Volume 19 Issue 43
Originally issued as A11



Global Journal of human-social science: A
Arts & Humanities - Psychology
Volume 19 Issue 11 Version 1.0 Year 2019
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-460x & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Ecocritical Analysis of R. K. Narayan's *The Man-eater of Malgudi*

By Md. Ali Rayhun Sarker
Begum Rokeya University

Abstract- In the 20th as well as in the 21st century, it has already been witnessed by human beings that the earth is going to encounter environmental change, and this change is directing us to a disastrous future. All the branches of human knowledge are concerned about this. In this respect, literature is not silent and plays a significant role. Ecocriticism analyses the representation of nature in literature, it traces the process of environmental disruption and comments on the overall situation for a solution. In this research article, R K Narayan's novel The Man-eater of Malgudi is seen from an ecocritical perspective. This article considers the issue of abusing animals by Vasu, the most enigmatic character in the novel, and shows how different characters react in different ways about this abuse. As it is related to environment, probable suggestion for saving the environment is expected. This article also highlights this issue.

GJHSS-A Classification: FOR Code: 190499



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



© 2019. Md. Ali Rayhun Sarker. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Ecocritical Analysis of R. K. Narayan's *The Man-eater of Malgudi*

Md. Ali Rayhun Sarker

Abstract- In the 20th as well as in the 21st century, it has already been witnessed by human beings that the earth is going to encounter environmental change, and this change is directing us to a disastrous future. All the branches of human knowledge are concerned about this. In this respect, literature is not silent and plays a significant role. Ecocriticism analyses the representation of nature in literature, it traces the process of environmental disruption and comments on the overall situation for a solution. In this research article, R K Narayan's novel *The Man-eater of Malgudi* is seen from an ecocritical perspective. This article considers the issue of abusing animals by Vasu, the most enigmatic character in the novel, and shows how different characters react in different ways about this abuse. As it is related to environment, probable suggestion for saving the environment is expected. This article also highlights this issue.

R K Narayan's *The Man-eater of Malgudi* is a fertile ground of applying ecocriticism. To bring out the ecocritical connotation of this novel, it must be considered as an allegory, and the symbolical indications must be extended up to the issues of environmental disaster. The focal point of this novel is the massive killing of animals and the ruthless process of stuffing. The activities of taxidermy detailed here can be extended to show the larger scale of environmental disruption. As hunting of animals is an important issue here, the connection between hunting and literature should be discussed briefly, and of course, it should be seen by the lens of ecocriticism.

Matthew Cartmill in his book *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature throughout History* uses a phrase 'romantic hunting,' and he defines it in this way, "…a white man dressed in buckskins, who lives simply in the wilderness on intimate and friendly terms with the natives, dislikes white civilization, and hunts only to satisfy his basic need for food or clothing." This notion of 'romantic hunting' rationalizes and legalizes hunting, and it is highly anthropocentric. In the same way it is reported in the novel *The Man-eater of Malgudi* that the forestry officer Ramaswami is bound to kill at least 18 elephants and 60 tigers in his life and the reason behind this is to save human life which is an anthropocentric idea for the reason that intrusion in the abode of animals makes them unrest and consequently they are bound to attack human habitation. The novels based on the stories of hunting, for example, the novels of Jim Corbett, Kenneth Anderson, etc., though the expressed intention of these hunting is sport not providing food or clothing, create such romantic notion for ruthless hunting in the name of saving human life and these kinds of writings create the zeal of slaughtering of animals among the mind of massive readers to such extent that they become fanatic. We do find the flavor of 'romantic hunting' as well as fanaticism in the hunting activities of Vasu.

In the writings of R K Narayan two temperamentally opposing goddesses, Laxmi and Saraswati, are often time mentioned and in his novel *The Financial Expert* this is the inherent theme where the central character Margayya is torn between the philosophy of Laxmi who highlights the materialistic aspect of human life and Saraswati who highlights the idealistic aspect of human life. Until a certain situation of the novel, Laxmi appears weightier than Sarasawati, but at the end of the novel, Margayya learns something exactly opposite by the bleak situation of his son. At this situation, he is economically solvent, but he does not find peace in mind for the fact that his son has gone ashtray and his enterprise of educating his son has failed. In respect of handling these two goddesses, Narayan is very much keen to come to a conclusion, and that is the perfect blend of these two, as human beings can deny neither materialism nor idealism. This standpoint of Narayan is well manifested in the very first paragraph of the novel *The Man-eater of Malgudi.* Here the character Nataraj mentions, "I hung up a framed picture of Goddess Laxmi poised on her lotus, holding aloft the bounties of earth in her four hands, and through her grace I did not do too badly." (Narayan 2000, 7) This statement indicates that he is well concerned about the materialistic aspect. In the same paragraph it is mentioned that he "I could have profitably rented out the little room in front of my press on Market Road,…" but he does not do so because he is not so "calculative." Hence, it can be mentioned that he has perfectly blended the materialistic and idealistic aspects of human life in respect to the formation of his life philosophy. Besides this character, Narayan sketches an opposite kind of character, namely Vasu who is rigorously materialistic and whose materialism is arid and extreme. The extent of the materialistic mentality of him can be well-understood by this statement of him regarding human relationship, "Even among brothers, business should be business." (Narayan 2000, 28) This

Author: Assistant Professor Department of English, Begum Rokeya University Rangpur, Bangladesh. e-mail: raihun00@yahoo.com

© 2019 Global Journals

is the attitude of Vasu towards human beings, and from this, it is not very difficult to conjecture his attitude to non-human lives. To Vasu, for example, an elephant is just a matter of earning money. In a very playful and lighthearted manner, he describes the monetary benefit of a dead elephant in this way,

> Has it occurred to you how much more an elephant is worth dead? You don't have to feed it in the first place. I can make ten thousand out of the parts of this elephant- the tusks, if my calculation is right, must weigh forty pounds, that's eight hundred rupees. I have already an order for the legs, mounted as umbrella stands, and each hair on its tail can be sold for twelve annas for rings and bangles; most women fancy them and it's not for us to question their taste. My first business will be to take out the hairs and keep them apart, while the blood is still hot; trunk, legs, even the nails- it's a perfect animal in that way. Every bit of it is valuable. I've already several inquiries from France and Germany and from Hong Kong. What more can a man want? I could retire for a year on the proceeds of one elephant. (Narayan 2000,132-133)

Beside this materialistic aspect, the impact of anthropocentric idea can also be detected in Vasu, and in his psyche, these two are intertwined together. It is next to impossible to find any ecocentric mentality in him. On the contrary, he indicates by his activities and statements that anthropocentrism is a natural phenomenon and his haughty reactions and attitudes towards animals and nature result from his anthropocentric notion. For this kind of claimed natural phenomenon of anthropocentrism, Graham Huggan and Helen Tiffin comment,

> Within many cultures - and not just western ones- anthropocentrism has long been naturalized. The absolute prioritization of one's own species' interest over those of the silenced majority is still regarded as being 'only natural'. Ironically, it is precisely through such appeals to nature that other animals and the environment are often excluded from the privileged ranks of the human, rendering them available for exploitation. (Huggan and Tiffin 2010,5)

In human nature, there is one kind of negativity, and this is mentioned in this statement of Nataraj, "Having always lived within the shelter of my press, I had probably grown up in complete ignorance of human nature, which seemed to be vicious, vile, vindictive and needlessly unfriendly everywhere."(Narayan 2000*,* 42) This is the impression of Nataraj regarding the negative attitude of human beings towards other human beings, and from this, it can be assumed how ruthless human beings may be for non-human lives. Thinking from the ecocritical point of view, it can be deduced that the basic impression of the philosophy of Laxmi or the philosophy of materialism is not favorable in the matter of preservation of nature rather it goes to the side of the forces who are interested of squeezing maximum from nature only for their material fulfillment. If this kind of materialistic philosophy is the main driving force of human beings, they may be the worst of the offenders of nature. On the other hand, Saraswati is the goddess of wisdom and learning, and only wisdom can create one kind of consciousness for the preservation of nature.

From ecocritical consideration, Vasu is the prominent character in the novel *The Man-eater of Malgudi* and his activities related to taxidermy is highly arresting, and for this reason, these two together should be considered as the central issue. Vasu is a taxidermist, and he hunts the required animals himself. He considers and claims that it is an artistic profession which can be compared to a sculptor or surgeon, and the activity is very delicate and precise. Regarding the preservation of animals, he claims, "Of course it will be preserved if you get help from a taxidermist who knows his job." (Narayan 2000*,* 79) The summary of his viewpoint regarding taxidermy is that it represents natural elements. About the artistic excellence of the stuffing of a lion by his master Suleiman, he mentions, "When he stuffed a lion he could make it more terrifying than it would be in the jungle." (Narayan 2000*,* 17) Ecocritically it can be explained in this way that the claimed art is artificial, and the taxidermists represent nature in an artificial way, and hence, it is the fabricated delineation of animal life.

Throughout the novel, Narayan describes the process of stuffing, and it creates one kind of pathos and negative impression regarding taxidermy. Narayan draws the picture of skins hanging to dry or to soak, skins lay scattered here and there, jungle squirrels and feathered birds heaped in the corner, Vasu surrounded with carcasses, smell of decaying flesh and raw hide, rotting smell in the air, stirring the broth in the tub, taking out the eyes from the animal and setting artificial lens in that place, pickling the skin in tins of salt immediately after flaying. With Narayan's description, the readers are bound to witness pure alum solution, carcass treatment, lifted paws of tigers, slaughtered head of some animal, resinous odor resulted from mixed matters and chemicals, incision, bleeding, skinning and cleaning, bits of flesh lying here and there. Without having an idea about this bleak background of taxidermy, the stuffed body of any animal may appear just a piece of art, but R K Narayan has successfully shown this aspect of taxidermy. The activities of Vasu become a nightmare for Nataraj, and this nightmarish experience is reflected in this way, "Stag-heads, tiger-skins and petrified feathers were going to surround me forever and ever. My house was becoming a Noah's Ark…" (Narayan 2000*,*58) As a native to Malgudi, it becomes very much frustrating realization to Nataraj that, "From this humble

© 2019 Global Journals

town of Malgudi stuffed carcasses radiate to the four corners of the earth." (Narayan 2000, 55) Again the discovery of Nataraj that a part of his house that is the occupied attic has been transformed into a charnel house is another abhorring experience for him. and he describes it in this way, "He brought in more and more dead creatures; there was no space for him in his room or on the terrace. Every inch of space must have been cluttered with packing boards and nails and skins and moulds." (Narayan 2000, 73) Not only Nataraj but also some other characters are disturbed by the heinous activities of stuffing by Vasu, and here in this example the predicament of Sastri is mentioned who is the helping hand of Nataraj in his work in press, "There was a hyena at the foot of the stairs, the sight of which upset him… 'How can I do any work with a wolf and a whatnot staring at me? And there's a python hanging down the handrail of the stairs'." (Narayan 2000, 74)

In the above situations and reactions of different characters, it is clear that Vasu announces war against animals and nature. Whenever he is successful in controlling any natural element, he enjoys the pleasure of victory. In his conversation with Nataraj, he reasons that as human beings are civilized, educated and cultured, they should always try to prove their superiority to nature and he places science as one kind of opponent to nature. (Narayan 2000, 17) Civilization, education, and culture are considered of having one kind of softening effect on the human mind, but Vasu is not softened by these. Again it is unscientific of considering science as an opponent to nature because science cannot work properly in a destroyed or semi-destroyed nature. Within the arena of science, there is always the craving for the preservation of nature. Vasu misinterprets this close relationship and mutual dependence of science and nature by mentioning the conquering of nature by science. This murderer of innocent creatures declares his enmity to nature in this way, "We have constantly to be rivaling Nature at her own game. Posture, look, the total personality, everything has to be created." And hearing this Nataraj reacts, "This man had set himself as a rival to Nature and was carrying on a relentless fight." (Narayan 2000, 52) The fact of this relentless fight can be understood by the information provided by the Forestry Officer as he reports, "A lot of game has been vanishing from our reserves and even tigers disappear from the blocks.", and the killing of a lot of animals within a short time is again confirmed by this, "Someone is busy with his gun". (Narayan 2000, 78)

Narayan sketches several characters in his novel having protecting mentality regarding nature and particularly animals. In this list, names like Nataraj, Rangi, Muthu, Sastri can be included. There is one kind of desperation in their role of protecting nature, and the actual reason for this desperation must be analyzed. Either this desperation results from the love and duty towards nature or it may come out from the influence of Hindu religion and Indian myth. Throughout the novel, Narayan cites a lot of characters, stories, mythical figures to substantiate this. The eagle is believed to be the messenger of God Vishnu, which is referred as 'Garuda', and this bird is very sacred to the Hindus. Ganesha is an elephant-headed God in Hinduism, and in the novel, a lot of incidents happen about the elephant Kumar. Apart from these references in the text, one can find in *Ramayana* another divine bird 'Jatayu' which is mentioned to try to protect Sita from Ravana. The reference of appearing of different gods in the shape of animals on earth to protect the endangered or to test the devotion can frequently be found. In a nutshell, it can be mentioned that all these mythical characters and stories have created one kind of restrain, sympathy, and fear among the people of India regarding animals.

Now the attitude towards animals of the afore-mentioned four characters must be considered. In the novel, it is seen that the character Muthu of Memphi takes a lot of tiring and time-consuming initiatives to protect the elephant, Kumar. By analyzing the activities of Muthu, it can be deduced that he does all these for the financial benefit that can be derived from Kumar as long as it is alive. The issue of protecting it for religious faith is secondary; the issue of protecting it for the sake of the protection of nature is not at all any concerned matter for him. For Nataraj, the case is exactly opposite as he does not have any financial loss-gain equation entangled with the slaughtering of animals, and he is motivated by the religious faith and his consciousness for the protection of nature. The character Sastri reacts several times for the ill-treatment of animals by Vasu, and this reaction solely results from his faith on the mythical belief. Rangi takes tremendous risk to save the life of Kumar. She is involved in such kind of profession, i.e., prostitution, that she does not seem to follow the dictation of religion, though this prostitution is related to Hindu religion, and from this we can come to the conclusion that all the activities she initiates are the product of her humane self which pricks her to take the side of all the lives, human or non-human. So, all these characters acted in favor of animals bearing in mind different intentions, and it is true that apart from Vasu, we do not find even a single character throughout the novel who is subversive to animal interest. It suggests that the number of persons and agents involved in the activity of environmental catastrophe is always few, but the impact of the disaster created by these chosen few, who grabs the benefit, falls on the shoulder of the massive people.

It is true that the demand for human beings is immense, and in response to this demand, the supply is not adequate if the demand is to fulfill from nature in the natural way. This is the predicament of the human race that if the demand is not fulfilled, unrest will be spread.

© 2019 Global Journals

To cope in a situation like this, human beings will have to be conscious and considerate. The consideration will have to be to such extent that they will be ready to sacrifice some of their demands. Human beings will have to be sympathetic towards the whole of nature only to be sympathetic towards the human race. The sentiment of this whole affair will have to be understood by them, and in this regard, sentimentality is essential for creating a mentality of preserving nature. Such precious quality of human beings is criticized by Vasu in this way, "You are sentimental. I feel sickened when I see a man talking sentimentally like an old widow. I admire people with a scientific look." (Narayan 2000, 134) The sentimentality of human beings is treated by Vasu as a negative quality, and having such sentiment is considered as feeble womanish characteristics.

There is a common story of all the ecologically damaged places. It is like this. The place was once upon a time very much pleasing and green; vibrant with life, not with life considered from an anthropocentric point of view, but from ecocentrism. The danger of this place was its natural abundance, and for this reason, this place was attracted by human beings. When it was explored by human beings, they started to come here. From the very beginning, it was very clear that they were coming here only to plunder the place. In spite of knowing that these plunderers might abuse the place, the native people felt one kind of attraction for these people because they came with the sugar quoted words of development. Anyway, this place was successful at the initial stage to tolerate this abuse. More and more visitors came with their gorgon-like machines and continued their torture. After a lot of struggle, the nature of this place collapsed. Then the people who came here with an unquenchable thirst for wealth started to realize that it is no longer any promising land for them. Without any delay, they left the place. It had been left dilapidated. But it was not completely deserted. The people who had been living here from time immemorial, who knew how to use natural resources without damaging productive power, were there. But they were endangered of extinction.

The above-mentioned story is the main plot of Dr. Seuss' *The Lorax* It is the story of all the environmentally destroyed places. More or less it is the generalized story of the novel *The Man-eater of Malgudi.* If the novel is considered ecocritically, the allegorical aspect of it will be clear. Like *The Lorax* in *The Man-eater of Malgudi*, it can be seen that before the coming of Vasu there was one kind of peaceful atmosphere in the house of Nataraj as well as in Malgudi, but that is destroyed with the intrusion of Vasu. The danger of Malgudi is its abundance of different varieties of animals and birds which attract the attention of Vasu. In the very first day of his entrance in Natraj's house, he molests the 'curtain' that is there in between the office room and printing room. It is the custom of him that even his friends would not step beyond the curtain, and this custom can be compared to natural law. This curtain can be considered as the protecting shield of nature, which is nothing but code and conduct of nature. Nataraj mentions the incident in this way, "He came forward, practically tearing aside the curtain, an act which violated the sacred traditions of my press." (Narayan 2000, 15) This molestation of the curtain foreshadows the later molestation of code and conduct of nature by Vasu.

It is seen in the story of *The Lorax* that the native people feel one kind of attraction for plunderers which can be found among a lot of people in Malgudi. In his first introduction, Nataraj is to some extent fascinated by Vasu. It is the nature of evil to have one kind of fascinating spell which is mentioned by Joseph Conrad in his novel *Heart of Darkness* in this phrase 'fascination of the abomination'. (Conrad 2008, 21) Nataraj should have rejected abominating Vasu at the very beginning which is understood by him later in this way, "If I had cared for a peaceful existence, I should have rejected Vasu on the first day." (Narayan 2000, 28)The forestry officer, Ramaswami, is also fascinated by Vasu and he decides to publish his book with the help of Vasu, though later he realizes the actual nature of him. Vasu does have one kind of mesmerizing spell over Rangi who contrary to this spell does not support the nefarious activities of Vasu and even takes some steps against Vasu. She thinks that there is one kind of love in the mind of Vasu for her in spite of the fact that he maintains physical relations with a lot of other prostitutes. All these characters welcome Vasu; in the same way, in real life often time we invite and support some agents who are dangerous for nature.

The remaining part of the story of *The Man-eater of Malgudi* does not exactly match with the remaining part of the story of *The Lorax* where at the end the place is left as a waste land by the industrialists. Malgudi is not deserted as a barren place for the fact that a lot of people raise their voice and take different kinds of initiatives to check Vasu. It is a great lesson for all the people across the world who live in the endangered places that there is no option of protesting together with the available power and energy. R K Narayan shows that Nataraj and his train appear weak against Vasu, but at the end, they are successful in bringing back the peaceful Malgudi.

Among different characters in the novel who contribute to some extent to save the life of animals particularly the life of the elephant Kumar, Rangi is especially remarkable for the fact that she takes a lot of risks in her initiative and there is utter desperation in such initiative. If we dig deep, it comes to us that Rangi does not know that to Vasu, there is no difference in between an animal and her. An animal may be subject of stuffing, and in a different way Rangi is used as a stuffed material. Symbolically, both are stuffed. Rangi is

© 2019 Global Journals

one of the preys to Vasu like all the other animals. It clarifies the fact that female are exploited by the male in the same way as human beings exploit natural elements. Women and animals are in the same platform for the fact that these two groups are bound to depend on others, as it is observed by Sunaura Taylor in her essay entitled "Interdependent Animals: A Feminist Disability Ethic-of-Care" published in the book *Ecofeminism: Feminism Intersections with Other Animals and the Earth*,

> It is generally accepted that disabled people are dependent. We are dependent on carers for our physical well being, and often dependent on the government for our economic wellbeing. It is also generally accepted that domesticated animals are dependent: they rely on human beings for feeding, shelter, health care, often even with birthing and aid with intercourse. Wild animals rely on us as well, albeit in a very different way- they are vulnerable to human decisions that involve their habitats, their food sources, whether they as individuals can be hunted or poached, and sometimes even whether their species will survive into the future. (Adams 2015, 111)

Like the animals, Rangi is dependent on patriarchy, that is to say on Vasu; she is dependent physically and economically, she is disabled-domesticated slave of intercourse, her decisions are taken by male, like Vasu, she is hunted and poached regularly, and for this reason there is no surety whether she will survive into the future. As a consequence, she feels one kind of urge in the core of her mind to save the animals, and she feels that animals are her real fellow on earth. As a response to the feeling of this closeness, she feels the necessity to save Kumar, the elephant, but she realizes that she can do nothing in this regard. Finding no other options, she goes to Nataraj and requests him to take some initiative. This proves how dependent women are. Considering Rangi, the distinguishing mark in between animal and female vanishes. This comment of Franz Kafka can be quoted here, "Animals are closer to us than human beings. That is the bars of the cage. We find relations easier with animals than with men.", (Corngold 1996, 75) though this comment is aimed at *The Metamorphosis*, it is not a far-fetched comparison for the fact that Rangi-Gregor Samsa-animals-female are same.

The readers get one kind of negative delineation of Rangi from the thought process and statements of different characters. For example, this impression of Nataraj can be shown here, "Although Rangi was black as cinders and looked rugged, there was an irresistible physical attraction about her, and I was afraid that I might succumb to her charms." (Narayan 2000, 120) The summary of Sastri's impression about her is that she is a disreputable woman having one kind of fleshy image which establishes her as the worst woman in Malgudi and most of the people in Malgudi do not want to recognize any kind of connection with her. Elsewhere in the novel, she is mentioned by Nataraj as 'a perfect female animal' (Narayan 2000, 85). Ecocritically, this comment is highly objectionable. Within the existing discourse of almost all the languages, it is seen that human beings have the tendency of using animal names to show evil characteristics of human beings. Considering the ecocentric meaning, it must be understood that in this way evil characteristics of an animal are not attributed to a human being, but the evil characteristics of a human being are forcibly attributed to an innocent animal. Anyhow, if we consider the anthropocentric meaning of the phrase 'a perfect female animal,' it creates one kind of contradiction for the fact that she plays a role to save the life a particular animal. Taking a great risk at the deep of night she comes to Nataraj and informs that Vasu is planning to shoot Kumar.

The sense of possessiveness is one of the dominant features of Vasu, and this becomes acute in the matter of natural elements and women. This statement of him can be worthy of mentioning,

> Only fools marry, and they deserve all the trouble they get. I really do not know why people marry at all. If you like a woman, have her by all means. You don't have to own a coffee estate because you like a cup of coffee now and then." (Narayan 2000, 33-34)

Having a woman by all means indicates the possessive attitude of Vasu, and this same attitude can be found in respect of nature also. At the same time Vasu suppresses Rangi as well as nature, he plunders animal kingdom as well Rangi, he tracks and tames women and animals in the same manner.

In the 20th and 21st century, a time of danger for animal and plant kingdom, still there are some places across the world where non-human lives enjoy peaceful and danger-free life. But human encroachment in these areas is so speedy that it is very difficult to ensure their safety in the future. This particular reality is echoed by this statement of Nataraj,

> The first rays of the sun touched up the walls of the barber's house with the morning glory. Sparrows and crows were flying already in search of grain and worms. As I watched them a part of my mind reflected how lucky they were to be away from Vasu's attic windows." (Narayan 2000, 61)

Here two aspects of our reality are shown. In the first two sentences, the freedom enjoyed by animals is shown, and side by side in the third sentence, the potential threat is also indicated. Sparrows and crows are reported to involve in their regular activity of collecting food, but there is the threat of the existence of

© 2019 Global Journals

Vasu; in the same way,a lot of Vasus are encroaching towards the safe abode of non-human lives. The existence and presence of Vasu create a sense of fear in Malgudi; in the same way, the existence and presence of greedy mentality and the thirst and hunger of necessity, artificial or real, create a sense of fear in the whole world.

In nature, it is very common and normal that one animal will devour another, and this law is essential for the subsistence of all the lives. It is very much realistic that the life of one animal is the meal of only one occasion of another. This is a very harsh law, but it is a reality as it is the part of the ecosystem. Bearing this in mind, the activities of Vasu cannot be justified because in nature, the death of one life gives life to another, but the activities of Vasu do not have any life-giving opportunity.

Now it is time to bring an end to this research activity. We have found an image of Vasu which tells that he is the prince of darkness, evil and destruction and of course this princely devastation is directed towards nature. It is shown by Narayan that even the supreme administration of Malgudi fails to take any action against him. Practically in the whole earth, there are a lot of powerful entities bearing the thirst and hunger for profit, against whom the environmentalist or the mass people who do have protective mentality regarding nature are less than feeble. Vasu represents these thirsty and hungry entities, and by mentioning the ultimate destruction of Vasu, Narayan wants to foreshadow the ultimate destruction of these all-consuming agencies. In this regard, he refers to *rakshasa* from Indian myth thus, "Every *rakshasa* gets swollen with his ego. He thinks he is invincible, beyond every law. But sooner or later something or other will destroy him." (Narayan 2000*,* 75) Rakshasa is a demonic creature who does not recognize any kind of restrain of man or God. Ecocritically, this rakshasa can be considered as agents who destroy nature. In Indian myth, they are reported to practise demonic power, and in a certain time of their reign, they appear to be invincible. But ultimately it is seen that they are subject to death and destruction. This idea can also be applied ecocritically in respect to the enemies of nature. Apparently, it seems that the resources of nature are inexhaustible, and hence the death of nature is unthinkable. But in the 21st century, the earth has already experienced the shrinking of natural resources. It is a warning that the death of nature will be the ultimate death of these demonic entities like the death of rakshasa.

At the last page of the novel, Nataraj concludes by referring one statement of Sastri in this way,

> '…Every demon carries within him, unknown to himself, a tiny seed of self-destruction, and goes up in the thin air at the most unexpected moment. Otherwise what is to happen to humanity?' He narrated again for my benefit the story of Bhasmasura the unconquerable, who scorched everything he touched, and finally reduced himself to ashes by placing the tips of his fingers on his own head. (Narayan 2000 183)

The novel ends with a symbolic warning to all who has the tendency of squeezing mother earth to the maximum level. Side by side, it also indicates that within the laws of nature, there is the provision of taking steps against the forces who abuse nature. Nature is powerful enough to annihilate its enemies in due time, and this process of annihilation comes in the shape of natural disasters. As Vasu is dead by the movement of his powerful and muscular limbs, the human race may be annihilated by the haughty activities of them in the same way, as a lot of other species had become extinct from the earth and sunk into oblivion.

Works Cited

1. Adams, Carol J. & Gruen, Lori, ed. "Interdependent Animals: A Feminist Disability Ethic-of-Care." *Ecofeminism*: *Feminist Intersections with Other Animals & the Earth.* New York: Bloomsbury, 2015. Print.
2. Cartmill, Matthew. *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature throughout History.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993. Print.
3. Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness.* Dhaka: Friends' Book Corner, 2008. Print.
4. Huggan, Graham and Tiffin, Helen. *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environment*. New York: Routledge, 2010. Print.
5. Kafka, Franz. *Metamorphosis.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996. Print.
6. Narayan, R. K. *The Financial Expert.* New York: The Noonday Press, 1959. Print.
7. ---, *The Man-eater of Malgudi.* Chennai: Indian Thought Publications, 2000. Print.
8. *The Lorax*. Dir. Hawley Pratt. Pro. Friz Freleng, USA 2012. Animated Film.

© 2019 Global Journals