

TRIBHUWAN UNIVERSITY

Ecological Consciousness in K.N.Panikkar's *Aramba Chekkan*

A Thesis submitted to the Central Department of English
in Partial fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Arts in English.

By

Dilli Prasad Wagle

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu.

2010 A.D.

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Dilli Prasad Wagle completed his thesis entitled “Ecological Consciousness in K.N. Pannikar's *Aramba Chekkan*” under my supervision. He carried out his research from July 2009 (A.D) to March 2010.

I hereby recommended his thesis be submitted for viva voce.

(Khem Raj Khanal)

Supervisor

Central Department of English

Kirtipur.

Tribhuwan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled “Ecological Consciousness in K.N.Panikkar’s Aramba Chekkan” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuwan University, by Dilli Prasad Wagle has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

(Head)

Central Department of English.

Date: _____

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head, Central Department of English for offering me a chance to carry out this research. I also owe my gratitude to Dr. Shiva Rijal, Mr. Amma Raj Joshi, Mr. Ghanashyam Bhandari, and Mr. Jibnath Lamsal without whose kind cooperation the work would have remained incomplete.

I must thank Mr. Khem Raj Khanal who provided me sufficient support by giving suggestions and by providing the materials. At the same time, I must say thanks to all the teachers who directly or indirectly supported me in this research.

I am much indebted to my parents, brother and sister-in-law who provided me ambience to prepare this thesis.

January, 2010

Dilli Prasad Wagle.

Abstract

This research work attempts to show how K.N. Panikkar's *Aramba Chekkan* arouses ecological consciousness. Anthropocentrism is a tendency of keeping man at the centre and exploiting other living beings and non-living things on earth for human profit or use. Such activities invite apocalypse as Aramba has to face his fate in the play-he is torn up by wild animals. Ecological awareness is an impetus that moves people away from centre, and compels to think of the consequences of human activities in the world. It is a vision that one day humankind's existence will be in danger. Therefore, as a solution or in other words, for smooth running of this natural world/ universe, biocentric vision is essential. Biocentrism means taking each and every organism of this universe with equal eyes and sense of respect. To ensure human existence, first man should learn to respect and preserve the nature.

Contents

Title	Page No.
Acknowledgement	iv
Abstract	v
I. K.N. Panikkar and ecological consciousness in literature	1-9
II. Ecocriticism	10-22
Anthropocentrism versus Biocentrism	
Natural Reverence	
Evocation for Nature's protection through apocalyptic vision	
III. Ecological Consciousness in <i>Aramba Chekkan</i>	23-37
IV. Conclusion	38-40
Work Cited	41-42

I. K. N. Panikkar and Ecological Consciousness in Literature

Aramba Chekkan is a play written by Dr. Kavalam Narayan Panikkar, who was born in India in 1936AD. His play shows the interconnectedness between the human and the non-human. They are brought together and assimilated in this play so as to reflect that man should be aware of protection of ecology. Ecological consciousness portrays the human attachment to the world of nature and how this ultimate place of dwelling appears in literature. Panikkar tinges on the eco-friendly images in order to concentrate upon various aspects of human to non-human entities related to each other.

He is equally conscious of an ongoing environmental degradation due to the anthropocentric vision in the world. For this, he points out the irresponsible human activities. Human beings are distracted from nature and harmonious bond between human and non-human. Panikkar rejects human crime against nature committed by anthropocentrism. He treats nature as a whole keeping man itself a part of it. He seeks to acknowledge the power of nature and human communion with the elemental world of nature.

The writer in this play uses men, animals, plants and insects as characters on the stage to perform the play *Aramba Chekkan*. Generally a play is written with a view to be performed by human characters. On the contrary, he has used plant like Chekki, animals like tiger, goats, leopards, and insect like snake on the stage to perform the play.

There must be certain reason behind using such unique technique where animals, plants, insects, act on the stage who personify qualities, attitudes, or ideas. For the present researcher, by doing so the writer wants to create ecological consciousness in human beings. The protagonist of this play is Aramba Chekkan or

Aramban, a goatherd. Aramba means the one who begins; Chekkan means boy or a guy. Chekkan is not simply a goatherd, he represents mankind's discovery of nature, the beginning of man's relation with nature. He is called simply Aramban by the other characters.

Wild animals comprise bears, leopards, tigers, wolves etc. The wild animals represent the untamed, vicious, destructive side of nature. Chekki is the name of an orange forest-flower found in Kerala. In this play, Chekki personifies the gentle spirit of the forest or of nature. Snake too plays an important role in the play. In Kerala mythology, snakes are the guardian of the soil and of all the treasure of the soil.

Dr. Panikkar is among the foremost historian of modern India. He has established himself as a historian of international repute, original and authentic in his views on the medieval and modern history of India and the world. He is a life long student and researcher in the historical discipline; he has been very prolific as an author as well. He has published eight highly rated books on the ideological, ethnic, socio political and economic under currents of the modernist phase of history. His books include '*Against Lord and State; Religion and Peasant Uprising in Malabar; Culture and Consciousness in Modern India; Culture Ideology and Hegemony--Intellectual and social Consciousness in Colonial India.*

Different critics have read Panikkar's *Aramba Chekkan* in their own way. However, no particular research work has been done in this text from ecological point of view. In *The Ecocriticism Reader*, Glotfelty, Cheryll, commenting on the play says:

K.N. Panikkar's Aramba Chekkan is a version of Orpheus/
Euridice myth which arose from collaboration with Erin, B. Mee.

This is certainly an interesting way of making Panikkar's process accessible to non-Indian readers, and scripting to some extent illustrate the largely Sanskrit theatre derived conventions within which he works: Performance builds on and enriches the written word often in the form of arabesque solos as in Kudiyattam, and events are never other than richly symbolic.(24)

Similarly, in *The Truth of Ecology; Nature, Culture, and literature in India*, Usha Ganguli expresses that Panikkar's *Aramba Chekkan* belongs to the theatre of roots (41). After independence in 1947, in their effort to create an 'Indian' theatre that was different from westernized, colonial theatre, and Indian theatre practitioners began returning to their 'roots' in classical dance, religions, rituals, martial arts, popular entertainment and aesthetic theory. The theatre of roots -- as this movement was known as -- was the first conscious effort at creating a body of work for urban audiences combining modern European theatre with traditional Indian performance while maintaining its distinction from both.

Since there are no specific research works done in this play from the point of view of ecocriticism, the present researcher attempts to read K.N. Panikkar's *Aramba Chekkan* from that point of view. The writer has shown the interconnectedness between/among plants, insects, and animals. One's existence directly or indirectly depends upon others. This interconnection is essential for the existence of all living beings. In the absence of one, the other may extinct. In such a nexus, human being considers himself higher being and use and exploits the others. In other words, due to anthropocentric laws, human being thinks that he is free to use the nature for his survival as well as his benefit.

While doing so, his actions jeopardize the life of the animals and insects that invites apocalypse in human life. For example, Aramba tames goats that action makes tigers angry. As a result, he is torn up by wild animals. Similarly, man cuts down trees for cultivation and settlement. That ends up the habitat of thousands of living organisms. That action again will be threat for human existence as it create imbalance in nature by collapsing the chain of ecosystem. Therefore, to save human life from the threat of being extinct or collapse, man should develop biocentric vision that respects all creatures and thinks that their presence is equally important for the smooth running of the ecosystem of the earth, and they have their right to exist in this earth and human intervention is not only useless but harmful for his own existence.

The proper role of human in the cosmic scheme has always engaged the literary imaginations. It is about maintaining or restoring a right relationships which are both thematically and symbolically present in the literature of every culture. For example, when *Oedipus Rex* opens with a plague upon land or the Bible begins with Adam and Eve's expulsion from the garden of Paradise or *The Divine Comedy* starts with Dante's lost in the rank wildness of the dark wood. We understand that the ethical propriety of an individual action is metaphorically conceived of in terms of health and balance of nature. Literature concerned with the creation and recreation of a sense of place. A great deal of literary work has dealt explicitly with nature whether to speculate upon our place with it or to explore and express its beauty irrespective to human concern. In the twentieth century, the most eloquent voices for an ecologically integrative vision of nature from literary artist diverse as D.H. Lawrence, Aldus Huxley, John Muir, Edward Abbey, Philip Larkin and many more.

Romantic writers seem to be guided by ecological consciousness. The most important feature shared by all romantic writers is that their works show the close relationship among all living as well as non-living things. For example, “The Haunted Tree” by William Wordsworth contains a vision of men and women living in harmony in an unspoiled nature. It is to all appearance an ecological poem because it discovers social community in a landscape of peace. The ground is not raped, the soil is not exploited and neither are people who live close to it. This balance between humans and the natural environment that they are nurtured is explicitly opposed to other exploitative kind of relationship both within human society and between humans and nature.

So far as the critical studies on such literary text is concerned, until very recently there has seen no sign that the institution of literary studies has even been aware of the ecological concern in literature. They lack the earthiness approach on the study of literary text. In some quarters there has been some change on emphasis, starting in America and currently taking a firm hold in Europe, named ‘Ecocriticism’.

However, the present study will attempt to study the play of K.N.Panikkar from the ecological perspective. In order to facilitate the textual analysis, the present study will adopt ecocriticism as its methodology. This study seeks to prove that due to human centric laws, human existence is falling in danger because it exploits and destructs the beautiful nature. That is why human being must develop biocentric vision to save his own existence as well as the whole nature.

Panikkar’s *Aramba Chekkan* Advocates for biocentric laws/ thinking to save the earth and its organisms. When man learns to respect and preserve the earth/ nature, only then human existence is guaranteed. Else, anthropocentrism definitely

invites apocalypse that will collapse all human existence. Thus ecological consciousness is very important for the smooth running of this whole nature.

Then question comes: what is ecoconsciousness? Or, what is ecocriticism?

Ecological criticism is a latest development in literary criticism. It looks at the relationship between human and non-human world. Feminist theory reveals the women suppression in the male dominated society. Marxism exposes the dialectical relationship between two different classes: higher class and lower class. Similarly, ecocriticism is one of the distinct theories, among others, that helps people to see the world from the ecological perspective.

On the one hand, this thesis looks at how text represents the physical world, on the other hand, more importantly, it examines at how literature raises moral questions about human interaction with the nature. Most ecocritical works share a common motivation: the awareness that we have reached the age of environmental limit, a time when the consequences of human actions are damaging the planet's basic life system. This awareness sparks a sincere desire to contribute environmental restoration. So ecologically focused criticism is a worthy practice to improve the degrading condition of the modern world. It ultimately helps us to direct attention to the conservation of environment.

Ecocriticism is a response to the need of humanistic understanding for our relationship with the natural world in an age of environmental destruction. In large part, environmental crisis is the result of human disconnectedness from the natural world brought about not only of increasing technology but also by particularization that fails to understand the interconnectedness among living and non-living things, which too is the focus of this dissertation.

Ecology studies the relations between species and habitats. Ecocriticism must see its complicity on what it attacks. All writers and their critics are stuck with language, and although we cast nature and culture as opposites, in fact, they constantly mingle, like water and soil in a flowing stream.

When we study relationship between literature and landscape, human and non-human animal world, we are not studying two separate things but interdependencies. For example, the following extract from the text shows that there is inseparable, deep relationship between man and nature. Chekki (a plant) sings a song that shows how human beings and nature are interdependent to each other.

Chekki sings:

Can you hear the sound of the sympathetic forest?

Do you hear the sound of the benevolent forest?

Aramban,

Can you hear me?

Can I trust you, Aramban?

If so, I will give you the singing throat of the Koel bird.

Sing, sing Aramban. (93)

If Aramba listens the sound of the sympathetic forest, or if he listens the plight of the forest, Chekki is ready to give singing throat of Koel bird. If Aramban understands the pain, afflict given by man, Chekki claims that his melody will flow like the mountain stream. Thus man and nature is intertwined like mud and water in the flowing river. This extract shows that all problems have been created simply because man has failed to understand and respect the nature. Man should listen the sound of the animals, forest, so that harmony between man and nature can be maintained.

Ecological studies embrace the opinion that no branch of knowledge can ever be devoid of ecocentric implication. Every knowledge follows the earth: nothing can be understood in the absence of any spatial or temporal point of view. Because of this reason, ecocriticism establishes the earth as crucial for the understanding of ethics and religion, art and literature, philosophy and physics, culture, and politics and all other disciplines. Ecocriticism leads the readers towards knowing the earth. Similarly it assumes that language evolves out of the same evolutionary process of the earth. Language can not be separated from eco-sphere. Language is not only representative of the world, but it functions within our experience of the world. Therefore, ecocriticism believes that language is earth and earth is language. Thus it studies the interconnectedness between language and landscape, text and terrain, woods and words.

Ecocritics and theorists ask question like the following: How is nature represented in the poem? What role does the physical setting play in the plot of this novel? Are the values expressed in the play consistent with ecological wisdom? How do our metaphors of the land influence the way we treat it? How can we characterize nature writing as a genre? In addition to race, class and gender, should place become a new category? Do men write about nature differently than women do? In what way has literature itself affected humankind's relationship to the natural world? In what way and to what affect is the environmental crisis seeping into the contemporary literature and popular culture?

To sum up, the present dissertation on K.N.Panikkar's *Aramba Chekkan* is prepared by applying ecological criticism. The writer's main motto behind writing this text is to arouse ecological consciousness in human beings. In other words, Panikkar is trying to shift people's position from ego-consciousness to

eco-consciousness. Ego-consciousness, here, refers to anthropocentric views that allow people to use and exploit nature as their wish.

Panikkar's message through this play is that men should abandon anthropocentric views, and adopt biocentric worldview to save human lives as well as this earth. Otherwise, apocalypse is at hand. In other words, the basis of analysis of this thesis is human relation to nature in terms of anthropocentrism, apocalypse, and biocentric worldview. These aspects of ecology will be elaborated in the coming chapters.

II. Ecocriticism

Ecocriticism is a literary theory that theorises the interdependent and essential relationship between human and non-human world. It fundamentally rejects the dualistic view of human and nature as separate and different. It depicts the interconnected relationship among all living and non-living beings and gives them equal value. It rejects the anthropocentric world view and also denies the human supremacy over other beings. Ecocriticism draws parallel line between human and non-human and advocates for the proper reverence for all creatures. It advocates for the biocentrism in place of anthropocentrism. Main motto or aim of ecocriticism is to preserve the earth or natural environment from the human exploitation by giving equal value to all creatures who are sharing the same planet; earth, and by exposing inevitable presence of one being for the peaceful existence of the other.

Ecocriticism as an academic discipline began in early 1990s, although its roots go back to the late 1970s. Because it is a new area of study, scholars are still engaged in defining the scopes and aims of the subject. Cheryll, Glotfelty one of the pioneers in the field has defined Ecocriticism as “study of relationship between literature and the physical environment” (xviii). And Lawrence Buell says, “This study must be conducted in the spirit of commitment environmentalist praxis” (23). It studies the reciprocal relationship between human being and land. The home ground of ecocriticism is the human’s inseparable attachment with the soil in its existence. So, dwelling place becomes the centre of ecocriticism in its experimentation.

The term ecocriticism was coined in 1978 by William Rueckert in his essay *Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism*. By ecocriticism Rueckert meant the application of the ecology and ecological concept to the study of literature

(*The Ecocriticism Reader*, xx). Rueckert's definition concerned especially with the science of ecology which includes all possible relation between human beings and the land they exploit to survive. The interaction between human and non-human world is the primary focus of the ecocriticism studies. Man cannot stay beyond the environment. All the living and non-living things depend upon each other for the continuation an existence of their lives. Ecocriticism admits Barry Commoner's first laws of ecology "Everything is connected to everything else" (33). It is the fact that everything in the world is interconnected and interdependent. Barry Commoner in his *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man and Technology* elaborate:

Each living species is also linked to many others [...]. And animal, such as deer, may depend on plants for food; the plants depends on the action of soil-bacteria for their nutrients, the bacteria in turn live on the organic waste dropped by the animals on the soil. At the same time, the deer is food of mountain lion [...] fungi degrade the bodies of dead plants and animals. All this may times multiplied and organized species by species in intricate, precise relationship makes up the vast network of life on the earth. (32)

This kind of interconnection shows the role of each eco-element in the environment since they all work as the significant and necessary ingredients of earthly system. Ecocriticism deals with the same interconnectedness among the living and non-living things in the environment, and analysis this connectivity in the literature. It examines how the concept of nature is defined, what values are assigned to it and why and the way in which the relationship between human and nature is envisioned. More specifically, it invites how nature is literally or metaphorically presented in certain literary or aesthetic genres and tropes and what assumption about nature

genres that may not address topic directly. As Cheryll Glotfelty in his *The Ecocriticism Reader*, points out:

How is the nature presented in the sonnet? What role does the physical setting play in the plot of his novel? Are the values in this play consistent with ecological wisdom? How do our metaphors of the land influence the way we treat it? [...] affected humankind's relationship to the natural world (xviii-xix).

This analysis in turn allows ecocriticism to assess how certain historically conditioned concepts of nature and the natural and particularly literary and artistic construction of it, have come to shape current perception of the environment. In addition, some ecocritics understand their intellectual work as direct intervention in current social, political and economical debates surrounding environmental pollution and preservation.

On the one hand, ecocriticism looks at how text represents the physical world, on the other, more importantly, it examines at how literature raises moral questions about human interaction with the nature. William Howarth defines ecocriticism in this way:

Ecocriticism is a name that implies more ecological literacy than it advocates now possess, unless they know what embattled course ecology has run during its history [...] writing that depicts the effect of culture upon nature, with a view toward celebrating nature, berating its despoilers, and revering their harm through political action. (69)

By depicting interconnectivity of the human and non-human world through literature, ecocriticism makes people aware that it is their moral duty to preserve,

protect, and respect the non-human world as their own. People's political, social and personal activities should not be harmful for the other creatures with which they have to complete their human journey.

This is how ecocriticism looks the natural world as an organic whole in which all species are equally significant parts. Ecocriticism inspires to see the things in connection, harmony, and totality. All the things in the world, living or non-living, have their own values in this world and connect to one another to run the ecosystem. This view of connection and combination bears the sense of harmony between human and nature. This theory also makes human being aware of the fact that if they think superior among the creatures and exploit others for the benefit of themselves, it may bring disaster in the world.

Anthropocentrism versus Biocentrism:

Anthropocentrism is the belief that humans must be considered at the centre of any aspect of reality. This concept is also sometimes known as Humanocentrism. This perspective is entirely human centered approach to look at nature. It views human at the top of all other creatures. The theory of anthropocentrism says that the world exists for humanity thus human can rightfully try to benefit as much possible from the environment.

Different societies have different attitude towards nature. Regarding the causes behind emerging environmental crisis, Lynn White Jr. blamed on the Judeo Christian notion of man's domination over nature. "Christianity for him is the most anthropocentric religion in the world" (143) on their holy book, Bible, itself gives overall emphasis on humans "everything moving lives should be food for you and as I gave you green plants, I give you everything" (133). So white predicted that

environmental problem would not be solved until western society changes its religious belief.

The anthropocentric view suggests that human have greater intrinsic value than other species. As a result to this attitude any species that are of potential use to human can be resources to be exploited. This use often occurs in an unsustainable fashion that results in degradation, some times to be the point of extinction of the biological resources, as has occurred with the animals. The view that human has greater instinct value other species also influence ethical judgment about interconnection with other organism. These ethics are often used to legitimize treating other species in ways that should be considered morally unacceptable if human were similarly treated. For example, animals are often treated very cruelly during the normal course of events in medical research and agriculture.

Therefore, anthropocentrism is a world view that considers human to be the most important factor and value in the universe. In contrast the biocentrism world view considers human to be no more than a particular species of animal without greater intrinsic value than any of the other species or organism on earth.

Biocentrism takes human as one of the concept of Earth's ecosystems and that human have an absolute and undeniable requirement of the products and services of ecosystem in order to sustain themselves and their societies. As Paul Taylor in his *Respect for Nature* equates status of human being with that of animals. He argues that "human and animals share the earth and should live equal and harmoniously" (75).

Biocentrists reject the view that every living creature is unique and lives in its own way for its own good. So people must not harm any part of nature that has inherent value, try to control or change natural ecosystem. Biocentrism believes to

have right to exist for itself. They always focus and value living organism and often emphasizes upon the values of individual organism as Paul comments, “Biocentrists demand that human must value and respect all other living and on living entities and expect human being to exist in harmony with nature” (76). Joseph Broche has cited:

If we see ‘the earth’ as the web of life that sustain us, then there is no question that the web is weakened, that the earth is sick. But if we look at it from another side, from the view of the living earth itself. Then the sickness is embedded in human beings and it carried out its illogical conclusion, the sickness will not kill the earth, it will kill us. (495)

Biocentrists reinforce for the biocentrism constitutional protection to the environment. Bruckerhoff, Joshua in his *Law Review* writes, “incorporating biodiversity protection to constitutional environmental rights will ensure that the rights will actually guarantee a truly healthy environment for present and future generation” (616). Bruckerhoff finds the most of the environmental law are anthropocentric: they only focus primarily on preventing and remedying only those environmental problems that directly affects the human, pollution prevention laws are the best example of an anthropocentric environmental laws. People should not pollute the environment because it affects their physical health. Main cause to protect the environment is for the human so human is always at the centre. So he rejects these laws. He proposed an alternative laws. ‘Biocentric law’ that aim to protect all forms of lives. In other words, biocentric law intends to protect all aspects of environment, not just those that benefit human (Bruckerhoff 616).

Both ecocriticism and biocentric criticism consider human as member of the earths community where there is complex web of inter-connected elements in the

universe. But for anthropocentric, human only hold hierarchal superior position to nature and they do have full right to value it in a way they like. At present situation when environment is worsening day by day, increase of environmental awareness is only a means to balance the situation which is becoming possible through ecocritical and biocentric world view. Both ecocriticism and biocriticism advocate for the natural reverence.

Natural Reverence:

The perpetual assault on natural world by industrial process has awakened many people to take corrective action to preserve our planet. But human will not be able to preserve what they do not respect. What is currently lacking however is a broad moral basis for changing our exploitation attitude towards nature, which is proper natural reverence. Therefore, natural reverence means respective attitude towards nature. In his essay, *A Metaphorical Grounding for Natural Reverence: East-West*, Eliot Deutch, writes “by natural reverence” I simply mean the attitude, the awareness of the belongingness, together of man and nature in freedom. In such a way that allows for a meaningful, creative play in the relationships” (260). Natural reverence simply stands for the way to see and treat the natural world. If human accepts the freedom of nature and treats all beings accepting their own existence that is proper reverence for the natural world. In other words how does humanity fit into the natural world without domination or exploitation? This is only possible with a depend sense of reverence in human being.

If we see the philosophical trend, human have been seen as the rational, reflective centre of creation while in the religious trend the relationship of human with the nature is dominating one. The earth and its myriad species were secondary to the significance of human being (Tucker 57). Most of the eastern culture believes

upon maintenance of right relationship with the earth. However, Christianity as the religion of the west has internalized the hierarchal understanding of the earthly creatures since its origin. It has ignored the biocentric value of ecosphere as it sets human against nature only to prove the benefit of human superiority over nature. According to Christianity, as L. White Jr. in his *The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis* writes:

God has created Adam and as an after thought, Eve to keep man from being lonely. Man named all the animals, thus establishing his dominance over them. God planned all of this explicitly for man's benefit and value: into item in the physical creation had any purpose. Although man's body is made in God's image. (148)

Because of this reason we can say that Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen. Christianity not only established a dualism of man and nature but also insisted that it is God's will that man exploit nature for his proper end. So he blames Christianity for given overpowering position to men to rule over nature and creatures.

This is how White blames the western Biblical tradition in part for the ecological crisis by suggestion that with the idea of he diving being removed from nature and with the Biblical injunctions for human domination over the other species there is no obvious moral basis for revering nature.

Hindus' views are different from Christian views on nature. The *Gita*, a holy Hindu book, contains elements that could lead significant to ecological consciousness, widely cited in the literature on Hinduism and ecology. The *Gita* has been praised as a source of environment sensitive ideas both by Hindus and by eco-thinkers in the west, Lance E Nelson in Reading the *Bhagavat-Gita* from an

Ecological Perspective writes: “The Hindu vision of ‘dharma’ involves, as supportive of its vision of a harmoniously ordered cosmos, the idea that human beings must accept certain curbs on their desires to that this orders can be maintained” (129). Hinduism believes that all life form – human and non-humans are of equal value. The co-existence of human and non-human beings brings the cosmos in harmony. Therefore Hinduism also teaches notion such as overcoming anthropocentrism as well as andocentrism and recognizing the intrinsic value in the natural world and in non-human species. So Hindu perspective of man natural relationship is biocentric having moral basis for revering nature.

Moreover, Native American religion and Romanists are pantheist too. They both have deep respect for nature. Native American regards all objects in nature as sacred. All the life forms therefore, have equal status to Native Americans. They share a belief that the universe consists of our world, the earth, and also our worlds below, where the spirit of the dead goes.

We find Native American eternal relations with the natural world. The earth, humans, and all the other life forms acquire equal value in their culture. In *American Indian Myths and Legends*, Richard Drones and Alfonse Ortize have elucidated:

Mysterious but real power dwells in nature, in mountains, rivers, rocks, even in pebbles. White people may consider them inanimate objects, but to the Indians, they are enmeshed in the web of the universe, pulsating with life and potent with medicine. (55)

Native Americans feel the nature as an animate being. Our survival depends upon mysterious power of nature which regards reciprocity in all creatures. In the same way, romantists connect human with non-human natural world and brought forth awareness that ‘environmental crisis involves a crisis of the imagination which

depends on finding better way of imaginary nature and humanity's relation to it' (Buell 3). The main theme of the movement was the wilderness of nature' supernatural elements, imagination and most importantly, self-expression. They respect nature and oppose the civilized exploitation. They like to see nature as living, among them is William Blake. 'Blake's poem "London" (Circa 1794) evolves the bleak polluted urban environment that resulted from unrestricted burning of coal, the discharge of raw sewages into the Thames" (Green Writing 96). His poetry engages in a sustained and bitter critique of material conditions of production. Blake felt his moral relationship with nature in which modern inventions are the villains of the environment. Same way S.T. Coleridge also shared a common perception of the natural world as a dynamic ecosystem and a passionate commitment to the preservation of wild creatures and scenic areas (Mucksick 36). In the same way William Wordsworth, a romanticist, whose poetry's subject matters are joy, primary of human emotion and necessarily the obedience of the moral law of nature. His characters enjoy living in the hills, having simple and independent life.

We cannot protect which we do not respect. Issues of protection should come from core of the heart. There are so many environmental laws, and violators are severely punished, but again people are failure to protect the natural environment, for which main cause is lack of natural reverence.

Evocation for Nature's Protection through Apocalyptic Vision

Now a days human beings have lost sight on the fact that they are undercutting the very source of life by toxifying the water they drink, contaminating the land they cultivate, sparing the food and polluting the air they breathe (Tucker 59). In *Environmental History Review*, Mary Evelyn Tucker writes, "in the name of progress we are consciously or unconsciously undermining our very survival as a species" (59). People are not aware of tomorrow. They are using natural resources in their own way as they like without considering its own existence. People's attitude towards plants and animals is narrow one. Rachel Carson in his *Silent Spring* writes:

If they see any immediate utility in a plant they foster it. If for any reason they find its presence undesirable or merely a matter of indifference; they may condemn it to destruction forth with. Besides the various plants that are poisonous to man or his livestock, or crowd out food plants, many are marked for destruction merely because, according to our narrow view[...] many other are destroyed merely because they happen to be associated the unwanted plants.(64)

The earth's vegetation is a part of life in which there are intimate and essential relations between plants and the earth between plants and other plants, between plants and animals as Mary Tucker points out, "The universe (nature) must be unified, inter-connected, and interpenetrating. Everything interacts and affects everything else. This is why the notion of microcosm and macrocosm is so essential to cosmology (62). But, people have forgotten these all essential thoughts; they are unaware of the consequences of their acts.

Because of increase in environmental pollution, over use of land, lack of reverence to land and land ethics people are inviting threat to their own dwelling place. People must respect to the human as well as non-human world for the betterment of the future life but not for the nature. As Lawrence Buell writes, “I continue to believe that reorientation of human attention and values according to stronger ethics of care for the human environment would make the world better place for human as well as non-human” (6). So, we should respect the nature, should give equal value to all organism in this nature, then only we people are safe in this planet.

Basically the source of getting knowledge is literature, which has a power to initiate life. Two different ontological zones, human and non-human brought together in literary work in past and present which evolves issues of apocalypse, so that people can get knowledge, what kind of nature, their present activities will bring. Especially what will be the result if human being goes on exploiting the nature for their own benefit without caring creatures and their contribution in the exiting ecosystem?

The theme of apocalypse is not new subject in the field of literature. It has long history in western as well as eastern literature. The catastrophic flood depicted in the Genesis is one of the best examples of it. Main cause of destruction of the world in Noah Flood was people’s sinful and unnatural activities. People in Noah’s Flood did not follow the rules of God, so that they had to sink except Noah. Same way in *Bible*, Adam and Eve had to fall because they did not obey the God’s command. They are responsible for their own tragedy.

But, in this modern time, such kinds of apocalyptic events were imaginable as the result of the normal human activities; lack of ethic, lack of reverence towards

the human and non-human beings, environmental pollution and anthropocentric world view rather than an inscrutable act of god.

Therefore, a catastrophic event may fall upon human, if we do not care about natural environment; one day unimaginable disaster on the part of human beings is inevitable. It suggests that if we do not think in the beginning, disaster is at hand. It evokes the fear of end, which makes people aware and conscious about the natural environment. So literature plays vital role in the field of environmental preservation.

III. Apocalypse as a result of Human Anthropocentrism

The main concern of K.N. Panikkar in the play *Aramba Chekkan* is to arouse ecological consciousness in human beings. The first thing he does is he uses animals, insects, trees, and a few human characters. A play is supposed to be performed by human beings, but here he is using animals, trees, plants, and insects etc as characters so as to show that they are important part of this ecosystem where human being is just a part not all in all. To make his message polemic, he has used them on the stage.

There may be different motives behind preserving the nature. Whether to save nature for human sake or to save the nature for nature's sake. Some people have the opinion that nature should be preserved by disregarding the existence of human beings, some other say that nature should be protected to insure the life of human beings in the earth. Thus different opinions are prevalent in relation to human beings and nature. If a conscious reader analyzes Panikkar's text, he/she comes to the conclusion that the writer is raising his voice to preserve the nature to save the human race in this earth. If we do not preserve, respect the nature, our existence will be in danger. Therefore, we should preserve the nature for the sake of whole human beings. While doing so we are not only saving our life from different dangers but at the same time we are preserving the natural world without which we can not live in this earth.

There is unavoidable relationship between men and nature. If we look back our history, myth, we come to find undistinguishable relationship between men and nature. Charls Darwin, a well known scientist, draws a parallel line between man and nature where environment plays vital role. In his *The Struggle for Existence and Natural Selection*, he writes: "Man selects for his own good nature only for that of

the being which she tends every selected character is fully exercised by her as is implied by the fact of selection” (385). Those who struggle in nature can exist in this earth; otherwise, he/she will be excluded from nature. Thus we can trace the anthropocentric vision of human being from the very beginning of human civilization.

Man posits himself at the centre of all the living and non-living beings and thinks that he is free to use/exploit the nature for his benefit and to show his superiority in the way he likes. This is known as anthropocentrism. Man, thinking so uses, exploits the nature for his advantages. But this act directly or indirectly affects the whole environment of which he has little knowledge.

This play shows how human beings are destroying the other plants and animals for their own benefit, how they have become superior to others, but the question here is- does that exist forever? Or does it invite unimaginable consequences? Of course, it invites unimaginable consequences. For example, while introducing the characters the writer says “Snake is the guardian of the forest and he sees himself as the guardian of everything in it, including Chekki. Snake protects the forest from mankind” (83).

It manifests the fact that human beings have destroyed forest for their own advantages without considering the effect to their actions on other organism. Why does the snake protect the forest? It is simply because human beings have destroyed the forest. The given extract shows human domination over animals. Aramban says to goats:

If you don't walk straight

I'll beat you with my stick (hits first goat)

I'll kick you with my leg (kicks second goat)

I'll hit you with my hand (hits third goat)

It's for your own good (hits last goat). (89)

Aramban thinks that he is superior to other creatures. He hits every goat with his legs and hands. He does not think that even goats are like human beings and have feelings and sentiments. After he has beaten the goats, goats also express their predicaments. For example, the first goat says, “we are poor four legged creatures with only two syllabuses. So why are you beating us?” (89). This question compels human being to rethink about his/her domination or injustice acts towards other creatures. Goat's question prods human mind that is he doing just to other animals? Human being has seen this universe from his own perspective but he has never tried to see it from others perspective. When human being thinks that he is the superior class, in the like manner snake is proud of its power and says:

I own this forest!

I am the sentry of the soil!

You fierce the forest dwellers are forgetting yourselves!

You are going against your own dharma! (95)

This snake's expression hints that when human beings exploit others, other creatures also can think like human beings. Probably, had man not exploited other creatures the snake would not have thought in that way. The snake blames that man has fierce the forest dwellers. Man has not taken the wild animals as his friends or co-partners of this ecosystem. Animals are frightened from man because man has domesticated, killed, or used them for his interest.

Another thing is that man has destroyed the nature. That is why, the snake blames that man has gone against his dharma. Man's dharma, for the insect like snake, is to respect all creatures who share the common earth and its resources for

survival. By using the snake as a character, the writer conveys the message that human centered laws are defective; therefore, the snake claims to safeguard his dharma.

The whole problem is created due to the human actions who have forgotten his dharma. Here, writer wants to suggest that man should not have intervened to other's lives. As a man has right to live, so is the right to animals, insects and other organisms in this earth. Why should man tame the goats and other animals? Why should he devastate the beautiful forest? Why should he hunt wild animals? These are very significant questions on which the writher compels every reader to think once? Are we doing just to them? Or our actions one day will put us our existence in danger? Therefore, snake thinks that it is the sentry of the soil, owner of the forest.

Human being considers himself superior to other creatures. He does not think that snake, insects, and wild animals are integrated parts of this universe. Rather he is eager to kill them. On the contrary, the snake, though it is an insect, thinks that tree is integral part of snake's life. There it says:

Chekki is the follower of my branch

The branch I wrap myself around,

In the tree that is my home

Everything you see here is mine!

Chekki belongs to me. (96)

It proves that sense of integration and co-existence is seen more in insects rather than in man. In fact, snake intends Aramban to listen this song. Snake says that Chekki is the flower of her branch. Snake feels that a tree and a snake are same branch of a tree. This sense of belongingness is hardly to be found in human beings.

For the snake tree is its home, and Chekki belongs to snake. Each and every word in the above song expresses the relationship between plant and snake is just like the nail and muscle. This is the lesson the writer wants to impart to every human being, who think himself superior, all-powerful, and ravaging the nature without considering the consequences of his actions.

Man is utterly indifferent to nature and natural world. Man perhaps never realizes how dangerously he is acting toward other creatures. But other creatures have understood human being as very dangerous creature. The following extract is an example of this. The snake, indicating Aramban, says:

You will realize how dangerous he is,
Till then I will safeguard my dharma,
Till then I'll guard the land
Till then, insult the forest.
Till then, hate me. (97)

The snake thinks that man is dangerous to nature. It, therefore, claims to guard the land. Human beings have exploited the land. It is a pathetic expression of the snake. Man has devastated the land; therefore the snake wants to be the protector of the land.

Now, when man disrespects, exploits, neglects and uses the nature for his/her own benefit then the result will be apocalypse. It is a kind of fear that human existence comes to an end because of human exploitation on nature. Man has increased pollution, has used natural resources rampantly that invites threat to their own dwelling place. In the name of progress people are consciously or unconsciously devastating the nature without being aware of tomorrow.

In the name of progress city areas have been grown up, rivers are being polluted, air is becoming polluted with poisonous gases, forest have been cut down for settlement and wild animals are going to be extinct. In such situation, K.N. Panikkr tries his best to aware human beings to save the nature and its creatures for the sake of human existence. His major contention is that incessant exploitation of nature will bring unimaginable devastation on the part of human being.

K.N. Panikkar, in the play, envisions apocalyptic vision as a result of extreme exploitation of human being on nature. When man's exploitation and domination over nature becomes extreme, one day may come when man's species fall in danger. Man will have to face unbearable and unimaginable circumstances for his/her survival. For example, the wild animals say:

The forest has shown only wilderness
The village has shown only fear,
The village is frightened of the forest,
These are the sounds of the forest. (91)

Here, it is difficult to trace a good mutual relationship between man and nature/ animal. Man is afraid of forest and wild animals are afraid of man. Had man learnt to respect wilderness/forest, or nature, they would have not afraid of each other. The wild animals, afterwards, advance upon the goats to tear them into pieces. Goats say that man is their savior. But wild animals ask goats—“But who will save the savior from us?”(91). This is a very genuine question in a sense that it forecasts the fact that if we do not start respecting and saving the nature and other creatures, one day its consequences may devastate the whole human race. When human being destroys them, their habitat, of course, they will turn against human being because they will have nowhere to go and take shelter.

Panikkar's characters –wild animals, are angry with Aramban because he has captured the food of the wild animals. The wild animals addressing the goat say:

Stop right there!

We want village meat,

Our mouths water for your tender flesh. (92)

Wild animals threaten the goats because goats are in the clutch of a man. Instead, they should have been in open space so that tiger would manage their food easily. This is why the wild animals are not only angry with goats but with a man who tames and captures goats to fulfill his purpose.

Prandan acts as a mad character. He says-“I am bored by people's endless ignorance, so I amuse myself by acting mad”. People's ignorance is of ignorance of nature. Man does not take nature as integral part of his life. Therefore, Maraprabhu (lord of trees) plants trees and punishes those who chop down trees. He is conscious about ecology but man is not. Goats say: “Our friend is a victim of the forest's cruelty” (92). Man has shown indifference towards forests and treated wild animals as enemy that is why man is being victimized by forest's cruelty. The last scene of the play is the best example of how it is dangerous for a man when he imposes his superiority over other creatures. At last, Aramban says:

I have found my stick

But I have lost my melody

Goats!

Small goats! Tall goats!

He-goat! She -goat! (110)

He realizes that it is his blunder to domesticate goats and rear them for his benefit. While doing so he became the foe of wild animals. After his expression, the wild

animals enter into the stage and pounce on him. He tries to escape them but is caught and torn into pieces. This is the end of Aramban's life. The final scene of the play is suggestive in a sense that the life of a man is in danger if he does not learn to protect, respect, and love other creatures in this universe. The biocentric vision is essential which sees every creature in equal parameter.

A Male distinguishes himself from nature on the ground of some alleged quality such as possession of an immortal soul or rationality, and then assumes that this distinction confers superiority upon human. As a male distinguishes himself from a woman on the ground of some alleged quality such as larger brain size, and then assumes that this distinction confers superiority upon man. Ecofeminism involves the recognition that these two arguments share a common logic of domination that women have been associated with nature, the material, the emotional, while men have been associated with culture, the non-material, and the rational.

Aramba, for an example, has domination over animals. He sues them according to his interest, thinking that he is superior being and others inferior. The whole nature can be compared with the female domain which is under the control of male and have become the subject of suppression and exploitation. The position of nature is helpless like the position of women in the strong patriarchal frame.

Prandon enters into the wood and chops down the trees. "He enters Maraprabhu's garden quietly, like a cat, and cuts down the trees with his axe" (105). Male domination in the society and human's intervention into the nature seem to have the similar attitude in which male stands as powerful agent and female or nature as agency less and weak.

Nature is innocent and can not oppose human intervention but woman can reject male domination, the society forces her to remain calm, however. Then, what does nature do? Nature shows its anger/ effects in such a form that can devastate the whole human existence. Aramba's position at the end of the play is the example of this--he is killed by the wild animals because they were angry with him. In the play, goats are under the control of a man. Tigers remain calm for a long time, when their hunger becomes insufferable; they pounce upon Aramba, (the goatherd) and kill him.

This text was written when industrialization was in peak in India after being free from the clutch of British colonial rule. Due to this reason, huge areas of forest had been cut down that endangered the existence of numbers of animals, birds and other organisms. Pollution increased and the environment deteriorated day by day.

Seeing such circumstances, Panikkar writes this play with a view to arouse ecological consciousness --human life can not be prosperous by ravaging the nature. Human life is unsafe without the protection of nature.

Definitely, he has used non-human characters on the stage to make his message polemic. His intention behind using them might have been that if animals, plants, insects express their own pain and suffering, men would listen to them with full attention. Writer's effort is a kind of lesson giving action to those who are in power and destroying the beautiful nature. Anthropocentric law is responsible behind such activities. K.N. Panikkar is showing the flaws of anthropocentric visions/laws and urging human beings to search some alternative which can protect the nature as well as human beings. In fact, he is urging for developing biocentric vision in human beings.

When human being impose superiority over other creatures, and deny other's existence then men one day may fall in a dangerous situation where he can not escape death. As we have seen the wild animals speech “who will save your savior from us” (91). Here, animals are threatening that no one can save the goatherd from them. Therefore, biocentric vision is the solution to this problem. Biocentrism is a notion which respects the other creature and accepts their existence as own self. Biocentrism considers human being to be no more than or particular species of animals without greater intrinsic value than any other species or organism that occur on earth. Paul Taylor in his *Respect for Nature* argues “human and animal share the earth and should live equal and harmoniously” (75).

Goats address Aramban as M..baa!. Aramban also says M...baa! Aramban says, “I speak this two syllable language, though I know a lot more than two syllables” (89). This expression hints that Aramban has understood the reality that there is no difference between a goat and a human being. In fact, the writer's message is that both man and animals are the same creation of the creator. Therefore, it's useless to have domination over animals. If we learn to have reverence on nature, it will help running the system of the universe smoothly. Aramba beats the goats. Then the goats express their feeling.

Fine, beat us if it makes you happy!

Beat us until your sticks breaks!

Get out your knife, if you have one-

A goat herd with butcher's knife

Becomes the butcher himself. (89)

This expression makes Aramban really think about his past deeds. These lines manifest that animals are given afflict by human being. Goats do not directly warn

goatherd, rather they express their feeling in such a way that Aramba happens to rethink about his deeds. Aramba is not happy to beat the goats, it is his arrogance that he should have control over them. Their warning is that goatherd with butcher's knife becomes the butcher himself. This suggestion of goats really prods the mind of Aramban. He threw his stick away and says "I'll get rid of sticks. I won't beat you, my children" (89). Aramban, a stubborn goatherd, changes his mind and starts loving animals.

Goats are the creation of nature. These goats are domesticated by men. In the natural world, tiger and other wild animals eat small ones like goats, deer, and buffaloes. It is natural. But man has domesticated goats, which is not natural. As a result, the tigers, leopards are getting angry with man. Man can be anytime attacked by these wild animals. It is natural that tigers eat goats but it is unnatural that human being domesticates animals and uses for his own benefit. The following extract shows that how a single action of a man is responsible to invite danger in human existence. The tiger chants:

My canine teeth snap under the spell of my desire to tear this goat
to

pieces!

I don't want the hide

I don't want the bones

I don't want the teeth

Mmm...

The flesh of this grass eating animal is good. (92)

Goats are domesticated by man. Therefore, tiger and leopard are angry with man.

The tiger says that his canine teeth are being sharp not to eat the bones of goat but to

eat its flesh. This expression shows that tiger depends upon the flesh of other animals which is a part of ecosystem of this earth. Had human being not shown superiority over other creatures, the world would have been running smoothly, respecting and preserving each other.

Not only the animals but also the plants suggest Aramban, representative of human being, to love and respect the nature and take others existence as his own.

Chekki says:

Can you hear the sound of the sympathetic forest, Aramban?

Do you hear the sound of the benevolent forest Aramban?

Can you hear me?

Can I trust you Aramban?

If so I'll give you the singing throat of the koel bird. (93)

Chekki, the plant, suggests Aramban that if he listens the sound of sympathetic forest, she would give him the singing throat of the koel bird.

Through the speech of Parndon, the writer wants to create awareness in human being that trees should not be cut down. Parndon, a mad man, says:

One day, a woodcutter came. (Parndon assumes the role of the woodcutter. Maraprabhu transforms into a tree. They enact the story as Prandon tells it.) He enters Maraprabhu's garden quietly, like a cat, and cut down the tree with his axe. (Maraprabhu, as a tree, falls down), Maraprabhu ties the woodcutter to the stump of the tree. (105)

Through this scene, the Panikkar wants to create a kind of awareness to human kind. Like animals trees should be protected and respected. Man is not given privilege right to ravage the nature. The writer could bring one small tree on the stage and ask one of his characters to cut down it. But instead of doing so, he has transformed one

character as a tree. The motive behind doing so is to give human a kind of feeling that as man feels pain to cut down his body parts, so is the feeling of plants. Here we find the writer's biocentric vision.

To sum up, man considers himself the superior creature of this earth and exploits other living and non-living beings without considering the effects of his deeds. Anthropocentric view has made man mad who ravages the nature. This invites apocalypse like in the play. Human exploitation results into something which is dangerous for himself. Therefore, to live happily in this world, and to protect this earth, human should develop and implement biocentric laws which respect all creatures equally. Through the role of Prandan, we come to know that trees or plants are like human beings. So that trees should not be cut down. Rather we should preserve forest as it provides necessary things for all living organism. If human being destroys forests, he is not only destroying one but he is destroying many other lives which are attached to forest. Along with the destruction of the forest, man is destroying his own home as well as of animals.

When a man is inclined to chop down trees, the animals which live in the forests are angry with man. Therefore, the tigers order leopard either to kill goats or to kill the goatherd. What made the tiger so angry? The answer is easy: first man has occupied and destroyed their habitat; second man has domesticated and captured goats, which should have grazed in the open field. Man's useless domination over goats makes tiger angry and it happens to pounce upon Aramban and torn him into pieces.

The writer has also used Hindu philosophy to arouse eco-awareness. Hindus believe that those who do wrong acts will suffer after death, or he/ she will be punished after death. The same idea can be found in the play. One day Prandan,

assuming the role of wood cutter, enters into the wood and chops down the trees. Maraprabhu, who assumes as tree, ties the wood cutter's hand to the stump of the tree. He ties woodcutter's hands and takes him to Chitragupta.

By bringing this reference from Hindu philosophy the writer wants to impart the message that cutting down a tree is a crime like murdering a man. Both are equally sinful acts. Therefore, those who cut down trees, kill animals, or any other organisms, should be punished because man has not got privilege to do all those things.

This incident shows that due to anthropocentric laws, man has dominated and even destroyed the other parts of this nature, he has not realized that all living and non-living beings have equal right to live in this earth. Man himself has invited apocalypse by ravaging the nature for his pride and benefit.

The snake sings a song which is intended to be heard by Aramban. Snake says Chekki (a plant) is the flower of his branch, tree is his home. Here, we find strong attachment between a snake and a plant, plant is the snake's house. Man has hardly understood the fact that while killing one, he is killing two organisms at the same time. An insect and a man are equal for the ecosystem of this earth. No one can claim that man is superior to all and has right to devastate other's house or habitat.

Aramban (representative of mankind) tames goat, and takes them to forest. On the way, he beats them with his stick and his legs. The goats request him not to beat them, but he mercilessly beats them. When goats express that the goatherd is going to be the butcher, Aramban decides not to beat them. Aramban develops biocentric concept, however, he is torn up by the wild animals because he has captured the nature's creatures- goat, which is the food for tigers and other wild animals.

Therefore, this play advocates in favour of biocentric perspective/laws which can look at all living and non-living creatures with equal eyes and sense of respect. Until we develop biocentric vision and incessantly carry out our anthropocentric laws / thinking, result will be collapse of human existence. Indicating this fear, the text advises all mankind to abandon anthropocentric tradition and adopt biocentric world view for the smooth operation or running of this earth.

To save human race, first we should protect the nature. It is because human existence is dependent on nature. Not only that all the living and non-living beings are interdependent and interrelated to each other. Absences of one cause the danger to others. That is why man should stop exploitation of nature. To ensure his existence, first he should save the nature by abandoning his arrogance and proud that he is the superior being on earth and he has right to do anything he likes.

IV. Conclusion

Panikkar's *Aramba Chekkan* advocates for biocentric constitutional protection of the natural environment by showing failure of anthropocentric laws. Aramban thinks that he is the superior among others, he domesticates goats, makes tigers angry, but at last, he is torn up by the tiger. It shows that it is the human action that leads mankind toward destruction. Aramban, as representative of human kind, has beaten goats, domesticated them, cut down the trees and destroyed the habitat of wild animals. As a result, tigers are angry with man. In the natural law, tiger's food is goat which is controlled by man. That is why tigers are attacking man. Anthropocentrism, thus, invites apocalypse. The forest has been cut down by human being for their settlement. Man thinks only of himself, but neglects others. In other words, man destroys others house to make his own. When animals lose their habitat and food, they will have no place to live and nothing to eat. Therefore they turn against human beings.

Because of blind superiority human kind has failed to see the interconnectivity of the human and non-human world. Man is failed to realize interdependent and essential relationship between human and non-human world. So his existence is in danger. However, if man can think himself just a part of the ecosystem and nothing else in the world, if man can develop biocentric vision , then only we can hope that human existence can be secured.

Ecocriticism as a distinct literary theory exposes this inter dependent and essential relationship between human and natural world through the literary work. Through the literary work, Ecocriticism draws parallel line between all forms of life, and reveals essential connection between them; the existence of one being in the absence of the other is impossible. Ecocriticism blurs the hierarchal line; superior or

inferior, primary or secondary that is drawn between human and non-human world, and advocates for the egalitarianism or biocentric world view. It also evokes the issue of apocalypse; if people fail to recognize this integrity, the world will meet its end.

By exposing such relation, Ecocriticism advocates for the preservation of nature. Same type of issue can be found in *Aramba Chekkan*. We find the depiction of pain, trouble, suffering, calamities, and catastrophe because of people's unnatural treatment to nature or their anthropocentric tendency. The writer in this play wants to make people aware of the fact that they should respect the natural world. If people ceaselessly destroy the nature and controls other living and non-living beings for his own benefit, the whole human's situation will be like that of Aramban's at last.

Most of the countries of the world have environmental laws. The constructional protection of the natural world is not new thing for the human society. The government of every country has been making new environmental laws for many years, and they try their best, in its effective implementation. The violators of these laws are severely punished. But the result is always hopeless. They are failure to protect the natural environment, which main cause is lack of biocentric environmental laws or lack of proper reverence for nature. People can not protect what they do not respect. Most of the present environmental laws are anthropocentric. Environmental pollution control laws are best example of anthropocentric one. People want to preserve the nature because it affects their health. So human keeps them always at the centre.

Human kind keeps them at the centre, thinking them as primary and others secondary. What currently lacking is biocentric environmental laws and thinking. People have to accept peaceful existence of the other non-human being for their own

sake, not the human sake. So people have to change their attitude towards non-human world. People should make their journey from anthropocentrism to biocentric world view.

To save this earth and its beauty, only biocentric vision/ thinking is the solution. We should let flow everything freely in their natural order. It is natural that big fish eats small fish and tiger eats goat, but it is unjust that man kills animals. It is because man is given other food for its survival. Therefore, to save this earth, biocentric vision is most essential aspect that should be developed by man; otherwise human existence may fall in danger.

Work Cited:

- Bennet, Michael. "The Urban Challenges to Ecocriticism." *The ISLE Reader: Ecocriticism 1993-2003*. Eds. Michael P. Branch and Scott Slovic. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003. 296-316.
- Bruckerhoff, Joshua. "Giving Constitutional Protection: A Less Anthropocentric Interpretation of the Environmental Rights." *Texas Law Review* 86.3 (Feb.2005): 615-46.
- Carson, Rachel. *Silent Spring*. New York: Fawcett Crest Books, A Unit of CBS Publication, 1964.
- Commoner, Barry. "The Environmental Crisis," *The Closing Circle: Man Nature and Technology*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1972. 11-13.
- Deutsch, Eliot. "A Metaphysical Grounding for Natural Reverence: East West." *Nature in Asian Tradition of Thought: Essay in Environmental philosophy*. eds. J. Baird Callicott and Roger T. Ames. New York: State University Press, 1989. 260-65.
- Glotfelty, Cheryl, and Fromm, Harold (eds.), *The Ecocriticism Reader*. Athens: Ga: University of Georgia Press, 1996.
- Ganguli, Usha. *The Truth of Ecology: Nature, Culture, and Literature in India*. New Delhi. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Mee, Erin B. (Ed.) *Contemporary Drama: India*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U.P, 2001.

- Punikarm, Raimindo. *The Vedic Experience Mantra Manjari*. London: Longman and Todd, 1997.
- Ruckert, William. "Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism." *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in literary Ecology*. Eds. Gloffelty and Fromm. Athens and London: The University of Georgian Press, 1996. 15-123.
- Taylor, Paul. "Respect of Nature". *Environmental Ethics: An Introduction with Reading*. Eds. John Benson. London. Routledge, 2002. 75-222.
- Tucker, Evelyn Mary. "The Relevance of Chinese Neo-Confucianism for the Reverence of Nature." *Environmental History Review* 15.2 (Summer 1991). 55-69.
- White, Lynn Jr. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis". Eds. Nico Nellissen, Janven Der Streaten and Loon Klinker's *Classics in Environmental Studies*. New Delhi, 2001. 143-52.
- Wordsworth, William. *The Oxford Authors*. Ed. Stephen Gill. Oxford: Oxford UP. 1984.

