

Othering Nature in Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things: A Postcolonial Ecocritical Study

GHULAM YASIN*

Abstract: By mainly referring to Huggan and Tiffin (2010) on postcolonial ecocriticism, the study aims to explore how Arundhati Roy's novel *The God of Small Things* (1997) contributes new perspectives on the intertwining between postcolonial studies and ecocriticism. In addition, it explores how the anthropocentric attitude of human beings ruins their natural environment. The selected text is analyzed by utilizing the techniques of content analysis. Human beings are involved to 'other' natural environments for their economic gains in the name of development. It is the way of justifying their colonizing attitudes and manipulation of nature. The research finds out that the humans' desires for economic development are materialized through putting aside the traditional ways of agriculture, building dams, clearing forests, and adopting modern ways of living which destroy the balance of their ecosystem. These factors eventually lead towards the 'othering' of nature and the natives in the hands of the colonizers, having some hidden economic and political agendas. Though, Roy's selected text (1997) has been explored through different postcolonial perspectives but, the colonizers' attitude towards nature and lands of the colonized is ignored. So, the study is an effort to fill this research gap.

Keywords: postcolonial ecocriticism; anthropocentrism; colonizers; nature; environment

Introduction

Arundhati Roy (born 1961) is not merely a fictional author but a social activist as well. Particularly, she presents her concerns for the nature and deteriorating environment of India. So, she is known as "[...] an environmentalist and social activist" (Anjan & Kumar, 2017, p. 09). Moreover, she presents it "through her criticism of postcolonial India's mal development" (Chae, 2015, p. 519). She integrates nature with her themes and presents its destruction in the name of modernization and development. Her criticism regarding the exploitation of

* Ghulam Yasin, University of Sindh, Pakistan, ghulam.yasin@scholars.usindh.edu.pk

nature and environment in postcolonial India exposes the interrelated ideology of ecological decline and subjugation on the basis of race, class and gender through *The God of Small Things* (1997).

The God of Small Things (1997) shows great concern for ecology and ecological issues. Importantly, Roy portrays these greater issues as the small things happening in daily life but being ignored since long time. Plot of the novel in particular emphasizes on the marginalization of female characters, nature and environment through the dominant forces. Its story begins with the story of two children Rahel and Estha, and ends with the reunion of two after more than twenty years. One era of 1960s presents the serenity and glory of nature and its elements. In contrast, the era of 1980s representing the capitalist mindset depicts the suppression of natural world. Importantly, the given time period is the shift of generations' attitudes towards nature and it also shows the changes occurred in the social and cultural environment of the small town. These small changes further portray the broader scenario of ecological changes coming in the world.

Postcolonial ecocriticism according to Asempasah (2022), is the marriage of postcolonialism and ecocriticism. The union of two introduces a new twist in postcolonial and ecocritical studies but Majeed et al. (2021), as a literary theory it has severe concerns "with the exploitation of land, its resources, its environment, and its people" (1). Hu (2021) argues that postcolonial studies should reflect on the complexity of relationship between political and environmental issues. Further Zhou (2020) demands that "colonial history, race issues, western Empire hegemony" (35) should be the part of modern ecocritical studies through this field of research. Chen and Hwangbo (2021) state that postcolonial ecocriticism also investigates how the indigenous people show dominancy over their local lands, people, nature and the environment.

Theoretical Framework

Postcolonial ecocriticism has attained a good place in the field of literary research in the last decade. It deals with the marginalized natural resources and people. It also raises questions about the allied oppressive forces raising several environmental and natural disasters in the community for their personal gains. Huggan & Tiffin (2010) claim that, "Anthropocentrism and western imperialism are intrinsically interwoven" (11) in the alliance of postcolonial and ecocritical ideologies. Further, it provides materialistic considerations about the "the changing relationship between people, animals and environment" (12). It also highlights how the attitudes of common men towards nature are changed and how they begin to marginalize the natural elements, physical environment and the non-human world. Moreover, they also call it an emerging field and its major

role is to produce “a viable alternative to western ideologies of development” (27).

The local people of the colonized lands acquire strong bonds with nature but later they began to treat it as *other* as they were marginalized by their colonizers. According to Huggan and Tiffin (2010), the local natives were dealt “as a part of nature, and thus instrumentally as animals” (6). The colonial powers considered them a commodity whose control was in their hands. As a result of this anthropocentric demonstration, the nature and environment began to be handled in a harsh manner and mercilessly as they were dealing with the colonized community. However, Sahin (2021) states that the roles were later changed and the colonized people became the authorities. They continued exploiting the natural world and its resources like their colonizers. In this way, postcolonial ecocriticism according to Huggan & Tiffin (2010) further finds, “how contemporary postcolonial crises are inextricably connected with ecological crises” (14).

Literature Review

Borade and Singh (2020) argue that Roy, as an environmental activist, highlights the destruction of nature in *The God of Small Things* (1997). She portrays the damage of nature in the hands of human beings and also shows love for the non-human life. The modern society has changed into “a consumer society at the cost of non-humans” (79). Further, Choudaraju and Lakshman (2019) observe the environmental colonization in *The God of Small Things* (1997). Pappachi finds new lands for farming as like the British colonizers started the plantation of Coffee and rubber plants in new lands of India. Being the imperial Entomologist, Pappachi suppresses not only the Indian labour but also estranges its culture and nature as well. Likewise, the destruction of ornamental garden in the hands of Baby Kochamma shows her abusive attitude towards the non-human elements. Moreover, Anjan and Kumar (2017) explore the responsibilities of human beings towards their natural environment, being an integral part of it. Roy (1997) raises her voice against the crucial behaviors of human beings towards their nature and environment. In addition, Francis and Thangaraj (2016) maintain that with the desires of improving their living standards, human beings are the cause of great loss to their environment. Arundhati Roy shows some severe concerns for nature and environment. Further, according to Mishra (2016), the major theme of the novel (1997) is to present the mistreatment of nature for human development and modern ways of living. Roy brings into light the rising environmental issues and raises voice for the protection of environment which is under some serious threats.

Postcolonial Ecocriticism and *The God of Small Things*

The colonized people in particular are considered as a part of nature. In this way, they are also exploited like non-human species (Mandal 2018). Roy shows her apprehensions for ecological desolation and its impact upon the life of oppressed people in *The God of Small Things* (1997). She points out some endangered species in the garden of Baby Kochamma, the evil effect of dam construction with the funding of world bank, the polluted water of the river Meenachal because of the industrial wastes, cutting of forests for human development, rapid change in the culture and environment of Ayemenem, and the effect of modern inventions like electricity and TV on the life of animals and humans. These all issues are created because of the ignorant and imperialistic behavior of the local people towards their surrounding nature.

Everything related to nature fascinates Arundhati Roy and she presents every natural object of insects, plants, flowers, water, river, wind, in an attractive manner. She describes the pastoral area in the surroundings of the village Ayemenem located in India, where the river Meenachal flows. The rich natural environment does surround the local areas in the season of summer “Red bananas ripen. Jackfruits burst. Dissolute bluebottles hum vacuously in the fruity air” (Roy 1997: 1). The scenes, the surroundings and the ways of living in 1960s narrate the close relation of the town with nature. Then, there comes a change in living style and the wave of modern development in 1990s destroys their culture and nature.

The title *The God of Small Things* illustrates that the worth of small things is nothing as compared to the big things. The people with lower caste, lower status and nature are being exploited equally by colonizers of the day. They all are the small things. The female and lower caste characters “have unsatisfied needs and they are penalized by the society or system in many ways” (Choudaraju 2019: 495). Further, the name of opening chapter of the novel *Paradise Pickles and Preservers* is the name of a factory dealing with green things where the local women work as labour and is being run by Mammachi – the male protagonist. It sets the patriarchal and colonizers’ model where the female characters are marginalized by the factory owner with low wages. The title mentions nature and some lower characters like Ammu and Velutha are merely small things and colonized community. Their masters are the dominant men who keep control of their existence like a god.

The local natives’ friendly relations with nature, their dependence upon the river Meenachal, fishing, and their connection with the lush green fruit trees make them part of the whole ecosystem. This sort of living style convinces their dominant colonizers that they are “less of a human and more of an animal” (Sahin 2021: 72). This ideology permits the colonizers not only to take nature

as a product, but also to disregard the people living closer to it. The novel (1997) highlights the environmental colonization through the characters of Pappachi and Baby Kochamma. They began farming in the Indian landscapes like the British colonials who began to plant coffee, rubber and later tea in the same green belt of Kerala. If the character of Pappachi is reviewed as an imperial Entomologist, he has estranged the culture and environment of this green land. Like colonial powers, the exploitative behavior towards the oppressed non-human world of Baby Kochamma is shown through the ruin of a beautiful garden due to her abusive attitude (Choudaraju 2019).

Ammu, the unfortunate female protagonists, is suppressed by the patriarchal system. She is forced to marry Babu who works as an estate assistant manager in a tea company at Assam. Her marriage becomes failure because of the severe alcoholic issues with her husband. Even Babu is desired to make her use like a sex doll and wants her to please his boss in the game of sex. After facing humiliation, she is returned to her father's home with two children Estha and Rahel. This return of a divorced girl opens various other chapters of her sufferings with her unacceptable status in the male dominated society. Roy (1997) describes these worst conditions of Ammu in ecological terms, "Like a pair of small bewildered frogs engrossed in each other's company, lolloping arm in arm down a highway full of hurtling traffic" (43). Moreover, Roy also develops a close relation between two suppressed entities Ammu and nature for the sake of their existence. Premalatha & Lourdes (2018) argue that the novel (1997) shows some unbreakable relationship between the women and nature as oppressed creatures. Their controls are in the hands of their colonizers who destroy them.

The second phase of Ammu's sufferings begins when no one believes in her tragedy. She is again marginalized by the both male and female members of the family. She is discriminated and othered being a divorced woman, "A married daughter had no position in her parent's home" and later being a divorced daughter, "she had no position anywhere at all" (45). In such conditions, Ammu finds relief in the company of marginalized beings. Velutha an untouchable and the wilderness provide her peace, love and shelter. Roy behaves like an Eco-feminist by depicting the nature and women together in such horrible conditions. The nature becomes because the dominant men exploit it for their personal gains. Similarly, the female characters in the novel (1997) also face sufferings because of the patriarchal mindsets having "issues in context of sex, marriage, relations and male dominance" (Choudaraju 2019: 501) prevailing in the society.

Chacko tells Rahel and Estha the story of 'the Earth' like the 'the Earth woman' in lesson of history. He further presents the Earth like "a forty-six-year-old woman". She always remains busy in producing and refining all other

elements existing on it (53–54). Such description of the Earth creates a strong connection between nature and women. The mother Earth also has the similar characteristics of producing and giving birth from her fertile lands like the worldly women. In the similar way, she can also be suppressed and exploited like the female characters in the novel.

The novel shows the aftershocks of colonialism particularly on the colonized society and environment. The master of Babu has several illegal relationships with different women working the tea farm. The women fear of being jobless allows him to influence his hegemonic masculinity. Babu, Pappachi, and Estha enjoy their feudal like status on the basis of their gender position in the colonized conservative society. Whereas Mammachi, Ammu, and Rahel suffer throughout the story because they are just having a feminine gender.

Roy (1997) connects the sufferings of female characters with the degradation of their environment. Okome (2013) argues that colonialism marginalized the status of feminine gender and offered to keep them financially dependent on their men within the premises of their houses. Similarly, the white colonialism also destroyed the financial power of the colonized men by occupying their lands and kept them subordinated. Later, the status of colonizers was taken over by the local men but the local women and lands remained marginalized.

From an anthropocentric perspective, man is the center of all creations and is superior one. He has the right to make the use of natural resources as per desires. *The god of small things* (1997) also presents how the humans exploit nature and its resources for the sake of development and modernization. In the past, the river Meenachal was “warm, the water. Greygreen. Like rippled silk. with fish in it”. Even its water was clear like a stream running through the mountains where reflects in “the sky and trees in it, and at night, the broken yellow moon in it” (123). The river was the centre of food and life for Ayemenem but the time changed everything with the change in life style of the people in its surroundings.

The same river Meenachal running in the same town after only two decades looks to Rahel “a ghastly skull’s smile, with holes where teeth had been, and a limp hand raised from a hospital bed” (124). The animals living in water like fish were the source of living for many but the polluted water has also affected them severely. Particularly, the fish died in hundreds on daily basis because of the stoppage of water through dams and remaining also “suffered from fin –rot and had broken out in boils” (13). It is because of the industrial development and the drainage of toxic material into water of the river. Due to the ignorant attitude of the human beings living around the river, now it does

not look like a river. It was almost shrunk into a drain, “the river was no more than a swollen drain now. It was choked with a succulent weed” (124).

Roy (1997) observes things minutely how the people contaminate and pollute the water of river, which is also alarming for the life in rivers; “Children hung their bottoms over the edge and defecated directly onto the squelchy, sucking mud of the exposed river bed” (125). According to Boarde & Singh (2020), the uses of pesticides by humans after ignoring the traditional ways of farming also “pollute the water and become the ground of dying the aquatic animals” (82). Thirty years before, Rahel being a child observed the river a real source of life and attraction for the people of the town but his return after a long time found the conditions at its worst, “that smelled of shit, and pesticide bought with World Bank loans” (13). Its water is filled with polluted materials and it does not seem to breathe even. Once its impact was “To changes life” but with the change of humans’ attitude, “its teeth were drawn, its spirit spent” (124). Above all, humans’ anthropocentric attitude towards natural resources is annihilating them. Once, the water of river was neat and clean that the sky, the moon and the stars all reflected in the water at night. Later, its conditions become worse day by day.

The river in the novel (1997) is initially portrayed like a mother. It is flowing with a conventional role of a mother to feed the living things and the source of reproducing in the lands but later, it also became lethal when exploited. Similar to the marginalized female characters, the river Meenachal also “rouses itself” with the acceptance of what the people are throwing in it. They begin to throw, “unadulterated factory effluents” (125). They begin to pollute and misuse it various manners without considering the lives of water animals and the beauty of our ecosystem being affected by the continuous throw of shit and chemicals in it.

Huggan and Tiffin (2010) argue that anthropocentrism and eurocentrism cannot be separated from each other in the case of colonization. The two ideologies presently justify colonialism of the past that disregards “indigenous culture as primitive, less rational, and closer to children, animals and nature” (5). Roy (1997) criticizes the degradation of local culture and the destruction of wilderness in the name of human development process. It is an exploitation of local people and of their culture. *Kathakali* dance is the cultural identity and traditional dance of Kerala city but it has been deformed while keeping the foreigners’ liking in view. Mandal (2018) also argues that the real dance performance in its original and traditional ways consists of many hours, “but now its glory is overshadowed and transformed into a cameo as per foreigners’ patience and taste” (516).

Moreover, History house also represents the culture and heritage of the town. It has been changed into a five-star hotel and lost its originality

and beauty of the surroundings. The guests arriving at this five-star hotel are “ferried across the backwaters, straight from Cochin. They arrived by speedboat, opening up a V of foam on the water” (125). It has lost the natural settings and its traditional values. It is now only a mega project to attract its customers. The local culture is being replaced with the modern needs of the business. This imperialistic and anthropocentric attitude is not only exploiting their cultural heritage but also destroying the natural assets as well.

Huggan and Tiffin (2010) criticize the western development in the colonized lands as, “little more than a disguised form of neocolonialism”, because such projects are designed “to serve the economic and political interest of West” (27). The funding provided for such a development has hidden agenda of attaining the western gains and profits. Roy (1997) also presents her criticism against the slogans and funding of the west in the name of human development. The construction of a dam on the river Meenachal with the World Bank funding also brings devastation in the area along with benefiting the few lords. Such development divides natural resources on the basis of status, color or race and even it is the cause of “environmental injustice” (Boarde & Singh 2020: 79).

With this new project, the few farmers “in exchange for votes from the influential paddy-farmer lobby” having large irrigation area or landlords with high status would get more water and benefits from the river. As the result of its construction, “now they had two harvests a year instead of one. More rice, for the price of a river”. In contrast, “downriver, a saltwater barrage had been built” (Roy 1997: 124), this saltwater would affect not only the life of animals inside water but its price would also be paid by the common men like fishermen and people settled near its bank. Further the poor farmers having small area of lands would suffer because of the stoppage of water. Roy (1997) points out the class discrimination in use of natural resources as well. The local poor community of the village is affected by the environmental burden resulted by the shitty river whereas the elite class enjoys the luxuries and benefits of the natural environment. The huge cost of construction would also put the country under the burden of a never-ending loan given by the World Bank.

The novel (1997) presents ecological exploitation by the human beings for their personal gains. The river Meenachal has lost its glory and changed into merely a drain. Roy gives the reason of this drastic change, “ferried garbage to the sea now” and secondly it also contains the smell of “shit and pesticide brought with World Bank loans”. It has affected lives of animals inside the river. Thousands of the fish have died because of the salty water in the Barrage built by the landlords for their double gains of crops and the remaining have “suffered from fin –rot and had broken out in boils” (13). Deforestation in bulk for the purpose of developing colonies has once evicted many people and is

also soil erosion. It has filled the dregs of river leaving no space for small fishes those “appear in the puddles that fill the PWD potholes on the highways” (1). Unplanned urbanization is also a threat for the lives of birds even. First the birds are homeless due to the cutting of trees and later “black crows stun themselves against clear windowpanes and die, fatly baffled in the sun” (1). The old Elephant of town’s temple was dead after having an electric shock due to carelessness of the people and even nobody neither lamented on its death nor realized the error. It was just ended with a police report.

These incidents are evident of humans’ anthropocentric attitude towards nature. Roy is terrified for the worst relation of these two in future. She believes if we face the nuclear war, our opponents will be the world super powers but “our foe will be – the sky, the air, the land, the wind and water – will all turn against us. Their wrath will be terrible” (Roy 2016: 1).

The God of Small Things (1997) describes how the Eurocentric life style is affecting the lives of common people of the world. The daily inventions by west in the field of technology are isolating the human beings from their natural environment. The nature is being ignored and marginalized and man’s perspective towards nature is also changing rapidly because of its rising interests in technology. The garden of Baby Kochamma was, “a circular, sloping patch of ground”, but later the place was changed, “into a lush maze of dwarf hedges rocks and gargoyles” (26). She knew the art how to tame the nature, “Like a lion –tamer she tamed twisted vines and nurtured bristling cacti, she limited bonsai plants and pampered rare orchids” (26). Later, a set of television entered in her home, the nature was out of her life. Her interests shifted from nature to watching TV: “She presided over the world in her drawing room on satellite TV” (27). It was not merely Kochama but almost her whole town was under its fever. Roy seems complaining that man’s ample shift towards technology is destroying the man’s relationship with the natural world.

It can be argued that the prevailing colonial education system is also contributing in the disruption of our ecosystem. Lunga (2020) also aligns with the idea that its impact can be observed on the local colonized people, lands and the environment. The character of Chacko is very evident of such influence when he returns from England. His desires to rise the business of a pickle factory at any cost is the cause of disturbance in the local environment because the business is directly connected with the local lands of the town. He becomes the sole beneficiary of his father’s business like a colonial company though Mammachi is alive. He pays wages to the local workers on his own terms and conditions. He even does not offer any share to the other family members like Ammu living hard and aware of her status as a divorced woman existing in the male dominated society, “Thanks to our wonderful male chauvinist society”

(57). So, the colonial behavior of Chacko not only disturbs his family set up but also disrupts the local social and environmental systems of the town.

Though Roy portrays the exploitation of nature in the hands of human beings for the sake of modernization and social development but she also presents the friendly relationship between the two. Velutha endures suppression like nature on the basis of his class. He is having “a light brown birthmark, shaped like a pointed dry leaf” (73). This birthmark of Velutha directly makes him the real part of nature. It was his belief that, “it was a lucky leaf, that made the monsoons come on time” (73). But it neither brings good fortune nor good days for the suppressed Velutha. After having some conflict with his father, he has to leave his home. This decision of him unites two suppressed bodies, nature and Velutha. Nature also welcomes him with its open arms and provides him the food and shelter as well. “He caught fish in the river and cooked it on an open fire. He slept outdoors, on the banks of the river” (76–77). Nature becomes the goddess for him as it was for Wordsworth. Roy presents that having friendly relationship with nature like Velutha, human beings can also enjoy all the resources spreading all around in the form of nature.

Conclusion

Huggan and Tiffin (2010) argue that the ideologies of anthropocentrism and euro-centrism are linked and cannot be separated in the colonialism. It is anthropocentrism that justifies colonialism observing “indigenous culture as primitive, less rational, and closer to children, animals and nature” (5). *The God of Small Things* (1997) also talks about such exploitation of local poor people by the rich community replacing imperialism of the past. The rich imperialists are devastating the surroundings, wilderness, forests and nature and the environment. The Adivasis are being compelled to vacate the forests and it is the destruction their living style, culture and their relationship with nature. Postcolonial ecocritical study of the novel observes the domestic and industrial colonization where the common local people suffer and stresses upon the restoration of their traditional and cultural ways of living.

The postcolonial ecocritical analysis of *The God of Small Things* (1997) brings forth that the local people of the town Ayemenem have a complex relationship with the surrounding nature and culture. It is because they have shifted towards the modern ways of life after ignoring their traditional culture, life style closer to nature and traditional methods of farming. It brings them not only away from the rich natural environment but also introduces the sense of alienation among them. The novel in the second phase of 1980s presents the Indian lands facing the influence of capitalism and this disruptive wave

imposes a new kind of colonization. It is spreading in the name of social and industrial development. The international funding in this regard is the modern way of occupying the local lands and exploitation of the local people and its natural resources.

Narrating the painful past life of Ammu, the novel (1997) describes that the women are also being othered like nature and face destructive behaviors of their dominated men or colonizers of the day. Ammu also feels comfort and empowerment in the company of river and wilderness. Velutha being a racial other also finds shelter in the lap of nature. Roy (1997) shows that the return of local people towards nature or their traditional culture may bring harmony and peace in their lives. The decline in social structure and the ruin of natural environment portray how the lives of local people are inseparably connected with devastation of their natural surroundings. The point of view also stands closer to Chen (2021) finding every individual organism existing in the ecosystem is the part of the whole and keeps an essential place and worth in it. Similarly, Ammu, Velutha, river Meenachal, the garden of Baby Kochama and elephant of the town face the similar type of worse conditions prevailing in the society showing the colonial bent of the text.

References

- Anjan, N., Santhosh Kumar, C. 2017. Environmental Ethics in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* and Amitav Ghosh's *The Hungry Tide*. – *The Criterion: An International Journal in English*, 8 (vi), 7–14.
- Asempasah, R., Aba Sam, C., and Abelumkemah, B. A. 2022. A postcolonial ecocritical reading of Yaa Gyasi's *Homegoing* (2016) and Kwakuvi Azasu's *The Slave Raiders* (2004). – *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 9 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2022.2145669>
- Bandyopadhyay, D. 2021. Postcolonial Ecocriticism through the Canadian Lens: Select Writings of Margaret Atwood. – *Revista Interdisciplinar de Literatura e Ecocrítica*, 7 (1), 80–98.
- Borade, A., Singh, A. 2020. Environmental Constructions and Ecocritical Observation in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. – *The Criterion: An International Journal in English*, 11 (vi), 78–86.
- Chae, Y. 2015. Postcolonial eco-feminism in Arundhati Roy's *the God of small things*. – *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 51 (5), 519–530. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2015.1070010>
- Chen, J., Hwangbo, K. 2021. An Ecological Elegy under Colonial Violence: The Counter-Pastoral Narrative and Ecocriticism in Doris Lessing's *The Grass Is Singing*. – *Studies in English Language & Literature*, 99–119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21559/aellk.2021.47.3.006>

- Choudaraju, N. 2019. Concept Of Ecocriticism In Roy's *The God Of Small Things*. – *Adalya Journal*, 8 (9), 491–503. <http://adalyajournal.com/>
- Francis, D. M., Thangaraj, M. 2016. Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things* from an Ecocritical view point. – *International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature*, 76–82.
- Hu, G. 2021. Postcolonial Ecocritical Study of *Lullaby* by Silko. *Open Access Library Journal*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1108004>
- Huggan, G., Tiffin, H. 2010. *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environment*. London: Routledge.
- Kunhi, R. M., Kunhi, Z. M. 2017. An Ecocritical Perspective of Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. – *SAGE Open*, 7 (2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017712767>
- Lunga, H. D. 2020. *A postcolonial ecofeminist comparative analysis of war fiction: The case of Arundhati Roy's The God of small and Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's Half of a yellow sun*. University of Namibia. <https://repository.unam.edu.na/items/4921156e-2c28-427f-924b-9097ff62b21b>
- Majeed, M., Imtiaz, U., Imtiaz, A. 2021. Reterritorialization in *A Small Place* by Jamaica Kincaid: *A Postcolonial Eco-Critical Study*. – *SAGE Open*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244021997419>
- Mandal. S. 2018. A Postcolonial Ecocritical Reading Of Arundhati Roy's Novels. – *International Journal of English Language*, 6 (3), 510–519.
- Maral, P. 2013. Ecocriticism in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. – *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 10 (4), 40–42. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-1044042>
- Mishra, N. 2021. Ecocriticism and its Portrayal in Indian Fiction Writing. – *Journal of Literary and Cultural Analysis*, 1 (1), 7–11.
- Mishra, S, K. 2016. Ecocriticism: A Study of Environmental Issues in Literature. – *BRICS Journal of Educational Research*, 6 (4), 168–170.
- Okome, M. O. 2013. *Domestic, regional and international protection of Nigeria against discrimination: Constraints and possibilities*. <http://www.africa.ufl.edu.v6.v6i3a3.htm>
- Premalatha, R., Lourdes, C. 2018. Novelists as Eco-Entrepreneurs: A Comparative Study of RK Narayan's *The Dark Room* and Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. – *Language in India*, 18 (3).
- Roy, A. 1997. *The God of Small Things*. Penguinbooks.
- Roy, A. 2016. *The End of Imagination*. India: Haymarket Books.
- Şahin, E. 2021. *Othering Nature in the Australian Novel: Postcolonial Ecocritical Reading of Kate Grenville's The Secret River And Kim Scott's That Deadman Dance*. (M.A. Thesis). Ankara: Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Zhou, S. 2020. A study of Coetzee's works from the perspective of postcolonial ecocriticism. – *The Frontiers of Society, Science and Technology*, 2 (1), 35–40.