

T.C.

İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE PROGRAMME



**THEORIZING THE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY IN DRAMA:
ECOFEMINIST STUDY OF CIRISH KARNAD'S THE FIRE AND
THE RAIN AND HENRIK IBSEN'S AN ENEMY OF THE
PEOPLE**

MA THESIS

RAHMAH SALAH HASAN AL-GBURI

21131306024

İSTANBUL, JUNE 2024

T.C.

İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE PROGRAMME



**THEORIZING THE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY IN DRAMA:
ECOFEMINIST STUDY OF CIRISH KARNAD'S THE FIRE AND
THE RAIN AND HENRIK IBSEN'S AN ENEMY OF THE
PEOPLE**

MA THESIS

RAHMAH SALAH HASAN AL-GBURI

21131306024

ORCID NO: 0009-0000-2083-1010

SUPERVISOR

ASSIST. PROF. DR. ADNAN BARIŞ AĞIR

JURY MEMBERS

PROF. DR. GÜNSELİ İŞÇİ

ASSIST. PROF. DR. ZAFER AYAR

İSTANBUL, JUNE 2024

T.C.
İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

TEZ ONAY BELGESİ

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı programı, 21131306024 numaralı Tezli Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi **Rahmah Salah Hasan Al-Gburi** "**Theorizing the Enviromental Study in Drama: Ecofeminist Study of Cirish Karnad's The Fire and The Rain and Henrik Ibsen's An Enemy of the People**" adlı tez çalışması, Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunun 14.05.2024 tarih ve 2024/04 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından oy birliği / oy çokluğu ile Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 28.06.2024

Öğretim Üyesi Unvanı, Adı ve Soyadı		İmzası
Tez Danışmanı	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Adnan Barış Ağır	
Jüri Üyesi	Prof. Dr. Günseli İşçi	
Jüri Üyesi	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Zafer Ayar	



T.C.

İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
MA PROGRAMME
ETHICAL STATEMENT

I prepared my project following the thesis writing rules of the Institute of Social Sciences at Istanbul Yeni Yüzyıl University, and I hereby declare that;

- I have obtained the data, information, and documents provided within the thesis according to academic and ethical rules,
- I have submitted all information, documents, evaluations, and results under the requirements of scientific ethics and moral rules,
- I have cited all works that I have used in the project by appropriately referring to my sources,
- I have not made any changes to the data used,
- I declare that the work I present is original, and

if found otherwise, I accept all loss of rights that may occur.

28/06/ 2024

RAHMAH SALAH HASAN AL-GBURI

PREFACE

I express my gratitude to my supervisor, Assistant Professor Dr. Barış Ağır, for his invaluable assistance and support in assisting me in making informed decisions. Furthermore, I would want to convey my appreciation to Prof. Dr. Günseli İşçi, whose passion and guidance have been immensely useful to me. I express my profound gratitude to all of my university lecturers. I am grateful for the support provided by my mother. I am appreciative to my friends and colleagues.

ISTANBUL, 2024

RAHMAH SALAH HASA AL-GBURI



ÖZET

TİYATRODA ÇEVRECİ ÇALIŞMANIN KURAMSALLAŞTIRILMASI: CIRISH KARNAD'IN *ATEŞ VE YAĞMUR* VE HENRIK IBSEN'İN *BİR HALK DÜŞMANI* OYUNLARININ EKO-FEMİNİST İNCELEMESİ

RAHMAH SALAH HASAN AL-GBURI

ORC-ID: 0009-0000-2083-1010

Bu çalışma, Girish Karnad'ın *Ateş ve Yağmur* ve Henrik Ibsen'in *Bir Halk Düşmanı* oyunlarında tasvir edilen ekofeminist fikirleri incelemektedir. Ekofeminizm, kadınlar ve çevre arasındaki karşılıklı ilişkiye açıklık getirmektedir. Ekofeminizm içerik olarak kadınların ekolojik kalkınmadaki rolü, toplumsal cinsiyet ve bilimin kesişimi, kadınların doğadaki varlığı, besin zincirine dahil olmaları, kadınların su kıtlığı üzerindeki etkisi, *terra mater* kavramı ve kadınların dişil ilke iddiaları gibi bir dizi konuyu kapsamaktadır. Bu çalışma bir dizi hedef ve amacı ana hatlarıyla ortaya koymaktadır. Bu tez ilk olarak, Henrik Ibsen ve Girish Karnad'ın seçilmiş edebi eserlerinde bulunan ekofeminist unsurların bir analizini ve değerlendirmesini yapmaktadır. Ayrıca, seçilen oyunlarda kadın karakterlerin bakış açısının bir tasvirini de sunmaktadır. Ayrıca, feminist kadınların özgürlükçü, feminist, sosyal farkındalığa sahip bireyler, rasyonel düşünürler ve eşit haklar savunucuları olarak etkileşime girdiklerinde kimliklerini nasıl uzlaştırdıklarını göstermektedir. Bu çalışma, ataerkil hiyerarşilere karşı direniş, çevre bilincinin teşvik edilmesi ve toplumsal cinsiyet dinamikleri ile ekolojik savunuculuğun incelenmesi de dahil olmak üzere ekofeminizmin çeşitli ilkelerini tanımlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Doğa, Ekofeminizm, Kadınlar, Tahakküm.

ABSTRACT

THEORIZING THE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY IN DRAMA: ECOFEMINIST STUDY OF GIRISH KARNAD'S *THE FIRE AND THE RAIN* AND HENRIK IBSEN'S *AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE*

RAHMAH SALAH HASAN AL-GBURI

ORC-ID: 0009-0000-2083-1010

The present study undertakes an analysis of ecofeminist ideas as portrayed in the plays *The Fire and the Rain* by Girish Karnad and *An Enemy of the People* by Henrik Ibsen. Ecofeminism elucidates the interrelationship between women and the environment. The content encompasses a range of subjects, such as the role of women in ecological development, the intersection of gender and science, women's presence in forests, their involvement in the food chain, women's impact on water scarcity, the concept of terra mater, and women's assertions of the feminine principle. This study outlines a number of objectives and aims. Firstly, it conducts an analysis and evaluation of the ecofeminist elements present in the selected literary works of Henrik Ibsen and Girish Karnad. Additionally, the selected play also presents a depiction of the perspective of the female characters. Furthermore, it demonstrates how feminist women reconcile their identities as they interact as libertarians, feminists, socially aware individuals, rational thinkers, and advocates for equal rights. This study identifies several tenets of ecofeminism, including the resistance against patriarchal hierarchies, the promotion of environmental consciousness, and the examination of gender dynamics and ecological advocacy.

Keywords: Ecofeminism, Domination, Nature, Women.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
TEZ ONAY BELGESİ	i
ETHICAL STATEMENT	ii
PREFACE	iii
ÖZET	iv
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
1- ECOFEMINISM: A MOVEMENT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND GENDER JUSTICE.....	5
1.1.Introduction to Ecofeminist Theory	5
1.1.1 Cultural ecofeminism	12
1.1.2 Socialist Ecofeminism.....	13
1.1.3 Spiritual Ecofeminism.....	14
1.3. Ecofeminist Theory as a Literary Criticism	19
1.3.1 Raising Awareness of the Environmental Crisis.....	21
1.3.2 Gender Dynamics and Environmental Advocacy	21
1.3.3 Resistance Against Patriarchal Hierarchies	23
2- ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS IN HENRIK IBSEN’S <i>AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE</i>: FROM ECOFEMINIST STUDY	26
2.1. Raising Awareness of the Environmental Crisis in <i>An Enemy of the People</i> ..	27
2.2. Gender Dynamics and Environmental Advocacy	32
2.3. Resistance Against Patriarchal Hierarchies in the Play	37
3- THE ECOFEMINIST PERSPECTIVE IN GIRISH KANRAD’S <i>THE FIRE AND THE RAIN</i>	46
3.1. The Complexity of Gender Dynamics in <i>The Fire and The Rian</i>	47
3.2. Opposition to Male-Dominated Power Structures	52

3.3 Questioning Patriarchal Representation in <i>The Fire and The Rain</i>	57
CONCLUSION	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY	74



INTRODUCTION

Ecofeminism emerged in the 1980s and describes the intersection of environmental feminism and feminist theory. Those who dislike categorizing women and nature will find political and social construction liberating. The biological study of natural ecological systems is derived from the term ecology. A growing body of research from biology and sociology is looking at how human activities destroy natural systems and pollute the air, water, and soil, endangering the very foundations of life. At the same time, feminism is a multi-faceted social movement that opposes patriarchy, sexism, oppression, and violence against women by calling for equal political and economic participation for women. By combining those two notions, ecofeminism will be present (Honderich, 1995, pp. 291-294). Within the more excellent patriarchal, hierarchical structure, which monopolized money, power, and knowledge through the possession of land, animals, and enslaved people as property, the dominance of women as a social class emerged. Constructed as a reflection of the nature of things and the will of God/the gods, ideological instruments legitimized this dominant structure derived from social forces. To codify these hierarchies of power, which included the dominance of males over women, enslaved people, animals, and land, legal systems emerged. It is believed that God or the gods bestowed these legal laws upon an inspired lawgiver. These elaborate narratives about creation illustrate the social hierarchy as a mirror image of the order in the cosmos.

Ecofeminism arose in the early 1970s, coinciding with the radicalization of feminism. Therefore, before delving into ecofeminism, it is necessary to examine the word feminism. It is also required to determine the purported relationship between women's subjugation and the workings of nature. In this context, feminism means pursuing equal rights for women and men. In addition to advocating for women's rights and equality, feminism stresses the importance of men showing empathy, understanding, and compassion. There has been a long-standing global trend of denying women fundamental economic and social rights. Nonetheless, women's self-awareness, sexuality, existence, and destiny have all grown in the 20th century. Feminism is the catchall word for the global movement of women fighting for equality and self-determination. One such platform that finds common ground between feminist and environmental concerns is ecofeminism. It contends that

environmental abuse stems from the same societal mindset and attitude that dominates and oppresses women. There is a great deal of misunderstanding regarding ecofeminism and its scope. According to Val Plumwood's arguments, "ecofeminism does help to clarify the dominance paradigm and raise essential questions about the way Western philosophy has traditionally viewed women and the natural world (1986, p.120). To show that women and nature are unfairly dominated, ecofeminism looks at how societal standards impact gender categories. It challenges the dominant societal hierarchy that allows men to exploit and dominate women and the natural world.

There are three significant ecofeminism wings, which are of prime importance in defining the connection between woman and nature. From a cultural and spiritual perspective, Ecofeminism highlights the special bond between women and the natural world and the idea of "Mother Earth" and the "femininity of nature." They contend that modern society should adhere to traditional wisdom by safeguarding and maintaining nature and honoring women. Vandana Shiva emphasizes "the significance of forests to Indian civilization" (2016, p. 105). They have long been revered as Aranyani, the Forest Goddess, and seen as a symbol of the forest's role as a community and a site of social and cultural development.

Henrik Ibsen, the esteemed Norwegian playwright widely regarded as one of the most prominent dramatists in the world, is recognized as the pioneer of modern drama and a staunch advocate for women. He does not identify as a feminist but rather as a humanist. Henrik Ibsen has undeniably attained a distinctive and characteristic position among the foremost contemporary playwrights. He gained renown for his plays, poetry, and profound philosophical and revolutionary concepts, which significantly influenced the progress of literature as a whole, with a particular emphasis on theater, during the 19th and 20th centuries. He is often regarded as the progenitor of contemporary theater and the pioneering playwright who penned several tragedies centered around everyday individuals. Ibsen pioneered the problem play genre, sometimes known as the theater of ideas, focusing primarily on portraying a dramatic conflict. George Bernard Shaw observes that the importance of the Norwegian playwright lies in his ability to bring social and political discourse into the theater using a character who is both a villain and an idealist and a lady who

defies traditional gender roles (1912, p. 190). Although Ibsen's plays do not directly tackle ecofeminist concerns, they provide significant perspectives on the interdependence of women, the environment, and society. Ibsen's works contribute to the more excellent ecofeminist debate by examining patriarchal power and the repercussions of environmental destruction. Ibsen's ecofeminist approach is characterized by its need for more straightforwardness and consistency. His plays frequently depict the intricate and conflicting views on nature and women that were widespread during his day. However, his writings have motivated ecofeminist researchers and activists to investigate the connections between gender and environmental subjugation.

Ecofeminism is vital to uncovering the exploitations and invasions over our ecology and its resources by developed countries in the names of globalization, urbanization, and development. Similarly, our interactions with the natural world, other forms of life, and members of the opposing sex or sexual minority can shed light on gender issues. *The Play Fire and the Rain* (1998), delve into the effects of pollution and industrialization on women's lives and the environment. The fundamental ecofeminist ideas in Karnad's plays center on the inseparable link between women and the natural world. According to Karnad, women are inseparably bound up with nature and often mirror its wisdom and vulnerability. Environmental exploitation and the oppression of women: The author draws parallels between patriarchal societies' treatment of women and environmental degradation. To ensure that future generations can enjoy a healthy environment, Karnad stresses the need for ecological sustainability. Many people in India now know about ecofeminist issues because of Karnad's plays. His focus on the interplay between gender and environmental injustice prompts him to challenge canonical accounts that emphasize masculine supremacy and human-centered viewpoints. Both ecological protection and women's emancipation have been sparked by his writings.

The aim of this study is to analyze and assess the ecofeminist aspects in the chosen writings of Henrik Absen and Girish Karnad. Secondly, to portray the female protagonist's point of view in the selected books. Lastly, we want to show women from a feminist point of view as they forge their identities— revolutionaries, rebels, socially aware people, liberals, rational thinkers, and champions of equal rights,

before wrapping off with an analysis of the preeminent power structures in Indian society.

The chosen works of Henrik Ibsen and Girish Karnad show a firm dedication to ecofeminist ideals by highlighting underrepresented groups, investigating the relationship between gender and the natural world, and critiquing repressive societal systems. Both writers enrich ecofeminist discourse with their stories, highlighting the interconnectedness of women, the environment, and social justice, which is sometimes neglected. The chosen pieces of literature deal with environmental issues from a gendered perspective and the emancipation of underrepresented groups.

This chapter division establishes a coherent framework for the thesis, enabling a thorough examination of ecofeminist themes in Girish Karnad's and Henrik Ibsen's literary works. Chapter One starts by explaining ecofeminism and its fundamental principles. It also provides an explanation of the relevant literature review and a theoretical framework. Part one of the chapter lays out the definition of feminism and how it developed into a complete theory apart from feminism; parts two and three follow. Secondly, ecofeminism and environmental issues are investigated. The last section has taken on the appearance of a mirror, reflecting the essential features and previous face of ecofeminism theory. Chapter Two explores ecofeminist themes Henrik Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*. It delves into the consequences of industrialization and environmental destruction and critiques patriarchal dominance over society and the natural world. Chapter Three delves into Girish Karnad's *The Fire and the Rain* and its ecofeminist themes. These include an analysis of women's relationships with nature, patriarchy's control over women and the environment, and the effects of environmental degradation on small groups. Ecofeminist opposition and the female characters are also explored in the work.

1- ECOFEMINISM: A MOVEMENT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND GENDER JUSTICE

1.1. Introduction to Ecofeminist Theory

Ecofeminism emerges as a distinctive and influential entity within the fabric of environmental movements. It fuses ecology and feminism into one and seeks to draw parallels between the exploitation of the environment and the exploitation of women with the belief that the earth is interconnected, and nature does not recognize human boundaries. This chapter delves into the origins, ideas, and practices of ecofeminism, a movement that combines the preservation of the environment with the advancement of gender equality. The study explores the fundamental ideas, significant intellectuals, and varied viewpoints that create this transdisciplinary domain. Ecofeminism arose throughout the latter part of the 20th century as a reaction to the perceived simultaneous problems of environmental deterioration and gender inequity. The origins of the movement may be attributed to several sources, like encompassing the women's involvement in the environmental issues, and the Feminist criticisms of conventional environmentalism. In the early 1970, Ecofeminism arose in conjunction with the radicalization of feminism. To go into the idea of Ecofeminism, it is necessary first to examine the term feminism, which is essential to the discourse around the notion of Ecofeminism. Additionally, it is required to ascertain the purported connection between the subjugation of women and the exploitation of nature. Here, feminism refers to pursuing equal rights, which males enjoy. Feminism encompasses not just the pursuit of gender equality and women's rights but also places significant emphasis on fostering compassion, respect, and understanding from males (Honderich, 1995, p. 291). Women worldwide have long been deprived of their social and economic rights. However, throughout the 20th century, women have developed a greater understanding and consciousness of their wants, sexual identity, self-identification, presence, and future.

The term Feminism is used by analysts and critics to describe the revolutionary endeavors of women worldwide to achieve their freedom and establish their self-identity. Traditional society has established a standard perception of women, and it is imperative to modify it by rejecting the practice of defining women

only based on their biological characteristics and labelling their primary purpose as procreation. The prevailing male inclination to assert their dominance over women is the primary catalyst for the discontentment experienced by women in contemporary society. For years, women have endured this hardship silently, and feminism addresses this issue with great care. Indian English authors have explicitly emphasized this topic in their literary works, such as Aneel Salman and Nuzhat Iqba who depict the transformation of female characters from a state of oppression to the state of strength:

She (women) trudges along day, silently going her way; she rises despite the strong patriarchal trends, which permeate attitudes and behavior in a society, entrenched in culture. She breaks the barriers of linguistic, ethnic and cultural complexities and emerges strong willed and more determined than ever. (Salman and Iqba, 2007, p. 853)

Feminism emerged as a means to confront and contest the prevailing patriarchal authority, with the aim of amplifying women's perspectives and lived realities. The feminist movement not only benefited women but also had a positive impact on the environment. Through its development to be a radical movement, it starts to allow women to question patriarchal systems and develop innovative perspectives on gender and society. Ecofeminism arose as a natural progression of this movement, employing feminist ideals to address environmental concerns. It enhances the profound ecological movement by including women's values, experiences, opinions, and viewpoints. The secret to cultural transformation is inside it, offering a balanced attitude towards humanity. This is crucial for harmonizing human life with the environment. The development process has progressively alienated humanity from the natural world, and this divide continues to widen with each passing day. This led to the depreciation of the environment, natural resources, and women through the division of labor based on gender, the exercise of power and control over women, and the perpetuation of culturally sanctioned crimes such as rape, abuse of women, honor killings, female genital mutilation, anxiety disorders, and forced marriages. Women face systematic marginalization and discrimination in all sectors of society, including politics, work, the arts, media, and culture. Consequently, a patriarchal society emerged by exploiting and degrading both the

planet and women (Honderich, 1995, pp. 291 -294). Since they are more vulnerable, women in patriarchal societies suffer disproportionately from the effects of the Earth's functioning. This is because women and nature are interconnected and cannot be separated.

Human beings have exerted dominion over all living and nonliving species on Earth. The rupture between men and nature resulted in the absence of gender inequality. Furthermore, in underdeveloped nations, particularly among impoverished rural women, their lives and social standing are closely linked to the prevailing environmental issues. Undoubtedly, women experience a range of negative consequences, including poverty, food and water scarcity, health difficulties, and sexual abuse, as a result of climate change and environmental challenges such as deforestation, water pollution, and environmental pollutants. Human beings rely entirely on the Earth for their existence, so they must appreciate and cherish it. Given the interconnectedness of all living beings, exploiting one organism has repercussions for others. Ecofeminists primarily concentrate on women as a result of the dual oppression they face due to factors such as poverty, race, education, and nationality, which encompass classism, racism, and sexism. In this way, ecofeminism emphasizes the intimate correlation between the subjugation of women under patriarchy and the exploitation of the environment via development (Lorentzen and Eaton, 2002, p.1). Ecofeminism is based on the understanding that different forms of oppression, as Gaard argues, mutually support and strengthen one other. According to Ecofeminists, patriarchal society is founded upon four interconnected pillars: racism, sexism, class exploitation, and environmental damage. The prevailing culture depicts women and other marginalized social groups as being inherently more connected to the natural world. In *Towards a Queer Ecofeminism*, Greta Gaard offers her own reflection on the matter:

An early impetus for the ecofeminist movement was the realization that the liberation of women—the aim of all branches of feminism—cannot be fully effected without the liberation of nature; and conversely, the liberation of nature so ardently desired by environmentalists will not be fully effected without the liberation of women: conceptual, symbolic, empirical and historical linkages between women and nature as they are constructed in

Western culture require feminists and environmentalists to address these literary efforts together if we are to be successful. (2012, p. 440)

The fundamental objective of ecofeminism diverges from that of liberal feminist. Ecofeminists advocate for the emancipation of women as women, rather than striving for equal rights with males. They emphasize the significance of tasks traditionally associated with women, such as birthing, caring, and household work, and seek acknowledgment for their relevance.

As a forementioned, feminism expanded itself to include topics the struggles of the environment mirrored the struggles marginal groups faced. This new movement became known as ecofeminism. The movement aimed to draw attention to current ecological crisis alongside the longstanding patriarchal oppression of women, with a classification as either feminist ecology or ecological feminism (Dubey, 2018, p. 99). Ecofeminism encompasses a variety of theoretical, practical, and critical efforts to understand and resist the interrelated dominations of women and nature. The term *ecofeminism* originated with French feminist Françoise d'Eaubonne in 1974 and became a useful tool to assess interconnections between women's oppression and the ecological crisis. Ecofeminism in North America has roots in antinuclear, antiwar, environmental, and lesbian-feminist activist movements. Numerous conferences and popular ecofeminist publications in the 1980s were precursors to a burgeoning of academic ecofeminist writings, especially in the fields of philosophy, theology, and religious studies. Analyses of critical links between militarism, sexism, classism, racism, and environmental destruction became central to ecofeminist thought and action. Ecofeminism now reflects the concerted efforts of women trying to integrate their personal, ecological, and sociopolitical concerns (Lorentzen and Eaton, 2003, pp. 1-2).

As this school of thought emerged under the rubric of ecofeminism, a peculiar elision occurred. Inexplicably, even as the association of ecofeminism with a spiritually inclined school of thought became more fixed, that word also remained in circulation as a term to refer indiscriminately to all manner of feminist environmentalisms. The word ecofeminism thus became a dual signifier, both meaning the specific spiritually centered school of environmental thought and also being used as a generic term for all feminist environmentalisms. This meant that by

the late 1980s ‘ecofeminism’ had become a fighting word. For every woman who reveled in the association of ecofeminism with earth goddesses. There was one who winced. Many women rejected ecofeminism, particularly academics in social and biological sciences whose engagement with environmentalism was forged in a rationalist tradition, and who feared that talk of goddesses and life forces would undermine their hard-won but precarious professional credibility (Anjum, 2020, p. 846). For many political feminists, ecofeminism was a word to define against; the spiritual side of ecofeminism was derided as mystical bunk, dangerously apolitical and atheoretical.

Ecofeminism is a practical movement for social change arising out of the struggles of women to sustain themselves, their families, and their communities. These struggles are waged against the ‘maldevelopment’ and ‘environmental’ degradation caused by patriarchal societies, multinational corporations, and global capitalism. They are waged for environmental balance, heterarchical and matrifocal societies, the continuance of indigenous cultures, and economic values and programs based on subsistence and sustainability. The foundation and ground of ecofeminism’s existence, then, consists of both resistance and vision, critiques and heuristics. Ecofeminism is not a single master theory and its practitioners have different articulations of their social practice. For the most part, those who set out to articulate its philosophy and worldview do so in the belief that such theorizing will assist specific movements, actions, and practices. Such theorizing will do so through increasing the self-consciousness of its participants and representing its beliefs to those who are open to it. As Irene Diamond and Gloria Feman Orenstein note in their introduction to *Reweaving the World*:

Ecofeminist politics does not stop short at the phase of dismantling the androcentric and anthropocentric biases of Western civilization. Once the critique of such dualities as culture and nature, reason and emotion, human and animal has been posed, ecofeminism seeks to reweave new stories that acknowledge and value the biological and cultural diversity that sustains all life. These new stories honor, rather than fear, women’s biological particularity while simultaneously affirming women as subjects and makers of history. This understanding that biological

particularity need not be antithetical to historical agency is crucial to the transformation of feminism. (1990, p. 11)

Although ecofeminism explores a range of women nature interconnections, three claims seem central-the empirical, the conceptual (cultural/ symbolic), and the epistemological. The empirical claim is that environmental problems disproportionately affect women in most parts of the world. The United Nations as early as 1989 observed, "It is now a universally established fact that it is the woman who is the worst victim of environmental destruction. The poorer she is, the greater is her burden" (Philipose, 1989, p. 67). The increased burdens women face result not only from environmental deterioration; the sexual division of labor found in most societies considers family sustenance to be women's work, and women, as primary caregivers, generally bear primary responsibility for the food and the health of family members. Providing fuel, food, and water for families becomes increasingly difficult with environmental degradation. To make matters worse, economic resources-ownership of land or commercial businesses-remain inaccessible to most women. (Eaton and Lorentzen, 2003, p. 2). Ecofeminists' empirical claim examines sociopolitical and economic structures that restrict many women's lives to poverty, ecological deprivation, and economic powerlessness.

A second claim is that women and nature are connected conceptually and symbolically in Euro-western worldviews. These connections are articulated in several ways. According to ecofeminists, Euro-western cultures developed ideas about a world divided hierarchically and dualistically. Dualistic conceptual structures identify women with femininity, the body, sexuality, earth or nature and materiality; and men with masculinity, the mind, heaven, the supernatural, and disembodied spirit (Eaton and Lorentzen, 2003, p. 2). Dualisms such as reason/emotion, mind/body, culture/ nature, heave dearth, and madwoman give priority to the first over the second. Ecofeminists refer to these pairings as hierarchical dualisms and claim they point to a logic of domination that is entrenched in Euro-western history and worldviews. Religion, philosophy, science, and cultural symbols reinforce this worldview, making male power over both women and nature appear natural and thus justified. Social patterns, including sexual norms, education, governance, and economic control, reflect this logic of domination.

The third claim is epistemological, following from connections noted between women and nature. Since environmental problems affect women most directly isn't it possible that women possess greater knowledge and expertise that could prove useful in finding solutions to pressing environmental problems? Some claim women possess more knowledge about Earth systems than men and thus should be epistemologically privileged. For example, in many parts of the world, women are the land's custodians and have greater agricultural knowledge than men. Thus, according to ecofeminists, these women are in a good position to aid in creating new practical and intellectual ecological paradigms (Eaton and Lorentzen, 2003, p.3). Women, then, are best equipped to address local environmental problems. For a few ecofeminists this epistemological privilege is more than a pragmatic claim however.

Some see women as closer to nature/earth than men and possessing innate traits of caring, community building, nonviolence, and Earth sensitivity. This type of women-nature essentialism may be found in some cultures and contexts; however, most ecofeminists consider the connections between women and nature to be based in theory and in conceptual frameworks rather than in essence. Where women have expertise in agriculture and ecological systems, it is not due to their essential nature but to their life experiences. Ecofeminism, although generally sharing the preceding three claims, is not one thing. It is, as Karen Warren notes, an umbrella term for a wide variety of approaches. Ecofeminist theorists differ on foundational assumptions, on the nature of the relationship between women and the natural world, on ecological paradigms, on feminist approaches, on the roots of environmental crises, and on goals and the means of achieving them. Ecofeminists may be liberal, Marxist, socialist, cultural, radical, postmodernist, or eco-womanist. They may advocate environmental resource management, deep ecology, social ecology, or new cosmologies in their ecological frameworks. Buddhist, Native American, goddess-worshipping, Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Jewish, and thoroughly secular versions of ecofeminism exist. Ecofeminist thought and activism occur in India, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Regional, ethnic, and cultural ecofeminism exist (Warren, 1994, p. 1). If myriad voices, theoretical positions, praxis, and political leanings characterize ecofeminism, then what makes ecological feminism feminist is the

commitment to the recognition and elimination of male-gender bias and the development of practices, policies, and theories without this bias. What makes it *ecological* is a commitment to the valuing and preserving of ecosystems, broadly understood. Ecofeminism is a textured field of theoretical and experiential insights encompassing different forms of knowledge, embodied in the concrete.

Ecofeminism has faced criticism from both deep ecologists and social ecologists. The ecofeminists diverge from the eccentric ideology of deep ecologists by scrutinizing their assertion that anthropocentrism is the single underlying factor responsible for the degradation of the natural environment. The ecofeminists attribute the loss to androcentrism. Deep ecologists, conversely, perceive ecofeminists as fundamentally mistaken in their contrasting perspectives, according to Deborah Slicer observed that the deep ecologists appeared to disregard or overlook ecofeminist ideas and failed to adequately portray and address the perspectives of the ecofeminists (1995, p.55). Plumwood criticized Beihl's argument for being trapped in the outdated belief of a single basis for hierarchy and a single remedy to dominance. (1993, p. 152). This reductionist perspective is fundamentally flawed, as it fails to see and appreciate differences and ignores the issue of exclusion. Currently, ecofeminism is gaining prominence in the field of gender studies. It is progressively expanding the scope of research in this specific field. It is being included in the curricula of prestigious institutions worldwide. There is still much opportunity for inter-theoretical disputes over the ideas put forth by ecofeminist critics.

Regarding the movements of ecofeminism, while ecofeminist philosophy and activism encompass other movements, three movements appear to be fundamental to ecofeminist theory.

1.1.1 Cultural ecofeminism

The initial form of ecofeminism, known as cultural feminism or often referred to as radical feminism, has a historical significance. Cultural feminism emerged in the early 1970 with the purpose of reclaiming the interconnectedness between women and nature, viewing it as a means of liberation and empowerment that showcases women's ability to nurture and protect the environment. Certain cultural ecofeminists contend that women's reproductive abilities establish a biological connection with nature, positioning women as being more closely associated with

nature than males (Dubey, 2018, p. 99). Some cultural ecofeminists argue that women's inherent connection to nature is deeply ingrained in social and psychological frameworks, which enables them to possess more suitable methods of understanding and moral reasoning to address environmental issues.

The core concept of cultural ecofeminism revolves around its defiance of the regressive influence of patriarchy, the concept examines the significance of a culture that has a strong influence on its members, effectively manipulating women and the environment for its own purposes. Its objective is to restore and retrieve the scattered historical records of women and rewrite their past (Dubey, 2018, p. 99). Cultural ecofeminism promotes the correlation between women and nature, emphasizing the connection through gender roles and biology. It originates from a nature-based religion and the worship of goddesses. Cultural ecofeminists argue that these links enable women to have a greater sensitivity and affinity for the environment, which is crucial for their well-being. Cultural ecofeminism addresses the patriarchal devaluing of nature by reimagining and reinstating the attributes that have traditionally been culturally and historically linked to women. It seeks to reassess the significance of feminine traits such as caring, nurturing, the physical body, and emotions (Lorentzen and Eaton, 2002, p. 2). According to them, the culture and spirituality centered around women are founded on nourishment and tranquility. It has a propensity for societal transformation through cultural, intellectual, linguistic, and spiritual means. They use pagan symbols, ordinary things, and personal experiences from their daily lives to express their opposition to the harmful influences of patriarchy.

1.1.2 Socialist Ecofeminism

It is a concept that specifically examines the interconnectedness between capitalism, patriarchy, and environmental degradation. The argument posits that the existing economic system is intrinsically unsustainable and that achieving a fair and sustainable society necessitates a profound overhaul of both economic and gender dynamics. . Ecofeminism- a social movement why it is a social movement, as it studies or tries to understand the present scenario. The word social movement gained its popularity in European languages in early nineteenth century, this term was concerned with creation of new society. Specifically, it seeks to critique the consistent domination that is occurred through globalization, industrialization,

modern trade and industry theory and practices. Yenesra King describes:

Ecofeminism is about connectedness and wholeness of theory and practice. It asserts the special strength and integrity of every living thing. For us, the snail darter is to be considered side by side with a community's need for water... We are a woman-identified movement and we believe we have a special work to do in these imperiled times. (1983, p.10)

In this context societal human resources may act as a team with communities and individuals to renovate to save our planet (Mellor, 2006, p.1). Observing the situation from a perspective that is extremely profound and serious, the connectivity and completeness of theory and practice are central to the ecofeminist ideology with a statement that every living thing have a unique strength and integrity that is unique to it.

1.1.3 Spiritual Ecofeminism

Theories explore the spiritual aspect of ecofeminism. According to this movement, the ecofeminist alternative to the Western patriarchal perspective is a radical reinterpretation that values the interconnectedness, change, embodiment, care, and love of all things. This notion shares similarities with several Eastern and indigenous spiritual belief systems. Spretnak explores the connection between ecofeminism and the primary religious traditions, as well as the utilization of feminine symbolism in relation to the concept of 'the holy'. She asserts that the use of feminine metaphors is a beneficial remedy against the cultural devaluation of women, especially in a patriarchal culture. Spiritual Ecofeminism utilizes spiritual and theological traditions to examine the interrelationship among women, nature, and the divine. Its objective is to foster a deep respect for the Earth and establish moral principles for coexisting harmoniously with the environment (Spretnak, 1993, p.187). The ecofeminists, feminists, and women's spirituality movements move together out of a common concern for the security of the Earth and all forms of life which depend on it. They promote to restore synchronization in a global environmental, damaged occurred due to a devaluation of nature and women; and support the earth. Judith Plant writes about the matter in her book, *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism*,

Our aim is a non-violent and ecological feminist transformation of societal structures. Our aim is radical, non-violent change outside and inside of us. The macrocosm and microcosm! This has to do with transforming power! Not power over power to dominate or power to terrorize – but shared power, abolishing power as we know it, replacing it with the power of non-violence or something common to all, to be used by all and for all! Power as the discovery of our own strength –as opposed to a passive receiving of power exercised by others, often in our name. Creating a truly free society- based on ecological and feminist principles that can mediate humanity’s relationship with nature- is our common aim...living, producing, working and living in comprehensible human dimensions is another common goal for us all... ecofeminism draws on the principles of unity in diversity, a most important aspect in times of social simplification. (1989, pp. 10-11)

Several other contributors declare that ecofeminism is a social movement too. Diamond and Orenstein assert in their book, *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism* (1990), that ecofeminism is a social movement. Ecofeminism has provided the voice to the women and connect them with the whole world. However some argue that ecofeminism has not yet developed into a social movement. Sale disputes that it is too early to speak of ecofeminism as a movement. and that it is best “thought of less as a movement than a philosophy or perhaps not a movement at all, in the traditional sense, nor even some kind of tendency” (1978, p.302), within a movement ecofeminists may subscribe to liberal, radical, or Marxist/socialist thought, their main focus is on ecology - both of nature and human systems but rather a way of re-regarding the world that can be brought to bear on a whole variety of movements and tendencies.

1.2. Ecofeminism and Environmentalism

The contributions of ecofeminism to feminist environmentalism are myriad, and ecofeminism itself is clearly an enduring part of the feminist environmental mix. Contemplation and contestation of the issues provoked by ecofeminism have produced a robust and challenging literature: on anthropomorphism, on the ‘sex – typing’ of the planet, on encounters between feminism and deep ecology, on the

nature of nature. The philosophy of ecofeminism is a well – developed field. Ecofeminism as a term indicates a double political intervention, of environmentalism into feminism and feminism into environmentalism, that is as politically important as the designations ‘socialist feminism’ and ‘black feminism’ were. Most feminists who pursue scholarship and activist work on the environment –whether from ‘ecofeminist’ portions or not share common interests, among them a commitment to illuminating the ways in which gender, class and race mediate people’s lived experiences in local environments; an interest in examining the ways in which human environment perceptions and values may be mediated through ‘gendered’ lenses and shaped by gender roles and assumptions; an interest in examining the gendered nature of constellation of political, economic and ecological power in institutions that are instrumental players in the state of the environment; and interest in exploring the interconnectedness of systems of oppression and domination. (Anjum, 2020, p. 847). The best of the recent feminist environmental scholarship engages with and extends transnational, postcolonial and poststructuralist deconstructions and challenges .

It is urged feminists to join their cause to that of the environment and lead the way into an ecological and truly humanist revolution. Ecofeminism, however stemming from ecocriticism needs to be read as a distinct methodology for understanding the current global climate because it brings consciousness to not only the ecological crisis but also intertwines this crisis with the subordination of women. One of the first ecofeminist conferences took place in March 1980 at Armherst, where ecofeminist Ynestra King stated:

Ecofeminism is about connectedness and wholeness of theory and practice...We see the devastation of the earth and her beings by the corporate warriors and the threat of nuclear annihilation by the military warriors as feminist concerns. It is the same masculinist mentality which would deny us our right to our own bodies...and which depends on multiple systems of dominance and state power to have its own way. (1983, p. 10)

Adherents to ecofeminism believe that the plight of nature and the plight of marginal groups, especially women, are intrinsically tied to each other. Ecofeminism

is often referred to as the third wave of feminism and blends ecology, feminism and women's spirituality. Eco-feminists have argued that in patriarchal society women have been considered closer to nature than their male counterpart and that this association has validated subjugation of both entities. Patrick Murphy has argued the connection between the environmental movement and the women's movement in the following way:

To be a feminist, one must also be an ecologist, because the domination and oppression of women and nature are inextricably intertwined. To be an ecologist, one must also be a feminist, since without addressing gender and oppression and the patriarchal ideology that generates the sexual metaphors of masculine domination of nature, one cannot effectively challenge the world views that threaten the stable evolution of the biosphere in which human beings participate or perish. (2009, p 48)

The logic of patriarchy is one that supports the subordination of nature and other oppressed groups. Any marginal beings, human or non-human, are otherized in order to subject them to hegemonic patriarchal thought, "The natural environment as empirical reality has been made to subserve human interests, and one of those interests has been made to make it serve as a symbolic reinforcement of the subservience of disempowered groups: non-whites, women and children" (Buell, 1996, p. 21). Scholar such as Val Plumwood (1993) who speaks about this process of subservience defining it as "backgrounding" otherwise known as a process of negation. According to Plumwood, backgrounding occurs due to the relationship of domination and its effects. The "superior" being attempts to profit from the "lesser" being, organizing its resources and thus benefitting from the other's work. This in turn creates a dependency on the inferior subject, however the superior will continuously attempt to negate any dependency. Plumwood extends her thought to include feminist ideology, citing Marilyn Frye:

I imagine phallocratic reality to be the space and figures and motion which constitute the foreground, and the constant repetitive uneventful activities of women to constitute and maintain the background against which this foreground plays. It is essential to the maintenance of the

foreground reality that nothing within it refer in any way to anything in the background, and yet it depends absolutely upon the existence of the background. (1983, p. 48)

The other is viewed as highly inessential by the superior. It never occurs to the superior that there may be a reality in which he is the background and not the foreground. This could be translated to the current ecological crisis. Society excavates nature and exploits its resources denying any dependency to the natural environment. Humanity believes they are self-sufficient, not realizing that with constant exploitation, resources are bound to be fully exhumed, and that is when the extreme dependency will be made evident (Buell, 1996, p. 21). The gender dimension of environmental issues rests on two linked claims. The first is that women and men stand in a different relationship to their environment, that the environment is a gendered issue. The second is that women and men respond differently to environmental issues, in particular that women are more responsive to nature. Nature in this sense is more diffuse than the specific natural environment (the local ecosystem, the resource base of communities, and so on); it reflects a more holistic and active view of nature as a force. The term 'environment' is used below to refer to the more limited meaning and nature to refer to the wider meaning. The claim that there is a gender dimension to environmental issues is initially the less contentious. It rests on the idea that, inasmuch as men and women have different life experiences, they have different environmental experiences. This idea becomes more problematic when extended to the assertion that environmental problems have more of an impact on women than on men. This in turn becomes linked to the second claim, that women are more responsive to environmental issues. Joni Seager, for example, has pointed out that women readily become active in campaigns about environmental issues and are overrepresented at the local level in formal environmental movements although underrepresented in the leadership of those movements.' There is also evidence that sexism and gender inequality in 'Green' movements are reflected not only in the leadership profile but in 'Green' ideologies.

The claim that women are more responsive than men to environmental issues has been expressed in two ways. The first is based on women's different experience in a gendered society, arguing that women and nature are in a historically contingent

relationship, that they have a socially constructed connection. The second sees the link as a more fundamental one: that women have an elemental affinity to the natural world based on biological or cultural sex difference. In either case, raising the question of women's relationship to nature is very problematic for feminism, which has long sought to separate sex and gender (Buell, 1996, p. 21). Nature in relation to women has tended to become entangled with embodiment, the perceived biological limitation and "weakness" of being female that has denied women political and social rights. As Simone de Beauvoir pointed out so forcefully, women appeared to be more prey to their biological destiny than men; they were locked in domestic and bodily immanence and could only gain freedom by rejecting and transcending their womanhood. The case for reconnecting women with nature must therefore be a good one if all the gains of (some middle class, white) women are not to be lost. After the development that occurred through the interaction of ecology and nature with the great problems of nature, the roles of both women and nature were transformed from inactive roles to constructive roles. This matter accelerated the emergence of ecofeminism as a literary theory. Ecofeminism turned to be global theory encompassing both academic feminists and environmentalists from wealthy and developing countries.

1.3. Ecofeminist Theory as a Literary Criticism

Ecofeminist literary criticism synthesizes ecological or environmental critique with feminist literary criticism. It provides a distinctive amalgamation of literary and philosophical viewpoints that grants literary and cultural critics a distinct perspective to examine the portrayal of nature in literature and its connection to depictions of gender, race, class, and sexuality. An essential undertaking of ecofeminist literary critics is examining the cultural fabrication of nature encompasses examining language, desire, knowledge, and power (Murphy, 1991, p.199). Ecological literary critics contend that the English profession reacted to the civil rights and feminist movements of the 1960 and 1970 by modifying their hiring and promotion practices. They also incorporated race, gender, and class into literary theory and criticism and thoroughly evaluated the literary canon. However, the profession did not exhibit a similar level of responsiveness towards the critical matter of the environment, constituting a significant social movement that has emerged

during the past three decades. Until lately, the profession of literature has curiously overlooked environmental problems. Eco-critics contend that the profession must prioritize ecological concerns due to the apparent escalation of the global ecological catastrophe. This entails examining how literature shapes human behavior about the natural world.

Ecofeminists assert that addressing tangible environmental issues, such as the placement of nuclear waste facilities, the construction of garbage incinerators, and the development of water systems in Latin American villages, is a dual responsibility of both ecological and feminist nature. They argue that the current state of potential environmental catastrophe is primarily a result of a patriarchal environmental ideology that has portrayed land as a feminine entity, thus leading to the exploitation and degradation of the environment (Murphy, 1991, p. 199). The prevailing land ethic in this society has been chiefly lacking in knowledge and unaffected by the impact of gender, race, and class on understanding nature and what is considered natural. Ecofeminists contend that revealing the symbolic and conceptual connections among gender, race, class, and depictions of nature in literature is a crucial aspect of developing a more sustainable environmental moral framework.

Ecofeminists contend that the portrayal of nature as feminine, specifically as a mother or virgin, is crucial in upholding the detrimental environmental ideology and justifying hierarchical thinking that perpetuates the oppression of marginalized groups in patriarchal societies. This is achieved by categorizing these groups as more closely associated with nature or labelling their actions as natural or unnatural. Ecofeminists propose that redefining the concept of nature and exploring new ways for humans to interact with the nonhuman world are crucial steps towards eradicating systemic oppression based on gender, race, class, and sexual preference. Furthermore, these efforts can contribute to the transformation of harmful environmental practices. Ecocritical scholars who adopt an ecofeminist perspective play a crucial role in reimagining and reevaluating the connections between humans and the environment (Murphy, 1991, p. 199). They accomplish this by increasing consciousness regarding a wide array of overlooked narratives concerning the natural world and landscapes, such as: raising awareness of the environmental crisis, gender dynamics and environmental advocacy, and resistance against patriarchal hierarchies.

1.3.1 Raising Awareness of the Environmental Crisis

Many studies on environmental awareness use results of opinion surveys as a proxy for level of environmental attitude. The worldwide environmental discourse has acknowledged the significance of empowering both women and men to actively engage in the development of environmental policies and decision-making processes, both within civil society organizations and formal representative institutions. The environmental justice movement has expanded in breadth over the last twenty years, originating predominantly from examinations of environmental disparities rooted in race, ethnicity, and poverty. Although ecofeminism has not explicitly identified itself as a member of this movement, it undeniably exhibits some similar traits. One notable similarity is the observation that women, at various scales ranging from individual to global, are more prone to being classified as living in poverty compared to men. The environmental justice literature, which has traditionally focused on matters of poverty and racism, is now considering gender. This is opportune, given the mounting evidence that gender is disproportionately linked to disadvantage in several aspects.

Women are much more disadvantaged than men in both chronic and catastrophic environmental hazard conditions. There are numerous studies made to examine the occurrence of violence against women, which tends to escalate under high-stress circumstances such as environmental disasters and chronically environmentally strained conditions (Mellor, 1992, p. 8) However, this issue is often disregarded in disaster management and development, which men predominantly control. A significant portion of the ecofeminism literature discusses the concept of ‘embodiment’, which refers to the heightened susceptibility of women’s bodies to environmental pollution.

1.3.2 Gender Dynamics and Environmental Advocacy

Women often possess a greater understanding of local environmental concerns due to the influence of gender norms (Dalal, 2020). Nevertheless, gender roles also provide difficulties and are seen as the primary obstacle to achieving successful environmental efforts. Gender norms and conventional labor roles can impede growth in both environmental elements and women’s social positions. The juxtaposition of women’s ability to sustain themselves through waste management

work while being confined to traditional gender roles creates a challenging scenario (Foster et. al, 2012). Women possess greater practical knowledge about the environment compared to men, making it advantageous for the organization to have more female leaders. However, the progress remains stagnant due to women's limited influence.

Despite the evident correlations between gender and environmental challenges, there has been a dearth of research conducted to elucidate this relationship. The relationships between gender and environmental concern are studied and “carefully theorized more than other structural variations in environmental concern” (Dietz, 1998, p. 2). It is generally believed that women are more concerned about environment than men because “women are potentially more environmentalist than men due to biosphere orientation” (Stein, 2004, p. 34). This is supported by the idea that more women are concerned about the environmental quality, critical about policy taken by government and willing to accept lower standard of living for fewer health risks. Nevertheless, other empirical investigations show inconsistent results on this hypothesis. For instance, earlier studies showed that men are more concerned about environment than women due to their higher level of education and involvement with the communities and political issues. However, other studies show that women are more concerned about environment than men because men are much more concerned about economic growth and economic stability and consider environment as constraint to the economic growth (Stein, 2004, p. 33), in this way, women tend to be more concerned about local environmental issues than men, but this difference is smaller when it comes to the issues at national or global level. It also notes that women are less likely to take political actions to protect the environment (Stein, 2004, p.34). In general, mothers are more concerned about local environmental problems than fathers. The reasons for such differences are based on role in the society: mothers prioritize welfare and health of family which closely associates with the local environmental quality such as water, air and solid waste, while fathers' priorities economic and material wellbeing of the family. Many studies suggest the possible relationships between gender and environmental concerns. However, this relationship must be treated with caution. All investigations indicated that environment-gender association has much

to do with the difference in social role, which is culturally conformed and changes greatly from time to time. Considering the fact that these hypotheses are based on Western culture and on period varying between 1970 to 90, different outcome can be expected from different cultural and historical context.

1.3.3 Resistance Against Patriarchal Hierarchies

Through the application of a feminist perspective, Ecofeminism brings attention to several key points: the various ways in which both nature and women are subjected to the control and mistreatment of a patriarchal society, the unjust exertion of social norms that result in the dominance of women and nature, and the interconnectedness between the development and destruction of nature and the exploitation of women by patriarchal systems. Ecofeminism is based on the social analysis that the subjugation of women by patriarchy and the exploitation of the environment through the Western paradigm of progress are inherently interconnected. “The exploitation and destruction of the environment, in all its manifestations, serves as a symbolic representation of the violation and abuse of women, in all their various forms” (Plant, 1985, p. 5). Hence, the ecological catastrophe and the enslavement of women are both manifestations of the same ailment. Ecofeminists are mainly concerned with resistance against patriarchal structures, as they view them as an extension of male rule on the planet.

Ecofeminism emerged as a theoretical framework and activity position in response to the feminist, ecological, and peace movements. It acknowledges the significant role of women in grassroots activism. Ecofeminism, similar to feminism, encompasses a wide range of perspectives and beliefs, including Goddess worship, lesbian separatism, Christian ecofeminism, and socialist ecofeminism. The presence of diversity is not contradictory but rather fundamental to the theory and application of ecofeminism. What all ecofeminists have in common is their recognition that the feminist movement and the ecological movement have not made substantial progress due to their refusal to acknowledge the shared root cause of both issues. They assert that a methodical control is exerted on both women and nature, supported by a philosophical framework of dualities. These dualities are often recognized as man/woman, mind/body, reason/emotion, human/nature, active/passive, and similar pairings. The significance resides in the assumption that reality indeed exists as

binary oppositions, with the belief that the first element in each pair is seen to be morally or logically superior to the second element (Howell, 1990, p. 233). Notably, both 'woman' and 'nature' are categorized in the dualism sets, representing what is distinct from 'man' or 'human'. Within this paradigm, women and nature are positioned as inferior entities, categorized as 'other', and consequently treated as such in a manner considered acceptable or justified.

Given that all kinds of dominance, including those that adhere to this particular pattern, are governed by the same conceptual framework, it is necessary to tackle each to handle the rest. Thus, it is impossible to address the ecological issues without simultaneously addressing patriarchy and vice versa. Ecofeminism provides a critical analysis of conventional social movements. Ecofeminism advocates for dismantling these dichotomies to establish a society based on equal exchange and shared responsibility, free from systems of hierarchy or control. Therefore, it is necessary to remove all forms of domination, such as racism, classism, and heterosexism, as they all originate from the same principle of dominance (Howell, 1990, p. 233). Overcoming dualism and value hierarchy necessitates appreciating variety since no single voice or group can definitively determine the highest value or worth. This concept is supported by ecological studies, which demonstrate that variety, mutuality, and reciprocity are advantageous for the overall survival of a system. Recognizing the significance of diversity - where 'truth' is subjective and multifaceted - is advocated to prevent falling into the postmodern pitfall of 'relativism' where truth loses its meaning. Thus, an ecofeminist representation of nature is inherently interconnected with civilization. Ecofeminists characterize deep ecology and its relationship with the two entities as distinct yet mutually beneficial. However, the independence of nature is acknowledged.

Overall, ecofeminism is a dynamic and diverse movement that unites the goals of environmental preservation with gender parity. It confronts the underlying male-dominated origins of ecological harm and aims to establish a fair and enduring global society for everyone. Ecofeminism provides a distinctive and influential viewpoint on the pressing issues confronting our world by promoting the acceptance of variety, inclusiveness, and a profound comprehension of the interdependence between humans and the environment.

The concept of the interconnectedness between the subjugation of women and the degradation of the environment has been explored through several approaches. Early ecofeminist literature praised the notion that women had a stronger connection to nature. While Ibsen's work is not strictly ecofeminist, it provides a unique perspective for ecofeminist study by exploring environmental deterioration and human response. Analyzing the environmental themes in Henrik Ibsen's play *An Enemy of the People* from an ecofeminist viewpoint includes understanding the play's ecological problems through the lens of a theoretical framework that integrates feminist ideas with environmental issues. Although the play does not directly address feminist concerns, its examination of environmental ethics and the associated social dynamics corresponds with fundamental principles of ecofeminism. As for the second play which aims to empower women by encouraging them to speak up against societal control. It also explores women's sensitivity towards environment, including the notion of ecofeminism into the play.

2- ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS IN HENRIK IBSEN'S *AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE*: FROM ECOFEMINIST STUDY

The five-act Norwegian drama *An Enemy of the People* (1882) takes place in a sleepy seaside village with heavy industrial influences. Municipal therapeutic baths and a cluster of tanneries produce a significant portion of the town's income. The town's purported healing powers stem from the use of water that has been polluted by nearby tannery companies for three generations; Dr. Thomas Stockmann's father-in-law, Morten Kiil, owns these damaged grounds. There is a scientist named Dr. Thomas Stockmann who is the brother of the mayor. Dr. Stockmann finds out early on in the play that the Baths are polluted and don't have any medical value. The town's powerful mayor, Peter Stockmann, uses his position to influence the working class and the media in order to keep the Baths profitable, even though it's bad for the town's residents' health and the health of the European tourists who visit. This chapter explores the intersections of ecofeminism within Henrik Ibsen's play *An Enemy of the People*. While Ibsen's work predominantly addresses themes of individual integrity, public health, and societal hypocrisy, an ecofeminist reading allows for a deeper exploration of the environmental concerns and the critique of patriarchal power structures implicit in the story. This chapter posits that the play, through its central conflict around environmental pollution and societal reaction, indirectly aligns with the core principles of ecofeminism. Though Ibsen's work is not

explicitly ecofeminist, its exploration of environmental degradation and the societal response offers a unique lens for ecofeminist analysis.

In order to put Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* into context, it is important to note that the book offers a new perspective on the varied ways in which humans view the environment, namely in relation to the contamination of the baths and the intricate political dynamics around this issue. As to Garrard's belief, "pollution" is "an ecological problem because it does not name a substance or class of substances, but rather represents an implicit normative claim that there is too much of something in the environment, usually in the wrong place." (2004, p. 6). Therefore, the play's bath contamination is solely an ecological problem, and the opportunities to assess various human responses to the pollution from an ecocritical perspective are still accessible. People are involved in environmental problems on three fronts: first, they cause pollution by dumping industrial waste into water sources; second, they are sick from the contamination; and third, when it comes to water purification, people have strong opinions for and against the practice. The inferred interplay between two components of nature is the main emphasis of an ecocritical interpretation of the topic. This aids efforts "to define, explore, and even resolve ecological problems in this wider sense" (Garrard, 2004, p.6). Ecofeminism appears in the play in many forms, raising awareness of the Environmental crisis, resistance, gender dynamics and environmental advocacy and Resistance Against Patriarchal Hierarchies.

2.1. Raising Awareness of the Environmental Crisis in *An Enemy of the People*

Out of all of Ibsen's plays, *An Enemy of the People*, is unique in that it focuses on the theme of professional knowledge. Thomas Stockmann is well known as "the doctor" and he considers himself to be a "man of science" (Fjelde & Ibsen, 1978, p. 289). In his correspondence with George Brandes on June 12th, 1883, Ibsen describes Dr. Stockmann as a visionary who is far more advanced than the bulk of people. Ibsen also mentions that he has had a harmonious relationship with Dr. Stockmann. Both individuals possess a heightened awareness of continuous advancement, setting them apart from the norm. The concept of "incessant progression" may be observed in Anthony Giddens' theoretical framework through the notion of modernity's reflexivity. Giddens argues that modern social life is characterized by reflexivity, which refers to the ongoing examination and

reformulation of social practices based on new knowledge. This process fundamentally changes the nature of these activities. This has a remarkable resemblance to the eco-feminist perspective.

In his critique of contemporary business, he focuses only on highlighting existing issues. Furthermore, he elevates these economic difficulties to the realm of spirituality, considering them “greater things to discuss” (Fjelde & Ibsen, 1978, p. 352). The pollution originating from the nearby hills is rendered inconsequential when compared to the pollution infiltrating the community from its historical spiritual background (Johnston, 2006, p. 136). Furthermore, there is no indication in the play, even until its conclusion, that Dr. Stockmann will address the issue of pollution once more. Dr. Stockmann delivers a public address where he vehemently criticizes the townsfolk’s spiritual beliefs. In his critique, he initially targets the incompetence of the authorities, exemplified by his brother Peter Stockmann, asserting that their thought processes are archaic remnants of a dying era. He then proceeds to condemn the majority, revealing them as the most treacherous adversaries of truth and freedom, while extolling the minority as the pioneers of truth. “Stupidity of the authorities” (Ibsen, 2012, p. 87). Finally, after illustrating the transitory nature of modernity, wherein established truths eventually fade away, he concludes that open-mindedness is nearly synonymous with morality. “broad-mindedness is almost exactly the same as morality” (Ibsen, 2012, p. 360). Dr. Stockmann used two analogies when referring to the narrow-minded majority. One term refers to a combination of several animal species, while the other term refers to elderly ladies or wives. The juxtaposition of animals and women in this context is not accidental, as it reflects Dr. Stockmann’s perception of these two groups via a male-centric lens. During his public lecture, the doctor draws a parallel between a purebred animal and a hybrid animal:

Just think what a difference there is between a cultivated and an uncultivated breed of animal? Take a common farmyard hen. How much meat is there on such a stunted chicken carcass? Not a lot, no! And what sort of eggs does it lay? A relatively decent crow or raven could lay eggs almost as good. Then take a cultivated Spanish or Japanese hen, or take a noble pheasant or turkey; - ah, then you’ll see the difference! Or what

about dogs, to which we humans are so very closely related. Think first of a plain, common dog, - which is to say a horrible, shaggy, vulgar mongrel that does nothing but roam the streets and foul the walls of buildings. Then set that alongside a poodle with a long pedigree, bred in a noble house where it has been fed on fine food and had the opportunity to listen to harmonious voices and music. (Ibsen, 2012, pp. 93-94)

In Henrik Ibsen's play, the principal topic is around the dissemination of knowledge, awareness, and information. Dr. Stockmann encounters substantial obstacles as he endeavors to disclose and safeguard the community from the polluted state of the town's baths. The protagonist's fight against the town's governing bodies, who prioritizes financial concerns above the well-being of the community, underscores the challenges of spreading accurate information in the presence of social opposition and the distortion of facts. This topic embodies the wider clash between the individual's obligation to society and the sometimes-antagonistic response to difficult realities. Eco-socialists, and ecofeminist argue that ecological deterioration is one of the repercussions of the capitalist system. This is a critical school of thought that asserts that the current ecological disasters are a result of human social problems. This environmental issue frequently causes significant disruption, such as bodily dysfunction, for all living organisms. Ecofeminism expresses worries on all forms of dominion over nature achieved by contemporary methodologies. In this regard, Lixin Han (2010) cites Grundmann's perspective that the concept of 'mastery over nature' or 'domination of nature' has played a significant role in the discourse around ecological challenges in recent years. Among the many ideas which have shaped the debate about ecological problem in recent years, the issues connected to the notion of (mastery over nature) or (domination of nature), have been of great importance. A unifying element among ecologists is the belief that the Promethean project of mankind and modern attitude towards nature are the ultimate causes of ecological problems. From this assumption, they [eco-socialists] proceed to a rejection of the modern attitude towards nature and tend to embrace an eco-centric outlook. In their [eco-socialists] view mankind's attempts to master nature have resulted above all in a destruction of the natural environment

It is evident that, in the play, most of the townspeople are engaged in a

capitalist endeavor. Their objective is to maximize profits from the baths while neglecting the preservation of the water, which is an essential element of the natural environment. Dr. Stockmann's strong pleas to purify the water in the baths are completely ignored "the water pipes will need to be relaid" (Ibsen, 2012, p. 39). He insists that all the water pipes need to be replaced because the intake is too low and there is decaying organic matter in the water, specifically millions of infusoria. In contrast, the locals, under the leadership of Peter Stockmann, saw the baths as a lucrative resource for the town. Furthermore, they fail to perceive any immediate peril, as the doctor proposes. Consequently, individuals exert control over nature to improve their own circumstances, but in doing so, they also expose themselves to potential harm. Han (2010) provides a more detailed examination on the concept of (mastery over nature). He divides the notion into two incompatible concepts:

It is an arbitrary attitude of humanity towards nature that humans define their roles like the autocratic monarch to domineer over nature, attempt dominate nature and make nature subordinate to themselves" (Han, 2010, p. 18). Hence, whatever they do towards nature and no matter how they exploit nature is not subject to moral constraints. He believes, as a secondary concept, that it demonstrates complete adherence to natural rules. Human beings are only administrators, rather than dominators, of the world. As the administrator, it is our duty to assume the appropriate responsibility for administration, which includes ensuring the well-being of the things being managed. Han (2010), endeavors once again to elucidate Marx's likely intention in proposing the idea of mastery over nature. According to Han's interpretation of the idea of (mastery over nature), Dr. Stockmann aligns with the second category, which is characterized as mastery with responsibility. Externally, his primary interest lies in the health hazards faced by the townsfolk. However, he also expresses deep care for the proper reverence and well-being of the environment. The author envisions a society that is ecologically focused and stands in contrast to the current industrial organization that is causing harm. Nevertheless, this ideal would remain unrealized due to the resolute opposition exhibited by the locals. On the other hand, the Burgomaster, along with his companions, adheres to the first categorization of "absolute domination" (Han, 2010, p. 18). They exploit nature and fail to acknowledge their responsibility for its destruction. They effectively transform

environmental contamination into a lucrative opportunity for financial gain (Kovel, 2007, p. 176). The municipality generates substantial revenue from the contaminated baths. Any cessation of operations at the baths will result in significant financial losses. Furthermore, during the closure, neighboring towns may seize the opportunity to construct their own health resorts, as the baths have already garnered considerable reputation.

As stated by the Burgomaster, those towns would immediately take action to attract all tourists to themselves. Consequently, this town's health resort would not thrive in the future, and the town's economy will be in serious danger. Nevertheless, the Burgomaster's organization has an anti-ecological stance towards nature. However, their positions indicate that they align with eco-feminist critique, as succinctly summarized by David Pepper, ecofeminism and ecosocialism exhibit an anthropocentric perspective, however it differs from the capitalist-technocentric approach, and is rooted on humanist principles (2003, p.200). This perspective opposes the principles of bioethics and the romanticization of nature, as well as any ideologies that devalue human existence. However, it does recognize the significance of human spirituality and the necessity for it to be fulfilled through non-material connections with the natural world. Hooti and Davoodi argue that the play can be seen as a conflict between the concepts of "responsibility" and "manipulation" (2011, p. 202). They categorize the doctor and the Burgomaster as representatives of these concepts. However, we believe that this text goes beyond this conventional interpretation. The Burgomaster, as a member of the governing elite, cunningly influences the general populace, garnering their support, despite his complete absence of eccentric ideals. Undoubtedly, he possesses exceptional skill in influencing others, as Hooti and Davoodi contend that "the Mayor's character exhibits a clear aptitude for distorting the truth" (2011, p. 202). He effectively changes the beliefs of individuals such as Hovstad, the editor of the "People's Messenger," and Aslaksen, a printer, who previously supported Dr. Stockmann, specifically in favor of the truth. The physicians received support due to their ability to evoke a moral sense and an eccentric awareness in the minds of the individuals. However, their viewpoint only shifts when the Burgomaster raises the subject of the town's economics. This demonstrates their exclusive focus on the economics, hence

seeing nature as a mere commodity.

2.2. Gender Dynamics and Environmental Advocacy

Although *An Enemy of the People* centers around a male protagonist, its core themes of environmental activism, ethical responsibility, and resistance to repressive cultural standards strongly align with the principles of ecofeminism. The play implicitly endorses the ecofeminist demand for greater inclusivity and ethical practices in environmental and social management. The play highlights the intricate and intertwined social structures, which also underscore the importance of examining the intersections of various oppressive systems concealed within societies. Mary Daly refers to this as “stolen female energy” (1978, p.230), where patriarchy thrives by distorting reality and presenting it as truth. This is seen in the reductionist mindset that permeates the drama and is further applied to likening the human characters to animals. The human/animal distinction in classical western philosophy is justified based on the dualistic polarization between reason and sensation. In her book *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*, Val Plumwood discusses Descartes’ approach to separating and eliminating the connection between humans and animals, as well as the mind and body (2002, p. 34). Descartes achieves this by redefining the concept of ‘thinking’ in a way that categorizes activities involving the body, such as sense perception, as purely mental operations or “modes of thinking” through their reinterpretation as “consciousness”. Contrarily, animals possess just the lower or corporeal level of feeling and hence spend their lives solely through physical motions (Plumwood, 2002, p. 115). Considering the dichotomy between humans and animals as a critical concept in Western philosophy, Dr Stockmann stands out from the majority by recognizing that humans are essentially not distinct from animals. He asserts:

Oh, bless my soul, but we are animals, father! We are, all of us, just about the best animals any man could ask for. But noble animals, they’re really aren’t too many of those among us. Oh, it’s a quite appallingly far cry from poodle-humans to mongrel-humans. And the odd thing about it is that on this point Mr Hovstad is very much in agreement with me, as long as we’re talking about four-legged creatures. (Ibsen, 201 p.94)

The doctor uses the term ‘the best’ to allude to the human capacity for

thinking, and by making this statement, he establishes a connection between the mind and the body. Furthermore, Dr Stockmann's comparison between humans and animals is quite reasonable: an individual lacking a discerning intellect and independent thought will be incapable of generating exceptional ideas or accomplishing remarkable achievements. Nevertheless, in this example, he disregards the principles of ecological thinking by reducing creatures to simple functional entities. Dr. Stockmann's discourse primarily centers on two distinctions between a purebred and a hybrid creature. One way to evaluate domestic fowls is by their productivity, which is determined by the quantity and quality of meat they can provide and the type of eggs they lay. In this regard, the Spanish or Japanese hen surpasses the barnyard fowl, crow, and raven. Dr. Stockmann's second differentiation between a purebred and a hybrid animal is related to their mental characteristics. Yet, the primary function of a poodle's distinct mind is to fulfil the role of serving and entertaining its trainer by doing remarkable tasks. Conversely, the lack of such mentality in a mongrel indicates its inability to accomplish a headstand. Dr Stockmann recognizes the connection between humans and animals, but he emphasizes that animals exist to serve humanity and their value is determined by their usefulness to humans. In the plays, Dr. Stockmann employs the metaphor of "old biddies /women" (Ibsen, 2012, p. 96) to describe the mediocre majority. During the conclusion of Act 3, Katherine endeavors to support her spouse by expressing:

MRS STOCKMANN: that would be a crying shame! But why are they so opposed to you, all of them?

DR STOCKMANN (*fuming*): Oh, I'll tell you why. It's because in this town they're all old biddies - like you; all thinking only of the family and not of society.

MRS STOCKMANN (*grasping his arm*): Well, I'll show them one – one old biddy who can be a man – for once. Because I'm on your side now, Tomas! (Ibsen, 2012, p. 75)

Furthermore, in his public statement, he dismisses the notion that corruption is a result of culture by referring to it as a "merely old wives' tale" (Ibsen, 2012, p. 96). Dr. Stockmann appears to believe that women should be responsible for

managing the household, while the task of caring for society is reserved only for males. He dismisses this notion by exclaiming: “Balderdash, Katherine! Go home and take care of your house and let me take care of society.” (Ibsen, 2012, p. 71). The quote appears to reflect Ibsen’s critique of societal norms, particularly regarding gender roles, which is a common theme in his works. This conversation exemplifies the condescending demeanour towards women that was widespread during the 19th century (and beyond). During this time, women were mostly restricted to household responsibilities, and their perspectives on topics beyond this arena were frequently ignored or diminished. This highlights the constraints placed on women’s independence and the cultural pressure for them to adhere to their conventional roles, while males were regarded as the active participants in the public and social domains.

In her book *The Domestication of Women: Discrimination in Developing Societies*, Barbara Rogers highlights that the domestication of women in western industrial society is justified “by the belief in the crucial role of women in raising children and the presumed existence of a maternal instinct” (2005, p. 6). This idea is accompanied by the concept that all males are inherently unable to care for children and, as a result, are naturally stronger than all women, who are considered incapable of doing physically demanding tasks. The household tasks carried out by women are often perceived as not being really labour or, at most, as being extremely easy job. This inherent gender disparity is then utilised to bolster the male-centric mindset prevalent in Western civilization, which endeavors to marginalize women from several significant domains of contemporary existence. Throughout the play, Dr. Stockmann has seen Katherine as a mere tool responsible for carrying out all domestic duties, while he himself is incompetent in every aspect, even unable to recall the maid’s name. Her spouse commends her for her frugality and astute management of the household (Fjelde & Ibsen, 1978, p. 378). Put simply, Dr. Stockmann evaluates her value in a manner similar to animals, specifically by considering the usefulness they provide to humans. Rogers has highlighted that the social status and lifestyle of a family mostly depend on the husband’s employment outside the home, and he is expected to have influence over the family’s internal affairs. This notion is accurately shown in the play. Dr. Stockmann believes that a

scientist should live with a certain level of elegance and sophistication (Fjelde & Ibsen, 1978, p. 289). Furthermore, due to his prolonged isolation in the northern region, he cannot resist the temptation of having company. Katherine strives to create a warm and inviting house in response to her husband's requests. Ibsen implies throughout the play that Katherine faces a challenging task: when the mayor casually criticizes his brother for indulging in such pleasures, Dr. Stockmann retorts, "Oh yes. I can allow myself that. Katherine says I'm now earning almost as much as we spend" (Ibsen, 2012, p. 21), indicating the challenging nature of making ends meet. Katherine complies with all of her husband's demands. She meticulously prepares meals that align precisely with her husband's specific and frequent mealtime preferences. This includes serving roast beef and toddy. Additionally, she enhances the ambiance of the room by purchasing a new tablecloth and lampshade, using her funds, to cater to her husband's personal taste. She willingly complies with Dr. Stockmann's request to fix the pants and "the floors swept" (Ibsen, 2012, p. 96).

Katherine, like all other women at that time of western history, is barred from participating in the important areas of modern life including public and professional events. In Act 2, Mayor Stockmann plans to have a discussion with Dr. Stockmann on the report he received. Katherine, understanding this, subtly signals Petra to join her in the room. During Act 3, when Katherine arrives to Hovstad's office to retrieve Dr. Stockmann, he exhibits his strong dislike by shouting, "What the devil are you doing here, Katrine?" (Ibsen, 2012, p.70). Both Katherine's and Petra's attendance in the office is considered inappropriate. Paradoxically, Katherine's justification for appearing in public in Act 4 only comes after she declares herself as a "man" who supports Dr. Stockmann at the close of Act 3. The scene at the close of Act 1 clearly demonstrates Dr. Stockmann's lack of respect for Katherine's intelligence and integrity. When Hovstad and Billing both praise Dr. Stockmann on his finding and propose a ceremony to honour him, the doctor firmly rejects their suggestion, saying, "No, dear friends, let such antics pass; I won't hear of any sort of celebration. And if the board of the Baths should take it into their heads to award me a bonus, I will not accept it. Katrine, I'm telling you, - I won't accept it" (Ibsen, 2012, p. 25). Through this act of "telling you," Dr. Stockmann deliberately distinguishes himself as a man of ethical uprightness, contrasting with Katherine who is solely preoccupied with

materialistic pursuits.

Katherine, in reality, possesses exceptional intelligence and perception. An important aspect to note about Katherine is that she lacks a mother figure in her life. She is solely in the care of Morten Kiil, making her similar to characters such as Nora Helmer, Rebecca West, and Hedda Gabler. Ellen Hartmann (2004), posits in her article *Ibsen's Motherless Women* that the absence of a mother figure during upbringing could account for the strong, independent, and contradictory nature of Ibsen's female characters. According to Hartmann, the lack of a maternal role model may facilitate women in making their own choices, surpassing societal expectations for women during that era, liberating themselves, advocating for equality and independence, deviating from societal norms, and engaging in unconventional behavior (2004, p.81). While Katherine may not possess the same level of strength as the more important female characters like Nora and Hedda, she has consistently demonstrated her capacity for comprehension and intellect throughout the play. In Act 2, despite leaving the men unattended in the living room to discuss business, Sarah and Petra attentively monitor the proceedings from the next room. Petra's abrupt entrance and expression of anger significantly irritate Mayor Stockmann, but Katherine demonstrates her diplomacy by attributing her loudness to an excuse.

Faraway, in contrast to Dr. Stockmann, Katherine possesses a far more distinct understanding of her husband's character, as well as the true nature of his so-called 'friends', which is humorously illustrated in Act 3 when she visits Hovstad's office to retrieve her husband. Dr. Stockmann, a person without clarity of thought, is oblivious not just to his own lack of clarity but also to the hypocrisy of others around him. When he thoughtlessly immerses himself in the feeling of 'security' and 'happiness' that comes from having "the majority of people supporting him:

DR STOCKMANN: To support me too. They'll all support me, if there should be any problem,

KATRINE - do you know what I have behind me?

MRS STOCKMANN: Behind you? No; what do you have behind you?

DR STOCKMANN: The compact majority.

MRS STOCKMANN: I see. And is that a good thing for you, Tomas?

DR STOCKMANN: Oh, I'll say it's good! (rubs his hands and paces up and down). Good heavens, yes, what a pleasure it is to be joined like this in brotherhood with one's fellow citizens!

PETRA: And to do so much that's good and useful, Father!

DR STOCKMANN: Yes, and for the town of one's birth at that, Petra!
(Ibsen, 2012, p. 38)

Dr. Stockmann exhibits his assurance and enthusiasm over the backing he perceives from the majority of the locals in this particular episode. He experiences a sense of empowerment and validation from this apparent support, viewing it as a uniting influence that connects him with his community. The context of this conversation is crucial. Dr. Stockmann has made a significant finding that the waters of the nearby baths, which are crucial for the town's economy, are polluted. At first, he is under the impression that disclosing this fact would be well-received and that he will be praised as a hero for safeguarding public health. He displays optimism, shown in this conversation, on the role of the majority in endorsing what is morally correct and advantageous for the community. Nevertheless, the drama undergoes a shift when the townsfolk, swayed by economic motives and political influences, become hostile towards Dr. Stockmann. The concept of the 'compact majority' that he mentions, instead of serving a positive purpose, transforms into a mechanism for hiding the truth in order to preserve the existing state of affairs. This change emphasizes a key aspect of the play: the clash between personal ethics and the collective welfare. The concept of the 'compact majority' becomes ironic as the play unfolds, illustrating the manipulation of popular opinion and its potential to turn against those who question it.

2.3. Resistance Against Patriarchal Hierarchies in the Play

The play delves on the metaphorical portrayal of nature and its correlation with the treatment of marginalized voices. While the play does not explicitly tackle gender problems, the clash between Dr. Stockmann and the town's administrators, who prioritise economic profit over public health, reflects the criticism of patriarchal power systems in ecofeminism. These institutions frequently contribute to ongoing environmental damage and suppress the voices of those pushing for ecological and

social fairness. The depiction of Dr. Stockmann, who experiences social isolation as he confronts the majority, mirrors the ecofeminist movement's opposition to dominant patriarchal views on the environment and marginalised voices. Act V of the play unveils that the leather tannery has been functioning continuously for three consecutive generations. The leather production process involves the utilisation of animal skins, chemical compounds, animal killing, corpse disposal, and tanning in order to create leather. The waste produced by the factories is released into the natural environment and seeps into the water supply pipelines that deliver water to the municipal spas and the coastal beach area. Act I highlights the significance of the Baths in the town's economic prosperity and the well-being of its citizens, as emphasised by Hovstad, the editor of the 'People's Messenger', and the Mayor:

JUDGE STOCKMANN: Exactly. We have our magnificent, big, new spa baths. Mark my words! Those baths will be the town's finest prerequisite, Mr Hovstad. Indubitably!

MRS STOCKMANN: That's what Tomas says too.

JUDGE STOCKMANN: What a quite extraordinary upturn this place has taken just in the past year or so! There's money about; life and activity. Buildings and land are increasing in value with every day that passes.

HOVSTAD: And unemployment is falling. (Ibsen, 2012, p. 7)

Judge Stockmann is optimistic about the economic advantages that the new spa baths will bring to the community. Mrs. Stockmann affirms that her husband, Dr. Tomas Stockmann, holds the same perspective. The dialogue emphasizes the recent upturn in the town's economy, the rise in property prices, and the decline in unemployment, so emphasizing the importance of the baths to the community's well-being. This establishes the foundation for the main conflict of the play, in which Dr. Stockmann's revelation about the pollution of the baths jeopardizes the ongoing economic prosperity. The prosperity is at risk due to the findings of the laboratory study that Dr. Thomas Stockmann plans to disclose in the local newspaper, revealing that:

DR STOCKMANN: That whole spa is a poisonous whited sepulchre, I tell you. Unsanitary in the extreme. All that filth and muck up in Mølledal, - all

that foul-smelling ordure, - it contaminates themwater in the feeder pipes to the well-house; and this same damnable poisonous sludge also seeps out onto the beach -.

HORSTER: Where the sea-baths are?

DR STOCKMANN: Just there.

HOVSTAD: How can you be so sure of all this, Doctor?

DR STOCKMANN: I have examined the conditions as conscientiously as possible. Oh, I had long suspected something of the sort. There were quite a few notable instances of illness among visitors to the Baths, - cases of typhoid and of gastric complaints - The whole Bath establishment is a whited, poisoned sepulchre, ...--the gravest possible danger to the public health! All the nastiness up at Mølledal, all that stinking filth, is infecting the water in the conduit-pipes leading to the reservoir; and the same cursed, filthy poison oozes out on the shore too. (Ibsen, 2012, p. 21)

Dr. Stockmann utters the aforementioned quotation to Petra, Mrs. Stockmann, Hovstad, Billing, and Horster upon entering the room to inform them that the water in the Baths is contaminated, as stated in the just received report. Additionally, he highlights that it is the nearby tanneries that contaminate the water. The remark suggests that a scientific discovery poses a threat to the fundamental principles of an ideal institution. The phrase “A whited, poisoned sepulchre” serves as a metaphor for ‘hypocrisy’. Essentially, the majority of individuals sacrifice their integrity in pursuit of power, wealth, and a favourable public image, so contributing to the contamination of the Baths. The cessation of the Baths as a business endangers the town’s employment rates and exposes it to the possibility of relapsing into recession. Dr. Stockmann harbors doubts regarding water as the underlying cause of the local population’s ailments:

I have investigated the matter most conscientiously. For a long time past I have suspected something of the kind. Last year we had some very strange cases of illness among the visitors--typhoid cases, and cases of gastric fever--. (Ibsen, 2012, p. 34)

The speech conveys Dr. Stockmann's awareness and apprehension over the polluted water, as he observes peculiar instances of disease (typhoid and stomach fever) among guests, which he feels are connected to the contamination of the baths. This event is crucial as it establishes the circumstances for the developing confrontation between Dr. Stockmann's moral position, the town's financial interests, and the public's reluctance to confront uncomfortable realities. Ibsen's work is frequently recognized for its examination of the conflict between personal ethics and society conventions, as well as the bravery required to defy the majority and this is shown in Dr. Stockmann's speech to Mrs. Stockmann when Peter Stockmann requires that the doctor should deny the results of his discovery in public "even if the whole world were to come tumbling down I will not bow my head to the yoke" (Ibsen, 2012, p. 49). If he fails to do so, he will face termination from his role as the medical officer for the Baths. Mrs. Stockmann and Petra are in favour of the doctor, however, the former is concerned about the family's financial stability in the event of her husband's job loss. The quotation demonstrates that the doctor abandons material riches in favour of his own moral conviction. Specifically, the doctor adamantly refuses to compromise his principles in light of the existing regulations, and is determined to revise them. Furthermore, he anticipates earning the privilege of confronting his boys with integrity when they reach adulthood.

A lab examination of the drinking water and the sea-water proved "the presence of decomposing organic matter in the water--it is full of infusoria. The water is absolutely dangerous to use, either internally or externally" (Ibsen, 2012, p. 35). Dr. Stockmann's fears are validated, and similar to Dr. Sonya, he has a profound ethical need to disseminate his discoveries. In the book *Ecofeminism*, by Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva argue that people exert control over and submit what is 'self-generative' in nature to colonization. In the play, the water supply is polluted by the tannery (1993, p.78). Dr. Sonya and Dr. Stockmann are the first to recognize the direct relationship between industrialization and the complete devastation of a whole ecosystem.

Ibsen's Mayor Peter Stockmann employs a comparable strategy when he speaks to his brother, Dr. Thomas Stockmann: "And all of this happening now, just as the Baths are gaining recognition... and then what would be our situation?" (Ibsen,

2013, pp. 67-8). It may be necessary for us to completely quit the project; despite the significant financial investment we have made. By doing so, you would be causing significant harm to your hometown. I am unconvinced by your assessment on the water quality at the Baths, as it does not provide sufficient evidence to support the severity of the situation. No information from it should be disclosed to the general public” (Ibsen, 2013, pp. 67-8). The mayor seems to grant Dr. Stockmann permission to undertake the task of renovating the contaminated water system in the town and provide his answer to the environmental issue. His independence is constrained due to his role as a scientist. The character in the play serves as a prime example of the various ways in which men have personally experienced negative effects from societal expectations of masculinity (Archambault, 1993, p. 20). The importance of this particular scene, in which he is granted authorization to address the environmental catastrophe but is promptly impeded, epitomizes the ecofeminist notion that men, presumably lacking the same level of sensitivity towards nature as women, cannot be relied upon to engage in this restorative endeavor. Dr. Stockmann’s proposal to purify the local water source is mocked and discarded due to its exorbitant expenses and lengthy implementation process, so exemplifying another instance of a repressive system inside established social frameworks. Dr. Stockmann alleges that his brother, the mayor, is concealing the facts regarding the polluted Baths.

a trick, a fraud, a lie, Yes, underhandedness is what it would be, - a swindle, a lie, a downright crime against the public, against our whole society![...] Oh, yes you have! How could you not? My report is as true and correct as it can be, I know it is! And you know that very well, Peter; you simply won’t admit it. It was you who pushed through the motion to site the Baths and run the water pipes where they now lie; and that – that damnable blunder, is what you won’t own up to. Bah, - don’t you think I can see right through you? (Ibsen, 2012, p. 41)

In this section of Henrik Ibsen’s play, Dr. Stockmann meets his brother, Peter, who holds the position of mayor and is his superior in the Baths Committee. Dr. Stockmann alleges that Peter is accountable for the erroneous placement and construction of the water pipes for the baths, which he contends resulted in their

pollution. Dr. Stockmann is experiencing frustration and anger as he believes that Peter is deliberately disregarding the facts about the contamination of the baths in order to evade any negative consequences for himself and his political career. This heated confrontation emphasizes the core themes of truth, morality, and the clash between personal integrity and societal well-being throughout the play. Dr. Stockmann is subjugated by superior patriarchal authoritarian structures “The lack of oxygen weakens the scruples. And it looks as though oxygen must be in terribly short supply in many, many houses in this town, when the entire compact majority can be so unscrupulous as to base the town’s prosperity on a quagmire of lies and deception” (Ibsen, 2012, p. 96). Dr. Stockmann addresses his fellow citizens, asserting that the unintelligent majority have authority, but this does not validate their correctness. He categorises the majority as ‘low-bred curs’ and the educated people as ‘well-bred poodles’. The remark indicates that the doctor perceives the educated elite as being superior to the rest of the town’s population, implying that they are the true guardians of “truth and freedom” and should have the authority to decide the town’s destiny.

Conversely, the doctor belittles the lower classes due to his belief that they would undermine the collective moral values, as he perceives them to be lacking knowledge and having a narrow perspective on societal issues. Dr. Stockmann is dismissed from his position as medical officer to the Baths. Additionally, his brother, the town’s Mayor, uses his government authority to restrict his freedom of speech as a scientist: “as a subordinate member of the staff of the Baths, you have no right to express any opinion which runs contrary to that of your superiors” (Ibsen, 2012, p. 75). Dr. Stockmann’s concern extends beyond the potential health hazard to encompass the degradation of a fundamental natural element, namely water. He is an environmentally aware individual who recognizes that the existence of human beings on earth is completely reliant on nature. Nature graciously furnishes humanity with the essential requisites for survival. According to Crosby he holds the belief that nature is not completely apathetic about the achievements, principles, and future of human people (2002, p. 141). Simultaneously, he exercises caution in the way human beings interact with nature, recognizing that they do not possess complete control over nature but rather exist as an integral component of it. Dr. Stockmann, in this

way acknowledges:

We [human beings] must find ways to cease disrupting and destroying our natural home and to build harmonious relations with all of its creatures. We must set aside and preserve wild places for their own sakes and to remind ourselves of the abiding significance and value of that nature of which we are part. (Crosby, 2002, p. 143)

The pollution discovered by Dr. Stockmann has a dual meaning. On one side, he discovers humanity's detrimental handling of nature, as they are causing destruction to the environment by releasing commercial waste into water, all in the pursuit of short-term benefits. Conversely, he observes that the townspeople are susceptible to severe health ailments. According to his argument absolutely noxious to health, whether used internally or externally (Ibsen, 2012, p. 125). Nevertheless, if the authorities take into consideration his recommendations, they would have the ability to preserve environment and human lives concurrently. Stockmann's discovery, when viewed via an ecofeminist lens, exemplifies the contradictory nature of science as both a creator of environmental risks and a discerning evaluator of them. In Garrard's argument (2014), the play portrays how commercial business owners, such as tanneries, are contaminating water sources and posing a significant threat to public health. This represents a demonstration of scientific control over the natural environment. Similarly, Dr. Stockmann's discoveries and recommendations represent a type of scientific advancement, but not a complete control over nature. Now, the question arises as to which choice the decision makers would choose to implement. It is evident that the authorities, represented by Peter Stockmann, the doctor's brother, rejects both of the solutions proposed by Dr. Stockmann to stop the mistreatment of the environment.

They continue to discharge waste from their tanneries and have not made any efforts to replace the water system of the baths. Both arguments are driven by simply economic rationale. They involve themselves in intricate political matters in relation to this. Peter Stockmann, the Burgomaster and chairperson of the baths committee, contends that the costs associated with the alteration of the baths ““extraordinary cases of illness among the patients—both typhoid and gastric attacks” (Ibsen, 2012, p. 145) and that “we, the townspeople, would be abandoned.” It would be prudent for

us to abandon the expensive project entirely, which would result in the destruction of your hometown, Dr. Stockmann. Peter prioritizes the economic well-being of the community while neglecting the need of ecological safety. He appears apathetic towards the repercussions of purposefully executing the faulty operation of the baths. Ultimately, he undertakes a scheme to demonstrate that Dr. Stockmann poses a danger to the town. In this ironic endeavour, he eventually finds other comrades who now back him, despite previously being in favor of the doctor.

This raises an ethical concern regarding the deliberate harm that humans inflict onto nature. According to Roach, environmental degradation is a significant and current manifestation of human wrongdoing. It might be argued that it is the most significant individual and social 'sin' with effects that currently pose a threat to mankind and the entire world. Regarding sin, the anthropocentric perspective of human beings is not acceptable in any theological viewpoint (Roach (2003, p. 5). Garrard contends that the conceptual frameworks of the relationship between people and nature may be attributed to ancient texts such as Genesis and Revelation, which are the first and final books of the Bible (2004, p. 2). Likewise, the instruction of Islam holds individuals responsible for any mistreatment of the environment. Hence, every act of hostility against environment poses a direct threat to the ethical and religious principles of humanity, in addition to the ecological awareness. Nevertheless, humanity's anthropocentric perspective on nature is a significant weakness, since it can ultimately lead to disastrous consequences for them. In this play, the occurrence of "unusual instances of illness among the patients—both typhoid and gastric attacks—" (Ibsen, 2012, p. 124) might be interpreted as a deliberate and gradual act of retribution against those who exploit others, as nature seeks to avenge all forms of mistreatment inflicted upon it. Consequently, the Burgomaster, along with his associates, adopts a "anti-ecological-consciousness stance" (Yan, 2011, p. 167) which entails the destruction of the natural environment and ultimately leads to the emergence of serious illnesses among the population. Dr. Stockmann, in contrast, supports an environmentally conscious concept.

Connecting ecofeminism with Henrik Ibsen's play *An Enemy of the People* involves interpreting the play's environmental themes through the lens of ecofeminism, a theoretical framework that combines ecological concerns with

feminist perspectives. While the play itself does not explicitly deal with feminist issues, its exploration of environmental ethics and the social dynamics surrounding them aligns with key aspects of ecofeminism. In conclusion, this chapter argues that Henrik Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*, while not explicitly ecofeminist, subtly incorporates themes central to ecofeminist discourse. Through its portrayal of an environmental crisis, the response of societal structures, and the dynamics of power and gender, the play offers a rich ground for ecofeminist analysis. Ibsen's work remains relevant to contemporary discussions of environmentalism and feminism, highlighting the interconnectedness of social justice and ecological integrity. This chapter underscores the importance of revisiting classic literature through modern theoretical lenses to uncover deeper, more complex interpretations.

3- THE ECOFEMINIST PERSPECTIVE IN GIRISH KARNAD'S *THE FIRE AND THE RAIN*

This part explores Girish Karnad's systematic exploration of human emotions such as passion, sacrifice, greed, loss, and spirituality. It is considered a highly intellectual piece of work. Additionally, *The Fire and the Rain* portrays certain rituals from the Veda, "A Hindu spiritual practices involving connecting with Gods" (Mohapatra & Sarang, 2020, p. 2162). Karnad's complex play, took him more than 37 years writing, is centered around the character from Yavakrita's story in the Mahabharata. Girish Karnad skillfully depicted the fundamental aspects of Indian mythology. His focus lies on the intricate and fragmented existence of contemporary individuals. The purpose of utilizing the ancient narratives is to stress the irrationality of contemporary existence, encompassing its fundamental emotions and confrontations.

The play explores many themes, including estrangement, love, family, religion, art, yagna, and the theatre. He relies on the myth of Yavakri Yajana and Indra, as recounted in the Mahabharata. The playwright applied the technique of play within the play to enhance his idea. This is the tale of Arvasu, a misunderstood and mistreated man, and his beloved Nittilai, who loves him back but waits to marry him until she has her father's and the town elders' blessing. Parvasu, Arvasu's brother, has led a massive prayer rite to placate Devraj Indra and provide rain to their territory. While Raibhya, their father, dislikes both of his sons and wants to destroy them before he dies. Raibhya hates Vishaka, Parvasu's wife, because he thinks she is having an affair with Yavaki. Yavaki left Vishaka for ten years to pray and serve Devraj Indra; when he returned, he discovered she had married Parvasu despite their love for one other. After a blissful marriage and three years of married life, Parvasu left Vishaka to lead the prayer ceremony for Devraj Indra. Furious that Vishaka had met with Yavaki, Raibhya calls for the demon Brahm Rakshas to kill Yavaki. This forces Arvasu to cremate the demon. This leads him to miss his meeting with Nittilai's father and village elders, and she ends up marrying someone else. Upon learning of Yavaki's death, Parvasu murders his father. He then holds Arvasu responsible and has him severely beaten and left for dead. Upon hearing this, Nittilai rushes to Arvasu's aid, only to discover that her husband and her brother are on the

prowl for her and want to murder her at first sight. To amuse the Devas, Sutradhar sets up an act that causes Arvasu to go insane, Nittilai to reveal herself, and her husband to murder her. Parvasu commits suicide after realizing he has failed. Consequently, everyone who was close to Arvasu died one by one. Devraj Indra shows up, satisfies Arvasu, and grants him a wish. The one question on his mind is whether or not Devraj Indra can change the course of history to aid Arvasu in his quest to revive Nittilai.

This chapter examines Girish Karnad's method of elucidating the patriarchal subjugation of women and nature within an Indian framework in his play *The Fire and the Rain*. The study seeks to analyze two key aspects of the play: firstly, the playwright's endeavor to explain the method of empowering women by encouraging them to challenge social oppression, and secondly, his contemplation on women's receptiveness to nature, which prompted the introduction of the concept of ecofeminism in the play.

3.1. The Complexity of Gender Dynamics in *The Fire and The Rain*

Ecofeminism encompasses not just feminist principles but also extends to broader humanitarian concerns. However, as women rely solely on the local environment to procure food, water, and wood for their families, they are the ones who experience the initial impact of the ecological crisis. Therefore, the restoration of peace is unattainable without the collaboration of women and environmentalists, as both groups share the same objective of mitigating the global survival crisis. Rosemary Radford Ruether argued that the persistence of a form of domination in society prevents women's freedom and the resolution of ecological crises. Feminists and environmentalists should collaborate to imagine a transformative restructuring of the peace agenda, "There can be no liberation for women and no solution for ecological crisis until we have united demands" (Ruether, 1975, p.21). Karnad, on the other hand, focuses in this play on the men-women relationship, the problems of women folk, their predicament, and their attempt to assert individuality in Indian patriarchal society through this dramatic art. It turns out that several organizations and behaviors in Indian society are exploitative of women. By referencing this myth, he has brought attention to current issues affecting women in Indian culture. The play's original title was "Agni Mattu Male" in Kannada, which translates to *Fire and*

the Rain in English. Girish Karnad is a master at weaving ancient myths and stories into his stage productions. His plays have a modern spirit because he deftly discovers and incorporates old fantasies with vital alterations. Based on the Mahabharata tales of 'Yavakri', Yajana', and 'Indra', this play by Karnad follows a similar pattern. *Fire and the Rain* has a preface by Karnad, who explains the play's inspiration in the following words:

The myth of Yavakri (or Yavakrita) occurs in Chapters 135-38 of the Vana Parva (forest Canto) of the Mahabharata. The ascetic Lomasha narrates it to the Pandavas as they wander across the land during their exile. I have met Sanskrit scholars who were unaware of the existence of the myth: it is easy to lose track of a short narrative like this in the tangled undergrowth that covers the floor of that epic.....It was fortunate for me that Rajaji did not do so, but the moment I read the tale, I knew it had to be turned into a play. (Karnad, 2001, p. 18)

The play is exceptional for its principles and subplot. In *Fire and Rain*, Karnad used the play-within-a-play mechanism. While the play explores themes of murder, jealousy, power, and politics, Karnad makes an effort to examine human nature through the actions of some of the characters. As Rama Nair composes:

The play begins with the dominant myth of Yavakri. It places the action that follows in the mythical and elemental realms. The quest for personal and social meanings through the myth contributes to the cohesive structure of the play. It involves the nature of the world analysis of the concept of morality and emotion, which leads one to the essentiality of human experience. The myth of Vritra and Indra acts as a catalyst to free Parvasu and Arvasu from the human bondage of fear and vengeance. The prologue and the Epilogue are inevitably conjoined to project a holistic view of life. (2006, p. 35)

The drama depicts the story of Arvasu, a Brahmin by social status, who becomes a stage actor and is misunderstood by the community. The post-colonial industrial overgrowth that gave rise to ecofeminism also brought about unfettered scientific research, ecological destruction, the enslavement of women, and, most crucially, a

danger to our survival. Categories such as masculine versus female, civilization versus nature, reason versus emotions, human versus nature, and so on are present in every social system on Earth. At the end of this duality, women are to the natural world what men are to society. Therefore, patriarchal supremacy, which is rationalized by cultural and scientific ideologies, suddenly ensnares both women and nature. It would be inaccurate to say that the ecological crisis primarily affects women; rather, it affects every living thing in the Third World that has a close relationship with nature, whether humans or other species.

Ecofeminism is a humanitarian issue as much as it is a feminist one. However, women bear the brunt of the ecological catastrophe because they rely entirely on their local environment to provide their families with food, water, and wood. As a result, environmentalists and feminists must work together to avert a global survival crisis and restore peace. Rosemary Radford Ruether argues that substituting a divine female being for a divine male entity does not resolve the 'god problem'. According to her perspective, we require a clear perception of existence's more plentiful and innovative origin. Ruether argues that a shift in awareness and the development of a new symbolic culture and spirituality is necessary to establish a restored connection between individuals and the environment "we need to transform our inner psyches and how we symbolize the environment through it " (1992, p. 388). Despite the play's lack of direct ties to environmental movements, Karnad skillfully incorporates ecofeminist concepts by highlighting the revolutionary actions of women in their quest for self-discovery and championing the ecological needs of the surrounding communities. The play's overall environment conveys a strong sense of ecology. In order to get rain, a 'fire' sacrifice is necessary, as shown in the opening scene regarding the drought. Fire and rain, two powerful elements with contrasting characteristics, are introduced by Karnad in this play. To get the life-sustaining 'rain' to Earth, 'fire' was used as a conduit. This exemplifies Karnad's ecological awareness as he portrays nature and its inherent importance to human existence. The play opens with a hunger scene, depicting the characters' spiritual journeys to restore the land's fertility. The eco-conscious of Karnad starts with lines:

It has not rained adequately for nearly ten years. Drought grips the land.

A seven-year-long sacrifice(yajna) is being held to propitiate Indra, the

God of rains. Fire burns at the center of step-like brick alters. There are several such alters, at all of which priests offer oblations to the fire while singing the prescribed hymns in unison. (Karnad, 2001, p. 50)

The beautification of the plot generates spirituality, myth, and an in-depth connection between humans and nature. Karnad had articulated, on the one hand, the necessities of human life and, on the other, the avarice that drove people astray. Karnad, in this play, laid bare the tragic endings of human-created trials that dared to face the might of nature. Parvasu, the play's chief priest, sacrificed himself to appease the Rain God by tending to the sacred fire. Arvasu gets a dream hallucination of himself: "Dying of thirst. But there is no water" (Karnad, 2001, p. 55). The monarch himself orchestrated the fire sacrifice ritual to reestablish his kingdom's fertility through the blessing of rain. Once again, Yavakri sought "inner knowledge" from Indra, the rain deity. Later, he stored his power in his 'Kamandalu' (an oblong water pot) to destroy the Brahma Rakshasa. However, when the water from the 'Kamandalu' was poured out, he cried, "My life!... water! Please! Just a drop. Oh gods! Only a drop" (Karnad, 2001, p. 21). Yavakri was then killed by the Brahma Rakshasa. Although Parvasu meant to sacrifice fire in exchange for rain or water, his narcissism and lack of empathy led him to murder his father. Parvasu covered up his transgression by having Arvasu beaten to death and then ordering the soldiers to kill him. His egotism slew the inherent humanity in Parvasu. However, Parvasu committed himself by diving into the blazing flames after he realized himself. Using the chanted power of "water," Raibhya conjured the Kritya or Brahma Rakshasa in another scene, demonstrating water's potency as an element. Since Nittilai wanted Yavakri to use his superpower to bring rain, he called on him to do just that.

Consequently, each character's backstory revolved around fire, rain, or a combination. Karnad depicted the power of water and rain as supreme, and he delved into human consciousness through various emotions expressed by fire and rain. The cultural ecofeminist theory of "women's spirituality," where a woman is physiologically grounded in nature, is evoked by Nittilai's engagement with nature. Growing up on the earth's surface made Nittilai feel a special bond with Mother Nature. When we become one with nature, we receive all the joy, love, and wisdom

the universe offers. Even Nittilai had imitated the language of animals along with their interpretations and also the capabilities of recognizing the footprints of various animals as she depicts: “Tracks of the barking deer. A couple of porcupines. A family of mongooses. No sign of a panther- or anything that big- not within the last three days” (Karnad, 2001, p.11) The Nittiali people used to sing, accompanied by the sound of a waterfall and trees. These natural occurrences unite Nittilai with its natural surroundings.

Nittilai just inquired about Yavakri’s “universal knowledge,” or intellectual accumulation, which he had received from Lord Indra. This all-encompassing wisdom did not benefit the locals, so she tossed it aside. Despite Yavakri’s magical abilities, his desire for vengeance triumphed over his humanity, and the long-awaited rains failed to reach the parched region. The difference of opinions towards nature and other living beings indicated the attitudes of human consciousness possessed by a woman and a man. Nittilai asked:

Since Lord Indra appeared to Yavakri and Indra is their God of Rains, why didn’t Yavakri ask for a couple of good showers? ...I want to ask Yavakri two questions. Can he make rain...what is the point of any knowledge if you cannot save dying children. (Karnad, 2001, p. 22)

Nittilai approached the ecofeminist thought by stating: “all the land needs a couple of heavy downpours. That will revive the earth. Not too much to ask of a god” (Karnad, 2001, p. 25). Humans will have all the resources they need to thrive when the Earth regenerates. Nittiali’s proposal on bringing rain was devalued by Yavakri’s father by saying, “such powers should not be used to solve day-to-day problems...they are meant to lead one to-to-inner knowledge.” (Karnad, 2001, p. 45) Ecofeminists argue that men see the ecological issue through the lens of vengeance and selfishness, whereas women see it through the lens of survival instincts. The Fire and the Rain does an excellent job of illustrating the interdependence of humans, deities, and the natural world. Not only did the author center on gender dominance in politics, but he also addressed class, caste, and racial dominance. Karnad’s depiction of ecofeminism quite matches the thoughts of Gaard and Murphy, who remarked that ecofeminism is:

Based not only on the recognition of connections between the exploitation of nature and the oppression of women across patriarchal societies” but also “on the recognition that these two forms of domination are bound up with class exploitation, racism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism (Gaard, 2011, p. 32)

Ultimately, Nittilai gave her life so her beloved could lead a noble life. The lord of rain, Indra, was happy with Nittilai’s great sacrifice for a noble cause, so he poured water on the village. Karnad writes: “Wind blows. Lightening. Thunder. People shout ‘Rain! It is raining! It pours. People dance with joy. They roll in the mud. Arvasu sits clutching Nittilai’s body” (Karnad, 2001, p. 62). In the play, the three men, Parvasu, Raibhya, and Yavakri, never hesitated to oppress the women of their lives by negligence, lust, ego, abuse, etc. Karnad’s ecofeminist ideas support Salleh’s ideas, “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” (Salleh, 1992). Nature and women were both seen by Yavakri and Raibhya as objects of oppression and dominance. In addition to Yavakri, who lied to Vishakha about her physical form, Raibhya also had sexual thoughts for his daughter-in-law after gaining the power of the universe. One by one, Karnad demonstrates how educated men were vanquished by nature and women.

3.2. Opposition to Male-Dominated Power Structures

The significance of literary texts regarding gender roles and their historical and contemporary comparisons cannot be disregarded by a religiously motivated culture. A patriarchal culture is one in which men’s ideals are prioritized over women’s and in which men’s dominance over women is reinforced. When taken at face value, patriarchy denotes father-centered authority. This anthropological and sociological interpretation is still relevant to the feminist political and philosophical movement. Maya, the play’s protagonist, serves as a vehicle for ecofeminist ideas. The young woman known as Maya has strong ties to nature. She sees a connection between the repression of women and the devastation of the forest around her hamlet, which fills her with horror. Each character in the play has a unique take on humanity’s place in the natural world, and they all dispute Maya’s ecofeminist views

(Yadav, 1995, p. 49). Like Maya's dad, some people think people should be able to take advantage of nature for their gain. Still others, like Maya's lover, believe that people should do what they can to preserve the natural world because we are an integral part of it. In the play's first scene, a member of an acting troupe says they would want to perform a dramatic play for the gods. A long round of deliberation ends with the group receiving permission to perform at the fire sacrifice. This ensemble is performing for two distinct demographics. Those who managed to escape the kingdom's devastating drought were among the first to offer fire sacrifices. As a second category, we have the people sitting in the audience. That is to say, the drama that the ensemble is presenting is the one that is central to the play; *this* was clear during the conversation between the actor-manager and the king himself:

Sirs, as is well known to you, Brahma, the Lord of All Creation, extracted the requisite elements from the four Vedas, combined them into a fifth Veda, and thus gave birth to the art of drama. He handed it to his son, Lord Indra, the God of the Skies. Lord Indra, in turn, passed on the art to Bharata, a human being, for the gods cannot indulge in pretense. So if Indra is to be pleased and end this long drought ravaging our land, a fire sacrifice is not enough. A play has to be performed along with it. If we offer him entertainment in addition to the oblations, the god may grant us the rains we pray for. (Karnad, 2001, p. 12)

Nittali is romantically involved with Aravasu, who is Paravasu's younger brother. There is a distinction between Brahmin traditions and tribal practices; Aravasu belongs to the higher caste, whereas Nittilai is the lower caste. Marriage proposals and declarations are more open and free-spirited among tribal people. Traditional tribal practices required a public proclamation of one's health and willingness to marry in the presence of the entire tribe. Following this tribal rite made the Brahmin Aravasu feel awkward and uneasy since he was unfamiliar with the notion. In his family, Aravasu knows precisely where he stands: he is inferior, and, as a result, nobody gives a damn about him. Additionally, he expresses his desire to be with his beloved Nittilai while dancing, singing, and acting. Since Paravasu has left his wife Vishaka, who is having an affair with Yavakri, who is

Paravasu's first cousin, Paravasu is also dealing with marital issues. After ten years of contemplation, Yavakri thinks Paravasu should not be a high priest. His words and deeds belie his professed state of enlightenment. Despite all his penance and sacrifice with God, He succumbs to want and longs for something an enlightened monk should not have. So, it turns out that Yavakri has not changed much from a decade ago. Despite the "knowledge" he supposedly has gained, he is just as uneducated, unruly, and vulgar as before (Yadav, 1995, p. 49). His ability to regulate his feelings and wants is lacking. Nothing he knows could make him understand the gravity of his improper words and actions.

The playwright brings up the question of knowledge vs wisdom in this way. Paravasu and Aravasu's father, Blind Rabiya, order a demon to murder Yavakri, but Vishaka begs him to stay in his house all day so she can save her beloved. Vishakha approaches Aravasu for assistance following her father-in-law's remarks. The demon murders Yavakri just as Aravasu arrives to save him. Upon completing Yavakri's burial ceremonies, Aravasu makes his way to the village of Nittilai. On that particular day, Nittilai's father had called all the people to meet with Aravasu so that he might bless the marriage. After Aravasu's father loses patience due to cremation chores and other family issues, he marries her off to the first volunteer in Nittilai's community. Paravasu's son chooses to sacrifice himself instead of the elder father, who is far more knowledgeable, wise, and experienced, leading to friction between the two. A month before the sacrifice ceremony, the father observes his son's conduct returning home, which further solidifies his already negative judgment of the King's decision. According to Paravasu's response to Rabiya, no one would notice if he resumed the procedure first thing in the morning. This reaction astonished the father since, during the sacrifice ceremonies, people were more concerned with pleasing God and themselves than with pleasing the public:

Paravasu: The king often says he would have preferred you to be the Chief Priest. However, it was a seven-year rite. They thought ... a younger man would be safer. Raibhya is full of anger and contempt for their son's and King's behavior. Raibhya: If you want to be alone with your wife, send that fool somewhere else. I do not need him. It is not the wild beasts one has to watch out for it is the human beings (Kanrad,

2001, p. 30)

Paravusu promptly eliminates Raibhya due to his interference in the sacrificial ritual by murdering Yavakri and engaging in inappropriate conduct with his daughter-in-law, Vishakha. Therefore, in Paravasu's opinion, his father, Raibhya, deserved to perish. He inquires Aravasu about the necessity of his presence to oversee the yajna and expresses his inability to depart from the vicinity of the ritual till its completion. Arvasu obediently follows his brother's instructions, leading to him being charged with murder and brutally assaulted, nearly losing his life. An ailing Aravasu is saved by the theatrical director and restored to good health by his cherished Nittilai. Nittilai's display of care and concern during Arvasu's time of distress brings a soothing effect to Arvasu, who had suffered emotional and bodily wounds inflicted by his brother.

Arvasu sought vengeance for his brother's treachery, as he firmly believed that the current series of events unfolded due to his intention to defy his social class by marrying Nittilai. The two fatalities and their consequences had compelled him to distance himself from Nittilai. Paravasu seeks revenge on his brother through two methods: firstly, by withholding his consent to act, and secondly, by orchestrating events that prevent his brother from marrying Nittilai. Nittilai, a member of a hunting tribe deeply connected to nature, has a wealth of pragmatic wisdom. She deterred Arvasu from seeking retribution since she believed that it would only result in further violence. Such a course of action would inevitably result in further anguish and distress. The act of seeking retribution was incapable of rectifying or altering any previous wrongdoing. She recommended maintaining the current state of affairs in order to reduce pain.

Patriarchy, according to feminists, denotes not only a society in which men retain authority but also a society in which a specific type of man has power. The traditional male ideal is deeply ingrained in such a society. Patriarchy, in this definition, refers to a social system on which the dominant values and norms are based and promoted by men. No matter where you are or what time of day it is, patriarchy has had a profound and almost permanent impact on the character and standard of human communities, their objectives and values, the status of women, and the dynamic between the sexes. Eco-feminism is a socio-political movement that

aims to improve fair and healthy relationships between men and women. It seeks to challenge and dismantle harmful and unjust beliefs and conventions that have dehumanized and subordinated women, often based on baseless misconceptions. Masculism is the erroneous attribution of masculine viewpoints, which are actually possessed by all persons, together with their own standards, beliefs, and values. The marginalization of women in intellectual and social spheres can be attributed to the ideology of masculinism. The pervasive presence of masculinity in women's subconscious brains is a significant concern.

According to Sheila Ruth in her book *Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies*, Feminism's objectives are regarded as a highly honorable worldview with a sense of spiritual dignity. According to her, "feminism and sexuality do not have a cause-and-effect relationship" (1980, p. 45); this capability is exclusive to men. Women's sexuality, at best, grants them limited power and, at worst, leaves them utterly vulnerable to men's control. This authority is a privilege that women do not deserve, as it undermines their character. It is commonly accepted that women are more adept at tending to children and the sick. Her proficiency in providing care for others categorizes her as a nurse, wet nurse, or mother. She can no longer fulfill the responsibilities of a parent or a doctor. According to Catherine Mackinnon, sexuality may be seen as a manifestation of power. Gender is a societal construct that encompasses individuals rather than individuals shaping it. Gender division between women and men is established by societal expectations of heterosexuality, which institutionalize male sexual dominance and female sexual submission, ultimately defining them as distinct sexes. If this statement is accurate, then sexuality serves as the crucial factor that perpetuates gender inequality. Gender, they say, is not a biological fact but rather a collection of socially constructed personality attributes; sex is the biological fact. A guy, for instance, is expected to be strong-willed, level-headed, reasonable, and protective of women and girls. On the flip side, women are expected to be submissive and kind in order to appease their male relatives and keep the peace, even if it means sacrificing their rights and identity. According to feminism, a critical perspective, this is the case. Such gender roles are constructed by patriarchal societies, which hold male values to be universal. Women are made weak by many things. As a foremost feminist critic,

Sheila Ruth's observation makes it clear how women are rendered weak in character and self-assertion:

Many factors in the environment conspire to impede women's competence and accomplishments in many areas—hostile or deprecating attitudes of incumbent men, lack of support and assistance from all quarters, dual and incompatible professional and nonprofessional functions, pervasiveness of the male (alien, inhospitable) ambience, and socialization that erodes confidence and self-assertion. Rather than being inferior, women are hampered in developing competence in the most profound ways. (1980, p. 160)

Given these obstacles, it is not shocking that very few women achieve the achievement society recognizes as a success story. This is the reason why women are consistently ranked lower than men in every public arena. Society and families often limit what is considered a good woman to being physically attractive, emotionally vulnerable, obedient, and prepared to sacrifice herself for the sake of her family and husband. This narrow view of femininity makes it hard for women to break out and make a unique impact in any field. There are many ways in which males benefit from the patriarchal views of women and the roles they promote. Traditionally, women have been expected to fulfill various roles within society. Firstly, physically, by tending to men's homes, property, clothing, and personal care. Secondly, economically, by performing many household chores for which women receive pitiful or no compensation. Thirdly, sexually, by satisfying men's desires as wives, mistresses, or prostitutes. Lastly, reproductively, by ensuring the continuation of men's family lines and dynasties, one significant tool for maintaining a masculinist self-image is the idea of woman as man's equal: the weaker and more reliant the woman, the more influential the male appears; the more submissive the woman, the more dominant the man appears. As a result, the numerous advantages enjoyed by males in the community are denied to female members simply due to their gender. Economic, political, and all other forms of power are taken away from women. Literature also reflects this state of affairs. Whether they intend to or not, writers often depict female characters as helpless and dependent on males for survival.

3.3 Questioning Patriarchal Representation in *The Fire and The Rain*

A scholarly model of the liberation movement includes challenging long-held beliefs and discourses about gender roles and relations since feminism is primarily about educating women about their rights and dignity and less about directly opposing males. Skeptics from all around the world have brought this movement into the spotlight. In light of this idea, the thesis details the many forms of oppression and deprivation women face, with the expectation that the downtrodden will rise against societal norms at some point. Erika Fischer-Lichte (2007) wrote in her treatise *Theatre, Sacrifice, Ritual: Exploring Forms of Political Theatre* that “the theatrical arts are reformatory, and they can criticize traditional gender roles. The second and third industrial revolutions and their effects, and the shift from an industrial and colonial to a post-industrial and post-colonial era, are just a few of the numerous reasons why the twentieth century is often seen as a time of transition (p.19). Among the numerous shifts that occurred in various cultural domains, what piques my curiosity in this context are the numerous reinterpretations of two relationships: the individual and their community and the one between the mind and the body. The shift from a mostly “textual” to a primarily “performative” culture in the West coincided with these reinterpretations and the pursuit of new cultural identities. Revolutions, political upheavals, natural disasters, and recurrent violent outbursts in the 20th century all played a role in these reinterpretations. Patriarchal, male-centric societies are the ones most responsible for the prevalence of violence against women, which does not discriminate based on age or culture. Contemporary playwrights like Kanards have begun to delve deeply into societal issues, exploring themes such as people’s perceptions of interpersonal relationships and women’s various constraints.

Fighting for women’s rights has existed since before the Enlightenment but has not gotten the traction it deserves. We must all do our part to raise gender consciousness as readers, critics, and authors if we want to finish this pre-Enlightenment task. However, You risk being stereotyped as an activist if you do this. The task is undertaken by Girish Karnad, who uses famous Bollywood actors to bring the ancient tale of the Mahabharata into the present day. He has done this while denying any feminist or political purpose, but from a critical vantage point, he has held patriarchal dominance over women. Regardless of his intentions, the play’s subject matter is inherently political; thus, he created a political drama for political

theatre. Treachery, betrayal, nonconformity, loyalty, etc., are recurring and essential issues that it addresses. According to reviewer Fischer-Lichte, Karnad's play is, thus, a political drama. In *The Fire and the Rain*, a member of Vishakha's family and their cousins trap her while she is a young maid. Raibhya, the father-in-law, the patriarch of the family, is lustful and gets his lust fulfilled through Vishakha, his daughter-in-law. Forgetting his shameful act, he asks his daughter-in-law, why are you so filthy? You look like a buffalo rolling in the mud"(Karnad, 2001, p. 19). He snatches her hair and proceeds to punch, kick, and beat her. He refers to her as a whore without considering that he is the one who has engaged in the disgraceful and unlawful deed. A woman in a traditional culture is expected to keep her emotions bottled up inside, like a corpse in a tomb, rather than expressing them to another man. While men who commit the same offence go unpunished, she is cursed and punished. Karnad has painted a vivid and brutal picture of life for Indian women in his play. Nittilai, the female hunter, faces several challenges when her boyfriend Arvasu fails to appear before the elders eagerly waiting for him beneath the banyan tree to end their illicit relationship.

Because Arvasu's conscience is nagging at him, he can't be selfish, so he has to cremate Yavakri's body. But Nittilai's brother disregards his warnings and seizes him by the neck scroll anyhow. In the coming days, Arvasu learns that Nittilai is to be married. To return home, he clumsily does so. Despite Arvasu's innocence, Nittilai ends up marrying someone else because of his deeds. So, in Ramachandran's *The Fire and the Rain*, Nittilai embodies the archetypal helpless victim who is "caught up in a whirlpool of Hindu patriarchy and is sucked down helplessly" (Karnad, 2001, p. 29). As Raymond Williams once stated, every character in Karnad is profoundly impacted by society, "every aspect of personal life is radically affected by the quality of the general life." (qtd. in Coupe, 2000, p. 584). Karnad depicts his characters as helpless inmates from whom there is no way out of their dreadful lives. The lower-class characters in *The Fire and the Rain* are forbidden from participating in the fire sacrifice that Lord Indra performs to appease him and bring rain. Because he disapproves of the savage entertainer Paravasu, Indra never appears. The other priests grow weary and feel "sick and tired of this endless philosophical discussion, metaphysical speculations, debates" (Karnad, 2001, p. 2). The priests are sick of

playing the role and are not looking forward to the tedious sacrifice. No one is permitted to enter the sacred place, and only higher caste members are allowed to attend this performance. Their entire performance is ruined because they have to wait forever for Indra, who never shows up. No member of the disadvantaged class has any business attending the show or even hearing the slogans. Karnad, a leading figure in modern media, possesses a rare talent for finding the good in bad situations. The majority of his plays have tragic endings and have heavy themes of carnage, murder, impersonation, betrayal, adultery, bribery, and violence. The themes of murder, vengeance, and jealousy within the educated houses of Raibhya and Bharadwajaa are the topics of Girish Karnad's play. The only thing that breaks the chain is the charity and nobility shown by Nittilai, a girl from the "Shudra" caste, and her boyfriend, Arvasu. The themes of vengeance, the fallacy of shallow understanding, and the human condition's vulnerability are at the play's center.

In this play, Karnad has projected the mystery of evil residing within human beings, which does not allow him to progress further. Despite his ten years of devout fasting, Yavakri cannot quench his lust for revenge. He wants to get even with another wise man, Raibhya, for the shame he inflicted on his father. In order to get even with Raibhya and Parvasu, his son, he molests Parvasu's wife as soon as he comes out of the forest. He learns of Vishakha's marriage to Parvasu after ten years of self-mortification and penance, during which he gains spiritual abilities and wisdom. He has been with her for a while and honored his vow that he "would not look at another woman" before he went on his penance journey (Karnad, 2001, p. 12). Vishakha goes to a beautiful spot in the bush to gather water, and he meets her there after ten years. He requests her to talk to him; she, being an Indian woman, says, "I cannot stay here chatting with a stranger" (Karnad, 2001, p. 12). Being a married woman, she avoids her erstwhile lover's company. However, he somehow succeeds in having a chat with her. She opens her heart and says, "You are hungry for words. And so am I. So let us talk. Sit down. (Karnad, 2001, p. 15). The two eventually fall in love and, unable to resist, hide behind a parched champak tree on the riverbank. She gives in to her baser desires, and Yavakri, the one she loved before, takes pleasure in her. Arvasu and Nittilai arrive at the scene and identify Vishakha's pot and footsteps.

Vishakha, whose garments are soiled and her back is coated in dirt, rushes out after Arvasu, who dashes into the bushes behind the champak tree in awe and fear. She dashes into the hermitage as soon as her father-in-law emerges. Seeing this frail yet energetic sage horrifies her. She gets a scowl from him. Arvasu, carrying the pot over his shoulder, trailed behind her. Since Vishakha's husband has been gone for seven years, he incorrectly assumes that she and Arvasu have formed an extramarital affair. In her wrath, Raibhya snatches her hair and begins to scold her. He strikes her with a forceful blow with his foot. Overwhelmed by the situation, Arvasu hastily intervenes to save her. However, Raibhya declares, "I demand the truth, and I am willing to take her life if required" (Karnad, 2001, p.20). Ultimately, Vishakha discloses that Yavakri paid her a visit. Then Raibhya defers to her husband's judgment, but Yavakri has already resolved his stance and articulates it as follows:

Vishakha, go and tell your lover I accept his challenge. I shall invoke the 'Kritya' and send a Brahma Rakshasa, a demon soul, after him. Let Yavakri save himself. He needs only to go and hide in his father's hermitage. I loved my brother and will not desecrate his altar. Let Yavakri cower in there like a dog. If he steps out, he will be dead. Tell him this, too: if he can manage to stay alive for another twenty-four hours, I, Raibhya, shall accept defeat and enter the fire. (Karnad, 2001, p. 20)

Vishakha comes forward for Yavakri's defense, saying, "No, please! Do not do anything to him. It is my fault. Please, do not harm Yavakri. I am willing to face the consequences. Punish me. Not him. Please." (Karnad, 2001, p. 20). Nevertheless, Raibhya does not heed her words, so Vishakha sends Arvasu to warn Yavakri. In her pursuit of Yavakri, she also flees in a different direction. At the same time, Raibhya opens his eyes, grabs a robust piece of hair, and hurls it to the floor. As soon as he arrives, the Brahma Rakshasa flees towards Yavakri. Arvasu begs the blind gatekeeper, Andhaka, to watch for Yavakri because he cannot find him in his hermitage. Nevertheless, Vishakha uncovers him behind the banyan tree and receives a warning from him about Raibhya's intention and determination. Nevertheless, Yavakri is exceedingly self-assured to the extent that he proclaims, "...your father-in-law will die, Vishakha, let us see what your husband does then" (Karnad, 2001, p.

23). Nevertheless, Vishakha methodically and serenely empties the water from the kamandala, and he currently yearns for “a drop-only a drop”(Karnad, 2001, p. 24). Ignoring her advice to go and run, he says, “I am not here to run away- I have triumphed over Indra, the lord of gods. Who are you to order me around?” (Karnad, 2001, p. 24). However, as soon as the Brahma Rakshasa appears, he starts running, and when he is about to enter the hermitage, Andhaka, not recognizing him, jumps up and grabs Yavakri. The hermitage is out of reach for Yavakri as he tries to enter, but Brahma Rakshasa attacks and spears him. Yavakri falls into Andhaka’s embrace. The demon takes the trident and flees. The punishment for Yavakri’s molestation of Vishakha has thus been met. In Naik’s opinion, “The fire in the title is thus the fire of lust, anger, vengeance, envy, violence, and death” (Karnad, 2001, p. 48). He succumbs to passion, jealousy, hate, and defeat.

The artistic framing by Karnad emphasizes the pointlessness of Yavakri’s knowledge, which is bestowed upon him by Lord Indra himself. He remained enslaved to his sense of self, even after gaining knowledge. The more he learns, the worse off he gets. Despite his extensive education, he cannot overcome his inherent defects. The reverse is true; his pride and knowledge fuel his vengeance-seeking zeal. Vishakha correctly points that out: “I cannot believe it! The whole world may be singing your praises. But you have not grown up! These ten years have not made any difference to your teenage fantasies. That has all gone, Yavakri.”(Karnad, 2001, p. 14). Yavakri strives to ruin Raibhya and his son Parvasu’s good name and happiness in his never-ending fire of envy and animosity. He resembles says to Vishakha as follows:

What matters is that I would not say I like your husband’s family. My father deserved to be invited as the Chief Priest of the sacrifice. However, that too went to Parvasu, your husband Indra came to me one night in the jungle and said: ‘You are ready now to receive knowledge. However, knowledge involves control of passions, serenity, and objectivity’. Moreover, I shouted back: ‘No, that is not the knowledge I want. That is not the knowledge. That is suicide! This obsession. This hatred. This venom. All this is me. I will not deny anything of myself. I want knowledge so I can be vicious, destructive!’

(Karnad, 2001, pp. 22-23).

Consequently, God grants Yavakri his desires. Like a wild beast, he turns violent. The evil that resides within robbed him of his reputation and life. His body starts to twitch. Even with all his education, he cannot overcome his inherent wickedness. Due to his malicious aspirations, he intends to ruin Raibhya and Parvasu's lives. In his debasement, he has abandoned his presence for the greater good. A combination of his ego and some unwanted urges has made him a slave to himself. The very act of Yavakri's presence is 'Tamasika,' leading him farther into oblivion. Raibhya comes across as a kind and selfless character in *the Mahabharata*. However, Karnad has portrayed him as an envious, spiteful, and lecherous character. His son Parvasu is invited to be the Chief Priest to perform the Fire Sacrifice to appease Indra since he is well-versed in Shastras and esteemed by the king and the Brahmin community. Father Raibhya is not nominated despite being just as educated, if not more so, than his son, "it was a seven year rite. They thought ... a younger man safer" (Karnad, 2001, p. 29). To this, the jealous father tells his son:

So, you measured my life-span, did you –you and your king? Has he tested the strength of my lifeline? Well, the sacrifice is almost over, and I am still here. Still here. Alive and kicking. Tell the king I shall outlive my sons. I shall live long enough to feed their dead souls. (Karnad, 2001, p. 29)

The following poisonous comments are indicators that he has become a slave to his self-hood; despite being a knowledgeable Brahmin, he is on par with Yavakri. Raibhya, seething with vengeance, calls upon Kritya and dispatches Brahmas Rakshasa to murder Yavakri. His knowledge of the harm he is doing does not stop him from giving in to his bad impulses. As a renowned sage, Raibhya also sins incest when he uses his daughter-in-law to satisfy his insatiable passion. One night, Raibhya is concerned that Parvasu was kicked out of the fire sacrifice due to the disgrace of his wife, Vishakha. However, Parvasu, Raibhya's eldest son and the chief priest of the fire sacrifice, disregarded all the religious ritual laws and returned home. When he shows up to see his wife, she tells him all about how she has been drawn to Yavakri and how he can help her. She opens up about how she and her

father-in-law spend much of their time alone in the hermitage. She further says:

Something died in your father the day the King invited you to be the Chief Priest. He is been drying up like a dead tree since then. No sap runs in him (pause). On the one hand, there is his sense of being humiliated by you. On the other, there is lust. It consumes him—an older man's curdled lust. Moreover, no one else is here to take his rage out on me. (Karnad, 2001, p. 32)

Amidst all this, he fires an arrow at his father, Raibhya, causing him to fall silently. Consequently, Parvasu, his son, kills Raibhya. Returning to the advice of the fire sacrifices, he then requests that his brother Arvasu carry out all of the funeral rituals for their father. "Do not rush through the rites. Perform them with care. Every detail has to be right" (Karnad, 2001, p. 35). Returning to the site of the fire sacrifice, Arvasu carries out the rituals after receiving Parvasu's blessings. However, Parvasu wants to know who Arvasu is and how he got here. Parvasu breaks down in tears as Arvasu explains that he was the one who finished Raibhya's obsequies and that he had murdered his father. "Patricide! Patricide! What is he doing in these sanctified precincts? Throw him out! Out! Demon!" (Karnad, 2001, p. 38). This exemplifies Parvasu's callousness, as he murders his brother, Abel, just like the biblical figure Cain. After hearing his brother's public scolding, Arvasu, who looked up to Parvasu as a father figure due to his intelligence and scholarship, is devastated and asks, "But why, Brother, why?...Why?" (Karnad, 2001, p. 38). However, two soldiers drag him out. To safeguard himself from accusation, Parvasu tells the assembly of priests and watchers: "As the sacrifice approaches its completion, the demons come out Rakshasa. Their sole aim is to disrupt the sacrifice. We must be on our guard" (Karnad, 2001, p. 38). To understand his expulsion, Arvasu seeks out his brother at night. However, the soldiers attacked him once more, ejected him from the premises, severed his terrified thread, and tossed him out into the cemetery. As a result of his intense shock, Arvasu tells his ladylove, Nittilai, "I worshipped my brother. And he betrayed me" (Karnad, 2001, p. 41) and "If he cannot justify his act-I'll33 I will push his face in it. I will make him pay-I will revenge myself on him" (Karnad, 2001, p. 43). However, Nittilai prevents him from discussing and acting vindictively. Jealousy, love, and politics are the unquestionable fuels that ignite the

play. According to Budholia, the face of jealousy can be visualized as follows:

Between, man against man, father against son, brother against brother, wife against husband, high caste against low caste people, man against God, ritual against sacrifices, freedom against bondage, attraction against repulsion, hate against love, the fire against the rain, illusion against the reality, passion against the truth and above all Vidya (knowledge) against Avidya (ignorance). (Karnad, 2001, p. 151)

Jealousy and vengeance cause devastation and damnation in the drama. Jealousy is a destructive force that may destroy whatever is in its path. As a human frailty, it numbs the intellect, sends man into a tizzy of insanity, and finally brings him to his demise. The once-friendly, educated sages Bharadwaja and Raibhya have become enemies due to their excessive ambition. As chief priest of the fire sacrifice, Raibhya develops feelings of envy towards Parvasu, his son. After Arvasu murders their father, Parvasu accuses him of patricide. It is a manifestation of sibling rivalry and plotting. As the hunting girl Nittilai says, “The whole family learned men lie in shambles,” Arvasu learns the hard way that envy is an inevitable evil. She aptly says, “Look at your family; Yavakri avenges his father’s shame by attacking your sister-in-law. Your father avenges her by killing Yavakri. Your brother kills your father” (Karnad, 2001, p. 43). Every contemporary household can relate to Parvasu and Arvasu’s experience.

The prevalent evil is a sin that has always been there, but now it stings even more, and it drives people insane. Raibhya, driven by envy, employs his spiritual powers to create a Brahma Rakshasa to eliminate Yavakri. As a response, Bharadwaja, a revered sage and a close companion of Raibhya, curses his buddy, decreeing that he will meet his demise at the hands of his eldest offspring. Parvasu wrongfully accuses his brother of a crime he did not commit, portraying him as a patricide and a murderer of a member of the Brahmin caste. At long last, judgment is passed, and all are destroyed. According to Maya’s insightful observation, Parvasu sees his father and Yavakri as individuals who “Were led on by the same blind fury flamed by the forces of jealousy” (Karnad, 2001, p. 72). Consequently, as Ralph Yadav has noted, “*The Fire and the Rain*, in particular, is full of violence and death, impelled by jealousy in family, rivalry, betrayals, caste and hierarchical taboos and

so on” (Yadav, 1995, p. 49). There is always some level of opposition, overt or covert, from the side that is being dominated. The same holds for Vishakha. She is a victim of injustice since her spouse abandoned her for seven years without a word. As the first year of their marriage came to a close, that occurred without delay.

This leaves Vishakha unfulfilled, without love for her husband, no children, and no protection. Consequently, she begins to feel an increasing sense of vengeance and discontent. Both her husband and society may have assumed that she would keep quiet and not speak out against his actions of abandoning his wife. However, when the chance arises to have sexual relations with her ex-lover in the peace of the forest, Vishakha seizes the moment. She expresses her physical and mental distress from her husband’s abandonment directly and explicitly:

However, in all these seven years, he has not come back. I know he cannot. However, I look forward to having him home after seven years. Alone, I have become dry like tinder. Ready to burst into flames at a breath. To burn things around me down at the slightest chance —
(Karnad, 2001, p. 16)

When her lover takes her into the forest for a sexual encounter, what she says becomes a reality for her, not just a threat. She has disobeyed the societal norm of being faithful to one’s spouse by doing this. In sum, Karnad’s drama is a scathing critique of the patriarchal society that harms women and the environment. An eco-friendly society that respects and values women is the goal of this plea for a more equitable and sustainable global community. Despite the play’s lack of direct ties to environmental movements, Karnad skillfully incorporates ecofeminist concepts by highlighting the revolutionary actions of women in their quest for self-discovery and championing the ecological needs of the surrounding communities.

In conclusion, ecofeminism is a feminist ideology highlighting the interdependence between women and the natural world. Ecofeminists claim that there is a correlation between the subjugation of women and the deterioration of the environment, asserting that both phenomena originate from patriarchal structures of control. Karnad’s oeuvre frequently delves into the intricate interplay between the female gender and the natural world. Karnad’s plays have garnered acclaim for their profound understanding of the impact of environmental degradation on women. He is

recognized as a trailblazer in ecofeminist theater, and his contributions have significantly shaped the evolution of ecofeminist ideology. The drama establishes a connection between the subjugation of women and the deterioration of the environment. The patriarchal council bears responsibility for both the occurrence of the drought and the subjugation of women. The play contends that to tackle the environmental catastrophe effectively, it is imperative to address the subjugation of women simultaneously. In *The Fire and the Rain*, the ecofeminist perspective posits that women and the environment are interconnected and that both are subjected to oppression by patriarchal systems of dominance. The play contends that in order to effectively tackle the environmental catastrophe, it is imperative to simultaneously confront women's subjugation.

CONCLUSION

Ecofeminism is a movement that emerged in the 1980s. It brings together environmental concerns with feminist theory. It focuses on the relationship between women and nature. At its core, ecofeminism stands against the patriarchal structures that dominate society. It recognizes the suffering and oppression of both women and the environment. It combines knowledge from biology, sociology, and feminist thought. Ecofeminism discusses how human activities degrade natural systems and perpetuate inequality. As a branch of feminism, ecofeminism advocates for gender equality and the empowering women in political, social, and economic spheres. It emphasizes the importance of women's experiences and rights to dismantle patriarchal systems of oppression. Ecofeminism builds upon these principles, asserting that the exploitation of nature is parallel to the subjugation of women. The movement emerged in response to the feminist, ecological, and peace movements, seeking to address the root causes of both gender inequality and environmental destruction. Cultural ecofeminists reclaim the historical links between women and nature. They attack patriarchal norms and advocate for the restoration of feminine traits such as caring. They argue that women's inherent connection to nature enables them to better address environmental issues.

Ecofeminist discourse centers on the exploration of the cultural and spiritual connections between women and the natural world. Ecofeminists tackle the symbolism of "Mother Earth" and the femininity attributed to nature. Such ideas are central for the preservation of women's rights. The historical reverence of nature in cultures like India, where forests are seen as sacred spaces, can embody social and cultural development. Ecofeminism encompasses different approaches that range from cultural and spiritual analyses to empirical and epistemological inquiries. Ecofeminists argue that women's experiences of oppression and ecological change are in fact connected. It calls attention to the disproportionate impact of environmental crises on marginalized communities like women. Critics of ecofeminism challenge its essentialist assumptions and its focus on gender binaries. They argue that ecofeminism oversimplifies social and environmental issues. Ecofeminism is used as an approach to literary analysis that continues to evolve and gain recognition within academic and activist circles. It is used as a framework for

understanding the connection of women and nature. Ecofeminism calls for a comprehensive approach to address systemic inequalities.

While it faces criticism and debate, ecofeminism is a vibrant and influential movement, that inspires communities to envision more sustainable futures. Ecofeminist literary criticism uses both the ecological and feminist perspectives to examine the image of nature in literature and its connection to gender and class. It focuses on the role of literature in shaping social attitudes towards the environment and calls for a more sustainable environmental ethic that is removed from patriarchal norms.

It is significant to note that ecofeminism raises awareness of the disproportionate impact of environmental issues on women and marginalized communities. Ecofeminism explores the gendered nature of environmental activism. It recognizes women's unique perspectives and experiences. It stands against traditional gender roles that limit women's participation in environmental decision-making. Ecofeminism confronts patriarchal oppression that lead to the harm of both women and nature. It aims at dismantling the thinking that nature as inferior entities and try to elevate them to a status of respect.

Ecofeminism is a concept that not only embraces feminist principles but also extends to broader humanitarian concerns. It recognizes that women, who often rely solely on the local environment for sustenance, are largely affected by ecological crises. The collaboration of women and environmentalists is crucial for mitigating such crises and achieving global peace, as they share the common goal of environmental conservation.

Henrik Ibsen, although not explicitly an ecofeminist, explored themes in his plays that resonate with ecofeminist ideas. He has works that discuss women's relationships with the natural world and society's oppressive structures. While Ibsen's plays may not directly address ecofeminist concerns, they provoke reflections on patriarchal power and environmental degradation. Henric Ibsen's play *An Enemy of the People* discusses the environmental concerns within a small seaside village heavily influenced by industrial activities. The story is about Dr. Thomas Stockmann, who discovers that the town's acclaimed therapeutic baths are actually polluted. His discovery poses serious health risks to residents and tourists. However,

the powerful mayor, Peter Stockmann, prioritizes economic interests over public health. This causes a conflict between individual integrity and social hypocrisy.

An ecofeminist reading of the play reveals that environmental themes and patriarchal power dynamics are related in the play. Ibsen's work primarily addresses issues of public health and social integrity. It indirectly aligns with ecofeminist principles through its exploration of environmental crises and social responses.

The contamination of the baths serves as a focal point for examining human attitudes towards the environment from an ecocritical perspective. The pollution represents an ecological problem. It reflects humanity's exploitation and manipulation of natural resources. People are involved in causing pollution, suffering its consequences, and holding conflicting opinions on remedial actions.

Moreover, the play raises awareness of the environmental crisis through the character of Dr. Stockmann, who embodies the pursuit of scientific truth and ethical responsibility. Dr. Stockmann's efforts to disclose and address the pollution face opposition from the town's authorities, who neglect public welfare. This conflict mirrors broader social tensions between individual conscience and social norms. It echoes eco-socialist critiques of capitalist exploitation of nature.

Gender dynamics also intersect with environmental advocacy in the play. Dr. Stockmann's dismissal of his wife Katherine's concerns and relegation of women to domestic roles mirror social norms of the time. Katherine's intelligence and agency are downplayed due to broader gender disparities prevalent in 19th-century society.

The play also explores the manipulation of public opinion and the clash between personal ethics and collective interests. Dr. Stockmann's initial optimism about garnering public support for his environmental concerns turns into disillusionment as economic interests and political influences sway public opinion against him. This illustrates the complexities of social norms and the advocacy for ethical principles in the face of opposition.

Through its characters and plot, the play invites reflection on the ethical responsibilities inherent in addressing environmental pollution and the importance of challenging patriarchal power in fostering sustainable solutions. While not explicitly tackling gender problems, the play discusses the clash between Dr. Stockmann and the town's administrators, highlighting their prioritization of economic profit over

public health. This conflict reflects the criticism of patriarchal power systems where institutions often contribute to environmental damage and suppress marginalized voices advocating for ecological and social adjustments.

Dr. Stockmann's discovery of the contamination of the town's baths by nearby tanneries serves as a metaphor for the broader exploitation of nature and marginalized communities. His insistence on revealing the truth despite facing social isolation mirrors the resistance seen in the ecofeminist movement against dominant patriarchal views on the environment.

The play exposes the economic interests tied to the exploitation of nature and the resistance faced by those challenging the status quo. Dr. Stockmann's confrontation with his brother, the Mayor, shows the conflict between personal ethics and societal conventions, as well as the bravery required to defy the majority in pursuit of truth.

Furthermore, Dr. Stockmann's ethical stance extends beyond mere environment concerns to encompass broader issues of social integrity and human well-being. His refusal to compromise his principles, even in the face of personal and professional consequences, exemplifies the struggle against oppressive systems and the prioritization of morality over material wealth.

Through the lens of ecofeminism, the play also shows the relationship between environmental exploitation, social injustice, and gender dynamics. It critiques the exploitation of nature for economic gain and the silencing of raising voices, while advocating for a more harmonious relationship between humanity and the natural world. Thus, *An Enemy of the People* offers a strong message that resonates with contemporary discussions on environmentalism, feminism, and social justice.

Similarly, Indian playwright Girish Karnad's works examine the intersections of gender, environment, and societal oppression. Karnad's writings show that there is an inseparable link between women and nature. He portrayed women as bearers of ecological wisdom and agents of change in the face of environment corruption.

There is a relationship between women's liberation and ecological solutions that both are hindered by social structures of domination. Girish Karnad's *The Fire and the Rain* is originally titled Agni Mattu Male in Kannada. The play discusses the

notion of gender within Indian society. Karnad skillfully uses ancient myths in his writing to bring to light contemporary issues that affect women. The playwright examines themes of power, politics, and individuality within the context of Indian society.

Karnad employs the play-within-a-play mechanism to present human nature through the actions of his characters. The dominant myth of Yavakri takes the play into mythical and elemental realms to bring awareness to human experiences. The characters' quest for personal and social meanings through this myth contributes to the play's structure and reflects on morality, emotion, and the essence of human existence.

The story revolves around Aravasu who is a Brahmin that defies social norms by becoming a stage actor. Aravasu's attempt to assert individuality in a patriarchal society. Karnad's presentation of Aravasu's journey reflects the broader struggle of women in Indian culture. Moreover, Karnad skillfully turns to ecofeminist concepts throughout the play. He emphasizes the connection of humans, deities, and the natural world.

The motif of fire and rain symbolizes the ecological balance and the dependence of human existence on natural elements. Karnad's eco-consciousness is evident in his depiction of the characters' spiritual journeys to restore fertility to the land and the play's overall environment discussion. His plot conveys a strong sense of ecology.

The characters' relationships and actions also explore gender dynamics and power structures within society. Karnad juxtaposes the patriarchal values upheld by characters like Paravasu and Raibhya with the pragmatic wisdom of characters like Nittilai, who defies gender roles and advocates for peace.

The play also addresses the male-dominated power society that suffers from the consequences of patriarchal ideologies on individuals. Karnad's characters discuss social expectations and morality.

The scholarly model of the liberation movement outlined in the thesis challenges the beliefs about gender roles and relations. This perspective has drawn skepticism worldwide, but it shows various forms of oppression faced by women and anticipates a social uprising against norms. The shifts between industry and

agriculture coincide with reevaluations of relationships between individuals and communities, and between mind and body.

Despite Karnad's denial of political or feminist intent, *The Fire and the Rain* reflects political and feminist themes. This play vividly portrays the brutal realities of Indian women's lives and explores the victimization under patriarchy.

Karnad's characters like Nittilai and Vishakha show the helplessness and victimization experienced by women. The play also discusses themes of jealousy, vengeance, and the human condition's vulnerability through characters like Yavakri and Paravasu. Karnad depicts jealousy as a destructive force that lead characters to violence and destruction. In essence, Karnad's presentation of these issues tells the importance of addressing them for a more sustainable future.

Both Henrik Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* and Girish Karnad's *The Fire and the Rain* offer a criticism of patriarchy and its on the environment but in different ways and different cultural contexts. In *An Enemy of the People*, Dr. Stockmann's discovery of water contamination shows the exploitation of nature and weak individuals in Norway. The play emphasizes the individual's resistance against higher power. The play focuses on the destruction of nature and silencing of women as a direct result of economic strength and not simply as a result of socially established norms. *The Fire and the Rain* by Girish Karnad explores themes of natural pollution and social injustice within the context of ancient Indian mythology. Karnad uses the story of King Yavakri's search for power as a background for the destruction of the forest and the displacement of its inhabitants. The objection of women and nature here happens due to the social rules that stress the legitimacy of power in the hands of men and male gods. It reflects the actual Indian culture which gives the priority to men and religion over women and nature pushing the later to the limits of corruption and pain. Thus, both plays challenge traditional notions of masculinity and power by centering on environmental and social justice but in two different countries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anjum, D. T. (2020). Ecofeminism: Exploitation of Women and Nature. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS)*, 5(4). Retrieved from <https://journal-repository.theshillonga.com/index.php/ijels/article/view/2210>
- Archambault, A. (1993). *A critique of ecofeminism*. Canadian Woman Studies/Les cahiers de la femme.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2003). *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in post-colonial Literature*. Routledge.
- Bagus, S. (2012). *Making Meaningful Choices in Ibsen's An Enemy Of The People Drama (1882): An Existentialist Criticism*. Surakarta: University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta
- Beihl, J. (1991). *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics*. Cambridge: South End Press.
- Buell, L.(1996). *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap of Harvard UP : Print.
- Carlassare, E. (2000). Socialist and cultural ecofeminism: Allies in resistance. *Ethics and the Environment*, 5(1), 89-106 .[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1085-6633\(99\)00025-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1085-6633(99)00025-)
- Costanza, R., Cumberland, J. H., Daly, H., Goodland, R., & Norgaard, R. B. (1997). *An introduction to ecological economics*. CRC Press.
- Coupe, L. (Ed.). (2000). *The Green Studies Reader: From Romanticism to Ecocriticism*. Psychology Press
- Crosby, D.(2002). *A Religion of Nature*. State University of New York Press .
- Dalal, A. (2020). What does it take to clean the Ganga? Gendered dimensions of protest and policy perspectives. *Indian Journal Of Gender Studies*, 27, 183-204. doi: 10.1177/0971521520910966
- Daly, M. (1978). Prelude to the First Passage. *Journal of Feminist Studies*, 4(3), 81–86. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3177539>

- Diamond, I., & Orenstein, G. F. (1990). *Reweaving the world: The emergence of ecofeminism*. Oxford University Press
- Diamond, I., & Orenstein, G. F. (1990). *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*. Sierra Club Books .
- Dubey, S. (2018). Ecofeminism and Quest for Identity in the Novels of Anita Desai Arundhati Roy Kiran Desai and Shashi Deshpande. <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/244006>
- Fischer-Lichte, E. (2007). *Theatre, sacrifice, ritual: Exploring forms of political theatre*. Routledge.
- Foster, O., & Nkhama. T. (2012). “Sweeping is women’s work”: employment and empowerment opportunities for women through engagement in solid waste management in Tanzania and Zambia. *International Journal Of Health Promotion And Education*, 50, 203-217. doi: 10.1080/14635240.2012.703392
- Frye ,W. (1983). *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory*. New York: Crossing Press.
- Gaard, G. (2011). Ecofeminism revisited: Rejecting essentialism and re-placing species in material feminist environmentalism. *Feminist Formations Journal*, 23(2), 26–53. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2011.0017>.
- Gaard, G. C., & Murphy, P. D. (Eds.). (1998). *Ecofeminist literary criticism: Theory, interpretation, pedagogy*. University of Illinois Press.
- Gaard, G. (2012). Toward a Queer Ecofeminism. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, 12(1), p.137,137155 http://www.bibliotecaalternativa.noblogs.org/files/2012/11/ecology_toward_a_queer_ecofeminism .
- Garrard, G. (2004). *Ecocriticism*. Routledge
- Han, L. (2010). Marxism and Ecology: Marx’s Theory of Labour Process Revisited. In Huan, Q. (eds) *Eco-socialism as Politics*. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-3745-9_2
- Hartmann, E. (2004). Ibsen’s Motherless Women. *Ibsen Studies* 4. (1), 80-91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15021860410007799>

- Honderich ,T. (1995.). *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy (2nd ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Hooti, N., & Davoodi, A. (2011). The Battle between Responsibility and Manipulation in Henrik Ibsen“ s ‘An Enemy of the People. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 12 (1), 201-210.
- Howell,N.(1990). Ecofeminism: what one needs to know’, *Journal of Religion and Science*, 32, (2), 231-241 . <https://doi.org/10.1111/0591-2385.861997085>
- Ibsen, H. (2012). *An enemy of the people*. Courier Corporation.
- Jackson, C. (1993). Women/nature or gender/history? A critique of ecofeminist ‘development’. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 20(3), 389-418.<https://doi.org/10.1080/03066159308438515>
- Jackson, E. (1992). Catherine MacKinnon and feminist jurisprudence: A critical appraisal. *Journal of Law and Society*, 19 (2),195-213. <https://doi.org/10.2307/141022>
- Johnston, B. (2006). *The Poetry of An Enemy of the People.” Turning the Century: Centennial Essays on Ibsen*. Ed. Michael Robinson. Norvik Press.
- Kanrad ,G.(2001).The Fire and The Rain. The John Hopkins University Press.
- King, Y. (1995). Engendering a Peaceful Planet: Ecology, Economy, and Ecofeminism in Contemporary Context. *Women’s Studies Quarterly*, 23(3/4),15–21. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40003496>
- King, Y.(1981). *Feminism and the revolt of nature*. Heresies :Print.
- Lorentzen, L. A., & Eaton, H. (2002). *Ecofeminism: an overview*. In The Forum on Religion and Ecology at Yale.
- Markandaya, K. (1982). *Nectar in a Sieve*. 1954. New York: Signet Classic.
- Mellor, M. (2006). Ecofeminist political economy. *International Journal of Green Economics*, 1(1-2), 139-150.<https://doi.org/10.1504/IJGE.2006.009341>
- Mies, M., & Shiva, V. (1993). *Ecofeminism*. Zed books.
- Mohapatra, B., Sarangi, I. (2021).*The Dominance of Patriarchy on Nature and*

- Women in Girish Karnad's The Fire and The Rain Ecofeminist Perspective.*
- Murphy, P. D.(2009). *Ecocritical Explorations in Literary and Cultural Studies: Fences, Boundaries, and Fields*. Lexington Books:Print .
- Nair, R. (2006). Ritual as Self-Discovery in The Fire and the Rain. Girish Karnad's Plays: Performance and Critical Perspectives, (pp. 243–249). Rutgers University Press.
- Parmar, A. D. (2018). Ecofeminism: An Ambivalent Relationship between Women and Nature in Selected Novels of Arundhati Roy, Anita Desai and Sarah Joseph (Doctoral dissertation, Gujarat Technological University Ahmedabad).
- Pepper, D.(2008). *Eco-socialism: From Deep Ecology to Social Justice*. Routledge.
- Philipose, P.(1989). Women Act: Women and Environmental Protection in India. In Plant ,J.(EDS).*Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism*, Toronto: Between the Lines.(pp.134-135). Oxford University Press
- Plant ,J.(1989). *Healing the wounds: The promise of ecofeminism*. New Society Publishers
- Plant, J. (1989). *Healing the wounds: The promise of ecofeminism*. Oxford University Press
- Plumwood, V. (1986). Ecofeminism: An overview and discussion of positions and arguments. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*,64(1),120-138.<https://doi.org/10.1080/00048402.1986.9755430>
- Plumwood, V. (2002). *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. Routledge.
- Radhakrishnan, S., & Moore, C. A. (Eds.). (1970). *A Source Book*. Princeton University Press.
- Roach, C. M. (2003). *Mother/nature: Popular culture and environmental ethics*. Indiana University Press.
- Rogers, B. (2005). *The domestication of women: Discrimination in developing societies*. Routledge.
- Roshwald, M. (2004). *The alienated moralist in an enemy of the people*. University of Wisconsin Press

- Ruether, R. R. (1992). *Gaia and God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco
- Ruether, R. R. (1995). *New woman, new earth: Sexist ideologies and human liberation*. Beacon Press.
- Ruether, R. R. (2003). Ecofeminism: Symbolic and social connections of the oppression of women and the domination of nature. In Gottlieb, R.S (Eds.), *This Sacred Earth* (pp. 388-399). Routledge.
- Ruth, S. (1980). *Issues in feminism: A first course in women's studies*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sale, K. (1987). *Ecofeminism: A new perspective*. The Nation..
- Salleh, A. (1992). The ecofeminism/deep ecology debate. *Environmental ethics*, 14(3), 195-216. DOI 10.5840/enviroethics199214317
- Salman, A., & Iqbal, N. (2007). Ecofeminist Movements—from the North to the South [with Comments]. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 46(4), 853–864. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41261200>
- Sankar, G. (2006). The Dominance of Power in The Fire and the Rain. *The Creative Launcher*, (1), 30-44.
- Shaw, B. (1912). *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*. Brentano Press
- Shiva, V. (2016). *Staying alive: Women, ecology, and development*. North Atlantic Books.
- Slicer, D. (1995). Is There an Ecofeminism–Deep Ecology “Debate”? *Environmental Ethics* 17 (2), 151-169.
- Spretnak, C. (1993). Critical and constructive contributions of ecofeminism. *The Bucknell Review*, 37(2), 181.
- Stein, R. (2004). New Perspectives on Environmental Justice: Gender, Sexuality and Activism.
- Stenport, A. W. (2011). *Global Ibsen: Performing Multiple Modernities*. Brentano Press

- Warren, K. J. (1994). Environmental stewardship: An ecofeminist philosophical perspective. In Stewardship, E. (EDS). *Environmental Stewardship: History, Theory and Practice: Workshop Proceedings* (pp. 42-58). University of Winnipeg, Institute of Urban Studies.
- Warren, K. J. (1995). The power and the promise of ecological feminism. *Earthcare: An Anthology in Environmental Ethics*. In Clowney, D., & Mosto, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Earthcare: An Anthology in Environmental Ethics* (pp. 245-62.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Warren, K., & Erkal, N. (Eds.). (1997). *Ecofeminism: Women, culture, nature*. Indiana University Press.
- Warren, K. (1994). *Ecological Feminism*. Routledge.
- Wenzel, J. (2011). Forest Fictions and Ecological Crises. *Postcolonial Ecologies: Literature of the Environment*. In DeLoughrey, E., & Handley, G. B. (Eds.). *Postcolonial ecologies: Literatures of the environment*, (pp. 136-187). OUP USA.
- Yadav, R. (1985). *Representation of violence in the fire and the rain*. New Delhi.
- Yan, Y. (2011). "The Call of the Wild: An Ecocritical Reading of The Old Man and the Sea." *Canadian Social Science* 7 (3), 167-175. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.css.1923669720110703.026>