Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt: 14, Sayı: 28, Temmuz 2024, ss. 237-268.
Trakya University Journal of Faculty of Letters, Volume: 14, Issue: 28, July 2024, pp. 237-268.

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article **DOI: 10.33207/trkede.1472379**

DEHUMANISATION OF COLONISED *HUMANS* REVISITED: RACIAL SPECIESISM AND CALIBAN'S "EXPLOD[ING] PROSPERO'S OLD MYTH" IN AIME CESAIRE'S *A TEMPEST*[*]

Sömürülen İnsanların İnsandışılaştırılması Üzerine Yeniden Düşünmek: Aimé Césaire'in A Tempest Adlı Oyununda Irksal Türcülük ve Caliban'ın "Prospero'nun Eski Mitini Yerle Bir Etmesi"

İmren YELMİŞ[**]

ABSTRACT: The political turmoil between the 1950s and the 1970s that stemmed from the liberation movements in Africa, and in the Caribbean Islands, in which African/ black diaspora is so common, triggered many writers of the time to visit colonial literature in order to be able to find a meaning for the liberation struggles of the blacks. Similarly, Aimé Césaire, a Francophone literary and political figure, revisited Shakespeare's The Tempest (around 1611), and adapted it into A Tempest (Une Tempête,1969). A Tempest is a play in which Shakespearean Prospero's strong and univocal status is replaced by strong and rebellious Caliban, who subverts all the colonial discourses that marginalise and dehumanise the blacks. In the light of these discussions, this paper aims to discuss that in A Tempest, Caliban becomes an instrument for Césaire in order to demarginalise the blacks contrary to Prospero's dehumanising methods applied through racial speciesism. By means of Caliban's "explod[ing] Prospero's old myth", Césaire wants to prove that blacks are humans, too, with a glorious history and identity to be proud of.

Keywords: Racial Speciesism; Dehumanisation of Colonised Humans; "Thingification"; Rebellious Language; "Explod[ing]" Old Colonial Myths

ÖZ: 1950'ler ve 1970'ler arasında, Afrika'da ve Afrika/ siyahi diyasporasının yoğun olduğu Karayip Adaları'nda gerçekleştirilen özgürlük hareketlerinden kaynaklanan politik çalkantılar, siyahilerin özgürlük mücadeleri konusunu daha da anlamlı kılabilmek için o

[*] This article is the revised and extended version of my paper entitled as "Questioning the Dehumanisation of Colonised *Humans* by Means of a Rebellious Language: Aimé Césaire's *A Tempest*" that I presented at "8. International BAKEA Symposium" (1-3 November 2023).

[**] Dr., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Ankara, imren.yelmis@hacettepe.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-1316- 2191

Geliş Tarihi / Received: 23.04.2024
Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 07.06.2024
Yayın Tarihi / Published: 31.07.2024

dönemki yazarların pek çoğunu sömürgecilik dönemi edebiyatını ziyarete sevk etti. Frankofon bir edebî ve politik şahsiyet olan Aimé Césaire, Shakespeare'in The Tempest (Fırtına) (yaklaşık olarak 1611) adlı oyununa yeniden dönüp, onu, A Tempest'a (Bir Fırtına) (Une Tempête,1969) uyarladı. A Tempest, siyahileri marjinalleştiren ve insandışılaştıran sömürgecilik söylemlerini yerle bir eden, güçlü ve asi Caliban karakterinin, Shakespeare'in çizdiği Prospero'nun güçlü ve tek sesli duruşunun yerini aldığı bir oyundur. Bu tartışmalar ışığında bu makale, A Tempest'ta, Prospero'nun, ırksal türcülük aracılığıyla uyguladığı insandışılaştırma yöntemlerinin aksine, Césaire'in, Caliban karakterini, siyahileri ötekileştirilmekten uzak tutmak için bir araç olarak kullandığını tartışmayı amaçlamaktadır. Césaire, Caliban'ın "Prospero'nun eski mitini yerle bir etmesi" aracılığıyla, siyahilerin de gurur duyulacak şanlı bir tarih ve kimlikleri olan insanlar olduğunu kanıtlamak istemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Irksal Türcülük; Sömürülen İnsanların İnsandışılaştırılması; "Şeyleştirme"; Asi Dil Kullanımı; Sömürgeci Mitlerinin "Yerle Bir Edilmesi"

Cite as / Atıf: YELMİŞ, İ. (2024). Dehumanisation of Colonised Humans Revisited: Racial Speciesism and Caliban's "Explod[ing] Prospero's Old Myth" in Aime Cesaire's A Tempest. Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 14(28), 237-268. https://doi.org/10.33207/trkede. 1472379

Yayım Tarihi	31 Temmuz 2024
Hakem Sayısı	Ön İnceleme: (Editör-Yayın Kurulu Üyesi) İçerik İncelemesi: İki Dış Hakem
Değerlendirme	Çift Körleme
Benzerlik Taraması	Yapıldı
Etik Bildirim	tuefdergisi@trakya.edu.tr
Çıkar Çatışması	Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.
Finansman	Herhangi bir fon, hibe veya başka bir destek alınmamıştır.
Telif Hakkı/Lisans:	Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi'nde yayımlanan makaleler **https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/** tarafından lisanslanır.

Date of Publication	31 July 2024
Reviewers	A Internal (Editor board member) Content review: Two External

Review Reports	Double-blind
Plagiarism Checks	Yes
Complaints	tuefdergisi@trakya.edu.tr
Conflicts of Interest	The Author(s) declare(s) that there is no conflict of interest.
Grant Support	No funds, grants, or other support was received.
Copyright & License	Trakya University Journal of Faculty of Letters is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Introduction

> "The earth seemed unearthly. We are accustomed to look upon the shackled form of a conquered monster, but there-- there you could look at a thing monstrous and free. It was unearthly, and the men were--No, they were not inhuman. Well, you know, that was the worst of it--this suspicion of their not being inhuman. It would come slowly to one. They howled, and leaped, and spun, and made horrid faces; but what thrilled you was just the thought of their humanity-- like yours--the thought of your remote kinship with this wild and passionate uproar. Ugly. Yes, it was ugly enough" (Conrad, 2005: 41-42).

Throughout the colonisation and slavery periods, there was colour prejudice against black people in the New World and Africa, as exemplified in the Congolese mentioned in Marlow's words above taken from Joseph Conrad's highly striking novella, *Heart of Darkness* (1899) in which the theme of racism is discussed disturbingly. Conrad's sentences are representative of such prejudices of white slave owners and colonisers about the blacks in their descriptions such as "ugly" and "monstrous" and their fears about being associated with "the others" in terms of human characteristics. As Achille Mbembe puts forth, the "theoretical and practical recognition of the body and flesh of 'the stranger' as flesh and body just like mine, the *idea of a common human nature, a humanity shared with others,* long posed, and still poses, a problem for Western consciousness" (2001: 2). Moreover, as Joseph Pugliese states in his article entitled as "Terminal Truths", "the West's confrontation with all its various others – animals, natives, colonial subjects and so on – has been oriented by the arrogation of a humanity predicated on the animality of its others" (2017: 24). Considered in relation to racial context, Mbembe's and Pugliese's arguments are observed to be related to two seemingly irrelevant but in the colonial and

postcolonial contexts relevant terms: speciesism and racism. The link between these two terms will be clarified in the following parts of the article as this article's focal point will be upon satirical discussions about racial speciesism as observed in *A Tempest* (*Une Tempête*, 1969) by Aimé Césaire (1913-2008), a Francophone Martinican poet, playwright, anti-colonial theorist, politician, who cofounded Negritude with another Francophone literary and political figure, Léopold Sédar Senghor (1906-2001).

A Tempest might be considered as a postcolonial revisit and response to *The Tempest* (nearly 1611) by William Shakepeare. As Gregson Davis notes, Césaire's adaptation not only reflects "the strictly historical referentiality of Shakespeare's drama" but also provides a space for the discussions of the relations between European master/ coloniser and African slave/ colonised via the Prospero-Caliban metaphor; and questioning these relationships makes Césaire's play a "drama of rebellion" (1997: 157-158). In the light of these discussions, this article aims to discuss Aimé Césaire's *A Tempest* as a literary work that resists and questions the consistent racial speciesist dehumanisation and "thingification" of colonised *humans* since the first contact with the indigenous people via Eurocentric discourses produced by white European colonisers. The discussions will go on to say that this dehumanisation results not in human contact, but in the relations of the control/ authority of the power and submissive bodies as a result of which the indigenous man is regarded as "an instrument of production" (Césaire, 2000: 42), that is to say, the indigenous man is (re-)constructed in the way the coloniser wants to define and describe. Moreover, within the play, there are different representations of the colonised such as Ariel, who does not question much his life of servitude to Prospero, and Caliban, who is a rebellious "slave". Unlike Ariel, Caliban, the Caribbean black colonised slave in *A Tempest*, is depicted as a rebellious individual who presents his anti-imperialist attitudes through use of a rebellious language as a metaphorical weapon, and he tries to defy the racist colonial discourses and dehumanising systems of colonisers mirrored in the play through Prospero. Due to the fact that this article's major focus will be upon the dehumanisation and "thingification" of the colonised in line with the discussions about the speciesism discourse, and that they are applied upon Caliban by means of the animetaphors and degratory words uttered by Prospero, particularly the master-servant and coloniser-colonised relationship between Prospero and Caliban will be at the centre of the discussions.

As a result of an extentive literature review, it has been observed that Césaire's *A Tempest* has been studied previously in relation to different topics, and the most outstanding studies are as follows: The functional use of Kiswahili and its significance in postcolonial discussions in Steve Almquist's "Not Quite the Gabbling of 'A Thing Most Brutish': Caliban's Kiswahili in Aimé Césaire's 'ATempest'"; discussions about the master-servant relationship between Prospero and Caliban in relation to the reconstruction of a space which is "multicentric, rather than multicultural or plural" (Willoquet-Maricondi, 1996: 46) in Paula Willoquet-Maricondi's "African Animism, Négritude and the Interdependence of Place and Being in Aimé Césaire's *A Tempest*"; and comparison and contrast between Césaire's *A Tempest* and Shakespeare's *The Tempest* in A. James Arnold's "Césaire and Shakespeare: Two Tempests". *A Tempest*'s analysis with respect to the speciesism discourse and questioning and subversion of dehumanisation has not been observed throughout the literature review. Hence, this study, which focuses on racial speciesism and Césaire's own theory about "thingification" and "discourse on colonialism" with a racial-critical lens against racist colonisers and a different perspective to the history of "the other" will bring forth new discussion points about Césaire's play.

Before the analysis of the play, it might prove useful to construct the theoretical, historical and cultural background of the play by giving brief information about racial speciesism, Negritude Movement and Shakespeare's *The Tempest*'s influence on Césaire's *A Tempest* respectively. First of all, the link between speciesism and racism will be delineated. The term "speciesism" was introduced by Richard D. Ryder, an English philosopher and psychologist, in 1970 to voice animal rights by defining the term as the practice of considering one's own species as morally more important than the other species. The concept was later popularised by Peter Singer, an Australian philosopher, when he published his book, *Animal Liberation* (1976). Both Ryder and Singer construct an analogy between speciesism and racism/ classicism/ sexism. Ryder, in his *Victims of Science*, claims that he uses "speciesism" "to describe the widespread discrimination that is practised by man against other species" and that "[s]peciesism is racism, and both overlook or underestimate the similarities between the discriminator and those discriminated against" (1975: 16). Similarly, Singer, in his *Animal Liberation*, delineates that racism, sexism and speciesism are "wrong" and

> "if we examine more deeply the basis on which our opposition to discrimination on grounds of race or sex ultimately rests, we will see that we

> would be on shaky ground if we were to demand equality for blacks, women, and other groups of oppressed humans while denying equal consideration to nonhumans" (2015: 30).

Ryder and Singer use the term, "speciesism", as a whole set of assumptions that members of a specific species, that is to say, *homo sapiens*, is superior to other species due to their privileged position in the membership in this species. It is obvious that the analogue built by them between speciesism and racism/ classisism/ sexism is instruments for both to satirise and focus on particularly the discrimination against animals.

Today, however, it is also possible to use speciesism as a wider concept that might be used in discussions about racially otherised *humans* who are seen as animals by racist power upholders. When considered in line with Foucault's biopolitics which is about the regulation of populations by the bio-power and the relations of dominance, the link between speciesism and racism might be better understood. In one of a series of lectures that he delivered in 1975 and 1976 at the Collège de France called as "Society Must Be Defended", in which he analysed power relations in political discourses, Foucault argued that

> "[t]he discourse of race struggle – which – when it first appeared and began to function in the seventeenth century, was essentially an instrument used in the struggles waged by decentered camps – […] will become the discourse of battle that has to be waged not between races, but by a race that is portrayed as the one true race, the race that holds power and is entitled to define the norm, and against those who deviate from that norm, against those who pose a threat to the biological heritage" (1997: 61).

According to Foucault's views, in the demonstration of the biopolitical and racist discourse, a kind of race war is felt. This war is claimed and declared by the race of the power that accepts itself as superior in the "biological continuum of the human race of races" (Foucault, 1997: 255). The norm mentioned in the quotation above is based on the normality and "the normal" of this particular race, which will lead to biological, cultural and racial segragation and categorisation in society. In Foucault's discussions about racism, which is "a way of fragmenting the field of the biological that power controls" (1997: 254-255), there is emphasis upon the hierarchical existence of races in which all the other biological and racial normalities of "other" races are excluded and denied.

Beginning with these arguments about race made by Foucault, Pugliese further develops them, and intermingles them with new arguments about speciesism. Pugliese, by referring to Foucault's statements about the

relationship between race and biopolitics, comes to the the following conclusion in his book, *State Violence and the Execution of Law*:

> "The biopolitics of race in the context of colonialism as theorised by Foucault is, in fact, underpinned by a governing biopolitical category that remains at once unspoken and untheorised: speciesism – understood in all of its anthropocentric dimensions. The entire apparatus of the biopolitics of race – its colonial and imperial dimensions; its discriminatory, exclusionary and necropolitical effects – are, I propose, all rendered culturally intelligible and biopolitically enabled by the category of the absolute non- human other: the animal – and I deploy the problematic definite article here precisely in order to underscore the violent operations of homogenisation, totalisation and genericity that are operative in the binary logic of anthropocentrism" (2013: 33).

Unlike Ryder and Singer, Pugliese's main focus in relation to speciesism is on the power upholder's (the state's) regarding the human subject as non-human animal, and on the relationship between biopolitics and race issues. So, in his discussions, speciesism gains a new meaning which encompasses humans. In this respect, and considered together with biopolitics, it is possible to widen the discussions about speciesism into race issues in the colonial and postcolonial contexts that are full of the representations of white colonial powers who fabricate their own linear chain of beings in which white Europeans are seen as real representatives of humans while colonised black subjects are regarded as non-human animals.

As a result of such racial classificatory systems produced in line with the colonial discourses and codes, the focal point of colonisers was cultural and biological differences between the whites and the blacks. This "non-identical" classification produced by them was generally triggered by some metaphors used for the blacks such as "things" or "animals" in order to justify the slavery and colonisation processes, in order not to give the slaves and the colonised human characteristics, which caused the dehumanisation of the colonised throughout the period of the Atlantic Slave Trade (between nearly 1526 and 1867), the colonisation period between the fifteenth century and the mid-twentieth century and the enslavement of Africans and African Americans in the USA (between 1776 and 1865). Throughout these periods colonised black slaves had been deprived of the rights to speak, to defend themselves before the law due to the fact that they were "stripped of [their] political existence, thereby reduced to a state of nature, which is to be exposed to an arbitrary and de facto law" (Seshadri, 2012: 67), which led to racial categorisations and judicial deprivations.

Negritude and Its Reflections in Aimé Césaire's Drama

In order to structure the backbone of the discussions of the article as regards dehumanisation of the colonised, and as Césaire's works and ideologies are shaped by the Negritude Movement, in this part of the article, this movement will be briefly explained. Negritude might be accepted as a literary movement which emerged as an instrument to revive the black consciousness that had been suppressed by the French colonial policies which primarily aimed at the assimilation of the blacks. With this aim in mind, Aimé Césaire, with Léopold Sédar Senghor, attempted to prepare a path for the blacks to be aware of their own selves and cultures. As Loomba explains, Negritude, in a similar way to Pan-Africanism, a movement in Anglophone countries, aimed at the establishment of a "pan-national racial solidarity", at giving an end to the so-called white superiority and its imperialist hegemonic representation, and at the celebration of blackness – especially that of Africans – as a cultural and racial being with distinct characteristics (1998: 211). The following points taken from an interview conducted by René Depestre with Aimé Césaire explain clearly the aims behind Negritude: When Depestre asked Césaire about his development of the concept of Negritude, Césaire, after emphasising the fact that the movement was actually a rebellion against "the politics of assimilation" of the Africans by the English and particularly by the French who saw Africa as inferior and "barbarian", and saw themselves as superior and representative of civilisation (2000: 88), stated that the Africans had inferiority complex, and as far as he could observe, the blacks were always in search of an identity. He thought that in order to be able to build up that identity, they at first have to have "a concrete consciousness of what [they] are – that is, of the first fact of [their] lives: that [they] are black; that [they] were black and have a history, a history that contains certain cultural elements of great value" (2000: 91-92).

In line with Césaire's words, it might be argued that Negritude is a reaction to racist colonial discourses that built their own "truths" about the colonised blacks which disregarded the blacks' cultures, histories and even their *human* characteristics. Césaire tried to prove that the Negro culture had been civilised, and he did not want to accept the blacks' being labelled as "barbarian" as seen within the colonial discourse. On the contrary, through Negritude, and, throughout his book, *Discourse on Colonialism* (*Discours sur le colonialism*, 1950), he wanted to prove that due to the actions, acts, massacres of colonisers throughout the colonisation period, he associates barbarity with Europeans, and civilisation with African culture. Hence,

Negritude should be considered as a reactionary movement that tries to construct a black identity which is not under the negative impact of colonialism, and not defined negatively as the definitions that have been "grafted" on the minds of the colonised peoples, non-western and western people throughout centuries. By means of Negritude, blackness and black cultures and black people were praised, and redefined positively. Césaire and Senghor wanted to enable the blacks to come to terms with their blackness and "respectable" and "cherished" black culture. These efforts as a whole seem to be a part of their anti-colonial but clearly pan-national and pan-continental purposes attempting to unite the blacks who live in different places under the umbrella of a common ancestry and origin (McLeod, 2010: 63).

Aimé Césaire used his literary and intellectual works as tools for his projects that were the outcomes of his attempts to voice oppressed and suppressed peoples who need to see themselves as a whole and as valuable human beings. Negritude first began as a reactionary and intellectual movement; however, later Césaire used his literary works, particularly the theatre as a political instrument for him to reflect his views about Negritude. In fact, as Robert Eric Livingstone points out, in the 1950s, Césaire was deeply indulged in the black independence movement at an intellectual base. In the 1960s, however, he turned his direction to the theatre which he used as an instrument for him to develop his political arguments about Negritude, and contribute to the political and cultural decolonisation of the African world. As a result, he collaborated with Jean-Marie Serau, the French director (1995: 180). Césaire's views he discussed as a part of Negritude and their reflections in his theatre might be regarded as tools that contributed to the initiation and development of "the culture of decolonisation" (Laville, cited in Livingston, 1995: 180), and a literary, cultural, and even political space about the blacks. Although the sympathy for and interest in Negritude has diminished in the twenty-first century, it still plays a prominent part in America, the Caribbean and Africa as a path through which oppressed and suppressed peoples can conceive of themselves as a unified group, and as a tool for the dream of change in their societies.

Shakespeare's *The Tempest*'s Influence on Aimé Césaire

By means of literature, postcolonial authors found an opportunity to turn back to their colonial history and culture; hence, their literary works may be considered as cultural and political. Many important postcolonial writers such as Chinua Achebe, Derek Walcott, Pablo Neruda, Salman Rushdie,

Brian Friel and Aimé Césaire revisit their colonial past or carry this past in themselves

> "as scars of humiliating wounds, as instigation for different practices, as potentially revised visions of the past tending toward a new future, as urgently reinterpretable and redoplayable experiences, in which the formerly silent native speaks and acts on territory taken back from the empire" (Said, 1993: 31).

Postcolonial literature made it possible for them to rebel against and question colonial discourses and assumptions constructed for the colonised. Becoming aware of the existence of a culture and history peculiar to their own nations or regions, postcolonial writers, by emphasising their difference from the imperial system and culture, want to decentralise Europe, European ideologies and discourses imposed upon their nations during the colonisation period, and attempt to empower their own selves which were previously in the margins, and they exclaim that previously unquestionable Eurocentric assumptions, discourses and ideologies are not "*the* Truth" any more. Some even reread and reinterpret "the great colonial masterpieces, which not only misrepresented them but assumed they were unable to read and respond directly to what had been written about them, just as the European ethnography presumed the natives' incapacity to intervene in scientific discourse about them" (Said, 1993: 31). These writers, by means of their literary works, have managed to transform the univocal characteristics of the colonial literature that was influential in the production and circulation of the colonial "truths" into a dialogic sphere or even a polyphonic space where multiple voices, even the voices of once suppressed and oppressed groups are heard.

Cesairé's *A Tempest*, too, might be evaluated among such literary works that question the Eurocentric worldviews, and turn upside down the dehumanising discourses of the Eurocentric views by revisiting and rewriting a canonical literary work that reflects the negative colonial representations of the colonised in the seventeenth-century: Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. *A Tempest* by Césaire was written at a time when cultural and political transformations and the rapid growth of nationalism were particularly prevalent as many Caribbean and African authors began to write about the gradual decolonisation of the colonies. As a matter of fact, the years between 1957 and 1973 witnessed the independence of many countries in Africa and in the Caribbean, and many writers wanted to contribute to the cultural independence of their countries, too, with their literary works some of which were the adaptations of European texts. Shakespeare's play attracted the attention of many writers of that time such as (in addition to

Aimé Césaire) Cuban literary critic, politician and poet, Roberto Fernández Retamar (1930-2019) and West Indian essayist and novelist George Lamming (1927-2022) due to the play's archetypal colonial representation as it is about a white European man who claims the ownership of an island that is already inhabited by the indigenous people (Almquist, 2006: 589-590). In addition, Shakespeare was not unaware of the existence of the slave-trade during the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, as his life time fell on these two periods. The profitable slave-trade that was concerned essentially with the slavery of the indigenous people in Africa or the New World, and conducted particularly by two seamen and Queen Elizabeth I's privateers, John Hawkins and Walter Raleigh was topical in England (Davis, 1997: 157) in the Elizabethan period. This slave-trade continued also in the Jacobean period in which *The Tempest* was written. So, it would not be wrong to claim that Shakespeare's life time coincided with the initiation and gradual development of the systematic slave trade, and on the expansion of overseas colonialism, which is reflected in his *The Tempest*, as well. Hence, Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, which might be reappraised and reread as a textual archetype of European colonial expansion (Almquist, 2006: 589), and as a representative text about the fact of slavery during the Renaissance, in a way, provided Césaire, too, with the material for his discussions about liberation, enslavement and satire upon colonisation. In this respect, the Caliban character in *The Tempest* provided Césaire with an instrument that has the potential energy and strength to bravely face and subvert the European representation of the indigenous and/ or colonised people. *The Tempest* also mirrors the cultural prejudices of early modern Europe towards blacks, which triggers dehumanisation of the colonised, as exemplified through the representation of the original inhabitant of the island, Caliban, in the play as "savage and deformed slave" (Shakespeare, 2009: 2), "hag born" (Shakespeare, 2009: 16), "monster" (Shakespeare, 2009: 38), "a born devil" whose body, "with age […] uglier grows" (Shakespeare, 2009: 63), and "freckled whelp" (Shakespeare, 2009: 16). Prospero, by building up a control over the island, and, othering the black man, Caliban, enslaves him, and builds up a hegemonic power over the colonised, which leads to power relations of master/ servant, power-upholder/ subaltern, coloniser/ colonised and civilised/ barbarian. Hence, Shakespeare's *The Tempest* was an effective tool for the writers who wrote between the tempestuous 1950s and the 1970s that witnessed great political struggles and movements. They reinterpreted the text according to their political and cultural arguments to voice their struggles for decolonisation, and the efforts to formulate their self identities. With the help of *The Tempest* by Shakespeare, Césaire, too, found an

opportunity to turn back to the Empire, to talk about the present, and to discuss his political and intellectual views about the points pertaining to the blacks and whites, to the colonised and the coloniser.

Racial Speciesism, "Discourse on Colonialism" and Prospero as an Instrument for Césaire to Question Colonisation and Dehumanisation

Under this subtitle, the central focus will be upon Prospero as he is the represantation of the coloniser and the colonial discourses that encompass "discourse on colonialism" and "dehumanisation" concepts, and racial speciesism. After these points are discussed, the discussion under the next subtitle will move on to the subversion of all these discourses by Caliban. Throughout the slavery and colonisation process, the coloniser produced, in Albert Memmi's words, "the mythical portrait of the colonised" (2003: 123), which included racial generalisations and negative stereotypes for the colonised such as "lazy, thief, degenerate, wretched, superstitious, primitive, underdeveloped, violent, savage" and "barbarian" among many others, and maybe the most derogatory of which are "a thing", "a brutish monster" or "an animal". The more the colonial process developed the more such constructed colonial stereotypes and discourses used for the colonised were naturalised and normalised by colonisers at first, and later by the colonised. All positive terms and values related to humanity, advancement and civilisation were attributed to white Europeans, and were regarded as the anti-theses of the negative stereotypes used for the colonised. As Robin D. G. Kelley emphasises, Césaire clearly shows that the superiority complex of the colonisers, and their assumption of being the civilisers of the world are based on transforming the Other into barbarous beings. According to such colonisers, it is not possible for the Indians, the Asians and the Africans to have the culture and civilisation of the imperialists no matter what they do. As a consequence, the colonial experience is in need of the reinvention and reproduction of the colonised, the intentional annihilation of the past/ history, which is called as "thingification" by Césaire (2000: 8-9). This degrading method led to a colonial discourse blended with dehumanisation at the expense of racism, and the invention of "an image of the colonised that made of the native the prototype of the animal" (Mbebme, 2001: 26). As Pugliese points out,

> "[i]n the discursive practices of colonialism, invariably informed by European philosophy, the general singular has been systematically applied to the human-animal counterpart of the animal: the Native. As with 'the Animal', 'the Native' is the colonial figure inscribed with the knowledge/power effects of homogenisation, totalisation and genericity. In colonial discourse, the figure of the Native homogenises different ethnicities, tribes and nationalities; it totalises through

> racist stereotypes different cultural and phenotypical attributes; and it thereby works to make intelligible the human subjects it captures under this descriptor in terms of a common sense genericity that establishes the Native as something always- already known: the Native as serial in her sameness and fungibility" (2013: 34).

The coloniser finds in himself the right to construct his own "truth" about the colonised and the coloniser in which all the values are measured, and all the definitions are made according to European values. In these definitions, the Native is generalised and humiliated altogether as "they" against the superiority of "us". In this generalisation, the characteristics peculiar to each ethnicity, tribe and/ or nationality are denied, and all the natives are accepted by the colonisers as the same with each other, without distict characteristics. Furthermore, the Native's place in the hierarchical ladder is lowered and is shown as the "human-animal", and is not accepted as 100 % *homo sapiens*. Hence, the Native becomes the victim of racist colonial discourses.

The emergence of colonial discourse has close connections and should be considered in line with geographical explorations, explorations of distant lands and peoples. These discoveries play a great role in shaping matters related to the geopolitical situation of newly explored places. When considered along with the travels for colonial desires or missions, with owning more lands in the other parts of the world, this knowledge, these explorations and mapping the world are never innocent, as, here, quest for geographical knowledge is associated with the construction of the colonial terrain. Take, for example, the geographical explorations of British explorer and naval captain, James Cook (1728-1779) whose discoveries caused the colonisation of Australia by the English, and of Italian explorer, Christopher Columbus (1451-1506), who aimed at obtaining the gold of the New World to start a crusade so that he could conquer Jerusalem (Delaney, 2011: ix), and whose discoveries caused the Europeans to know about the richness that existed in the Caribbean Islands and in Central and South America, which was their earliest encounter with the indigenous people there. Similarly, within *A Tempest*, Prospero, who, with his knowledge of the sea and geography, manages to establish a settlement in the Caribbean Islands, whose "exact location" was discovered by him, by means of his continuous scientific studies, researches and experiments (Césaire, 1992: 7). He, to build up a political and cultural hegemony within the island by means of the control of the inhabitants of the island, initiates his actions of colonisation through his knowledge of books. As Willoquet-Maricondi explains, Césaire reflects Prospero as a man who is indulged in scientific researches, and his will power for the quest for geographical knowledge was related to his

imperialistic desires. Moreover, he used science and language as a highly effective means of explaining the world (1996: 54). Prospero, like the previous colonisers, in a way, approached the land as if it were a *tabula rasa* to be filled with his cultural and political claims. He uses his knowledge to explore new places in the world, which will lead to his idealisation and reformulation of the superiority of the whites over the blacks, and the dehumanisation of the blacks due to the mythical and ideological differences and distinctions as regards the skin colour. Knowledge becomes an instrument for his domination over the colonised land explored by him as a result of great effort to claim its ownership, and which he calls "my as-yet-unborn empire" (Césaire, 1992: 7) even in the process of his explorations and before he possessed it. Moreover, although Prospero complains about the usurpation of his power by his brother Antonio, who attempts to take his throne and his lands in Europe, and to seize the control of the lands he owns overseas that his 'great intelligence' explored (Césaire, 1992: 9), the words he uses to define the land as his own prove his desire to own the overseas lands as the only owner as he sees it as his "possession". This desire mirrors his greed for lands where he would stringently enforce his power, and it is, in Almquist's words, "an archetypal dramatisation of the colonial experience" (2006: 590). In Prospero, one can observe desire for hegemonic power, which is explained in the play as he "has reserves of will power" (1992: 1). In relation to his efforts to colonise the land and its inhabitants, it might be argued that the geographical explorations are transformed into the geographies of racism.

After Prospero's exploration of the land where Ariel and Caliban live, he sees the land like a white sheet upon which he attempts to write his own story, "on which to inscribe his monologic master narrative" (Willoquet-Maricondi, 1996: 58), and wants to use it as he wishes, to be the master of the real owners of the land, and to formulate his own colonial discourses about "logic, beauty, harmony" according to Eurocentric "truths", which is also observable in his following words: "[S]tarting today I want to inculcate in them [the gods and goddesses] the spectacle of tomorrow's world: logic, beauty, harmony, the foundations for which I have laid down by my own will-power" (Césaire, 1992: 46). The discourses and laws that he wants to construct, in a way, are instruments for him to be able to have the absolute sovereign authority of the master in all spheres of life in the colonised lands. Prospero's attempts at building such authority by means of the constructions of discourses mirror the centuries-old history of colonial and racial facts. The beauty discourse determined by the European whites is accepted as the

only fact, which stems from the fact that ethnography, anthropology, all sciences and cultural researches had been conducted according to the perspectives of the whites. Césaire's following discussions and quotations in his *Discourse on Colonialism* are about this problematic and biased white Eurocentric approaches: "Gobineau said: 'The only history is white.' M. Caillois, in turn, observes: 'The only ethnography is white.' It is the West that studies the ethnography of the others, not the others who study the ethnography of the West" (2000: 70). Ethnography, discourses on beauty, race, definitions of cultural and political approaches to the colonised, all were decided by white Europeans, and according to their own thinking and teachings. As a matter of fact, it is the white European man who produces the image of the blacks as "ugly, savage, animal" and "object". As a result, "superiority complex" emerges in the white European man, who claims that "compared to the cannibals, the dismemberers, and other lesser breeds, Europe and the West are the incarnation of respect for human dignity" (Césaire, 2000: 71). The white European man behaves as if the white race were the only civilisation and had the only way of thinking and the moral superiority in the world; therefore, he thinks that the white race is the only race that has the right to build up their own "civilising mission" projects.

Furthermore, contrary to the superior image of the West, even the most civilised colonised person is associated with all the negative characteristics. Césaire claims that in order to appease his conscience, the coloniser prepares the ground for accepting "the other man" as an animal and for adjusting himself to treating him as if he were an animal. Moreover, through colonisation, even the most intellectual and civilised colonised man is dehumanised (2000: 41). During the colonisation period, there were also some philosophers such as David Hume (1711-1776), who thought that blacks were inferior to Europeans in terms of civilisation and ingenuity. Hume was a Scottish Enlightenment essayist, philosopher and historian, and, in his essay, "Of National Characteristics" (1748), which is about the causes of physical and moral characteristics of a nation, he discusses his views about the "inferiority" of the blacks to Europeans and the blacks' "animality":

> "I am apt to suspect the negroes to be naturally inferior to the whites. There scarcely ever was a civilised nation of that complexion, nor even any individual eminent either in action or speculation. No ingenious manufactures amongst them, no arts, no sciences. […]. Not to mention our colonies, there are Negroe slaves dispersed all over Europe, of whom none ever discovered any symptoms of ingenuity; though low people, without education, will start up amongst us, and distinguish themselves in every profession. In Jamaica, indeed, they talk of one

> negroe as a man of parts and learning; but it is likely he is admired for slender accomplishments, like a parrot, who speaks a few words plainly" (1987: 629-630).

Moreover, in the footnote of the revised version of this essay (1753), Hume wrote:

> "I am apt to suspect the negroes and in general all other species of men (for there are four or five different kinds) to be naturally inferior to the whites. There never was a civilised nation of any other complexion than white, nor even any individual eminent either in action or speculation. No ingenious manufactures amongst them, no arts, no science" (1987: 208).

Hume's views about "species of men" seem to be based on racialist thinking in which he constructed a hierarchy of "species" among "men" and in this hierarchy, blacks are at the bottom. As can clearly be observed in the sentences taken from his aforementioned essay, while humiliating even a black man of learning in Jamaica, he uses an animetaphor in order to emphasise his closeness to or similarity with an animal: a parrot. In this respect, Hume's racialist "speciesism" seems to be related to physical features as well as cultural, geographical, social, national and political ones, and "the white European" is the basic standard in determining all the racial norms and normalities. By regarding the colonised as animals, colonisers "communicate their sense of exceptionalism and recognise each other as the supreme species through the merciless language of speciesism" and "the merciless language of a sovereign anthropocentrism" (Pugliese, 2017: 20).

Such a way of treating the colonised "like an animal" is observed in the following example in *A Tempest*: After Caliban greets Prospero by saying "Uhuru!" (Césaire, 1992: 11), Prospero gets nervous as Caliban uses his native language. Prospero's accepting Caliban's use of his native language would mean to accept the fact that Caliban also has a race that stands out with its own distinct linguistic and cultural features which may not be always about biological features, and this may give Caliban a position equal, or at least closer to that of Prospero. His following words uttered after Caliban's use of his native language are representative of racist colonialist discourses, and they are reinforced by use of animal representations such as "ape", and are used as a justification method to exclude the blacks from the *idealised* definition and categorisation of the human, particularly associated with the white European man: "You ugly ape! How can anyone be so ugly?" (Césaire, 1992: 11). As Frantz Fanon points out, "[i]n fact, the terms the settler uses when he mentions the native are zoological terms. […]. When the settler seeks to describe the native fully in exact terms he constantly refers to the bestiary" (Fanon, 1963: 42). By using such "zoological terms",

Prospero reflects humiliating, derogatory and dehumanising attitudes towards the colonised, because he wants to define his image as superior to Caliban, and Caliban as inferior in all aspects including color, his whole way of life, manners, different culture and language. That is why in defining Caliban, Prospero emphasises Caliban's differences compared to Eurocentric representations. Caliban's use of his native language might be considered as a threat to Prospero's power and authority over the weaker servant, Caliban, and in line with Prospero's fear of loss of prestige and authority as the word, "Uhuru" has a great symbolic power due to its meaning as "Freedom now". As Kalpana Rahita Seshadri puts forth, "the practice of dehumanisation depends on the logic of a power that can decide on the value of a given life. Such a decision works fundamentally to exclude the other from the realm of human intercourse, which can be achieved only by denying access to speech" (2012: ix-x). Prospero, as the master, who is used to being the "owner" of the *logos*, and who believes in "a fundamentally colonial formation of power premised on the pivotal role of racism in governing subject peoples and assigning them positions on racialised hierarchies of life" (Pugliese, 2017: 29), does not want this hegemonic power related to language and dominance to be shattered by a slave. As Seshadri argues, "the other is silenced – rendered speechless as a mute beast undeserving of human sympathy or recognition" (2012: ix). According to this claim, allowing a black slave to speak, even to speak in his own native tongue, would mean that the so-called "owner" accepts the slave as a human being. All these prove that Prospero "is confined within the four walls of his 'biological' ideology" (Bruner, 1976: 244). He actually needs Caliban and the negative definitions to be used for Caliban to define himself as the opposite of Caliban. In other words, Prospero needs his "other" in order to be aware of his own existence as a "superior" man. As Mbembe remarks, "[t]his is why, to exist, the coloniser constantly needs the native as that animal that serves as the support for the coloniser's self-consciousness" (2001: 188), and "[t]he other chief predicate to be found in colonial reason is the radical opposition between the I and the non-I" (2001: 190).

Moreover, as Ashcroft, et al. accentuate, "[t]hese include the assumption of authority, 'voice', and control of the 'word', that is, seizure and control of the means of interpretation and communication" (2002: 96). All these attempts to have the right to have a say even in the formation of the history, culture and language of the indigenous, and to even define the image of the indigenous are indeed relevant to the colonisers' search for a justification/ ways of legitimacy for the colonisation of the land and the indigenous

people. That is why the coloniser comes up with the "White Man's Burden"[1] discourse through which he rules out any praise for the indigenous peoples and civilisations. In Livingston's terms, "the Césairean *Tempest* becomes […] an obsessive psychic script" (1995: 189-190), which might be explained as "the psychological need for self-justification of the coloniser" (Bruner, 1976: 241) in the process of slavery, his violent territorial expansionism, and exertion of power and authority over a weaker country and its people. As a reflection of this "superiority complex" and a justification method, in *A Tempest*, by means of Prospero, Césaire brings back the ancient colonial discourse about the coloniser's role in the introduction of civilisation to underdeveloped native people: "Since you're so fond of invective, you could at least thank me for having taught you to speak at all. You, a savage… a dumb animal, a beast I educated, trained, dragged up from the bestiality that still clings to you" (Césaire, 1992: 11). By using such dehumanising and humiliating words for Caliban, and by accusing him of being racially and culturally resistant to progress and civilisation, Prospero tries to psychologically feel at a superior position to Caliban. With all these traits and representations of racist discourses, Prospero acts like a stereotypical coloniser.

In a similar vein, Gonzalo, an honest old Councillor, Stephano, a drunken Butler, and Trincolo, a jester, three other representative figures of white Europeans, although they step on the island for the first time after Prospero's tempest, as soon as they see the land, plan to own and colonise it and use its inhabitants, Caliban in this case, according to their own wishes as they associated the land and the inhabitants with money and profit. At first, they see the land and its resources as objects, commodities to be bought and sold. At their first encounter they discuss how profitable it might be to take advantage of it logically, which is clearly explained in the following words uttered by Gonzalo: "A magnificent country! […]. I think we should investigate all the caves on this island one by one to see if we find any [guano], and if we do, this island, if wisely exploited, will be richer than Egypt with its Nile" (Césaire, 1992: 24). These lines represent an archetypal colonial process and traces followed for the commodification of the land and its inhabitants, and might be associated with the "rape" of the virgin land, a widely discussed topic in postcolonial studies.

[1] "The White Man's Burden" (1899) is the title of the poem written by Rudyard Kipling in order to encourage the United States of America to have colonial control over the Philippines. This title, since then, is used as a symbolic instrument for colonisers to justify their colonialist mindsets.

After a while, Trinculo and Stephano lose each other and separately see Caliban, for whom they make plans and state as follows:

> "TRINCULO: Ah, an Indian! Dead or alive? You never know with these tricky races. […]. If he's alive I'll make him my prisoner and take him back to Europe and then, by golly, my fortune will be made! I'll sell him to a carnival. No! I'll show him myself at fairs! What a stroke of luck!" (Césaire, 1992: 38).

> "STEPHANO: [I]t looks like a Nindian! […]. I really am lucky. There's money to be made from a Nindian like that. If you showed him at a carnival… along with the bearded lady and the flea circus, a real Nindian! An authentic Nindian from the Caribbean! That means real dough […]. My fortune is made. Come on, you wonderful monster…" (Césaire, 1992: 39).

Trinculo and Stephano's speciesist, racist and dehumanising viewpoints and attitudes can clearly be distinguishable throughout these words which include "tricky races" and "wonderful monster". In addition to these derogatory comments and remarks uttered for Caliban, their plan to display him in a carnival place like an object or animal is outstanding, which reminds of the human zoos which were so popular in Europe and the USA between the late nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries, and which exhibited indigenous black people like animals or objects. In this example there is a direct correlation between racial degradation and the exploitation of animals, which reminds of Peter Singer's definition of speciesism as "a prejudice or attitude of bias in favour of the interests of members of one's own species and against those of members of another species" (1975: 6). Trinculo and Stephano's dreams about Caliban's being exhibited in a circus like an animal are reflective of their toxic thoughts that fabricate a speciesism in which the blacks are considered as different from humans and close to animals and things. In this respect, Trinculo and Stephano might be regarded as two white men who are two loyal servants of the racial speciesist discourse. Due to the skin colour difference between the whites and the blacks, onto the black "'body-thing'" (Mbembe, 2001: 27), the images of "the other" and "inhuman" are projected, and, in Caliban example, the two white Europeans find in themselves the right to possess and commodify the body of the indigenous person which can be bought and sold, and upon which they can exercise their control and will. Hence, they expect the white coloniser and the black servant relationship to be that of dominance, which will lead to psychological, verbal and physical violence.

All these examples show the impact of colonialism on the colonised, how in this process the colonised are humiliated, decivilised, thingified, objectified, brutalised, otherised and dehumanised as a result of "race hatred" (Césaire, 2000: 35), "plunder and torture" (Césaire, 2000: 57), which

will lead to the "barbarism" of the European (Césaire, 2000: 32), and to the argument which is cried so loudly by Césaire that "'Europe' is morally, spiritually indefensible" (2000: 32). A culture that puts itself into the center and "the other" into the margins is associated by Césaire, with tyranny, and is severely satirised by him in *A Tempest* and in his *Discourse on Colonialism*. In *A Tempest*, particularly Prospero and then Trinculo and Stephano represent the dehumanising European colonisers that are satirised by Césaire. On the contrary, Césaire uses Caliban in order to subvert the so-called fixed "truths" constructed by colonisers, which will be the topic of discussion under the following subtitle.

Caliban's Subversion of the Colonial Discourse and "*Explod[ing] Prospero's Old Myth*"

> "I do not say that it is impossible to change a man into an animal: I simply say that you won't get there without weakening him considerably" (Fanon, 1963: 15).

As Fanon claims above, the first step into dehumanising colonised people is to weaken them. This weakening is enabled by forcing the colonised to bow down before colonisers through colonising the minds of the colonised, cultural imperialism, annihilation of the cultural memory that builds strong bonds with the past and national/ cultural history/ heritage of a nation. Destruction of this link with the past leads to the transformation of the indigenous people, in Fanon's words, into "political animals in the most universal sense of the word" (1963: 81). In a similar vein, as Pugliese argues,

> "[t]hese racial operations, critically, are predicated on relegating the Native to the very animal kingdom […]. Captured under the sign of non-human Animal and relegated to the savage outside of the Human, the Native can then be managed […] under the same laws that govern colonial understandings of fauna and flora" (2013: 34).

The native is dehumanised not only by denying the fact that they have a distinct history and culture. This dehumanisation is sometimes put into practice by placing the native at the same level with the fauna and flora and by thinking that the management and biopolitical governance of the native is not different from the management of the fauna and flora. Hence, the bio-power sees no problem in bringing the native to the level of the animal, the "non-human Animal" in order to prove that they are savage and away from any traces of civilisation. The portrayal of the colonised as animals and things is nothing more than the attempt of the colonisers to construct colonial, ideological, cultural and political formations of power. No matter which term is used to define the disadvantageous position of the colonised,

"thingification", "objectification", "dehumanisation" or "depersonalisation", all of them prove that the colonised all together are regarded as nothing more than masses, numbers or even animals, all of which are used as instruments to deprive the colonised of dignity and even human qualities.

Césaire, in his *A Tempest*, satirises this dehumanisation and "thingification", which stemmed from the deliberate destruction of the glorious indigenous culture, religion, art, history under the name of the so-called progress, civilisation and achievements. As a matter of fact, postcolonial writers revisit and revise their past in order to reinterpret them as experiences that might be used to reshape the future. Similarly, Césaire, through *A Tempest*, revisits the traumatic past, and he juxtaposes the tragedies of the past with the attempts to change the present for the reconstruction of the future which would revive their lost cultural and historical values. He, in order to achieve his purpose, uses Caliban as an instrument. Hence, his Caliban representation "must be shown to have a history that can be perceived on its own, as the result of Caliban's own effort. One must, according to Lamming, 'explode Prospero's old myth' by christening 'language afresh'" (Said, 1993: 213). Césaireian Caliban, as opposed to Shakespearean Caliban, *dares* to revive the pre-colonial cultural and historical facts peculiar to his own life. Césaire depicts him as a character who undermines the colonial teachings, doctrines, discourses that had previously been considered as unquestionable by the majority of colonised people. In this sense, it might be claimed that Caliban is a revolutionary character with a rebellious language and actions, which can clearly be observed in his attempt to rebel against Prospero by "setting forth to conquer Prospero" (Césaire, 1992: 52).

Caliban's first attempt to "conquer" Prospero is observed in the language sphere. By means of language, Caliban constructs a metaphorical battleground in which he produces his own discourses reflective of his revenge taken from the coloniser that tried to erase everything belonging to the indigenous people. When Prospero uses derogatory and dehumanising words for Caliban's appearance by saying he looks like an ugly ape, Caliban, in a rebellious manner, subverts the beauty and speciesist discourses constructed by white Europeans according to their geographical and racial standards by saying: "You think I'm ugly…well, I don't think you're so handsome yourself. With that big hooked nose, you look just like some old vulture. (Laughing) An old vulture with a scrawny neck!" (Césaire, 1992: 11). Caliban's reply reverses the fixed definitions of the *ideal* human, and re-produces the image and definition of the white man in such a way that, now,

the white man is dehumanised through animetaphor, through the resemblance between Prospero and an animal: a vulture, a wild bird representing the brutal violence perpetrated by the colonial power. Césaire, by means of Caliban's rebellious language, sharp tongue and insurgent manners, defies and shatters the Eurocentric discourses and codes, whose emphasis is on the positive image of the coloniser, and on the colonial "civilising mission" myth, which is defied by Césaire in *A Tempest*, and is seen as nothing more than "a smoke screen" (Kelley, 2000: 21). Caliban's acrimonious and pejorative words are, in fact, reflective of his anger at and disillusionment with all the colonisers from the past to the present, and their man-made "white man's burden" myth, which claims that the white European man brought civilisation and light to the "heart of darkness". They also reflect Caliban's views against Prospero's assumption of power and control by means of "truths" constructed in relation to certain biological, physical and cultural features peculiar to a specific race. Caliban is portrayed as an indigenous man who is aware of the fact that all these claims are nothing more than myths and reflections of egoistic manners rather than means used for the benefit of the colonised as always claimed by the coloniser, which is possible to be felt in the following words uttered by Caliban:

> "In the first place, that's not true. You didn't teach me a thing! Except to jabber in your own language so that I could understand your orders: chop the wood, wash the dishes, fish for food, plant vegetables, all because you're too lazy to do it yourself. And as for your learning, […] [a]ll your science you keep for yourself alone" (Césaire, 1969: 11-12).

Caliban now understands that Prospero has taught him his own language not for the sake of civilisation or as a part of "the white man's burden", but for his desire to be served by Caliban in a better way, and knowing the language of the coloniser, French language in the case of *A Tempest*, makes this servitude easier. Furthermore, he is now aware of the fact that Prospero has been indulged in agriculture which is not for the benefit of Caliban, who represents the indigenous people toiling on land, but for his own benefit as, in Jim Mason's words, "'agri-culture'" functioned as "'a license for conquest'" (cited in Pugliese, 2017: 30). By means of agricultural productions in which slaves were forced to work, colonial biopower found a way to claim the ownership of the land besides the ownership of the slaves, which are directly linked with biopolitical economies observed throughout the slavery process and the evolution of European capitalism beginning with the 1600s. This evolution owes much to the European colonial, territorial and economic expansionism, as a result of which a strict political, cultural

and economic domination over the indigenous peoples of the colonised lands and the ones brought as slaves from Africa was observed. In this respect, it might be argued that there is a close relationship among the slave plantation, capitalism and using the slaves as labour force that would contribute to the economic profit of European traders and colonisers. The slavery institution might be accepted as the backbone of European colonialist and capitalist system. About this argument Foucault argues that capitalism "would not have been possible without the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and adjustment of the phenomena of population to economic processes" (Foucault, 1978: 141). Moreover, as Pugliese puts forth, in biopolitical economies, in the production process, "a body whose controlled insertion into biopolitical economies was instrumental in the development of capitalism: the human slave" and he continues to state that

> "[t]he critical qualifier 'human species' is always - already fully racialised in terms of its biopolitical operations once it is situated within the colonial economies of the slave trade: the category 'human' was, by definition, one that could only be inhabited by the European subject" (2013: 35-36).

There is a close connection between the plantation of the land and the slave plantations in that slaves were used as tools for the colonial exploitation of the resources of the land, and the slave populations expected to be "docile" were controlled and regulated by the power. Slaves, who were already regarded as the inferior race, and hence who were excluded from the classification of "human", were forced to serve the circulation of the production process and the development of Western capitalism, as a result of which colonisers could get as much profit as possible and the hierarchical gap between slaves and coloniseres were widened.

After his realisation of the "appearance versus reality" situation, that is to say, after he understands the fact that behind Prospero's appearance as a compassionate and beneficial master lies egoistic desires, Caliban makes fun of this "mission" myth with deprecating comments: "You make me laugh with your 'mission'!" and "Your 'vocation'!", which is "to hassle me". He goes on to state that he knows that Prospero will stay to continue this hassle in a similar way to "those guys who founded the colonies/ and who now can't live anywhere else". He also claims that Prospero is "just an old addict" (Césaire, 1992: 65). Moreover, Caliban even dares to say that it is not Prospero, the white master, but Caliban, the black man, who taught Prospero knowledge. Caliban, by calling Prospero" as "Ingrate!" (Césaire, 1969: 13), now can claim that Prospero would do nothing on this land without Caliban, that he taught Prospero the language of nature, the plants,

the trees, the seasons, the birds. Prospero, however, still calls Caliban as slave and animal, and Caliban feels abused and misused (Césaire, 1969: 13). He also says that for years he served Prospero, and endured his racist taunts, insults, "ingratitude", and more derogatory of all for Caliban is Prospero's "condescension" (Césaire, 1992: 65). From this time on, however, he is determined not to continue with the same old story, and wants to write his own story with a new beginning, and without Prospero's physical and psychological imprisonment. Caliban claims that now "it's over!", and he does not "give a damn for [Prospero's] power / or for [his] dogs or [his] police or [his] inventions!" (Césaire, 1992: 65). Although Prospero, in all occasions, claims that without his efforts and existence, Caliban would be a "nobody", and tries to impose the European civilisation versus underdeveloped Other myth upon Caliban, Caliban's counter-attacks are observed to be harsher. Caliban claims that without Prospero he would even be the King of the island, the right of which came to him from his mother, Sycorax (Césaire, 1969: 12) by means of which he implies that the power of Prospero is the "nonsovereign power, a power without right, as that which empties the legitimised power of disciplines and law (moral and juridical)" (Seshadri, 2012: xiii).

Caliban now gains self-awareness, and knows that he would have a more valuable *human* position, even be the rightful owner of the island as the king who has a say upon the political and cultural matters of his own country without the existence of the coloniser. His words and new and strong stance on the subversion of the colonial discourse become his new language by means of which he implies the "*Non serviam*!" disobedience, that is used in modern times as a cultural and political manifestation of protest and rebellion against the "fixed" definitions of the racist and colonial discourse. Caliban, without any traces of fear, "vomits" his suppressed feelings of anger and frustration towards the centuries-old fact of colonisation, colonisers and the colonial discourses that have been circulated among colonisers from different periods, and that had been constructed upon strictly consolidated racist "truths" and cultural and biological discrimination. It is obvious that Caliban is not the prototypical submissive subaltern colonised man any more. Furthermore, it might not be wrong to put forth that, contrary to the widespread discussions and analyses of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* particularly in terms of the Western perspectives, and the monophonic/ univocal and autonomous representation of the play reflecting the biased views of Prospero, the primary focus of Césaire's *A Tempest* is on black

culture and the black colonised man, Caliban, who is given an opportunity to voice himself and his anger at colonisation.

In fact, Caliban's subversion of this colonial discourse is a tool for Césaire to emphasise that, with their self-identities, their rooted history and culture (although annihilated throughout the colonisation period, it is still possible to reconstruct them), the blacks are *humans*, too, humans with great value, away from any trace of inferiority. In line with this self-awareness and black consciousness, Césaire's Caliban takes another step within the path to self-recognition as regards his self-identity, his own choice of name. He does not want to be called as "Caliban" any more. As Davis states,

> "[t]he very appellation 'Caliban' is derived from the reality of Amerindian resistance in the New World context, since it has been shown to be an anagram of 'Cannibal' (the latter being itself derived by a process of corruption, from "Carib" – the name of a prominent Amerindian tribe that occupied the archipelago at the time of the first European explorations)" (1997: 157).

Reflective of this fact about the association of the name Caliban with cannibalism in the first European and colonised encounters as a consequence of explorations, Prospero's name suggestion for Caliban as "Cannibal" is really annoying for Caliban. Prospero says: "Cannibal would suit you, but I'm sure you wouldn't like that, would you?" (Césaire, 1969: 15). Prospero's attempts to call Caliban (even this name is not his real name) with a derogatory name, "Cannibal" is an example of "onomastic violence" (Seshadri, 2012: 167), which takes away the autonomy of an individual as naming, in a way, is declaring authority and power over the subaltern. In a reactionary mode to the "naming is claiming" assertion, Caliban rejects the name imposed upon him by Prospero, particularly a name which is associated with "cannibalism" like "Caliban", does not want to be defined and named by the coloniser, which proves his denial of being identified with any name given by the colonisers, and exhibits his anti-imperialist stance, and he gradually becomes more and more aware of his own self. He, just like Malcolm X, wants to be called as "X":

> "Well, because Caliban isn't my name. It's as simple as that. […]. It's the name given me by your hatred, and everytime it's spoken it's an insult. […]. Call me X. That would be best. Like a man without a name. Or, to be more precise, a man whose name has been stolen. You talk about history… well, that's history, and everyone knows it! Every time you summon me it reminds me of a basic fact, the fact that you've stolen everything from me, even my identity! Uhuru!" (Césaire, 1969: 14-15).

Moreover, Caliban understands clearly that Prospero has lied to him, and deceived him since they met

"about the world, about myself,
that you ended up by imposing on me
an image of myself:
underdeveloped, in your words, undercompetent
that's how you made me see myself!
And I hate that image… and it's false!
But now I know you, you old cancer,
And I also know myself!" (Césaire, 1992: 64).

Caliban, with these bitter words, exclaims his complaints about the deception about his image and the image of the white man produced by the coloniser, Prospero, which Caliban had to endure for years without knowing about the facts. From Caliban's case, one can clearly see that dehumanisation of the colonised should not be evaluated only in relation to use of language by means of which colonisers humiliate the colonised with degrading words, but also should be considered in line with "stealing" the rights of the colonised such as freedom, self identity, even their names. As Loomba states, colonialism, generally through violence, reconstructs territories, social domains and human identities (1998: 185), which is explained by Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o as a "cultural bomb" (1986: 3) that destroys the language, identity and culture of the indigenous people. As a result, the culture and views of the so-called "superior" race are imposed upon the indigenous people by suppressing their own ways of life. However, as can be observed in Caliban's personality; self-exploration, self-awareness and self-knowledge might make the colonised more powerful and might initiate the first steps into the liberation process. He clearly understands the colonial discourses constructed for the colonised, that is, the native as an animal and a thing that has no value is not a natural but a man-made construct of colonisers, and that without finding his own self, it would not be possible for him to have his own thoughts, knowledge, civilisation, and that he would be doomed to be defined and directed to all the directions by the white man. After Caliban's firm stand against Prospero and on self-discovery, Prospero's so-called unshakable hegemonic power is destroyed, as can be understood from Prospero's words that have remonstrance and grief: "Well, I hate you as well!/ For it is you who have made me/ doubt myself for the first time" (Césaire, 1992: 66). Caliban's new portrait and Prospero's present weakened condition show that "[t]he old world is crumbling down!" (Césaire, 1992: 65). Now aware of the fact that *the competent and omnipotent coloniser myth* can be destroyed, Caliban metamorphoses into a man with his own decisions. His exploration of the self-knowledge paves the way for the discovery of the fact that he has his own culture and history, that he is not a "thing" without spirit, but somebody

who is capable of naming himself and who has the right to decide upon anything related to his own body and identity. As Davis puts forth, "[i]n Césaire's re-fashioning of the Shakespearean plot […], the figure of Caliban is no longer a caricature of the savage, noble or ignoble; rather it incarnates the irrepressible will of the colonised to be his own master" (1997: 161-162). Caliban struggles to retain his language and culture, and to "celebrate" his roots, demarginalise himself and his culture, language, history, and in Thiong'o's words, to "decolonise the mind". After the discovery of his self as a black man with great cultural and historical heritage, he does not allow Prospero to have a say upon the definition and construction of his own image and to indulge in his writing of history or *his* story, and metaphorically saves himself from the bondages of colonisation, which is emphasised by the Kenyan word, "Uhuru", which means "freedom now".[2]

As a result of the destruction of the Eurocentric myths, the "majesty" attributed to Prospero's "Tempest", that is to say, "*the* Tempest" is destroyed and replaced by "*a* Tempest" implying the existence of other tempests, too, and this time a tempest that is produced by Caliban is suggested. Caliban's metaphorical tempest blows so severely that it shakes the strong and seemingly unshakable power and image of the coloniser, Prospero. By means of *A Tempest* by Césaire, it becomes possible to hear the voice of once suppressed and oppressed man, Caliban, and his wishes such as once again to be the owner of his island, to emancipate from bondage, to "get rid of [Prospero]", "to spit [him] out, all [his] works and pomps!" and "[his] 'white' magic!" (Césaire, 1992: 64). In the end, the "White Man's Burden" Myth, Prospero's Myth, the "Mythical Portrait of the Colonised" as a "thing" or "animal" are debunked, even "exploded". Only Caliban and Prospero stay in the island, and they challenge each other: Caliban by saying that he knows he will be totally free and be the victor, and will have a decisive advantage over Prospero, and Prospero, by claiming that "Ten times, a hundred times, [he's] tried to save [Caliban], above all from [himself]", and he "shall set aside [his] indulgent nature and henceforth [he] will answer [Caliban's]

[2] It should also be emphasised that although *A Tempest* takes place in the Caribbean Islands, with Caliban's insistence on the name X like Malcolm X and with the use of a Kenyan term like "Uhuru", Césaire tries to construct a pan-African awareness and solidarity with the other black independence movements like that of Malcolm X in the United States, and wants to voice Kenya that struggled a lot to get its independence from the United Kingdom in 1963. Through this solidarity and as a contribution to his views in Negritude, Césaire manages to symbolically unite all blacks as a whole and resists the racist colonial discourses that humiliated the blacks as backward and primitive.

violence with violence!" (Césaire, 1992: 67). Prospero, while even occupying someone else's country, still wants to show Caliban as an ungrateful servant, and emphasises the white man's justice in the plantation of his colony, and the *civilising mission* process that would be conducted for the so-called "barbarous" people. This proves that he is entrapped by the claws of the ideological and discursive codes of the colonial world, which he sees as a strategy with which he could control Caliban and as a weapon of power, and he sees new Caliban, now a self-fashioned and independed minded man as a threat to his imperial hegemonic power representation, and to the colonial discourses that had been embroidered by the old and new colonisers. That is why he threatens Caliban with violence. Time passes, and the play ends with Prospero's appearance as weak, "aged and weary" (Césaire, 1992: 68). Although this is the case, however, he still does not want his "work" he has built until now to be annihilated, and wants to protect his so-called civilisation that he formulated on the island. Then he calls Caliban; however, rather than Caliban's answer, his song about freedom is heard: "FREEDOM HI-DAY, FREEDOM HI-DAY!" (Césaire, 1992: 68). It is annoying for Prospero, because he demands biopolitical hegemonic power over his subject, and, in order to manage to reach this aim, and to define himself as superior, Prospero needs Caliban as the weak other as he is used to "[p]recisely what the operation of speciesism […] has enabled", that is to say, "the West's assignment of all its others along biopolitical hierarchies of life – with the tautology of Western-white-man at the apex and all other forms in descending scale towards that brute animality that can be captured, enslaved and killed with impunity" (Pugliese, 2017: 25). However, at the end of the play, the discourse on this speciesism is shattered. In the end, it is still not clear whether Caliban will be able to become totally free; however, his energy to continue his struggle for total liberation and Prospero's lack of energy can be felt. Prospero has not been depicted as weak as this until now, and Caliban most probably has never been so close to freedom, the "decolonisation of his mind", of his culture, of his body and of his land. For Prospero it becomes more and more impossible to continue his "superiority" over the land as Caliban is not any more the submissive slave who, without questioning, served the master. Transformation of the strong coloniser image of Prospero into such a weak position is not different from the metaphorical death of the power upholder, and the explosion of all colonial myths, which contributes to Césaire's voicing his efforts to pave the way for the liberation of the blacks, and his attempts to "weav[e] a future from a tangled past" (Rust, 2001: 102).

Conclusion

As Giorgio Agamben argues, in Western politics, "the decisive political conflict, which governs every other conflict, is that between the animality and the humanity of man" (cited in Pugliese, 2013: 37), and as Dinesh Wadiwell states, "Western politics expresses the fact of war between human and animal life" (cited in Pugliese, 2013: 37). By revisiting Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, it is possible to discuss such political and cultural matters related to the definitions of human and to destructive European colonialism that erased the history and culture of the colonised and dehumanised the indigenous *humans*. By the subversion of familiar Prospero-Caliban master-slave relationship, Césaire destroys the authority of Prospero's political and hegemonic system. Through Caliban, he seems to be suggesting that in the liberation process there might be so many choices the most outstanding of which might be the one related to being a Caliban who manages to overcome his previous unquestionable servitude to Prospero and to explore "his essential, pre-colonial self" (Said, 1993: 214). As a matter of fact, as Ashcroft, et al. note, cultural decolonisation requires "a radical dismantling of the European codes and a post-colonial subversion and appropriation of the dominant European discourses" (2002: 220). So, what Césaire does by means of using Caliban as a tool to question the "barbarism" and "dehumanisation" of colonialism is to question the Eurocentric discourses that accepted European values and the white colour as superior to the rest of the world, and the ingrained European cultural and political systems which erased the indigenous cultures and histories of peoples. *A Tempest*, although it was written during the 1960s' political turmoil about the efforts of the blacks to get liberation and equality with all the whites, still appeals to the twenty-first century readers and audiences as, unfortunately, speciesism, racism against and dehumanising attitudes towards the blacks[3] still continue.

[3] As this article focuses particularly on the blacks, only speciesist violence applied upon them is discussed. In our century, unfortunately, the blacks are not the only ones who experience such degrading treatments. Even in these days in which I am writing this article, this kind of violence that is an open racism towards "the otherised" is also applied voluntarily by, for example, Dan Gillerman, Israil's thirteenth Permanent Representative to the UN, who called the Palestinians as "horrible, inhuman animals" in an interview, and by Yoav Gallant, Israeli Defense Minister, who has claimed they are "fighting against animals". These dehumanising words are used in order to legitimise Israil's settler colonialism in Palestine and its war crimes against the Palestinians among which there are massacre of innocent civilians (as of today, death toll according to official figures is more than 36,470) including women and children, displacement of the Gazaians, and the prevention of food and medicine aid into Gaza. It is possible to observe that Aimé Césaire's *A Tempest* transgresses its time, and appeals to 2024 as well. In this sense, the play might be considered as a

Today it is still possible to hear the cry of a black American man, George Floyd, who was murdered by a white police officer, Derek Chauvin on 25 May 2020 in Minneapolis: "I cannot breathe". As Desmond Morris states, "[i]t [guilt] still fails to treat negroes as individuals. It still persists in looking at them as members of an out-group" (1996: 143). The ones who saw and explained the world through the Eurocentric, colonialist and racist lens have committed great crimes against the history of humanity due to the psychological, verbal and physical violence, massacres, racism that they brought under the name of civilisation, development or democracy but, in fact, because of their political and colonial interests. In line with all the discussions in the article, *A Tempest* by Césaire might be considered as a literature of resistance that speaks for all subjugated people who are *humans* deserving to have their own identities, cultures and histories. The play also shows that it is possible to write one's own story, and to sing one's own song as seen in Caliban, who sings his song of freedom for which he struggled much. Caliban's story, in *A Tempest*, brings forth many possibilities for changes into betterment in our world that is shared by different peoples that have different customs, traditions, histories, cultures, languages, identities such as a collaborative effort to try to understand these differences, to design a beautiful mosaic out of these differences, and to see these different peoples not with a geography-centred lens or as a part of *xenophobia*, but as a part of *xenophilia*.

REFERENCES

ASHCROFT, Bill, GRIFFITHS, Gareth and TIFFIN, Helen (2002), *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*, London and New York, Routledge.

ALMQUIST, Steve (Spring, 2006). "Not Quite the Gabbling of 'A Thing Most Brutish': Caliban's Kiswahili in Aimé Césaire's 'A Tempest'", *Callaloo*, 29 (2), 587-607, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3805633.

BRUNER, Charlotte H. (Sep. 1976). "The Meaning of Caliban in Black Literature Today", *Comparative Literature Studies*, 13 (3), 240-253, https://www.jstor.org/stable/40246045.

CESAIRE, Aimé (1992), *A Tempest*, Trans. Richard MILLER, New York, Ubu Repertory Theater Publications.

CESAIRE, Aimé (2000), *Discourse on Colonialism*, Trans. Joan Pinkham, New York, Monthly Review Press.

metaphor for the twenty-first century dehumanising events, or even for all dehumanising experiences observed throughout history, and Caliban might be the voice of all the dehumanised *humans* that lived in the past and still live in the present.

CONRAD, Joseph (2005), *Heart of Darkness. Webster' German Thesaurus Edition*, San Diego, Icon Classics.

DAVIS, Grogson (1997), *Cambridge Studies in African and Caribbean Literature: Aimé Césaire*, Ed. A. IRELE, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

DELANEY, Carol (2011), *Columbus and the Quest for Jerusalem*, New York, Free Press.

FANON, Frantz (1963), *The Wretched of the Earth*, Trans. Constance FARRINGTON, New York, Grove Press.

FOUCAULT, Michel (1978), *The History of Sexuality*, New York, Pantheon Books.

FOUCAULT, Michel (1997), Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-1976. Eds. M. BERTANI and A. FONTANA, New York, Picador.

HUME, David (1987), *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary*, Indianapolis, Liberty Fund.

KELLEY, Robin D. G. (2000). "A Poetics of Anticolonialism", *Discourse on Colonialism*, New York, Monthly Review Press, 7-28.

LIVINGSTON, Robert Eric (1995). "Decolonising the Theatre: Césaire, Serreau and the Drama of Negritude", Ed. J. E. GAINOR, *Imperialism and Theatre: Essays on world theatre and performance 1795-1995*, Routledge, London and New York, 179-194.

LOOMBA, Ania (1998), *Colonialism/ Postcolonialism*, London and New York, Routledge.

MBEMBE, Achille (2001), *On the Postcolony*, California, University of California Press.

McLEOD, John (2000), *Beginning Postcolonialism*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

MEMMI, Albert (2003), *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, London, Earthscan Publications Ltd.

MORRIS, Desmond (1996), *The Human Zoo: A Zoologist's Classic Study of the Urban Animal*, New York, Tokyo and London, Kodansha International.

PUGLIESE, Joseph (2013), *State Violence and the Execution of Law: Biopolitical Caesurae of Torture, Black Sites, Drones*, Oxon, Routledge.

PUGLIESE, Joseph (2017). "Terminal Truths: Foucault's Animals and the Mask of the Beast", Eds M. CHRULEW and D. J. WADIWEL, *Foucault and Animals*, Brill, Leiden, 19-36.

RUST, Susie Post (Sept. 2001), "The Garífuna: Weaving a Future from a Tangled Past", *National Geographic*,102-113.

RYDER, Richard D. (1975), *Victims of Science: The Use of Animals in Research*, London, Davis-Poynter.

SAID, Edward W. (1993), *Culture and Imperialism*, New York, Vintage Books.

SESHADRI, Kalpana Rahita (2012), *HumAnimal: Race, Law, Language*, Minneapolis, Minnesota UP.

SHAKESPEARE, William (2009), *The Tempest*. *The Cambridge Dover Wilson Shakespeare*, 33. Ed. J. D over WILSON, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

SINGER, Peter (2015), *Animal Liberation*, New York, Open Road.

wa THIONG'O, Ngugi (1986), *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*, Oxford, James Currey Ltd.

WILLOQUET-MARICONDI, Paula (Fall 1996). "African Animism, 'Négritude', and the Interdependence of Place and Being in Aimé Césaire's 'A Tempest'", *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, 3 (2), 47-61. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44085429.