

POST-COLONIAL ECO-CRITICAL CONCERNS IN D.H. LAWRENCE'S POST-WAR NOVELS

Abdul Shakoor*

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Hazara University, Mansehra, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
adshakoor@hu.edu.pk

Mustanir Ahmad

Associate Professor, Department of English, Hazara University, Mansehra, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
mustanir@hu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Post-colonial eco-criticism examines the impact of colonization on indigenous life, culture, and environment in pre-colonial societies. It analyses how the natural environment, in the colonized regions, is exploited, degraded, contaminated, and destroyed in the process of colonization. D.H. Lawrence, disillusioned by the accesses of modern industrial civilization, is fascinated by the vital and potent cultures of the primitive societies which offered a better alternative to degenerate European existence. He, especially in his later works, idealizes the primitive modes of life and presents a critique of barren European culture. Such dissatisfaction with collapsing European civilization and glorification of foreign primitive cultures led him to a decolonizing vision reflected in his post-war fiction where he offers a serious commentary on imperialism. Colonialism, for him is means of exploitation, an unnecessary intrusion, and a threat to the vitality of primitive cultures, a source of disintegration in traditional modes of life and an important cause of eco-environmental disruption in the colonized world. This article attempts to analyse Lawrence's post-war fiction from a post-colonial eco-critical perspective by employing a qualitative research approach and the theoretical frameworks of post-colonial and eco-critical theories.

Keywords: Colonialism, Imperialism, Postcolonialism, Eco-criticism, Postcolonial eco-criticism.

INTRODUCTION

In modern times the human and natural worlds are facing severe ecological crises at the global scale owing to the rise of industrialization and humans' urge for modernity and insatiable lust for profit and comfort. In response to this ever-worsening environmental condition, eco-criticism emerged in 1970s. The term was first used by William Rueckert in 1978 in his work, "Literature and Ecology: An experiment in Ecocriticism." Later, the area was developed as an academic discipline in 1990s. One of the main goals of this approach is to reread the classical literary works from the ecological perspective so that we can know about the origin and causes of the environmental problems we face today and get awareness about our duty and responsibility to our environment and the non-human world.

Eco-criticism is a relatively new and multidisciplinary field of study borrowing methodologies and approaches liberally from a variety of disciplines like biology, ecology, anthropology, ethics, and philosophy. It has similarities with other leftist theories like marxism, feminism and post-colonialism, because like them it also deals with the master-slave relationship and speaks against the exploitation of nature by the human species. According to Garrard (2004) eco-criticism, like feminism and marxism, is a political way of analysis dealing with "cultural, political and environmental agendas" (p.129). Garrard adds that it is "oriented environmentally and is closely related with political and philosophical theories" (p.54). Garrard's arguments refer to the relationship of eco-criticism with the natural world with respect to political way. Ecocriticism has expanded its domain beyond nature writing to analyse the built environments of urban landscapes. This new shift has made the eco-critics engage with a variety of interconnected concerns such as racism, poverty, gender biases and so on. Postcolonial literature resists the loss of socio-cultural and natural values in the pre-colonial regions. According to Ashcroft & Tiffin (2007), the idea of the savage has promoted in the western discourse as the opposite

* Corresponding Author

of the civilized. Post-colonial theory rejects such stereotypical representation of the colonized world. It is an attempt to rediscover a nation's real identity and present a counter narration of the oppressed people. Colonized subjects face a variety of issues affecting their identity, culture and nature and the way of life. Native writings play a crucial role to explore the importance of natural world. Harold Fromm (1996) thinks that these writings can "contribute to environmental restoration; nature writing boosts a rich past, a vibrant present and a promising future" (p. 39). In recent era, literary scholars are focusing more upon the connection between post-colonialism and eco-critical studies in the "sense of political commitment" (Gersdorf & Mayer, 2006, p. 4). Buell, Heise, and Thornber (2011) claim that ecocriticism, in the postcolonial context, is concerned with the link between imperialism and ecological problems portrayed in the literary texts produced in Asia, Australia Africa and other parts of the world. This increasing preoccupation of the non-western literature's commitment with contemporary environmental issues like contamination of water, changes in world climate, and growing pollution has resulted in a rich variety of literary endeavours from all over the world. Postcolonial Ecocriticism is interested to trace how the attitude of the western world towards the environment, animals and plants is different from that of the non-western world.

D. H. Lawrence's early works express his optimism, but the world war and the fast-growing mechanization of the society filled him with disgust for the sterile western life. Hence in his post-war writings he condemns the western ideals and romanticizes the vital and organic life of the primitive foreign cultures such as Indian and Mexican cultures, which offered vitality that was lacking in European culture. His affection for the unravished primitive lands is evident from the motif of quest for ideal colony (Rananim) recurrent in most of his post-war novels and personal letters. Lawrence's fascination with the primitive cultures in post-war fiction is also accompanied by his anti-imperialistic vision. In these texts, along with idealizing primitive modes of life, he also presents a critique of imperialistic and colonial practices. He condemns colonialism because of its corrupting influence on the native cultures. He believes that the colonial process is ravishing the virginity of the unspoilt and untouched pre-colonial primitive cultures. This paper is an attempt to analyse Lawrence's post-war fiction from post-colonial eco-critical perspective.

Research Objectives

Research objectives of this study include:

- To trace anti-colonial elements in D. H. Lawrence's post-war novels.
- To relate Lawrence's anti-colonial vision with his ecological philosophy.
- To analyse post-colonial eco-critical concerns in Lawrence's post-war novels.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Postcolonial eco-criticism examines the vicious colonial tradition, loss of native culture, and the exploitation of the native land and resources. The traditional Indian perspective is diametrically opposed to Euro-American's outlook. Huggan & Tiffin (2010) believe that because of total physical subordination, postcolonial eco-criticism "highlights alterity, difference, and rupture, which are vital methods of deconstructing the discourses of Enlightenment universalism" (p. 22). Barras (2017), referring to American Indians' subordination, argues that the main purpose of imperialist powers, is to displace American Indians from their indigenous land and "their own customs and spirituality" (p. 43). The colonialists used the American Indians' culture, tradition, natural environment, and resources for their own benefits. It was a "total physical subordination" (p. 47). Postcolonial eco-critical studies highlight the effect of colonial rules not only on the environment but also on the culture of the colonized land. Ecological Imperialism, an alternative concept and almost synonymous to post-colonial eco-criticism, talks about the adverse and devastating effects of imperialism on the colonized ecologies and communities. The term was introduced by Alfred Crosby (1986) to refer to, "the violent appropriation of indigenous land to the ill-considered introduction of non-domestic livestock and European agricultural practices" (Cited in Huggan, & Tiffin, 2010, p. 3). Another form of ecological imperialism is "bio-colonization" a term that refers to the current western technological and scientific experiments which include genetic modification and biotechnological experiments for serving the western needs and political ends. "Environmental racism" is also a form of ecological imperialism. Deane Curtin, the American environmental philosopher, defines it as, "the connection, in theory and practice, of race and the environment so that the oppression of one is connected to, and supported by, the oppression of the

other” (Cited. in Huggan, & Tiffan, 2010, p. 4). It is a sociological phenomenon dealing with environmentally discriminatory treatment of socially marginalized or economically disadvantaged people.

Only a few critics have pointed out anti-imperialistic vision in some of Lawrence's novels. One of such studies is Mark Kinkead-Weekes' article “Decolonising imagination: Lawrence in the 1920s,” which presents a post-colonial analysis of some of Lawrence's later works and examines his oscillating responses to racial and colonial issues. *The Plumed Serpent* gets Weekes's special attention, which according to him “anticipates anti-colonial writers like Chinua Achebe” by representing in it “an ancient pre-colonial culture and religion” and a “growing hostility to the Christian church as an agency of colonialism” (2001, p. 71). Weekes highlights the issues which later on attracted Achebe in *Things Fall Apart*. Both the writers condemn colonialism for its disrupting effect on the pre-colonial life and culture. Alastair Niven (1979), in his book, *D.H. Lawrence: The Novels*, has also traced Lawrence's anti-imperialistic vision in his novel, *Kangaroo*. Niven evaluates Lawrence's critique of colonial society. According to him *Kangaroo* occupies a “special place in the canon of imperial literature” and Lawrence's viewpoint in this novel “shares much with that of a writer who in our own time has interpreted colonialism with especial penetration, V.S. Naipaul. Both detect an essential fraudulence at the heart of it, an element of mimicry and even puppetry” (p. 153). Niven, thus, compares Lawrence's anti-imperial imagination with renowned post-colonial writers, but he does not link Lawrence's postcolonial temperament with his ecological vision. The above-mentioned critics have pointed out Lawrence's preference for the primitive cultures and his growing anti-imperialism in some of his later novels. These critics have confined their studies to a few representative texts. Apart from the novels, these critics have selected to trace Lawrence's attraction for the primitive cultures and his anti-imperialistic imagination, most of the writer's later works also express fascination for the unexplored regions and present a critique of colonialism and its effects on colonial life and culture. Lawrence's appreciation for the local cultures and his assessment of colonialism, which is overt in *The Plumed Serpent* and *Kangaroo* in particular, can also be marked out in other post-war novels and short stories, especially the ones written in the 1920s. All these works should be considered to elucidate Lawrence's characteristic attitude to colonies and colonial issues. These critics have also ignored an important fact that these concerns were part of Lawrence's ecological philosophy. In order to bridge this research-gap the present study has attempted to analyse Lawrence's post-war novels from post-colonial eco-critical perspective.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study has employed qualitative method of research. The researchers have utilized all the available facts, information, and instances for the analysis of the selected texts in order to achieve the targeted research objectives. The study has relied upon both primary and secondary sources. Texts of Lawrence's post-war novels have been used as primary sources of data collection whereas various critical interpretations and research articles on the selected texts have been used as secondary sources to perceive the idea and motivation for this research. The researchers have adopted the technique of Textual analysis for the collection and analysis of the selected data.

Post-colonial eco-criticism, a combination of the theories of eco-criticism and post-colonialism, has provided the framework for this study. Eco-critics express aversion for modern industrial civilization and advocate a return to the “Ecological Indian” (Garrard, 2004. p. 120), representing the primitive and vital modes of life. Similarly Post-colonial thinkers condemn colonial activity for its disrupting impact on native cultures. Post-colonial eco-critics deem colonization as a threat for the life, ecology, and environment of the colonized world. Buell, Heise, and Thornber (2011) claim that ecocriticism, in the postcolonial context, is concerned with the link between imperialism and ecological problems portrayed in the literary texts. Laura Wright (2010) comments upon representation of the relationship between colonization and environmental degradation in the works of literary artists from Africa, India, and Western nations. Marzec (2007), has examined how creative texts by Anglophone writers as diverse as Daniel Defoe, Henry Fielding, E. M. Forster, D. H. Lawrence, and Salman Rushdie contribute to restructuring of people's relationships with the land which greatly influences ecosystems on multiple continents. D.H. Lawrence, in his novels, presents a critique of colonization or imperialism for its disrupting influence on the life, culture and environment of the pre-colonial primitive societies and indigenous land. In the present research fundamental ideas and concepts of the theories of eco-

criticism, post-colonialism and post-colonial eco-criticism have provided the theoretical framework for the analysis of post-colonial eco-critical elements in Lawrence's post-war novels.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Postcolonial ecocriticism, drawing parallels between suppression of nature and suppression of the colonized, establishes the relationship between postcolonial studies and environmental studies and equates master-slave relationship of the colonizer and the colonized with that of humans and nature. It deals with how colonial activity affects nature, local land and environment, and life and culture of the native colonies. Postcolonial ecocritics generally show interest in environmentally focused post-colonial literature and they attempt to promote a "genuinely post-imperial environmentally based conception of community" (Huggan, & Tiffin, 2010, p. 6). They believe that the colonizer's view of their superiority over the colonized and their claim of so-called responsibility to civilize the uncivilized is just like anthropocentric mindset, which gives human beings superiority over nature and other species. Postcolonial eco-criticism also evaluates the relationship of the native people with their indigenous environment. Native land, they believe, is always important for the natives as a symbol of their identity, history, and pride and a tool of their existence. Postcolonial eco-criticism examines mutual relationship among human beings, animals, all living entities, and physical environment in a postcolonial text.

Lawrence, completely disenchanted by the barrenness of European people and culture, left England in 1920s and started his worldwide wanderings. In this life of exile, he visited different countries some of which were under colonial rule. Thus, he had a chance to see the clash of colonial realities with indigenous cultures. In this way he started taking interest in pre-colonial primitive societies and was fascinated by the vitality of non-European cultures especially Indian and Mexican cultures. This fascination for the primitive cultures also led to an anti-colonial vision which can easily be observed in Lawrence's post-war writings where he condemns colonial activity and expresses his feeling that the ambitious colonizers from Europe have been ravishing the freshness and virginity of the local primitive cultures. Lawrence, in these writings, looks like typical post-colonial African and Indian writers, defending like them, pre-colonial traditions and rejecting colonial expansionist mission. He expresses the main concerns and pre-occupations of the representative post-colonial writers such as Chinua Achebe and V.S. Naipaul, sharing their distinctive post-colonial feeling of resentment against colonial activity and tracing the upsetting and disintegrating influence of the colonialism on traditional ways of life. His personal experience of living in alien regions and knowing imperial realities gave him an acute understanding of the colonizing process and the complications it created in local cultures. This first-hand experience gave him an acute understanding of the phenomenon of colonialism and its effect and he examines the same in novels of the time.

Eco-critics assert that nature has the right to exist with its peculiar wildness and natural processes and patterns. Human desire to humanize, domesticize or regulate nature is an unjust sense of superiority over other species of nature. Similarly, for post-colonial ecocritics, colonizer's sense of superiority reflects their unjustified arrogance. Lawrence mocks at the so-called civilizing mission of colonizers. For him it is unpardonable prejudice of the Europeans to consider the inhabitants of the colonies as savages who need to be civilized. He thinks that there is no need of such civilizing mission because natives lead their lives according to their established tribal rules and they look uncivilized only to the jaundiced eyes of the colonizers. Colonial enlightening project causes disruption in the well-set traditional ways of life. In *The Rainbow*, Ursula rejects colonizers' educating venture as an impudent sense of supremacy. She chastises Skrebensky: "You think the Indians are simpler than you ... and you'll feel so righteous governing them for their own good" (p. 462). Ursula, being a spokesperson of Lawrence, condemns the colonizers' insolent sense of superiority for considering the natives as uncultured savages needing instruction for enlightened modes of living.

Lawrence glamorizes the unspoilt and untouched primitive cultures in pre-colonial tribal societies, and believes that colonial process ravishes the freshness of these cultures. He has a great affection for the unravished lands as his quest for an ideal colony (Rananim) testifies. He detests colonialism because of its corrupting influence on the native lands and cultures. Thus, his hatred of colonialism is directly linked with his idea of Rananim, a pure and virgin colony away from dead industrial world. In *The Rainbow*, Ursula is thrilled to listen about India. "India tempted her-the strange, strange land" (p. 474). Here, Lawrence idealizes mystery and purity of the colonies before the colonizers unveiled it. Ursula rejects colonial rule for its corrupting influence on the colonies. She tells Skrebensky

that in India the British rule makes “things as dead and mean as they are here” (p. 462). In *Women in Love*, Gerald’s assertion that no nation should be allowed “to take away living from another nation” (p. 29) illustrates that pre-colonial cultures have the right to save their mystery and independence from the negative impact of ravishing colonial interference.

Eco-critics object to anthropocentric mindset and stereotypical beliefs for seeing nature as raw, threatening, lawless and chaotic entity which needs to be humanized and refined. Lawrence rejects the stereotypical, exotic, and distorted image of the natives as savages, promoted in imperial literature and history. He thinks that colonizers’ perception of the colonized, as uncivilized, and brutal beings, is a prejudiced notion. In his novels, he maintains that the so-called savages are only different not inferior to the white people. In *The Rainbow*, Ursula criticizes narrow-minded Europeans, like Skrebensky, who think that Indians and Africans are savages. In *Women in Love*, Gerald, who had been an explorer of the savage regions, tells Minnette that he was never afraid of savages of Amazon. Minnette, representing the stereotypical image of the savages in the European mind, says: “Oh, I thought savages were all so dangerous, they’d have your life before you could look round” (p. 66). But Gerald rejects this distorted image and asserts that these savages “are over-rated” and that they “are too much like other people, not exciting, after the first acquaintance” (p. 66). Thus, Lawrence, like famous post-colonial theorist, Edward Said, rejects the exotic representation of the colonized world which is recurrent in imperial discourses.

Eco-criticism condemns human interference in nature. Similarly, post-colonialism criticizes colonizers’ intrusion in the local life and cultures. Lawrence regards colonialism is an unwanted interference in the colonies and he believes in the right of the natives to rule themselves and be accountable for their actions. In *Women in Love*, Lawrence evidently implies that colonialism is an intrusive activity. Gerald asks: “You don’t allow one mans to take away his neighbours’ living, so why should you allow one nation to take away living from another nation” (p. 29). Such a comment by Gerald expresses Lawrence’s denunciation of colonialism as an interruption in the affairs of independent countries.

Many of Lawrence’s novels give scattered references to the colonial issues, however, *Kangaroo* and *The Plumed Serpent* are more penetrating and consistent in the assessment of colonial society. *Kangaroo* is like a typical post-colonial text. Here, Somers, being a Lawrentian figure and so representative of the author’s views, appreciates mystery of the Australian Bush which stands for the richness of the pre-colonial primitive cultures or nature. As the Bush resists intrusion of the colonizers, in the same way, these cultures oppose corrupting influence of the colonizing process. The Bush terrifies Somers as if it were alive and wanted to kill him: “It was biding its time with a terrible ageless watchfulness, waiting for a far-off end, watching the myriad intruding white men” (p. 9). Here Lawrence plainly describes colonizers as ‘intruders’ into the mysterious life of the natives. And this intrusion is resisted by the nature itself. The bush, representing nature, wants to preserve its mystery and vitality and resists the corrupting interference of the colonizers. Thus, Nature is anti-colonial and it resists any attempt to adulterate it. Describing white man’s colonialism as intrusion, Somers here justifies the right of the Bush to defend its mystery and pristine darkness and save it from being tainted by the intruders. Somers says about the corrupting influence of colonialism: “A colony is no longer younger than the parent country.... [it] is perhaps even older than its parent country, one step further gone” (p. 45). Somers means that colonies cannot preserve their purity after colonization. The corruption of the colonizers is transferred to the colonies. Hence colonialism deprives primitive cultures of their richness, mystery, and pristine darkness.

Lawrence’s post-colonial vision is closer to that of such post-colonial writers as Chinua Achebe and V.S. Naipaul who, in their novels and critical works, demonstrate that colonies can manage their affairs on their own without involvement of the colonizers. Lawrence’s views also bear resemblance to these representative post-colonial writers. In *Kangaroo*, Jack, being one of the colonized victims, protests:

I hate the thought of being bossed and messed about by the old Country ... I don’t altogether want the mills of the British empire to go grinding slowly on and yourself compelled to do nothing but grind slowly with them ... Leave us Australians to ourselves; we shall manage. (p.190)

Jack is irritated by the intervention of the English colonizers in the affairs of Australia. He complains: “We want to do our best for Australia, it being our own country. And the Pommies come out from

England to upset us" (p. 296). Similarly, for Somers, colonial rule is unnecessary encroachment. He tells Jaz, "You may as well sink or swim on your own resources", and when Jaz says, "perhaps we are likely to find ourselves sinking", Somers replies, "Then you will come to your senses, after you've sunk for the third time" (p. 58). Thus, for Lawrence the colonizing process is an unjustified interference which has disrupting influence on native life, culture, and environment.

In *Kangaroo*, Lawrence denounces the so-called 'white man's burden, and the civilizing mission. Somers believes that the natives can live their life according to their traditional rules and customs, and they are answerable to themselves. The Europeans should not impose their so-called civilized way of living upon the natives. Jack criticizes the colonizers who look down upon tribal mode of life. He rejects their unpardonable impertinence to think that their way of life is superior to that of the natives. He tells Somers: "It is pretty well always the same. You come out from the old country very cocksure, with lot of criticism to you" (p. 296). Lawrence denounces the self-imposed civilizing mission of the colonizers because, he believes that every race has its own traditions and no mode of life is universally applicable. Therefore, colonizers endeavours to impose their so-called sophisticated way of life on the colonized regions proves disrupting for the indigenous culture and the nature itself. And even if the natives adopt this forced way of life, it would be an imitation not necessarily befitting them; Alastair Niven (1979), referring to the same fact, writes: "Traditions which feed the life blood of one country become degenerate copies in other" (p. 153). In *Kangaroo*, Harriet looking at Sidney, asks Somers: "Is this all men can do with a new country?" He replies, "What do you expect them to do? Rome was not built in a day" (p. 7). Here, Somers defends the naivety or primitiveness of the colonies and he is sure that the colonies will triumph over their backwardness with the passage of time.

Lawrence condemns cheap mystification, distortion and exoticism employed in colonial discourse for the representation of natives. He resembles Achebe who criticized Conrad for calling Africa, 'a heart of darkness' and rejects the prospective distortion in portrayal of the natives in the imperial history, the Commissioner, in *Things Fall Apart*, intends to compile. The natives are misrepresented because they have no historians of their own. Since the history of their pacification during colonial expansion is written by the imperialists; so, it is prejudiced and one-sided. It only takes into consideration the wisdom and bravery of the colonizers in taming the savages. It does not reveal the courage and fervour of the natives with which they resisted the colonizing process, as the Commissioner in *Things Fall Apart* intends to devote only one paragraph to the resistance and revolt of the hero, in his narration of the pacification of the barbarians. Lawrence attributes vitality, energy, and potency to his savages. The natives, in his novels, enjoy full and passionate life unlike the impotent life of European people, as Somers observes in *Kangaroo*: "There is one thing ... when these colonials do speak seriously, they speak like man, not like babies" (p. 26). By idealizing the manliness and confidence of the natives in comparison with the sterility of the white men, Lawrence attempts to challenge the distorted and stereotypical image of the natives as brutal savages, represented in most of European history, literature, and cultural discourses.

Lawrence criticizes the exploitative practices of the colonizing process, which according to him as it was to Conrad, a means of pillaging of the colonies' resources. The colonizers have no right to misuse the assets of the colonies and capture their land and property. They should not dispossess the natives from the sources of their living. Lawrence, like Conrad's denunciation of parasitic ivory trade in *Heart of Darkness*, thinks that colonizing practice is a leechlike activity. In *Kangaroo* colonizers are portrayed as bedbugs feeding upon the resources of the colonies. Somers fears the danger of parasites to Australia: "A wonderful country ... The land that invites Parasites now" (p. 313). The colonizers make use of the wealth of natives for their own ends. They adulterate the purity of the land and disturb the ecological balance by introducing new technology. They do nothing for the benefit of the natives; they do what could serve their political and economics ends, as in the novel the commercial life of Australia is "going on full speed; but only because it is the other end of English and American business" (p. 22). Jack, a native of Australia, is conscious of the fact that the countries' resources are being plundered by the foreigners. He is against the bloodsucking presence of "Jew capitalists and bankers" (p. 190) in his native homeland, Australia.

Nature shows resistance against human attempts in subduing and conquering it. Similarly, postcolonialism shields the right of the colonized to defend their liberty. Lawrence justifies the right of the colonized to defend their autonomy. He regards colonization as an infringement at the liberty of the natives and if they fight back for their liberation they are not to blame, as Gerald argues: "If I go and

take a man's hat from off his head, that hat becomes a symbol of that man's liberty. When he fights for his hat, he is fighting me for his liberty" (p. 29). As nature's reaction against human attempts is justified, similarly the aggressive reactions of the colonized against the colonizers are not demonstrations of violence but fight for independence. Willie Struther, in *Kangaroo*, criticizes colonial encroachment over the liberty of the natives. He bewails the slavery of the colonized. Talking about Australian labour and linking it with Indians and Africans, he says: "We are in one box with them in this Empire Business ... A sort of slavery, slaving to keep this marvellous Empire going, with its out-of-date Lords and its fat arsed hypocritical upper classes" (pp. 319-20). Here, Lawrence resembles Achebe, who in *Things Fall Apart*, defends the right of the natives to defy the colonial advances and imposition.

In *The Plumed Serpent*, Lawrence looks like typical post-colonial writers in his appraisal of colonialism. He rather anticipates such post-colonial writers as Achebe and Naipaul. The novel, like Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*, portrays clash or hostility between local and foreign cultures, religions, and modes of existence. As in Achebe's novel, Lawrence in *The Plumed Serpent* also depicts a growing antipathy among the natives towards the Christian church as an agency of colonialism. Here, Lawrence shows his characteristic idealization of pre-colonial or indigenous cultures, pagan religions, and tribal traditions. Another novel *Aaron's Rod* also presents a critique of colonial process. The Hindu doctor in Chapter Two holds, "India should be allowed to rule herself because people can only be responsible to themselves" (Lawrence. 1988. p. 52). Lawrence, here, candidly rejects colonialism and advocates the right of the natives to govern themselves.

Lawrence exhorts the Americans to "catch the pulse of the life which Cortes and Columbus murdered" (1936. p. 90). He romanticises the uncharted and unexplored pre-colonial life and nature before it was corrupted and trampled by the explorers. Alluding to Lawrence's love of rich primitive cultures, Salgado (1982) observes: "It was the sense of a different, more primitive and deeper level of life superficially affected but essentially untouched by European religion and culture, which he instinctively felt among the Pueblo Indians" (p. 51). In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Mellors refers to the corrupting influence of colonialism on the colonies: "When I feel the human world is doomed ... then I feel the colonies aren't far enough. The moon wouldn't be far enough" (p. 238). Thus, for Lawrence colonies, which are pure and virgin like moon, are despoiled and desecrated by the doomed western culture and he condemns colonization for its disrupting effect on the life, nature, culture and environment of the indigenous land and tribal societies.

Lawrence not only condemns British colonialism but all colonizing attempts of the past. As Marlow in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* links British imperialism with that of the Romans and rejects all imperialist invasions, similarly Lawrence also denounces all the imperialist activities of human history. He condemns Romans for exercising brute force in wiping out the "Etruscan existence as a nation and a people" (Lawrence. 1938. p. 1). Lawrence, unlike some of the imperialist writers who favour and promote colonial rule and agenda, condemns colonialism as an exploitative activity. He agrees with Jack, in *Kangaroo*, who tells Somers "You have let us down" and Somers "was silent. Perhaps it was true" (1938. p. 296). Lawrence, like Conrad and Achebe, depicts the conflict between obtrusive foreign culture and local culture during the colonizing process and believes that this encounter between imperialism and primitive native life leads to cultural disintegration in the colonies. Lawrence's novels, like Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*, depict the things falling apart in native cultures due to the invasion of the foreign culture. In many of his post-war novels, he describes the devastating impact of colonialism on the primitive cultures of tribal societies.

CONCLUSION

This research was undertaken to trace post-colonial eco-critical concerns in D.H. Lawrence's post-war novels. The research also aimed to show that Lawrence anti-colonial vision is linked with his ecological philosophy. The analysis has proved that in Lawrence's post-war novels colonization or imperialism is considered as an important cause of eco-environmental disruption in the colonized world. Postcolonial eco-critics believe that the local environments have been disturbed with the interference of colonizers. They examine how the natural environment is exploited, corrupted, and destroyed in the process of colonization. D.H. Lawrence, in his novels, presents a critique of colonization for its disrupting influence on the pre-colonial primitive cultures and indigenous life of the colonies. He romanticizes the unspoilt and untouched pre-colonial primitive cultures and societies and condemns the colonial process

for ravishing the virginity of these cultures. Thus, it can safely be concluded that Lawrence's post-war novels express many of the typical post-colonial eco-critical concerns.

REFERENCES

- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2007). *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge.
- Barras, A. (2017). *Ecopoetic metafiction: the interaction of organism and environment in postcolonial literatures* [Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Geneva. Doi: 10.13097/archive-ouverte/unige:96382. ouverte.unige.ch/unige:96382. [Retrieved on 20th October, 2022].
- Buell, L. Heise, U. K., & Thornber, K. (2011). Literature and Environment. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*. Vol 36: pp. 417-440. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-111109-144855>. [Retrieved on 20th October, 2022].
- Fromm, H. (1996). From Transcendence to Obsolescence: A Route Map. In C. Glotfelty and H. Fromm (Eds.), *The ecocriticism reader: Landmarks in literary ecology*. (pp. 30-39) Athens: The University of Georgia Press.
- Garrard, G. (2004). *Ecocriticism: The new critical idiom*. New York: Routledge
- Gersdorf, C., & Mayer, S. (Eds), (2006). *Nature in Literary and Cultural Studies: Transatlantic Conversations of Ecocriticism*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Göçmen, G. (2020). DH Lawrence's green politics in *The Rainbow*: A precursor to modern socialist environmental ethics. *Journal of Narrative and Language Studies*, 8(15), 255-264.
- Huggan, G., & Tiffin, H. (2010). *Postcolonial Ecocriticism*. New York: Routledge.
- Kinkead-Weekes, M. (2001). Decolonising imagination: Lawrence in the 1920s. In A. Fernihough (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to D. H. Lawrence* (Cambridge Companions to Literature, (pp. 67 -86). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawrence, D. H. (1926). *The Plumed Serpent*. Herts: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.
- _____. (1955). *Kangaroo*. London: Heinemann.
- _____. (1968). *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. New York: Bantam Books.
- _____. (1978). *The Lost Girl*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- _____. (1986). *The Rainbow*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- _____. (1995a). *Women in Love*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- _____. (1995b). *Aaron's Rod*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- _____. (1936). America, Listen to Your Own. In McDonald, E.D. (Ed.), *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*, (pp. 87-91). London: Heinemann.
- _____. (1938) *Etruscan Places in Mornings in Mexico and Etruscan Places*. London: Heinemann.
- Marzec, R. P. (2007). *An Ecological and Postcolonial Study of Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Niven, A. (1979). *D.H. Lawrence: The Novels*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Rueckert, W. (1996). Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism. In C. Glotfelty and H. Fromm. Eds. *The ecocriticism reader: Landmarks in literary ecology*. (pp. 105-123). Athens: The University of Georgia Press.
- Salgado, G. (1982). *A Preface to Lawrence*. London: Longman.
- Wright, L. (2010). *Wilderness into Civilized Shapes: Reading the Postcolonial Environment*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.