, complicating clear assignment and enforcement of accountability. This diffusion can lead to gaps where no single actor is fully responsible for environmental harms or ethical breaches.

b. Environmental Impact and Measurement Challenges

AI’s environmental footprint, especially in data-heavy applications like large language models, is significant but hard to quantify precisely. The complex, multi-stakeholder AI ecosystem creates difficulties in measuring resource use and carbon emissions, raising the question of who should bear responsibility for mitigation. Regulatory frameworks such as the EU AI Act are emerging but still face gaps in clarity and enforcement relating to sustainability. Assigning responsibility involves not just operational energy consumption but also upstream emissions tied to hardware manufacturing and data center operations.

c. Anthropocentrism and Ecological Ethics

AI systems often embed human-centered biases and configurations, making ecological considerations secondary to human priorities. This anthropocentric framing complicates ethical AI that is meant to support human-nature coexistence. The challenge is to de-anthropocentralize AI ethics to include the intrinsic value of non-human nature and ecosystems, thus expanding responsibility beyond human benefits to include ecological wellbeing. This shift involves reconsidering AI's role in environmental monitoring, conservation, and decision-making to avoid instrumentalizing nature solely as a resource.

d. Governance and Transparency

Strong governance mechanisms are essential but underdeveloped. Effective governance requires multi-stakeholder participation, transparency of AI systems (data, algorithms, decision-making processes), oversight, impact assessments, and audit mechanisms. Yet governance is often uneven across countries and sectors, with weak international coordination for global environmental oversight. There is also a need for adaptive governance that can evolve with AI technology and its emerging ethical and ecological complexities.

e. Power Dynamics and Corporate Control

Corporate entities dominate AI development, raising concerns about concentration of power over ecological data, technology, and planetary management practices. This concentration can conflict with democratic accountability and environmental justice, as profit incentives may overshadow sustainability goals. Ethical responsibility requires addressing these power imbalances to ensure that AI supports equitable and inclusive environmental outcomes.

f. Human Autonomy and Societal Impact

AI's influence on human decision-making poses risks to autonomy, especially when algorithms subtly shape perceptions and choices related to environmental issues. Ethical AI must preserve and promote human agency in socio-environmental contexts, ensuring that AI acts as a tool for empowerment rather than control or manipulation.

g. A Call for Interdisciplinary and Global Approaches

Because the Anthropocene challenges are systemic and global, ethical responsibility for AI must incorporate interdisciplinary perspectives—from environmental science and philosophy to law and technology governance—and embrace global cooperation on shared ecological futures. This includes recognizing environmental justice, safeguarding common goods like clean air and biodiversity, and urgently mitigating AI's own carbon footprint.

In essence, the challenge is that responsibility for the Anthropocene Algorithm is collective and multi-dimensional, needing coherent systems of rights, duties, transparency, and accountability that integrate human and ecological values within the rapidly evolving AI landscape. Achieving this will require innovation not only in technology but in ethical governance and societal norms.

5. International Law Adapting to AI in the Anthropocene Era

International law is adapting to the challenges and opportunities posed by artificial intelligence (AI) in the Anthropocene era—characterized by significant human impact on Earth's ecosystems—by evolving frameworks that integrate ethical responsibilities related to AI's role in human-nature coexistence.

a. Context of AI and the Anthropocene

The Anthropocene highlights human activity as a dominant geological force impacting planetary boundaries such as climate, biodiversity, and nutrient cycles. Technology, including AI, is both a tool for addressing environmental crises and a source of new risks and ethical dilemmas. International law must mediate this balance by incorporating AI governance in the environmental context to safeguard ecological integrity while promoting sustainable development.

b. Ethical Responsibilities of AI

AI introduces complex considerations around consciousness, agency, and decision-making. While

AI lacks consciousness and agency akin to humans, it affects human rights, privacy, ecological systems, and social equity. Ethical frameworks emphasize responsible AI development to avoid harms such as bias and environmental degradation. International cooperation to enforce such frameworks is essential, alongside human rights-based approaches that foreground the dignity of human communities disproportionately impacted by AI-driven environmental applications.

c. Evolution of International Legal Frameworks

Existing international environmental treaties like the Paris Agreement and Kyoto Protocol address some technological developments but are insufficient for emerging AI challenges. There is a growing need to strengthen international environmental law with:

i. Normative principles such as the precautionary principle guiding technology regulation under uncertainty

ii. Enhanced ethical oversight and accountability mechanisms for AI technologies affecting ecosystems

iii. Recognition of technological disparities between nations to ensure equitable access and sustainability

iv. Engagement of human rights law to protect fundamental freedoms against AI-related risks

This evolving legal landscape focuses on harmonizing technological innovation and ecological stewardship while promoting ethical AI deployments that respect human-nature interdependence.

d. Summary for "The Anthropocene Algorithm"

The theme of "The Anthropocene Algorithm: Navigating the Ethical Responsibilities of AI in Human-Nature Co-existence" can be framed around international law's ongoing adaptation to legally and ethically integrate AI within environmental governance. It highlights the responsibility to develop and enforce global AI frameworks that are precautionary, equitable, and human rights-centered, ensuring AI supports sustainable human-nature coexistence in the Anthropocene epoch.

6. International Treaties Adapting to Emerging AI Environmental Risks in the Anthropocene

International environmental law and treaties have begun to grapple with the dual-edged role of emerging technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) in the Anthropocene epoch—the geological age defined by significant human impact on the Earth's ecosystems. While AI offers transformative potential for environmental monitoring, climate modeling, and sustainable resource management, it also presents novel environmental risks such as intensive energy consumption, transparency deficits in algorithms, and electronic waste. Existing global treaties including the Paris Agreement and the Kyoto Protocol have laid foundational normative principles such as the precautionary principle and sustainable development. However, these frameworks often lack the specificity and agility demanded by AI's rapid evolution and complex ecological footprint.

Recent advancements in international governance show efforts by entities like the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to integrate AI-specific environmental considerations into global policy. UNEP recommends standardized metrics to assess AI's lifecycle environmental impacts, mandatory reporting of digital technologies' footprints, and promotion of green data centers and renewable energy use in AI operations. Furthermore, international treaties increasingly emphasize ethico-legal principles such as accountability, transparency, and equity to ensure that technological interventions do not exacerbate global inequalities or ecological harm.

The adaptation of international treaties in the Anthropocene entails stronger binding frameworks for high-risk technologies, enhanced mechanisms to balance innovation with precaution, and inclusive governance that addresses disparities between developed and developing nations in AI capacities. Ethical oversight becomes crucial, ensuring AI contributes positively to human-nature coexistence without compromising planetary boundaries. This evolving treaty landscape signals a shift towards dynamic, ethically informed regulation fostering sustainable AI deployment aligned with ecological integrity and justice.

7. Recommendations

To navigate the ethical responsibilities of AI in human-nature coexistence, consider the following recommendations:

a. Understanding Anthropocentrism in AI

- Recognize that AI systems can perpetuate anthropocentric biases, prioritizing human interests over environmental wellbeing. Research suggests that AI ethics standards often reflect strong anthropocentrism, where nonhumans have at most extrinsic value to humans.
- Conduct thorough environmental impact assessments for AI systems, considering factors such as energy consumption, e-waste generation, and potential ecological disruptions.
- Develop frameworks for evaluating the environmental sustainability of AI systems, including metrics for measuring ecological footprint and impact.
- Explore alternative approaches to anthropocentric AI ethics, such as sentiocentrism, biocentrism, and eco-centrism, which extend moral concern to the wider nonhuman world.

b. Designing AI Systems for Sustainability

- Develop AI systems that support and enhance ecological balance, rather than disrupting it. This can be achieved by:

  - ❖ Optimizing Resource Management: Use AI to reduce waste and promote sustainable resource use.
  - ❖ Conservation Efforts: Leverage AI-powered tools for monitoring ecosystems, predicting illegal activities, and protecting natural habitats.
  - ❖ Minimizing Ecological Footprint: Design AI systems with lifecycle sustainability in mind, using energy-efficient algorithms and hardware that can be upgraded, reused, or recycled.

c. Addressing Ethical Challenges

- Ensure transparency and accountability in AI decision-making processes, particularly when they impact the environment and human communities.
- Foster collaboration between humans and AI systems, prioritizing human agency and moral responsibility.
- Develop frameworks and methods for balancing competing ethical values and principles, such as

  - ❖ Human Wellbeing vs. Environmental Sustainability: Balance human needs and interests with environmental concerns.
  - ❖ Short-term Gains vs. Long-term Sustainability: Prioritize long-term sustainability over short-term benefits.

d. Implementing Ecosystem-Centric AI Ethics

- Adopt an ecosystem-centric approach to AI ethics, prioritizing the wellbeing of both humans and the environment.
- Implement principles and guidelines for responsible AI development and deployment, such as

  - ❖ Respect for Nature: Prioritize environmental sustainability and respect for natural systems.
  - ❖ Precautionary Principle: Exercise caution when deploying AI systems that may have unknown or unintended environmental consequences.

  - ❖ Transparency and Accountability: Ensure transparency and accountability in AI decision-making processes.

- Encourage ongoing research and dialogue on the ethics of AI in human-nature coexistence, incorporating diverse perspectives and stakeholders.

e. Future Directions for AI and Environmental Sustainability

Explore emerging trends and technologies in AI, such as:

- AI for Climate Change: Leverage AI to support climate change research, prediction, and mitigation.

  - AI for Conservation: Use AI-powered tools for monitoring ecosystems, predicting species extinction, and protecting natural habitats.
  - Sustainable AI Development: Develop AI systems that prioritize environmental sustainability and minimize ecological footprint.

These recommendations provide a comprehensive framework for navigating the ethical responsibilities of AI in human-nature coexistence, prioritizing environmental sustainability and responsible AI development.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion for "The Anthropocene Algorithm: Navigating the Ethical Responsibilities of AI in Human-Nature Co-existence" can emphasize the pressing need for implementing robust ethical frameworks in AI as it increasingly influences human-nature relationships within the Anthropocene era. As AI systems grow more autonomous and pervasive, their design and deployment must reflect moral standards that prioritize ecological stewardship, fairness, and respect for the intrinsic value of nature alongside human interests. Ethical AI in this context is not only about mitigating biases or preventing harm but also aligning AI's objectives with sustainable, just, and inclusive ways of coexisting with the natural world. The Anthropocene presents a critical backdrop where AI's role must move beyond anthropocentrism, embracing multi-species considerations and shifting toward an ethical responsibility that includes ongoing human-nature dialogue and accountability.

Such ethical navigation is urgent because AI systems carry the potential to either exacerbate environmental degradation and social inequalities or become powerful tools for regenerative practices and equitable futures. Therefore, interdisciplinary efforts combining environmental ethics, AI governance, and ecological sciences must guide the evolution of AI technologies. Ultimately, "The Anthropocene Algorithm" calls for a reevaluation of human and machine roles, emphasizing that navigating this new epoch ethically demands cooperation, humility, and a shared commitment to sustaining life on Earth.

REFERENCE

[1] Nynke Van Uffelen, Delft University of Technology, "Towards an Environmental Ethics of Artificial Intelligence"
[2] A. Zhuk (2023) "Artificial Intelligence Impact on the Environment: Hidden Ecological Costs and Ethical –Legal Issues). https://doi.org/10.21202/jdtl.2023.40
[3] European Parliamentary Research Service (EPRS) (2020) "The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Issues and Initiatives"
[4] Isabelle Hupont, Marina Wainer (2024) P. 1-9, "Synocene, Beyond the Anthropocene: De-Anthropocentralising Human-Nature-AI Interaction". https://doi.org/10.1145/3613905.36371
[5] Adam Wickberg & Johan Gardebo (2023) p. 328-346, "Computation, Data and AI in Anthropocene History". https://doi.org/10.1080/07341512.2024.2330724
[6] Sarah DeWeerdt (2025) "How AI Narrows Our Vision of Climate Solutions and Reinforces the Status Quo"
[7] Jinyoung Hwang (2025) "Technology, Law and Ethics: Regulating the Risks of the Anthropocene". DOI: https://doi.org/10.53022/oarjms.2025.9.1.0014
[8] Frank Biermann (2014) "Earth System Governance: World Politics in the Anthropocene".
[9] DOI: https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262028226.001.0001
[10] Andre Uhl (2025) "Earthbound: AI Governance and the Rights of Nature"

[11] Lu Cheng, Kush R. Varshney, Huan Liu (2021) "Socially Responsible AI Algorithms: Issues, Purposes and Challenges"

[12] emre bayamlioglu (2021) "Date Anthropocene: A Common Perspective for Data, AI and ecological Crisis". https://doi.org/10.20935/AL3843

[13] Jessica McLean (2024) "Responsibiity, Care and Repair in/of AI: Extinction Threats and More-than-Real Worlds". https://doi.org/10.1177/26349825241228586

[14] Sadi Evren SEKER, Fatih Huseyin BOREKCI, "RESPONSIBLE AI: TRANSFORMINING CLIMATE ACTION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS"

[15] Dr. Volha Litvinets (2024) "AI and Sustainability: Opportunities, Challenges and Impact"

[16] Gabriela Ramos UNESCO "Ethics of Artificial Intlligence"

[17] Sharon Gal-Or (2024) "Ethical AI Through The Lens of Ecology"

[18] Hao Wang and Vincent Blok (2025) "Why putting artificial intelligence ethics into practice is not enough: Towards a multi-level framework". https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517251340620