Une Tempête Politicizing *The Tempest*: Césaire Rewrites Shakespeare

Lotfi Salhi
Assistant lecturer of literature, Tunisia.

Abstract— *New Historicists and their British counterparts, cultural materialists, viewed classical texts from Renaissance and romanticism in less favourable terms. In so doing, they highlighted the view that great works of literature, Shakespeare's plays for instance, advocated dominant discourses of power and sustained existing political systems of their period. This paper, therefore, explores not so much the theory of New Historicism and British Cultural Materialism, but uses the assumptions of these two literary movements in favour of the view that Shakespeare's plays were instruments for the promotion of European culture, particularly its colonial aims at the start of empire building age. The interest of this paper is to trace through reproductions of The Tempest the contours of the dialogue between Shakespeare and the colonial question, arguing that the Shakespearean theatre whatever its ideological complexities is not somehow above the historical and political conditions of its production.*

Keywords*: Shakespeare, text, colonialism, history, culture, representation, hegemony.*

I. INTRODUCTION

E.E Stoll wrote in 1927, "there is not a word in *The Tempest* about America […] Nothing but the Bermudas, once barely mentioned as faraway places" (Stoll, 58). In *TheTempest* Shakespeare makes several references that allow one to consider what was happening in the New World of the Americas and the West Indies, particularly what was known about a shipwreck group of colonials headed for America but stranded for a year on a deserted West Indies island, as an opening of the colonial desire for adventures in far away places. It was during the Renaissance that Europe began to withdraw from its medieval backwardnesss and to emerge to the world hegemony. The Renaissance was an era marked by Europe's greed for 'discovery'and exploration of lands across the sea. The Roman impressive colonial history and legend of the time has widely had its effect on the British imaginative mind.

Not only did Shakespeare display in some of his plays Rome as an imperial force somewhere in the world, but as a narcissistic model for England's imperial ambitions. The extraordinary shipwreck of some would-be Virginian colonists on the Bermudas flavours *The Tempest*. Following Stoll, one could argue that the action of *The Tempest* takes place between Tunis and Naples, presumably in the Mideterranean. The shipwrecked characters are returning from Tunis after a wedding. Not only were they attracted to the woman's body, but also fascinated by the land on which she was born.Yet, though no English colony was successful in Shakespeare's life-time, Prospero's full control of the island and his seizure of authority over Caliban in *The Tempest* brings to mind the colonial question in the play. *The Tempest* is a play which bespeaks the degree to which Shakespeare's canonical power is aligned with a coherent national imaginary. The hierarchical relationship between master and slave, or discoverer and discovered, in a dispossessed island falls into the format of colonial identity and colonialism.

As a dominant Elizabethan public art form, Shakespeare's theatre also operated concomitantly with the golden age of British imperialism specifically in its early, tentative steps of development. Being a playwright and poet of English descent, Shakespeare is also the product of his historical moment. Starting from Prospero's policy based on power and authority, *The Tempest* functions as a documentary material fraught with multiple forms of Elizabethan world politics and colonial psychology.This is made prominent through the Caliban-Prospero-Ariel troika dear to Césaire's *Une Tempête*, a play which adapts Shakespeare's *The Tempest* for a Negro theatre. By reproducing Shakespeare's play into *Une Tempête* of his own invention, Césaire demonstrates the suffering of his fellow people from the atrocity of politicians like Henry Stanley or Cecil Rhodes whose crimes on the African land were camouflaged in the civilizing mission they pretended they were there to fulfill. In *Postcolonial Shakespeares*, Ania Loomba and Martin Orkin, discussing Francis Barker's and Peter Hulme's essay about *TheTempest*, attribute a colonial role to Shakespeare:

> "As Francis Barker and Peter Hulme argued in a revisionist essay on *The Tempest*, English colonialism had previously been acknowledged only as a source material for Shakespeare's play; they showed instead how colonial discourse was central to the play's thematic as well as formal concerns, forming not a

> background but rather one of its'dominant discursive con-texts".
> (Barker & Hulme, 198 in Loomba& Orkin, 4).

Yet, although many readings of *TheTempest* debunk the idea of the existence of visible bonds between Shakespeare and the issue of colonialism by denying the broad claims of the bard as a producer and purveyor of paternalistic ideologies basic to the colonialist aims of Western imperial enterprise, postcolonial re-writings of *The Tempest* generally assume that the interaction between Shakespeare and Western colonialism is as clear as saying good day. Shakespeare's play enters into this debate about the relationship between colonizer and colonized, or discoverer and discovered. Caliban is widely recognized as an anagram for cannibal which implies that the discovered (also the colonized) is inferior, savage, brute, slave, and a devil in need of civilization. The colonizing process is therefore deemed by men like Prospero as a necessary mission to humanize the other and to bring him to civilization. The symbolic relationship between Caliban and Prospero, who identifies himself lord of the island, even though Caliban was there first, draws attention to the whole enterprise of colonization in which England had become more and more involved by the time Shakespeare crafted his romance *TheTempest*.

By reproducing the discursive logic implied within 16th century colonial England, *The Tempest* also functions as an active agent in the construction of self-awareness and the fashioning of the British national identity. The play provides a vocabulary which suggests the existence of natural differences- social, racial, cultural and historical- between colonizer and colonized by which colonial identity is legitimized and naturalized. Eventhough it is not Shakespeare who initiated ideologies of colonialism and histories of race, we find that he provides in *The Tempest* a diction expressing cultural difference and uses metaphors sustaining colonial projects either implicitly or explicitly. The critical investigation of plays like *The Tempest* and *Antony and Cleopatra* reveals the extent to which they convey resonance of Western colonial authority and representation. Shakespeare's theatre instead of passively reflecting Elizabethan society and its power relations, "it now often is seen as engulfed by colonial discourse" (Willis, 279), retaining little separate identity of its own. In *The Tempest* the character of Prospero who is critically associated "with his playwright-creator more often than any other Shakespearean figure"(Cartelli, 105) is reminiscent of European politicians and military leaders who brought their assumptions of racial superiority and cultural difference and imposed them on culturally dispossessed peoples.

As far as the interplay between *The Tempest* and *Une Tempête* is concerned, it is Césaire's conviction that nothing was left of Shakespeare on his "ancestral African soil" (Zabus, 45) in the 1930s which informs his reproduction of the play. Césaire reproduces Shakespeare's *The Tempest* into *Une Tempête* of his own invention by rendering the five acts into three and portraying Caliban as a character who dares to talk back to Prospero, revealing him as a liar who has come to the island not to lift him to civilization but to satisfy his capitalistic greed for gold and money. The discursive relations which Césaire's play shares with Shakespeare's show Shakespeare as a metaphorical figure, a window through which one peeps into the deep abyss of colonial hegemonies and imperial ideologies on the African continent. Césaire uses *TheTempest* characters to revive the British colonial policy of the Elizabethan and Jacobean kings and queens, and the whole Renaissance, in the 1960s on an isolated island in the Caribbean region where chance and fate rather than careful arrangement brought kings and slaves together. We read in Césaire that Shakespeare meant the characters of Prospero, Caliban and Ariel to "be located in a hierarchical power relationship" (Zabus, 56) in which Prospero is the master and Caliban and Ariel are slaves. On Caliban's island like in colonized countries where British colonialism aggressively subjugated the land and its people, Césaire and his fellow Caribbeans identify with Caliban, finding in him an expression of their long history of colonial oppression. At the start of decolonization movements from the late fifties onwards, postcolonial writers turned to *TheTempest* to unearth from it a suppressed narrative of their historical abuse. For them and other postcolonial critics *TheTempest* was not value-free, atemporal and transcendent masterpiece. Shakespeare is rather a predictive and essentialist conditioner of textual signification.If this is really the case, then Shakespeare could beapproached both as a literary genius, and a formidable source of discursive power.

In fact, the whole colonial question in *The Tempest* is embodied in its protagonist Prospero. His relationship with Caliban and his treatment of him brings Shakespeare to colonialism by uncovering his parochial support for Elizabethan monarchy and patriarchy. The idea of Prospero's superiority versus Caliban's inferiority is but a colonial construct used to confirm, Césaire makes clear in his *Tempête* that a natural inequality exists between the two which gives justification for the idea of domination and authority. To Césaire, Lamming, Modisan, Mannouni and others who have interpreted *The Tempest* in this light, the play conveys the miseries and atrocities of colonial

oppression manifested in the repression of African people and the usurpation of their land. When Prospero first set his feet on the island, Caliban perhaps out of a culturally inherent sense of hospitality or because overwhelmed by years of solitude and excluion, trusted him, served him and guided him through the island: "and showed thee o' th' isle" (1.2. 337). He even loved him, "I loved thee" (1.2. 335). Contrariwise, Caliban's hospitality is returned with Prospero's hostility.

The supremacist role Prospero played while marooned on Caliban's island by chance and fate is an event of critical importance and of wide relevance to colonial policy and to colonialism. Césaire exhaustively stresses this event in his play through Caliban's indictment of Prospero:

> You didn't teach me a thing ! Except to jabber in your ownlanguage so that I could understand your orders: chop wood,wash the dishes, fish for food, plant vegetables because youwere too lazy to do ityourself (17).

Here Césaire discloses one of the strategies that mostly characterizes colonialist discourse which is the gift of language. Language as a medium of power plays an important role in what Stephen Greenblatt called"the process of self-fashioning". Prospero capitalizes on the motif of language to fashion his European self against the image of an ignorant, voiceless Caliban. Here Césaire mocks Prospero's ill-founded assumptions about Caliban, hinting at the fake characterization he conceives of him. Prospero's image of Caliban is bounded by the signs of fictionality and inventiveness; Prospero is, says Caliban, "an old hand at deception" because he "lied so much to [him]" (*Une Tempête*, 3.2. 61-62).Furthermore, by giving Caliban a voice through teaching him language, Prospero reveals discontinuities and paradoxes within the whole political system of colonialism.

Aimé Césaire uses the Prospero-Caliban relationship as an interpretive model through which he describes the historical logic implied within the colonialist discourse. Prospero is a reminder of the monolithic entity which comes to shape the British subjective and politcal policy developed during the activities of overseas travel and cultural exchange from the late fourteenth century onwards. Thus, what Octave Mannouni calls the "Caliban complex" or "the dependency complex"(Mannouni, 22) is there to serve one major end: to give legitimacy and entitlement for Prospero to rule over Caliban and to take control of the island. The case for colonialism is also evident in so far as Prospero is presented as a good character while Caliban is identified with bad attributes: dirty, savage, brute, backward, and so on. This paradoxical presentation of both characters serves as a rationalization and perhaps a legitimation for Prospero's domination of Caliban. This goes hand in glove with the colonial project of subjugating and containing the colonized other under the pretext of his inability to govern himself and his need for an authority which represents him.

Yet although Aimé Césaire, like Frantz Fanon, envisions in his play the clear bond between Prospero and Caliban to highlight the elements of interdependence and reciprocity on the island: Prospero gave Caliban water with berries and taught him Renaissance Knowledge (mainly astrology) and Caliban, in turn, showed him all the qualities of the fauna and flaura, he eventually ends up shredding this bond by disrupting into smithereens the legitimacy and authority Prospero has established since he first set his feet on the island. Prospero and Caliban become equal partners disputing the issue of territory and evoking a serious crisis of representation. Césaire even highlights Caliban's disruptive potential which led to the progressive erosion of Prospero's high self esteem on the island. Faced with this new order of things the latter recurs to the powers of his magic and grapples with it in a bid to escape Caliban's threat. If on the one hand Shakespeare presents a Prospero who flaunts the beneovalent act of teaching language to Caliban, Césaire on the other hand endorses Caliban's claims, arguing that by seemingly pretending to civilize their "others" colonizers enslave them and fix them into perpetual otherness. Otherness, it seems obvious, is foregrounded against a symmetry Césaire establishes between Prospero's education of Caliban by teaching him language and astrology and Shakespeare the playwright as symptomatic and symbolic, in Rob Nixon's words, "of the education of Africans and Caribbeans into passive, subservient relationship to dominant colonial culture" (Nixon, 3). Here, there is a strong sense of how historical discourse is related to the individual playwright which in retrospect portrays him as a participant in that discourse.In *Une Tempête* Césaire makes it obvious that Shakespeare forms his ideas about non-Western subjects by drawing upon a whole range of imagined ideas about Western people and uses them in the service of colonialism.

Caliban's subaltern position is but an artificial construct Prospero uses to legitimize his authority on the island. Besides, colonial authority requires that Prospero usurps and even erases Caliban's culture making him dependent for the most inherent of rights including even his freedom.Indeed, Prospero is "the crusher, the pulverizer" (*Une Tempête*, 2.1.27) whose despotism and omnipotence stem from the purpose of his colonial scheme after his occasional arrival to the island. Caliban defies Prospero, "you think I'm ugly… well I don't think you are so handsome yourself" (*Une Tempête* 1.2.17.

Translation, *Richard Miller*). Caliban's pronouncement here, perhaps, demolishes all artificial boundaries that Prospero employed to confirm his supposed superiority.In act I scene II Caliban discloses Prospero's strategy by reminding him of his first attempts at flattening him when he needed him: "In the beginning the gentleman was all sweet-talk: dear Caliban here, my little Caliban there". Only then did Caliban realize that Prospero is not the collaborating type of leader Ariel thinks. Césaire identifies tripartite elements to the colonizing structure in *The Tempest*: the domination of the physical space of the island, the reformation of *natives*' minds, most particularly Caliban's and Ariel's, and the integration of local economic histories into the Western perspective. This structure of complementary acts "completely embraces the physical, human, and spiritual aspects of the colonizing experience" (Mudimbe, 2).

Not only are Prospero's imperialistic values of domination and authority understandable from his relationship with insurgent Caliban but also implicated in his treatment of subservient and compromising Ariel. In fact, by promoting Ariel in the hierarchy of servitude to the position of the privileged and trusted servant, Prospero also places him in the role of the overseer whose function is to watch over and safeguard the island. Ariel is reminiscent of the spy, the sentry, the secret eye. He serves his master dutifully and faithfully in order to morally induce him to keep his promise and grant him freedom. Yet, Prospero never stops testing Ariel's loyalty nor does he miss the opportunity to humiliate or to torture him in order to naturalize his subservience: "Hurry! Unless you want to be the next to feel my wrath", says Prospero intimidatedly addressing Ariel (*Une Tempête*, 3.3.50). He even keeps reminding him of his former life, how he freed him of his torment: "dost thou forget from what a torment I did free thee?", "thou liest, malignant thing! Hast thou forgot...?" (*The Tempest* 1. 2. 250). Prospero's pronouncements perhaps perfectly illustrate the colonial strategy of the *TheTempest* as implicated in the violence and agression which mark his authoritarian behaviour throughout the play.

In *Discourse on Colonialism* Césaire adumbrates his conception of the phenomenon of colonialism embodied in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* by equating the word colonization to thingification or *chosification*, terms which favour decivilizarion and subordination of the colonized subject.Yet, Césaire's view of colonialism as a dehumanizing process might have shaped his counter-ideological orientation grounded in a reaction against Mannouni's idea of the "Caliban dependency complex",and hence augurs a reversal in the trope of colonialism through Caliban's self recovery. In *Tempests after Shakespeare* critic Chantal Zabus sees at the heart of Césaire's *Tempête* a challenge both to Shakespeare and to the conception of colonialhistory he promotes inhis play. The indefinite article which changes the current of the playfrom *The Tempest* into *A Tempest* is the gaze returned. It suggests a "hostile takeover", a seizure of authority over the adapted text which marks the play as interventionist and hostile in nature.Césaire attributes a colonial role to Shakespeare by portraying him as instrumental in maintaining and implementing ideologies of race and hegemonies of colonialism on Afro-Caribbean lands. In *Le Théatre de la Tempête*, as Jean Marie Serreau calls it, there is a total denunciation of the static conception of history as an interval embodying the dreams of the protagonist Prospero in *The Tempest*. Conversely, history in Césaire's *Tempête* is oriented toward the reopening of the history of the "decolonizing process" (Fanon 66).**:**

The Prospero-Caliban metaphor Shakespeare initiates in *The Tempest* provides a precedent for a politics of imperial domination based on, in Charles Burton's word, the "intractability" and incivility of the non-native and black element. Caliban's urgent need for education is the reason which ostensibly brought Prospero to the island and with him his books of magic.The books constitute the documentary material which condition and reinforce his absolute reign on the island.Prospero's strategy of subjugating Caliban under his control is yet reminiscent of the painful lesson Césaire learnt in the post war period when French officials were sent to the colonies to preside over local black Martiniquan bureaucrats. They trained them in the old school of Prospero and his descendents. In this respect, whether Shakespeare sympathizes with blackness embodied in Caliban or derides him, identifies with Prospero or condemns his power, he appears to endorse the imperial project embodied in Prospero's colonial regime on the island seemingly by defending it and furthering its workings. Furthermore,Shakespeare employs in Prospero's tongue so prominently the language of missionary idealism which occupied so clearly a position in sixteenth century colonial England.In this way, *The Tempest* Protagonist Prospero, especially regarding his relationship with Caliban, becomes a character subject to discursive interpretation.

To Thomas Cartelli, Prospero is "a foundational paradigm in the history of European colonialism" (101). His European affiliations, particularly his authority and power relations with all around him allow us totracehis multi-perspective connections with the global history of British colonialism. Cartelli's attitude toward Prospero parallells with Césaire's though the latter's formulation as opposed to the former is informed with the physical return of Africa and the decolonizing of the African mind.This makes Shakespeare's Prospero an indefatiguable agent of

colonialism. Though he is not initially a colonialist on mission, one who has been marooned on the island by chance and desires to return to Milan, Prospero showed no reluctance to play the role of the colonizer when he found himself thrust in such a position of power. This argument perhaps pushes the discussion further by suggesting that Shakespeare's Prospero, or the Western subject in general, has an unconscious colonial drive which is a central aspect of his character, identity and relationships.

Perhaps Césaire's claim in Caliban's tongue, (*Une Tempête* 3.5.61): "Prospero you're the great magician,
you're an old hand at deceptionYou lied so much to me
that you ended up by imposing on mean image of myself" parallels Edward Said's view about the colonial tactics whereby European identity is fashioned. In*Orientalism*, Said openly puts it:

> "The representation of the 'Orient' in European literary texts,travelogues and other writings contributed tothe creation of a dichotomy between Europe and its 'others', a dichotomy that was central to the creation of European culture as well as to the maintenance and extension of European hegemony over other lands".(23)

Said clearly questions the subjectivityof the representation of the Orient in the Western colonial discourse and argues that it can not in any way be authentic. The colonial discourse of early modern England legitimates itself through the exploitation of the idea of the the existence of differences between European and non-European subjects. These differences which are central to the creation of a dichotomybetween center and periphery are premised on cultural and racial segregation as the key factorfordetermining the relationship between the two poles of representation on the one handand for creatingthe colonial authority of the West on the other.

With these insights in mind, the legitimacy Prospero has given his rule on the island could only be judged and understood in concert with the criteria of racial segregation and cultural superiority colonials establish between the so-called civilized and under-civilized races. Prospero found in Caliban a threatening other whom he could control and contatin only through the enforcment of artificial forms of masque and segregationdrawn from Western imperial culture. This strategy, I argue, is used by Western politicians as a good ground to confirm and implement colonial policies in occupied territories. Prospero's whiteness as opposed to Caliban's blackness and Prospero's active-mindedness as opposed to Caliban's backwardness are used as a stable discourse which justifies and yet even mystifies Western racist mythologies concerning the "otherness" they invent to legitimize colonial authority. These demarcations create a complex of superiority within the complete system of colonization which in turn rationalizes and even naturalizes policies of subjugation and hence expand ideologies of conquest and exploitation. One of the contradictions Césaire's *Une Tempête* discloses in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and which most defines colonialist regimes is the missionary idealism which is ostensibly foregrounded against the background of an entire history of racial segregation and imperial domination.

There is no doubting that colonialism as a political institution requires the existence of the need for dependence which the other expresses as a result of his naturalized inferiority. When this need is made obvious as we see in *The Tempest* "the necessity for the subordination" (Vaughan, 115) of the inferior element becomes inevitable. Prospero's obsession with the "superiority complex" (Mannouni, 82) as opposed to Caliban who suffers from an unresolved "dependency complex" (Mannouni, 33) due to the supposed bestiality and uncivility imposed on him by the colonialist Prospeo gives a logical pretext for the former to dominate the latter. Richard Burton speaking about the colonial encounter between the Europeans and Africans also echoes the same idea in *The Lake Regions of Central Africa* (Qtd in Brantlinger, 179). He says:

> [The African] is inferior to the active-minded and objective European and to subjective and reflective Asiatic. He partakes largely the worst characteristics of the lower Oriental types- stagnation of mind,indolence ofbody, moral deficiency, superstition and childish passion" .

Shakespeare's text is thus seen as fundamental to the creation of the West's colonial history and culture. We read in *Une Tempête* that *The Tempest* performs such ideological role by rationally upholding and euphemizing Prospeo's power on Caliban, and never contesting its implied political agenda. The Prospero-Caliban encounter is, in fact, a deterministic factor suggestive and conclusive of the multi-faceted manifestations of Western power and authority. The character of Prospero displays, as Mannouni puts it in *The Psychology of Colonization*, the psychology of colonials who projected their disowned tracts onto the natives of the New World and onto an Africa they present to their people as a land to be brought to civilisation.Both Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and Césaire's *UneTempête* clearly raise the interrogation of who has the natural and legal rights to be owner of the island.

By portraying Prospero as the liberator as opposed to Sycorax the enslaving tyrant, Shakespeare deviates from the real account of Prospero's project on the island.Both Shakespeare and Césaire engage in an ambivalent and

contradictory representations of discourse. If Shakespeare is concerned with the Prospero component; he uses otherness embodied in the masterless Caliban to justify the colonialist project and to "further its workings"(Brown, 78), Césaire reverses the self-other binarism inherent in *The Tempest* by establishing a symmetrical design whereby the other becomes able to retort and to speak for himself as other (this is referred to in the play by the Calibanesque revolutionary potential).

While Shakespeare's Prospero is on Caliban's island to perform his virtuous mission of raising the latter savage from superstition and blood-sacrifice to an enlightened existence, Césaire, by representing the character of Caliban in terms that suggest his disruptive potential (especially his revolt against Prospero and his attempt to deflower Miranda's virginity, which comes to symbolize Western aristocratic purity), shows the extent to which Prospero fails to have Caliban willingly do his bidding, thus sketching the internal instability and flimsiness of the colonial project itself. This reading is expressly derived from the interplay of ambivalent and analogous ideologies behind the writing and re-writing of a canonical literary text.Césaire presents Prospero as a figure who naturally appeals to an idealistic Western politician seeking to provide legitimation and justification for his illegitimate exploitation of both Caliban's body and his land . For, the image of blackness does more than just produce and maintain the ideology of whiteness. In fact, it is this element of difference between the two characters which determines the rigid demarcation between "self" and "other" giving priority for the first to rule over the second. Critic Chantal Zabus provides a similar view arguing that in *The Tempest*Prosperoprovides a precedentfor a politicsof imperial domination premised on the denied intractability of the native elements.

Yet, if we allow history to supply chronology, Prospero, and more especially his language of missionary idealism, becomes a good reminder ofhistorical tyrants and dictators like Kurtz, John Thompson, Cecil Rhodes and Henry Stanley whose crimes on the black continent are premised on their unquestioned claim to superiority and their embedded belief in racial privilege. Bearing in mind Jean Guéhenno's *Caliban et Prospero*, the character of Prospero in Cesaire's *Une Tempête* could also be interpreted as reminiscent of other totalitarian forms of control such as fascism and Communism.If the interrogation about the real owner of the island has been left unanswered in Shakespeare, Césaire, by portraying a bellicose Caliban who takes his roots from the earth, denounces Prospero's uprootment of the latter from his ancestral African soil; Caliban addresses Prospero: "you think the earth […] is dead"(12). Contrary to *The Tempest*, *Une Tempête* affirms the interrogation, making it evident that Prospero's project on the African soil is the usurpation and annexation of the island Caliban inherited from his mother Sycorax:

> Prospero: What were you hoping for?
> Caliban:to get back my island and regain my freedom.
> Prospero: And what would you do all alone here on this island haunted by the devil tempest-tossed?
> Caliban: First of all, I'd get rid of you! I'd spit you out, all your works and pomps! Your 'White magic'. (*Une Tempête*, 3.5.60).

Obviously,the interplay between the source text and its adaptation presented here demarcates the contours of a political dialogue between Shakespeare and Césaire in addressing the issues of colonization and decolonization.

The relationship between Prospero and Caliban is also a vantage point from which we could derive a clear understanding of the psychological landscape of colonization and its project of work. Such an event is perfectly consummated by the presence of Western feminine chastity, epitomized in the play by the character of Miranda, on the land of misshapen demons and black-skinned cannibals. Even Prospero's paranoid about the Caliban-Miranda encounter (properly the erotic encounter he always envisages in mind and fears most) is symptomatic of the pathological impulses and racial anxieties underlying colonialist discourse. As we see in *TheTempest*, Caliban who, Prospero alleges, threatens to rape his daughter Miranda turns in Césaire's *Tempête* to one who reverses the trope of colonialism as rape, and hence deflects the violence of the colonial rapist from the colonized to the colonizer. This strategy may be understood as a colonial effort to rationalize and euphemize the colonial guilt, and hence give legitimacy for the prevailing order to rule on the now Prospero's island. Here I emphasize psychology- itself a product of culture and a political conscience- as an essential approach to understanding Renaissance colonial psyche. This tempts us to look for, with Frederic Jameson, the "political unconscious" of *The Tempest* by using Freuds concepts of displacement, condensation and the management of desire. The "political unconscious" is revealed when Prospero becomes exceedingly enraged at Caliban's attempt to deflower Miranda's virginity.

Meridith Anne Skura argues that Prospero's irrational rage which suggests a conjunction of psychological and political passion derives from the politics of colonialism. She explains in her essay "Discourse and the Individual" that anger reveals Prospero's political "disquiet at the irruption into consciousness of the unconscious anxiety concerning his legitimacy" on the island. Prospero is afraid because Caliban nowrepresents a threat to his

authority on the island and is a warning to the legitimacy such authority has.This reveals Prospero's psychology of domination which becomes clearer the more his presumed dukedom on the island is threatened to disappear. Prospero's fear transforms into a shock when the discovers that the tempest Caliban raises is more elemental than physical, when he also realizes that Caliban in a dialectician who could overthrow his world of "beauty, logic and harmony" (*TheTempest*, 2.1.46). In *DiscourseonColonialism*, Césaire argues that the character of Prospero displays the psychology of colonials who projected their greed and disowned tracts onto the natives of the colonized regions. The whole story of *The Tempest* is thus interpreted to serve one major end: to establish Prosper's authority on the island and to rationalize his illegitimate power over its inhabitans. When the encounter between Caliban and Prospero is brought again to surface, the latter's giving of water with berries to the former may be read as a colonial tactic the aim of which is to disempower the colonized subject and to gain advantage over him. Even if the giving of water with berries, which is normally a sign of hospitality, might seem spontaneous and voluntary at first, it is in fact deliberate and interested. This is made clear through Prospero's stroking and fussing over Caliban (as one would with a child) in order to gain his bearings and to evoke in him the image of the good comrade and friendly companion.

To claim Shakespeare's direct relation to the Western colonial enterprise is of course to admit his participation in the rationalization and legitimation of the idea of domination and the need by colonized peoples for an authority which guides and governs them. The play's relation to its discursive context is as evident an argument that *TheTempest* is informed by the forces-discursive, political and cultural-that conditioned and shaped sixteenth century England.

REFERENCES

[1] Shakespeare, W. *TheTempest.*The First Folio, 1623. edition, New Cambridge Shakespeare Cambridge, 2005.

[2] Césaire, Aime′. Une *Tempête,* Paris, Seuil, 1969.

[3] Alvis, John. "The Coherence of Shakespeqre's Roman Plays." In *Modern LanguageQuarterly*, 1979: 115-134.

[4] Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread ofNationalism,* London and New York, 1991.

[5] Anne Skura, Meredith. "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *TheTempest*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

[6] Appiah, kwame Antony. *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

[7] Ashcroft, Bill. Griffiths, Gareth & Tiffin, Helen. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory andPractice in Post-colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.

[8] Aschcroft, Bill. Griffiths, Gareth & Tiffin, Helen. *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

[9] Atking, G. Douglas, and Bergeron, David M. (eds) *Shakespeare and Deconstruction*, NewYork: Oxford University Press, 1994.

[10] Barker, Francis and Peter Hulme, "Nymphs and reapers heavily vanish: the discursive con-texts of The Tempest" in *AlternativeShakespeares*, John Drakakis ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

[11] Bate, Jonathan. *The Genuis of Shakespeare* Trans. Richard Miller, Hill and Wang. New York, 1973.

[12] Bondanella, Peter. *The Eternal City: Roman Images in the Modern World*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1987.

[13] Brown, Paul. "This Thing of Darkness I acknowledge Mine: *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism", in J. Dollimore and A. Sinfield (eds) *PoliticalShakespeare:NewEssaysinCulturalMaterialism*, Manchester University Pess, 1989.

[14] Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilisation of The Renaissance in Italy*. London: Phaidon, 1951.Cartille, Thomas. "Prospero in Africa: The Tempest as Colonialist Text and Pretext" in Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations,Postcolonial Appropriations. London and New York: Routeldge, 1999.

[15] C.Bryant,J. McDonald, J. Sutli Sanders, J. Haward, G. Erskine, and N. Dobbyn.*The Tempest:The Graphic Novel*. Classical Comics Ltd, 2009.

[16] Césaire, A. Discourse on Colonialism, New York and London: Monthly Review Press. 1972.

[17] Derrida, Jacque. *The Ear of the Other*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

[18] Dirlik, Arif. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Globa Capitalism", *Criticalinquiry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

[19] *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeareand his Contemporaries.* New York: New York University Press, 1989.

[20] *PoliticalShakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Ithaca,NY: Cormell University Press, 1985.

[21] Fanon, F. (1963) *TheWretchedofthe Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 1963.

[22] Foucault, Michel. "What's an Author?", translated by Joseph Hari, in David Lodge (ed.) *Modern Criticism and Theory*: A reader, 1979.
[23] " Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century", London: Oxford University Press, 1989.
[24] Howard, J. E and Connor, M. F. *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology*, London and New York: RoutledgeUniversity Press, 1997.
[25] Hunter, G.K. "A Roman Thought: Renaissance Studies to History Exemplified in Shakespeare and Honson" in *An English Miscellany*.ed B.S.Lee. Capetown and New York: Oxforf University Press, 1977. 93-115.
[26] Hulme,Peter.*ColonialEncounters*, *Europe and the Native Caribbean,* London: Methuen, 1986.
[27] Kermode, Frank. *The Tempest by William Shakespeare*. *Northwestern* University Press, 1984.
[28] Loomba, Ania. *Shakespeare, Race and Colonialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
[29] Mannoni, Dominique. *O. Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonization*.
[30] Mason, Fran. Historical Dictionary of Postmodernist Literature and Theatre.Lanham, Md: Scarecrow Press, 2007.
[31] M. A. Skura. Discourse and the individual: The case of colonialism in *The Tempest*. Shakespeare Quarterly, pp.42-69, 1989.
[32] Marsden, Jean. *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myths.* New York. New York University Press, 2005.
[33] Ngugi, Wa Thiongo. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in AfricanLiterature*, London: James Currey, 1986.
[34] Palmer, John. *Political Characters of Shakespeare*. London: Macmillan, 1945.
[35] Parker, Patricia. *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*.New York: New York University Press, 2002.
[36] Rich, Adrienne. "When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Revision", New York, Grove Press, 1992.
[37] Said, Edward. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, London: Penguin, 1995.
[38] "On Originality" . New York. New York University Press, 1998.
[39] Scammel, G.V. The First Imperial Age: European Overseas Expansion 1400-1715. London: Harper Collins Academic, 1989.
[40] Skura, Meredith Anne. "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in the Tempest," in ed. Peter Childs, Postcolonial Theory and English Literature: A Reader.Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.