POLITICS OF LIFE: ECOPOLITICS OF *THE WAR OF THE WORLDS* BY H.G. WELLS

Pamukkale University
The Institute of Social Sciences
Master Thesis
The Department of English Language and Literature
Master of Arts Programme

Soner GÜVEN

Supervisor
Assist. Prof. Dr. Elçin PARÇAOĞLU

July 2025
DENİZLİ

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that as required by these rules and conduct I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Signature:
Name, Last Name: Soner GÜVEN

To my mother, the strongest woman whom I know.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to show my gratitude to the PAU ELL team for believing in me and giving me a chance after 5 years of absence.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Şeyda SİVRİOĞLU, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Baysar TANİYAN, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meltem UZUNOĞLU ERTEN, Assist. Prof. Dr. Çelik EKMEKÇİ for their valuable teachings and guidance.

A special thanks to my dear esteemed supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Elçin PARÇAOĞLU. I thank her for her guidance, her support, and her patience. I am grateful to her for being a guiding light to me and supporting me in my ups and downs.

I also would like to thank my family, especially my mother, for their support and my dear friend Lect. Cafer KAPLAN.

ABSTRACT

POLITICS OF LIFE: ECOPOLITICS OF *THE WAR OF THE WORLDS* BY H.G. WELLS

Güven,Soner
Master's Thesis
The Department of English Language and Literature
The Master of Arts Programme in English Language and Literature
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Elçin PARÇAOĞLU

June 2025, VII + 78 Pages

This thesis aims to study H.G. Wells' *The War of the Worlds* (1898) novel by analysing it through the lens of ecopolitics. The central claim of this thesis is that politics determines the lives of all beings, as well as non-living things. Especially, this thesis will argue whether organic or inorganic, politics affect the right to exist. Initially, this thesis will explore the science fiction genre. Later, it will examine ecopolitics and support the theory by utilising ecocriticism and biopolitics, which are interrelated.

Keywords: H.G. Wells, *The War of the Worlds*, ecocriticism, biopolitics, ecopolitics

ÖZET

HAYATIN POLİTİKASI: H.G. WELLS'İN *DÜNYALAR SAVAŞI*'NIN EKOPOLİTİKASI

Güven,Soner
Yüksek Lisans Tezi
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Yüksek Lisans Programı

Haziran, 2025, VII + 78 Sayfa

Bu yüksek lisans tezi H.G. Wells'in *Dünyalar Savaşı* (1898) adlı romanını ekopolitika teorisini kullanarak irdeleyecektir. Tezin ana iddiası bütün yaşayan organizmaların ve yaşamayan şeylerin politika ve siyaset tarafından karar verilmesidir. Özellikle, bu tez organik veya inorganik şeylerin var oluşunun politika tarafından karar verilmesidir. İlk olarak, bu tez bilim kurgu türünü tanımlayacaktır. Sonrasında ekopolitika teorisini açıklayıp, bu teoriyi ekoeleştiri ve biyopolitik teorileriyle destekleyecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: H.G. Wells, *Dünyalar Savaşı*, ekoeleştiri, biyopolitik, ekopolitika

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The English author Herbert George Wells (1866-1946) and his science fiction stories are pioneering pieces in the formation of the genre. His works are among the first examples of the science fiction genre. *The War of the Worlds* (1898) is a revolutionary novel. The novel established important themes for the genre, such as aliens, Mars, and scientific perspective fiction, and the novel achieves these themes by exploring and revolutionising both existing and new ideas. The novel is critically acclaimed and has been adapted to other media. Numerous analyses have been conducted on the novel. Since it is a Victorian-era novel, it tells an invasion narrative, doing so through the use of the Martians. It invokes the 'reverse invasion' anxiety of the Victorian Age people. There might be many points that can be examined in this novel. However, this thesis will focus on both its science fiction aspects and its ecopolitical implications. These topics are evident broadly in the novel. This thesis will scrutinise *The War of the Worlds* (1898) by utilising ecocriticism and biopolitics, and the combination of these, known as ecopolitics.

Initially, the terms used in this thesis would be better clarified. First, science fiction will be argued. The genre mainly reflects humanity's aspirations and imaginations concerning the future. It is mostly about the future, but the genre also has a speculative aspect, which does not necessarily mean it is about the future. The genre began to take shape around the late 1800s, and H.G. Wells is not only an essential figure in British science fiction but also a pivotal one globally. He is also a revolutionary figure for the genre, thanks to his 'inventions' of new narrative techniques and the radical employment of both old and new themes for the genre. Thanks to Wells, the genre has been shaped and established. Since Wells, numerous great authors have emerged, including Isaac Asimov. As of 2025, science fiction is often associated with space travel, aliens, and advanced technology. However, 'proto-science fiction' was not like this. For instance, Jules Verne's works mostly explore the present world and speculate about the future. Wells brought alien, invasion, and technology themes. This is a great demonstration of how Wells actually created a discipline, a genre.

The second topic is ecopolitics, which this thesis handles. Ecocriticism criticises human action and behaviour towards nature and the environment, while biopolitics criticises the sovereign's politics over human life. Merging these two ideas broadens the

scope of politics to encompass all aspects of life. Politics not only affects human life but also affects plant and animal life. Therefore, solely thinking about 'human vs nature' is wrong. Humans are a part of nature as well. They have alienated themselves because of the politics of survival. Also, these politics decide the value of life. For instance, humanity loves some animals while killing others, and they engage in selective breeding for plants to produce better food. On the other hand, ecopolitics also determines the right to exist of non-organic issues.

The third topic for the thesis is ecocriticism. Ecocriticism emerges as a protest against human actions and the harm they cause to nature. By 'nature,' this thesis does not only mean the 'natural' world but also the environment constructed by humanity. Humanity harms not only the natural world but also its own built environment.

The last topic is biopolitics. The term was popularised by Michel Foucault, who focused on the notion of power. Biopolitics is about using politics to control life. Also, it is about managing the death itself. The decision-maker in this case is the sovereign, or, in modern form, the state. States use politics to control the population and shape how they want it to be. This thought is refined by Giorgio Agamben, who further develops it through his concepts of 'bare life' and 'sacred life'. It is a system that differentiates between acceptable and unacceptable citizens. This system discriminates between citizens of the country and non-citizens such as refugees, immigrants, and asylum-seekers. Agamben's binary system not only discriminates between citizens and non-citizens but also discriminates and categorises citizens in itself. A good illustration is that heteronormativity. States require a population for taxation, military purposes, or representation in the form of votes; therefore, states encourage people to marry and reproduce to increase their citizenry. And the last notion this thesis utilises in biopolitics is 'necropolitics'. Achille Mbembe coined the term, which demonstrates how the sovereign applies politics to death and the dead. A model for this might be the concept of 'martyrdom'. States highlight this concept to combat artificial or organic threats. Thus, the state can consolidate its own citizens.

What inspired this thesis is that *The War of the Worlds* (1898) contains all these aspects. Although ecocritical analyses of the novel can be found, it is rare to encounter biopolitical analyses. The politics over all lives are present in the form of aliens. It is at this time that the Martians harm nature and elect life.

To achieve these in the thesis, the first chapter will research the history of the science fiction genre. Initially, the first chapter will define science fiction, utilising

various key figures and authors associated with the genre. Later, it will explore the genre's history, with a particular focus on its origins. The chapter will continue with how H.G. Wells is often regarded as a 'founding father' of the science fiction genre and how he introduced new methods and devices to the genre during its early stages. Later, the chapter will discuss the themes and motifs that are commonly evident in most science fiction stories. Especially highlighting 'alien' and 'Mars' and 'Martians' motifs, and how these two themes were brought to the genre and popularised by Wells.

In the second chapter, ecopolitics will be explored. It explains how the term is important and asserts that politics not only decides on human life but also non-human life. Lastly, it provides details on how various countries have varying approaches to ecology, illustrating how politics influences the value placed on human lives.

Later, it will examine ecocriticism. First, it will provide a definition of ecocriticism and explain its evolution over the years. It will then explore the relationship between humans and nature in literature. It will investigate how nature has been or is portrayed. The chapter will explain how humans are gradually alienating themselves from nature and the consequences of this alienation. It will explain the term 'Anthropocentrism' and survey its effects on nature. Moreover, the chapter will provide ecocriticism in science fiction and the depiction of nature in the genre. In the final section of the chapter, the thesis will delve into the concepts of 'ecology', 'nature', and 'environment'. It will establish 'environment' as an umbrella term and will remind that the constructed environment is part of 'nature' as well.

After ecocriticism, the chapter will begin to discover biopolitics. Initially, it will define what biopolitics is and how it begins to take shape. Later, Michel Foucault will be scrutinised. The chapter will explore how Foucault popularised the term and almost established it. It will explore Foucault's notion of power and explore his concepts of governmentality and sovereignty. Then, the chapter will discuss Giorgio Agamben's thanatopolitics. Foucault's ideas inspire Agamben, who further develops the concept of biopolitics. The chapter will define Agamben's 'homo sacer' term. Agamben claims that the sovereign divides populations into two categories: the first is 'sacred life', which refers to the important life. The other category is 'bare life', which refers to spare life. Finally, the section will conclude by mentioning Achille Mbembe's concept of necropolitics. It will explain the term and how the sovereign utilises politics over death. The last section of the chapter defines ecopolitics.

The third chapter will analyse the novel. Initially, it will provide brief information about the author, the novel, and the year it was written. Later, it will explore Mars and alien themes in literature and how Wells is a revolutionary figure for these themes and the genre. The chapter will then continue with the analysis of the novel. It will explore how the Martians are a projection of humanity's future. The novel is an excellent example of early science fiction. The analysis will first focus on how science fiction is woven into the novel, as well as bringing new perspectives and devices to literature. Later, it will explore how the Martians are an analogy for humanity. Instead of humanity, it is the Martians that destroy the environment. It will explore how they damage the environment and the response to their activities. The chapter will continue to analyse the novel from biopolitical theories. It will discuss the Martians' elimination of life on Earth and examine how they attempt to create their environment by utilising their life politics. The analysis will then conclude with an examination of ecopolitics. It will demonstrate how the Martians feel entitled like humanity and their speciesism. The last section of the chapter will explore projections of humanity's future, and the Martians serve as an analogy for it. Later, to address current criticisms, the section will use the Kardashev scale to project humanity's potential future.

Finally, H.G. Wells's masterpiece *The War of the Worlds* (1898) is a great narrative. The novel introduces new tools and devices to create a genre. Wells projects humanity to the Martians and makes humans watch their actions at the hands of others.

CHAPTER ONE
SCIENCE FICTION, HISTORY, AND ITS THEMES

1.1 Science Fiction

Fiction or poetry depicts some aspect of current scientific knowledge. Oxford English Dictionary gives this sentence as the first description of science fiction. Although a definition of SF[1][2] may be vague and personal, attempts have been made by important figures in the genre. For instance, Lester Del Rey, who was an SF writer and critic, defines it as: "Even the devoted aficionado—or fan—has a hard time trying to explain what science fiction is. People have been trying to define it since the first magazine of science fiction appeared" (1979: 3) in his book named *The World of Science Fiction: 1926-1976*. "SF is, then, a literary genre whose necessary and sufficient conditions are the presence and interaction of estrangement and cognition, and whose main formal device is an imaginative framework alternative to the author's empirical environment" (1979: 7-8), which Darko Suvin, a Canadian academic and literary critic, defines. Moreover, Isaac Asimov, an acclaimed author of the genre, asserts that: "Science fiction can be defined as that branch of literature that deals with the reactions of human beings to changes in sciences and technology" (1975: 92). In addition, James Gunn, who is an SF writer, editor, and scholar, describes it as "literature of change" (2005: x).

Darko Suvin's definition is significant because he differentiates SF from other genres. His definition touches upon social and political matters and how SF reflects real-world problems. Damien Broderick, a critic and a novelist, further evolves Darko Suvin's definition of SF. He claims that the blossoming of SF in the 19th and 20th centuries demonstrates immense change in the cultural, scientific, and technological upheavals of these eras (Roberts, A., 2016: 1). These upheavals can be speculated upon. Culturally, it might represent urbanisation. For instance, *Metropolis* (1927) (dir. Fritz Lang) depicts a heavily urbanised environment with robots. Thus, these robots may represent significant scientific and technological advancements. More precisely, in his own words:

> SF is that species of storytelling native to a culture undergoing the epistemic changes implicated in the rise and supercession of technical-industrial modes of production, distribution, consumption and disposal. It is marked by metaphoric strategies and metonymic tactics, the foregrounding of icons and

[1] Science Fiction will be abbreviated as SF throughout this thesis.
[2] Abbreviations such as "sci-fi" (liked by the media but not by most fans, who use it to describe had science-fiction movies) and "SF" (preferred by most readers) further complicate the issue (Gunn, J. 2005: ix).

> interpretive schemata from a collectively constituted generic 'mega-text' [i.e. All previously published SF] and the concomitant de-emphasis of 'fine writing' and characterisation, and certain priorities more often found in scientific and postmodern texts than in literary models: specifically, attention to the object in preference to the subject (Roberts, A 2016: 1-2).

Roberts asserts that both Suvin's and Broderick's definitions concentrate on the content of the SF text (2016: 2). Both Suvin's and Broderick's definitions encompass cultural and scientific change, as well as how these changes impact society. However, Samuel Delany declares that SF is a social performance and a semiotic engagement rather than "a vast play of codic conventions" (Roberts, A., 2016: 2). This might mean that society's actions shape the literature, rather than outside influences shaping it.

Besides automatically accepting SF as a genre, there is an argument on whether SF is a genre. In the introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction* (2003), Farah Mendlesohn writes that SF is a mode of discussion rather than a genre (2003: 2). In the book the cause explained as; if SF were to be a genre, we would know the outline of every book that we picked up (James, E & Mendlesohn, F., 2003: 2). This standpoint is significant because it provides that SF, as a genre, does not have rigid lines to be drawn. SF can provide a broader range of imagination. Therefore, SF could be a more liberal genre.

David Seed explains this freedom excellently in Oxford's *Science Fiction: A Very Short Introduction* (2011). He further improves on this idea by claiming that calling SF a genre is problematic because, among its products, there is not a union; it is more of a mode or a field that contains different genres and subgenres (2011: 1).

Orson Scott Card presents a distinct perspective. He takes a different view on separating genres. He declares that publishers 'slap' these genre etiquettes in order for bookstore owners to put books on shelves more easily (1990: 5). Genre labelling might be restrictive for both readers and writers. Because when rigid lines are drawn for a genre, both writers and readers may expect certain elements. However, this is against the idea of SF's freedom and speculation.

While this debate is never-ending, it is essential to establish a definition, as this open-ended discussion may not come to a close. To conclude, it might be said that it is a cultural discourse which involves different views of the world that are distinct from the real world (Roberts, A. 2016: 2). Furthermore, a last opinion to be considered on the SF definition may be Hugo Gernsback's definition. Hugo Gernsback is a pivotal figure in the

SF genre, which will be discussed further in the upcoming sections. Gernsback defines SF as an important aspect of SF in the first edition of *Amazing Stories* magazine. Hugo Gernsback initially names 'scientifiction' and defines this type of story as those of H.G. Wells, Jules Verne, and Edgar Allan Poe, which are charming romances intertwined with scientific facts (1926: 3). These three writers are especially important for SF. The reason for this will be explored in the upcoming sections.

Considering these definitions and the primary concern of this thesis, H.G. Wells and *The War of the Worlds*, it may be helpful to construct a definition. The various definitions mentioned above share common themes. These themes would be an alternate world based on objective scientific evidence, with a touch of imagination and fantasy. Crafting these stories also includes technology, which is the sister of science. Science fiction speculates on aliens, as in the case of *The War of the Worlds*, time, the Earth itself and so on. It speculates; however, these speculations are not vague and without a foundation. SF as a genre feeds itself from the latest developments in science and technology. Therefore, SF creates stories which might become true someday. For instance, the cylinder that the Martians use to come to Earth might be seen as rockets of modern times. Another one would be the Martians' weapon, a heat-ray that resembles a laser greatly. Considering these, before the invention of rockets and lasers, Wells predicted what might become a reality.

To broaden one's understanding of SF and its definition, one must know its history, themes, and motifs to construct one's version of the definition.

1.2 History of Science Fiction

There are arguments about when SF as a genre started and what its very first examples would be. For some critics and scholars, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) might be one of the first written examples of SF, which will be explored in upcoming sections. There is a consensus on the starting points for SF, with one in the late 19th century and the other in the early 20th century. However, works from the Renaissance or the early 19th century demonstrate techniques closer to SF. Therefore, they might be called 'proto-SF' (Seed, D. 2011: 3). Proto-SF are pieces that were written before the late 19th century. These are called 'proto-SF' because even if they do not demonstrate the full characteristics of contemporary SF, they have paved the way for our modern understanding of SF. A notable example of this is Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), in which

the author describes an ideal society in which to live. It is indeed speculation, and this aspect of SF has persisted since then.

If one were to read an SF narrative, they would realise that it is indeed speculative. The speculation may concern the Earth itself or extraterrestrial subjects that interact with humans and/or the Earth. One of the earliest specimens for speculations may be 'utopia' narratives. Etymologically, the term "Utopia" originates from ancient Greek. *Eutopos* means 'good place' while *outopos* means 'no place'. Thomas More is credited with first constructing the word 'Utopia,' which was influenced by these words (Levitas, R., 2010, p. 191). Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516) presents an idealised vision of humanity's future. Generally, people tend to think of utopias as an ideal place. Additionally, Thomas More's work has been a pinnacle book and a beacon for SF (Roberts, A., 2016: 42). Similarly, juxtaposing words to construct sentences, early speculative fiction helped shape modern SF. They were ladder steps to reach the ultimate destination.

However, in the 17th and 18th centuries, authors began to write speculative fiction using scientific and technological advancements. As a product, the concept of 'utopian fantasy' has emerged, which is characterised by imaginary voyages (James, E., & Mendlesohn, F., 2003: 15). By utilising scientific and technological advancements up to that point, human imagination explored the unknown using new information. Even if they might not be one hundred per cent scientifically accurate, they sparked a lot more possibilities in the human mind. Speculation about the unknown depths of the Earth and the exploration of them was a popular idea. Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* (1627) and Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) are great examples of utopian fantasy. Moreover, since it is speculative, "[l]anguage is not trustworthy in sf: metaphor becomes literal" (James, E., & Mendlesohn, F., 2003: 5). Because metaphors can potentially become real.

These narratives are harvests of cumulative information deposited over the years. As the genre's name is 'science' fiction, there must be scientists to broaden the possibilities and help humanity to exceed their imagination. Three names are often highlighted when discussing 17th-century science. These are Copernicus, Bruno, and Kepler. Some even go further, claiming that if it were not for Copernicus, modern SF would cease to exist (Roberts, A., 2016: 51). Therefore, it is an undeniable fact that SF, as a genre, needs materials to produce end-products. These materials represent scientific and technological advancements that have been made throughout human history.

However, writers reduced these scientific advancements to a single aspect, while social, political, and religious topics remained at the centre (James, E., & Mendlesohn, F., 2003: 15). Nevertheless, scientific and technological progress was limited. To realise their dreams, writers in the 17th and 18th centuries used phantasmagorical objects on pen and paper to make their dreams possible, such as interplanetary voyages (James, E., & Mendlesohn, F., 2003: 16). By phantasmagorical objects, it means that uncanny objects that do what is not expected of them. These would be the mirror in *Snow White* (1937) or the wands in *Harry Potter* (2001). These objects' primary functions are not what they are used for. Therefore, writers of SF used these fantastical objects to realise their dream of an interplanetary voyage. During the 17th century, travelling to another planet in the universe was complex and nearly impossible.

Since it was a relatively newer genre that relied on cumulative scientific and technological information, there were few examples of SF until the late 19th century. Until the formation of the standard SF 'formula', the works that have been considered as SF were lecturing and descriptive (James, E., & Mendlesohn, F., 2003: 3). One of the primary motivations for being descriptive and informative was trying to teach science to the readers. A reason for this informativeness was wonder. Humanity wonders about things, and thus, early SF was informative. Its mode was a sense of wonder, which was the fuel of SF (James, E., & Mendlesohn, F., 2003: 3).

Given these, the SF genre as we know it today, or 'modern SF', can be traced back to the 19th century. As mentioned before, utopian fantasies and *Frankenstein* (1818)[3] might be close to SF as it is known, but they are not. Famous American poet and author Edgar Allan Poe is a key figure for modern SF. Edgar Allan Poe was the first to experiment with the science fiction method, and his preface became the first manifesto for SF (James, E., & Mendlesohn, F., 2003: 18-19). Even though Poe is known for his gothic tales, a good portion of his works are SF, and these are some of his very best works (Roberts, A. 2016: 138). There is a debate about who is the source of modern SF, between Mary Shelley and Edgar Allan Poe, between Thomas Disch and Brian Aldiss (Roberts, A., 2016: 138). Either way, it can be concluded that modern SF started in the 19th century.

On the topic of Poe's art, he uses words so that readers get the feeling of SF. For instance, his poem "Al Araaf" (1829) implies saving alien life from the sin of Adam (Roberts, A., 2016: 138). Poe used magic and science together to make SF. However,

[3] Modern historians of SF often locate the origins of British Scientific Romance in this novel (James, E. & Mendlesohn, F. 2003: 19).

another way of creating SF is alternative history. A lesser-known writer, compared to Poe and Shelley, is Louis-Napoléon Geoffrey, who introduced the concept of 'alternate history' to the genre. However, he is not the first to write alternative history (Roberts, A., 2016: 143). Still, among these three, Poe takes the highlight for some reasons that will be explained in the next section.

Edgar Allan Poe takes the spotlight due to his influence on Jules Verne (1828–1905). Jules Verne is considered one of the 'fathers of SF', along with H. G. Wells, by the general public. Thanks to the translation of Poe's poems into French, Jules Verne began to write fiction based on science (James, E., & Mendlesohn, F., 2003: 20). Verne experimented with Poesque[4] short forms and created voyages also known as 'Voyages *extraordinaires'*. However, his voyages were not focused on space, interplanetary, or interstellar, instead, he used contemporary technology and speculated new ones to explore the Earth (James, E & Mendlesohn, F. 2003: 20). However, some critiques claim Jules Verne is not SF writer, instead he is a generic adventure-teller with interesting facts and his works are "mere entertainment" (Roberts, A. 2016: 183). However, his utilisation of contemporary technology and speculation on new ones, based on that day's technology, and his gripping stories about the exploration of the Earth might disprove this thinking. Adam Roberts says:

> Verne's great appeal for readers had to do with the dream he sold them of mobility, imaginatively extrapolated from the present into a near-future where restrictions and incapacities could be removed and new things become possible (2016: 152).

Considering the quotation, humans have indeed sought a better and quicker mode of transportation since the invention of the wheel. Jules Verne's strategy of selling a mobility dream is helpful, especially for those who cannot afford or undertake a journey, as well as for those who cannot embark on impossible journeys. His famous books *Journey to the Centre of the Earth* (1863) and *Twenty Thousand Leagues under the Seas* (1870) demonstrate these. Between these, the former one invoked humanity's desire to explore unknown and new places and has done it on the planet that humanity left. For instance, today, people have more knowledge of the moon than they do of Antarctica. Jules Verne pushed the button that struck a chord with humanity. That button is a wonder, which is the fuel for SF.

[4] Edgar Allan Poe style texts.

On the other hand, in *Thousand Leagues under the Seas*, Verne touches upon technology. He uses contemporary technology, such as submarines, to explore. Therefore, it might be said that Verne directed his readers towards wonder and exploration. As a result, it may be deduced that Jules Verne's works are educational. His works consist not only of journeys through the Earth. He also wrote a book named *Earth to the Moon* (1865), and the title is pretty self-explanatory.

There might be a lot to say about Jules Verne's works. However, to condense and to shorten, it may be said that he excels in writing voyages or in an authentic way of saying *'voyages extraordinaires'*. He made significant contributions to SF as a genre and was one of the key figures in shaping it, alongside H.G. Wells. He and Wells have their differences. When read, the different tones in Verne and Wells are apparent. Verne's narratives are mostly informative and emphasise the good side of technology, whereas Wells' narratives speculated on the bad side of technology and the dangers of it.

Herbert George Wells (1866 – 1946), commonly known as H.G. Wells, is a British writer who is an important figure in SF. He is regarded as one of the fathers of science fiction and may be solely 'the' father of SF. He may not have 'invented' the SF genre, but he nonetheless has a significant role in shaping the genre. His new ideas and narrative techniques make him so important, and Brian Aldiss thinks he is "the Shakespeare of science fiction" (1973: 132). He brought new techniques and established new themes.

Initially, Wells worked as a schoolteacher. While working as a schoolteacher, he began writing scientific journalism and selling articles to journals. To journals, sometimes, he also sent fiction. His article "The Man of the Year Million" was entirely speculative, and he utilised Darwinism[5]. He speculated how humans might evolve in the future (Roberts, A. 2016: 200). Also, critics divide his writing into two: before and after 1914, the former ones are SF and the latter ones are non-fiction and journalism (Roberts, A. 2016: 201).

Since this dissertation's concern is the first part of his writings. Although there are his predecessors, it was not until H.G. Wells that anyone tried new, he was the one explored whole range of narrative framework (James, E. & Mendlesohn, F. 2003: 24). His very first novel *The Time Machine* (1895) was a pioneering work for SF (Aldiss, B.W. 1973: 115). Also, the idea of a 'time machine' and the term are indeed coined by H.G. Wells himself (Pilkington, A.C. 2017: 137). Brian Aldiss claims that "Wells proved

[5] In this case, it mentions Charles Darwin's theory of evolution which can be further studied in his own material named *Origin of Species* (1859).

himself the great originator of science fictional ideas" (1973: 117). James and Mendlesohn believe that Wells's time machine marked the beginning of a series of enabling devices, which allowed for a more rational exploration of the distant realms of time and space. This exploration had previously been greatly hindered by outdated narrative frameworks (2003: 24).

The critical invention of the time machine opened windows that made possible a whole different set of narrative devices. By interpreting these alone, it may be deduced that H.G. Wells is indeed the father of Science Fiction. For instance, in *The Time Machine* (1895), Wells uses Darwinian thinking to imagine how the proletariat, depicted as 'Morlocks', and the upper classes, described as 'Eloi', might evolve. By doing this, he brings a new breath to the genre and helps shape it (Roberts, A., 2016: 202).

H.G. Wells experimented with new literary techniques and introduced them to the literary world. An example of Wells's bringing new literary techniques is his third publication, "The Chronic Argonauts" (1888). In this piece, he replaced the dreams as a gadget to discover possibilities (James, E. & Mendlesohn, F. 2003: 24). Wells established new methods for modern SF by using the narrative technique he developed in *The Time Machine* (1895) and adding melodrama powerfully like no one have done ever before and creating a moral narrative framework (James, E. & Mendlesohn, F. 2003: 25). *The Island of Dr Moreau* (1896), *The Invisible Man* (1897), and *The War of the Worlds* (1898) are all "moral fables" that convince its readers central devices are logical by cleverly using narrative (James, E & Mendlesohn, F 2003: 25).

His inventions in narrative techniques encouraged other writers who were enthusiastic about writing action-adventure fiction with a more gorgeous manner than naturalistic fiction would ever allow (James, E & Mendlesohn, F. 2003: 25). As James and Mendlesohn states "Wells imported such powerful narrative energy and sturdy conviction into his works that he transformed the methodology of speculative fiction, with almost instantaneous effect" (2003: 25). He nearly defined the genre on his own.

There is certainly much to discuss regarding H.G. Wells. However, the most crucial part is that he might have single-handedly shaped a whole new genre before it was even depicted and described. *The War of the Worlds* (1898) holds great value, and it will be scrutinised in detail in upcoming chapters.

1.2.1 After Wells

The post-Wells era is indeed when SF as a genre formed, defined, and established by Hugo Gernsback,[6] as mentioned in the first section. Exotic pulp fiction was the one that helped Hugo Gernsback to invent 'scientifiction', a new genre (James, E & Mendlesohn, F. 2003: 30). "It was from this point that the collaborative work of horizon-expansion, social extrapolation and moral resophistication which has been the labour and triumph of modern science fiction began anew" as James and Mendlesohn point out (2003: 31). After these events, a new genre should have been named.

This era, between 1926 and 1960, is called the magazine era, where SF pieces were published in pulp magazines[7]. Gernsback founded the first SF magazine, *Amazing Stories,* first published in April 1926. Important SF stories were published in this magazine. E.E. Smith's *The Skylark of Space* (1928) introduced the concept of space opera. Wells's *The Invisible Man* (1897) was serialised in the magazine in 1927. This introduced H.G. Wells to a broader audience, especially the American audience. Gernsback's magazine was the first to limit its stories to scientific extrapolation, and it defined the genre by initially calling it 'scientifiction'. However, the term 'science fiction' began to be used in 1929 (James, E. & Mendlesohn, F. 2003: 33). This change was due to several reasons. First, the 'science fiction' term is more convenient than 'scientifiction'. Science fiction is simpler and clearer. Second, science fiction was gaining popularity among readers. Lastly, changing the name makes it appealing to a broader audience because 'scientifiction' feels more complex. During and following this period, much of what defines science fiction is widely recognised, including notable authors like Isaac Asimov. Naturally, as technology has evolved, science fiction has transitioned from the written form to visual media. As of February 2025, 'sci-fi' films surpass the written SF in popularity. Furthermore, as the genre evolved, some themes and motifs have been concurrent. The following section will briefly scrutinise themes and motifs in SF.

1.3 Themes and Motifs in Science Fiction

When read carefully, it is hard to miss concurrent themes and motifs in science fiction. The most common of these themes and motifs are voyages, aliens, technology, utopias, and dystopias; however, they are not restricted to these.

---

[6] There is a Science Fiction award to his name, 'Hugo Awards'

[7] The term 'pulp magazine' comes from its material. Its papers are made of cheaper wooden material.

Although the first theme this thesis will discuss is not directly related to the novel, the voyage theme is an essential motif in SF. It is especially seen in Jules Verne and his '*voyage extraordinaires'*. These stories are the keystone for the voyage theme in SF, and these narratives are not set in the future but explore our globe. They are educative (Seed, D. 2011: 8). "Imaginary explorations in early SF use three main settings: the Earth itself, near space, and the interior of the Earth" (Seed, D. 2011: 8), and this explains hollow earth narratives. Hollow Earth theories and narratives originated in the late 19th century, stemming from John Cleves Symmes' theories that the Earth has openings at both poles (Seed, D., 2011, p. 8). These hollow Earth narratives speculated on new species, such as the Morlocks in H.G. Wells' *The Time Machine* (1895). There are many sub-themes under this category; however, one prominent sub-theme is 'space opera'. As hollow earth theories emerged towards the end of the 19th century, another sub-theme occurred with the pinnacle of the British Empire. SF began to have space opera and combine it with the exploration aspect of SF, and it produced a space opera sub-theme with star wars[8] (Seed, D. 2011: 12). This also paved the way for alien narratives.

Another theme is aliens and alien encounters related to the novel. For instance, people in *The War of the Worlds* encounter aliens in their rocket-like vehicles.

> As science fiction boomed in the pulp magazines, thanks to Hugo Gernsback's founding of Amazing Stories and his imitators' successes in creating a sciencefiction market, stories of aliens became the genre's common fare, alongside superscience tales, what-if yarns, space operas, and robot stories (Levy, M.M. & Mendlesohn, F. 2019: 6).

One key 'what-if-yarn' is aliens, more precisely, extraterrestrial beings. SF questions the notion of identity by using alien encounters and, aliens need not to be extraterrestrial being, it might be very well underground workers from *The Time Machine* (1895) or zombified workers from *Metropolis* (1927, dir. Fritz Lang) and this way SF aims to make people question their own identity with confrontation to other (Seed, D. 2011: 27). "The very term 'alien' suggests otherness and difference. The aliens in science fiction are always imagined through reference to familiar human groups, animal species, or machines" (Seed, D. 2011: 28). Humanity harbours biases regarding the appearance of aliens.

[8] Should not be confused with the popular franchise Star Wars.

Humanity tends to think of aliens as humanoid figures. However, it does not have to be that way. For instance, H.G. Wells's *The First Men in the Moon* (1901) depicts a non-humanoid alien (Seed, 2011: 30). A complementary theme to aliens is invasion. Following World War II, alien encounters became increasingly invasive and threatening, and the paramount issue in alien invasion is survival (Seed, D., 2011, pp. 31, 39). Sympathetic aliens, such as those depicted in the movie *E.T.* (1984, dir. Steven Spielberg), also exist alongside threatening ones.

The history of the alien theme is also fascinating. According to some Islamic and Christian scholars, God has created many Earths, implying that there are many kinds of humans and animals in each world (Levy, M.M. & Mendlesohn, F. 2019: 4). One of the most well-known examples of a pre-modern alien is Lucian Samasota's *True History*, released in the 2nd century AD (Levy, M.M. & Mendlesohn, F. 2019: 3). Nonetheless, "it is with Wells that the alien emerged, or at least became recognizable, as a potent generic trope for addressing themes of alterity, difference, and the other in science fiction" (Levy, M.M. & Mendlesohn, F. 2019: 5), further emphasising Wells's significance.

Another aspect and theme of SF is its association with technology, due to its promotion in the early 20th century to some extent (Seed, D. 2011: 47). Concerning this, one of the most concurrent themes is humanity and its relation to its creation—sometimes in a good way, sometimes, as Isaac Asimov asserts, 'technophobia', in a bad way (Seed, D. 2011: 47).

The last topic this section and chapter will address is the motif of Mars. As a planet, Mars is the closest planet to ours, along with Venus. Due to its closeness, it has always been on the scope. Mars has long been a subject of speculation due to its relative obscurity. Thus, humans reflected their speculations, dreams, or fears towards the rocky planet. For instance, in Roman mythology, Mars is the God of war. This belief shaped narratives and other things. In astrology, Mars, as a planet, embodies the traits of the Roman god Mars and reflects characteristics seen in the Sailor Mars character from the *Sailor Moon* series (1992-1997, created by Naoko Takeuchi). These are just brief explanations of how humanity imagined the planet Mars. In the upcoming chapters, the exploration of aliens and Mars will be further developed and explored in more depth.

CHAPTER TWO
ECOPOLITICS

This chapter will delve into ecopolitics, though not as the sole focal point. Ecopolitics can be defined as a discipline that examines the right to exist of both organic and inorganic entities. The chapter will commence with a thorough analysis of ecopolitics, supporting this literary exploration with insights from ecocriticism and biopolitics, both of which are closely related to ecopolitics. It may be reasonable to assert that ecopolitics serves as a synthesis of these two theories, as both ecocriticism and biopolitics address political dimensions.

2.1 Ecopolitics

Ecopolitics is a discipline that studies the politics of/on the environment. Verena Andermatt Conley claims that ecopolitics "is a study of environmental awareness (or non-awareness) in contemporary French theory. The renewed attention brought to the environment, at the heart of political debates in industrialized nations, reaches back to an intellectual climate that was born in the late 1950s but grew exponentially in the 1960s" (Conley, V. A. 1997: 1). Moreover, Imanaka asserts ecopolitics could "appear to bring together the world of ecology with that of politics. Since both fields encompass many subdisciplines that already intersect, ecopolitics converges with concepts, frameworks and paradigms like environmental ethics, environmental justice, environmental democracy, deep ecology, ecofeminism, and political ecology" (Tripathi, S. et al. 2023:2). More or less, 'ecopolitics' can be assumed as interfering of politics towards the environment and its health.

Initially, it is a must to decide on the concept of the state. Briefly and in a basic way, states are mechanisms that a group of people constructs. Society grants states the power to protect their citizens. The basic idea behind a state is that people pay taxes, obey the rules, and serve as law enforcement officers or soldiers in exchange for security, services, and other benefits. It is a mutual contract between the society and the sovereign. The sovereign might be a monarch or a president. Since humans began to settle into agricultural life, they started living in groups. These groups constructed villages, and their

growth led to the development of cities. Since they were not living in small groups or tribes, humanity needed rulers. Otherwise, there would be entropy. People gave their agrarian produce or paid taxes to kings or sultans. In modern times, society attributes the power to the sovereign in taxes and state apparatuses. There is an unseen contract between the population and the sovereign. The power is inside the population. The society is comprised of soldiers or police. They are the enforcers and the coterie that is given power and governs them accordingly. "Governors are always reflections of the public, whether they are good or bad, heroic or cruel[9]" (Petrov, G. 2024: 6). Therefore, it would not be wrong to say that wars or cruelty to either other humans or nature are society's constructs. There are instances where states oppress their subjects. However, the main power is still subject to the population, and they can break the wall, e.g. the French Revolution. Nonetheless, the new form of state may still be the same, with a nuance. The new regime might still be suppressive; however, this time, according to the subjects of the new regime. Herein, Foucault is proved right. Sovereign, or state, controls the population with biopolitics; however, it is what society constructed in the first place. Apart from Foucault's and Agamben's definitions, it would be beneficial to explore the ideas of other thinkers to gain a comprehensive understanding of the state and be exposed to diverse perspectives on the subject.

Max Weber defines state as: "[A] state is a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory" (2014: 2). Closer to Weber's definition, Anthony Giddens explains a state as: "[A] state can be defined as a political organization whose rule is territorially ordered and which is able to mobilize the means of violence to sustain that rule" (1985: 20). Furthermore, Charles Tilly claims that a state is "an organization that controls the major concentration of coercive means within a substantial territory, exercises priority in some regards over all other organizations operating within the same territory, and receives acknowledgment of that priority from other organizations, including states, outside the territory." (2017: 186).

Considering these opinions, it may be deduced that a state is constructed in a particular area and territory where it exercises power to rule its subjects. However, it can also be inferred that a state, especially a modern one, tends to be exclusionist. It excludes

[9] This quotation is translated by Soner Güven from *Beyaz Zambaklar Ülkesinde* which is written by Grigori Petrov. English name is *Finland, the country of white lilies* and the original Serbian name is *Зидари живота.*

other people who are not subjects of that specific state. Therefore, they may decide whom to live or die. In other words, states can create their own 'bare' and 'sacred' life, and by life, it should not mean only human life. Here, it is beneficial to examine various definitions of life.

Various philosophers, literary critics, and authors wrote about life. Because deciding on life is sophisticated, it is hard for the human mind to comprehend because it is an abstract concept. Aristotle states: "[B]y life I mean both nutrition through itself and growth and decline" (qtd. in Polansky, R. 2007: 171). Ronald Polansky also comments on Aristotle's ideas on life. "[U]nlike many of his predecessors who limit life to animals, and thus restrict it to beings that have awareness, Aristotle extends life to plants. The self-motion involved in growth and nutrition, and even better the self-preservation of such beings, suffices for life," claims Polansky. (2007: 28). This interpretation is critical because humanity tends to see life and give value to life when life is about either humanity or humanity's favourable animals or in other words, animate or inanimate. Immanuel Kant declares:

> [W]e may adduce the transcendental hypothesis that all life is properly intelligible, and not subject to changes of time, and that it neither began in birth, nor will end in death. We may assume that this life is nothing more than a sensuous representation of pure spiritual life; that the whole world of sense is but an image, hovering before the faculty of cognition which we exercise in this sphere, and with no more objective reality than a dream; and that if we could intuite ourselves and other things as they really are, we should see ourselves in a world of spiritual natures, our connection with which did not begin at our birth and will not cease with the destruction of the body (1855: 250-251).

Kant does not reduce life to a simple concept; life is comprised of multiple elements. In his book, Davide Tarizzo explores and comments on three aspects of modern life.

> The basic properties of life in the modern world are three. Life appears as the individuation of an unfathomable Self: this means that life individuates itself in forms whereby the force of the Self, otherwise amorphous, constantly forges itself. Life results in a furious struggle for life: this means that life manifests itself in forms-of-life, but there isn't a form-of-life that can contain the savage force-of-life and can domesticate its intensity once and for all. Life is kept alive by our will to health: this means that the living being always tends to seal and to heal the—unbridgeable—gap between its generic force-of-life and its specific form-of-life. If life as such is a force that exceeds every form, a potentiality

> that exceeds every actuality, then life can live through itself only by consuming all living beings (2017: 54).

Indeed, the definitions of states and life are necessary to comprehend ecopolitics more effectively.

Historically, many critics locate the origin of this discipline in Rachel Carson's Silent Spring (1962). Carson's book is groundbreaking in terms of ecological studies in general because it is a scientific book rather than a fictional or literary book. Rachel Carson manages to do this by drawing attention to the use of pesticides—specifically DDT—highlighting the industrial capitalism and its use of chemicals, especially in agriculture, as well as the arrogance of humanity, and the disturbance to the natural world's equilibrium. In the beginning, she tremendously exemplifies the destruction of the natural world by narrating a 'fable' named 'A Fable for Tomorrow' which describes an imaginary American town with a fascinating natural beauty. The town is renowned for its natural beauty and harmony; humans come to appreciate this beauty only to eventually destroy it (Carson, R. 1962: 1-3). It is inferred from this brief story that humans, either intentionally or unintentionally, are compelled to destroy nature due to their natality. This might be explained by evolutionary situations or humanity's desire to be 'the' master on the Earth, which results in partial 'mastering'. Moreover, this 'mastering of the natural world' brings its consequences not only for humans but also towards animals and plants as well.

Carson explains this ambitious and self-harming activity of humanity through the use of chemicals and chemical agriculture, but it is not the only one. Throughout the second quarter of the 20th century, 'man', with their acquired power, which can alter nature, not only changed characteristically, but also became disturbing. The most alarming manifestation of this is the assault against nature in forms of "contamination of air, earth, rivers, and sea with dangerous and even lethal materials" (Carson, R. 1962: 5-6). By contamination, an educated guess via Carson's mind, it might be meant the emission of 'unnatural' elements and products and the contamination of these onto nature. It is known that humanity, during and after the Industrial Revolution, started to produce 'artificial' abundancy of some specific elements and molecules, also inventing synthetic elements like 'californium' or utilisation of radioactive elements, such as enrichment of 'uranium', for other purposes that is harmful to both humans and natural world. Correspondingly, disruption of the harmony of nature, the 'organic' world, is confronted by 'pollution'. It manifested itself as higher CO2, microplastics, and a garbage patch in

the Pacific Ocean. Pollution harms both ‘unnatural’ and ‘inorganic’ vicinity, and “pollution is for the most part irrecoverable; the chain of evil it initiates not only in the world that must support life but in living tissues is for the most part irreversible” (ibid., 6). Carson further claims that the chemicals that occur naturally are no longer abundant. They are suppressed by “the synthetic creations of man’s inventive mind, brewed in his laboratories, and having no counterparts in nature” (ibid., 7). A prominent symbol for this is plastics, which are made from petroleum, a byproduct of fossil fuels, and are paradoxically derived from the remains of dinosaurs. These non-organic materials are artificial and decompose in 20 to 500 years, depending on the type of plastic.

Rachel Carson approaches this problem from the perspective of pesticides, considering that plastic was not a significant ecological issue in the 1960s. It is understandable. She declares that humanity’s war against nature has created 200 basic chemicals, a number based on the year 1962, which would be false for 2025, and these are created to kill insects, weeds, and rodents (ibid., 7). Indeed, the widespread use of DDT, especially its public availability, created its vicious cycle. As the Darwinian idea of the survival of the fittest declares, organisms develop immunity against pesticides. To further eliminate unwanted creatures, a more deadly chemical had to be created. Therefore, “the chemical war is never won, and all life is caught in its violent crossfire” (ibid., 8). On the other hand, a contemporary example of this is the damage caused by plastics and microplastics, which harm both nature and humanity. Apart from acknowledged and overt dangers it poses, such as sea animals consuming plastics or being tangled in it, it also poses a hazard to human health. In 2022, scientists discovered microplastics in human blood for the first time (Carrington, 2022). As the hazards are recognised, necessary actions might not be taken.

Carson explains this by the collaboration of the corporate and government sectors. “It is also an era dominated by industry, in which the right to make a dollar at whatever cost is seldom challenged” (ibid., 13). What can be surmised from this excerpt is that Carson alleges the industry and government are ignoring scientific facts to gain profits. Considering Carson’s claim, it is hard not to agree, particularly given the monetisation of natural resources. She declares, “[i]t is not my contention that chemical insecticides must never be used. I do contend that we have put poisonous and biologically potent chemicals indiscriminately into the hands of persons largely or wholly ignorant of their potentials for harm” (ibid., 12). Hence, both the industry and the government must collaborate with science to achieve the optimum result. Her views paved the way for the study of ecology.

Verena Andermatt Conley approaches the issue of ecology from a structuralist view; since structuralism is beyond the scope and concern of this work, it will not be explored further. Conley asserts that the understanding of dominating nature with science and technology is linked to domination of nature as well as domination of women "[b]ut domination of nature also equals 'progress.' And it is that very 'progress' that both enabled and impeded the emancipation of women in the Occident" (Conley, V. A. 1997: 35). Structuralism decentres humans and as a result, it champions ecology and Claude Lévi-Strauss asserts that nothing is thanks to the humans nature existed before humans and will most likely exist after humans (ibid., 36). A rationale for 'domination' might be 'culture versus nature'. It might be said that every cultural organisation is built upon myths, and some myths are more destructive than constructive for humans (ibid., 36). "Against Sartre and his "philosophy of man" that separates nature from culture, Lévi-Strauss reminds his audience that the homo sapiens is but a 'living species' and, in Rousseauesque fashion ("my freedom is limited by that of my neighbor"), adds that it has no right to extinguish another species for its own profit" (ibid., 37). Levi-Strauss believes that the lives and ways of living of humans are ethical concerns, and humans should expand their space to other humans, animals, and plants to live (ibid., 37).

Moreover, Strauss claims that the grand declarations about human rights in 1776, 1789, and 1793 served 'historical needs' for those times. Nonetheless, in contemporary times, it is essential to establish rights for nature (ibid., p. 41). Despite several technological advancements, humans remain tied to nature, and Lévi-Strauss asserts that it should not be a matter of 'nature versus culture,' meaning there should not be an opposition between them (ibid., pp. 42-43). Adding human nature to the debate, ecopolitics and biopolitics can be applied.

Jessica Ludescher Imanaka, in her chapter of the book Eco-Politics and Global Climate Change (2023), construct the idea of merging these two disciplines. Imanaka declares that both fields encompass numerous interrelated subtopics. Ecopolitics merges frameworks such as environmental ethics, environmental justice, environmental democracy, deep ecology, ecofeminism, and political ecology (Tripathi, S. et al. 2023: 2). In the 1990s, Paul Rutherford articulated a relation of Foucauldian biopolitics for environmental governmentality in connection with ecopolitics (ibid., 2). In the early 2000s, Andrée and Hindmarsh started to apply ecopower to the analysis of the politics of genetically modified organisms (ibid., 2). Later, Pasetti extended biopolitics to planetary governmentality and neo-liberalism and the 'eco-governmentality' term was developed

by Malette (ibid., 2). Furthermore, “scholars have explored the interconnections between biopolitics, ecopolitics and geopolitics via the concept of ‘border environments’ in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic and issues related to migration and climate change (Banerjee, 2021). Cadalen (2023) has retheorized Foucault’s notion of biopower (Foucault, 1990) as ecopower, understood as a new form of sovereignty generating the Anthropocene” (ibid., 3). To finalise, “[i]n its most negative manifestation, a framework of ecopolitics would devolve into pure technocratic management of life systems for the benefit of powerful parties at the expense of vulnerable beings (human and nonhuman)” (ibid., 22).

When thought thoroughly, life cannot be defined firmly. Whether animate or inanimate, life is life. Moreover, appraising life is political. As stated earlier, humans altered their lands for their benefit. While humans view cows, cats, dogs, and birds as friendly and refrain from killing them, snakes, scorpions, and mosquitoes are often viewed as pests and are easily killed. Because the latter group does not benefit humans, while the former group does. Furthermore, the line that life is sacred, and which one is not, is drawn politically. For instance, humanity uses and cuts down trees to produce various products. In exchange for deforestation, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere rise, which is harmful to living beings on the planet, including humans. However, humans plant trees primarily for their benefit, not for the benefit of animals or plants. Because in the anthropocentric view, humanity is the sacred life. They imbalance the environment and try to rebalance for themselves.

Another key point in ecology is politics, the policies of Russia and the USA. As of March 2025, the President of the United States, Donald Trump, has withdrawn the country from the Paris Agreement. On the other hand, Russia has no policy to reduce CO2 emissions. Meanwhile, China is trying to reforest the Gobi Desert.

2.2 Ecocriticism

Ecocriticism has been a subject of study since the 1990s. Although ecological, environmental, and natural notions and problems have been relevant throughout human history, ecological studies in literature relatively began late. Even if ecology, nature, or environmental issues seem related to physical sciences, literature might talk about these. Cheryll Glotfelty briefly defines ecocriticism as “[s]imply put, ecocriticism is the study of the relationship between literature and the physical environment” (1996: xviii). A good illustration of Glotfelty’s ideas can be found in Henry David Thoreau’s *Walden* (1854).

In his article named "Thoreau's Ecocriticism: An Improved Means to Unimproved Ends", Vipin Sharma explores the pragmatic relationship between humans and nature (2017). Proportionately, it might be said that ecocriticism is a political movement and critique, resembling Marxism and Feminism (Glotfelty, C. & Fromm, H. 1996: xviii; Garrard, G. 2012: 3). Ecocriticism is openly a political criticism and ecocritics tie their cultural analyses explicitly to a green moral and political agenda (Garrard, G. 2012: 3). In this perspective, "ecocriticism is closely related to environmentally oriented developments in philosophy and political theory" (Garrard, G. 2012: 3-4). Lawrence Buell claims that, similar to racism, environmental crises cannot be restricted to only one discipline; besides the physical sciences, humanities disciplines such as history, philosophy, literature, and the arts are also affected by environmental problems (2005: vi). This may be attributed to the fact that the humanities, especially literature, serve as a mirror of humans' actions and emotions. This addition of politics is evident in Helena María Viramontes's *Under the Feet of Jesus* (1995). The book tells the story of a Mexican American girl whose family works in toxic farm fields. Furthermore, literature may seem irrelevant to ecology studies; however, it is a great tool to understand the human-made world (Gold, B.J. 2021: 3). Moreover, Axel Goodbody defines ecocriticism as

> Ecocritical practitioners typically examine literary, filmic, and other cultural representations of nature, and subject to critical analysis the understandings about humankind's relationship with other species and the natural environment, which they encapsulate (Westling, L. 2014: 61).

The majority of ecocritics analyse the texts as a reflection of the physical environment and human interaction with it (Buell, L. 2005: 30). Even though literature that displays pastoral or natural themes has been produced, it was not until the late 20th century that ecocriticism or a movement that scrutinised the relationship between literature and nature was present. Although ecocriticism and its subjects may seem new, medieval or Renaissance texts can be scrutinised in an environmentally critical way (LeMenager, S. et al. 2011: 8-9). Christopher Marlowe's 1599 poem "The Passionate Shepherd to His Love" is a pastoral poem that depicts nature in a romantic light. However, concurrent nature themes did not pave the way to analyse the 'human vs nature' relationship.

Glotfelty states that if one's knowledge for the outside world were from literary publications in late 20th century, they would think that race, class, and gender were hot topics and problems however, they would not consider "the Earth's life support systems

were under stress" and Glotfelty also notes that environmental studies were present in 1970s in other fields of humanities except for literary studies (1996: xvi). However, there are claims that Joseph Meeker's engagement with Darwin's theory of evolution in a comedic mode might be called the first work for environmental criticism (LeMenager, S. et al. 2011: 2).

Initially, it is helpful to define terms such as ecocriticism and environmental studies. Roughly, ecocriticism is a literary approach for examining how humans interact with ecology and nature, and how their interactions are reflected in literature. Based on this, environmental criticism would be similar, albeit with nuance. It not only includes nature, but also includes the environment constructed by people.

In the mid-1980s, scholars began to collaborate on projects. Frederick O. Waage and Alicia Nitecki are key figures in the beginning of environmental studies in literature. By 1993, ecological literary studies had evolved into a substantial critical school (Glotfelty, C., & Fromm, H., 1996: xvii-xviii).

Early ecocriticism primarily focused on Romantic poetry,[10] wilderness narratives, and nature writing. Recently, however, there has been a noticeable shift towards popular culture artefacts like television, film, scientific literature, and the arts (Garrard, G. 2012: 5). While these items are predominantly from popular culture, Garrard asserts that "the widest definition of the subject of ecocriticism is the study of the relationship of the human and the non-human, throughout human cultural history and entailing critical analysis of the term 'human' itself" (2012: 5). Certainly, once we define 'human', its products ultimately connect to nature.

> Despite the broad scope of inquiry and disparate levels of sophistication, all ecological criticism shares the fundamental premise that human culture is connected to the physical world, affecting it and affected by it. Ecocriticism takes as its subject the interconnections between nature and culture, specifically the cultural artifacts of language and literature. As a critical stance, it has one foot in literature and the other on land; as a theoretical discourse, it negotiates between the human and the nonhuman (Glotfelty, C. & Fromm, H. 1996: xix).

Glotfelty mentions the issue of the subject and object of environmental studies (1996: xix). *Princess Mononoke* (dir. Hayao Miyazaki, 1997) demonstrates these well. The

[10] It mentions Romanticism movement in literature that had occurred against enlightenment age ideas and romantic writers were writing pastoral pieces in an attempt to protest enlightenment era's scientific truths and realism.

anime narrates struggles between industrial expansion and nature; however, it does not portray the sides as black and white. Additionally, Greg Garrard offers his thoughts on the distinction between ecocriticism and its contemporary counterparts, highlighting the unique relationship between ecocriticism and the science of ecology (2012: 5).

Greg Garrard names his book's first chapter 'pollution'. This may imply that depictions of nature or the environment have changed over time. As stated previously, environmental problems were largely ignored until the mid-twentieth century and even later in literary studies. On this matter, Glotfelty asserts that "if we're not part of the solution, we're part of the problem" and claims that harms in nature are the product of humanity and culture (1996: xxi). Additionally, John Passmore proposes a distinction to negotiate the problem and declares problems in ecology are scientific and can be solved by ecological experiments. These problems are features of our society which originate from human actions (Garrard, G. 2012: 6). In this respect, literature cannot solve the ecological problems; however, it can help us pinpoint these problems with the close inspection of the relationship between humans and nature. To describe an environmental problem, it is a must to establish a 'normative' claim about how humanity wishes something to be (Garrard, G. 2012: 6). By 'normative claim' it is meant that expressing how a thing ought to be rather than how it is in reality (Shafer-Landau, R. 2021: 363).

Therefore, the answer to the question of how ecological problems occur is the concept of the 'Anthropocene', which will be examined in the upcoming sections. As Lynn White Jr. gracefully explains, "all forms of life modify their context" (Glotfelty, C. & Fromm, H. 1996: 3). Considering this, how humanity has been modifying its surroundings throughout its evolution is evident. Garrard gives a great example of this:

> 'Weed' is not a botanical classification, it merely denotes the wrong kind of plant in the wrong place. Eliminating weeds is obviously a 'problem in gardening', but defining weeds in the first place requires a cultural, not horticultural, analysis. Likewise 'pollution' is an ecological problem because it does not name a substance or class of substances, but rather represents an implicit normative claim that too much of something is present in the environment, usually in the wrong place (2012: 6).

Even though ecocriticism cannot contribute to resolution of the problems, it can aid to identify and explore or in a way resolve ecological issues in the broader sense (Garrard, G. 2012: 6). Ursula Heise further develops this claim and ecocriticism is not necessarily "remain parasitic upon the natural sciences" it might help diagnose and resolve ecological

problems (Garrard, G. 2012: 13). As expected, solution to the issues such as pollution, global warming, or climate change is task of physical sciences. Nevertheless, environmental problems require both cultural and scientific analysis because they result from the interaction between ecological knowledge and cultural practices (Garrard, G. 2012: 16). The origins of these problems, or the nature versus culture approach, stem from an anthropocentric view.

Anthropocentrism, in other words human-centrism, is a perspective in which *homo sapiens sapiens* are superior to other living organisms on the Earth. Eugene F. Stoermer first coined the term Anthropocene in the 1980s. Roughly, Anthropocene means human-centrism. This signifies that humans are prioritised above all, with human life valued more than animals or plants. It depicts humanity's role of becoming a decision-maker in ecology and geology (Clark, T. 2015: 1). Discussions about the origin of human-centrism focus on either the industrial revolution or extensive agriculture (Clark, T. 2015: 1). 'Extensive agriculture' suggests that humans have shaped the land and its produce by removing undesirable or 'harmful' species. Aldous Huxley discusses humanity's unnatural relationship with nature and its severe repercussions. He recounts how the grassy valley from his childhood has transformed into an unkempt thicket, attributing this change to a decline in the local rabbit population. Interestingly, these rabbits were introduced to the area in 1176 to enhance the protein diet of peasants (Glotfelty, C. & Fromm, H. 1996: 3). This is just a small portion of many other examples and might be comparatively more minor scale effect of homo sapiens' actions.

When history of homo sapiens is inspected, narratives upon human-centric prospect differs throughout different geographies and beliefs. Initially, it is essential to note that humans are not exempt from nature but are certainly part of it. In biology, there are only two primary types of cells: animal and plant cells. So, in the organic realm of the Earth, there is no such thing as 'humans' as it is not distinct from other organic beings. The reason for the division between humanity and other organisms may be culture. During the evolution period of homo sapiens, in the beginning, humans were just like other apes or animals that were trying to thrive and survive. The fact that humans pride themselves on having 'logic' or 'language' does not necessarily make them superior. Other animals have their way of communication, even if it is not something like humans' language, and they have their way of living that has been coded through their genes, just like humans. For instance, mushrooms, neither animals nor plants, have their communication system via the roots beneath the soil. Contemporary evidence of harming

nature is the climate crisis. It is due to the carbon emissions resulting from human activities. Excessive CO2 leads to global warming, which contributes to the climate crisis.

'Natural' connotes what comes from nature organically. Since humans are not from outer space, they are part of nature as well. However, throughout human history, as humans developed culture, they became increasingly alienated from nature, a trend that accelerated significantly after the Industrial Revolution. Therefore, the alienation from nature for humans may have begun with the transition to domestic life. It has probably been a gradual alienation. For example, regarding beliefs, paganism presents a harmonious relationship with nature, valuing a tree or an ant equally to a human being. This balanced perspective is more prevalent in the Eastern sphere than in the Western sphere, which encompasses European and Anglo-American Protestant cultures. Similarly, Native Americans view humanity as a part of nature rather than separate from it.

Alienation from nature and a superiority complex mainly originates from Middle Eastern monotheistic religions, which have shaped European minds. The earliest known literary work, the *Epic of Gilgamesh,* portrays the antagonist as the forest, thereby representing nature (Garrard, G., 2012: 40). The setting of this epic is Sumer, now located in Iraq, which is situated in the same region as Middle Eastern monotheistic religions. Gilgamesh is essential because it is the stage where 'nature vs culture' shows itself. The very first literary work exhibits human-centrism, and undoubtedly, it is a milestone for culture[11]. However, other cultures, such as Aboriginal culture, view nature as a spirit, alive, and intimately related to human identity (Rose, D. B., 1996).

Humanity's first tales indoctrinated people into being dominant in this world, and religious texts are the starting point (Buell, L., 2005: 1-2). However, some claim that these texts were misinterpreted, and 'cultivate' instead of 'dominion' or 'subdue' would be a better word choice (Buell, L. 2005: 2). Whether misinterpreted or not, there is an undeniable fact that humanity has altered the environment in which it lives. The change

[11] A definition of culture should be made. Raymond "Williams suggests three broad definitions. First, culture can be used to refer to 'a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development' (90). We could, for example, speak about the cultural development of Western Europe and be referring only to intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic factors – great philosophers, great artists and great poets. This would be a perfectly understandable formulation. A second use of the word 'culture' might be to suggest 'a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period or a group' (ibid.). Using this definition, if we speak of the cultural development of Western Europe, we would have in mind not just intellectual and aesthetic factors, but the development of, for example, literacy, holidays, sport, religious festivals. Finally, Williams suggests that culture can be used to refer to 'the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity' (ibid.). In other words, culture here means the texts and practices whose principal function is to signify, to produce or to be the occasion for the production of meaning. Culture in this third definition is synonymous with what structuralists and post-structuralists call 'signifying practices'" (Storey, 21).

is for the benefit of humanity. For instance, humans drill through mountains or dig underground for better transportation. They terraform or change the environment they live in for their convenience or sometimes their amusement. “Europeans had been radically modifying their environment for well over a thousand years. Even a cursory look at English Medieval and Renaissance literature makes this clear. For example, consider the issue of plant diversity” (LeMenager, S. et al. 2011: 7). In 1500, there were fewer than 200 nonindigenous species of plant in England, however this count increased to 20.000 in 1700 (LeMenager, S. et al. 2011: 7). Considering this, the terraforming of the Earth by extra-terrestrial beings might be inevitable just like how humans treated their ‘inferiors’, when faced with ‘superiors’ humans might be a subject of their transformation of the environment. “Environments are ’timescapes,’ to use Buell’s term, reshaped over and over through various durations” (LeMenager, S. et al. 2011: 12).

This gradual change of environment might be the reason for alienation from nature alongside mechanisation and industrialisation. Slowly becoming alien to nature may plant the seed for a contemporary understanding of ‘man vs nature’. By ‘man vs nature’, it is meant that humanity is fighting against the natural world instead of staying harmonious. In the dominant Euro-American culture, humans are distinguished from nature as well as opposed to it and feel human superior to nature (Garrard, G. 2012: 28). Furthermore, philosopher Descartes ‘hyperseparated mind and body and denied animals. He thought animals were inferior to humans (Garrard, G. 2012: 28). ‘Hyperseperated’ was coined by Val Plumwood to criticise Descartes and other Enlightenment philosophers. These philosophers drew rigid boundaries and asserted the idea that humans are above or outside nature (Plumwood, V. 1993). According to this, Anthropocene in Euro-American culture can be comprehended.

Christianity is one of the most important, if not ‘the’ most important, aspect of Western civilisation. Christianity is in contrast with paganism and established the duality of man and nature and further insisted the idea that God’s will is man’s exploitation of nature (Garrard, G. 2012: 42). For non-Christian regions, even if some may still believe that humans are not superior to other living beings, due to colonisation or globalisation, the ‘man vs nature’ thought has spread. Still, it would be wise to consider that humans are not above all, and this manifests in natural disasters. It is instinctual for Homo sapiens to eliminate other species; they do this to ensure their survival. However, when Lynn White Jr. said, “man and nature are two things, and man is master” (Glotfelty, C, &

Fromm, H., 1996: 8), he was wrong. The concept of superiority is rooted in culture, which encompasses literature.

SF as a genre has taken a long time to earn respect from ecocritics. However, it has changed thanks to literary studies' increasing interest in popular culture even though many of them still thinks SF is "pop stuff, not serious stuff" (Buell, L. 2005: 56). Nonetheless, SF for over a century has taken a good amount of interest in ecology, planetary endangerment, in environmental ethics, and humans' relationship to non-human subjects (Buell, L. 2005: 56). SF speculates in ways that it can make educated guesses about humanity and their future. Therefore, the SF genre is indeed a great ground to scrutinise ecocriticism. Buell puts it as this: "No genre potentially matches up with a planetary level of thinking 'environment' better than science fiction does" (2005: 57). To some extent, ecocriticism has shifted its angle from an anthropocentric view to a more biocentric one (Baratta, C. 2012: 2). A biocentric view means giving equal value to all biological beings. Therefore, SF is a great tool to utilise thanks to its speculative characteristics. "Ecocriticism urges us to embrace the fact that the study of the nonhuman world is just as important a study of the human world when we investigate current social and cultural constructs of civilization" (Baratta, C. 2012: 2). Along with fantasy, science fiction has been one of the beneficiaries of the emergence of ecocriticism which urges people to embrace newer thoughts about natural world and relationship between homo sapiens and nature (Baratta, C. 2012: 2-3). Like any other literary work, an ecocritical work should demand a reader to understand its theoretical pillars besides invoking them to envision their possible twisted points of view (Baratta, C. 2012: 3). To achieve this, an ecocritical piece must do two things: to make reader realise about the connection between them and nature as well as remove them from man/nature binary discourse (Baratta, C. 2012: 3). Science fiction and fantasy literature have been achieving this task for almost a century and occurrence of ecocriticism has highlighted the importance of SF and fantasy (Baratta, C. 2012: 3). Indeed, a prominent illustration of this is H.G. Wells's *The War of the Worlds* (1898).

> And, since science fiction writing can be dystopian in nature, we can see— through the power of allegory—into the future: we can see what could happen if we succumb to the dangerous and reckless behaviors of our current anthro-dominated commodification and destruction of the natural world (Baratta, C. 2012: 5).

Baratta excellently explains how science fiction can serve as a meditation on the future of nature, the Earth, and humanity. An aspect of SF is speculation, and it can be used as 'climate fiction'. A great example of this is Margaret Atwood's *Oryx and Crake* (2003). The books tell of a post-apocalyptic world when a human experiment goes wrong and almost kills the entire human population.

So far, 'nature', 'eco' and 'environment' have been used as intertwined terms. However, it might be helpful to differentiate these terms. Lawrence Buell asserts that initially, 'ecocriticism' invokes shallow nature worshippers, and it cannot be applied today. He also believes that changing the discourse to 'environment' is necessary because 'environment' suggests a fusion of nature and constructed elements (2005: viii). He further asserts that "'environmental criticism' somewhat better captures the interdisciplinary mix of literature-and-environment studies" (Buell, L. 2005: viii), and it is indeed true. Nature and ecology evoke non-human places or things, such as forests, seas, or jungles. However, the environment captures all. Since not only is nature being harmed, but also cities where humans live. Therefore, it may be better to use 'environmental criticism' as it encompasses the entire living environment. Environmentalism in literary studies has been issue-driven rather than paradigm-driven and this is the reason why the term 'ecocriticism' is less inclusive than 'environmental criticism' or 'literary-environmental-studies' (Buell, L. 2005: 11). A further reason to stay on terminology issue is that the term 'eco' connotes the natural rather than the 'built' environment (Buell, L. 2005: 12). Etymologically, ecology term originates in Greek 'oikos', in modern usage it means the study of biological interrelationships and the flow of energy through organisms and inorganic matter and metaphorically, it might mean 'energy exchange and interconnection' (Buell, L. 2005: 13).

Like feminism, ecocriticism has 'waves' as Buell asserts. First wave ecocriticism's definition of environment was natural environment where humans are excluded, thus, it is better to say environmental criticism rather than 'ecocritical' and in this process, the ecocritic might seek to redefine concept of culture itself in organicist terms and would break down the hierarchical speculations between human beings and other elements of the natural world (Buell, L. 2005: 21-22). However, second-wave ecocriticism acknowledges the 'built' environment and combines nature and human-made elements into 'environment', challenging organicist models (Buell, L. 2005: 22). This means that urban places are considered part of the environment. As Buell states,

"environment is artificially constructed" (Buell, L. 2005: 23). Ecocriticism is a tool to probe these constructed environments.

2.3 Biopolitics

On the term, Catherine Mills asserts: "Since Michel Foucault's crucial articulation in the 1970s, and the subsequent publication of Giorgio Agamben's Homo Sacer (1998) in English, biopolitics has become indispensable as a theoretical point of reference in disciplines across the humanities and social sciences" (2018: 1). It is hard to pinpoint a time in the past when biopolitics was born (Campbell, T. & Sitze, A. 2013: 1). However, the concept of biopolitics emerged in the beginning of the 20th century in a *'Lebenphilosophie'* (the philosophy of life) atmosphere in which philosophers such as Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, and Bergson were scrutinising about life and trying to reevaluate it by:

> Life—understood as bodily fact or organic existence, as instinct, intuition, feeling, or 'experience' (Erlebnis)—was opposed to the "dead" and the 'petrified,' which were represented by the 'abstract' concept, 'cold' logic, or the soulless 'spirit' (Lemke, T. 2011: 9).

Life constructed individuals, and individuals assembled states. Rudolf Kjellén had an organicist idea of the state. He considered states as 'super-individual creatures' as real individuals, however, bigger and more powerful. He believed that the natural form of statehood is the nation-state, which expresses the state's ethnic identity (Lemke, T., 2011: 9-10). During Nazi era, antidemocratic, conservative characteristic of organicist concept of state acquired racism (Lemke, T. 2011: 11). There were two key features of Nazism, one is that subjects of history are group of people who share common genetic heritage and the other one is social and political problems and unrests could be attributed to biological causes (Lemke, T. 2011: 11). In the 1960s and 1970s, biopolitics' meaning has shifted to "life processes as a new object of political reflections and action" (Lemke, T. 2011: 23). Biopolitics also acquired another meaning which is political action directed at "the preservation of the natural environment of humanity" (Lemke, T. 2011: 23). Dietrich Gunst asserts that:

> biopolitics embraces 'anything to do with health policy and the regulation of the population, together with environmental protection and questions concerning the future of humanity. This political arena in its comprehensive form is comparatively new

> and takes into consideration the fact that questions about life and survival are increasingly relevant' (Lemke, T. 2011: 24).

Since the 1970s, 'life' has become a reference point for political thinking and political action in two respects:

> On the one hand, we can say that the human 'environment' is threatened by the existing social and economic structures and that policymakers need to find the right answers to the ecological question and to secure the conditions of life on Earth and the survival of humanity. On the other hand, it is becoming increasingly difficult to know, because of bioscientific discoveries and technological innovations, what exactly the 'natural foundations' of life are and how these can be distinguished from 'artificial' forms of life (Lemke, T. 2011: 27).

Humans may complicate these definitions. Being biological, they cannot be separated from nature. Consequently, 'biopolitics' emerged.

Even though Michel Foucault did not coin the term, the term was popularised mainly by Foucault. Still, ironically, he uses the term 'biopower' [12] more than 'biopolitics'. Indeed, Foucault considers these two terms to be synonymous. The term is clearly defined as the intersection of politics and biology, encompassing the realm of life. It might seem simple, yet it is so intricate. To grasp how biopolitics is applied today, treatments towards refugees, criminals, or non-citizens could be scrutinised. First, it is practical to explore definitions of biopolitics.

Foucault introduces the concept as strategies and mechanisms that control human life which is imposed by political power and political power not only uses 'traditional' methods, but also uses concepts such as health, reproduction, sexuality, and surveillance to optimise population's health and productivity (Foucault, M. 2008: 1-25). Giorgio Agamben is also a key figure in biopolitics—his revisionist ideas on Foucault's term mark a milestone for biopolitics studies. Agamben expands on Foucault's idea by further asserting and introducing the idea of 'bare life' (*vita nuda*). He explores how sovereign power establishes life, excluding certain groups of people and denying them rights, which in turn marginalises these groups by dehumanising them (Agamben, G. 1998: 1-12). Another perspective on biopolitics is by Robert Esposito. Esposito audits biopolitics from the perspective of immunity, claiming that societies produce mechanisms to protect themselves from potential threats, which may ironically lead to the exclusion and

[12] Throughout this thesis, biopower and biopolitics terms will be used interchangeably.

suppression of certain life forms (2008: 45-67). The term is quite broad. It is possible to derive new ideas from it. Such ideas would be Byul Chung-Han's 'psychopolitics' or Achille Mbembe's 'necropolitics'. Three concepts of biopolitics will be argued, namely those of Foucault, Agamben, and Mbembe.

Paul-Michel Foucault is a French philosopher and lecturer. Apart from his writings, most of his ideas originate from his lectures at the university. Briefly, Foucault summarises the process by which natural life begins to be incorporated into the mechanisms and calculations of state power, and politics transition into biopolitics (Campbell, T., & Sitze, A., 2013: 135). On his behalf, Agamben writes: "[M]ichel Foucault began to direct his inquiries with increasing insistence toward the study of what he defined as biopolitics, that is, the growing inclusion of man's natural life in the mechanisms and calculations of power" (Campbell, T. & Sitze, A. 2013: 145). According to Foucault, life does not express the basis or the object of politics (Lemke, T. 2011: 4), "[i]nstead, it presents a border to politics—a border that should be simultaneously respected and overcome, one that seems to be both natural and given but also artificial and transformable" (Lemke, T. 2011: 5). Foucault's concept of biopolitics considers alienation and abstraction of life from its physical shell and objects of biopolitics are not singular human beings but their parts as well (Lemke, T. 2011: 5). "As a result, 'life' has become an independent, objective, and measurable factor, as well as a collective reality that can be epistemologically and practically separated from concrete living beings and the singularity of individual experience" (Lemke, T. 2011: 5).

In the 1970s, Michel Foucault brought a revolution to the term 'biopolitics', describing biopolitics as an explicit rupture with the attempt to trace political processes and structures back to biological determinants and "from this perspective, biopolitics denotes a specific modern form of exercising power" (Lemke, T. 2011: 33). Foucault's biopolitics holds a valuable distance against the perspective of life as the objects of politics and according to Foucault, biopolitics does not provide new things to current political structures; instead, it transforms politics' core (Lemke, T. 2011: 33). Foucault evaluates an analytical and historical delimitation of various mechanisms of power and clashes sovereign power with biopower and sovereign power is characterised by power relation like deprivation of goods, products, and services (Lemke, T. 2011: 35).

Foucault asserts that biopower emerged as a particular rationality of power in the 18th century, and this power is distinguished from sovereign powers in multiple ways. However, one key aspect of it is that it places population and individual at the centre of

governments (Mills, C. 2018: 2). Foucault's central claim in *The Will to Knowledge* (1976), is that 'life' becomes object for politics at the end of 18th century (Mills, C. 2018: 13). Foucault believes that the emergence of biopower in the final chapter of *The Will to Knowledge* and contrasts biopower with sovereign right of death which characterised political power until the end of 18th century (Mills, C. 2018: 15). Foucault defines sovereign power as a 'subtraction mechanism' that has right of confiscation such as time, things, bodies, or even life (Mills, C. 2018: 15). In the beginning of modern period, sovereign power went into changes, it was no longer sole power, it turned into collective work to control the forces under it and "further, the right of death of the sovereign underwent a correlative transfiguration to 'align itself with the exigencies of a life-administering power'" (Mills, C. 2018: 15). Foucault argues two types of new emergent life-administering power, one in late 17th century and the other one in 18th century, and the latter one is called 'biopolitics of population' which focuses on well-being of the population (Mills, C. 2018: 15). "Foucault argues that while sovereign power had prioritized the blood relation as one of its fundamental values, the regime of biopower that emerged in the eighteenth and nineteenth century focused instead on sexuality" (Mills, C. 2018: 16). According to Foucault, one of the characteristics of biopolitics is seeing population as 'man-as-a-species' and its primary concern is to control the mass in terms of birth rate, rates of mortality, etc. (Mills, C. 2018: 16).

> Interestingly, in Society Must Be Defended, Foucault clearly relates the emergence of biopower to the inscription of mechanisms of race within the operation of the state. Indeed, here racism was posited by Foucault as fundamental to the operation of the state, such that 'the modern State can scarcely function without becoming involved with racism at some point, within certain limits and subject to certain conditions' (Foucault 2003b, 254), Foucault argues that with the mobilization of death through racism warfare was essentially about two things – first, eliminating the biological threat to a population posed by the 'enemy race', and second, the exposure of one's own race to the 'absolute and universal threat of death' in order to 'truly constitute itself as a superior race' (Foucault 2003b, 259, 260) (Mills, C. 2018: 17-18).

These writings of Catherine Mills show the 'darker' side of biopolitics. Indeed, the idea of power may be vital for the survival of 'biothings'. Because 'power' asserts a group's

or an individual's right to live. Foucault claims that definitions of power are crucial, and in order to grasp Foucault's biopower, his concept of power must be understood.

Initially, Foucault opposes traditional view of political power, instead he proposes 'quasi-military' by which he comments non-stop battle of forces (Mills, C. 2018: 23). He identifies four categories of power which are, sovereignty, biopower, security, and governmentality (Mills, C. 2018: 23-24). In the sovereign model, power is repressive, imposed upon 'above' to its subjects, this view asserts individuals are independent and later go under control (Mills, C. 2018: 24). This type of power is totalizing. Its instrument is law (Mills, C. 2018: 24). In contrast, Foucault argues that power need not necessarily be repressive and can be constructed by its subject, thereby making power productive. Power's subjects produce power (Mills, C. 2018: 24-25). In other words, considering contemporary so-called 'democratic' rules, power originates from the subjects that suppress them, so the people indeed create this binary.

> Throughout the years in which he sought to analyze power, Foucault proposed numerous names for the various technologies of power at work in modernity, including discipline, biopower, biopolitics and governmentality. The insistence on different force relations and a multiplicity of techniques and apparatuses at work in the operation of power provides a rationale for this multiplication of names. This indicates that these terminologies are not competing in the sense that the positing of one denies prior articulations – for example, governmentality does not deny or entail the rejection of the existence of discipline. These different terminologies describe different technologies of power – but they are not necessarily indicative of either historical succession in regimes of power or of conceptual succession in Foucault's work (Mills, C. 2018: 25-26).

In his description of biopower, Foucault attributes excellent importance to norms and normalisation, even suggesting "normalizing society is the historical outcome of a technology of power centred on life" (Mills, C. 2018: 26 & Foucault, M. 1990: 144). In normalising societies, apparatuses[13] are incorporated into institutions and norms become the source of operation of the law of biopower (Mills, C. 2018: 26). Moreover, Mills claims "power, Foucault contends, is no longer primarily exercised through the hierarchical and deductive mechanisms of the sovereign, but through productive networks

[13] On Apparatuses, Louis Althusser asserts the idea of 'Ideological State Apparatuses'. He mentions that the governments install some institution such as churches, schools, family, and media. He claims that these institutions are apparatuses that injects the dominant ideology through ideological influence (Althusser, L. 2014: VII – XVIII).

that include non-state institutions" (2018: 33). The mechanisms where power is practiced is states, more specifically governments that run states for a period. Foucault studies this and names it 'governmentality'.

Governmentality studies mainly address contemporary forms of governments such as transformation from welfarism to neo-liberal rationalities and technologies (Nilsson, J. & Wallenstein, S.O. 2013: 36). Studies of governmentality are greatly helpful illuminating the 'soft' or 'empowering' mechanisms of power showing in what ways individuals or society are governed by freedom and choice (Nilsson, J. & Wallenstein, S.O. 2013: 37). Governmentality studies "have successfully exposed the paradoxes of 'controlled autonomy' in neoliberal governmentality and the intimate relationship that exists between the universal call for 'self-determination' and quite specific societal expectations and institutional constraints" (Nilsson, J. & Wallenstein, S.O. 2013: 37). Foucault's 'government' and 'governmentality' descriptions demonstrate inconsistency, however, in a large scale, it means 'conduct of conduct' and determine tools to guide human beings (Nilsson, J. & Wallenstein, S.O. 2013: 38). Governmentality denotes power relations in general and Foucault asserts 'analytical grid for these relations of power' specifically, governmentality refers to a distinct form of power (Nilsson, J. & Wallenstein, S.O. 2013: 38). In Foucault's own words:

> By 'governmentality' I understand the tendency, the line of force, that for a long time, and throughout the West, has constantly led towards the pre-eminence over all other types of power—sovereignty, discipline, and so on—of the type of power that we can call 'government' and which has led to the development of a series of specific governmental apparatuses (appareils) on the one hand, [and, on the other] to the development of a series of knowledges (savoirs). Finally, by 'governmentality' I think we should understand the process, or rather, the result of the process by which the state of justice of the Middle Ages became the administrative state in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and was gradually 'governmentalized.' (2009: 108-109).

Thomas Lemke puts this shift excellently: "Studies of governmentality, then, have often assumed a continuous rationalization of forms of government, while discipline and sovereignty have been conceived as accidental, auxiliary or residual, modes. According to this line of interpretation, discipline and sovereignty will sooner or later be replaced by governmental technologies, which are taken to be more 'economic.'" (Nilsson, J. & Wallenstein, S.O. 2013: 39). Governmentality studies tend to promote the productive side of power at the cost of repressive and authoritarian

mechanisms (ibid., 40). The central argument of biopolitics is that contemporary politics is characterised by a tight connection between state operations and life (ibid., 73). And Catherine Mills contributes to governmentality studies, claiming modern politics takes control of the phenomena of life (ibid., 74). Western politics have shifted from sovereign power to biopower, in which the biological life becomes the object and target of political power and "biopolitics centred around the regulation and management of the life of a new political subject, the population. This new regime of political power operates according to the maxim of "fostering life or disallowing it," and signals for Foucault the threshold of our modernity. It entails new forms of government and social regulation, such that power no longer operates through violence imposed upon subjects from above, but through a normalising regulation that regularises, administers, and fosters the lives of subjects (Nilsson, J., & Wallenstein, S.O., 2013: 85-86). Foucault has brought a distinct perspective to biopolitics, linking power struggles to the workings of governments. Giorgio Agamben builds upon his ideas, further developing them and introducing a new term, 'thanatopolitics', which represents Agamben's interpretation of biopolitics.

Giorgio Agamben is an Italian philosopher. He is known for his concepts of state of exception, form of life, and the most famous one is *homo sacer*. Undoubtedly, Giorgio Agamben is a significant philosopher in the field of biopolitics. Michel Foucault greatly influences him, but not the only one. He is also influenced by names such as Carl Schmidt, Walter Benjamin, Hannah Arendt, Martin Heidegger, and Georges Bataille. In his work *Homo Sacer* (trans. 1998), he claims that democracy and totalitarianism are in a solidarity and concentration camps are biopolitical paradigm of the west (Lemke, T. 2011: 53). Agamben illustrates that connection between sovereign power and biopolitics in the way that biopolitics constructs the core of sovereign power (Lemke, T. 2011: 53). "According to Agamben, the constitution of sovereign power assumes the creation of a biopolitical body. Inclusion in political society is only possible, he writes, through simultaneous exclusion of human beings who are denied full legal status" (Lemke, T. 2011: 53-54). In other words, outcasts of society and people who deny the norms of the community may not be counted as 'life' and are sparable. Thomas Lemke provides a clearer understanding of the skeleton of this thinking. He says: "the central binary relationship of the political is not that between friend and enemy but rather the separation of bare life (*zoé*) and political existence (*bios*)- that is, the distinction between natural being and the legal existence of a person" (2011: 54). For Agamben, all politics establish a border and an opening of a space that is exempt from the protection of the law. Agamben declares: "the

original juridico-political relationship is the ban" (Lemke, T. 2011: 54; Agamben, G. 1998: 181). Agamben explains hidden foundation of sovereignty by using an archaic roman law, *homo sacer*, a person who can be killed without consequences because they are outcasted and banned from political community, thus reducing their lives just into their physical existence (Lemke, T. 2011: 54-55). At this point, Agamben describes bare life as marginal and the furthest from political and therefore makes life and death of someone as an object of sovereign decision (Lemke, T. 2011: 55). In contemporary times, asylum seekers, refugees, and the brain dead may be the bare life according to Agamben (Lemke, T. 2011: 55). Asylum seekers, refugees, and the oppressed people by the Nazis have one thing in common - camps. On the one side, it is refugee camps; on the other side, it is concentration camps. Agamben depicts camps as where bare lives are produced and in his own words: "the camp is the space that is opened when the state of exception begins to become the rule" (Lemke, T. 2011: 55; Agamben, G. 1998: 168-169). Agamben sees camps as a line which divides 'bare life' and 'political existence'. It means that Agamben disregards the fact that some life forms are seen as more or less valuable. Instead, he focuses on death as the ultimate boundary. According to Agamben, biopolitics primarily involves controlling life through the management of death. Therefore, Agamben suggests that biopolitics could be viewed as 'thanatopolitics' (Lemke, 2011: 59). At this point, Agamben's and Foucault's visions of sovereign power diverge. And Thomas Lemke beautifully narrates this as: "Foucault shows that sovereign power is by no means sovereign, since its legitimacy and efficiency depend on a 'microphysics of power,' whereas in Agamben's work sovereignty produces and dominates bare life" (2011: 59).

States are the ultimate power centre for biopolitics. Because states apply discrimination. Herein, it is beneficial to realise Agamben's conception of the sovereign and government. As mentioned before, Agamben was influenced by Foucault. Regarding the matter of controlling power, he was also influenced by Hannah Arendt; however, Arendt's work did not directly address biopolitics. Instead, she wrote about totalitarian regimes. Agamben claims that both thinkers were unable to link their own ideas. Agamben converges their insights:

> [T]he concept of 'bare life' or 'sacred life' is the focal lens through which we shall try to make their points of view converge. In the notion of bare life the interlacing of politics and life has become so tight that it cannot easily be analysed. Until we become aware of the political nature of bare life and its modern avatars (biological life, sexuality, etc.), we will not succeed in clarifying the opacity at their centre. Conversely, once modern politics

> enters into an intimate symbiosis with bare life, it loses the intelligibility that still seems to us to characterize the juridicopolitical foundation of classical politics (1998: 119-120).

It is hard not to agree with Agamben in this matter. The way humanity lived and the changes in their lives throughout time are apparent. Therefore, 'avatars' of 'life' are apt to change, thus control mechanisms. Administration styles have changed throughout history. The changes brought different tools to control communities. The modern state's control mechanism is biopolitics. Even though Arendt and Karl Löwith claim only 'totalitarian regimes', such as Soviet Russia or Fascist Italy, that use camps to control the population, other types of regimes use different tools to control their subjects. Therefore, it would be wrong to say that 'first world[14]' countries do not utilise biopolitics to control society and utilise them for their own good.

Karl Löwith defines the central characteristic of totalitarian states as 'politicisation of life', then broadly explains as such:

> [S]ince the emancipation of the third estate, the formation of bourgeois democracy and its transformation into mass industrial democracy, the neutralization of politically relevant differences and postponement of a decision about them has developed to the point of turning into its opposite: a total politicization [totale Politisierung] of everything, even of seemingly neutral domains of life. Thus in Marxist Russia there emerged a worker-state that was "more intensively state-oriented than any absolute monarchy"; in fascist Italy, a corporate state normatively regulating not only national work, but also 'after-work' [Dopolavoro] and all spiritual life; and, in National Socialist Germany, a wholly integrated state, which, by means of racial laws and so forth, politicizes even the life that had until then been private (qtd. in Agamben, G. 1998: 120-121).

Then, Agamben comments on it. He claims that almost all major political events have two sides. Whenever people gain freedom, rights, and space, in their conflict with central authority, they unintentionally become more deeply integrated into the state's control. By doing this, they unknowingly strengthen the sovereign power that they were trying to eliminate. They create a new and maybe more powerful oppressive device in the place of the previous one (Agamben, G. 1998: 121). These recalls of the French Revolution, and the revolution consumed its own children after some point. As states have bare lives, they

[14] The terms first, second, and third world annotated different meanings from today. These terms were initially used for different axis of countries during the Cold War period. First world countries were NATO members, second world countries were allies of USSR, and third world countries were neutral ones.

also have desirable persons. Agamben calls them ‘sacred life’. And he claims the first ground observed in sacred life is the Magna Carta. The signing of Magna Carta between John the Landless and his subjects may be a good reference for ‘sacred life’ (Campbell, T. & Sitze, A. 2013: 148-149). In contemporary times, Agamben claims that modern democracy does not destroy the concept of sacred life. Instead, modern democracy allocates pieces of sacred life to every individual (1998: 124). He exclaims it as follows: “he who will appear later as the bearer of rights and as the new sovereign subject can only be constituted as such through the repetition of the sovereign exception and the isolation of *corpus*, bare life, in himself” (1998: 124). If the law requires a body to think correctly, democracy responds to this by constraining the law to assume responsibility for this body (Agamben, G. 1998: 124-125). When modern sovereigns create ‘sacred life’ and allocate its pieces to every individual, they create bare lives. Agamben asserts that, within the nation-state system, so-called sacred and inalienable human rights often disappear. They disappear for non-citizens. The nation-state system deprives the ‘holy’ and ‘sacred’ human rights of others, and refugees are a great example of it (Agamben, G. 1998: 126). These new sovereigns still create bare lives; their sacred life is their ‘citizens’. Agamben declares that the basis of nativity and sovereignty was separated in the *ancien regime*. However, they merged to form a ‘sovereign subject’, which is the basis of the nation-state. Further, Agamben states: “man’s bare life, the simple birth that as such is, in the passage from subject to citizen, invested with the principle of sovereignty” (1998: 127). With a distant view, it is easy to see that sovereign power throughout human history has undergone significant transformations. The suppression or oppression has not changed at all, but their subjects have. Therefore, it is hard to establish a universal ‘human rights.’ Giorgio Agamben believes that the divide between humanitarianism and politics we have today is due to the extreme phase of separation of human rights and citizen rights (1998: 133). As mentioned, Agamben suggests ‘thanatopolitics,’ which is about death being part of biopolitics. Governmentality affects people’s daily lives. It does not have to be a person from another nationality, but governments themselves have their own ‘bare life’ and ‘sacred life’ based on whether they are supporters of the government or not. The concept is further developed by Achille Mbembe and his ‘necropolitics’.

Joseph-Achille Mbembe is a Cameroonian historian and political theorist. Another way of controlling the population is deciding who lives and who dies. Briefly, Mbembe describes necropolitics as follows: “[T]he ultimate expression of sovereignty largely resides in the power and capacity to dictate who is able to live and who must die”

(2019: 66). He then adds: “late modern political criticism has unfortunately privileged normative theories of democracy and made the concept of reason into one of the most important elements of both the project of modernity and the topos of sovereignty” (2019: 67). In other words, sovereignty creates its norms and have audacity to eliminate those who are not compatible. This view, the ultimate expression of sovereignty, is the production of general norms by a body comprising free and equal individuals (Mbembe, A. 2019: 67). A real-life illustration of necropolitics is the situation between Israel and Palestine, especially after October 2023. The Israeli government controls the border of Gaza as well as their food, medicine, electricity, and water supplies.

CHAPTER THREE

ECOPOLITICS OF H.G. WELLS'S *THE WAR OF THE WORLDS*

Herbert George Wells wrote *The War of the Worlds* and first published it in 1898. The novel is one of the first alien invasion and encounter narratives. Thus, the novel is a pioneer in the SF genre. The novel has also had a significant influence on popular culture. There are many adaptations of the novel. Important adaptations of the novel include the 1953 film, directed by Byron Haskin, and the 2005 film, directed by Steven Spielberg. Additionally, there is an infamous radio adaptation, narrated and directed by Orson Welles[15][16]. On the 30th of October 1938, as a part of Orson Welles's radio programme series, *The Mercury Theatre on the Air*, a radio adaptation of *The War of the Worlds* as a Halloween episode aired on CBS Radio Network.

The publication of the novel was in the late Victorian era. 'Victorian era' connotes Queen Victoria's reign between 1837 to 1901. This age is well known for the Industrial Revolution. It would not be wrong to say that due to industrialisation, heavy urbanisation occurred. Additionally, the new production methods made everything more accessible and affordable. Naturally, these changes manifested in society and, consequently, in literature. Compared to before, novels were printed in greater numbers. There were numerous novels, and reading novels was popular, just like the 20th century's TV and the 21st century's social media. In the 1800s, a reading revolution emerged, the literary counterpart of the Industrial Revolution. It shifted from a religious to a secular focus, from collective to individual reading. It was thanks to the development of press techniques (Brantingler & Thesing, 2002: 31-32). Novels in this period mostly told societal stories. It was either a matter of gender issues or class issues. There was a utilitarianism in the novels of this age. Notable novelists from this era would be Charles Dickens, Charlotte Brontë, and Emily Brontë.

The accelerated development of science and technology also marked the age. Besides societal novels, a new genre emerged. Thanks to scientific improvements, human

---

[15] There was news that the radio programme created a hysteria. People who heard the radio programme supposedly thought it was real and panicked. However, later it was claimed that the hysteria news was fake. (Pooley & Socolow, 2013). Further reading on this matter is available here: https://slate.com/culture/2013/10/orson-welles-war-of-the-worlds-panic-myth-the-infamous-radio-broadcast-did-not-cause-a-nationwide-hysteria.html

[16] Wells was not happy when he heard the radio adaptation. "In fact, the seventy-two-year-old Wells was angered when he learned of the American radio adaptation of the novel that he had published forty years earlier. He thought, with some justice, that it coarsened a serious political allegory into a sensational hoax. But the radio script also highlighted an aspect of The War of the Worlds that has made it a central text in the cultural history of Mars" (Crossley, R. 2011: 115).

imagination discovered further possibilities. In the late 1800s, towards the end of the Victorian Age, the SF genre emerged and began to be published as novels. And a pioneer in this matter is none other than Herbert George Wells. As discussed in previous chapters, he is a key figure in SF. He introduced many concepts, and ***The War***[17] is an important narrative. The novel incorporates societal changes in this era by triggering the 'reverse invasion' anxiety of the British at that time, because the British Empire was in its heyday at that time. The subjects of the empire were anxious about being invaded by its colonies. Wells applies this concern via extraterrestrial beings. Additionally, considering the UK population today, even if it is not a reverse invasion, most of the former colonial subjects of the empire migrated to British cities. In a way, the anxieties of the time proved right. However, the invasion of the alien theme is inherited by the American film industry. This might be due to the fact that the USA is becoming 'the empire' after the British Empire.

Another societal mirroring in the novel is the fear of accelerating technology. As science and technology are cumulative disciplines, the speed of development accelerates. Considering the technological advancements between the start of the Victorian Era and its end, 1901, the change is remarkable. For instance, the telephone was invented in 1876. The telephone indeed changed the whole landscape of communication. Therefore, Wells' meditation on the fear of technology was inevitable. Wells illustrates this fear through Martian technology. This technology comes in the form of cylinders, tripods, and heat-ray. All three of these gadgets have taken a physical form. For instance, a heat ray could be a laser, while the Martians' cylindrical vessels are evident in the form of rockets. These devices were once a thought back in the day and became a reality over time.

Echoes of these anxieties are still evident in the contemporary world. As mentioned earlier, the fear of alien invasion remains a persistent concern for humanity. It might originate due to the fear of the unknown and 'the other'. Because, as of 2025, the whole world is in contact with itself, thus there are no groups of people to fear. This gap reflected itself in extraterrestrial beings. Wells wrote about this anxiety, and it continued to increase. It is an excellent illustration of the novel's significance for both past and present.

The other anxiety, which is still present in 2025, is the fear of technology. Humanity cannot release its technological advancements and the comfort that they bring. However, people still panic when roles are reversed. For instance, there are narratives

[17] *The War of the Worlds* will be abbreviated as *The War*.

about robots, even if they are still not as advanced as expected, suggesting that they might use humanity for their own purposes. The film *The Matrix* (1999) is an ideal dystopia or utopia for this narrative to be comprehended. Another point in favour of technology is Artificial Intelligence. In 2025, the usage of AI has become more accessible to end-users. People fear that they might get 'conscious' and overthrow humanity's throne. However, AI is fed by humanity. All the fears projected onto AI originate from humanity itself. For instance, in March 2016, Microsoft announced a Twitter AI chatbot named Tay. Nonetheless, Microsoft had to shut it down due to interactions with other users. Because Tay started to give replies based on other users' tweets, and it began to become racist, sexist, etc (Mason, 2016).

The last remaining anxiety evident in 2025 is the degradation of the natural environment. Wells wrote the book after the Industrial Revolution had become fairly established. The revolution had its advantages and disadvantages. One of the most significant disadvantages of it was the harm it caused to nature. It was probably easier to see the depredation of nature in those times, such as deforestation, because urbanisation and urban population were low compared to 2025. Therefore, Wells reflected his concerns about nature in his book. Wells was right about his concerns about nature. Climate crisis is a fact in 2025. People fear droughts, rising sea levels, changes in seasons and climate, excessive or insufficient precipitation, and displacement due to environmental reasons. These are all human-made events indeed. In other words, just like in *The War*, humanity still fears itself, and this fear is articulated through literature.

The novel tells a story of alien encounter and invasion and is one of the first examples of post-apocalyptic fiction. H.G. Wells is praised thanks to the novel and Robert Crossley comments on the book as "Like *Frankenstein*, *The War of the Worlds* achieves its special status by an effective combination of intimacy and generality, archetypal storytelling and open-ended allegorical possibility, a richly specific sense of time, place, and occasion, and an interrogative mode that transcends circumstantial detail" (2011: 116). As mentioned above, a key aspect of the novel is that it is set in the Victorian era. Considering that, and that age was the pinnacle of the British Empire, there is an invasion motif in the novel. Nonetheless, the fear of reverse invasion projects itself through the notion of an invasion by extraterrestrial beings. To illustrate society's situation, Wells utilised two themes. H.G. Wells used Mars and alien motifs to reflect. They are relevant because Mars and technology symbolise the developing technology of the time, while the alien represents the other and unknown. *The War* intricately weaves Mars and Alien

motifs, which have troubled the human mind since the beginning of history. A closer inspection of these two concepts would be beneficial.

3.1 Mars and Alien Concepts in Literature

Throughout human history, space, planets, and stars have always been wonderful. People attributed their imaginations, dreams, and aspirations towards these heavenly bodies. The naked eye can see five planets, one star, and one moon in the sky. Without help, the five visible planets in our solar system are Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn. The visible natural satellite is the Moon, and the star is the Sun. Naturally, the Moon and the Sun stand out because of their size and impact on the sky. Venus and Mars are other celestial bodies besides the Sun and the Moon. These heavenly bodies became integral to narratives of humanity. However, Robert Crossley asserts that "by the mid-nineteenth century, when fantasies of lunar life no longer could be entertained seriously, attention shifted to Mars" (2011: XI). Since the concern of this section is Mars, the planet and its cultural reflections will be explored.

Various 'Marses' perceived or created by scientists, writers, and visual artists (Crossley, R. 2011: X). Perhaps the first representations of Mars can be found in Greek and Roman mythology. In Greek mythology, the God Ares is associated with the planet Mars. He is one of the Olympian Gods and the son of Zeus (Jupiter) and Hera (Juno). Ares is the God of War, associated with battles and aggression. In Roman mythology, Ares is associated with Mars, which gave its name to the red planet[18]. (Hamilton, E. 1942: 35). A reason why the planet was named after the God of War, Mars, might be the colour red's fiery and aggressive feelings it invokes. In Norse mythology, Týr is associated with the planet Mars. There are not many writings that have survived about Týr. However, he is a deity representing law, justice, and heroic sacrifice. Compared to Ares or Mars, Týr is not associated with war. Instead, he shows qualities of Athena. One of the most notable tales about Týr is his binding of Fenrir. In the tale, he loses his arm to protect the Gods (Lindow, J. 2001: 297-299). In Hinduism, Mangala represents the planet Mars. Mangala is associated with disease, particularly smallpox (Cush, D. et al., 2008: 489; Dalal, R., 2010: 240).

Mars in Japanese is Kasei, and the Babylonians named the planet Nergal. The planet is often associated with blood and war in ancient societies (Crossley, R., 2011: 2-3). After antiquity, the planet became a subject of interest in the Middle Ages. However,

[18] All the planets' names in our Solar System come from Roman mythology.

in the Middle Ages, Mars was more of an astrology figure than an astronomical one. Wife of Bath character in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (1392) believes in Mars's lust and battle aspects (Crossley, R. 2011: 3). Mars remained an object of wonder. The invention of the telescope further accelerated the process of gathering information about Mars.

An amateur astronomer, Percival Lowell, wrote books about Mars. He claimed that a Martian civilisation was built around a global canal system. His concepts were impactful and led to the creation of the first American science fiction novel about Mars: *A Princess of Mars* (1912) by Edgar Rice Burroughs. Lowell's three major books about Mars, as of 2025, feel like fine SF and "Lowell is the bridge between science and literature of Mars" (Crossley, R. 2011: 7). 1877 was a significant year as Mars drew closer to Earth. Therefore, Mars in literature gained speed (Crossley, R. 2011: 37). In 1883, Wladislaw Somerville Lach-Szyrma published *Aleriel*. In this work, Martians were depicted as nine-feet tall, large-chested, and hairy (Crossley, R. 2011: 47-48).

By the late 19th century, most of the Earth had been discovered, and utopian narratives shifted to Mars (Crossley, R. 2011: 90). *Aleriel* depicts a utopian society. It merges utopian fiction with SF (Crossley, R. 2011: 48). Lowell was an important figure in early Mars narratives. Lowell's Mars was big, fun, and exciting. However, Lowell's Mars was more creation than discovery (Crossley, R. 2011: 72).

Unlike *The War*, in most early works, Martians were depicted as human-like. However, for the first time in *The War*, Martians were portrayed as monsters, rather than kinder and nobler versions of humans (Crossley, R., 2011: 112). Another point H. G. Wells differs from Lowell is the reason for the planet's colour. Lowell's theory was that the redness of Mars was due to its deserts. However, Wells wrote that it is due to its red plantation, which was the theory of Camille Flammarion in her *Astronomie Populaire* (1880). Wells followed her footprint (Crossley, R. 2011: 115). However, in 2025, it is known that Mars is red due to its soil being rich in iron oxide (Valantinas et al., 2025: 1).

As discoveries have been made on Mars, the narratives of Mars and its inhabitants, the Martians, have also evolved. Lowell's observations led to the discovery of a human-like, advanced civilisation. However, discoveries changed stories to a more realistic Mars. A good illustration of this is *The Martian* (2015, dir. Ridley Scott). Mars is a good ground for alien narratives due to its mysterious nature.

Another theme in the novel is the presence of aliens. Extraterrestrial beings have been a concern for humanity, and this concern has been reflected in various cultural products. Gregory Benford comments on aliens in literature as such: "[A]liens have been

used as stand-in symbols for bad humans or as trusty native guides, as foils for expansionist empires, and so on" (Levy, M. & Mendleshon, F. 2019: XIV). Initially, the word 'alien' was used for 'strange' or 'the other'. However, over time, it began to take on the connotation of extraterrestrial beings. Aliens might be a subject for all genres. In SF, aliens meet mere humans. Therefore, one underlying message in SF is that aliens do not just disturb and educate; they break reality, often fatally for humans (Levy, M., & Mendlesohn, F., 2019, p. XVII). In history, one of the pre-modern aliens in literature is Lucian Samasota's *True History* in the 2nd century AD. It tells a story of war between the people of the moon and the sun over colonising Venus. Lucian's *True History* is regarded as a pioneer in SF. (Levy, M. & Mendlesohn, F. 2019: 3).

In the following centuries, the existence of aliens was a topic of debate among theologians, metaphysicians, and epistemologists. Perhaps the single most significant influence on aliens was the Islamic and late-Christian concept of cosmic pluralism (Levy, M., & Mendlesohn, F., 2019: 3). For Islamic and Christian scholars, God has created many worlds, similar to the Earth, implying that there should be diverse kinds of humans and animals. The notion of cosmic pluralism was also used in satirical and utopian British fiction. (Levy, M. & Mendlesohn, F. 2019: 4). However, it was thanks to Wells that the alien became a recognisable figure. By the end of 19th century, alien was a familiar cultural figure (Levy, M. & Mendlesohn, F. 2019: 5). The *fin de siècle* (turn-off-the-century) alien became a scientific debate on life and patterns of evolution as well as "the alien came to be seen as no longer just a hoax or an allegorical blank space but rather a figure for extrapolating the real possibilities for nonhuman difference from the basis of contemporary knowledge of biology, astronomy, and human society" (Levy, M. & Mendlesohn, F. 2019: 5). By this way, the 'shape' of an alien has always been a wonder.

In the earlier examples, the alien figure was mostly humanoid. Lucian's aliens were like mushroom or dog-faced people (Levy, M. & Mendlesohn, F. 2019: 3). However, H. G. Wells revolutionised this theme. Sean Guynes-Vishniac asserts:

> Wells's tentacled imperialist Martians in the former made a lasting impact on the alien imaginary in the next century. The War of the Worlds not only embodied Victorian British anxieties about the revolt of the colonies through an attack by the alien other on England herself but also made of the invading alien a monstrous, uncommunicating, destructive force, seemingly untethered to human conceptions of morality. Wells's aliens were horrifying monsters, setting a precedent that established the nonhumanoid alien as signaling a biological alterity so great that the peaceful

> coexistence of differences between alien and human became impossible (Levy, M. & Mendlesohn, F. 2019: 5).

H. G. Wells was a pioneering author in SF, creating new perspectives on its themes.

3.2 Analysis

Wells's *The War* is a pioneer novel, and it has been the subject of academic and literary discussions for more than a century. As discussed in previous chapters, the story is an essential component of SF, and some of its themes include aliens and Mars. The book was scrutinised from very different perspectives. One of the key analyses of the book is its colonial and post-colonial perspectives. Since the book is set in the Victorian Era, critics believe it is a reverse invasion narrative. The book tells a story of a Martian invasion of England and its effects. While colonialist or post-colonialist views are valid, there are some other perspectives to scrutinise. This chapter will analyse H.G. Wells's *The War of the Worlds* (1898) from the perspectives of ecocriticism and biopolitics, also examining it from the viewpoint of ecopolitics.

The novel not only captures the essence of its time period but also foreshadows future speculations made during that era. A contemporary analysis of this critique exists. From an environmental perspective, the narrative illustrates the devastation of nature: "In the sudden thud, hiss, and glare of the igniting trees" (Wells, H.G. 2022: 43). This serves as a poignant example of the destruction wrought upon the environment. Relating this to 2025, deforestation remains a critical issue facing our planet. Whether for agricultural production or the creation of new development spaces, the widespread clearing of trees leads to unstable temperatures and exacerbates climate change.

On the biopolitical front, the title of Book Two, "The Earth Under The Martians," presents the Martians as a form of sovereign state. Like any governing body, they exert control over the population: "[I]n a little island of daylight, cut off by the Black Smoke from the rest of the world" (Wells, H.G. 2022: 157). Such practices continue to resonate today, as various states implement measures that restrict certain groups of people. Examples include Israel's restrictions and sanctions on Gaza, as well as the United States' control over immigration. Visa requirements to enter a country can also be viewed as a method of population control.

Richard Hauer Costa claims that Wells incorporated unusual elements into everyday life, and thanks to this, Wells's narrative style is iconic and popular throughout literature and cinema (1967: 42). He not only experimented with new techniques but also

critiqued the politics of his time. Wells located himself as an 'archenemy' of the idea that the Union Jack[19] would always prevail (ibid., 43). Thinking about the events in the book, Costa's claim might indeed be valid because the novel captivates the occupier with a good narrative, which is praised. Compared to the poetic style of *The Time Machine* (1895) and *The First Man in the Moon* (1901), *The War* has a realistic documentary tone (ibid., 44). This realistic energy in the book resonates with the human mind, as events are plausible. Regarding this, J.R. Hammond notes that using real-life locations, such as Horsell Bridge and Chobham Road, strengthens the narrative (1979: 91). Moreover, Hammond further praises the narrative. He asserts that Wells's "sombre opening paragraphs" create suspense and build excitement, and he believes the narrative possesses the quality of timelessness, akin to great myths (ibid., 92).

Frank McConnell comments on the book as: "[F]or the Martians represent not just an invasion from space, but an invasion from time, from the future of man himself" (1981: 128). In Warren Wagar's perspective, Martians are not 'evil', they are just immoral, and they utilise fighting machines to oppress vulnerable species (1989: 392). Wagar's idea can be linked to McConnell's words: "[T]hose soulless Martian invaders are future versions of ourselves who have become 'heads-merely heads,' and who are pathetically prey to so simple a threat as the common cold" (1980: 183). Considering these, Martians can be seen as a projection of humanity's future. However, they do not act solely for destruction's sake. They show human qualities and do actions for selfish reasons, just like humans. *The War* touches multiple problems and occurrences. The first concept this thesis will scrutinise is the Science Fiction aspect of the novel.

The Science Fiction genre, as discussed in the first chapter, arose from human curiosity. While it may seem that SF serves purely as entertainment, its speculative nature suggests that many of its ideas could indeed become a reality. Furthermore, SF often relies on fundamental scientific principles, lending credibility to its speculations and projections. H.G. Wells and his seminal work, *The War of the Worlds*, are pivotal to the development of this genre. Both the book and its author are of great significance; H.G. Wells is often regarded as the "Shakespeare of SF", and he remains one of the genre's most influential figures. In his writing, Wells adeptly explores and intertwines themes of science and technology.

[19] Union Jack is the flag of the United Kingdom

The book opens with a remark of not expecting more intelligent and more advanced species other than humanity by an unnamed narrator as such: "[T]his world was being watched keenly and closely by intelligences greater than man's […] at most terrestrial men fancied there might be other men upon Mars, perhaps inferior to themselves" (Wells, H.G. 2022: 9-10). It can be said that humans have a superiority complex, believing themselves to be the only intelligent species. Aside from humanity's hubris on the topic, space, aliens, and extraterrestrial life have long been a troubling question for both scientists and the general public. While creating the genre, Wells introduced the concept of extraterrestrial life, specifically the idea of aliens. Later, the narrator provides information about Mars. For instance, he[20] narrates "[t]he planet Mars […] revolves about the sun at a mean distance of 140,000,000 miles, and the light and heat it receives from the sun is barely half of that received by this world" (ibid., 10). Then, he begins to speculate about the planet: "The fact that it is scarcely one seventh of the volume of the earth must have accelerated its cooling to the temperature at which life could begin. It has air and water" (ibid., 10). Herein, it is easy to observe the speculative nature of SF. However, this speculation is based on what is known about the planet at that time. In 2025, it is known that Mars and Earth formed around the same time. Additionally, it is understood that Mars has water in the form of ice at its poles, but it does not possess a thick atmosphere (Buried Water Ice at Mars's Equator?, 2024). The narrator continues to speculate on Mars, saying that "their world is far gone in its cooling and this world is still crowded with life (ibid., 11). The Martians demonstrate a reflex of survival by trying to capture other places. It is as if we are almost guessing how humanity searches for habitable planets in the Goldilocks[21] zone of the Solar System or other star systems. The Goldilocks zone refers to a habitable zone where the right conditions exist for liquid water, not too cold or too hot. He then informs the reader about observations on Mars: "[M]en like Schiaparelli watched the red planet […] [D]uring the opposition of 1894 a great light was seen" (ibid., 12)[22]. Again, SF's aspect of reality is evident. Wells is a genius because he increases the probability of the fictional by incorporating scientific observations and astronomical phenomena relevant to the time of writing.

[20] He can be used for the narrator as we know he has a wife and considering Queer rights and situations in late Victorian era, it is acceptable to assume the pronoun of the narrator.
[21] Goldilocks Zone is the other name of habitable zone that is a reference to children fairy tale *Goldilocks and the Three Bears* (1837).
[22] Giovanni Schiaparelli is an important figure for astronomical observations of Mars in the 19th century. He influenced both planetary science and development of science fiction, especially the idea of intelligent life on other planets.

In Chapter 2 of Book One, Martians arrive on Earth. The description notes, “the uncovered part had the appearance of a huge cylinder […] [T]he cylinder was artificial - hollow - with an end that screwed out!” (ibid., 20-21). This illustrates the imaginative aspects of science fiction’s future vision. Notably, the first modern rocket was launched in the USA in 1926 and also featured a cylindrical design. Wells cleverly employs this shape to depict the Martians’ spacecraft landing on Earth. Furthermore, one could argue that envisioning future technology through writing or illustration may inspire actual technological advancements. Another notable reference to future technology in the narrative is the heat-ray.

The narrator witnesses a ‘heat-ray’ for the first time and describes it as “suddenly there was a flash of light […] [T]his smoke was so bright […] [F]orthwith flashes of actual flame, a bright glare leaping from one to another […] [I]t was as if some invisible jet impinged upon them and flashed into white flame […] [A]n almost noiseless and blinding flash of light” (ibid., 37-38). The heat-ray idea was indeed before the invention of the laser. Here, the heat-ray can be assumed as a laser. Since then, lasers have become an integral part of SF technology. Again, Wells ‘invents’ new technologies and his speculations become real. This indicates how science can be affected by literature, SF, particularly that which is shaped by imagination. Additionally, heat rays are used for killing (ibid., 38). Still, lasers are a deadly weapon or bullet in SF stories, and they can be traced back to *The War*: “[T]his intense heat they project in a parallel beam against any objects they choose [...] [H]eat, and invisible, instead of visible, light” (ibid., 41). The hero describes the process of killing in this manner. The laser was invented in 1960 and works as described in the book, although it is not yet used for killing. The only thing that does not match with laser is that it is an invisible light. However, it is known that there are lights and colours that the human eye cannot see in the spectrum.

The narrator once again immerses himself in the concept of gravitational force, pondering the challenges Martians would face in movement. He notes, “[o]n the surface of the Earth, the force of gravity is three times that on the surface of Mars. Consequently, a Martian would weigh three times as much on Earth [...] Despite their formidable appearance, Martians have remained immobilized in the pit [...] This is likely due to the relative strength of Earth’s gravitational pull” (ibid., 48, 101). This excerpt exemplifies a logical framework that contrasts with many pre-Wells narratives, where logic was often overlooked. By incorporating real-world information and informed conjectures, the text significantly enhances the believability of the narrative.

This thesis last mentions the Martians' tripod in SF: "[A]nd this Thing I saw! How can I describe it? A monstrous tripod, higher than many houses" (ibid., 66). These tripods are machinery that Martians use for battle, and they are piloted. They are high in the sky and shoot from afar. It is as if it were a primitive warplane. Also, it is evident that humanity's awe of Martian technology. This can also be interpreted as humanity's aspiration and yearning for the future and the technology that it will bring. This aspiration for the future, by all means, also projects some unappealing aspects of the future.

Wells' effects upon the upcoming writers of SF are evident. On alien invasion and vulnerability of humanity, the theme is narrated as hostile alien life and humanity not being at the centre and superior. These are evident in Arthur C. Clarke's *Childhood's End* (1953) and Robert Heinlein's *The Puppet Masters* (1951). Arthur's book depicts advanced aliens coming to Earth to analyse evolution, while Robert's story narrates alien invaders utilising Wells' 'invasive others' under the shadow of the Cold War's anxieties. Other themes would be war, apocalypse, and dystopia. George Orwell's *1984* (1949) tells of a dystopian society under constant surveillance, much like the Martians in *The War of the Worlds*. About his impact, Brian Aldiss asserts: "In many of these stories Wells proved himself the great originator of science fictional ideas. They were new with him and have been reworked endlessly since. He seems to have been the first fiction writer to use the perspectives of evolution to look backwards as well as forwards" (Aldiss, B.W. & Wingrove, D. 1986: 120). Moreover, John Rieder claims: "In The War of the Worlds, we should remember, the 'native' human narrator himself occupies not only the position of the dominated, dehumanized colonial subject, but also that of the scientific observer, especially when he becomes an ethnographer in the marvelous chapter on the Martians' anatomy and technology" (2008: 10). A final remark on Wells' importance for literature and especially *The War*, is from Frederic Jameson. He comments as: "Yet Wells' Museum registers our own earthly future as a past which is the sorry history of human devolution: a prophetic archaeology whose time paradox consists in the reversal of the one that interests us here, and secures its shock" (2005: 99). It is easily observed that Wells is critically acclaimed author and a great person for SF. His wit is obvious, and another example of his wit is the depiction of nature, which is abundantly evident in the novel.

The Martians are searching for a new planet to inhabit and survive: "The secular cooling that must eventually occur on our planet has already progressed significantly with our neighbor. Their world is deep into this cooling process. To engage in warfare against the sun is, indeed, their sole means of escaping the destruction that creeps upon them

generation after generation" (ibid., 10-11). This situation underscores the critical importance of maintaining a healthy environment. It can be interpreted as an allegory for Earth and humanity. When H.G. Wells wrote the novel, the Industrial Revolution was already underway, and he observed its effects on nature. Even considering the relatively minor impact of that era compared to 2025, Wells foresaw potential realities for people and the Earth in the future. In light of the current situation on our planet, Wells was only incorrect about the cooling aspect. Nevertheless, as he predicted, the Earth is indeed suffering. Carbon emissions began to rise with the Industrial Revolution, a phenomenon that Wells observed at its inception. The increase in CO2 emissions has damaged our atmosphere and ozone layer, leading to the climate crisis and global warming. While the ozone layer has shown signs of healing due to ecological policies, the damage has already been done.

Wells thought the Earth's death may be due to cooling. However, by 2025, it is widely acknowledged that global warming is a real phenomenon. Instead of cooling, it is warming, and it is due to the actions of humanity. Here, it can be deduced that even if the narrator does not tell, Martians are the reason for their planet's death.

The first harm done by Martians to the Earth is by their landing: "[A]n enormous hole had been made by the impact of the projectile, and the sand and gravel had been flung violently in every direction over the heath, forming heaps of visible a mile and a half away" (ibid., 20). As depicted by the narrator, the cylinder falls to Horsell Common[23], harming not only smaller living beings but also the ground itself. Also, nature's depredation may affect one psychologically. An unknown object, not from the terrestrial world, hits the ground and harms trees. Seeing this, people's psychology can also be affected. Due to the evolutionary line, no matter how advanced and alienated from nature, humanity still needs to be surrounded by nature. The destruction of it not only harms physically, but also damages psychologically. After arriving, the Martians start the invasion procedure.

The narrator bears witness to the Martians' wrath and their destructive, cruel technology: "Suddenly, a flash of light illuminated the scene, releasing a plume of luminous greenish smoke. Almost immediately, actual flames erupted, creating a bright glare that leaped from one man to another, all of whom were still unaware that this was a harbinger of death" (ibid., 37-38). The Martians can be seen as an analogy for humanity,

[23] Horsell Common is in Woking, Surrey and includes various habitats. More information available here: https://horsellcommon.org.uk/.

suggesting that humans themselves are akin to animals, particularly as they suffer from the environmental damage they inflict upon their own planet. The Martians' assault on humans echoes the harm humanity does to nature. By exterminating a large number of a species, the balance of nature is inevitably disrupted, a reflection of humanity's own actions. Take, for example, bees, which are vital pollinators; yet due to human activities, their populations are declining, a situation that will have dire consequences for humanity. Humanity is, in essence, hoisted by its own petard. As the Martians embody human traits, they perpetuate this ongoing destruction.

The Martians use heat-ray to kill humanity as well as harm trees.: "[T]hey saw the flashes and the men falling and an invisible hand, as it were, lit the bushes… the beam swung close over their heads, lighting the tops of beech trees […] [I]n the sudden thud, hiss, and glare of the igniting trees" (ibid., 43). The Martians not only destroy organic matter, such as plants, animals, and humans, but also harm the environment: "[A]nd splitting the bricks, smashing the windows, firing the window frames" (ibid., 43). As constructed buildings or roads count as the environment, the displacement of people is also an abuse of nature. As the artilleryman will later exemplify, while humans mind their own business, a sudden destruction comes from a more 'advanced' being. Then, a fire starts due to a heat ray (ibid., 43). The fire, indeed, damages the environment. Also, fire destroys the 'homes' of living beings. And the terror that Martians create affects the psychology of living beings, creating psychological warfare as well.

In chapter 9 of Book One (ibid., 55-62), fighting with Martians begins. The chapter includes elements of farming, gardening, and other related activities. However, like all wars, the war between humanity and Martians tramples the environment. Martians have the advantage due to their superior technology: "[A]pparently the Martians were setting fire to everything within range of their Heat-Ray," asserts the narrator (ibid., 62). As mentioned above, wars displace humans from their places.

The Martian invasion displaces humans from their places: "[R]ipley Street was deserted, and except for a lighted window or so the village showed no sign of life" (ibid., 65). Displacement can have a negative impact on nature, similar to the effects of displacing or destroying animal habitats. It may involve planting vegetation in unsuitable areas or leading to the extinction of endemic species: "[T]hen suddenly the trees in the pine wood ahead of me were parted […] [T]he horse lay motionless" (ibid., 67). It is not only plants and humans but also innocent animals that are affected by the Martian destruction. Here, the narrator's psychology could become unhealthy. Because the

environment that is ‘natural’ for the narrator is decaying. The terror of Martians disrupts the equilibrium of nature and the environment. It is also evident in the form of buildings: “[T]he towers of the Oriental College and the pine trees about it had gone, and very far away, lit by a vivid red glare, the common about the sand-pits was visible” (ibid., 71-72). The narrator observes ruins: “[T]he fires had dwinled down now. Where flames had been there were now streamers of smoke; but the countless ruins of shattered and gutted houses and blasted and blackened trees that night had hidden” (ibid., 77). The destruction of the environment is now complete, and the narrator marks the complete decay of the environment.

The outcomes presented here reflect themes of “human-centrism” and pollution. In this context, however, it cannot be described as human-centric; rather, it can be termed “power-centric.” The Martians assume the role of the “masters” of nature, feeling entitled to act as they wish. Even if their actions are not driven by a desire for destruction, they pursue them for the sake of harvesting benefits. Clearing the landscape serves their settlement needs, mirroring human behaviour. Consequently, the actions of the Martians result in pollution, further contributing to the degradation of nature. Evolution has created a delicate balance within ecosystems, and removing even a single element can lead to the collapse of the entire system. Pollution acts as that disruptive force, pulling out a critical “brick” and interrupting nature’s equilibrium. Such disruption to the natural world’s harmony carries significant consequences.

The two sides of nature are seen in the novel: “[I] followed the river, because I considered that the water gave me best chance of escape […] [I] resumed my paddling. [T]he sun scorched my bare back” (ibid., 95). Nature provides and heals; however, when damaged, it also causes harm to itself. An obvious manifestation of this is global warming. The Earth experiences cycles of warming and cooling. However, human-made and artificial effects not only accelerate the cycle but also harm humanity itself. Martians not only use physical destruction weapons but also use biological weapons. Herein, Wells’ farsightedness is once more present.

The following serves as a method for suffocating living beings and eradicating endemic species: “The Martians are capable of releasing massive clouds of a black and toxic vapor, leading to cries of ‘Black Smoke!’ from the voices” (ibid., 114). Given that this is a narrative of war, Wells anticipated the utilisation of biological weapons. This concept also ties into biopolitics, as the Martians specifically target biological vulnerabilities.

Additionally, the narrator asserts: “[I] may allude here to the curious suggestions of the red weed. [A]pparently the vegetable kingdom in Mars, instead of having green for a dominant colour, is of a vivid blood red tint. [A]t any rate, the seeds which the Martians (intentionally or accidentally) brought with them gave rise in all cases to red-coloured growths” (ibid., 175). Red weed spreads quickly (ibid., 175). Introducing new vegetation into a habitat would harm both the existing vegetation and the animals. The spreading of red weed could be a metaphor for invasive species. On the other hand, red weed spoils the balance of nature. The narrator remarks as: “[A]t first I was surprised at this flood in a hot, dry summer, but afterwards I discovered that it was caused by the tropical exuberance of the red weed” (ibid., 198). Martians disturb the balance of nature. However, red weed cannot withstand the Earth’s natural environment: “[I]n the end the red weed succumbed almost as quickly as it had spread. [A] cankering disease, due, it is believed, to the action of certain bacteria […] [N]ow by the action of natural selection, all terrestrial plants have acquired a resisting power […] but the red weed rotted like a thing already dead” (ibid., 199). It is obvious that nature employs its defence mechanism, which has been developed through evolution. When the equilibrium is disturbed, nature utilises its weapons, and these weapons are superior to technological weapons. Because, no matter how advanced artificial power is, biological power remains at the centre. It is a foreshadowing of the Martians’ ends and nature’s revenge. Nature kills the red weed as a defence mechanism to save itself. And finally, nature takes its revenge on Martians as well: “[S]ilent and laid in a row, were the Martians-dead!- slain by the putrefactive and disease bacteria against which systems were unprepared; slain as the red weed was being slain; slain, after all man’s devices had failed, by the humblest things that God, in his wisdom, has put upon this earth” (ibid., 230). It can be interpreted as a form of divine justice inherent in nature. Humans’ weapons cannot eliminate the invading Martians; however, nature saves humanity. The other point related to the book’s environmental criticism is its biopolitics.

Initially, the narrator describes how Martians and other extraterrestrial beings are perceived by humanity: “[N]o one would have believed in the last years of the nineteenth century that this world was being watched keenly and closely by intelligences greater than man’s and yet as mortal as his own” (ibid., 9). He also asserts humans yearned to live among beings on Mars. However, humanity thought that they would be inferior to them: “[A]t most terrestrial men fancied there might be other men upon Mars, perhaps inferior to themselves” (ibid., 9-10). It is an excellent demonstration of human hubris.

Humanity tends to feel superior. Their evolutionary development or politics can cause it. Besides being treated as superior to plants or animals, humanity even differentiates their species. It is explained by biopolitics. Considering that Martians are perceived as 'superior' to humanity, they can also be used to illustrate biopolitics. It is undeniable that Wells projected humanity to the Martians. The narrator is also aware of humanity's hubris: "[A]nd we man, the creatures who inhabit this earth must be to them at least as alien and lowly as are the monkeys and lemurs to us" (ibid., 10). The narrator is attempting to understand the mentality of other living beings, particularly animals, on Earth. However, he cannot release his humanity, which is seen at the end of the book.

At this point, it is clear that humans become another type of animal when Martians come. It is beneficial to help humans sense Martians' actions. Humans tend to view themselves as superior because they have relatively 'advanced' intelligence compared to other species. Due to their intelligence, humanity has successfully conquered the natural world, despite their physical strengths not matching those of wild animals such as bears or lions. It is not only towards animals, but also towards other humans. Africans or Native Americans are homo sapiens just as Europeans, however, politics over life prevent equality among humans.

The narrator is self-conscious about this: "[A]nd before we judge them too harshly we must remember what ruthless and utter destruction our own species has wrought, not only upon animals such as the vanished bison and the dodo, but upon its inferior races. The Tasmanians, in spite of their human likeness, were entirely swept out of existence in a war extermination waged by European immigrants" (ibid., 11-12). He talks about how humanity caused the extinction of some animal species as well as genocide against other people. However, the narrator still carries this discourse. He mentions Tasmanians as 'human likeness', language is an indicator or shaper of actions. Tasmanians are human, not 'human-like'. It is indeed a sign for biopolitics and how politics decides the value of life. For Europeans, Tasmanians were 'bare life', and they were 'sacred life'. Bare life is easier to spare because it is 'the other'.

Again, the narrator, thus H.G. Wells, criticises humans and asserts that Martians would do the same. Because for both humanity and Martians, 'the other' or alien life is not 'sacred life', it is 'bare life' that does not carry the same 'qualities' as them. Therefore, killing 'the other' does not hold a criminal status.

Considering the difference in how people treat cats and pests, ecopolitics becomes more evident. While it is acceptable to poison pests, the cats are companions of humans.

Then, the question of who decides a life's value arises. It is, as in the case of *The War*, the Martians' decision. They feel entitled to be above all because they have better 'tools' and more advanced 'intelligence': "[A]nd scoffed at the vulgar idea of its having inhabitants who were signalling us" (ibid., 15). The character Ogilvy thinks that the idea of Mars having intelligent living beings is vulgar. It reflects human vanity, considering that only they are superior: "[H]undreds of observers saw the flame that night […] no one on earth has attempted to explain" (ibid., 15). No one tries to explain the observed flames; people think that it could be another meteor shower. This further asserts the homo sapiens' arrogance.

Before the cylinder opens, people think that there would be a humanoid thing inside it:

> [I] think everyone expected to see a man-possibly something little unlike us terrestrial men, but in all essentials a man. I know I did. But, looking, I presently saw something stirring within the shadow: greyish billowy movements, one above another, and then two luminous disks-like eyes. Then something resembling a little grey snake, about the thickness of a walking stick, coiled up out of the writhing middle, and wriggled in the air towards me (ibid., 30).

People are disgusted by this creature because it does not resemble a humanoid. They are disgusted by Martians because it does not resemble humanity. Humans can even experience disgust toward other humans, such as in cases of discrimination based on skin colour. Black people have faced racism because they did not have 'appropriate' skin colour, and this is the same for brown skin. It is biopolitics that discriminates based on appearance. Humanity would do such to the Martians if they were not technologically advanced: "[T]hose who have never seen a living Martian can scarcely imagine the strange horror of its appearance. The peculiar V-shaped mouth with its pointed upper lip, the absence of brow ridges, the absence of a chin beneath the wedgelike lower lip, the incessant quivering of this mouth" (ibid., 31). Again, there is disgust here as well as fear. It is frightening because humans fear what they cannot understand. As they fear, they show aggression towards the unknown. This may be the reason why European settlers killed locals or used them as slaves.

Another point that resembles the European invasion of the Americas or Australia is the technological difference. Martians have more advanced technology than humans.

Just like humanity invaded with better guns, they try to invade with their own guns. They use their heat-ray, which is an unknown technology to humans.

Even though there are apparent signs that Martians are more intelligent than humans, people still assume they might not be. It could be that Martians are not humanoids. The narrator remarks, "since the Martians were evidently, in spite of their repulsive forms, intelligent creatures" (ibid., 37). The hubris of the children of Adam and Eve is almost maddening. They think that because Martians do not seem like them, they automatically would be inferior. It bears a resemblance to the invasion of America and Africa. Nevertheless, they taste their own medicine when the Martians use a heat-ray. Heat-ray is an analogy of rifles against bows and arrows. The narrator questions how Martians efficiently and swiftly slay people as "it is still a matter of wonder how the Martians are able to slay men so swiftly and so silently" (ibid., 41). It is yet another demonstration of how humans struggle to comprehend Martian technology. It can also be seen how animals experience the impact of human weapons, as this concept does not exist for them. Again, since humanity does not comprehend, it is beyond people's comprehension. As humanity cannot comprehend Martians, they are not expecting intelligent human beings on the Earth, as the narrator guesses: "[P]erhaps they expected to find no living things, certainly no intelligent living things" (ibid., 49). It is a reference for humanity's discovery age. The first European explorers probably did not expect to encounter other humans in the Americas. Even if they had expected it, they would not have considered them human. Therefore, 'the other' becomes bare life. It is how Martians may feel.

In response to the Martian invasion, people attempt to resist; however, as the milkman observes, "'[t]hey aren't to be killed'" (ibid., 55). Humanity's capabilities fall short compared to those of the Martians; even if the Martians appear biologically frail, their strength lies in their advanced technology. The narrator reflects, "[I] began to compare the things to human machines, to ask myself for the first time in my life how an ironclad or a steam engine would seem to an intelligent lower animal" (ibid., 73). Here, he again seeks to empathise with the animals that have suffered at the hands of humans: "[N]ever before in the history of warfare had destruction been so indiscriminate and so universal" (ibid., 77). Throughout history, wars and destruction have favoured humanity, but now it is humanity itself that is being ravaged, irrespective of species. The Martians serve as a poignant reminder of what animals and plants endure under human dominance.

It becomes evident that, in this instance, a superior being administers destruction without regard for species, race, or class.

However, Martians are not invincible. In an attempt to destroy a tripod, humans acquire it by killing one of them: "[T]he living intelligence, the Martian within the hood, was slain and splashed to the four winds of heaven, and the Thing was now but a mere intricate device of metal whirling to destruction" (ibid., 89). It is a foreshadowing of the Martians' end. Without their machinery, they are vulnerable. Their advanced technology does not necessarily make them invincible. They are still biological beings, subject to the laws of nature. Thus, this invokes the question "[W]hat are these Martians?" and the narrator answers as "'What are we?' I answered" (ibid., 97). Alien encounters serve as a tool for humanity to define or construct its identity. Also, both humans and Martians are biological, thus it also invokes the question of what makes the difference between them and how they are more advanced. Nevertheless, despite their technology, "'[f]ormidable as they seem to be, the Martians have not moved from the pit into which they have fallen, and, indeed, seem incapable of doing so. Probably this is due to the relative strength of the earth's gravitational energy'" (ibid., 101). The narrator reads this telegram message. Despite their machinery and intelligence, their biological power is more real than the constructed artificial power. Whether Martians or humans, they evolved from their respective planets; therefore, no matter how advanced their technology might be, they cannot be free from nature's wrath, and their original power comes from their biological bodies and intellect. A further demonstration of Martians' vulnerability is evident in chapter fourteen. People realised that Martians "were nor merely a handful of small sluggish creatures, but that they were minds swaying mechanical bodies" (ibid., 107). It is now understood that Martians are vulnerable; however, there is still a tendency to belittle them. Because they are not humanoid, people often assume they cannot be intelligent; yet they can operate advanced machinery.

A different variant of biopolitics could be deciphered as displacement. Chapter sixteen of Book One talks about the 'exodus' from London. Forced migration is also a means of population control. Humanity has done this throughout its history. Martians also employ this tactic, whether intentionally or not. Pushing locals to another place is a crucial step in invasion or capture. A woman who is affected by the Exodus is Mrs. Elphinstone. She has to migrate to France; however, she is not willing to, and the narrator tells her situation as such: "[S]he seemed, poor woman, to imagine that the French and the Martians might prove very similar" (ibid., 148). This is how bordering and

governmentality work. States draw imaginary lines and call them borders. Whether based on language, race, or religion, it is a device to categorise people. When the border is crossed, one's value of life changes. Before crossing, a person might be sacred life; however, their situation would change to bare life after crossing. Here, Mrs. Elphinstone likens the French to Martians, even if the French are also humans. It is an excellent demonstration of biopolitics. She thinks that the French can also do what Martians do. The other is the enemy. For her, the French are also aliens. It might be interpreted that if the French invaded the UK, they would show the same cruelty because the British are the other.

Mentioning governmentality, book two's title is "The Earth Under the Martians". Herein, Martians start to control most of the country. Martians do not refrain from destroying the environment and adjusting it for their benefits: "[W]e were hopelessly hemmed in by the Black Smoke all that day and the morning of the next […] [A] Martian came across the fields about midday, laying the stuff with a jet of superheated steam that hissed against the walls" (ibid., 158). By this, it can be concluded that the Martians are the sovereign. The sovereign decides whom to live or die. The sovereign determines what is useful and what is not. Therefore, Martians do not kill all humans because killing all of them would provide no benefit: "[A]pparently he tossed them into the great metallic carrier […] It was the first time I realised that the Martians might have any other purpose than destruction with defeated humanity" (ibid., 161). A deduction would be the Martians using humanity as slaves. Slavery was a shameful part of human history. Those who invaded a place made the locals slaves. And there is no reason why Martians should not be able to do this. Another perspective is that of necropolitics. If humanity were as beneficial as death, Martians would do so. Perhaps killing humans was initially their plan, as only the useful ones were to be spared.

Later, the narrator has the chance to inspect Martians closely. He remarks that

> [T]hey were, I now saw, the most unearthly creatures it is possible to conceive. They were huge round bodies-or, rather, heads-about four feet in diameter, each body having in front of it a face. This face had no nostrils-indeed, the Martians do not seem to have had any sense of smell, but it had a pair of very large dark-coloured eyes, and just beneath this a kind of fleshy beak. In the back of this head or body-I scarcely know how to speak of it- was the single tight tympanic surface, since known to be less in our dense air. In a group round the mouth were sixteen slender, almost whiplike tentacles, arranged in two bunches of eight each… The internal anatomy, I may remark here, as dissection has since

> shown, was equally simple. The greater part of the structure was the brain, sending enormous nerves to the eyes, ear, ant tactile tentacles. Besides this were the bulky lungs, into which mouth opened, and the heart and its vessels… And this was the sum of the Martian organs. Strange as it may seem to a human being, all the complex apparatus of digestion, which makes up the bulk of our bodies, did not exist in the Martians. They were heads-merely heads. Entrails they had none. They did not eat, much less digest. Instead, they took the fresh, living blood of other creatures, and injected it into their own veins… Men go happy or miserable as they have healthy or unhealthy livers, or sound gastric glands. But the Martians were lifted above all these organic fluctuations of mood and emotion… the Martians were absolutely without sex, and therefore without any of tumultuous emotions that arise from that difference among men (ibid., 170-173).

The narrator provides an intricate description of Martian anatomy. Considering that Darwinian theories have a significant impact on Wells' narratives, it is possible that the Martians represent the ultimate point of evolution. Martians are 'merely heads' and do not carry needs except fresh blood. They are exempt from humane requirements; therefore, they are not considered human. However, as they do not seem to be human, they have brains. Their brains work like the human brain, and it is selfish. It is almost as if the Martians purposefully evolved themselves this way to reduce their vulnerability while augmenting themselves with machinery. Another point is emotions. Martians do not have emotions as well. This may lead to a crueller behaviour. Since the feelings are absent, they cannot feel mercy towards other living beings. Therefore, killing is not immoral for them. And they feed on "fresh, living blood of other creatures" (ibid., 171). This is another reason why Martians do not wipe out human existence from the Earth.

The narrator once again empathises with animals: "[I] think that we should remember how repulsive our carnivorous habits would seem to an intelligent rabbit" (ibid., 172). Again, the narrator tries to sympathise with animals; however, with a nuance, this time he imagines an intelligent rabbit instead of a regular one. Nevertheless, the Martians cannot sympathise with other creatures due to their evolutionary situation: "[T]o me it is quite credible that the Martians may be descended from beings not unlike ourselves, by a gradual development of brain and hands […] at the expense of the rest of the body" (ibid., 174). Considering Wells' uses of Darwinian theories, the ultimate evolutionary station might be how Martians are. Also, it is a projection of human evolution's future and how people might become as cruel as the Martians.

Another biopolitics by the Martians is red weed. They might have unintentionally brought the seeds here; however, this is an attempt to change the flora. Red weed is not endemic to the Earth, so it might damage the planet. This is an attempt to change the planet and its creatures.

An illustration of this would be: "[I] saw the Martian, in its Briareus of a handling-machine, scrutinizing the curate's head" (ibid., 191). It is like how humans use and scrutinise animals for their experiments. Also, it could be an examination to alter the human brain and its functions. The narrator deeply understands the plight of other creatures that have suffered at the hands of human wrath.

> For that moment I touched an emotion beyond the common range of men, yet one that poor brutes we dominate know too well. I felt as a rabbit might feel returning to his burrow and suddenly confronted by work of a dozen busy navvies digging foundations of a house. I felt the first inkling of a thing that presently grew quite clear in my mind, that oppressed me for many days, a sense of dethronement, a persuasion that I was no longer a master, but an animal among the animals, under the Martian heel (ibid., 197).

Here, the narrator almost begins to be exempt from human hubris and understands how other living beings might feel against humanity. And he describes this as "a sense of dethronement" (ibid., 197). Humanity has dethroned so many things, including other humans. Besides displacing, people caused extinctions, even among other humanoid species, such as Neanderthals.

Red weed is not endemic to Earth, as mentioned above: "[I]n the end the red weed succumbed […] A cankering disease […] to the action of certain bacteria" (ibid., 199). The Red Weed is not immune to terrestrial disease, but terrestrial plants are. However, humans are not immune to the Martians' invasion. The narrator again remarks: "Surely, if we have learned nothing else, this war has taught us pity-pity for those witless souls that suffer our dominion" (ibid., 205). "'This isn't a war,' said the artilleryman. 'It never was war, any more than there's war between man and ants' […] There's the ants build their cities, live their lives, have wars, revolutions, until the men want them out of the way, and then they go out of the way. That's what we are now-just ants […] 'We're eatable ants.'" (ibid., 209). Here, the artilleryman also realises how animals might perceive humans. Here, the ant analogy is apt because it effectively illustrates how Earthlings, this time, became the subject instead of the master.

As mentioned before, Martians do not kill all men. They probably save some for use. The artilleryman asserts this as "Martians will make pets of some of them; train them to do tricks […] And some, maybe, they will train to hunt us" (ibid., 214) and while mentioning the need to form a resistance, "Eh? You begin to see? And we forma band-able-bodied, clean minded men. We're not going to pick up any rubbish that drifts in. Weaklings go out again… Able-bodied, clean-minded women we want also-mothers and teachers. No lackadaisical ladies-no blasted rolling eyes" (ibid., 215). It is another demonstration of biopolitics. First, the Martians will utilise some humans. Second, the resistance would be ableist because a person should be 'functioning' to be useful. "Weaklings" (ibid., 215), as the artilleryman puts it, are not helpful and can be spared. Here, the artilleryman is not only sexist but also ableist. Martians want functioning humans because they want useful servants, just like humanity eliminates disabled and infertile domesticated animals. Also, the human side wants functioning people to be able to fight. This demonstrates how states and the contemporary economic order impose a 'standard' of men and women stereotypes. And while the artilleryman mentions his thoughts that the Martians could make humanity their 'pet', the narrator cannot bear this. "'No,' I cried, 'that's impossible! No human being'" (ibid., 214). Here, despite all his efforts to grasp and comprehend suppressed animals and plants, the narrator still cannot release his human identity and carries human pride.

Finally, the narrator witnesses the dead bodies of Martians:

> [A]nd scattered about it, some in their overturned war-machines, some in the now rigid handling-machines, and a dozen of them stark and silent laid in a row, were the Martians-dead!- slain by putrefactive and disease bacteria against which their systems were unprepared; slain as the red weed was being slain; slain, after all man's devices had failed, by the humblest God, in his wisdom, has put upon this earth […] These germs of disease have taken toll of humanity since the beginning of things-taken toll of our prehuman ancestors since life began here […] our microscopic allies (ibid., 230).

Just like their plant, they are also not immune to terrestrial diseases. And the irony is that, despite their power, their small, 'petty' species destroyed them. It can be deduced that biological power can be the real destroying force. And undermining a life by their appearance or 'wit' might be wrong. Like the COVID-19 pandemic, a small virus or bacteria can threaten great civilisations. Also, humanity's biopolitical struggle against nature is evident. Humans encounter many things and try to survive and thrive, and

diseases are one of them. They developed immunity through their body and evolution. A third view that can be deduced from the quotation is the human tendency towards hypocrisy. Usually, humans try to eliminate bacteria, germs, and other microorganisms. However, they like them when it comes to saving humanity and become 'microscopic allies'.

The final step to analyse the novel is ecopolitics. Ecopolitics is a discipline that discusses humanity's relationship with nature. Considering the discipline explained in the previous chapter, it is safe to claim that states are the authorities over decisions not only regarding life, but also the environment, including organic/inorganic matters. These policies are implemented and enforced through discourses and institutions. Such discourses are the Anthropocene discourse and 'nature vs culture' thought, which are institutionalised. These discourses, as discussed above, were first applied in literature and occidental beliefs, including Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Through religions, it might be asserted that human-centrism has taken the highlight. And since these religions were the prevailing norms of the time, their discourse of placing humans above other creatures was normalised. Therefore, institutions that occurred throughout history acted accordingly. Modern manifestations of these systems are states, and states utilise human-centrism. In fact, categorising as nature, environment, and ecology is political because it is a linguistic discourse. Without artificial labels, there would be no difference between a rock, a tiger, and an ape. However, linguistic and cultural discourses shape the divide, and this division between human and nature is evident in *The War*, even if it is expressed in the form of aliens.

As Carson asserts in her fable, the Martians come to the Earth for their pleasure, also for their own survival because "[t]he secular cooling that must someday overtake our planet has already gone far indeed with our neighbour" (ibid., 10). Also, "[a]nd looking across space with instruments [...] a morning star of hope" (ibid., 11), the Martians observe the Earth with envious eyes, like in the case of humanity's view towards natural beauties. Hence, both humans and the Martians disrupt the harmony of nature because they artificially construct the environment. An illustration of this is the Martians utilising their weapon as "the Martians were setting fire to everything within range of their heat-ray" (ibid., 62). The motivation trailing the evident action is political because either saving or destroying nature is a political decision which is accessed and assessed through institutions and discourses. Because it provides profit, as in the case of deforestation, it often occurs due to monetary concerns. And the reflection of this for the Martians is their

destructiveness upon the Earth; however, their profit will not be monetarily, but in surviving: "[T]hen suddenly the trees in the pine wood ahead of me were parted […] they were snapped off and driven head long" (ibid., 67). Comparable to humans opening up space for buildings, the Martians opening up space for themselves and their profit and economy is their survival. Thus, the Martians accept the destruction even though they realise the harm. Later, the Martians take control of the planet, and it becomes a symbol of the state. They demonstrate another point that Rachel Carson mainly criticises, which is the use of pesticides: "[A]t Halliford whither we fled to escape the Black Smoke" (ibid., 157), which symbolises pesticides. From a far perspective, the Martians are humans who use pesticides, and humans are the pests, rodents, and weeds whom the Martians target. Additionally, there may be another interpretation of the novel's ecopolitics, one that applies biopolitics to it.

Martians are analogous to humans. They also demonstrate an entitlement. Martians observe humans and consider the Earth as their right. They feel entitled, just like humanity. Humans only care about their comfort in nature and do not refrain from 'occupying' others' habitat. Moreover, it is not only a case for vegetation or animals. Humans even divide themselves into their species. Therefore, it is selfish and akin to the 'survival of the fittest' principle. If humans rank themselves within their species, inevitably, more intelligent extraterrestrial beings would not value their lives. It is a demonstration of ecopolitics. Martians do the same. They destroy life without discriminating. The narrator then describes how Martians view our planet, rich in resources, in contrast to their dying planet: "[A]nd looking across space with instruments […] our own warmer planet, green with vegetation and grey with water" (Wells, H.G. 2022: 11). It is as if Europeans' thoughts during the age of geographical discoveries. The current is not enough. Therefore, new places to pillage should be searched. Just like humans did, Martians view people as inferior, sparable beings. However, it would be vice versa for humanity if they had the facilities. Humans show disgust when they see the Martians. In her PhD dissertation, Rosalind Diaz takes this situation from a body politic[24] view and claims that the Martian body creates disgust (2018: 13-14).

[24] Body politics might be counted as a discipline in Biopolitics. Body politics refers the practices of power over physical body, particularly gender, sexuality, race, and reproduction. Judith Butler comments on the subject as: "Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being (1999: 43-44).

No matter how developed and strong they are, bacteria defeat Martians. Their biology is not suitable for this planet. Nevertheless, still, they insist on settling on the Earth. Ultimately, nature has taken its revenge, reminding us of its supremacy. Martians try to eliminate creatures without differentiating them. This novel is just a perfect analogy of humanity's actions. H.G. Wells published this in 1898; however, as of 2025, human wrath upon the environment and also upon other humans remained.

3.3 Future of Humanity

Venus planet of love was destroyed by global warming, did its people want too much too? (Mitski, 2018)

The novel is a metaphor for humanity and its future. There are already analyses on this matter. This section will explore what has already been said and approach this theme by utilising the Kardashev Scale.

As stated in the book, Mars is dying as a planet, and the Martians are searching for a new planet to settle. Their planet is dying because of cooling, Wells wrote. In the book, unlike humans and the Earth's situation, Martians are not the cause of the planet's demise. Even if there was no such concept back when Wells wrote the novel, he speculated based on the Earth's situation after the Industrial Revolution, the decline of resources and species on Earth. B.J. Gold asserts the Martian atmosphere's damage is frighteningly close to Earth's and "The Martians' effect on the Terran atmosphere is thus all too familiar, accelerating the entropic changes we are already creating for ourselves" (2021: 166-167). Until the late 20th century, people were largely unaware of global warming and the concept of the Earth's impending demise. *The War* shifted the view of Mars and led humanity to imagine a 'dying planet' (Gold, B.J., 2021: 167). The Victorian speculation about humanity's future is evident in the novel, and Wells merges Darwin's theory of evolution and thermodynamics to reflect humanity's inevitable end (ibid., 187-168). Either dying of Mars stems from Martians or a natural process; their technology allows them a way out of Mars (ibid., 170). One day, humanity will also try to colonise other planets or moons. There are already works on this matter. Some scientists say there can be liquid water on Jupiter's moon Europa as of 2025 (NASA, n.d.). SpaceX has a programme to colonise Mars (SpaceX, 2024). The irony is that in the novel, it is vice versa.

Martians' superior technology cannot save them from a bacterium, resulting from their detachment from nature, even though they are more evolved than humankind (ibid., 170-171). Finally, Gold declares: "[T]he general slipperiness of Wells's imaginary makes such a certainty impossible to sustain. Even as we confront ourselves as 'natives' or 'barbarians,' we must also recognise ourselves as Martians. Even as we succumb to their designs upon Earth, we are reminded that they are doing no more than we have done, or would have done, or are in the process of doing" (ibid., 174).

Wells in the novel "challenges assumptions of human primacy and dominance by introducing a threat to humanity in the form of a highly evolved Martian competitor" (Canavan, G. & Robinson, K. S. 2014: 25). Unlike the majority of the invasion narratives, *The War* does not provide a heroism, instead what beats Martians is nature (ibid., 27). Wells warns humanity about the probable end of humans. Nature can take its revenge and "the novel as a whole makes clear that scientific knowledge and technological power cannot guarantee the survival of a species, and that even the most advanced species has only limited agency in the face of the natural world and the physical laws that govern it" (ibid., 27). Also, the novel and Wells "expresses a distinctly fin de siècle, evolution-induced anxiety about the future of human dominance, the power of technology, and the long-term survival of the species and the planet" (ibid., 30). Therefore, the moral that can be deduced from this narrative is to take good care of the environment in which one lives. While nature can provide and nurture, it can also be a nightmare if not correctly cared for. Both humans and Martians are at the mercy of nature rather than being its masters (ibid., 35). Another perspective that can be added here is utilising civilisation scales, which can expedite further analysis for projections upon the future.

Nikolai Kardashev was a Soviet astronomer who proposed a scale for advanced civilisations in 1964. For him, there are three types of civilisations.

> Type I—A civilisation that could harness the energy resources available to the planet.
>
> Type II—A civilisation that could harness all the energy produced by its planet's star.
>
> Type III—A civilisation that could harness all the energy produced by its galaxy (Adler, C. L. 2014: 327).

For Type I, a civilisation must be able to utilise all its planet's resources. This might involve harnessing the planet's core as a source of energy, rather than relying on fossil fuels or nuclear power. An example of this type of civilisation could be Isaac Asimov's

Foundation (1951), which efficiently utilises its planet's resources. For the second type, Type II, a civilisation must be able to harness all its stars' energy. Indeed, there is a hypothetical machine proposed by Freeman Dyson, which is a spherical object that surrounds the star and collects energy from it (Stableford, B.M., 2006: 133). An illustration for this type could be the humanity in *Interstellar* (dir. Christopher Nolan, 2014). Although humans are not exactly Type II in the film, it hints at access to higher-dimensional technology. The last one is Type III. This type of civilisation can tame a galaxy's power. This is illustrated in *2001: A Space Odyssey* (dir. Stanley Kubrick, 1973). The monolith builders are almost godlike, proving they are Type III and beyond.

These are the categories of civilisation Kardashev proposed. According to Carl Sagan, humanity is a type 0.7 civilisation (Adler, C. L. 2014: 327-328). When analysed for the Martians, it can be observed that they are a Type 1 civilisation, or perhaps further along. Because if they could utilise the Sun's power, they would not need to colonise other planets. Considering these factors, it seems essential to be a Type 2 civilisation for a clean environment and a healthy home. Like Martians, humanity may need to find other planets or moons to live on someday if they do not take good care of its home.

CONCLUSION

Humanity reflects its dreams, aspirations, and desires in literature. The SF genre has been a tool to write these down. H.G. Wells is a significant person in the formation of the genre. He made significant contributions to SF and paved the way for the genre. He might be the greatest constructor of SF because he introduced new themes, tools, and narrative techniques. His masterpiece, *The War*, revolutionised Mars and alien themes specifically. The novel invoked a reverse invasion anxiety while practising ecocritical and biopolitical elements. The book provides a good foundation for examining these two subjects. The story narrates an invasion by the Martians.

This thesis has utilised SF, ecocriticism, biopolitics, and ecopolitics. The book presented a mirror image of humanity to the Martians. In the novel, the Martians were harming the environment, not humans. Mars was dying, and the Martians were searching for a new settling place. They exhibited a humane approach to invasion when they came to Earth. Also, the Martians practised biopolitics. They killed living beings according to their needs and made live the 'useful' ones. The novel portrayed humanity's future. To achieve these goals, this thesis applied specific theories and examined the history of SF.

The first chapter investigated the history of SF and how this genre formed during the late 19th century. Initially, SF was more of a speculation about the Earth rather than a future dream. However, it was Wells who changed the landscape and forged the genre. He designed the genre and became a pioneer for SF. Most famous SF writers followed Wells' steps. SF used real-world scientific knowledge to speculate about the future. For instance, Wells achieved this by speculating that the Martians represent the last stage of the evolutionary line, based on Darwin's theory of evolution. The first chapter also explored the first examples of SF and Jules Verne. Also, it examined how the genre shaped after Wells.

Chapter two began by explaining ecopolitics at first. It explored Rachel Carson's seminal book, *Silent Spring* (1962), and its significance. It also provided the relationship between structuralism and ecology studies. It mentioned that language and culture constructed a division between humans and the natural environment, which should not be separated, as humanity also belongs to the natural environment. The Ecopolitics section explained how the right to live of either organic or inorganic things was determined by sovereign power in the form of states.

Chapter two elaborates on ecocriticism, a relatively new literary theory. It begins by defining the concept and tracing its historical background. The chapter addresses the concept of anthropocentrism, highlighting its implications for nature and the environment. This perspective embodies a human-centred worldview, placing humans above all other living beings on Earth. It also explores humanity's disconnection from nature. Furthermore, chapter two examines the presence of ecocriticism in science fiction (SF), analysing how the environment is portrayed in SF literature. The final section discusses various terms such as 'nature,' 'ecology,' and 'the environment,' using 'environment' as an overarching term that includes both organic and artificially constructed settings.

Chapter two delved into biopolitics, beginning with Michel Foucault's concepts of governmentality and power, which played a crucial role in its popularization. It subsequently analysed Giorgio Agamben's concept of 'homo sacer,' distinguishing between sacred life (acceptable citizens) and bare life (unwanted existence). The chapter concluded with an exploration of Achille Mbembe's concept of necropolitics.

In Chapter Three, information on Wells and The War was provided. The chapter explored the Victorian Era and concepts of Mars and aliens. Then, the chapter analysed the novel according to these theories. At first, it analysed how SF is evident in the novel. It demonstrated that the common themes of SF were evident here at first. The novel used real scientific knowledge to speculate about what the future might bring. The analysis then examined the ecocritical aspects of the novel. It was the Martians who devastated the environment, not humans. However, the novel also showcased that nature took its revenge on them. After this, the analysis scrutinised the biopolitics of the novel. In the novel, the Martians decided who would live and who would die because they were the sovereigns. Nevertheless, their biological power was insufficient to invade the Earth fully, and they were ultimately defeated by bacteria to which terrestrial beings had developed immunity.

Finally, the chapter stated that the Martians showed ecopolitics. They eliminated the species that were not beneficial for them and kept the species and individuals that would benefit them. Then, the chapter closed by mentioning that the book and the Martians were predictions for the future. It gave previous ideas and created a new perspective using the Kardashev scale.

In conclusion, H.G. Wells's *The War of the Worlds* (1898) serves as a compelling novel for the exploration of ecocriticism, biopolitics, and ecopolitics. It offers a thought-

provoking perspective on humanity's potential future by reflecting human behaviours through the lens of the Martians. The Martians exemplify traits such as discrimination against other species, the exploitation of nature, and a tendency to eliminate perceived threats through invasion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, C.L. (2014). *Wizards, Aliens, and Starships: Physics and Math in Fantasy and Science Fiction*. Princeton University Press. Princeton.

Agamben, G. (1998). (trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen). (ed. Werner Hamacher & David E. Wellberry). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life.* Stanford University Press. Stanford, California.

Aldiss, B., & Wingrove, D. (1986). *Trillion Year Spree: The History of Science Fiction*.

Aldiss, B.W. (1973). *Billion Year Spree: The True History of Science Fiction.* Doubleday & Company, Inc., Garden City, New York.

Althusser, L. (2014). *On the Reproduction of Capitalism*. Verso. New York.

Baratta, C. (2012). *Environmentalism in the Realm of Science Fiction and Fantasy Literature*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Brantingler, P. & Thesing, W. (2002). *A Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Blackwell Publishing.

Buell, L. (2005). *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination.* Blackwell Publishing. Malden, MA, the USA

Buried water ice at Mars's equator? (2024). Esa.int. https://www.esa.int/Science_Exploration/Space_Science/Mars_Express/Buried_water_ice_at_Mars_s_equator?

Butler, J. (1999). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge. New York.

Campbell, T. & Sitze, A. (2013). *Biopolitics: A Reader.* Duke University Press. Durham.

Canavan, G. & Robinson, K.S. (2014). *Green Planets: Ecology and Science Fiction*. Wesleyan University Press.

Card, O.S. (1990). *How to Write Science Fiction and Fantasy*. Writer's Digest Books. Cincinnati, Ohio

Carrington, D. (2022, March 25). Microplastics found in human blood for first time. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/mar/24/microplastics-found-in-human-blood-for-first-time

Carson, R. (1962). *Silent Spring*. Houghton Mifflin Company. Boston.

Clark, T. (2015). *Ecocriticism on the Edge: Anthropocene as a Threshold Concept.* Bloomsbury Academic. London

Conley, V.M. (1997). *Ecopolitics: The Environment in Poststructuralist Thought*. Routledge. London.

Costa, R. H. (1967). *H. G. Wells*. Twayne Publishers Inc., New York.

Crossley, R. (2011). *Imagining Mars: A Literary History.* Wesleyan University Press.

Cush, D. et al. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Hinduism.* Routledge.

Dalal, R. (2010). *Hinduism: An Alphabetical Guide.* Penguin Books India.

Del Rey, L. (1979). *The World of Science Fiction: 1926-1976.* Ballantine Books, New York

Diaz, R. (2018). *Alien Invasions, Vulnerable Bodies: Science Fiction and the Biopolitics of Embodiment from H. G. Wells to Octavia Butler.* [Doctoral dissertation, UC Berkeley]. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6qr256tg

Esposito, R. (2008). (trans. Timothy Campbell). *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy.* University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis.

Foucault, M. (2008). (trans. Graham Burchell). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collége de France.* Palgrave Macmillan. New York.

Foucault, M. (2009). (trans. Graham Burchell). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at Collége de France.* Palgrave Macmillan. Hampshire.

Garrard, G. (2nd ed.) (2012). *Ecocriticism*. Routledge. Abingdon. the UK

Gernsback, H. (ed.), (1926) *Amazing Stories (vol.1, no.1, April 1926)* Experimenter Publishing Company, New York.

Giddens, A. (1985). *The Nation-State and Violence.* Polity Press. Cambridge.

Glotfelty, C. & Fromm, H. (1996). *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. University of Georgia Press. Athens, Georgia, the USA.

Gold, B.J. (2021). *Energy, Ecocriticism, and Nineteenth-Century Fiction: Novel Ecologies.* Palgrave Macmillan. Cham, Switzerland.

Gunn, J. & Candelaria, M. (ed.) (2005). *Speculations on Speculation: Theories of Science Fiction.* Scarecrow Press Inc.

Hamilton, E. (1942). *Mythology.* Back Bay Books. New York.

Hammond, J.R. (1979). *An H.G. Wells Companion.* Macmillan Press. London

James, E, & Mendlesohn, F. (2003). *The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction,* Cambridge University Press

Jameson, F. (2005). *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions.* Verso.

Kant, I. (1855). (trans. J. M. D. Meiklejohn). *The Critique of Pure Reason.*

LeMenager S. et al. (2011). *Environmental Criticism for the Twenty-First Century.* Routledge. New York.

Lemke, T. (2011). (trans. Eric Frederick Trump). *Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction.* New York University Press. New York.

Levitas, R. (2010). *The Concept of Utopia (vol.3).* Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, Bern

Levy, M.M. & Mendlesohn, F. (2019). (ed.) *Aliens in Popular Culture*. Greenwood. Santa Barbara, California.

Lindow, J. (2001). *Norse Mythology: A Guide to the Gods, Heroes, Rituals, and Beliefs.* Oxford University Press. Oxford, UK.

Mason, P. (2016, March 29). *The racist hijacking of Microsoft's chatbot shows how the internet teems with hate*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/mar/29/microsoft-tay-tweets-antisemitic-racism

Mbembe, A. (2019). (trans. Steven Corcoran). *Necropolitics.* Duke University Press. Durham

McConnell, F. (1981). *The Science Fiction of H.G. Wells.* Oxford University Press.

McConnell, F. D. (1980). H. G. Wells: Utopia and Doomsday. The Wilson Quarterly (1976-), 4(3), 176–186. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40255984

Mills, C. (2018). *Biopolitics.* Routledge. London.

Mitski. (2018). Nobody [Song]. *Be The Cowboy*. Dead Oceans.

NASA. (n.d.). Evidence for an Ocean | Why Europa? NASA's Europa Clipper. https://europa.nasa.gov/why-europa/evidence-for-an-ocean/

Nilsson, J. & Wallenstein, S.O. (2013). *Foucault, Biopolitics, and Governmentality.* Södertörn University. Stockholm.

Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. "science fiction (n.), sense 1," July 2023, https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/8194789587.

Petrov, G. (2024). (trans. Ayser Ali). *Beyaz Zambaklar Ülkesinde.* İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. İstanbul.

Pilkington, A.C. (2017). *Science Fiction and Futurism: Their Terms and Ideas*. McFarland. Jefferson, North Carolina.

Plumwood, V. (1993). *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. Routledge.

Polansky, R. (2007). *Aristotle's De Anima.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Pooley, J., & Socolow, M. J. (2013, October 29). Orson Welles' War of the Worlds Did Not Touch Off a Nationwide Hysteria. Few Americans Listened. Even Fewer Panicked. Slate Magazine. https://slate.com/culture/2013/10/orson-welles-war-of-the-worlds-panic-myth-the-infamous-radio-broadcast-did-not-cause-a-nationwide-hysteria.html

Rieder, J. (2008). *Colonialism and the Emergence of Science Fiction*. Wesleyan University Press.

Roberts, A. (2016). *The History of Science Fiction 2nd ed.* Palgrave Macmillan

Rose, D. B. (1996). *Nourishing Terrains: Australian Aboriginal Views of Landscape and Wilderness*. Australian Heritage Commission.

Seed, D. (2011). *Science Fiction: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press

Shafer-Landau, R. (2021). *The Fundamentals of Ethics.* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

SpaceX. (2024). Missions: Mars. SpaceX; SpaceX. https://www.spacex.com/humanspaceflight/mars/

Stableford, B. M. (2006). *Science Fact and Science Fiction: An Encyclopedia*. Taylor & Francis.

Storey, J. (2012). (6th ed.) *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: An Introduction.* Routledge. Abingdon, the UK

Suvin, D. (1979). *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre,* Yale University Press, New Haven and London

Tarizzo, D. (2017). (trans. M. William Epstein). *Life: A Modern Invention.* University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis.

The American Museum of Natural History (1975) *Natural History Vol. LXXXIV,* The American Museum of Natural History, New York

Tilly, C. (2017). (ed. Ernesto Castaneda & Cathy Lisa Schneider) *Collective Violence, Contentious Politics, and Social Change: A Charles Tilly Reader.* Routledge. New York.

Tripathi, S. et al. (2023). *Eco-politics and Global Climate Change*. Springer.

Valantinas, A., Mustard, J.F., Chevrier, V. et al. Detection of ferrihydrite in Martian red dust records ancient cold and wet conditions on Mars. Nat Commun 16, 1712 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-56970-z

Vipin, K. S. Thoreau's Ecocriticism: An Improved Means to Unimproved Ends. American Journal of Arts and Design. Vol. 2, No. 1, 2017, pp. 24-29. doi: 10.11648/j.ajad.20170201.14

Wagar, W. W. (1989). H. G. Wells and the Scientific Imagination. The Virginia Quarterly Review, 65(3), 390–400. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26437855

Weber, M. (2014). (ed. trans. H. Gerth & C. Wright Mills). *Politics As a Vocation.* Inoulin Digital Editions.

Wells, H.G. (2022). *The War of the Worlds.* Literart. İstanbul.

Westling, L. (2014). *The Cambridge Companion to Literature and the Environment.* Cambridge University Press.