T.C.
ERCİYES ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI

İNSAN VE DOĞA ARASINDAKİ DÜŞMANLIK: *SİNEKLERİN TANRISI*'NIN EKOELEŞTİREL BİR ANALİZİ

(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)

Hazırlayan
Baturay ERDAL

Danışman
Yrd. Doç. Dr. A. Arzu KORUCU

Temmuz 2016
KAYSERİ

T.C.
ERCİYES UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

THE ENMITY BETWEEN HUMAN AND NATURE: AN ECOCRITICAL ANALYSIS OF *LORD OF THE FLIES*

(Master's Thesis)

by
Baturay ERDAL

Supervisor
Assist. Prof. Dr. A. Arzu KORUCU

July 2016
Kayseri

BİLİMSEL ETİĞE UYGUNLUK

Bu çalışmadaki tüm bilgilerin, akademik ve etik kurallara uygun bir şekilde elde edildiğini beyan ederim. Aynı zamanda bu kural ve davranışların gerektirdiği gibi, bu çalışmanın özünde olmayan tüm materyal ve sonuçları tam olarak aktardığımı ve referans gösterdiğimi belirtirim.

Baturay ERDAL

"İnsan ve Doğa Arasindaki Düşmanlik: *Sineklerin Tanrisi*'nin Ekoeleştirel Bir Analizi" adlı Yükek Lisans tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Tez Önerisi ve Tez Yazma Yönergesi'ne uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır.

Tezi Hazırlayan	Danışman
Baturay ERDAL	Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayşe Arzu KORUCU

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı ABD Başkanı
Doç. Dr. Melih KARAKUZU

iii

Yrd. Doç. Dr. AYŞE ARZU KORUCU danışmanlığında BATURAY ERDAL tarafından hazırlanan "İnsan Ve Doğa Arasindaki Düşmanlik: *Sineklerin Tanrisi*'nin Ekoeleştirel Bir Analizi" adlı bu çalışma, jürimiz tarafından Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalında Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

30/07/2016

JÜRİ:

Danışman : Yrd. Doç. A. Arzu KORUCU

Üye : Doç. Dr. Melih KARAKUZU

Üye : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yavuz ÇELİK

ONAY:

Bu tezin kabulü Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunun 08/08/2016 tarih ve 17 sayılı kararı ile onaylanmıştır.

08/08/2016

Prof. Dr. Celaleddin ÇELİK
Enstitü Müdürü

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Ecological crisis today has nearly reached an irreparable extent and many experts have already begun to foretell the approaching environmental scenario inviting people to face the fact that the earth is getting worse day by day. Being at the centre of the universe and all kinds of conversations and discussions, man has dominated the earth leaving nature silenced and defenceless. Fascinated by those who do their best for the environment, I must admit that the purpose of speaking for nature and taking her to the very centre as a subject instead of an object in a well-known work play an essential role in beginning this thesis.

First, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Arzu KORUCU not only for her encouragement and guidance throughout the completion of this study but also for her moral and intellectual support throughout my undergraduate education. This study would have been impossible without her stimulating counselling and guidance.

I would also like to thank for the lecturers of English Language and Literature Department at Erciyes University and for my former lecturers of English Language and Literature Department at Atatürk University, from whom I received education throughout my undergraduate years.

Finally, I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to my beloved wife and soul mate, Betül USLU ERDAL who has been there for me all the way with patience and devotion.

Baturay ERDAL

Kayseri 2016

İNSAN VE DOĞA ARASINDAKİ DÜŞMANLIK: *SİNEKLERİN TANRISI*'NIN EKOELEŞTİREL BİR ANALİZİ

Baturay ERDAL

Erciyes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Temmuz 2016

Danışman: Yrd.Doç.Dr. Ayşe Arzu KORUCU

ÖZET

Yapılan birçok araştırma, insan ve doğa arasındaki ilişkinin köklerinin ve insanın doğa üzerindeki etkisinin bilinen tarihten çok daha ötelere dayandığını işaret etmektedir. Dolayısıyla modern çağın bir problemi olarak algılanan ve içinden çıkılamayacak bir hal alan insan kaynaklı çevre sorunlarının nedenlerini de aslında bu köklerde aramak doğru olacaktır. Ne yazık ki bu tarihi artalan derinlemesine incelendiğinde, doğa ve insan arasındaki ilişkinin bir düşmanlık temelinde süregeldiğini gözlemlemek kaçınılmazdır.

Edebiyat ise sosyal, kültürel, politik, ekonomik bütün konularda olduğu gibi çoğunlukla doğa yazınları aracılığıyla çevre sorunlarına da kayıtsız kalmamış ve bu sorunlar için bir farkındalık yaratmayı amaç edinmiştir. Son yıllarda yeni bir edebi eleştiri türü olarak ortaya çıkan ekoeleştiri, insan ve doğa arasındaki bu ilişkiyi incelemeyi prensip edinmiş ve edebi eserlere ekomerkezci bir yaklaşımla yeni bir bakış açısı kazandırmıştır.

Bu tezde insan ve doğa arasındaki ilişki ve bu ilişkinin temelindeki ekolojik krize yol açan düşmanlık analiz edilecektir. Ekoeleştiri'nin edebi eserlerin insan merkezci değil çevre merkezci bir bakış açısıyla ve doğayı bir nesne olmaktan ziyade özne olarak ele alan bir yaklaşımla yeniden keşfedilmesi gerektiği ilkesinden hareketle, bu çalışmada William Golding'in *Sineklerin Tanrısı* adlı eseri ekoeleştirel bir bakış açısıyla incelenecektir. Bu amaçla, doğaya karşı takınılan insan merkezci ve düşmanca tutumların ve yine doğanın insan tarafından sömürülmesinin eserde nasıl resmedildiği üzerinde durulacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Doğa ve insan, ekoeleştiri, düşmanlık, William Golding, *Sineklerin Tanrısı*

THE ENMITY BETWEEN HUMAN AND NATURE: AN ECOCRITICAL ANALYSIS OF *LORD OF THE FLIES*

Baturay ERDAL

Erciyes University, Institute of Social Sciences

The Department of English Language and Literature

M.A. Thesis, July 2016

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. A. Arzu KORUCU

ABSTRACT

Many researches indicate that the roots of the relationship between man and nature and human's impact on nature trace back further than the recorded history. Thus, it seems necessary to seek the reasons of human-driven environmental problems which have been perceived as a recent matter and have turned into a chaotic situation within these roots. Unfortunately, when this historical background is examined thoroughly, it is inevitable to see the fact that man maintains his engagement with the nature on the basis of enmity.

Literature raises concern about the environmental problems, as well as about the social, cultural, political and economic issues, through the nature writings and aims to raise an awareness of these problems. Emerging as a recent literary criticism, ecocriticism takes as its principle the act of examining the connection between man and nature and provides a new insight into the literary works through an ecocentric approach.

In this thesis, the relationship between man and nature and also the enmity that lies behind this relationship and causes ecological crisis are analysed. With reference to the principle of ecocriticism principle that literary works should be revisited through an ecocentric view instead of an anthropocentric view by handling nature as a subject rather than an object, this study aims to examine William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* through the lens of ecocriticism. For this purpose, the study also focuses on the author's portrayal of how human exhibits anthropocentric and hostile attitudes towards nature and exploits nature in the work.

Key Words: Man and nature, ecocriticism, enmity, William Golding, *Lord of the Flies*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE ENMITY BETWEEN HUMAN AND NATURE: AN ECOCRITICAL ANALYSIS OF *LORD OF THE FLIES*

Sayfa

CHAPTER 3

ECOCRITICAL ANALYSIS OF *LORD OF THE FLIES*

INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that it is quite late, it has been encouraging to hear progressively rising voices against the environmental problems in the last three decades and inspiring to witness green studies that take their place both in literature as a subject rather than object and in department of literature as a field. However, it seems to be quite late in that environmental degradation dates back to the beginning pages of human history and has nearly reached unpredictable levels recently. Contrary to the common perception that the human-induced corruption in nature is recent, it is much earlier than estimated. In a deeper sense, this havoc in nature bears the traces of human factor that causes pre-historic extinctions. Accusing humans of being a predatory threat, the biologist and zoologist Paulay discusses that about 2.500 years ago "the arrival of humans to Polynesia led to the extinction of generally more than half, and in some cases up to 80%, of each island's avifauna, with large, predatory and flightless birds being most vulnerable."[1] According to a recent book about early human influence on ancient ecosystems, human impact may date back to tens of thousands of years ago that seems rather earlier than previously believed: "The settlement of California's Channel Islands by maritime peoples as much as 13.000 to 12.000 years ago ... also demonstrates an earlier and more sophisticated use of maritime or aquatic technologies than previously believed and may support early coastal colonization models."[2] Incidentally, many myths of different cultures and worldwide religious sources manifest the interaction between man and nature. To whatever extent they include trivial differences and similarities due to the regional and cultural factors, each shares the common perception that the event of man's creation cannot be distinguished from the operation of nature. Ancient Greek philosophy, on the other hand, regards man as a rational animal that signifies a classical distinction between human and nonhuman. This distinction causes

[1] Gustav **Paulay**, "Biodiversity on Oceanic Islands: Its Origin and Extinction", *American Zoologist*, Vol. 34, Issue 1, February 1994, p. 141.
[2] Jon M. Erlandson and Torben C. Rick, eds., Human Impacts on Ancient Marine Ecosystems: A Global Perspective, Berkeley 2008, University of California Press, p.4.

Western civilization to claim the right to dominate as Greek philosophy forms the basis of Western thinking model. Through the emergence of Christianity, more people adopt the opinion that man's spiritual house is in the heaven, not on the earth.

Rooted in the earliest steps of Adam's sons and daughters on the earth, environmental problems increasingly continued in preindustrial period. For instance, in the thirteenth century, "two royal commissions were appointed to inquire into complaints about pollution caused by coal-fired lime kilns operating in London."[3] Moreover, Queen Elizabeth prohibited "the taste and smoke of sea-coal issuing from brewing houses sited near the Palace of Westminister"[4] in 1578. Upon the arrival of Industrial Revolution, the impacts of man-made factors on nature were so profound that it was considered as a major turning point for the ecology of the earth. With the needs brought by industrialization and mechanization, the revolution turned into a declaration indicating the exploitation of nature.

The process of colonisation, capitalist tendencies and arms race, when coupled with the increasing human needs owing to over-population, transformed the earth into a global battlefield. The world wars, within which many deadly methods from nuclear and chemical weapons to radioactive substances took place, caused devastating impacts on biodiversity. As an accumulation of this ecologically blurred past, the earth has to struggle with the global warming and climate change today. Though one hundred and ninety five countries theoretically agree on keeping global temperature rise below two degrees with Paris Agreement, which replaced Kyoto Protocol, the success of the agreement in practice will only be seen in the near future.

On the other hand, there have been important literary writings under the influence of this awareness of the ecological problems. Though Romantics emphasize heavily on the nature regarding her as a spiritual source of renewal, the efforts for creating awareness through nature writing trace back to the mid-nineteenth century. Such American nature writers as Henry David Thoreau, John Muir, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Aldo Leopold, Rachel Carson and Edward Abbey intend to evoke environmental consciousness by contributing to the wilderness protection with a

[3] Stephen Mosley, "Environmental History of Air Pollution and Protection", **The Basic Environmental History**, Eds. Mauro Agnoletti and Simone Neri Serneri, Springer, Cham 2014, p. 147.
[4] Mosley, p.147.

different kind of sensitivity. These writings can be considered as a precursor to the rising of a more organized environmental criticism; besides, they indicate how the ecological order of the earth has arrived at an alarming rate. Carson's beginning words of the final chapter in her spectacular novel called *Silent Spring* best sum up the fact that human beings have reached the end of the road on which they have walked relentlessly and carelessly throughout the human history:

> We stand now where two roads diverge. But unlike the roads in Robert Frost's familiar poem, they are not equally fair. The road we have long been traveling is deceptively easy, a smooth superhighway on which we progress with great speed, but at its end lies disaster. The other fork of the road — the one less traveled by — offers our last, our only chance to reach a destination that assures the preservation of the earth.[5]

In the mid-1980s, dispersed and wilderness-based nature writings evolve into an interdisciplinary and more organized study of literature and the environment called ecocriticism. It brings literature and ecology together, concentrating on the revelation and discussion of the environmental problems, counting on the literature's sphere of influence in creating awareness and targeting the voice of silenced nature. William Rueckert, thereby, concludes that "we need to make some connections between literature and the sun, between teaching literature and the health of the biosphere."[6] Scholars dealing with ecocriticism initially work through wilderness in American nature writing, pastoral in British Romantics, and green in nature-oriented narratives. Later on, ecocritics have a tendency to focus on urban landscapes as well as wilderness; not only the 'unconstructed' but also the 'constructed' become the subjects of ecocriticism. However, the recent years have shown that ecocriticism has widened its scope to embrace ethnic and transnational voices. There is a small but growing body of studies to demonstrate that ecocriticism is now more interdisciplinary and multinational when compared to its early period. Ecocriticism today has managed to diversify from the traditional American-based thought of nature protection into "a complex set of ideas derived from cultural and literary studies, science and animal studies, ecophilosophy, environmental ethics and history, environmental justice movement, ecofeminism,

[5] Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring*, Fortieth Anniversary Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston 2002, p.277.
[6] William Rueckert, "Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism", **The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology**, Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, The University of Georgia Press, Georgia 1996, p. 109.

animal studies, sociology and psychology, and globalism studies, among other academic domains."[7] On the other hand, there also exist some skeptical voices commenting on ecocriticism as a literary theory. In his work *Blues in the Green: Ecocriticism under Critique*, Michael P. Cohen observes that "ecocritical theory," instead of solving problems, "structures discussions of environmental literature, drawing upon science, history and philosophy, while critiquing these sources." [8] He further states that "ecocriticism must question more closely the nature of environmental narrative, not simply praise it, as it has too frequently"[9] because ecocritics are "examining textuality, not just summarizing textual context"[10] as other literary critics.

Among the writers who deal with the relationship between human and nature and with ecological problems, William Golding has an important position with his different opinions. In an age of environmental crisis which includes two world wars, Golding is one of the most significant literary figures of the period not only with his literary characteristics but also with his military past. The rapid change of human in his period into a dangerous creature deprived of self-knowledge is the common ground of his works. In her introductory notes to *William Golding: A Critical Study*, Usha George observes:

> Man has distanced himself away from nature and from his own self. He is cushioned in smugness; he has become his own God. Nothing can touch him. Golding has made it his task to break down these false illusions: his creed is that of the Delphic Oracle, "Know yourself". He believes that the only hope for humanity is self-knowledge attained and practiced by the individual.[11]

Golding's sceptical view of human indicates that he has no confidence in modern human and the relationships he has developed with both human and nonhuman. Thus, the author's most famous novel *Lord of the Flies* is his most important work warning human to 'know himself' and evoking the sense of despair against human nature. Leaving a group of children alone in an uninhabited island, this work depicts the picture of an anthropocentric mentality that destroys the idyllic island and causes an

---

[7] Serpil Oppermann, "The Future of Ecocriticism: Present Currents", **The Future of Ecocriticism: New Horizons**, Eds. Serpil Oppermann, Ufuk Özdağ, Nevin Özkan et al., Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle 2011, p. 16.
[8] Michael P. **Cohen**, "Blues in the Green: Ecocriticism under Critique", *Environmental History***,** Vol. 9, No. 1, January 2004, p. 11.
[9] Cohen, p. 23.
[10] Cohen, p. 17.
[11] Usha George, *William Golding: A Critical Study*, Atlantic Publishers & Dist., New Delhi 2008, p. 4.

environmental corruption through hostile attitudes and that is alienated from nature and from his original roots as a consequence of this enmity.

Golding's loss of confidence in human beings and his wish to reveal the instinct of enmity which already exists in human nature and turns into a tendency towards violence both for human and nonhuman has become the source of inspiration for the current study. The fact that the behaviours and views of the children characters isolated in the nature are a smaller-scaled reflection of what is happening in the real world is also encouraging in analysing *Lord of the Flies* through the lens of ecocriticism. Thus, in this thesis, it is discussed whether *Lord of the Flies* indeed includes a great deal of image diversity in terms of ecological criticism when the functionality of ecocriticism in analysing literary texts and in examining the concept of enmity between human and nature is taken into consideration.

Consisting of three main chapters, this thesis includes a historical background of the relationship between human and nature and the hostility that lies behind this relationship. The thesis also probes into the green literary theory called ecocriticism in the light of recent developments and revisits William Golding's most famous work *Lord of the Flies*, which is literarily studied in many ways due to its abundance of modern allegories, through the lens of ecocriticism. Chapter I outlines a general historical background of man's interaction with nature focusing on social, cultural and economic parameters with regard to mythological, religious and literary texts. It also analyses the violation of nature with an emphasis on the Industrial Revolution and The World Wars spanning multiple countries on multiple continents. Chapter II examines the developing process of nature writing and ecocriticism and analyses how this process has widened its scope from wilderness to global. Ecocriticism as a recent literary theory, the theory's background, its primary principles and its leading contributors with its exploration of hermeneutical stages take part in this chapter, as well. Chapter III provides discussions concerning ecological sense of William Golding and the analysis of his famous novel *Lord of the Flies* from the ecocritical perspective. Chapter III also tends to emphasize the island in the novel created as an alternative microcosm to the modern world. The chapter indicates how the corruption of the initial ecocentric order by anthropocentric intervention, when coupled with human exploitation, causes havoc of the nature of island in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. Finally, it will be debated whether behind

this destruction lies unequal social hierarchy omitting nature and the instinct of enmity triggering human violence on nature.

The concluding part of the thesis embodies the general discussions on human-nature relationship and comments on the causes of environmental problems. It also examines the outcomes of the enmity between man and nature in the light of ecocriticism and the novel studied in the thesis. In order to support the discussions mentioned above, related sources including Turkish[12] and English books and articles and journals are scanned.

[12] English translations of the Turkish texts and sources are mine. The responsibility and the right of translations from Turkish into English belong to me.

CHAPTER 1

THE BACKGROUND OF SOCIO-CULTURAL ENMITY FEEDING ECOCRITICISM

Like human beings, nature has a long history shaped by many intrinsic and extrinsic parameters. Throughout the history, mankind has been an important part of the nature, which has played a significant role in contributing to the position of human-being on the earth. Since the fall of Adam and Eve onto the world, a battle has been going on between sons and daughters of Adam and nature for dominating the centre of the planet. Giving references to some holy and mythological sources, this chapter is intended to indicate the very beginning of the connection between human-being and nature within the frame of an endless enmity between them. The chapter is also designed to analyse the eternal war not reminiscent of any struggle for political or social reasons; however, the term 'war' is identified with an everlasting fighting between man and nature, that is, a more serious danger devastating the earth. Together with the transition to modern life, human-being paves the way for technological tendencies while they are expected to gain consciousness concerning ecological destruction that prepares the end of wildlife. Though the main purpose is simplifying the life, the use of technology contributes to the conflict between man and nature. Finally, the rise of technology which triggers the enmity and causes nature's bitter response to the technological tendencies is also discussed in this chapter.

1.1 Historical Development of Mankind's Engagement with Nature

Studies on the history of nature result in not only observing its evolution but also comprehending the human behaviours. In a wider sense, it enables the researchers to conceptualize human's relationship both with himself and with the gods and the universe. The tie between man and nature can be traced back to the creation and creation myths that bear the traces of this relationship. The religious discourses in

heavenly religions claiming that man is created out of soil and clay indicate that this tight relationship goes beyond the known history of humanity. Thus, it makes human not only an indispensible part of nature but also a natural part of the nature, some of whose most important components are revived in human body. From a complementary point of view, the connection is emphasized in all parts of the holy texts that do not discriminate between the existence and subsidiary effect of nature while explaining the creation. It can be seen that some marks of the concepts of 'nature' are described when the holy books are examined:

> "O Adam! dwell thou and thy wife in the Garden, and enjoy (its good things) as ye wish: but approach not this tree, lest you become of the unjust."[13]

> And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. [14]

Although some differences concerning the theme of religion appear on the creation of human-being, similar expressions that define the nature as an inseparable part of human show up in the other holy books, as well. The inseparableness can be identified with the creation of Eve presupposed to be a partner of Adam. For holy texts, the human-being is in need of keeping his/her existence interacting with another existence called nature. However, this natural reality does not mean voicing superiority among the creatures; that is, Adam would be meaningless without Eve and both beings as the representation of man and woman would be unachieved without putting the environmental elements on the scene. Moreover, God asks human to realize himself by means of nature that is attributed to the 'knowledge of good and evil'. The fate of human-being is directly based on his relationship with nature. In other words, whether one becomes an 'unjust' human or someone who 'enjoys (its good things)' is determined through the way he approaches the nature.

Almost all of the genesis stories include the fact that human being cannot be a self-perpetuating creature on earth. Either in his forming into a shape and coming into

[13] *Quran*, The Elevated Place, 19, Web Page: http://www.theholyquran.org/?x=s_main&y=s_middle&kid=14&sid=7 (Date accessed: Monday, December 2015).
[14] *Bible*, Genesis, 2:8-2:10, Web Page: http://incil.info/kitap/gen/2 (Date accessed: Monday, December 2015).

existence or in his positioning into the planet, the narration directly or indirectly refers to the significance of man's relationship with environmental aspects. As in religious texts, mankind is not mentioned free from everything and the earth with its some elements manifests itself in the process of creation in mythological resources. Many myths prepare a suitable and secure environment before human steps on the earth. Thus, it can be easily seen that some natural and environmental elements from dust through rivers to mountains carry a prominent role in order to define its relationship with mankind. According to what Edith Hamilton tells in his famous book *Mythology*, before the appearance of mankind, the earth around which the flowers blossomed on the trees and upon the waters had been ready for serving for the benefit of human-beings who would live in comfort and security.[15] The war between the Olympians and the Titans actually symbolizes this preparation process in which almost all the grotesque figures like giants and other strange creatures are cleaned up. Hamilton observes that the well-being of the environment is the prerequisite of the existence of mankind. This prerequisite represents a mutual interdependence of all kinds, for the security and the comfort are not single-acting concepts. On the other hand, as in the holy discourses about genesis, in most of the world mythologies it is said that there is only immense and dark water at the very beginning before the creation of all the living creatures on the earth. Turkish mythological discourses can also be claimed to share the common idea that nature remains at the forefront of mankind's existence on earth. In opposition to human-centred perceptions regarding human-nature relationship, Çoruhlu emphasizes the environmental objects mentioned in the myths of creation:

> In the myth compiled by Radloff, it is suggested that everything had been composed of water before earth and sky were created… Also in this myth, God making a twigless tree into a tree having nine twigs demanded nine people to upspring from the roots of these twigs and nine nations to rise from these people…[16]

As the source based on mankind's coming into existence indicates, the essence of humanity is identified with the nature; that's why the primitive men hallow nature just like a child's commitment to his mother. In this sense, the connection between man and nature resembles the mother-child relationship. Accordingly, this may be the reason why nature is called 'Mother Nature'. The earliest people of the world encounter the

[15] Edith Hamilton, *Mythology*, Back Bay Books/Little, Brown and Company, Boston 1942, p.85.
[16] Yaşar Çoruhlu, *Türk Mitolojisinin Anahatları*, Kabalcı Yayınevi, Istanbul 2000, p. 105-106

nature when they open their eyes to the world just as a baby encounters his mother. Regarding all godly and mythological discourses, nature, therefore, seems to lie behind the question of where humanity comes from. At the very beginning of this relationship, human needs a complete dependence on the nature which has an active role in regenerating and accepting the human being. In other words, human being as a passive subject is the one who existed as an intrinsic part of nature; nature is the one who is not only employed to devote itself to the creation of mankind but also assigned to provide a space and protection for the goodness and perpetuity of mankind. However, there is another face of nature apart from its benign and compassionate side. It is also used for punishment by some deific powers both in heavenly religions and mythological discourses. In the Bible Adam is told that he will survive with the foods from earth but with a great toil. The human beings protected by Prometheus are punished and cleaned up by Deluge sent by Zeus.

Following Adam's fall from the heaven to the earth, mankind realized some environmental facts that helped man overcome his imperceptions; that is to say, the level of perception toward his environment began to widen. On account of eating the forbidden fruit that may be regarded as a symbol of nature's balancing element, he knew he had to become more reconciled with nature and more cautious of his relationship with the environment which included regenerative things as well as dangerous and deadly ones at the time. People living in pre-historical ages may be claimed to have maintained an ecocentric way of life, compared to modern people. Their fundamental goal, at first sight, was not to dominate the nature but to grasp it in details in order to establish a healthy relationship with it. Having provided him with things for his needs, nature made man a part of its huge ecological cycle. By means of his reasoning ability that makes him different from other creatures, man learned from nature and used its extensive potential to survive. Namely, they began to extend the interaction in the frame of a teacher-student relationship. He used natural objects to keep his life and learned to protect himself by curving the stone, to shelter by hiding in a cave and not to get cold by using peltries as a dress. Though it may be considered as the beginning of exploitation of the nature, the conditions of the time, regarding ecological balance, make it a vital necessity for man. Furthermore, people personified the nature and they believed that there were gods responsible for the good of nature. People would

not sail and hunt fish unless they honoured the gods of sea, would be careful of chopping down a tree to escape the wrath of gods of forests and communities engaged in farming would worship the goddess of earth to plough the field.[17] It is clear that nature, as Lynn White explains, was attributed to the existence of spirit which made the natural elements heavenly on the earth:

> In Antiquity every tree, every spring, every stream, every hill had its own *genius loci*, its guardian spirit. These spirits were accessible to men, but were very unlike men; centaurs, fauns, and mermaids show their ambivalence. Be-fore one cut a tree, mined a mountain, or dammed a brook, it was important to placate the spirit in charge of that particular situation, and to keep it placated.[18]

Therefore, the integrity between these two actors completely seemed to be ensured and people were maintaining a life in accordance with the rules of nature. Considering the fact that people respect what they fear, his instinct of behaving well to the nature may be caused by this fear or lack of knowledge. Whatever the reason might be, however, it would not be wrong to claim that the bond between human and nature was at its highest.

Transition of human cultures from hunting-gathering to agriculture is unquestionably thought of as one of the most prominent milestones in human history. This changeover occurred just after people had grasped the productive and self-replicating power of the nature. This radical step taken by human being paved a new way for his relationship with nature. The sons and daughters of Adam turned back to their parent material in origin by dealing with the soil. They realized the importance of fertile lands and of rain for growing crops and learned to live an easier life without migrating continuously. In other words, they began to perceive that everything was possible for a smooth life on the condition that they spoke the language of nature. The agricultural lands in which they had to be engaged made permanent settlement a necessity for human being; hence, they lived near the agricultural estates. Instead of hunting only, man managed to establish a close relationship with animals by feeding and raising them. This new environmental position adopted by human being enabled him to transform into someone who produced hand in hand with nature rather than

[17] Tamra Andrews, *A Dictionary of Nature Myths: Legend of the Earth, Sea and Sky*, Oxford University Press, New York 2000, p. 62

[18] Lynn **White Jr**., "Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis", *Science***,** Vol. 155, No. 3767, March 1967, p. 1205.

being a consumer who merely gets without contributing. They were aware of the fact that their survival mainly depended on this collaboration.

Meanwhile, along with the appearance of the first philosophers, mythological, religious and primitive discourses and beliefs on nature began to be replaced by the questioning of human's place in the cosmos as Edward Grant observes:

> There can be no doubt that this was a monumental change of outlook. It was a new approach that was added to the mythological explanations of the world that had characterized earlier Greek descriptions of physical phenomena by the likes of Hesiod and Homer. Pre-Socratics no longer explained natural phenomena, such as earthquakes, lightning, storms, and eclipses, as the actions of happy or angry gods, but as the actions of natural forces that regularly produced such effects (…) Rather than attribute earthquakes to Poseidon, god of the sea, as Greeks had done for centuries, Thales chose to give a natural explanation, as did all the Pre-Socratics who followed him.[19]

G.E.R. Lloyd also claims that human's search for his place in the nature at that time resulted in a kind of "discovery of nature" that stands for "the recognition that natural phenomena are not the products of random or arbitrary influences, but regular and governed by determinable sequences of cause and effect"[20]. Henceforward man realized the fact that he had to add the cause and effect law to his relationship with nature. The idea that gods of nature were responsible for any event that happened in nature came to nothing; instead, man's engagement with nature was handled as "the practice of rational criticism and debate."[21] With the contributions of philosophers who dealt with nature in order to question the existence, man's relationship with nature was taken a step further. Such discourses of Aristotle as that "man is by nature a political animal endowed with a gift of speech" attracted the nature thinkers together with other scientists and philosophers in the upcoming centuries. This represents the significance of nature for human beings who tried to seek for the truth by the way of understanding the nature. Probing into the natural philosophy of that period, Falcon suggests that:

---

[19] Edward Grant, *A History of Natural Philosophy: From the Ancient World to the Nineteenth Century*, Cambridge University Press, New York 2007, p.8.
[20] G.E.R Lloyd, *Early Greek Science: Thales to Aristotle*, W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York 1970, p.9.
[21] Lloyd, p.8.

> At the time there was an already established tradition of inquiry into nature, which is registered and transmitted by Plato in the *Timaeus*. According to this tradition, the student of nature was expected to put all natural explanations into the context of an overall narration whose order of topics is first the heavens, then the elements, and finally the living beings[22].

In this sense, it can be claimed that any change in human being's way of life has an influence on nonhuman nature as well. Following the victory of Christianity over primitive faiths and religions, this new belief made radical changes in the life style of people as well as in their perspectives on the nature. Christian explanation of the universe led human to re-imagine his environment and his world. Asking "What did Christianity tell people about their relations with the environment?" Lynn White claims that Christianity deriving from Judaism adopts a "linear and non-repetitive" time concept in contrast to the old beliefs. A merciful God eventually created Adam and Eve after he had put all elements on the stage of the world. Then the thoughts began to change into a notion that man was created in God's image ignoring the clay in the story of creation.[23] Whether the course of events moved man's engagement with nature to better conditions or gave harm to this relationship, mankind kept seeking for his place and existence in nature. In spite of the church's misteachings, man did not give up his searching about his environment and succeeded in proving the roundness of the world. Having a profound effect on human history, the rise of Islam also brought a new perspective, different from other divine religions, on nature through its teachings. According to Turan Güngör:

> Islam, like other divine religions, admits the superiority of human over other living things in the great chain of being; yet, unlike those religions, Islam emphasizes that superiority of human does not allow him to dominate the nature. Man is responsible for all kinds of positive or negative actions; he is in charge of the nature and the other beings and he cannot be discharged from this obligation. His foremost responsibility is to treat the nature as a protector, not as a master of it[24].

---

[22] Andrea Falcon, *Aristotle & the Science of Nature: Unity Without Uniformity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005, p.8.
[23] **White Jr**., p.1205.
[24] Turan Özgür Güngör, "Daniel Defoe'nun *Robinson Crusoe*, Charles Dickens'ın *Hard Times* (Zor Zamanlar), Graham Swift' in *Waterland* (Su Diyarı) Adlı Eserlerinin Ekoeleştirel Açıdan İncelenmesi", Atatürk Üniversitesi SBE, Erzurum 2013 (Published Ph.D. Thesis), p. 21-22

Owing to the fact that most people organize their lives in parallel with the religion to which they are faithful, the religions become prominent in determining the role of human-beings in the nature. It also appears that Islam arranges his followers' relationship with the nature and environment both with its commandments and the teachings of its prophet. This evokes the thought that protecting the nature is a divine obligatory while doing harm to nature is one of the actions considered as a sin. In this sense, "in Islam, the relationship between humans and nature is one of use as well as contemplation, worship, appreciation of beauty, moral responsibility toward protection, prohibition of destruction and revival. This relationship is a moral destiny; if fulfilled it will lead humans to their desired Gardens of Heaven"[25].

Apart from the regulations of celestial religions, medieval man's tight relationship with nature caused the observation of nature which triggered many inventions of human beings in grasping the cosmos. For example, an apple falling from the tree could be regarded as a stimulating effect of nature and it encouraged man to discover the gravity. When the calendars of the time are browsed as an indicator of this tight relationship, even the pictures on the calendars can be said to have depicted some natural objects and men working in the nature. Here the tight relationship means that man had only nature to go to spend time and stay alone in contrast to modern man who has no chance to escape from crowded shopping centres built in the place of natural living environment for capitalist needs. On the other hand, the economy at the time was not based on the consumption exceeding the production. Namely, it was not dominated by capitalist needs as understood today. This advantage enabled man to attach more importance to nature whose fertile lands provided him with not only a working space but also food. Namely, dealing with the environment in a friendly manner was seen as a means of supporting and ensuring man's maintenance of the life. The tension between economy, theology and cause-effect relationship contributed much to the place of nature in mankind's life. Medieval men were much closer to defining the operation of the macrocosm than ever before and assumed that the nature could be perceived and analysed by his mind. Thus, this can be claimed to have paved a way to rising scientific developments.

[25] Nawal Ammar, "Islam and Deep Ecology", **Deep Ecology and World Religions: New Essays on Sacred Ground**, Eds. David Landis Barnhill and Roger S. Gottlieb, State University of New York Press, Albania 2001, p. 194.

On the other hand, it would be inevitable to give a reference to literature while defining the relationship between man and nature at the time. Later on, before the domination of technology on nature, Sir Philip Sidney demonstrates the power of literary men who are able to give voice to the nature: "Nature never set forth the earth in so rich tapestry as divers poets have done- neither with pleasant rivers, fruitful trees, sweet-smelling flowers, not whatsoever else may make the too much loved earth more lovely."[26] Francis Bacon also claims that "man is the helper and interpreter of Nature. He can only act and understand in so far as by working upon her he has come to perceive her order." [27] To make an inspired guess, this symbolizes a compelling evidence of the period in which literature and literary men have a word for the situation of man and nature.

1.2. The Influence of Industrial Revolution and the Rise of Technology

Following the end of socio-cultural and natural system of medieval past, human's engagement with nature underwent a change. In order to mark the human-nature relationship, it must be considered that the revolution had a tremendous influence on every facet of life including nature and ecosphere. The reflection of the impact varied from the cultural and social improvements to the energy options. Scientific and technological developments were applied to the production and the power of nature was replaced by that of machines. This radical change that happened in the system concerning the human life had possible alterations in man's attitude and perception toward nature.

Industrial Revolution first sprang in Britain and it went beyond the boundaries outstretching to the rest of the world. What were, then, the commonly cited reasons paving the way for the coming of this Industrial Revolution which was regarded as the main cause of the beginning of the ecological destruction? Figuring out the operation of the nature directly associated with the life-standards of people, man managed to live longer. Natural solutions for the deadly diseases together with the developments in health industry and the ability of surviving the unexpected events made human beings more durable in nature. It caused a rapid population growth in Europe. Thus, faster machines and factories for producing more goods were needed to meet the higher

[26] Sir Philip Sidney, "An Apology for Poetry", **Critical Theory Since Plato,** Eds. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle, Thomson/Wadsworth, Boston 2005, p. 188.
[27] Francis Bacon, qtd. in Michael W. Fox, *Bringing Life to Ethics: Global Bioethics for a Humane Society*, State University of New York Press, Albany 2001, p.120.

demands of the increased population. People who had been embedded in farm lands were driven to the cities on account of Enclosure Movement. Arable common lands were captured and enclosed by rich landowners and people were obliged to find new jobs and shelters far from natural rural areas. Contributing to the human growth in the cities, this immigration also served the source of human labour to the industrializing sectors. On the other side, self-supporting communities who had had an organic relationship with nature began to disappear; instead, the operations of exploitive and colonial societies that did not pay attention to their bonds with nature and environment began to rise. The fundamental areas of the production which had been mainly based on farming, livestock and craftsmanship before the Industrial Revolution were replaced by the requirements of the capitalist economy. This seems to imply that once tightly dependant on nature, man kept his one hand off the nature.

All these preconditions served for the acceleration of the impacts of the Industrial Revolution. Depending upon the development of industrial life, it was possible to mention about the existence of technology now. James Watt invented an engine working by steam. This invention marked the era of new machines that was regarded as a turning point both for humans and ecosystem. The use of telegraph machine began to become widespread and consequently natural communication techniques such as using birds remained nostalgia for the past. Graham Bell, who probably would not predict the threats of base stations causing biological incompatibility in the environment, invited human beings to meet the telephone instead of touching pen and paper. Moreover, the use of artificial fertilizers was initiated to make more profit, ignoring its impoverishing impact on the lands. The discovery of combined harvesters provided people with the opportunity to coerce the land intensely. Technological developments whose influences were mainly felt in agriculture allowed man to consume the unnatural canned foods. The rising need of iron and steel stimulated mine coals to work and produce more and more; therefore, men producing iron and using coal polluted the environment in order to meet the excessive demands. Paying no attention to the requirements of the earth, human took these developments to a step further with the aim of constructing huge buildings, bridges and channels at the expense of destroying natural areas. The population was also growing day by day because of technological facilities, enabling more people to maintain their lives. The

condition of human-nature relationship at that age can be identified with a story of the chicken-egg relationship; that is, the more mushrooming population the planet has, the more energy demand increases.

As industrial and technological improvements dominate the period, the critics agree that this era was the golden age of the English novel. It was mainly due to the fact that the novel told the stories of ordinary people and social life of humans on the earth. The radical alteration concerning both humans and nature made Industrial Revolution a crucial issue for the literature of that period. As well as the authors of the period, Charles Dickens, who is regarded as the greatest author of the Victorian age, questions the 'condition of England' in his works that give evidence about the relationship of human and nature in terms of industrial and technological developments. Born into an industrial age, Dickens depicts an unhappy and colourless life in his works whose settings indicate that both environment and human beings were deeply influenced by the devastating results of the revolution.

In *Bleak House*, for example, Dickens depicts the industrial atmosphere of London, in which most of the story takes place. The environmental description of London affected profoundly by the industrial catastrophe reveals the condition of nature for an eco-critic to take a deeper look:

> London. Michaelmas term lately over, and the Lord Chancellor sitting in Lincoln's Inn Hall. Implacable November weather. As much mud in the streets as if the waters had but newly retired from the face of the earth, and it would not be wonderful to meet a Megalosaurus, forty feet long or so, waddling like an elephantine lizard up Holborn Hill. Smoke lowering down from chimney-pots, making a soft black drizzle, with flakes of soot in it as big as full-grown snowflakes—gone into mourning, one might imagine, for the death of the sun. Dogs, undistinguishable in mire. Horses, scarcely better; splashed to their very blinkers. Foot passengers, jostling one another's umbrellas in a general infection of ill temper, and losing their foot-hold at street-corners, where tens of thousands of other foot passengers have been slipping and sliding since the day broke (if this day ever broke), adding new deposits to the crust upon crust of mud, sticking at those points tenaciously to the pavement, and accumulating at compound interest[28].

How one of the greatest authors of the period focuses on the effect of industrial danger for the environment at the very beginning of the novel must be observed.

[28] Charles Dickens, *Bleak House*, Wordsworth Classics, Ware 1993, p. 3.

Dickens explicitly implies that ‘the death of the sun’ makes mankind a brutal killer of the nature. ‘Smoke lowering down from chimney-pots’ is an obvious indicator of man’s loss of the contact with nature through this radical alteration concerning the lives of both living beings. Furthermore, he follows the description of the pathetic situation of London that can be thought of as a prototype of Europe in the second paragraph:

> Fog everywhere. Fog up the river, where it flows among green aits and meadows; fog down the river, where it rolls defiled among the tiers of shipping and the waterside pollutions of a great (and dirty) city. Fog on the Essex marshes, fog on the Kentish heights. Fog creeping into the cabooses of collier-brigs; fog lying out on the yards and hovering in the rigging of great ships; fog drooping on the gunwales of barges and small boats. Fog in the eyes and throats of ancient Greenwich pensioners, wheezing by the firesides of their wards; fog in the stem and bowl of the afternoon pipe of the wrathful skipper, down in his close cabin; fog cruelly pinching the toes and fingers of his shivering little ‘prentice boy on deck. Chance people on the bridges peeping over the parapets into a nether sky of fog, with fog all round them, as if they were up in a balloon and hanging in the misty clouds. Gas looming through the fog in divers places in the streets, much as the sun may, from the spongey fields, be seen to loom by husbandman and ploughboy. Most of the shops lighted two hours before their time—as the gas seems to know, for it has a haggard and unwilling look[29].

It must be quite agonizing that Dickens uses the word ‘fog’ thirteen times to emphasize the industrial destruction contrary to a novelist who prefers to begin his setting in company with sparkling snowflakes, a rainbow smiling over the sky or sunlight reflecting upon the green plants and trees. As a natural consequence of the transition to a consumer and industrial society, the priority of industrial human was not to breathe clean air, drink clean water and enjoy the nature but to make more profit by being slaves of industry. This transition is the fundamental basis of Dickens for portraying the setting via pathetic descriptions.

Another major work of Dickens voicing the marks of industry and technology over the nature and man is *Hard Times*. His fictional city, Coketown, in the novel stands for the reality of the industrial and mechanical revolution’s reflection on the planet:

[29] Dickens, p. 3.

> It was a town of red brick, or of brick that would have been red if the smoke and ashes had allowed it; but as matters stood, it was a town of unnatural red and black like the painted face of a savage. It was a town of machinery and tall chimneys, out of which interminable serpents of smoke trailed themselves for ever and ever, and never got uncoiled. It had a black canal in it, and a river that ran purple with ill-smelling dye, and vast piles of building full of windows where there was a rattling and a trembling all day long, and where the piston of the steam-engine worked monotonously up and down, like the head of an elephant in a state of melancholy madness. It contained several large streets all very like one another, and many small streets still more like one another, inhabited by people equally like one another, who all went in and out at the same hours, with the same sound upon the same pavements, to do the same work, and to whom every day was the same as yesterday and to-morrow, and every year the counterpart of the last and the next[30].

Though Coketown is fictionalized as an imaginative city watched from a hill through the smog that environs it, Dickens reveals the indisputable fact that human is willing to break off his relation with the ecosystem and likens Coketown to the planet suffering from the misuse of human beings. 'The town of unnatural red and black' and 'of machinery' demonstrates the extent to which the nature seems to be alienated from itself and from human beings. In the era of senseless industry and technology, monotype models of man and environment that 'are equally like one another' are the portrayal of devastating results of the anthropocentric worldview.

Industrial Revolution and the rise of technology posed a stark contrast between the anticipated dreams and the unforeseen consequences to the detriment of nature. Chasing the dreams of wealth and prosperity and leaving his engagement with the nature, man made himself a slave of himself and technology that could not offer a maternal affection like nature. Disturbed and horrified by these problematic times of the increasing population, the terrible conditions confronted by the proletariat, the environmental calamity and the mechanization of the life, Engels who is one of the most leading socialist and ecological thinkers expresses his concerns during his visit to Manchester:

> I am forced to admit that instead of being exaggerated, it is far from black enough to convey a true impression of the filth, ruin, and uninhabitableness, the defiance of all considerations of cleanliness, ventilation, and health which characterize the

[30] Dickens, *Hard Times*, s. 18.

> construction of this single district, containing at least twenty to thirty thousand inhabitants.[31]

It can be inferred that industrial man was confined to the realm of nonchalance created by his own hands and that the system of which he was a part did not allow him to question his disappearing bonds with nature. The capital made man insensitive to returning to the self that could enable him to be aware of what was happening in his neighbouring circles. Through the observations of Engels, one can deduce that the system causes the pollution surrounding the cities and the alienation of the planet. Reinterpreting Engels's *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844* through the lens of environmental facts, Clark and Foster invite us to face the portrayal of the highly controversial environmental conditions of the era:

> Engels highlighted the fact that human society is dependent on the ability of nature to regenerate. Marx (1977, 1991) illustrated similar relationships in his discussions of capitalist agriculture, which continually depleted the soil of needed nutrients and created periodic soil crises, which were only met by the importation of guano and, later, the production of artificial fertilizers. Thus, to avoid the environmental degradation that is inherent within the operations of capitalism, society must organize itself under a new economic system that provides the means to regulate the transformative actions of humans in a way that does not violate "the laws of nature".[32]

As noted above, the disengagement with nature deprived humans of the act of benefiting from the regenerating power of nature. Dependence on technology and industry instead of Mother Nature pushed man into the hands of capitalism, causing many radically transformed unnatural cities. It is emphasized that the interruption of human-nature relationship, actually, is directly responsible for the rise of capitalism. What Clark and Foster mean by the sentence that "society must organize itself under a new economic system" can be evaluated as a wish to return to the ecocentric way of life that adopts "the laws of nature" instead of violating it through the operations of capitalism. Until this time, it was clearly seen that man and nature had been thought of as the components of the whole; however, the rise of Industrial Revolution and mechanization aimed to

---

[31] Friedrich Engels, *The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844*, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London 1892, p.45.

[32] Brett **Clark** and John Bellamy **Foster**, "The Environmental Conditions of the Working Class: An Introduction to Selections from Frederick Engels's The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844", *Organization & Environment*, vol. 19, no. 3, Sept. 2006, p. 379.

rule and dominate the nature. The disengagement of man and nature, which has a direct influence on the roots of capitalism, not only seemed to deepen the discrimination between the rural and urban but also ruined the transaction between man and nature, thereby causing an environmental degradation and exploitation of the soil. Based on healthy fundamentals, human-nature connection turned into a relationship based on self-interest. Though they had once cared nature for the purpose of feeding, sheltering and surviving and even worshipping, people now exploited it for the sake of individual interests. Thus, human being added a new contrast to his history, which was 'man versus nature'. In fact, this opposition can be observed as a natural result of the sense of hidden enmity and mutual revenge between nature and sons/daughters of Adam.

1.3 The Invisible Part of the Iceberg: Human-Nature Enmity behind the Scene

It is a common thought that man is the one of the most significant components of the nature and the relationship between both throughout the history mentioned above is an inevitable reality; however, this engagement does have a bilateral meaning that can identify this relationship from another angle. What if we re-read the relationship between man and nature reversely? Though the roots of the relationship between nature and human dating back to the pre-historical ages can be thought to influence the development of the earth positively- at least till the Industrial Revolution- and to affect the improvement of nature considered as mother who helped mankind grow bigger and survive, both actors seem to bear hostility towards each other contrary to what is believed. Each text written on the unity of man and ecosphere focuses on their indispensible ways, and human beings are imagined as the unique part of nature. However, what is suggested throughout the history in theories may lose its consistency in practice or what is suppressed in the mind may not be voiced through the words. Namely, it seems highly controversial that nature welcomes and tolerates all the harmful actions of human being and man accepts nature as equal to his own existence. Acting as if he cares to protect the environment as his primary mission and to approach respectfully to the earth, mankind has performed nothing but enmity throughout the history. As a reaction to the man's repressed sense of superiority, nature has taken her revenge not only by regenerating but also by risking man's life and his future on the

earth. In this sense, it is necessary to revisit the history by facing the other side of the coin.

As discussed before, human's contact with nature extends to the creation myths and holy texts. It is quite possible to suggest that man's first test with nature started with Adam's approach to the forbidden tree. Some feminist critics assert that the reason why males have some hostile feelings to females is that Eve tempted Adam to eat the fatal fruit and she caused mankind to be expelled from the heaven. The same can be claimed for the enmity between man and nature as well. The underlying reason for the conflict between man and nature is the forbidden tree that causes people to be far from the desired paradise. Thus, the way Adam approached the tree signifies the first human intervention in nature and paved the way to an on-going battle. The father of the mankind did not prefer nature to "enjoy its good things" and then turned to "become of the unjust"[33] triggering the enmity that has lasted for ages. Also, in Bible, an enduring enmity is put between human and animal. God addresses snake: "I will put enmity between ... thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."[34] People put the blame on that tree and snake, causing Adam and Eve to transgress and disobey the orders of God, who punished them by putting on earth. Due to Adam and Eve's transgression, they have always suffered from the natural world instead of enjoying the heaven far from the earth which they have turned into a turbulent place. As a consequence, human destruction in the nature may be likened to a recurrent reflection of Adam and Eve's intervention in nature without permission. Thus, all humans born and to be born genetically bear the traces of Adam's eating from the tree of the sin and they interiorize the hostility towards the nature subconsciously.

Being quite capable of creating enemies for him throughout the history, man immediately invented his first enemy in pursuit of inhabiting the earth: nature. In his new place he would live long years after he came face to face with the environment that had existed before him. He slowly began to exploit nature, rejecting any existence before him. People generally respect the things of which they are afraid. Thus, people living in pre-historical ages were afraid of the things they did not know and they were limited to giving harm to nature. That's why this early period may be marked as more

[33] Quran, The Elevated Place, 19.
[34] *Bible*, Genesis, 3:15, Web Page: http://incil.info/kitap/gen/3 (Date accessed: Friday, January 2016).

ecocentric than the other periods. Human beings were defenders rather than attackers in force, yet they were willing to know and describe their environments to make a move. After they had learned to what extent nature could be dangerous and how to survive, it could be claimed that they were not pleased enough with nature's role as a mother and teacher for them and decided to take the administrative power gradually. Instead of obeying the rules of Mother Nature, they tried to give a body to her as they wished. Curving the stones, sheltering in a cave and wearing peltries were one of the earliest steps of protecting themselves from nature by using it. It was the beginning of human's armament for the battle to be fought with nature for a long time. Despite the fact that it was at the lowest level, hunting and domesticating animals, coercing the soil and personifying the nature revealed the dimensions of the exploitation at that time. According to Lynn White Jr.:

> This same exploitive attitude appears slightly before A.D. 830 in Western illustrated calendars. In older calendars the months were shown as passive personifications. The new Frankish calendars, which set the style for the Middle Ages, are very different: they show men coercing the world around them-plowing, harvesting, chopping trees, butchering pigs. Man and nature are two things, and man is master.[35]

Lynn White invites us to face the fact that human had an effort to establish sovereignty over the nature. Sons and daughters of Adam and Eve began to take the revenge by seizing the power. This transition of the control from nature to mankind occurred in accordance with some sequence of events in the history. In other words, the clear disclosure of enmity of human towards nature followed the nature's losing its huge mystery in the eyes of people. Philosophers' announcements on the cause and effect relationship made people knowledgeable about the operations and the cycle of nature. They got the impression of superiority over the nature as they began to use their ability of reasoning. This awareness encouraged human being to reveal his sense of hostility hidden in his subconscious mind genetically. It can be observed that when the conditions are ready, human is subconsciously eager to violate the nature. For instance, the rise of Christianity provides a strong background in revealing the conflict. Hence, it is regarded as another turning point of the environmental history. "What did Christianity", asks Lynn White, "tell people about their relations with the environment?" and he responds it for Christianity: "God planned all of this explicitly for

[35] White Jr., p. 1205

man's benefit and rule … And, although man's body is made of clay, he is not simply part of nature: he is made in God's image." Based on Western form of Christianity, he concludes that "Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen."[36] By this way, mankind made up an excuse for the enmity under the cover of an organized religion. Old beliefs based on the animism were replaced by the Western materialism established by the Christian church's worldview promoting the exploitation of the nature through the justification of the ends. In the early Christian churches, nature fundamentally signified a symbolical structure and it was regarded as a means of God's speaking to men related to the Christian dogma of creation.[37] From an ecocritical point of view, while Bible imposes some environmental stances for the admiration of nature, it also includes considerable numbers of divine stories based on ecological destruction. In the book, for instance, the flood sweeps away not only human beings but also animals, trees, plants, namely, all living beings but Noah and his family.[38] In this sense, Western tendency to the creation of a conflict with nature seems to be based on an ecclesiastical and religious background. In the *Kindred of the Wild*, Canada's first and greatest storytelling naturalist, Charles Roberts, focuses on Western approach towards nature which, by virtue of Christianity, is seen as "the ally of the enemy":

> The advent of Christianity, strange as it may seem at first glance, did not make for a closer understanding between man and the lower animals. While it was militant, fighting for its life against the forces of paganism, its efforts were to set man at odds with the natural world, and fill his eyes with the wonders of the spiritual. Man was the only thing of consequence on earth, and of man, not his body, but his soul. Nature was the ally of the enemy. The way of nature was the way of death.[39]

Men of seventeenth century felt antipathy to nature instead of embracing it as his partner to respect. What underlies the antipathy is the after-life anxiety. According to Havelock Ellis, the French philosopher Nicholas Malebranche claims that "the irregularities of the earth's surface, like the uncertainty of its seasons, … are due to the fact that God has intended that our thoughts should be fixed on the world to come, and

[36] White Jr., p. 1205
[37] White Jr., p. 1206
[38] Timothy J. **Burbery**, "Ecocriticism and Christian Literary Scholarship", *Christianity and Literature*, vol. 61, no. 2, Winter 2012, p. 195.
[39] Charles G.D Roberts, *Kindred of the Wild*, Exile Editions, Toronto 2001, p. 142

not on a world which is the abode of sinners..."[40] Ellis makes further analyses on the two fundamental reasons why human beings had a hostile manner in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. "There was, in the first place, their high cultivation of the social instincts. They cultivated sociability, the art of fine human relationships, with an ardour that almost amounted to passion." They never tried to hear the silent wild nature because nature "had no voice for them" and they never "turn from man to the solemnity of wild Nature". For Ellis, the second factor "why it was peculiarly difficult for the man of that age to approach sympathetically the rugged wildness and confusion of Nature" was "the sudden rise and popular expansion of geometrical and mathematical studies during the latter of the seventeenth century."[41]

Especially during the period of Industrial Revolution, the footsteps of the mechanization, the ravages of technology and the anthropocentric attitude of modern science were the most explicit signs of the battle between man and nature by that time. Industrial and technological developments caused people to lose the contact with nature and reinforced the process of alienation of man from nature. Furthermore, modern science regarded human as a superior being over the nature. As George Sessions claims, Bacon argued that modern science enabled man to reclaim the control over nature that was lost because of Adam's fall in the Garden. Regarded as one of the heading figures of modern Western philosophy, Descartes claimed that the new science would allow human beings to become the masters and the professors of the nature. By the time all the historical factors including medieval Christian anthropocentricism and the scientifically based technology of the Industrial Revolution were combined with the Scientific Revolution, man became the central fact of the universe. He also adds that "the Scientific Revolution also overturned the age-old organic view of the world as a living organism and replaced it with a mechanistic clockwork image of the world as a machine."[42] This ecological transition from the organic to the mechanistic also enabled the so-called civilized techniques to replace the primitive methods. The transformation radically consolidated the contrast between earth and humanity by making deeper wounds on the face of the nature. Man began to use excessive force while attacking his

[40] Havelock Ellis, qtd. in "Havelock Ellis on the Psychological Roots of the Love of Wilderness", **A Century of Early Ecocriticism**, Ed. David Mazel, The University of Georgia Press, Athens 2001, p.186
[41] Ellis, p. 187
[42] George Sessions, "Ecocentrism and the Anthropocentric Detour", **Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century**, Ed. George Sessions, Shambhala Publications, Boston 1995, p. 161.

enemy. Namely, people of that age seem to have used more devastating weapons called "machine" instead of digging tools along with the appearance of revolutionary period. Thus, the excessive pollution, water contamination and many other environmentally destructive operations of man forced nature to give her first serious response to human beings eventually. Though she is not as unscrupulous and cruel as people, the ecosphere deprived people of having the breathing space because of the heavy smoke and the environmental justice punished them for their arrogant attitudes towards the earth. Many people were killed as victims of unhealthy environmental conditions causing the diseases cholera, tuberculosis, typhus and typhoid. Additionally, numerous natural disasters from earthquakes to floods and avalanches claimed the lives of human beings in exchange for their hostile attitudes. Nonetheless, people were not willing to understand the law of great chain of being; to put it differently, their opposition to the Mother Nature would also give harm not only to nonhuman beings but also to themselves. By this way, following the turn of the twentieth century, the world witnessed the bloodiest century that the history had ever seen. There happened two great wars causing irreparable damages at the heart of the ecosphere in order to make things better. When compared to the previous wars, the use of developed technology, modern weapons and the broad participation of the nations led the World War I and World War II to endanger wider places on earth. Asit K. Biswas asserts that "chemicals like chlorine, phosgene, diphosgene and mustard gas were used by both sides during World War I". These destructive behaviours in the war "contributed to several environmental damages, such as large-scale of devastation of crops, deforestation, soil loss due to reduction in vegetation, destruction of wildlife habitat, and decline in fish catch."[43] The situation was not so different in World War II and all other wars fought in the modern world. The atomic bombs and biological weapons profoundly influenced the biodiversity and caused severe environmental disasters.

This violation raises the question of whether the war is fought among the human beings or waged against the nature. It seems that the hostility towards environment and towards everything that was natural caused man's loss of synchronization with nature, and this situation led man to become a mechanical monster

[43] Asit K. Biswas, "Scientific Assessment of the Long-term Environmental Consequences of War", **The Environmental Consequences of War: Legal, Economic and Scientific Perspectives,** ed. E. Austin and Carl E. Bruch, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 307.

who could sweep away every living being for his instinct of dominance. In other words, modern man's sense of occupancy expanded from his neighbouring to overseas. In this sense, man's domination over the earth is best exemplified by Seyyed Hossein Nasr who likens humans to a rapist:

> The dangers brought about by man's domination over nature are too well known to need elucidation. Nature has become desacralized for modern man, although this process itself has been carried to its logical conclusion only in the case of a small minority. Moreover, nature has come to be regarded as something to be used and enjoyed to the fullest extent possible. Rather than being like a married woman from whom a man benefits but also towards whom he is responsible, for modern man nature has become like a prostitute-to be benefited from without any sense of obligation and responsibility toward her. The difficulty is that the condition of prostituted nature is becoming such as to make any further enjoyment of it impossible. And, in fact, that is why many have begun to worry about its condition.[44]

Disappearance of the equilibrium between man and nature emerging with further conquest and abuse of nature seems to make things worse for man day by day. He begins to diverge from his self and his aim on earth and the genetic hostility he keeps extends to the greater levels including not only nonhuman but also human beings. It appears that this malice, greed and hatred of human will take much longer and result in the annihilation of his race. In order to defend the borders of his humanity and his natural values, he needs a radical revolution for the benefit of nature before he turns to his self. Nasr advises that "peace in human society and the preservation of human values are impossible without peace with the natural and spiritual orders and respect for the immutable supra-human realities which are the source of all that is called 'human values'."[45] He invites humanity to discover that the offensive attitude towards the nature must transform into a shape that is based on the dialogue in which nature must have a word to say equally. From this point of view, all that can be said about the source of the enmity is the lack of negotiations between man and nature. It cannot be possible to mention about over-developed societies and scientifically improved nations unless the inadequacy of reconciliation with the nonhuman world is resolved. That is the reason for the delusion of modern man and the superficial and temporal solutions of science

[44] Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *Man and Nature: The Spiritual Crisis in Modern Man*, Unwin Paperbacks, London 1990, p. 18.
[45] Nasr, p. 14

and technology. "The only alternative is inter-subjective, socially negotiated moral truths achieved in the interests of (environmental) justice."[46]

To sum up, the enmity between man and nature begins with man's first relationship with the nature. Since Adam's first touch of the tree to eat the forbidden fruit, mankind has maintained the hostility moving it to the greater extents. Even though the connection between mankind and nature is called a 'relationship' and the nature, for which many appreciative words are voiced, is referred as 'mother' who harbours her people affectionately, the backstage reality explicitly displays a kind of battle fought between fierce enemies. Throughout the history, it is seen that the mutual interdependence increasingly has turned into a reciprocal revenge. The more human beings violate, the more the earth shows her turbulent sides and both beings get harmed and suffer from this unending battle. The nature loses its naturalness and human is deprived of his essence that makes him human because of this hostility. Consequently, man's regaining his values and reconciliation with his self initially depends on the ending of the enmity by means of negotiation and *sym-pathia* for nature. As Elizabeth Ann R. Bird observes, "environmental problems are not the result of a mistaken understanding of nature. Rather they are the result of mis/taken (unfortunate or ill-chosen) negotiations with and constructions of nature in the shaping of new socio-ecological orderings of reality." [47] In her brilliant essay *Recovery from Western Civilization*, Chellis Glandinning gets to the heart of the problem and summarizes the hostility that the Western societies mainly experience. She thinks that people feel the distress of "Original Trauma" created by the "systematic removal of our lives from nature, from natural cycles" that "began slowly with the introduction of agriculture" and then, "has grown to crisis proportions in technological society (which began only about five generations ago). With it comes the traumatic loss of a sense of belonging on the Earth." In the modern technological culture, people have had numerous addictions that he calls "techno-addiction" and have created a "techno-utopia" by removing themselves from this natural cycle. Thus, their "physical reality became less wild and more technological." She finally concludes that "the ultimate goal of recovery is to refine our

[46] Elizabeth Ann R. **Bird**, "The Social Construction of Nature: Theoretical Approaches to the History of Environmental Problems", *Environmental Review: ER*, vol. 11, no. 4, Special Issue: Theories of Environmental History, Winter 1987, p. 261.
[47] Bird, p. 261.

place in nature" disturbed by the blinding "mechanistic worldview."[48] As Bird and Glendinning offer, human beings need to have sympathy with nature and refine their existence for the recovery of the earth. It can be easily observed that this is only achieved by a socio-ecological revolution which may be the remedy of this lasting enmity. Thus, man is able to turn back to the essence he actually belongs to. In a global age which is dramatically based on technology, industrialization and capitalism, it may be seen as a delusion to achieve an ecological and social reconstruction; yet, if the negotiations with nature are delayed, each individual is likely to suffer from the possible results of the separation from nature.

[48] Chellis Glendinning, "Recovery from Western Civilization", **Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century**, Ed. George Sessions, Shambhala Publications, Boston 1995, pp. 37-39.

CHAPTER 2

ECOCRITICISM AS A DISCIPLINE: FROM WILDERNESS TO GLOBAL

> *Much ecocriticism has taken for granted that its task is to overcome anthropocentrism, just as feminism seeks to overcome androcentrism. The metaphysical argument for biocentrism is meant to sustain moral claims about the intrinsic value of the natural world, which will in turn affect our attitudes and behaviour towards nature.*[49]

Voicing every defective side of human life since its beginnings, literature has not remained unresponsive to verbalizing the rights of nature. It has been mentioned about the history of relationship between man and nature and the hostile exploitation of nature up till now. It is time to touch on the environmentalists who cry out against the ecological calamity and allow nature to defend her rights. This chapter deals with the every facet of ecocriticism as a literary theory and aims to examine its rapid development beginning with environmental writings and proceeding to move into new phases day by day. The chapter also probes into the precursors of ecocriticism that contribute much to the emergence of the theory and pioneering people who are labelled as the first names within the context of ecocriticism. The analyses are furthered with references to the thoughts and ideas on ecocriticism and the theoretical frame of ecocriticism is depicted in the light of these ideas and thoughts. Labelled as "waves" by Lawrence Buell, the phases of ecocriticism- the first, second and third waves- are also discussed with their possible development in the future.

[49] Greg Garrard, *Ecocriticism*, Routledge, New York 2004, p. 176.

2.1 Nature Writing Before the Rise of Ecocriticism

A growing impetus in the process of human-nature engagement has focused on the problem of anthropocentricism. Nature silenced by human was echoed by many authors and philosophers but it was not under an organized theory. Writings and thoughts on nature before ecocriticism were dispersed and disconnected. Ecocriticism can be claimed to mature nature writing, nature literature, environmental literature and environmental writing. However, ecocriticism, as the youngest literary theory, is based on some developments that occurred before gathering under the single roof. Individual interests and observations on the wilderness based on regional issues became the precursor to ecocriticism. Before reaching its third stage including international voices, ecological writing has made some process starting from the mid-nineteenth century. The roots of ecocriticism were implicitly planted in nature writings of this century. Ufuk Özdağ, in this sense, claims, "In American writing, the tradition of defending the rights of nature began in the second half of nineteenth century."[50] Henry David Thoreau, John Muir, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Aldo Leopold, Rachel Carson and Edward Abbey are among the best-known environmentalist authors who created consciousness towards the nature and paved the way to the emergence of this revisionist and young theory.

Henry David Thoreau, who was a nature writer and philosopher, lived in the mid-nineteenth century exploring and studying the wilderness. Thoreau is still accepted as the father of modern environmental movement and he has influenced the thoughts of modern environmentalist thinkers. His works are of vital importance in reinforcing the positive attitude of man towards nature. Thoreau's nature-oriented observations cannot be discussed as having only academic purposes. His primary purpose is to change the ordinary man's view of nature.[51] Observing the place of man in nature, he reflects the individualistic side of mankind and displays man as the one who can satisfy his soul not in the corrupted civilization but in the nature. In *A Century of Early Ecocriticism* edited by David Mazel, James Rusell Lowell comments on Thoreau's life style which is far from American dream:

> Thoreau's experiment actually presupposed all that complicated civilization which it theoretically abjured. His aim was a noble and a useful one, in the direction of plain living and high thinking…his whole life was a rebuke of the waste and aimlessness

[50] Ufuk Özdağ, *Çevreci Eleştiriye Giriş: Doğa, Kültür, Edebiyat*, Ürün Yayınları, Ankara 2014, p. 7.
[51] Özdağ, p. 21.

> of our American luxury, which is an abject enslavement to tawdry upholstery. His better style as a writer is in keeping with simplicity and purity of his life.[52]

Due to the fact that his fame crosses the borders of America, his ideas cannot be thought to be simply American. Özdağ observes that he holds an international approach that cannot be limited to that time and place. His environmentalist writings narrating the wild areas via his personal observations reach wide audiences in the world. In this sense, his green book *Walden*, receiving a great attention all over the world and inspiring many environmental thinkers and their writings, "is an offer for the disobedience against the modern world that dominates the nature by giving much importance to materiality and destroys the nature brutally."[53] In *Walden,* it is quite possible to find the traces of why Thoreau lived in his cabin in the woods for more than two years to pen this work. He denies the material needs of the life, gives ear to the suppressed voice of the nature and explains:

> I went to the woods because I wished to live deliberately, to front only the essential facts of life, and see if I could not learn what it had to teach, and not, when I came to die, discover that I had not lived. I did not wish to live what was not life… I wanted to live deep and suck out all the marrow of life, ... to drive life into a corner, and reduce it to its lowest terms, and, if it proved to be mean, why then to get the whole and genuine meanness of it, and publish its meanness to the world…[54]

Another significant nature writer who made major contributions to the emergence of ecocriticism is John Muir. For the Scottish-American defender of preservation of wilderness, it is claimed that "of those who has written of surpassingly well- Gilbert White, Henry Thoreau, Richard Jefferies, W. H. Hudson- John Muir was the wildest. He was the most active, the most at home in the wilderness, the most daring, the most capable, the most self-reliant."[55] Called the father of national parks, he founded Sierra Club as an environmental organization and established Yosemite National Park. It is seen that during the long period of his life he deals with fighting for the protection of rural areas. Inspiring many members of the environmental movements,

---

[52] James R. Lowell, qtd. in "James Russel Lowell on Thoreau", **A Century of Early Ecocriticism**, Ed. David Mazel, The University of Georgia Press, Athens 2001, p.32

[53] Özdağ, p.21.

[54] Henry David Thoreau, *Walden: or, Life in the Woods and On the Duty of Civil Disobedience*, Harper & Row, New York 1965, p.67.

[55] Edwin Way Teale, *The Wilderness World of John Muir*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston 1954, p. xi.

the signs of his fundamental philosophy on nature can be witnessed in his view of life. Teale claims that Muir, who belongs to no churches, considers the woods and mountains as his temple. His perspective on wilderness and attitude towards nature seem to be a worshipful approach. There can be seen a spiritual and religious sublimity in his relationship with all nature which he perceives as a "direct handiwork of God."[56] Muir's environmental tone in *A Thousand-Mile Walk to the Gulf* indicates his passion for nature which he reflects as a shelter for his existence on earth:

> To lovers of the wild, these mountains are not a hundred miles away. Their spiritual power and the goodness of the sky make them near, as a circle of friends. You bathe in these spirits-beams, turning around and around, as if warming at a campfire. Presently you lose consciousness of your own separate existence; you blend with the landscape, and become part and parcel of nature.[57]

Though Thoreau and Muir are considered as one of the greatest nature writers of the time, Ralph Waldo Emerson is the most important representative of transcendentalism with his profound influence on all nature writers including Muir and Thoreau. Joseph Dorsey claims that "he acted as Thoreau's mentor and also became a personal friend of Muir later in life. Emerson, nearing the end of his life, visited and camped with Muir at Yosemite National Park, an enormous event for Muir, who followed Emerson's work throughout his life."[58] For Emerson, comprehending the divine is possible through working out the operations of the nature. Thus, nature and spirit come out as two essentials of the universe. According to him, "the lover of nature is he whose inward and outward senses are still truly adjusted to each other; who has retained the spirit of infancy even into the era of manhood".[59]

Best known for his contributions to the development of modern environmental ethics and wilderness protection, Aldo Leopold is the author of *A Sand County Almanac* which is one of the most important works of environmental and ecological movement.

---

[56] Teale, p. xiii.
[57] John Muir, *A Thousand-Mile Walk to the Gulf*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston and New York 1916, pp. 41-42.
[58] Jocelyn Elizabeth Ellis, "The Legacy of John Muir: Writing to Promote Ecological Preservation and Change Environmental Values", Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 2005 (Published Ph.D. Thesis), p. 22-23.
[59] Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Nature", **Nature and Other Writings**, Ed. Peter Turner, Shambhala Publications, Boston 2003. p.5.

He advocates the view of harmony between man and nature mentioning about an ethic different from the view of an ecological science. John Rodman concludes:

> By the time one reaches Leopold's discussion of the land ethic, one has grown accustomed to thinking of different animals- and (arguably), by extension, different natural entities in general- as subjects rather than objects, as beings that have their own purposes, their own perspectives on the world, and their own goods that are differentially affected by events.[60]

His concise statement indicates the fundamental tenet of his formulation of the land ethic: "A thing is right," according to Leopold, "when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise."[61] It evokes the idea of Aristotle, who remarks that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Garrard also regards a community as a whole whose duty is to protect the collectivity, and a community "in which human beings are neither more nor less than citizens."[62]

Greatly influenced by earlier environmentalist writers such as Muir and Thoreau, Rachel Carson and Edward Abbey leave marks on the twentieth century through highly effective works. Carson's *Silent Spring* focuses on the dangerous and devastating results of using pesticides and seems to "combine both the scientific approach and the artistic approach"[63] and the literary language. Supporting her lyrical narration with the scientific data, she uses the power of literature to describe the harm brought to the environmental health. Supporting Carson's struggle with restraining the overuse of chemical pesticides, President John F. Kennedy invited United Nations to contemplate on the danger of an uninhabitable planet.[64] In this sense, Carson might be said to have a wide range of influence with her attempts on nature preservation. Although Edward Abbey praises her as being among the "serious and wholly admirable" nature writers, he insists in the preface of his famous *Desert Solitaire* that he does not desire to be labelled as "nature writer" which "is a title" he has "not earned,

---

[60] John Rodman, "Four Forms of Ecological Consciousness Reconsidered", **Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century**, Ed. George Sessions, Shambhala Publications, Boston 1995, p. 127.
[61] Aldo Leopold, *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1989, pp. 224-225.
[62] Garrard, p. 72.
[63] Özdağ, pp. 27-28.
[64] Lawrence Buell, *Writing for an Endangered World: Literature, Culture and Environment in the U.S and Beyond*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge and London 2001, p. 39.

never wanted, does not enjoy."[65] So he can be considered as a fierce anarchist and a militant philosopher of the twentieth century. Though he does not enjoy being labelled as nature writer, the ultimate purpose of his writing is to make people hear the voice of the silenced nature. His anarchist and activist statements in his works tend to encourage the nature-lovers to take more strict responsibilities. According to Scott Slovic, Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang* "is usually read as straightforward call-to-arms for environmentalists, and such radical preservationist groups as 'Earth First!' have even claimed it as their Bible." Slovic also believes that "Abbey's true project, his essential consciousness-raising effort" is based on "the conflation of pure aesthetics and volatile moral issues (such as the sacredness of the wilderness, the inviolability of private property, and the appropriate use of public lands)."[66]

2.2 Ecocriticism

The popular term ecocriticism is a widely acclaimed word in the literary world and it, etymologically speaking, comes out by combining both the prefix eco- and criticism. The word derives from Greek *oikos* which means house, and *kritis* which means judge and both, when combined, it stands for the house judge. Thus, *Oikos* means nature and *kritos* means an "arbiter of taste" who desires to keep the nature clean and in good order.[67] Howarth, then, notes that an ecocritic is "a person who judges the merits and faults of writings that depict the effects of culture upon nature, with a view toward celebrating nature, berating its despoilers and reversing their harm through political action."[68] Though his definition can be considered as a little bit aggressive, it offers an agreeable frame for those who deal with ecocriticism and those who desire to condemn the house-pollutants for exploiting the nature. Though ecocriticism seems to have been limited mainly to American literature, Peter Barry draws the picture of "two distinct national variants of the ecological approach" as British and American. He advocates that these two variants of the ecological movement "suggest a situation similar to the one … in which … 'British' cultural materialism and 'American' new

[65] Edward Abbey, Desert Solitaire, University of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1988, p. x.
[66] Scott Slovic, "Nature Writing and Environmental Psychology: The Interiority of Outdoor Experience", **The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology**, Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, The University of Georgia Press, Georgia 1996, pp. 359-60.
[67] William Howarth, "Some Principles of Ecocriticism", **The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology**, Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, The University of Georgia Press, Georgia 1996, p. 69.
[68] Howarth, p.69

historicism are clearly linked in their approaches and aims, but differ in emphasis and 'ancestry'." He also concludes that while 'ecocriticism' is a favoured term in American literature in which the tone is more "celebratory", the term 'green studies' is mainly preferred in British literature that adopts a "minatory" tone for "environmental threats emanating from governmental, industrial, commercial, and neo-colonial forces."[69] However, through the steady expansion of interest in ecocritical theory, it has gained a world-wide acceptance and employment by crossing the initial borders. No matter what diversity it offers, the fundamental purpose of ecocriticism is to focus on the environmental threats and refuse the thought that human is the essential and superior being on earth.

In his essay entitled as *Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism*, William Rueckert used the term ecocriticism for the first time. As one of the important contributors of ecocriticism, Cheryll Glotfelty maintains that "by ecocriticism, Rueckert meant the application of ecology and ecological concepts to the study of literature" and some other coinages in use include "ecopoetics, environmental literary criticism, and green cultural studies". According to her, "some scholars like the term ecocriticism because it is short and can easily be made into other forms like ecocritical and ecocritic."[70] "What then is ecocriticism?" asks Glotfelty and gives an oft-quoted definition of ecocriticism:

> Simply put, ecocriticism is the study of the relationship between literature and the physical environment. Just as feminist criticism examines language and literature from a gender-conscious perspective and Marxist criticism brings an awareness of modes of production and economic class to its reading of texts, ecocriticism takes an earth-centred approach to literary studies.[71]

Scott Slovic, another featured ecocritic, provides a general description for this literary theory which, he thinks, is to include all kinds of texts. They even neglect nonhuman world: Ecocriticism is "a term which means either the study of nature writing by way of any scholarly approach or, conversely, the scrutiny of ecological implications and

---

[69] Peter Barry, *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, Second Edition, Manchester University Press, Manchester 2002, p. 251.
[70] Cheryll Glotfelty, "Introduction: Literary Studies in an Age of Environmental Crisis", **The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology**, Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, The University of Georgia Press, Georgia 1996, p. xx.
[71] Glotfelty, p. xviii

human-nature relationships in any literary texts."[72] When defining ecocriticism, the early ecocritics do not make contradistinctive mentions in drawing an ecocritical frame. Başak Ağın Dönmez states that "ecocriticism has broadened its scope, transcending the borders of the study of literature" and has included "the analysis of the media and the audio-visual texts from an environmentalist perspective."[73] It demonstrates the evidence that as ecocriticism develops, its scope and definition stretch out to a great extent as well. For instance, Slovic emphasizes the ever-changing status and praxis of ecocriticism which "has no central, dominant doctrine or theoretical apparatus- rather, ecocritical theory, as such, is being re-defined daily by the actual practice of thousands of literary scholars around the world."[74] This observation seems to echo what Serpil Oppermann writes in her essay entitled *Theorizing Ecocriticism: Toward a Postmodern Ecocritical Practice*:

> Almost none of the definitions of ecocriticism signals a move towards a field-defining theoretical method, nor provide a viable model of interpretation. The only discernible pattern among ecocritical definitions is their focus on the importance of the relationship between literature and the physical relationship; they also share the common aim to synthesize literary criticism with the natural sciences, and the literary studies with the environmental philosophies. In fact as most of the ecocritics have repeatedly stated, ecocriticism seems to resist a single definition…[75]

The debates on the theoretical framework, the praxis and the definitions of ecocriticism can be claimed to date back to its newly-shaped character. Though ecocriticism as a proper literary theory does not have a deeply-rooted past, it takes firm steps forward along with many international and interdisciplinary contributions in order to put "environmental criticism in a more productive relation with other, perhaps suspiciously humanistic, theoretical perspectives and critical practices."[76] After two decades from its emergence, many scholars dealing with ecocritical theory are broadening the scope by probing the environmental issues involved both in early literary works, such as plays, poems and fictions, and in various contemporary studies.

---

[72] Slovic, *Going Away to Think: Engagement, Retreat, and Ecocritical Responsibility*, p. 27.
[73] Başak Ağın Dönmez, "Bang Your Head and Save the Planet", **New International Voices in Ecocriticism**, Ed. Serpil Oppermann, Lexington Books, Lanham 2014, p. 71.
[74] Slovic, **The Green Studies Reader: From Romanticism to Ecocriticism**, p. 161.
[75] **Oppermann**, "Theorizing Ecocriticism: Toward a Postmodern Ecocritical Practice", p. 105.
[76] Steven Rosendale, "Introduction: Extending Ecocriticism", **The Greening of Literary Scholarship: Literature, Theory, and the Environment**, Ed. Steven Rosendale, University of Iowa Press, Iowa City 2002, p. xvii.

Shortly after Rueckert had used the term ecocriticism and the 1980s had witnessed the reawakening of the issues of environmental history through the literary works like Glotfelty's "Toward an Ecological Literary Criticism" and Glen A. Love's "Revaluing Nature: Toward an Ecological Criticism", ecocriticism as an ordered and coordinated discipline gained recognition as from the 1990s with the contributions of some ecocritics like Cheryll Glotfelty, Harold Fromm, Lawrence Buell, Scott Slovic, William Rueckert, Suellen Campbell and William Howarth. That is to say, nineties were the milestone of ecocriticism which was handled not only in the conferences but also, as Love states in his introductory notes to *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology and the Environment*, in the compelling "articles in *The New York Times Magazine, The Chronicle of Higher Education, The Washington Post, PMLA*, and elsewhere."[77] Also, it would be noteworthy to remember the contribution of Glotfelty and Fromm who are the editors of the reference guide *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology* including significant literary articles. Moreover, the literary organizations arranged in these years reinforced the evolvement and development of ecocriticism.

Among these organizations, the most influential contribution comes through the foundation of Association for the Study of Literature and Environment (ASLE). During the annual meeting of the Western Literature Association held in 1992, the scholars decide to found a nature-oriented organization called ASLE and Scott Slovic becomes the first president. Glotfelty announces that the mission of ASLE which turns into a vibrant international community today is "to promote the exchange of ideas and information pertaining to literature that considers the relationship between human beings and the natural world and to encourage new nature writing traditional and innovative scholarly approaches to environmental literature, and interdisciplinary environmental research."[78] Every next meeting following its foundation, ASLE has gained an international voice moving away from an American-dominated organization. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* (*ISLE*), the official journal of ASLE, was founded in 1993 by Patrick Murphy to "reflect the vision of ecocritics around the world, a vision that includes but extends far beyond literary and linguistic

[77] Glen A. Love, Introduction to **Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology, and the Environment**, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville and London 2003, p. 5.
[78] Cheryll Glotfelty, p. xviii.

analysis, and to spur that vision forward in additional fruitful directions."[79] In this sense, ASLE and *ISLE* assume the role of an ecocritical school in which the students and the teachers of environment all over the world collaborate to broaden the scope of environmental consciousness in an age of environmental crisis.

Ecocriticism as a literary movement adopts a position that some former current literary theories aim to verbalize. While Marxist literary theory tries to give a voice to the suppressed proletariat against the dominant class, feminist literary theory aims to equalize and defend the rights of women in a male-dominated world and postcolonial literary theory reveal the injustice between the colonized and the colonizer, ecocriticism presents the silence of nature and aims to displace the human from a central role in the universe. Though what makes ecocriticism different from others is that its subject is nature and the physical environment, ecocriticism has many common grounds to be evaluated in an interdisciplinary way. Hence, the term dualism plays a considerable significance in determining the association of ecocriticism with other disciplines grounded on the contrast between, for instance, the higher and the lower and in arguing the interdisciplinary way of ecocriticism. Val Plumwood argues that dualism may refer to "an alienated form of differentiation, in which power construes and constructs difference in terms of an inferior and alien realm." All contrasts seem to have a "set of interrelated and mutually reinforcing dualisms". According to Plumwood, "while human/nature contrast is one of the more recent of these dualisms, like the others, it can be fully understood only as part of the interrelated set." All of these dualistic structures connect to some other factors and have common points which should be seen as having "an interlocking structure" and complementary functions.[80] She explains these "contrasting pairs" some of which are as below:

culture/nature	self/other	human/nature (non-human)
male/female	public/private	mind, spirit/nature
master/slave	subject/object	civilized/primitive (nature)[81]

[79] Patrick Murphy, Foreword to **The ISLE Reader: Ecocriticism, 1993-2003**, Eds. Michael P. Branch and Scott Slovic, The University of Georgia Press, Athens, Georgia 2003, p. viii.
[80] Val Plumwood, *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*, Routledge, London and New York 1993, pp. 42-43.
[81] Plumwood, p. 43.

Thus, it can be claimed that the contrasts literary criticism benefits also encourage some new ecocritical sub-branches in an attempt to pave the way to more interdisciplinary connections including ecosocialism or eco-Marxism, postcolonial ecocriticism, feminist ecocriticism and ecopsychology. Together with ecocriticism's dependence on the place, its connection to the already existing categories of class, race and gender become the new critical subject of literature because they all have such common traces as exposure to the exploitation, the domination, the alienation and the othering performed by the mastery. Plumwood concludes that "what is happening to the earth and its complement of life is also to be found in this problematic, in the logic of mastery, now being seared into the biosphere of an entire scarred and wounded planet as well as across its sociosphere." She identifies the historical stages of this dualistic perspective and calls it as "master story":

> In the first stage, the story is set up and the leading characters of mastering reason and the lower separate sphere of nature are established…In the second stage, that of invasion and annexation by later rationalists…The third stage, appropriation, reconceives rationality as egoism and nature in instrumental terms as a resource for the master.

Calling the ultimate stage the phase of "devouring the other", Plumwood observes that "if we allow the fourth stage to come about, the trajectory I have plotted extends into a fearful future. In the fourth stage, reason systematically devours the other of nature."[82] In other words, if human lets the continuation of the process, the othered and the degraded subjects like nature, woman, the colonized, low class, etc. are likely to experience the deepening of the discrimination and the ultimate extermination in the sociosphere.

Comparing ecocriticism to a "constellation of approaches", David Mazel states in his introductory notes in *A Century of Early Ecocriticism*: "No matter how it is defined, ecocriticism seems less a singular approach or method than a constellation of approaches, having little more in common than a shared concern with the

[82] Plumwood, pp.190-192

environment."[83] Glen A. Love also observes ecocriticism as a "blanket term" and considers it as a multifarious movement embracing some ecology-oriented approaches:

> What is emerging is a multiplicity of approaches and subjects, including-under the big tent of environmental literature – nature writing, deep ecology, the ecology of cities, ecofeminism, the literature of toxicity, environmental justice, bioregionalism, the lives of animals, the revaluation of place, interdisciplinarity, eco-theory, the expansion of the canon to include previously unheard voices, and the reinterpretation of canonical works from the past.[84]

It is believed that the genealogy of ecocriticism provides a deeper understanding and a strong background to this green theory. In the broad scope of ecocriticism, four main environmental movements called deep ecology, ecofeminism, social ecology and bioregionalism or ecoregionalism are 'chief pillars' which are regarded as "radical environmental ethics" by Karen Warren.[85] These four mainstreams form the main sources to which ecocritics mostly refer.

In this huge constellation and environmental tent, the movement of Deep Ecology can be manifested as one of the significant pieces to which ecocriticism mainly refers and turns in order to reveal its philosophical attitude toward ecology. George Session and Arne Naess, after camping together in Death Valley, California, manifest the eight fundamental principles of Deep Ecology which are adopted by the deep ecologists all around the world. Summarizing the general characteristics of the approach, the eight points are as follows:

> 1. The well-being and flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth have value in themselves (synonyms: intrinsic value, inherent worth). These values are independent of the usefulness of the non-human world for human purposes.
>
> 2. Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves.
>
> 3. Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs.

[83] David Mazel, Introduction to **A Century of Early Ecocriticism,** The University of Georgia Press, Athens 2001, p. 2.
[84] Love, p. 5.
[85] Karen J. Warren, *Ecofeminist Philosophy: A Western Perspective on What It Is and Why It Matters*, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham 2000, p. 83.

> 4. The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantially smaller human population. The flourishing of non-human life requires a smaller human population.
>
> 5. Present human interference with the non-human world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.
>
> 6. Policies must therefore be changed. These policies affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures. The resulting state of affairs will be deeply different from the present.
>
> 7. The ideological change will be mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of inherent value) rather than adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between bigness and greatness.
>
> 8. Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to try to implement the necessary changes.[86]

Deep Ecology finds its roots in the writings of early environmental writers such as Henry David Thoreau, John Muir, D. H. Lawrence, Robinson Jeffers, and Aldous Huxley. Deep ecologists like Arne Naess, George Sessions, Bill Deval and Gary Snyder ask for a rightful equality for the survival of all kinds of beings in the universe. The philosophical base of deep ecology is a reaction to the historical background of the human-nature relationship. The time when the exploitation is initiated may be regarded as the beginning point that deep ecology resists. It offers co-participation of all sides in surviving under the equal circumstances. In *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century* which is a reference guide for those who deal with deep ecology, Sessions emphasizes that Naess mentions about two environmental approaches in the Third World Future Conference in 1972. The first one is the 'shallow' approach meaning "anthropocentric technocratic environmental movement concerned primarily with pollution, resource depletion, and the health and affluence of people in the developed countries" and the second one is the ecocentric approach which is "Deep, Long-Range Ecology movement." [87] Professor Naess distinguishes shallow and deep ecology and characterizes shallow ecology as "fight against pollution and resource depletion. Central

[86] Arne Naess, "The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects", **Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century**, Ed. George Sessions, Shambhala Publications, Boston 1995, p. 68.
[87] George Sessions, Preface to **Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century**, p. xii.

objective: the health and affluence of people in the developed countries". He also defines deep ecology as:

> the rejection of the man-in-environment image in favour of the relational, total field image. Organisms as knots in the biospherical net or field of intrinsic relations. An intrinsic relation between two things A and B is such that the relation belongs to the definitions or basic constitutions of A and B, so that without the relation, A and B are no longer the same things. The total-field model dissolves not only the man-in-environment concept, but every compact thing-in-milieu concept — except when talking at a superficial or preliminary level of communication.[88]

Naess, in this passage, formulates deep ecology in terms of the togetherness of society and nature and this total-field image seems a holistic approach which is "premised on a rejection of humanity as the marker of value in the human and non-human value…"[89] His approach to the relationship between man and nature can be taken as not only holistic but also ontological because "Naess uses 'intrinsic relations' to refer to what are usually called 'internal relations', that is, relations constitutive of the identity of the relata" and to emphasize that "the identity of each human being is partly constituted by the relation in which they stand to their environment."[90]

This sophistic perspective paves the way to the source of what Naess calls 'self-realization' which is considered as the first premise of deep ecology. According to this principle, man reaches this awareness only when he/she grasps his/her ecological sense without regarding his/her self as independent and distinguished from the nature. Human, then, enlarges and deepens his ecological self. "What is", Naess asks, "the practical importance of this conception of a wide and deep ecological self? He emphasizes and indicates the innermost feelings of human beings:

> When we attempt to defend Nature in our rich industrial societies, the argument of our opponents is often that we are doing it to secure beauty, recreation, and other non-vital interests for ourselves. Our position is strengthened if, after honest reflection, we find that the destruction of Nature (and our place) threatens us in our innermost self. If so, we are more convincingly defending our vital interests, not

[88] **Naess**, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement. A Summary", p. 95.
[89] Andy Price, "Social Ecology", **The Bloomsbury Companion to Anarchism**, Ed. Ruth Kinna, Bloomsbury Publishing, New York 2012, p. 239.
[90] Jonathan Hughes, *Ecology and Historical Materialism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000, p.29.

> merely something "out there." We are engaged in self-defense. And to defend fundamental human rights is vital self-defense.[91]

Eco-centred or ecocentric approach against man-dominated anthropocentric view underlies the core of deep ecology. Ecocentrism is a philosophical reaction approving the nature-centred values contrary to the anthropocentric way of perceiving the earth in which the dominance and superiority are given to human. Thus, humans regard the biosphere as their servant and put themselves at the very centre of the great chain of being. Anthropocentrism is accused of being in favour of misusing and abusing nature and its source. To put it ontologically, an anthropocentric idea defends that the environment exists in order to serve for the good of human. In a deeper sense, anthropocentrism, as in class systems in societies, presumes a hierarchical classification. In this hierarchical order, it is certain that human is placed above the nature as opposed to the egalitarianism or the belief of equality. As Kortenkamp and Moore suggest, "anthropocentrism considers humans to be the most important life form, and other forms of life to be important only to the extent that they affect humans or can be useful to humans."[92] Despite the fact that it is in favour of the superiority of man over the nature, it does not mean to refuse the existence and the value of nature totally. For instance, "it would be considered wrong to cut down the rainforests because they contain potential cures for human diseases."[93] It underscores the notion of the simplicity and vulgarity of the nature. Stan Rowe confirms that the environmental perception of anthropocentrism is based on the misconception of the nature regarded as an object designed for the comfort of humans and further asserts that "ecocentric argument is grounded in the belief that compared to the undoubted importance of human part, the whole Ecosphere is even more significant and consequential: more inclusive, more complex, more integrated, more creative, more mysterious and older than time."[94] Being conscious about the reality and operations of the ecosphere leads ecocentric thinkers to invite humans to reconstruct their societies in concordance with the premises of nature. In this sense, the reconstruction of humans' way of thinking about nature necessitates a

---

[91] Naess, "Self-Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World", p. 232.
[92] Katherine V. **Kortenkamp** and Colleen F. **Moore**, "Ecocentrism and Anthropocentrism: Moral Reasoning About Ecological Commons Dilemmas", *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, Vol. 21, Issue 3, September 2001, p. 262.
[93] Kortenkamp and Moore, p. 262.
[94] Stan J. **Rowe**, "Ecocentrism: The Chord That Harmonizes Humans and Earth", *The Trumpeter*, vol. 11, no. 2, Spring 1994, p. 106.

deeper ecological insight, that is, an integration of the intrinsic motivators with the environmental reality. Accordingly, as Rowe advises, "it is time to eschew human self-interest and recognize the inherent worth and surpassing values of Earth's miraculous ecosystems whose workings we do not understand." Because the approach to this "miraculous ecosystem" is quite different, Rowe makes a contrast: "anthropocentrism says we know how to control and manage them, while ecocentrism says "not yet; maybe never."[95] As an anthropocentric discourse, the control over nature seems to become through technology that may probably result in unforeseen consequences. In other words, anthropocentricism considers modern societies as irresponsible for the ecological problems. Humans are able to work out environmental problems via technological infrastructure. Ecocentric thinkers, on the contrary, claim that the sense of superiority or "human arrogance" is the main reason of these problems that never end.[96]

The term ecofeminism, which connects feminism to ecocriticism, first derives from the French feminist Françoise d'Eaubonne's book named *Le Feminisme ou la Mort.* [97] As evident from its name, ecofeminism unites feminist movement and ecological approach with the intention of revealing the connection between woman and nature. Identifying ecofeminism as "a value system, a social movement and a practice" which investigate the bonds between "androcentrism and environmental destruction", Birkeland remarks that "it is 'an awareness' which begins with the realization that the exploitation of nature is intimately linked to Western Man's attitude toward women and tribal cultures…"[98] Ecofeminists hold the position that victimization of nature and women is quite similar and they argue that there exists a "parallel in men's thinking between their 'right' to exploit nature, on the one hand, and the use they make of women, on the other."[99] Namely, the fate of the nature and the mother on the ecosphere resemble each other within the context of exploitation. That may be the reason why a feminine identity is attributed to nature with the name of 'Mother Nature'. Even in religious books the characteristics of women are explained by the way of examples from

[95] Rowe, p.106
[96] Helen **Kopnina**, "The Lorax Complex: Deep Ecology, Ecocentrism and Exclusion", *Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences*, Vol. 9, No. 4, December 2012, pp. 238-239.
[97] Niamh Moore, *The Changing Nature of Eco/Feminism: Telling Stories from Clayoquot Sound*, UBC Pres, Vancouver, BC 2015, p. 42-43.
[98] Jenis Birkeland, "Ecofeminism: Linking Theory and Practice", **Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature**, Ed. Greta Gaard, Temple University Press, Philadelphia 1993, p. 18.
[99] Ariel **Salleh**, "Stirrings of a New Renaissance", *Island Magazine*, No. 38, Autumn 1989, p.26.

the nature. Moreover, both give birth to, produce, preserve and have a regenerating power. In the essay entitled as *Ecofeminism: Toward Global Justice and Planetary Health*, Gaard and Gruen note that "Ecofeminists claim that environmental issues are feminist issues because it is women and children who are the first to suffer the consequences of injustice and environmental destruction."[100] The identification of nature and environmental problems with the feminine features and feminist issues creates an eco-philosophical background to ecofeminism.

Like ecofeminism, social ecology, within the frame of an equalitarian view, advocates the notion of social order and equality. It evaluates the relationship between nature and human beings through a communitarian view. Murray Bookchin suggests that "social ecology provides more than a critique of the split between humanity and nature; it also poses the need to heal them."[101] Conceptualizing social ecology, Bookchin invites us to face the fact that the social disjointedness is the most fundamental cause of the environmental degradation. He accuses hierarchical social class system of being deprived of totality, oneness and integrity. This social crisis is directly caused by the man's desire for the dominance over the earth. As an established institution, society seems to fall apart both from its own values that help create the dynamics of this institution and from its physical environment. Though modern man is responsible for the natural destruction, he is also able to find the remedy for reconstruction.[102] In this sense, social ecocriticism differs largely from deep ecology and ecofeminism by the way of its attitude to human, science and technology:

> The powerful technological agents we have unleashed against the environment include many of the very agents we require for its reconstruction. The knowledge and physical instruments for promoting a harmonization of humanity with nature and of human with human are largely at hand or could easily be devised.[103]

Contrary to a wholly ecocentric approach omitting any scientific solution to the environmental problems, social ecology relies on the capacity of human being and science that must combine their forces in order to create a better planet for all living

[100] Greta **Gaard** and Lori **Gruen**, "Ecofeminism: Toward global justice and planetary health", *Society and Nature: The International Journal of Political Ecology*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1993, p. 11.
[101] Murray Bookchin, *The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy*, Cheshire Books, California 1982, p. 22.
[102] Bookchin, pp. 18-19
[103] Bookchin p. 19

beings on earth. Bookchin claims that the social reconstruction can be performed if man gains the consciousness and the sensibility he does not have. Yet the consciousness and sensibility must be not only poetic but also scientific. According to Bookchin, "poetry and imagination must be integrated with science and technology…We must combine them, relate them and see them in their totality as well as their specificity." Social ecology, then, aims to respond to the needs for scientific and poetic consciousness and sensibility.[104] In this sense, the communitarian and holistic view adopted by social ecology is "the result of a conscious effort to discern how the particulars of a community are arranged, how its 'geometry' (as the Greeks might have put it) makes the 'whole more than the sum of its parts'."[105]

As the fourth movement in the field of ecocriticism, bioregionalism targets the coalescence of nature and culture. Both are accepted as an indivisible whole. Bioregional imagination appearing regularly in ecocritical writing reflects a local sense of place. In an interview, Peter Berg, who is one of the leading bioregionalists, clarifies the place of bioregionalism among environmental movements. He claims that bioregionalism or ecoregionalism, different from a protest-based point of view, is at peace with the existence of human culture and industry:

> Bioregionalism is proactive. It is carrying the concept of a life-place into the activities and goals of human society, as opposed to protest. Environmentalism has been a protest-oriented activity based on attempting to deal with a destructive industrial society. On the one hand, it tries to preserve pristine wilderness areas for their own sake and, on the other, to keep water and air clean for the sake of humans. Bioregionalism goes beyond both of these. In a bioregion there are different zones of human interface with natural systems: urban, suburban, rural, and wilderness. And each of these has a different appropriate reinhabitory approach.[106]

As Lynch, Glotfelty and Armbruster remark on ecocriticism and bioregionalism, ecocriticism developed from a need for making people aware of environmental degradation and it focused on the contribution to the understanding and solving of the problem. Though bioregionalism includes the general tenets of ecocriticism, it does not

[104] Bookchin, pp. 19-20
[105] Bookchin, p. 23.
[106] Peter Berg, qtd. in "Bioregionalism Comes to Japan: An Interview of Peter Berg by Richard Evanoff", **The Biosphere and the Bioregion: Essential Writings of Peter Berg**, Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Eve Quesnell, Routledge, London and New York 2015, p.139.

embrace the problem in a broader sense as ecocriticism does.[107] Such authors as Henry David Thoreau, John Muir and Aldo Leopold commonly used ecoregions or bioregions in their works in which bioregional practice and imagination take an important place. They scrutinized the natural circle, the biodiversity and the wildlife of a specific region in their works.

Under the umbrella of ecocriticism, all these basic movements contribute to the development of the ecocritical understanding and different perspectives to nature in various fields all over the world. Especially in literature, there have been significant works produced with the nature-conscious and an incisive approach trying to warn human being about the urgent environmental problems and the imminent disasters related to the ecocide in the near future.

2.3 The Phases of Ecocriticism

Over the past three decades ecocriticism has evolved into an interdisciplinary academic trend. The basis of this theory dates back to the nature-oriented studies before the coinage of ecocriticism in 1978. Going beyond probing a solely nature-writing, ecocriticism moves to a prominent position in literary world. As studies and researches are done over the future of the theory, it finds new voices, develops new tenets and faces new intersections with other disciplines. Unlike any other movement, the phases of ecocriticism cannot be identified as sequential. In other words, "the phases, labelled as waves are not a strict consecutive sequence of one another. It is a stretch of overlapping phases in the disciplinary development of the field."[108] In his book *The Future of Environmental Criticism,* Lawrence Buell suggests two waves of ecocriticism: the first wave and the second wave of ecocriticism. As the studies progress on the field of ecocriticism, a new one, the third wave, begins to emerge after 2000.

Before analyzing the three waves of ecocriticism, it would be inevitable not to touch on a notable suggestion of Kovacik for the period in which there had been pre-*Walden* environmental works. Taking all of these nature-oriented studies into account, nearly all ecocritics share the common idea that these works paved the way for Henry David Thoreau's *Walden* that is included in the first-wave of ecocriticism. Jozef

[107] Tom Lynch, Cheryll Glotfelty and Karla Armbruster, *The Bioregional Imagination: Literature, Ecology and Place*, University of Georgia Press, Athens and London 2012, p. 16.
[108] Ismaila O. Azeez, T.A.N Abubakar, E.S Akuso et al. "An Exploration of the Hermeneutical Phases of Ecocriticism", *Global Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences* , vol. 2, no. 7, September 2014, p. 1.

Kovacik recommends that "these pre-Walden works, following with Buell's division of the history of ecocriticism in waves, could be put in a bundle named the "zero wave".[109] John Lawson's *A New Voyage in Caroline*, Gilbert White's *The Natural History of Selborne* and Ralph Waldo Emerson's *Nature* can be put in this bundle as a part of zero wave.

2.3.1 The First Wave of Ecocriticism

The first period of ecocriticism can be claimed to concentrate on the nature writings only. The main purpose is to create environmental consciousness over the people through a close reading of these nature-based works. In this sense, the first wave of ecocriticism represents a conventional environmental movement. Distinguishing the development of ecocriticism into waves, Buell argues that "for first wave ecocriticism, 'environment' effectively meant 'natural environment'. In practice if not in principle, the realms of the 'natural' and the 'human' looked more disjunctive than they have come to seem for more recent environmental critics."[110] While questioning the position of nature regarded as superior to the culture, the traditional attitude towards nature includes a kind of anarchic point of view. It demands for a change in the centre of the universe occupied by human being, and invites human being to reposition the nature. The reason why it may be called anarchic is that the first wave ecocritics consider nature and culture as opposed to each other. So the desire for repositioning the nature raises the idea that eco-philosophers of the first wave calls for a conditional peace agreement between man and nature as if they fight a war for centralizing. It is clear that one of the main focuses of early ecocriticism tends to reveal and rehabilitate the disengagement between man and nature. Therefore, the first wave opts for a traditional realism in order to provide a reengagement or, maybe, reinstatement. Without using complicated literary and figurative sayings, it directly manifests what is good or what is bad and what should be done. As Oppermann claims, before it accepted "the postmodern ecology that demolishes the binary oppositions forming the foundation of Western thought and questions the legitimacy of all dualism-based meta-narratives on

[109] Jozef Kovacik, "The Influence of Henry David Thoreau's Writing on the First and Second Waves of Ecocriticism", Masaryk University Faculty of Arts, Brno 2011 (Master's Thesis), p. 49.
[110] Buell, *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination*, p. 21.

nature today", ecocriticism had prioritized "realist epistemology in the first phase it began to be structured."[111]

According to Buell, the first wave of ecocriticism deals with the traditional nature writing, the nature-oriented works and the history of nature. To protect the wilderness is one of the main topics of the period. The ecocritics included in the first wave observe the wilderness fiction that gives references to nature poetry and the wild.[112] Nature writers like Henry David Thoreau, John Muir, Mary Austin, Barry Lopez, Wendell Barry, John Burroughs, Aldo Leopold, Edward Abbey, and Terry Tempest Williams have influences on the writings of the first wave. These writings, for Özdağ, are dominated by the "organic world-view" and "man is not superior to the nature but he is a part of it and the continuity of the man depends on the healthy operation of the nature."[113] Hendry David Thoreau's *Walden*, Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, Aldo Leopold's *A Sand County Almanac* and Edward Abbey's *Desert Solitaire* are among the most important works inspiring the first wave of ecocriticism. Due to the fact that there are no precise lines between the waves, some critics claim that early ecocriticism dates back to British Romanticism. In their article named *Literature and Environment*, Buell, Heise and Thornber argue:

> Some of the most distinctive work of first-wave environmental studies focused accordingly, on Wordsworth as laureate and denizen of the English Lake Country… on the intimacy of the late Romantic poet John Clare's tie to the vanishing traditional landscape of early nineteenth-century Northamptonshire…[114]

With its radical approach to man-centred universe and radical solutions to the environmental predicament, the deep ecology movement also takes place within the boundaries of ecocriticism's first wave. According to Mary Jacobus, in *The Future of Environmental Criticism*, Buell defines how first-wave ecocritics, as deep-ecologists, are opposed to the anthropocentric view which attempts to remove "the human figure from the imaginary landscape."[115] On the other hand, the models of organic and holistic

---

[111] Oppermann, **Ekoeleştiri: Çevre ve Edebiyat**, pp. 21-22.
[112] Lawrence Buell, qtd. in Ufuk Özdağ, *Çevreci Eleştiriye Giriş: Doğa, Kültür, Edebiyat, Ürün Yayınları*, p. 38.
[113] Özdağ, p.39.
[114] L. **Buell**, U.K. Heise and Karen Thornber, "Literature and Environment", *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, vol. 36, August 2011, pp. 420-21.
[115] Mary Jacobus, *Romantic Things: A Tree, A Rock, A Cloud*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London 2012, p. 75.

world view are the intersection of both early ecocriticism and deep ecology. First wave ecocritics are largely keen on the wild which is assumed to be consisting of organic wholeness. Such common characteristics of deep ecology as self-realization, ecocentric society and biocentric egalitarianism which defends the view that all things are equally worthy is mainly rooted in the first-wave ecocriticism's nature-oriented writings. Though some critics dealing with environmental issues argue that the first phase of ecocriticism adopts a thorough discussion of nature and defends that anything except the wild is of secondary importance, it contributes much to the development of ecocriticism.

2.3.2 The Second Wave of Ecocriticism

In her introduction to *The Ecocriticism Reader*, Glotfelty turned out to be right after he stated, "Ecocriticism has been predominantly a white movement. It will become a multiethnic movement when stronger connections are made between the environment and issues of social justice, and when a diversity of voices are encouraged to contribute to the discussion."[116] Compared to the first wave, ecocriticism's second wave can be claimed to evolve into new horizons including widely-accepted issues and get in touch with more pluralist and inclusionary voices. It is significant to note that the second wave does not develop as a reaction or opposition to the early ecocriticism. Including the resources of the first wave and carrying its fund of knowledge to a step further, the second wave of ecocriticism finds the chance of representation on a large scale. As Johnson indicates the transition to the second wave:

> A product of the revived interest in nature writing in the late twentieth century, first-wave ecocriticism gave way to second-wave ecocriticism, which moves from unbuilt to built environments, from wilderness to urban landscapes, and ultimately all space, including "nonspace" (a blank page may be an environment, just as an office cubicle is an environment)[117]

The word "unbuilt" in Johnson's words stands for the space far from human intervention and the "built" is the space distorted and unnaturally created by human for building "urban landscapes". For him and the ecocritics, both are considered as the environment focused in ecocriticism's second wave. Instead of reflecting personal or individual observations and experiences, the second wave depicts an idea of socio-cultural illustrations of metropolitan areas in the environment.

---

[116] Glotfelty, p. xxv.

[117] Loretta **Johnson**, "Greening the library: The fundamentals and future of ecocriticism" , *Choice*, vol. 1, December 2009, p.8.

Buell handles this transformation as a revision whose followers, namely the practitioners of the second wave, take this sociocentric perspective further. He argues that the concept of environmental criticism has moved from natural only to urban, to the mixture of the built and natural in each space and to the explication of the local through the global. According to Buell, the first wave ecocritics' indifference to the science is surpassed by some environmental critics like Ursula Heise and Katherine Hayles who support scientifically-based green literature. However, "the discourses of science and literature must be read both with and against each other." Though scientific discourses provide a significant background, they do not play a domineering role in reading environmental literature.[118]

The second wave provides the recognition for removing the segregation of human from non-human and nature from the non-nature. Furthermore, the environment includes both nature and urban areas. The removal of the discrepancy leads the second wave ecocritics to "examine literary construction of nature beyond the discussions of setting to discussing how gender, race, and class mediate the perception of environment."[119] Thus, as argued in *Literature and Environment*, the shift makes "more sociocentric environmental ethics" and "environmental (in)justice", or eco-justice for some, the current issues in the second wave. In the article, environmental justice which "sought to show the structural links between social and environmental problems" is defined as "movements to address the unequal distribution of environmental benefits and hazards across population groups, especially by race and/or class."[120] Among the bedside books concerning these issues of the second wave of ecocriticism are *Reading Under the Sign of Nature*: *New Essays in Ecocriticism* edited by John Tallmadge and Henry Harrington in 2000, *Beyond Nature Writing: Expanding the Boundaries of Ecocriticism* edited by Karla Armbruster and Kathleen Wallace in 2001 and *The Environmental Justice Reader: Politics, Poetics and Pedagogy* edited by Joni Adamson, Mei Mei Evans and Rachel Stein who intend to give place to the multidimensional contexts including racial, sexual and social inequality in local and global scales.

[118] Buell, *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination*, pp. 1-28.
[119] Azeez, Abubakar, Akuso et al., p. 3.
[120] Buell, Heise and Thornber, p. 419.

Consequently, until the third wave, some patriarchal assumptions are redefined or altered throughout the development of ecocriticism and the connections are made with some cultural studies including gender, race and class. The non-homogeneous structure gives its place to more heterogeneous voices. However, some critics agree that no definitive map can be drawn between the first and the second wave of ecocriticism. The reason why it is difficult to determine an exact line may probably be related to the fact that ecocriticism has been not only a recent theory but also a productive field. Because this fertile theory has much to be discussed and has a potential for more development, the experts and the researchers who are involved in environmental literature make an effort to reach the next before they come to an agreement upon the preceding concepts. For instance, before the first and the second waves reach an exact clarification, the third wave discussions begin to appear. Accordingly, all these excuses lead to the overlapping developmental stages for ecocriticism. While the third wave of ecocriticism has kept carrying the scope of the early ecocriticism to the future issues, Slovic clearly indicates that "the waves don't simply end when a new wave begins."[121]

2.3.3 The Third Wave of Ecocriticism

Following Glotfelty's *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology* which is an introduction to the field and the first major collection deepening what ecocriticism is and Buell's "palimpsest" which he uses as a metaphor for the first two waves of ecocriticism, the third wave is the popular issue of the environmental literary criticism today. Adamson and Slovic declare that "the third wave recognizes ethnic and national particularities and yet transcends ethnic and national boundaries" and also "explores all facets of human experience from an environmental viewpoint"[122]. The third wave portrays an ecocritical movement which includes "all facets of human" and maybe in this way, ecocriticism reaches its broadest borderlines of all time.

Though there have been debates on to what extent ecocriticism will shelter the discourse of human and nonhuman in the last wave, the expression of "all facets of human" provides a wide range of blank spaces to be filled. Slovic, who draws the picture of the third wave, acknowledges that among the main aspects of the third wave

[121] **Slovic**, "The Third Wave of Ecocriticism: North American Reflections on the Current Phase of the Discipline", p. 5.
[122] Joni **Adamson** and Scott **Slovic**, "Guest Editors' Introduction: The Shoulders We Stand On: An Introduction to Ethnicity and Ecocriticism", *MELUS: Multi-Ethnic Literature of the US*, vol. 34, no. 2, June 2009, pp. 6-7.

are: **I**. Global concepts of place are being explored in fruitful tension with neo-bioregionalist attachments to specific locales, producing such neologisms as "eco-cosmopolitanism", "the global soul" and "translocality"; **II**. Strong comparatist impulses are raising questions about the possibility of post-national and post-ethnic visions of human experience of the environment, while some consider the importance of retaining ethnic identities but placing ethnically inflected experience in broader, comparative contexts (including postcolonial contexts); **III.** Earlier varieties of ecofeminist scholeadership have evolved into the new wave of "material ecofeminism", which has become part of the general trend towards new gendered approaches in ecocriticism, ranging from eco-masculinism and green queer theory; **IV.** Intensified focus on the concept of "animality" (evolutionary ecocriticism, ecocritical discussion of animal subjective and agency in works, linkages between ecocritical practice and lifestyle choices such as vegetarianism or omnivorianism, and expansion of the scope of environmental justice to encompass nonhuman species and their rights)[123]

As seen above, Slovic outlines the third wave by melting ethnical concepts, human and nonhuman issues, daily ecological practices and preferences in a global and cosmopolitan pot. Eventually, this mixture forces ecocriticism to become more interdisciplinary and multinational than ever before. Ecocriticism, in its third phase, tends to be in collaboration with neo-bioregionalism encapsulating the local through the lens of global, material ecofeminism voicing the impacts of globalization on women, animality which is a post-human theory exploring beyond the discrimination of human and animal, posthumanist theories practicing human, human nature and human subjectivity, postcolonial ecocriticism whose followers investigate the (post)colonial in terms of the imagination of the environment, queer theory refusing the categorization of man and woman's essential traits, environmental justice extending to nonhuman and its rights, evolutionary ecocriticism and cultural ecology. In short, for the purpose of producing new environmental discourses and drawing attention to the rising environmental problems, today's ecocriticism has applied its principles to any ecology-based cultural theories on race, class and gender. According to Opperman, ecocriticism which began as an American-based theory has now evolved into a quite different position embracing a large variety of cultures and literatures. Losing its American-

[123] Slovic, "The Third Wave of Ecocriticism: North American Reflections on the Current Phase of the Discipline", p. 7.

dominated voice, ecocriticism, as she claims, has gained a greater international legitimacy.[124] Thus, as Murphy states, the broader contribution and this revisionist approach "will also enable critics and readers such as myself, who focus primarily on American literature, to place that literature in an internationally relative and comparative framework."[125] Among the works reflecting these multicultural and transnational tenets of the third wave are *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global* by Ursula K. Heise and Joni Adamson's *American Indian Literature, Environmental Justice, and Ecocriticism: The Middle Place*.

Ecocriticism, as nature itself, can be claimed to have self-perpetuating characteristics: from wilderness to urban and then to global. Finding its roots in deep ecology, the first wave is quite traditional and seeks to protect nature which is thought as distinct from human. It is distrustful of the revision in the age of postmodernity and prefers to use realist epistemology. In the second wave, it begins to adopt heterogeneous voices mentioning about the urban, gender, race and class. The third wave represents a global view of the local, includes multidisciplinary points, reaches the broadest sense of environment and shows a tendency to postmodernism. Though the critics discuss whether today's ecocriticism is postmodernist or not, Oppermann makes a remarkable observation on the development of ecocriticism comparing it to the progress of postmodernism:

> New theories of globalization, translocal approaches, transnational ecocritical perspectives, post-humanist views, new materialism theory indicate that ecocriticism draws a new route map and that this way interestingly resembles the route map of postmodernism…For me, this change in ecocriticism shows that the field is restructured in postmodernist way.[126]

As usual, how ecocriticism follows and takes shape in the future has been an ongoing discussion recently. Before making a future-oriented assessment about the future of ecocriticism, Buell determines at least four "challenges or crises that critical movements can expect to face." The first is "the challenge of organization", the second is "the challenge of professional legitimation", the third is the challenge of defining distinctive models of critical inquiry and the final one is "the challenge of establishing

[124] Oppermann, **Ekoeleştiri: Çevre ve Edebiyat**, p. 30.
[125] Murphy, *Farther Afield In the Study of Nature-Oriented Literature*, p. 58.
[126] Oppermann, **Ekoeleştiri: Çevre ve Edebiyat**, p. 34.

their significance beyond the academy." Through the lens of these criteria, he adds that "the progress of environmental criticism in the field of literary studies has been on the whole encouraging but mixed." [127] Though some of these challenges have been overcome, it seems that there are some difficulties, as Buell claims, for the environmental criticism to face in the future.

On the other hand, many critics commonly agree that ecocriticism, in its promising future, must reach the larger masses and the other disciplines like art and music. While reaching this goal, ecocriticism had better develop something different from the other critical theories, something unusual based on prescience. The transnational critics of the field must verbalize striking discourses on the possible environmental predicament of the approaching danger: not after but before a possible third-world war.

[127] Buell, *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination*, p. 128.

CHAPTER 3

ECOCRITICAL ANALYSIS OF *LORD OF THE FLIES*

> *"Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!"*
>
> *Now out of the terror rose another desire, thick, urgent, blind.*
>
> *"Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!"*[128]

Whether men are born as sinners or not has been discussed for hundreds of years. Some claim that men are born evil while others claim that men are tainted with more as they advance in age. The issues of how the concepts of evilness and goodness originated and how they find a place in the deeper self of human have always been interrogated. Is human nature sinful in itself? If not, does man fight against an enemy that he creates by himself in the infinite beauty of the earth where every species including human has enough possibility to get along well with each other? In this sense, are children who are generally thought to have pure and clear feelings really innocent or do they have potential for savaging when they have the opportunity? In *Lord of the Flies*, William Golding reveals the responses of all these questions and he analyses the deeper sides of human nature. Just like Adam's fall onto the earth, Golding leaves a group of children alone in the nature. And then, he gracefully narrates the process of the relationship between nature and human being who gets alienated from both himself and the environment. Thus, the novel represents a mirror which the reader looks at and sees his endless hostility towards both human and non-human. Before analysing the work by wearing ecocritical glasses, it seems necessary to know about the author and the novel in order to carry out a better analysis.

---

[128] William Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, Perigee Books/Penguin, New York 1954, p. 152.

3.1 Ecocritical Golding and *Lord of the Flies*

Born into a chaotic period in which the sounds of World War I began to be heard, Golding is considered as one of the greatest British novelists who experienced both world wars and their destructive impacts on nature and human. He was raised and influenced by a rationalist and socialist father who was a science master in Marlborough Grammar School where Golding and his brother were also the students. He attended Oxford for the purpose of studying Natural Sciences. Despite the impact of his father, Golding realized that he was keen on writing and literature more than science. Then, he began to be occupied with literature and philosophy. However, he never refused the power of science and rationalism in his life. In his writing career, he would combine this scientific and rationalist root with his inner-directed philosophy. Before he came to be known, Golding had published his first work on poetry despite regarding them as unsuccessful in his later life. Apart from his *Poems*, he was also interested in drama and published a play entitled *The Brass Butterfly*.

As a matter of fact, Golding is best known for his novels. Paul Crawford identifies the scope of Golding's novels as "deployment" which exceeds "all human endeavours or actions" and classifies the deployment of his major novels in five main ways. Emphasizing Golding's socialist and Marxist tendency, Crawford observes that "first, the modes attack an English national identity that constructs itself in opposition to Nazism." To Crawford, this is reflected in *Lord of the Flies* (1954), *The Inheritors* (1955), *Pincher Martin* (1956), *Free Fall* (1959), and *Darkness Visible* (1979). Interpreting Golding's hatred of class distinction, the second is that "they expose the poisonous nature of the English class system." This takes place in *Lord of the Flies*, *The Spire* (1964), *The Pyramid* (1967), and *To the Ends of the Earth.* "Third, the modes critique religious dogmatism and authority" which is "most clearly effected in *The Spire.*" The fourth one is that "they lambast the world of depthless, postmodern literature, literary criticism, and biography" as in *The Paper Man* (1984). "Finally, they intensify a questioning of 'truth-telling' in fiction" achieved in Golding's many novels.[129] In addition to Crawford's determination, the sixth deployment can be suggested for some of Golding's novels. Encapsulating his focus on human nature, the sixth is that the modes provide an attack on man's evil side. This evil part of man

[129] Paul Crawford, *Politics and History in William Golding: The World Turned Upside Down, University of Missouri Press*, Columbia and London 2002, p.7.

creates an enemy called nature and attempts to destroy this enemy. As clearly seen, this is mainly achieved particularly in *Lord of the Flies* and also in *The Inheritors*. He is able to reflect the possible consequences of this evil side and hostile attitude in his works.

It is undoubtedly clear that the struggle between nations deeply affects the process of nature and that Golding is a writer probably aware of this circumstance due to his mission in the army. In 1940, he joined the Royal Navy in order to fight a war in favour of Britain in World War II. Throughout the war, Britain justified all kinds of damage caused by the British soldiers. As a man who has a literary spirit, he was horrified by what was happening in the war. William Golding realized the reality that environmentalist writers had warned for a long time. He witnessed the extent to which human capacity reached to cause violence for both human and nonhuman. He raises a question on the perfectibility of man through his interchanging ideas that can be interpreted from shallow ecology to deep ecology and then to humanism:

> Before the Second World War I believed in the perfectibility of social man; that a correct structure of society would produce goodwill; and that therefore you could remove all social ills by a reorganization of society. It is possible that I believe something of the same again; but after the war I did not because I was unable to. I had discovered what man could do to one another. I am not talking of one man killing another with a gun, or dropping a bomb on him or blowing him up or torpedoing him. I am thinking of the vileness beyond all words…[130]

His discourses on man here reflect how his thought on human varies from time to time. Golding first thinks of man as capable of overcoming issues in favour of man himself as shallow ecology suggests. However, he later demands a reorganization of the society whose ills may be cured through self-realization as deep ecologists do. Then, he seems to believe in the death of human subject which is a discourse adopted by post-humanist critics. Furthermore, he gives the impression of human who is too incapable of being superior and perfect to find a way out of the 'vileness'.

According to Mukadder Erkan, William Golding, as an author, "cannot be categorized by any school of English fiction. His novels, in fact, show mankind's situation in the universe. Apart from *Free Fall*, his novels are the books of isolation."[131]

---

[130] Golding, *The Hot Gates and Other Occasional Pieces*, pp. 86-87.
[131] Mukadder Erkan, "A Critical Approach to William Golding's Early Novels", Atatürk Üniversitesi SBE, Erzurum 1994 (Published Ph.D. Thesis), p. 2.

The isolation Erkan suggests naturally results in alienation and isolation of human being from his environment. From this point of view, it would be surprisingly hard for people to friendly treat the things they are not acquainted with. In fact, via his fiction, Golding depicts the source of the ecological problem. That is, mankind who cannot identify himself adequately with nature and who isolates himself from the outer space applies to his inherent nature and encounters his evil side. Then Golding's reader is forced to face the conflict between human nature and Mother Nature, and ultimately, he invites his readers to review what it means to be human on earth. That's absolutely what ecocritics search for in the texts and nearly all of these ecocritics share this ontological review as their main objective.

The image of environment and man's engagement with it is one of the outstanding themes in Golding's fictions. Thomas Wilson claims that William Golding is among the writers who obviously use the environmental imagination in English literature.[132] In his book entitled *Literary Darwinism: Evolution, Human Nature, and Literature*, Joseph Carroll takes Golding's environmental imagination too much further by considering him as a literary Darwinist. To emphasize this, Carroll additionally advocates that:

> Without preaching, without didacticism, simply by enabling us to share in his own achievement of imaginative sympathy, Golding gives new depth and breadth to our capacity for sharing in the experience of other creatures. He takes us outside the limitations of our own particular identities and our own local cultural values. He enables us to register our common nature not merely on the level of "human universals" but on the level of universals that extend beyond the characteristics of our own species.[133]

Golding's interest in and inspiration from environmental studies – maybe it is because of his pre-occupation with Natural Sciences – can be best understood through a hypothesis called 'Gaia'. Greg Garrard states that "it was the novelist William Golding who suggested the name 'Gaia', the ancient Greek Earth-goddess, for the inflection of the Earth developed by his friend James Lovelock."[134] Lovelock identifies the Earth

[132] Thomas M. Wilson, *The Recurrent Green Universe of John Fowles*, Rodopi, Amsterdam and New York 2006, p. 14.
[133] Joseph Carroll, *Literary Darwinism: Evolution, Human Nature, and Literature*, Routledge, New York and London 2004, p. 179.
[134] Garrard, p. 172.

with a self-regulating living organism. The Gaia hypothesis may be analogous to a human body. The mainland is its bones; oceans, seas and rivers are its circulatory system; the atmosphere is its respiratory tract and the living being on it is the neural system. This self-regulating circulation evokes the first law of ecology suggested by Barry Commoner: "Everything is connected to everything else."[135] Both share the idea that the damage on any part of the body will have influence on the whole body. The Gaia hypothesis has been given references by ecologists and ecocritics. Ecocriticism, particularly Deep Ecology, finds a scientific ground in Gaia hypothesis in relation to its ecocentric perspective.

Experiencing two great world wars and their destructive harms not only to a number of people but also to nature during his life, William Golding, in *Lord of the Flies*, creates an alternative microcosm to the modern world in which the wars cause environmental disasters. He pens a group of children between six and twelve who are sent to a remote and secure place because of an atomic warfare. He skilfully describes the children's relationships with both each other and the island. At first glance, the readers may think the novel is an adventurous book in which a group of children embark on a dangerous adventure. Furthermore, for his protagonists Golding uses the names Ralph and Jack, which are also the names of *Coral Island*'s protagonists. However, *Lord of the Flies* is not a children's book, it explicitly goes beyond becoming an adventurous book through its trueness to the life and its symbolical meanings. The children find themselves in a wild and untouched island where Golding frequently and insistently describes natural beauties. The author draws a picture of the huge difference taking place in this splendid wilderness between the first arrival of the children and their departure from the island. He also reveals how human beings can turn into a barbaric creature damaging brutally everywhere and everything when they follow their basic instincts. Moreover, the argument that humans are naturally evil and this evil side causes a chaos for all living organisms is proven to be right in the novel.

3.2 An Ecocentric Island Far From the War on Earth

Golding writes *Lord of the Flies* just after the World War II is over. While the novel's characters between the ages of six and twelve struggle to survive on the island

[135] Barry Commoner, *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man and Technology*, Knopf, New York 1971, pp.16-19.

fictionalized as somewhere in which there is not an established society, World War II causing the death of millions of people and the annihilation of the environment still continues. The massive destruction of the environment in the war is not unique to a special region but it surrounds the entire earth. The devastation of productive soil that provides vital contribution to the nutrition of all living beings, the loss of tree cover preventing many areas from being exposed to erosion, air-pollution poisoning humans and threatening the urban life and the chemicalization of human's environment having a lethal impact on water sources, fauna and all habitat are only several subversive results of the war. Murphy explains "the two greatest threats after World War II to the natural world" as "population growth" and "nuclear weapons". The latter "could not only kill hundreds of thousands of human beings, but also wreak havoc on the ecosystems within its fallout radius."[136]

There is no doubt that all these scars on the earth receive widespread literary attention. The socio-cultural and environmental background seems to have influence on William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, as well. He fictionalizes the nature of island in the novel as an escape from the real world in which every living being including human and nonhuman suffers from the battle.

In the work, he prepares a natural setting that is far away from the civilization occupied with an atomic war. He presents the natural rather than the built environment. Golding puts there no adult human experiencing the evil and the suffering in the world and he seems to create a place in which mankind, with his pure and innocent side like a child, faces the Mother Nature. At the beginning of the novel, a group of schoolboys are in a plane which is shot down over the island. Reminding the readers of Adam's fall into the earth, the first step on the island is accompanied with Golding's descriptions of this heavenly place. As mentioned in Chapter I, all godly and mythological discourses show that before first human comes to the earth, the nature is there waiting to embrace people as part of itself. In the same way, Golding designs an island that has never been touched by human until the arrival of the boys. Considering the fact that nature reflects its beauty best without human intervention, Golding tries to depict the environment of the island with its pure loveliness at the beginning of the novel:

[136] Murphy, *Ecocritical Explorations in Literary and Cultural Studies: Fences, Boundaries and Fields*, p. 171.

> Out there, perhaps a mile away, the white surf flinked on a coral reef, and beyond that the open sea was dark blue. Within the irregular arc of coral the lagoon was still as a mountain lake--blue of all shades and shadowy green and purple. The beach between the palm terrace and the water was a thin stick, endless apparently, for to Ralph's left the perspectives of palm and beach and water drew to a point at infinity…[137]

The environmental cycle and harmonious operation of nature is emphasized till the children's desire for domination of the island. The setting of the novel is reflected as an idyllic place and the children have possibility to reach life-supporting basic needs like fresh water and fruits. By putting these little children in this idyllic island, Golding gives them a chance to build a civilization in harmony with nature. Thus, he uses two parallel elements for the reconstruction of the earth; one is little children representing the innocence and the good, and the other is a virgin island representing the purest sense of nature. In this way, at the beginning of the novel, both human and nonhuman mechanisms in their most base state are invited to an ecological reconciliation by the author. The boys seem to be aware of the island's self-perpetuating mechanism and ecological balance because they are surprised by the island's unique beauty and they think they can enjoy here. Ralph, as if he knows that being a part of the ecocentric order on the island would make them survive in this island for a long time, says "But this is a good island. We--Jack, Simon and me—we climbed the mountain. It's wizard. There's food and drink, and, rocks, blue flowers."[138] Golding highlights the imagery of the island clearer focusing on the reality that Nature is a manifestation of God:

> Beyond the platform there was more enchantment. Some act of God--a typhoon perhaps, or the storm that had accompanied his own arrival--had banked sand inside the lagoon so that there was a long, deep pool in the beach with a high ledge of pink granite at the further end…But the island ran true to form…[139]

Above, Golding points out the early form of the island the boys first meet as soon as they arrive and adds that the natural order is as it should be. The island is described as having adequate things for the survival as Jack states "There's pigs…

[137] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.10.
[138] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.34.
[139] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.12.

There's food; and bathing water in that little stream along there--and everything."[140] The reason why the author highlights this flawless setting is his willing to tell the perfect running of ecological balance. In this alternative microcosm he creates, he tells not about a war in the real world that the children come from, but a place where nature is at the centre of the order. While there is a battle among people in the real world, the children's new world is described as somewhere unchanged by human intervention yet:

> They were on the lip of a circular hollow in the side of the mountain. This was filled with a blue flower, a rock plant of some sort, and the overflow hung down the vent and spilled lavishly among the canopy of the forest. The air was thick with butterflies, lifting, fluttering, settling.[141]

Though the concept of security is thought only by way of human security, the sense of feeling safe is not intrinsic only to only human. It is surely beyond doubt that environmental justice provided by the biocentric view has direct implications on the security of ecosystems and all living beings. While drawing a picture of an idyllic island in the novel, Golding uses a celebratory tone for the natural bliss and peace on the island. The scene before children's killing the first pig presents how the island's natural cycle makes pigs secure and blissful as a part of the eco-centred function dominating the island:

> The pigs lay, bloated bags of fat, sensuously enjoying the shadows under the trees. There was no wind and they were unsuspicious; and practice had made Jack silent as the shadows. He stole away again and instructed his hidden hunters. Presently they all began to inch forward sweating in the silence and heat. Under the trees an ear flapped idly. A little apart from the rest, sunk in deep maternal bliss, lay the largest sow of the lot. She was black and pink; and the great bladder of her belly was fringed with a row of piglets that slept or burrowed and squeaked.[142]

The word "unsuspicious" used here for the mood of the pig sums up the natural formation of the island best. Golding tries to reflect the atmosphere and to reveal some premises of the ecologically flawless island before children create an anthropocentric devastation and turn into a kind of little terminators damaging nature day by day. Commenting on the natural idyll, Prof. R. Awad, in his critical notes to *Lord of the*

[140]Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.35.
[141]Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.28.
[142]Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.134.

Flies, concludes that "there could be no clearer image of natural bliss, with the word 'unsuspicious' emphasising the Eden-like innocence of the scene."[143]

3.3 Anthropocentric and Exploitative Attitudes toward Nature

Ecocentric approach, as mentioned before, is a reaction to human supremacism over nature. Ecocriticism refuses this anthropocentric attitude which puts human ego at the centre of the planet. In the novel, the children's existence in the uninhabited island portrayed as Eden-like and idyllic poses a threat to the natural cycle through their exploitative and anthropocentric behaviours. Thus, as mentioned earlier in the analysis of ecocriticism as a discipline, Val Plumwood's contrasting pairs can be obviously seen in the novel. After the children set foot on the island, they turn into representatives of self, mind, master and subject while nature is treated as other, beast, slave and object. In this sense, by the arrival of the characters, the deserted island that is presented as the setting of the novel enters into the Anthropocene, the final epoch in which natural cycle is changed by human activities, as the Earth has already entered.

On the other hand, the earliest environmental problem begins with the opening page of the novel. Golding comments the crashing of the plane on the island as "the long scar smashed into the jungle."[144] When the rise of technology is thought of as the most visible declaration of battle between man and nature, the plane crash is the announcement of the beginning of environmental problems on the island. Namely, this crash is the first moment that the jungle meets man-made technology. As the runaway technology progresses, it leads to the production of similar voices in distant societies in terms of intoxicating the air, ruining the soil, stripping the forests bare, spoiling the water resources. That's why its arrival to the island is narrated as a scar by the author. Moreover, Golding is a man witnessing the worldwide wars that could make use of the modern technology not for the benefit of peace and safety in the planet but for making a deep wound in the heart of the planet. He could see the crying earth which suffers from the countless scars. Thus, following "a bird, a vision of red and yellow, flashed upwards with a witch-like cry"[145], the scar in the jungle is insistently emphasized by the author in the first page of the novel in order to show the negative environmental atmosphere: "The undergrowth at the side of the scar was shaken and a multitude of raindrops fell

[143] Golding, **Lord of the Flies: Text, Criticism, Giossary and Notes**, p. 284.
[144] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.7.
[145] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.7.

pattering."[146] This negative reaction of the island to this unexpected guest can be evaluated as the ecology oriented island's refusal of the technology.

The desire for depending on technology increasingly causes mankind to alienate from the green gradually. The novel indicates how mechanization and technology that disengages man from nature seem to capture human nature deeply. Golding, in his book, reveals this dependence by means of childish desires of his characters. Despite the island's fascinating natural environment, children's dreams and ambitions ironically contradict with this environment full of beauties. Although they are free individuals living in the nature of island, children seem to desire a mechanization enslaving humanity. While Ralph takes a rest under the trees, Piggy sits down next to him saying he is thinking of making a clock. And then, Ralph adds voicing his dream "And an airplane, and a TV set, … and a steam engine."[147] It is seen that designing these materials in their minds provides a sense of safety and relief because humans experience the sense of safety as they put themselves at the centre and dominate the 'other' at this point. This can only be achieved by using every means possible, for instance, the technology as a means of controlling the environment. Accordingly, Piggy repeats his wishes that the children in the jungle agree: "if only we could make a radio! Or a plane, or a boat."[148] These are the ways of breaking away from the deserted island and they can escape from the island through these technological devices. Golding invites his readers to face the similarity that human beings escape wilderness using the technology discovered through the greed of consuming and exploiting nature more efficaciously.

As God creates the earth and puts all natural elements on it before Adam's fall, the author creates a natural island in his fiction before he sends the sons of Adam into this idyllic island. Both for emphasizing the innocence of human before he pollutes and violates the earth to which he is sent by God and for evoking a sense of allusion to innocent Adam and Eve's nudity, Golding lets Ralph be nude just after he falls into the island:

[146] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.7.
[147] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.64.
[148] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.162.

> Then he leapt back on the terrace, pulled off his shirt, and stood there among the skull-like coconuts with green shadows from the palms and the forest sliding over his skin. He undid the snake-clasp of his belt, lugged off his shorts and pants, and stood there naked, looking at the dazzling beach and the water.[149]

Just like Ralph, before they begin to discover and exploit the nature of island, some children are described as naked as Adam and Eve on earth: "Some were naked and carrying their clothes; others half-naked, or more or less dressed…"[150] In addition to this allusive reference, one of the small children claims that he sees a "snake-thing"[151] in the woods. The snake, as in the stories of Adam and Eve before falling into the world, represents the evil. However, Golding tries to evoke the idea that the evil reaches the island together with human beings and this evil which is intrinsic to human will turn them into an enemy towards not only each other but also nature in the following pages.

In the same way, the religious narratives on the fall of man consider the story of Adam as the beginning of the original sin coming into the world. Moreover, ecocritics assume that the event is a turning point for the earth; for, it is the beginning of the corruption of natural world. As Gandhi comments about the human's occupation on earth: "The Earth provides enough to satisfy everyone's need, but not everyone's greed"[152]. Since the fall of the first man, the nature has turned out to be a place seen as something to be dominated and exploited by human greed. In this sense, children's fall into the island and destruction of this intact natural wonder bear a resemblance to human's exploitation of nature after he is dismissed from Eden and comes to the earth. As emphasized above, children's arrival becomes a turning point for the nature of island. After they fall, the readers can observe a man-dominated island; that is, human is located at the centre of the nature. The transition to the centre represents an anthropocentric detour which leads to breaking island's natural formation. Though the island is described as suitable for survival and for meeting their needs, the children are enslaved by their greed to rule over the nature displaying arbitrary behaviours.

This human transition to the centre in the novel can evidently be observed through Ralph's claiming possession of the island: "Ralph turned to the others. This

---

[149] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.10.
[150] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.18.
[151] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.35.
[152] Mahatma Gandhi, qtd. in Daniel Faber, *Capitalizing on Environmental Injustice: The Polluter-Industrial Complex in the Age of Globalization*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham 2008, p.1.

belongs to us."[153] Following the egocentric statement of Ralph, the author exhibits his ability to reveal the minds of children by describing their triumph of exploiting the nature of island along with its nonhuman habitants: "Eyes shining, mouth open, triumphant, they savoured the right of domination."[154] This is a confession that the natural environment maintaining a biogenetic cycle is dominated by human being now. In a similar manner, it is a reflection of mankind's having right to own and exploit the earth for self–interest throughout the ages. As if he longs for immortalizing the moment, the author tells the beginning of the end, and actually tells the fundamental tenet behind the corruption of nature. Human's passion and desire for exploitive domination over the earth is reflected once more in the novel: "Ralph spread his arms: All ours. They laughed and tumbled and shouted on the mountain." [155] This approach to the environment is the entrance into the field of freedom of nonhuman organisms. In addition to the human occupation and mastery over the nature, these scenes in the novel recall "an image of man at the centre, surrounded by things."[156] In a deeper sense, behind the human praxis aiming to move a centripetal position, there is "the delusion that we are separated from nature: that somehow we exist as independent human beings apart from the rest of the world."[157] Ralph's attitude toward the environment and the celebratory agreement of his friends seem like a manifestation of human mastery over nature. Poisoned by the greed of domination, the children are unconsciously in pursuit of self-independence that causes a disengagement from nature. The anthropocentric discourse, as it occurs in Ralph's sayings that humanity is able to achieve victory over the environment through human mind, is only an illusion based on a belief that human is superior to nonhuman. Thus, this idea of superiority becomes the source of 'the right of domination'. The children's motive of celebrating this right of possession of the island unveils the concept of dualism between self and nature. The separation between self and nature causes human to ignore his environment and prevents him from turning to his ecological self. In this sense, the lack of ecological self, as it occurs in the children on the island, turns into a mechanism alienating them from nature and into the

[153] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.29.
[154] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.29.
[155] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.30.
[156] Jonathan Bate, *The Song of the Earth*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 2000, p. 107.
[157] Intaek Oh, *Peter Matthiessen and Ecological Imagination*, Peter Lang, New York 2010, p.23.

greed of exploiting everything environing them. Therefore, the environmental problems occurring in the novel can be claimed to have their source in this alienation.

As mentioned earlier in relation to historical development of human's relationship with nature, the process of exploitation initiates through the curiosity of discovering the environment. This interest in grasping the environment arises from man's struggle to survive. Believing that only the powerful can survive, man uses the objects gained out of nature against nature on the grounds that survival requires reinforcing the superiority. As he discovers the planet, confirms his mastery over nature and adopts the anthropocentric view as a result of these, mankind utilizes the natural materials for the purpose of exploiting nature. The process of abusing nature in this way turns into a vicious cycle over time.

Sharing similar characteristics with this cycle, *Lord of the Flies* transparently manifests the process of exploitation. After the meeting in which Ralph is chosen as chief of the boys, he says: "three of us will go on an expedition and find out"[158]. They don't want to be unguarded and unknowledgeable about the island. So, the recognition that whether the nature of island is appropriate for their survival is the prior condition of the hegemony over the nature. Following the discovery of the island and what it includes, the boys ensure that they can enjoy here because there are many things they need. Jack, who yearns for killing a living thing, finds a stick and sharpens it to make a spear. Throughout the novel, he is seen as lifting and swinging his spare passionately that can be seen as a symbol of hunting the nature. Following his first abortive attempt to kill a pig, he asks for developing his material making barbs with the intention of giving more harm:

> "We want meat" "And we don't get it." Now the antagonism was audible. "But I shall! Next time! I've got to get a barb on this spear! We wounded a pig and the spear fell out. If we could only make barbs"[159]

The image of spear with barbs wished to be used for killing a pig above recalls Lynn White Jr.'s environmental criticism on the exploitation of nature. In the aforementioned *Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis*, he attacks earlier calendars which "show men coercing the world around them-ploughing, harvesting, chopping trees, butchering

[158] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.24.
[159] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.51.

pigs. Man and nature are two things, and man is master."[160] In this regard, Jack's sense of mastery over nature gives him the right to exploit for the sake of his desire for spilling blood though eating meat is not of vital importance both for him and the other boys as implied in the novel.

The nature writer Mabel Wright, in her work entitled *Life Outdoors and Its Effect Upon Nature*, claims that no source in the history of literature and art indicates that people have loved nature. On the contrary, these writings focus on the value of food and meat instead of loveliness. Revealing the desire for chasing food and meat in earlier writings, Wright also notes that "we had the explorer, the trapper, and the hunter, - in fact I believe that with man as with other animals the primary instinct is to hunt…"[161] The reflection of exploring, trapping and hunting anything found in nature into literature is the symptom of exalting the exploitation through a human-centred point of view. Hunters, hunting and the wish for eating meat become an important part of *Lord of the Flies* as well as in the writings Wright indicates. The children are divided into groups sharing the works to be done on the island. With the agreement of all children, Jack and his choir assume the role of hunters: "Ralph waved again for silence. They can be—what do you want them to be? Hunters."[162] Later on, they become hunters eager to get armed using spears for trapping and chasing after pigs. They adopt this role and, for them, hunting and finding meat is the most important work to be done on the island. However, they are willing to do this work not because they die of hunger but because they desperately have the greed of exploiting and dominating something living in the nature. William Golding shows how those children's game for hunting transforms into an abusive and disturbing action after they kill a pig:

> "I cut the pig's throat," said Jack, proudly, and yet twitched as he said it. "Can I borrow yours, Ralph, to make a nick in the hilt?" The boys chattered and danced. The twins continued to grin. "There was lashings of blood," said Jack, laughing and shuddering, "you should have seen it!"[163]

With the enthusiasm felt by the victory of exploitation reflected in the passage above, children are not satisfied with what they have on the island. It is understood that as they

---

[160] White Jr., p. 1205
[161] Mabel Osgood Wright, qtd. in "Mabel Osgood Wright on Nature, Gender, Outdoor Life and Fiction", **A Century of Early Ecocriticism**, Ed. David Mazel, The University of Georgia Press, Athens 2001, p.154
[162] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.23.
[163] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.69.

manage to dominate the island and exploit the sources arbitrarily, this achievement turns into a capitalist practice and children want more and more. After Jack proudly tells the abundance of pig's blood, he voices his greed for more exploitation: "We'll go hunting every day."[164]

Though the invention of fire is thought of as highly beneficial on account of serving human needs for heating, lighting and protecting from wild animals, many ecocritics agree that people using fire as a land management tool have failed in the management of fire and misused it for ages. Particularly, forest fires are the primary reason for the deforestation which has been a planetary issue today. The use of fire in *Lord of the Flies* is another important aspect demonstrating human-centred praxis and exploitation of nature. As it is seen in the long history of humanity, the children fail in controlling the fire while they intervene in natural atmosphere on the island. The misuse of fire and its ravaging impact on the nature of island is told in two parts. In chapter II entitled "Fire on the Mountain", Golding evokes the feeling that the island would be annihilated by the arbitrary use of the fire at the end of the novel. Ralph finds a way to be rescued from the island and he offers to set a fire hoping that a plane may see the smoke rising out of fire: "So we must make smoke on top of the mountain. We must make a fire."[165] The children use Piggy's glasses and manage to start a fire. However, the unconscious attempt to make an innocent fire becomes a torture for the mountain:

> Smoke was rising here and there among the creepers that festooned the dead or dying trees… Acres of black and yellow smoke rolled steadily toward the sea. At the sight of the flames and the irresistible course of the fire, the boys broke into shrill, excited cheering…Beneath the capering boys a quarter of a mile square of forest was savage with smoke and flame.[166]

Golding describes this fire on the mountain with nearly one page. Any people who read the whole passage above can easily see that the author tells the spread of the flame, the chaos and natural destruction brought to the island through a pathetic and a piteous tone as if his ecological self is crying for the devastation of nature.

However, the reaction of the children to the fire is very different from Golding's grief. The children's scream of joy during the fire is explicitly related to

[164] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.70.
[165] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.38.
[166] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.44.

human exceptionalism. They seem to enjoy while the trees agonize over the fire. The children watching the burning plants are not able to empathize with the nature because they come from an environment in which people observe everything with regard to human experience and values. For instance, though Piggy is aware of that the children "build a bonfire that isn't no use", he interprets this situation in terms of an anthropocentric aim: "Won't we look funny if the whole island burns up? Cooked fruit, that's what we'll have to eat, and roast pork."[167] The burning of the whole island leads Piggy to think of what he is going to eat or how he will benefit from the island. Piggy's approach to the natural problem can be identified with shallow ecology aforementioned in Chapter II. Shallow ecology does not reject anthropocentrism totally and offers a solution for the benefit of human to keep exploiting; in other words, it wants to preserve vegetation so that people can eat fruits and vegetables. Accordingly, Piggy criticizes the flame of the island so that the children can eat something on the island.

In the last chapter, Golding reflects how devastating the use of fire savagely by human can be. At the end of the novel, Ralph falls afoul of Jack and his gang who seek to catch Ralph hidden in the forest. In a daring way, though they experienced how dangerous the fire was for their environment, they started a fire in the forest in order to smoke Ralph out of the place he hides himself: "They had smoked him out and set the island on fire."[168] However, their former experience as human beings means nothing for them because they are unable to "think like a mountain"[169] as Leopold says as a reaction to the anthropocentric thought otherizing natural environment in his famous book *A Sand County Almanac*. Consequently, the whole island is on fire this time. The impact of the battle fought among children is seen on nature once more: "those volleying shots were great limbs, trunks even, bursting. The fools!" Golding mockingly keeps reminding shallow ecological vision of human again: "The fools! The fire must be almost at the fruit trees—what would they eat tomorrow?"[170] Eventually, along with this human-instigated disaster demolishing the nature of island, the author reveals how anthropocentric practices and exploitative approach contribute to the idyllic island's transformation into the subject of an apocalyptic scenario.

[167] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.45.
[168] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.197.
[169] Leopold, p. 132.
[170] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.198.

On the other hand, the author's choice of boys' nationality is highly meaningful, or even ironic. Britain, known as a place where Industrial Revolution and its impacts were first seen, cannot be claimed to have positive marks on environmental history. Furthermore, England is one of the countries taking place in both world wars making deep wounds in the heart of the earth. To crown it all, many developed countries including England are accused of overconsumption and overexploitation of natural sources causing environmental havoc by the ecologists. Due to the abuse of natural sources and market-based environmental policies leading to heavy air pollution, approximately four thousands of Londoners lost their lives in 1952. Although Britain has constituted so-called environmental laws in recent years, the country has not been at peace with nature since Industrial Revolution. In *Lord of the Flies*, Golding emphasizes being a British man and/or an English man on an uninhabited island. While the children argue that they must have a regular life organized by social rules, Jack begins to speak after Ralph: "I agree with Ralph. We've got to have rules and obey them. After all, we're not savages. We're English, and the English are best at everything. So we've got to do the right things."[171] The children's aims are as ironic as the fact that ecocriticism first rises in the West condemned by the persecution of nature. It is understood that they look forward to re-establishing the collapsed modern Western civilization on the island. Actually, what Ralph and Jack offer to do on the island is a manifestation of Western discourse. Though they try to impose these discourses, the novel ends with a disappointment because children become best at killing each other and the nature by doing the wrong things. In this respect, the traces of colonialist Western attitudes are felt in this island. Gogoi articulates this exploitative Western colonization over the nature as responsible for the present day environmental predicament:

> While the reshaping of nature has been executed throughout human history, the episode of European colonialism is the most outstanding example of human interference with nature as the whole enterprise of colonization was based on the idea of exploiting nature and its resources. The Western cultural tradition of using nature for human benefits was most strongly propounded through colonialism. In fact, it is not only during the era of colonization, but the practice against nature is being carried out in the neocolonial period in the present day circumstances.

[171] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.42.

> Therefore the blame for environmental crisis falls primarily on the West as it is inspired by the Western principle of separation of the human from the non-human.[172]

As claimed above, the Western cultural tradition is based on the exploitation of nature and this is kept alive in a deserted island by the children who were born into this tradition in the territory they come from. This situation is quite surprising for a British adult who sets foot on the island. In the final page of the novel, after realizing the smoke rising up from the island, the British naval officer arrives on the island to save the children and witnesses the devastation. He has difficulty in expressing his feelings in front of the scene he sees: "I should have thought, said the officer as he visualized the search before him, I should have thought that a pack of British boys--you're all British, aren't you?--would have been able to put up a better show than that--I mean--"[173] Golding here invites Western culture and civilization to face what it leaves behind for the next generation. What would the children do grown in a post-colonialist age but exploiting and killing? Certainly, like their ancestors, they would devastate this untouched island even though they are Westerners who always 'do the right things'.

As human beings alienate from nature and diverge from its beauties, regaining the natural products back become purchasable. Namely, after destroying natural areas for the construction, people pay huge amounts of money to make a garden in front of these buildings. The human-induced harms are thought to be compensated through capital. The more people are estranged from nature, the more they pay to have it. Thus, the exploitation turns into a vicious cycle. In the novel, the value of a natural conch on the island is expressed through its price of money by Piggy: "a conch; ever so expensive. I bet if you wanted to buy one, you'd have to pay pounds and pounds and pounds—he had it on his garden wall, and my auntie."[174] Piggy's approach to the conch is a clear indication of human view of nature. Human being whose natural living environment is limited to artificial concrete structures in the towns tends to be interested in nature's purchasable sides instead of its natural value. According to the classical principle of the economy, the cost of a product changes due to its availability; the less it is available, the more it costs. As a dramatic conclusion of the exploitation of the nature,

---

[172] Gitanjali **Gogoi**, "An Ecocritical Approach to Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* and *Arrow of God* ", *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 19, Issue 11, November 2014, p.1.
[173] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.202.
[174] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.16.

and of the anthropocentric lifestyle, people are having difficulty reaching these natural objects. In this respect, a simple conch is treated like something out of this world. In Piggy's eyes, the conch does not carry an ecological value; instead, it is a material to be exploited and sold in exchange for pounds and pounds.

3.4 Hierarchical Disorder as a Source of Ecological Crisis

Just after human occupation in the earth and his passion for mastery over everything environing him, the socio-ecological order undergoes a deep change. In the period dating back to the preliterate communities, human seems to be dependent on nature; however, he later develops a strong will to evaluate himself as independent from nature in the course of time. Even when he is required to see himself as a part of nature, his position has not become lower than the top in the ecological system. Humans have not remained as an individual being while having the superiority over nature. That is, they establish societies, groups and organizations like hunters, gatherers, scientists and decision-makers each of which take different parts in this ecological hierarchy. No matter whatever these groups include, nature, eventually, ranks the lowest level. This social hierarchy based on the power in terms of physical and economic conditions causes not only the constitution of ecological hierarchy but also the ecological differentiation in the natural formation. The failure and the disorder in hierarchical system contribute to the corruption of nature. Bookchin clearly states that hierarchy lies behind the basis of dualism between society and nature. According to him:

> Hierarchy established itself not only objectively, in the real, workaday world, but also subjectively, in the individual unconscious. Percolating into virtually every realm of experience, it has assimilated the syntax of everyday discourse- the very relationship between subject and object, humanity and nature.[175]

Each member of the island community Golding creates is defined by certain roles. The ecological crisis in the novel can be regarded as a result of the failure of this social hierarchy. Also, the disorder appears through the struggle among the characters structured in the hierarchical lineage. This struggle is not only between man and man but also between man and nature. Anthropocentric actions and exploitation of the nature of island makes nature an oppressed character. That's why nature, as unequal to human or organizations created by human, must be included in this hierarchy. As from the

[175] Bookchin, p. 63.

children's fall into the island, Golding begins to depict the children's struggle of survival as a part of ecological hierarchy on the island. In this sense, they are integrated in the flawless ecological system. The fact that there is the problem of inequality and injustice wherever human being exists is also another problem handled in the novel. Though the concept of inequality is discussed over notions of gender, class and race in many novels, the physical power determines the structure of hierarchy in *Lord of the Flies*. The differentiation by physical appearance is stated in the novel:

> The smaller boys were known now by the generic title of "littluns." The decrease in size, from Ralph down, was gradual; and though there was a dubious region inhabited by Simon and Robert and Maurice, nevertheless no one had any difficulty in recognizing biguns at one end and littluns at the other. The undoubted littluns, those aged about six, led a quite distinct, and at the same time intense, life of their own.[176]

Thus, Ralph and Jack are presented to take place in the highest level in the hierarchical order of the island as decision-makers. Piggy comes after these boys because of his assistive teachings to the elected leader, Ralph, and of his scientific approaches to the problems that can be argued in an environmental point of view. The hunters who were formerly Jack's choir are also an important part of the ecological hierarchy. After that, the littluns spend time by gathering and enjoying irresponsibly and they obey the decisions taken by the biguns. When considered a hierarchical ecology, Simon takes place close to the bottom with nature because of his ecosophical vision which causes him to be destroyed like nature at last. In a natural environment in which social life is not organized, neither class nor money determines the position in nature. In the novel, the biguns decide and manage while the littluns obey. Eventually, in this hierarchical order, the nature ranks the lowest level due to their contempt and exploitation.

Ralph is elected as a chief on the island because of the conch. Though many literary critics regard him as the defender of democracy and regard his conch as the sword of the democracy, Ralph, with his actions and thoughts, cannot signify a wholly environmentalist character. As in real life, the leaders of many countries are not willing to take adequate and strict cautions for environmental protection; however, all of them share the same idea that the democracy is an absolute must. Yet the equality that is

[176] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.59.

thought to be provided by the democratic rights is only for human; unfortunately it does not contribute anything for the exploitation of non-human. Despite Ralph's attempts for maintaining the order and the harmony, his decision to light a fire causes "a quarter of a mile square of forest" to be annihilated "with smoke and flame."[177] Ralph is also aware of his failure as a leader. Golding questions his ability to administrate and the readers are told about his thought on the leadership: "Only, decided Ralph, as he faced the chief's seat, I can't think. Not like Piggy."[178] He only seems to be good at organizing assemblies in which the decisions of no use are taken and the advices are given. However, in Ralph's leadership, all happenings including the nature and the natural beauty of the island diminish gradually. Similarly, in the world, many assemblies are organized and people make decisions of no use; yet the environmental calamity as the most important problem of the planet approaches day by day. Namely, the situation is similar to what causes an environmental crisis in the novel:

> We have lots of assemblies. Everybody enjoys speaking and being together. We decide things. But they don't get done. We were going to have water brought from the stream and left in those coconut shells under fresh leaves. So it was, for a few days. Now there's no water. The shells are dry. People drink from the river.[179]

The life-style called civilization actually refuses what is 'natural'. The image of a man who is engaged in nature or covered with mud or dust like a child playing outside or like man occupying with his garden contradicts the image of a good-looking man imposed by civilization. In *Lord of the Flies*, Ralph is situated at the top of the hierarchy on the island, so his attitude and his view are significant for the protection of the nature as a leader. In this respect, his view to what is natural seems to be the same with the principles of civilization. Through Ralph's strict defence of civilization, the novel exhibits the contrast between 'civilized' and 'natural'. Ralph underestimates his friends because of their most natural conditions. He is uncomfortable with this natural image that lacks unnatural cleaning materials used by a civilized man:

> With the memory of his sometime clean self as a standard, Ralph looked them over. They were dirty, not with the spectacular dirt of boys who have fallen into mud or been brought down hard on a rainy day. Not one of them was an obvious subject for

[177] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.44.
[178] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.78.
[179] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.79.

> a shower, and yet--hair, much too long, tangled here and there, knotted round a dead leaf or a twig…[180]

Ralph shares the top of the ecological hierarchy with Jack. Though Ralph is elected a leader, he maintains a conflict with Jack from the beginning of the novel. Then, Jack overtakes Ralph as chief through his savage and cruel traits. Jack is likened to a dictator who tortures his public and manages by anti-democratic ways. Yet it is commonly forgotten that the nature of island also suffers most by Jack's anti-nature actions. Jack's actions mostly bear the negative traces of human interaction with nature throughout the history. Throughout his life on the island, Jack is only interested in punishing those who resist his mastery, hunting and killing other living creatures. In *Lord of the Flies*, his role is of vital importance because of his egocentric approaches to any living being except him. Hunting, for Jack, is an indication of having power over both the boys and the nature. He uses the ability of hunting and the act of killing to take place at the top this hierarchy and eventually he manages to reach his aim. Unfortunately, what allows his being at the peak of the ecological hierarchy is not knowledge, virtue and morality but is his power of exploitation. In this respect, this hierarchical disorder leads to devastation on the island. As mentioned before, Jack's decision to set the whole island on fire for catching Ralph who hides is the worst and the silliest decision that can be taken by a chief because this decision is the end of the island and its creatures inside it. Thus, the most intensive damage given to nature is caused by someone who claims to have ability to manage environmental cycle.

There is no doubt that Jack's desire for playing a game of war on the island cannot be distinguished from his background. Jack's image created with "sharpened stick about five feet long"[181], "bloodied knife in his hand"[182] and his desire for "an army-- for hunting pigs"[183] evokes the idea of his carrying the war fought by the adults in the real world into the island. As these adults give harm to both nature and each other, Jack assumes the role of a military leader in a British army by killing Piggy and other living creatures on the island. Furthermore, Jack is also a leader of church choir. Many ecocritics agree that Christianity is an anthropocentric religion and Christian church, particularly in the age when church plays an administrative role in social

[180] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.110.
[181] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.48.
[182] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.71.
[183] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.32.

hierarchy, not only justifies that environmental cycle exists for the benefit of human being but also it paves the way for abusing nature for human benefit. In this sense, Jack seems to adopt an ecclesiastic view of nature. The reason why he does not feel discomfort with his increasing greed and cruelty against nature and with his belief that the powerful have the right to survive can be identified with his church background. For Jack, the nonhuman on the island serves for their survival and spending good time on the island by hunting and eating meat. Before being rescued from the island, Jack desires to enjoy as much as he can through spilling blood of a living being: "Rescue? Yes, of course! All the same, I'd like to catch a pig first."[184] He despises anything that he cannot utilize, because it has no use for him. When Simon finds green candles, Jack's first attempt is to check whether it is useful or not: "Green candles, said Jack contemptuously. We can't eat them. Come on."[185]

As another important character in the novel, Piggy's reasoning ability is approved due to his scientific and rationalist approaches while overcoming the problems in the novel. However, human mind and science are not considered as adequate solutions that can say stop to the ongoing environmental crisis. Moreover, the scientific solutions are found quite anthropocentric that only give precedence to human comfort. Obviously, the science and technology are seriously accused of contributing ecological degradation by most ecocritics. Golding narrates this situation using Piggy as the representative of science and human mind. The rational attitude of Piggy never becomes related to maintaining the environmental cycle. Piggy's nearly all warnings and reactions on the island are the resistance to the mistaken practices endangering human survival. His belief is also based on a human delusion that environmental problems will somehow be healed. On the island, he claims to "know that what goes on and if there's something wrong, there's someone to put it right" and further adds that "you have doctors for everything, even the inside of your mind."[186] Yet, the corruption of nature on the island does not prove Piggy's theory based on "life is scientific, that's what it is."[187] As Allan Fitzsimmons states, reconstructing "harmony within nature or to allow nature to return to a balance presumably upset by clumsy humans is out of touch with

[184] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.53.
[185] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.30.
[186] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.84.
[187] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.84.

current scientific understanding." [188] In an eco-scientific notion, the scientific precautions taken after the corruption may be too late to reestablish the harmony and only the nature undisturbed is balanced and harmonious.[189] In one of the assemblies where the problems are tried to be solved through human mind, Ralph, contrary to Piggy, is eventually aware of the fact that supremacy of human mind or sanity is not adequate for solving the problems on the island: "To Ralph, seated, this seemed the breaking up of sanity…and when one tried to get the thing straight the argument sheered off, bringing up fresh, unpleasant matter.[190]

Apart from the characters including decision-makers like Ralph, Jack and Ralph's advisor Piggy, the biguns including Roger, Maurice, Robert, Samneric, Bill, Harold and the littluns including Percival, Johnny, Henry, Phil, Wilfred and Stanley assume the role of a hunter-gatherer society. The survival of hunter-gatherer people, as well as the children in the novel, is mainly based on the forest resources. Tim Ingold believes that hunter-gatherers, compared to other social structures, develop healthier relationships with nature. The domination and the exploitation causing an environmental crisis are not initial aims for their approach to the non-human environment. For him, they intend to establish a dialogue with their environment.[191] In *Lord of the Flies*, it is possible to see the exact opposite. The hunters, consisting of Jack and his choir largely, are more aggressive against nature than the littluns. They own sharpened sticks ready to perform an act of killing a living being. Roger, for instance, is reflected as a blood-thirsty boy who pursues the desire to spill blood with other biguns. The littluns, on the other hand, gather fruits, play games and aimlessly participate in the assemblies. However, as Martin Amis criticizes the human impact on earth saying "we turned paradise into a toilet"[192], the littluns disrespectfully turn the island into a toilet. Though the rocks beyond the bathing pool are chosen as a toilette so that the tides can clean, the children "seem to use anywhere. Even near the shelters and the platform."[193]

---

[188] Allan K. Fitzsimmons, *Defending Illusions: Federal Protection of Ecosystems*, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, Maryland 1999, p. 154.
[189] Garrard, p. 56-58
[190] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.88.
[191] Tim Ingold, "From Trust to Domination: An Alternative History of Human-Animal Relations", **Animals and Human Society: Changing Perspectives**, Eds. Aubrey Manning and James Serpell, Routledge, London and New York 1994, pp. 9-17.
[192] Martin Amis, qtd. in, Brian Finney, *Martin Amis: Routledge Guides to Literature*, Routledge, New York 2008, p. 21.
[193] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.80.

Though he is a bigun and a part of Jack's hunter group as a member of choir, Simon is the only boy who can keep up a dialogue with nature. Moreover, he is the only human in the novel who possesses ecological wisdom. Simon represents the goodness and he never kills or damages any other living beings. Instead, he is narrated as a kind child sharing his food with Piggy and helping the littluns in picking fruits they could not reach. He makes an impression of a man at peace with nature by being alone in nature and watching the butterflies dancing. Simon's unusual approach to the environment makes the children think that he is a boy exhibiting strange behaviours. Simon is different for them because he is able to communicate with nature and see that the real enemy for them is not within the nature, but inside the human. Simon faces the pig's head cut off by the hunters, which represents lord of the flies. This conversation can be identified with a man's dialogue with nature. The author eventually ceases the silence of oppressed nature and gives voice to it: "You knew, didn't you? I'm part of you?"[194] Through this conversation, it can be claimed that Simon turns to his ecological self or acquires self-realization. As Naess states, self-realization is the ultimate norm of ecosophy in which "comprehensive Self (with a capital "S") embraces all the life forms on the planet (and elsewhere?) together with their individual selves (*jivas*)."[195] In this sense, understanding that the evil exists inside the human being and that this evil otherizes nature as an enemy, Simon is reflected as an ecosopher who is able see the reality behind the delusion.

Though all these positive features, Simon becomes the victim of his ecosophical vision. Simon is killed by the children when he tries to tell the truth he discovers. It is not a coincidence that Golding does not let the children learn the truth because Golding invites his readers to face the fact that the other children killing living creatures on the island, burning the forest and dominating the nature are not ready to possess ecological wisdom through Simon's teachings. It recalls Plato's allegory of the cave in which the prisoners kill anyone who tries to demonstrate the reality out of the cave. The reality is that human is a beast threatening the nature and Simon is the ecosopher killed during his attempt to show the truth. The rest of the children are also environmentally blind prisoners imprisoned on the island.

[194] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.80.
[195] Naess, "The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects", p. 80.

The death of such a character indicates the hierarchical disorder on the island. Under ecology oriented conditions, Simon likened to an ecosopher with his ecological vision and other values had better be at the top of the social hierarchy on the island instead of Jack or Ralph. This evokes the question that what if Simon is chosen as a leader and the children are guided by this ecologically wise character? Precisely, the animals would not be killed, the forest would not be destroyed and the non-human environment would not suffer from the anthropocentrism. The reconciliation with nature would be possible through his visionary recipes for the problems.

In *Lord of the Flies*, nature is seen as the subaltern. Most of the critics evaluating the novel often aim to focus on human issues and raise a question on human nature; yet, it is surely beyond doubt that the nonhuman nature in the novel is adversely affected by human interference. The idea that nature not equal to human is doomed to fade away clearly occurs in the novel. As it fades away gradually, Golding makes the voices of nature heard as if it is one of his characters. In addition to pig head's symbolical speech for Simon, the nature seems to be extremely disturbed by human's torture throughout the novel. This disturbance is reflected with some sounds like "whine of insects"[196], sigh and roar of the trees[197] and "grumble of the forest."[198] As the story progresses in the novel, the nature produces only suffering sounds: "A herd of pigs came squealing out of the greenery behind the savage and rushed away into the forest. Birds were screaming, mice shrieking, and a little hopping thing came under the mat and cowered."[199] Despite all screams of nature that can only be perceived by the author, it cannot be heard by the sons of Adam on the island. Due to nature's position reflected as being at the lowest rank value in the hierarchy of *Lord of the Flies*, the children who are at the top in this hierarchy become deaf toward nature. Consequently, in the hierarchical disorder, the voice of the subaltern means nothing for the superior and this silence of nature causes the expansion of ecological crises in the novel.

3.5 Human-Nature Enmity

Human being has struggled with nature from the beginning of time and particularly in early times natural disasters made man perceive nature as an empire of fear. Later on, nature has become a victim through man's rising domination and control

[196] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.49.
[197] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.98.
[198] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.197.
[199] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.199.

over her. It is hardly surprising then that man's occupation in nature has deepened the opposition between man and nature. This struggle has eventually reached an irreparable point causing a violent enmity. Furthermore, "with all her forces", as Korucu claims, "nature now tries to resist against the human dominance and moreover comes to threaten him."[200]

Human history has proved that creating an enemy is intrinsic in man who is accustomed to existing with this enemy. In a word, human being needs to create an enemy which is required for man to be a hero. The fact that he considers himself as a superior creature paves the way to his will for desiring to be a hero. In this sense, he may feel incomplete without putting an enemy just opposite to himself as contrasts like hero-anti-hero (enemy), love-hatred and good-evil exist with its counterpart. His desire for invention of an enemy around, when coupled with the destruction and annihilation motives, leads him to regard both human and nonhuman life as things to be tortured and ruined. According to Maxine Sheets-Johnstone:

> The enemy is hence a psychic figure evoking not just fear but hatred, and in turn, a figure from whom one does not in actually just turn away or even run from as one might from a stranger, but a figure whom one wants in turn to kill and exterminate.[201]

In accordance with his description of the concept of enemy, he objects to Alfred Tennyson's view of nature in *In Memoriam A.H.H* which depicts nature as cruel and also views it as red in tooth and claw. He claims that "human history- biblical texts included- shows indisputably that what is red in tooth and claw are human groups, tribes and nations."[202]

In *Lord of the Flies*, the little heroes of the novel grow hostility to both each other and the nature. However, William Golding invites his readers to face the fact that the enemy exists within human beings. It is beyond doubt that the beast or the enemy on the island is the very part of the characters. As mentioned above, it comes out that the one who is red in tooth and claw is quite different from what the children presume. Indeed, it is understood that the island is reflected as a microcosm of the earth exposed

---

[200] Arzu **Korucu**, "Loss of Innocence: The Enemy Archetype in *Lord of the Flies*", *8th International Idea Conference: "Studies in English"*, Muğla 2014, p. 47.
[201] Maxine **Sheets-Johnstone**, "The Enemy: A Twenty-first Century Archetypal Study", *Psychotherapy and Politics International***,** Vol. 8, No. 2, May 2010, p. 149.
[202] **Sheets-Johnstone**, p. 149.

to the human's hostile attitudes. From the beginning that the plane is shot down on the island, the children's process of adaptation to the island's conditions and the island's gradual deterioration can be identified with the human history since Adam's fall.

The boys in the novel cannot be claimed to be innocent due to their ages, that is, the evil within the children seems to be suppressed by the society and its rules. Roger, for instance, threw the stone at Henry but he intentionally aims to miss because "Roger's arm was conditioned by a civilization."[203] Though their past is limited by the prohibition and restrictions, they ignore these restrictions afterwards and the traces of the civilization are seen to be disappeared gradually. This raises the debate over whether the evil, which is the primary source of the instinct of creating an enemy, is innate or gained later. Golding probably seems to defend the former one. Nevertheless, the hostile approach to the nature in the novel would definitely be quite different if the children did not experience the ongoing war in the world and were a part of a real civilization depending on peace with nature. In his *Enemy of Nature*, Joel Kovel states that the natives in Amazon manage tocreate new ecosystems promoting the diversification of species. They also use controlled burnings as American Indians do for the enhancement of fertility. Thus, according to Kovel:

> Far from being a congenital enemy of nature, then, humans can be a part of nature that catalyses nature's own exuberance. This ecologically creative activity is reserved, however, for those whose human ecology is closely configured to the varying natural ecologies with which it interacts, so that the combined human–natural ecosystem is integral and differentiated rather than disintegrated and split.[204]

Whatever the conclusion of the debate above is, the enmity towards nature stems from the way of life they are inherited in the real world. In this situation, the crucial point is that what kind of a world is inherited to the children as well as what kind of children is inherited to the world by human beings.

Representing the cruellest enemy of the nature in the novel, Jack can be claimed to suit well to Tennyson's monster red in tooth and claw. His acts and attitudes reflect all characteristics of a man being foe to the nature. That's why his practices in the novel are of crucial importance in terms of hostility towards nature. His struggle to

---

[203] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.62.
[204] Joel Kovel, *The Enemy of Nature: The End of Capitalism or the End of the World*?, Zed Books, London and New York 2007, pp. 119-120.

spill blood of a living being in the novel is a suppressed inherent instinct and this is disclosed by vandalism. For instance, after his first attempt to kill a pig fails "he snatched his knife out of the sheath and slammed it into a tree trunk" and his sense of enmity is so intense and his hatred for a living nonhuman being is so heavy that "next time there would be no mercy"[205] for Jack. It is not coincidence that his statement that he will be merciless for the next time comes right after sticking his knife into a tree trunk. His knife, indeed, indicates the enemy target he is inclined to attack. On the other hand, this enmity is not an earthly battle whose result includes one winner and one loser. There is no doubt that the harm given to nature turns back to human ultimately. Jack thinks that "you can feel as if you're not hunting, but-being hunted, as if something's behind you all the time in the jungle."[206] This feeling of him is a manifestation of the consequence of the relationship between man and nature. In fact, it can easily be seen that he talks about a vicious cycle by which both sides are affected. More precisely, human, seeming to be decisive in keeping this enmity, is the only creature who is mostly influenced and who finally realizes that he is not hunting but being hunted like Jack.

This sense of being hunted by nature indicates the despair of human beings. The reason why man feels despair is that he cannot completely succeed in dominating nonhuman beings. His level of domination is limited to his power. Namely, man is not able to interfere with the sunrise or with the rotation of the earth. He can only cope with nature as far as his human characteristics allow him to do. This inadequacy is the fundamental point triggering the intension of enmity. Man, who cannot take the exact control over the nature, feels himself restricted and isolated and then the sense of isolated existence poses a danger for his environment including human and nonhuman, for he needs to break this isolation and this can be provided by his hegemony. The same situation can be witnessed in the novel as well. The isolated existence of the children characters in the novel promotes a particular human attitude towards nature. To put it simply, Henry playing along the beach cannot help being satisfied with his hegemony and mastery over the little creatures:

> He poked about with a bit of stick, that itself was wave-worn and whitened and a vagrant, and tried to control the motions of the scavengers. He made little runnels

[205] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.31.
[206] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.53.

> that the tide filled and tried to crowd them with creatures. He became absorbed beyond mere happiness as he felt himself exercising control over living things. He talked to them, urging them, ordering them. Driven back by the tide, his footprints became bays in which they were trapped and gave him the illusion of mastery.[207]

Though Henry is too little to be aware of any hostility, he innately tends to act like a man capturing an enemy soldier. The feeling of being imprisoned in a deserted island creates an ontological uneasiness for him, because he leaves his superiority in the real world he comes from. The ontological uneasiness caused by his despairing insufficiency against the nature leads him to bear hostility against the nonhuman beings he can cope with. For the sake of suppressing his isolated existence or insufficiency, Henry bears hostility and turns to dominate little scavengers. In this regard, his hegemony makes him satisfied and relaxed and also allows him breaks his isolated existence finally.

However, Henry's illusion of mastery or the children's hostile attitudes produce nothing but a fictitious triumph. During the first tour for the invention of the island, Ralph, Jack and Simon meet a large rock and they aimlessly try to push it down the forest. Surprisingly enough, Golding pretends to draw a picture of a battle scene in which the enemies- nature on the one hand and the children on the other hand- collide: "The assault on the summit must wait while the three boys accepted this challenge."[208] Moreover, after the rock falls down smashing "a deep hole in the canopy of the forest", the children cry out of happiness comparing the impact of the rock to "a bomb". Golding mockingly conveys this situation as a "triumph" over their enemy. However, this enmity is not a feeling that paves the way to human's triumph for the author who does not avoid telling the disturbing result of this aimless hostile attack: "Echoes and birds flew, white and pink dust floated, the forest further down shook as with the passage of an enraged monster: and then the island was still."[209]

This inconclusive effort to create an enemy and fight with it constantly manifests itself in the novel. Children seem to prepare for a war with the nature which they treat like an enemy. Jack paints his face with the clay "for hunting. Like in the war."[210] Children memorize one side of the mountain on the island that they rarely go as

[207] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.61.
[208] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.28.
[209] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.28.
[210] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.63.

"unfriendly side of the mountain."[211] Furthermore, they put their hostility into words by inventing a march, a march of enmity divulging the hatred: "Kill the pig. Cut her throat. Spill her blood."[212] On the other hand, they begin to perceive the real enemy as the story progresses. The children see what is to be scared of is not the beast that they suppose it exists in nature, but the beast existing potentially inside the human. Piggy mentions that it is futile to search the beast in the jungle and they must only be frightened of people. Moreover, Simon points out that they may be the beast itself.[213]

In this respect, depicting human as a creature who both produces a beast as an enemy and struggles with it, Golding reveals human-nature enmity by allowing the nature represented as a hostile beast to express her feelings to Simon. The author uses Lord of the Flies supposed as a beast by the children to break the silence of the nature. In this part, the voice of beastly nature raises in a sarcastic and instructive way and this has never happened previously in the novel. She seems to call human beings to account for their enmity to her. Shaking nervously, Simon shudders with horror when the beast talks. Though they regard her as an enemy to be scared, she asserts that "there isn't anyone to help you. Only me."[214] It symbolizes that human being has no other option but getting on with nature for survival. She also makes fun of Simon claiming that "fancy thinking the Beast was something you could hunt and kill."[215] Golding, here, wants to reflect the idea of nature's regenerating power that still keeps her alive despite human occupation and exploitation. During this confrontation with his enemy, human is ridiculed by the forest which echoes "with the parody of laughter."[216] She not only recalls the interdependent characteristics of human-nature relationship saying that "you knew, didn't you? I'm part of you?", but also warns that this interdependence is a must from which people cannot escape.[217] Namely, she is everywhere, around the huge buildings constructed by cutting the trees, around the factories polluting the air and in the cities established through destroying wilderness. That's why she says "you'll only meet me down there" and warns Simon not to "try to escape."[218] On the other hand, she does not avoid threatening human beings if they insist on maintaining this enmity and

[211] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.68.
[212] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.69.
[213] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.89.
[214] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.143.
[215] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.143.
[216] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.143.
[217] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.143.
[218] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.143.

keeping their activities that do harm to nature: “Or else, said the Lord of the Flies, we shall do you. See?”[219]

[219] Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, p.144.

CONCLUSION

Contrary to what is believed, there are growing body of evidences to support the fact that human's engagement with nature traces back to quite older times. Although man is a creature created as compatible with nature and as an indispensable part of it, his attitude towards nature is left to his choice. However, it is seen that human's approach to his inseparable part cannot be claimed to have positive impacts on this relationship considering the process throughout the history. Initially, nature seems to be his instructor as a guiding spirit; that is, she is considered as a Mother Nature. Beside her teaching and protecting characteristics, the fundamental reason of calling her as Mother Nature is due to her procreating and generating aspects.

However, it gradually turns out into an illusion that "nature is imaged" as a mother "whose basic tasks include reproduction and nurture" and also sustaining and providing "for the human race".[220] As man learns to cope with the difficulties and survive more, he begins to hold the power he gains over nature. Moreover, as he discovers the environment and develops tools, not only does he begin to question his role and existence, but he also is possessed with the greed of controlling. In addition, footsteps of ecological crisis come with the appearance of ecclesiastical teachings that indicate human beings as the main subject at the centre of the universe and nature as the serving object.

Industrial Revolution and mechanization, later on, cause human to sever all ties with nature. The population grows rapidly as well as the needs of people. To compensate the increasing needs, men make mistakes harming the environment and this insensitive behaviour results in a wide range of human death due to the pollution of air and water. By that time, human beings who are accustomed to living in harmony with nature to some extent find himself in concrete jungles filled with nature deficit disorder. Human is no more a part of nature, but a slave of technology and machinery. The

[220] Pramod K. Nayar, *Contemporary Literary And Cultural Theory: From Structuralism To Ecocriticism*, Dorling Kindersley, New Delhi 2010, p. 250.

technology and the science of twentieth century on which human beings rely for the all sorts of solutions deepen the environmental problems rather than finding a way out of crisis. The problems are getting worse at a rapid rate to which technology cannot keep up with. Nowadays, the scientists have gone as far as to discuss the end of the world as a result of human-based problems.

Literature both reflecting all social, cultural and economical problems of life for the purpose of raising awareness, and aiming to search for ways to make things better does not remain insensitive to the conflict between man and nature. Thus, a new literary theory emerges gathering the efforts of being the voice of nature, of having a word to say for the destruction of nature and of revisiting literature through ecocentric view instead of traditional anthropocentric approach under the roof called ecocriticism. This critical theory with its scope reaching the large masses and interdisciplinary studies intends to reduce the increasing degree of conflict between human and nonhuman in an effort to expose ecological conscious and awareness. "In this new millennium", says Lindholt, "ecological criticism shows no signs of waning... Major university presses, including Arizona, Georgia, Utah, and Virginia, are offering more and more new book titles in this emerging field every year."[221]

Following the discussions mentioned above, it can be concluded that human's torture and domination on nature is not a spontaneous and baseless historical event that happens at the end of usual dynamics of the life. There also exists another reality behind the scene. Human has made all the destruction on account of the sense of enmity. Namely, they seem to take revenge of the expulsion of Adam and Eve from paradise, because the earth is a kind of human's prison to which they are sentenced for punishment. Owing to eating from forbidden tree in the Garden of Eden, which indicates to what extent the roots of nature reach, sons and daughters of Adam have to live on earth and also they not only cause deforestation through cutting trees but also punish the earth where he regards himself as a prisoner. Therefore, it is quite possible to claim that all these detrimental human efforts on earth against nature are nothing but a reflection of human's hostility towards nature.

A natural conclusion can also be reached by claiming that there exists an ongoing cold war together with man's carrying the instinct of enmity to his actions. On

[221] Paul **Lindholt**, "Ecological Criticism Today", *Sewanee Review*, Vol. 110, No. 1, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Winter 2002, p. 174.

the other hand, human will face the biggest loss if he wins this eternal war he has fought throughout the history, because nature will not remain unresponsive to these hostile attacks. Actually, such massive natural disasters like earthquake, erosion and tsunami punish human beings as well. During this process, though human loses his humanity while nature loses her naturalness, Mother Nature achieves to maintain its effeminacy, since she is prolific, productive and fertile. However, descending to earth, man is destined to be mortal at the same time. Thus, there is no doubt that a mortal creature cannot claim mastery over the nature that still keeps its productive and regenerating energy and which is famous for its eternal cycle with the amazing rebirth myths.

Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, when examined through ecocritical approach, is seen to reflect the process of enmity between man and nature dramatically in the century in which Golding lives. The novel is situated at the era marked by the global environmental disaster caused by wars, over-exploitation of natural sources, intervention in the natural area of nonhuman for providing human with comfort and disregard for technological problems on nature. In the novel, a group of boys drops on an uninhabited tropical island just as Adam and Eve fall into the untouched earth. For the boys, "the reality of nature in the tropics is profoundly sinister and threatening."[222] Created as an alternative microcosm of the earth, the island's natural beauty turns to hell in a far shorter time than human beings have done all over the world for a long period. This is done by means of anthropocentric interference, exploitative approach, hierarchal disorder in which the strong oppresses the inferior and eventually the divulgation of the instinct of enmity.

Till the arrival of the boys on the island, the natural cycle of the island is as excellent as ecocritics undoubtedly indicate. Nonhuman living beings described in the novel have the right of life in peace and harmony they deserve. Pigs, trees, rocks and even little scavengers are reflected as they should be in a perfect ecological order, which has been regarded as utopia today. Golding, just like first wave nature writers, depicts a flawless wilderness far from the brutal world. Surprisingly enough, this flawless ecological structure exists at the same time when nuclear weapons and atomic bombs destroy the environment in the real world. This shows Golding's longing for an ecocentric order as well as his ecological insight. It can also be evaluated that this

[222] S. J. Boyd, "The Nature of the Beast: *Lord of the Flies* ", **William Golding's Lord of the Flies**, Ed. Harold Bloom, Infobase Publishing, New York 2008, p. 31.

ecocentric island in the novel is a present for the boys and a last chance for human beings to provide reconciliation and integration with nature. However, it can be obviously seen that the boys as the representatives of man have no effort for the reconciliation. Unfortunately, it is emphasized that nonhuman living beings are exploited not just for the survival but for the purpose of enjoying on the island. Ralph's statement that they own the island like a property sums up the situation best. The trace of the plane shot down on the island in the beginning of the novel is described as a wound. Moreover, it can be concluded that Jack's permanent chase for pigs with his hunters with the intention of spilling blood of a creature instead of nourishment and boys' scream of joy during the flaming of trees indicate how man is intolerant to the peace in nature and exhibits disruptive attitudes rather than being constructive. To put it another words, in *Lord of the Flies,* Golding manifests that along with the transition of human into the centre of the world, ecocentric order is disrupted and human recreates an unliveable universe with his hands.

It is a well-known fact that the fictional institution called civilization otherizes and dehumanizes the social establishment that does not live and act like the civilized one. Thus, the tribes and the undeveloped societies managing the merit of making peace with nature are scorned by civilized societies. Yet, it depends on the perspective; the same point of view cannot be claimed for the individuals who desire for an ecological-based social structure. Supposing a group of civilized British boys could cope with the difficult conditions away from civilization –actually it can be regarded as Golding's test of humanity- the soldier, upon his arrival for saving the boys, is horrified when he faces the fact that the boys as the products of the cradle of civilization destroy the nature and begin to kill each other. Actually, the modern civilization alienated to the environment produces those individuals who bring the earth into an uninhabitable place. In an ecological sense, the novel is seen as a dramatic reflection of the dualism between the civilized and the primitive. Furthermore, it can be concluded that the novel, in terms of questioning of the concept of civilization, also becomes a portrayal of nature indicating that "wildness is a civilization other than our own."[223] That is, it considers nature as the

[223] Henry David Thoreau, qtd. in Sherman Paul, For Love of the World: Essays on Nature Writers, University of Iowa Presses, Iowa 1992, p. 204.

real civilization itself and "nature thus becomes the civilization from which, in the biblical sense, we have fallen."[224]

On the other hand, nearly all of the studies conducted on *Lord of the Flies* focus on the appreciation of Ralph concerning his prudent and decisive personality and of Piggy concerning his philosophical and scientific evaluations. The present thesis, on the contrary, handles the characters from a different viewpoint and infers that the reflection of these characters as the representatives of mind and sense is quite anthropocentric. The attitudes of such characters like Ralph and Piggy to the nature are not seen to be acceptable enough when ecocritical view is adopted. Piggy's thought that the life is mainly scientific and everything has its own remedy is quite human-centred and this idea based on human mind has never been able to solve critical environmental problems; instead, it has deepened the corruption of nature. Also Ralph, as ordinary leaders, is contented with organizing abortive assemblies. This study also suggests discussions on his decisions and reveals that these decisions must be questioned ecologically considering children's destroying the balance of nature and destruction of jungle because of lighting a fire for salvation unconsciously. Jack, on one hand, is an obvious enemy of nature and a little fascist. In the novel, it is found out that most of the human acts of violence and the enmity towards nature embody in Jack. One can infer from his assaults against both humans and nonhumans with knife and spear identified with his image that he is a clear portrayal of the human exploiting and slaughtering nature. Simon, on the other hand, differs from other characters as a boy who can communicate with nature. He, like those who fight for the rights of nature, is called bizarre. However, he reflects an ecosophical stance due to his ecological insight grasping the fact that the real beast and enemy is man himself. From this point of view, in the novel, it can be seen that there exists a defective hierarchical structure omitting nature. The *littluns* and some of the *bigguns* signify the society living with the rules imposed.

As the study demonstrates, the subversive behaviours of the little boys having insufficient knowledge on the course of life can be explained not only with the fact that they come from an anthropocentric world but also with the instinct of enmity that they already have. It is obviously seen in the novel that they create an enemy and fight with

[224] Sherman Paul, For Love of the World: Essays on Nature Writers, University of Iowa Presses, Iowa 1992, p. 204.

it. Yet, according to the findings acquired by this study, it can be easily observed that Golding gives nature the right to communicate her opinions and ideas by means of a pig head. The author invites his reader to seek the enemy inside the human instead of nature. It is also understood that man's effort to overtake mastery over nature and to take revenge of his father, Adam, and also man's humanitarian inability to accomplish this goal stimulates this hostility. In the light of this information, it is concluded that the thoughts on nature and on the enmity between man and nature are reflected by Golding through extremely striking image diversity and that *Lord of the Flies* provides a remarkably appropriate ground for ecocritical approach.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbey, Edward. (1988). *Desert Solitaire*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Adamson, Joni and Scott Slovic. (2009). "Guest Editors' Introduction: The Shoulders We Stand On: An Introduction to Ethnicity and Ecocriticism". *MELUS: Multi-Ethnic Literature of the US*. Vol. 34. No. 2. June. pp. 5-24.

Ammar, Nawal. (2001). "Islam and Deep Ecology". *Deep Ecology and World Religions: New Essays on Sacred Ground*. Eds. David Landis Barnhill and Roger S. Gottlieb. Albania: State University of New York Press. pp. 193-212.

Andrews, Tamra. (2000). *A Dictionary of Nature Myths: Legend of the Earth, Sea and Sky*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Azeez, Ismaila O., T.A.N Abubakar, E.S Akuso and E.O Abah. (2014). "An Exploration of the Hermeneutical Phases of Ecocriticism". *Global Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 2. No. 7. September. pp. 1-6.

Barry, Peter. (2002). *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Second Edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bate, Jonathan. (2000). *The Song of the Earth*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Berg, Peter. (2015). "Bioregionalism Comes to Japan: An Interview of Peter Berg by Richard Evanoff". The Biosphere and the Bioregion: Essential Writings of Peter Berg. Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Eve Quesnell. London and New York: Routledge. pp.138-148.

Bible. Genesis. 2:8-2:10. Web Page: http://incil.info/kitap/gen/2 (Date accessed: Monday, 21 December 2015).

———. Genesis. 3:15. Web Page: http://incil.info/kitap/gen/3 (Date accessed: Friday, 8 January 2016).

Bird, Elizabeth Ann R. (1987). "The Social Construction of Nature: Theoretical Approaches to the History of Environmental Problems". *Environmental Review: ER*. Vol. 11. No. 4. Special Issue: Theories of Environmental History. Winter. pp. 255-264.

Birkeland, Jenis. (1993). "Ecofeminism: Linking Theory and Practice". *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature*. Ed. Greta Gaard. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. pp. 13-59.

Biswas, Asit. K. (2000). "Scientific Assessment of the Long-term Environmental Consequences of War". *The Environmental Consequences of War: Legal, Economic and Scientific Perspectives*. Ed. E. Austin and Carl E. Bruch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 303-315.

Bookchin, Murray. (1982). *The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy*. California: Cheshire Books.

Boyd, S. J. (2008). "The Nature of the Beast: *Lord of the Flies*". *William Golding's Lord of the Flies*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2008, pp. 27-44.

Buell, Lawrence. (2001). *Writing for an Endangered World: Literature, Culture and Environment in the U.S and Beyond*. Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

———. (2005). *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination*. Malden: Blackwell.

———. U.K. Heise and Karen Thornber. (2011). "Literature and Environment". *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*. Vol. 36. August. pp. 417-440.

Carroll, Joseph. (2004). *Literary Darwinism: Evolution, Human Nature, and Literature*. New York and London: Routledge.

Carson, Rachel. (2002). *Silent Spring*. Fortieth Anniversary Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Clark, Brett and John Bellamy Foster. (2006). " The Environmental Conditions of the Working Class: An Introduction to Selections from Frederick Engels's The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844". *Organization & Environment*. Vol. 19. No. 3. September. pp. 375-388.

Cohen, Michael P. (2004). "Blues in the Green: Ecocriticism under Critique". *Environmental History*. Vol. 9. No. 1. January. pp. 9-36.

Commoner, Barry. (1971). *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man and Technology*. New York: Knopf.

Çoruhlu, Yaşar. (2000). *Türk Mitolojisinin Anahatları*. Istanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi.

Crawford, Paul. (2002). *Politics and History in William Golding: The World Turned Upside Down*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press.

Dickens, Charles. (1993). *Bleak House*. Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics.

———. (2000). *Hard Times*. Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics.

Dönmez, Başak Ağın. (2014). "Bang Your Head and Save the Planet". *New International Voices in Ecocriticism*. Ed. Serpil Oppermann, Lanham: Lexington Books. pp. 71-84.

Ellis, Havelock. (2001). "Havelock Ellis on the Psychological Roots of the Love of Wilderness". *A Century of Early Ecocriticism*. Ed. David Mazel. Athens: The University of Georgia Press. pp. 173-194.

Ellis, Jocelyn Elizabeth. (2005). *The Legacy of John Muir: Writing to Promote Ecological Preservation and Change Environmental Values*. Miami University. Published Ph.D. Thesis. Oxford, Ohio.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. (2003). "Nature". *Nature and Other Writings*. Ed. Peter Turner. Boston: Shambhala Publications. pp. 3-40.

Engels, Friedrich. (1892). *The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

Erkan, Mukadder. (1994). *A Critical Approach to William Golding's Early Novels*. Atatürk Üniversitesi SBE. Published Ph.D. Thesis. Erzurum.

Erlandson, Jon M. and Torben C. Rick, eds. (2008). *Human Impacts on Ancient Marine Ecosystems: A Global Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Faber, Daniel. (2008). *Capitalizing on Environmental Injustice: The Polluter-Industrial Complex in the Age of Globalization*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Falcon, Andrea. (2005) *Aristotle & the Science of Nature: Unity Without Uniformity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Finney, Brian. (2008). *Martin Amis: Routledge Guides to Literature*. New York: Routledge.

Fitzsimmons, Allan K. (1999). *Defending Illusions: Federal Protection of Ecosystems*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fox, Michael W. (2001). *Bringing Life to Ethics: Global Bioethics for a Humane Society*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gaard, Greta and Lori Gruen. (1993). "Ecofeminism: Toward global justice and planetary health". *Society and Nature: The International Journal of Political Ecology*. Vol. 2. No. 1. pp. 1-35.

Garrard, Greg. (2004). *Ecocriticism*. New York: Routledge.

George, Usha. (2008). *William Golding: A Critical Study*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Dist.

Glen A. Love. (2003). "Introduction" to *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology, and the Environment*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press. pp. 1-12.

Glendinning, Chellis. (1995). "Recovery from Western Civilization". *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. George Sessions. Boston: Shambhala Publications. pp. 37-40.

Glotfelty, Cheryll. (1996). "Introduction: Literary Studies in an Age of Environmental Crisis". *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. Georgia: The University of Georgia Press. pp. xv-xxxvii.

Gogoi, Gitanjali. (2014). "An Ecocritical Approach to Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* and *Arrow of God* ". *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. Vol. 19. Issue 11. November. pp.1-4.

Golding, William. (1954). *Lord of the Flies*. New York: Perigee Books/Penguin.

———. (1970). *The Hot Gates and Other Occasional Pieces*. London: Faber & Faber.

———. (2013). *Lord of the Flies: Text, Criticism, Giossary and Notes*. Ed. Prof. R. Awad. Al Manhal.

Grant, Edward. (2007). *A History of Natural Philosophy: From the Ancient World to the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Güngör, Turan Özgür. (2013). *Daniel Defoe' nun Robinson Crusoe, Charles Dickens'ın Hard Times (Zor Zamanlar), Graham Swift' in Waterland (Su Diyarı) Adlı Eserlerinin Ekoeleştirel Açıdan İncelenmesi*. Atatürk Üniversitesi SBE. Published Ph.D. Thesis. Erzurum.

Hamilton, Edith. (1942). *Mythology*. Boston: Back Bay Books/Little, Brown and Company.

Howarth, William. (1996). "Some Principles of Ecocriticism". *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. Georgia: The University of Georgia Press. pp. 69-91.

Hughes, Jonathan. (2000). *Ecology and Historical Materialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ingold, Tim. (1994). "From Trust to Domination: An Alternative History of Human-Animal Relations". *Animals and Human Society: Changing Perspectives*. Eds. Aubrey Manning and James Serpell. London and New York: Routledge. pp. 1-22.

J. Burbery, Timothy. (2012). "Ecocriticism and Christian Literary Scholarship". *Christianity and Literature*. Vol. 61. No. 2. pp. 189-214.

Jacobus, Mary. (2012). *Romantic Things: A Tree, A Rock, A Cloud*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, Loretta. (2009). "Greening the library: The fundamentals and future of ecocriticism". *Choice*. Vol. 1. December. pp. 7-13.

Kopnina, Helen. (2012). "The Lorax Complex: Deep Ecology, Ecocentrism and Exclusion". *Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences*. Vol. 9. No. 4. December. pp. 235-254.

Kortenkamp, Katherine V. and Colleen F. Moore. (2001). "Ecocentrism and Anthropocentrism: Moral Reasoning About Ecological Commons Dilemmas". *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. Vol. 21. Issue 3. September. pp. 261-272.

Korucu, Arzu. (2014). "Loss of Innocence: The Enemy Archetype in *Lord of the Flies*". *8th International Idea Conference: "Studies in English"*. Muğla. pp. 47-53.

Kovacik, Jozef. (2011). *The Influence of Henry David Thoreau's Writing on the First and Second Waves of Ecocriticism*. Masaryk University Faculty of Arts. Published Master's Thesis. Brno.

Kovel, Joel. (2007). *The Enemy of Nature: The End of Capitalism or the End of the World?*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Leopold, Aldo. (1989). *A Sand County Almanac, and Sketches Here and There*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lindholt, Paul. (2002). "Ecological Criticism Today". *Sewanee Review*. Vol. 110. No. 1.. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Winter. pp. 169-174.

Lloyd, G.E.R. (1970). *Early Greek Science: Thales to Aristotle*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Lowell, James R. (2001). "James Russel Lowell on Thoreau". *A Century of Early Ecocriticism*. Ed. David Mazel. Athens: The University of Georgia Press. pp. 26-32.

Lynch, Tom, Cheryll Glotfelty and Karla Armbruster. (2012). *The Bioregional Imagination: Literature, Ecology and Place*. Athens and London: University of Georgia Press.

M. Wilson, Thomas. (2006). *The Recurrent Green Universe of John Fowles*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Mazel, David. (2001). "Introduction" to *A Century of Early Ecocriticism***.** Athens: The University of Georgia Press. pp. 1-19.

Moore, Niamh. (2015). *The Changing Nature of Eco/Feminism: Telling Stories from Clayoquot Sound*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Pres.

Mosley, Stephen. (2014). "Environmental History of Air Pollution and Protection*". The Basic Environmental History*. Eds. Mauro Agnoletti and Simone Neri Serneri. Cham: Springer. pp. 143-170.

Muir, John. (1916). *A Thousand-Mile Walk to the Gulf*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Murphy, Patrick D. (2000). *Farther Afield in the Study of Nature-Oriented Literature*.

———. (2003). "Foreword" to *The ISLE Reader: Ecocriticism, 1993-2003*. Eds. Michael P. Branch and Scott Slovic. Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press. pp. vii-ix.

——— . (2009). *Ecocritical Explorations in Literary and Cultural Studies: Fences, Boundaries and Fields*. Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Naess, Arne. (1973). "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement. A Summary". *Inquiry*. Vol. 16. No. 1. pp. 95-100.

———. (1995). "Self-Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World". *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. George Sessions. Boston: Shambhala Publications. pp. 225-239.

———. (1995). "The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects". *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. George Sessions. Boston: Shambhala Publications. pp. 64-84.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. (1990). *Man and Nature: The Spiritual Crisis in Modern Man*. London: Unwin Paperbacks.

Nayar, Pramod K. (2010). *Contemporary Literary And Cultural Theory: From Structuralism To Ecocriticism*. New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley,
No. 3767. March. pp. 1203-1207.

Oh, Intaek. (2010). *Peter Matthiessen and Ecological Imagination*. New York: Peter Lang.

Oppermann, Serpil. (2006). "Theorizing Ecocriticism: Toward a Postmodern Ecocritical Practice". *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*. Vol. 13. No. 2. Summer. pp. 103-128.

———. (2011). "The Future of Ecocriticism: Present Currents". *The Future of Ecocriticism: New Horizons*. Eds. Serpil Oppermann, Ufuk Özdağ, Nevin Özkan and Scott Slovic. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. pp. 14-29.

———. (2012). "Ekoeleştiri: Çevre ve Edebiyat Çalışmalarının Dünü ve Bugünü". *Ekoeleştiri: Çevre ve Edebiyat*. Ed. Serpil Oppermann. Ankara: Phoenix. pp. 9-59.

Özdağ, Ufuk. (2014). *Çevreci Eleştiriye Giriş: Doğa, Kültür, Edebiyat*. Ankara: Ürün Yayınları.

Paul, Sherman. (1992). *For Love of the World: Essays on Nature Writers*. Iowa: University of Iowa Presses.

Paulay, Gustav. (1994). "Biodiversity on Oceanic Islands: Its Origin and Extinction". *American Zoologist*. Vol. 34. Issue 1. February. pp. 134-144.

Plumwood, Val. (1993). *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. London and New York: Routledge.

Price, Andy. (2012). "Social Ecology". *The Bloomsbury Companion to Anarchism*. Ed. Ruth Kinna. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing. pp. 233-251.

Quran. The Elevated Place. 19. Web Page: http://www.theholyquran.org/?x=s_main&y=s_middle&kid=14&sid=7 (Date accessed: Monday, 21 December 2015).

Roberts, Charles G.D. (2001). *Kindred of the Wild*. Toronto: Exile Editions. 2001.

Rodman, John. (1995). "Four Forms of Ecological Consciousness Reconsidered". *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. George Sessions. Boston: Shambhala Publications. pp. 121-130.

Rosendale, Steven. (2002). "Introduction: Extending Ecocriticism". *The Greening of Literary Scholarship: Literature, Theory, and the Environment*, Ed. Steven Rosendale. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press. pp. xv-xxix.

Rowe, Stan J. (1994). “Ecocentrism: The Chord That Harmonizes Humans and Earth”. *The Trumpeter*. Vol. 11. No. 2. Spring. 106-107.

Rueckert, William. (1996). “Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism”. *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. Georgia: The University of Georgia Press. pp. 105-123.

Salleh, Ariel. (1989). “Stirrings of a New Renaissance”. *Island Magazine*. No. 38. Autumn. pp. 26-31.

Sessions, George. (1995). “Ecocentrism and the Anthropocentric Detour”. *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. George Sessions. Boston: Shambhala Publications. pp. 156-183.

Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine. (2010). “The Enemy: A Twenty-first Century Archetypal Study”. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*. Vol. 8. No. 2. May. pp. 146-161.

Sidney, Sir Philip. (2005). “An Apology for Poetry”. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Eds. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle. Boston: Thomson/Wadsworth. pp. 185-206.

Slovic, Scott. (1996). “Nature Writing and Environmental Psychology: The Interiority of Outdoor Experience”. *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press. pp. 351-370.

———. (2000). “Ecocriticism: Containing Multitudes, Practising Doctrine”. *The Green Studies Reader: From Romanticism to Ecocriticism*. Ed. Laurence Coupe. London and New York: Routledge. pp. 160-162.

———. (2008). *Going Away to Think: Engagement, Retreat, and Ecocritical Responsibility*. Nevada: University of Nevada Press.

———. (2010). “The Third Wave of Ecocriticism: North American Reflections on the Current Phase of the Discipline”. *Ecozon@: European Journal of Literature, Culture and Environment*. Vol. 1. No. 1. Spring. pp. 4-10.

Teale, Edwin Way. (1954). *The Wilderness World of John Muir*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Thoreau, Henry David. (1965). *Walden: or, Life in the Woods and On the Duty of Civil Disobedience*. New York: Harper & Row.

Warren, Karen J. (2000). *Ecofeminist Philosophy: A Western Perspective on What It Is and Why It Matters*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

White Jr., Lynn. (1967). "Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis". *Science*. Vol. 155.

Wright, Mabel Osgood. (2001). "Mabel Osgood Wright on Nature, Gender, Outdoor Life and Fiction". *A Century of Early Ecocriticism*. Ed. David Mazel. Athens: The University of Georgia Press. pp. 154-162

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Baturay ERDAL
Tel: +90 (506) 842 73 11
Adres: Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü Efeler/AYDIN

Doğum Tarihi : 12.06.1986
Doğum Yeri : Kırıkkale
Uyruğu : Turkey (TR)
E-posta : baturay.erdal@adu.edu.tr
Eğitim Durumu :

2004-2008 **Atatürk Üniversitesi**
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı / Lisans

Yabancı Diller : **İngilizce**
Çok İyi Seviyede
Almanca
Orta Seviyede

Deneyimler :

2008-2009 İngilizce Öğretmeni – M.E.B
2009-2016 Okutman – Bayburt Üniversitesi
2016-Still Araştırma Görevlisi – Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi

Çalışma Alanları : Modern ve Çağdaş İngiliz Romanı, Ekoeleştiri

Yayınlar :

Uluslararası Bilimsel Toplantılarda Sunulan Ancak Bildiri Kitabında Basılmayan Bildiriler

Erdal, Baturay. "An Ecocritical Approach to Son Ada", *The Third International Congress of Turkology 600 Years of Polish- Turkish Relations – Research on Turkology Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*, June 25-27, 2014, Warsaw, University of Warsaw.

Uluslararası Bilimsel Toplantılarda Sunulan ve Bildiri Kitabında Basılan Bildiriler

Erdal Baturay. "Oyun Kavramı ve Çevreci Fikirler Işığında Narnia'nın Yeniden Keşfi", *Uluslararası Oyun ve Oyuncak Kongresi*. May 7-8, 2015, Erzurum, Atatürk University. pp. 336-340.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Baturay ERDAL
Telephone:+90 (506) 842 73 11
Adress: Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü Efeler/AYDIN

Date of Birth : 12.06.1986
Place of Birth : Kırıkkale
Nationality : Turkey (TR)
E-mail : baturay.erdal@adu.edu.tr
Education :

2004-2008 **Atatürk University**
English Language and Literature / BA

Foreign Languages : **English**
Advanced
Deutsch
Intermediate

Job Experiences :

2008-2009 English Teacher – Ministry of National Education
2009-2016 Instructor – Bayburt University
2016-Still Research Assistant- Adnan Menderes University

Fields of Interests : Modern and Contemporary British Novel, Ecocriticism

Publications :

Papers Presented in the International Academic Conferences, yet are not published in the Proceedings

Erdal, Baturay. "An Ecocritical Approach to Son Ada", *The Third International Congress of Turkology 600 Years of Polish- Turkish Relations – Research on Turkology Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*, June 25-27, 2014, Warsaw, University of Warsaw.

Papers Presented in the International Academic Conferences and published in the Proceedings

Erdal Baturay. "Oyun Kavramı ve Çevreci Fikirler Işığında Narnia'nın Yeniden Keşfi", *Uluslararası Oyun ve Oyuncak Kongresi*. May 7-8, 2015, Erzurum, Atatürk University. pp.336-340.