

Intertextuality in Literary Discourses: Reconstruction and Interrogation of Ideologies

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of
Tribhuvan University in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

ENGLISH

By

Niran Khanal

PhD Regd. No. 7/2072

TU Regd. No. 6-2-311-238-97

Tribhuvan University

Kathmandu, Nepal

September 2024

Letter of Recommendation

We certify that this dissertation entitled “Intertextuality in Literary Discourses: Reconstruction and Interrogation of Ideologies” was prepared by Niran Khanal under our guidance. We hereby recommend this dissertation for the final examinations by the research committee of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English.

Dissertation Committee:

Prof. Amma Raj Joshi, PhD

Supervisor

Date: September 1, 2024

Prof. Ram Chandra Paudel, PhD

Co-Supervisor

Date: September 1, 2024

Approval Letter

Acknowledgments

Foremost, I would like to express my profound gratitude to my mentor, the principal supervisor of Ph. D. dissertation, Prof. Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, for his constant inspiration and constructive suggestions to bring this work in the present form. Under his direction, my intellectual journey materializes its goal. I also extend my gratefulness to the co-supervisor, Prof. Dr. Ram Chandra Paudel, whose insightful comments after the meticulous observation of my dissertation have been instrumental in refining this work.

I sincerely express my gratitude to my revered guru, Prof. Dr. Shreedhar Prasad Lohani, whose inspiration and guidance led me to the pursuit of knowledge. The present project is the outcome of his encouragement.

I thank Prof. Dr. Jib Lal Sapkota, the Head of the Central Department of English, TU. Dr. Sapkota's insightful comments on my dissertation for the report to University Grants Commission, gave me the direction for the revision of the dissertation. I extend my thanks to Prof. Dr. Dhurba Karki, Prof. Dr. Beerendra Pandey, Dr. Hari Adhikari and Dr. Bhushan Aryal for offering me their creative suggestions on my Ph. D. proposal. Similarly, other professors, Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Dr. Mohan Lohani, Dr. Gobinda Raj Bhattarai, Dr. Susmita Talukdar, Dr. Ananda Sharma, Dr. Anirudra Thapa and Dr. Sharad Chandra Thakur deserve my gratefulness for their comments and suggestions to improve a seminar paper, the review of literature and the dissertation. I thank the research committee of the Central Department of English, TU for the academic support to this research.

I am especially thankful to University Grants Commission, Nepal for offering me the Ph. D. Fellowship. With its funding and guidelines, UGC made it possible for me to manage the resources for the completion of this research in the given time.

Institutionally, Padma Kanya Multiple Campus, Bagbazaar and Coordination Division, TU supported me in the process of approving the study leave for this research from

TU. Similarly, the Central Department of English, TU, the host institution for Ph. D. program, and the Dean's office of Humanities and Social Sciences in collaboration provided me the opportunity for Ph. D. research. Dean, Prof. Dr. Kusum Shakya, and assistant Dean, Prof. Dr. Dubinanda Dhakal, deserve special recognition for both academic and administrative support. I acknowledge the contributions of aforementioned institutions.

I am indebted to Dr. Narottam Prasad Upadhyay, the Principal of Sathya Sai Shiksha Sadan, for his continuous support to make this project successful. For the technical support, I thank Mr. Khum Prasad Sharma, Mr. Sanjit Khanal, Prof. Kumar Koirala, Prof. Dr. Raj Kumar Pokhrel and Mrs. Anita Khanal, administrative officer of Dean's office. Likewise, I acknowledge the contributions of friends and colleagues who assisted me during the research.

Finally, I appreciate the patience of my family. My wife, Mina Bhattarai, and Son, Pranab Khanal, compromised with the family time for my study. Their love boosted my spirit to work relentlessly to complete this dissertation.

Declaration

I hereby declare that my dissertation entitled “Intertextuality in Literary Discourses: Reconstruction and Interrogation of Ideologies” submitted to the office of the Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, is my original work. I have acknowledged the sources for the ideas and data that I borrowed from others in the process of writing this dissertation. The findings that I have documented in this work have not been shared with others for any purpose. I have not published any part of this dissertation before. If any evidence contradicts with my declaration, I shall take the responsibility.

Niran Khanal

September 1, 2024

Abstract

This study examines the literary discourses with the perspective of intertextuality to uncover the underlying social condition that supports for the existence of social disparities. To explore the intertextual relations, I have selected the mainstream narratives: William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre*, and their alternative narratives: Aime Cesaire's *A Tempest*, J.M. Coetzee's *Foe* and Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*. The research aims to assess the role of hegemonic ideologies for the creation and maintenance of mainstream-margin hierarchies. It uses the critical-comparative approach to explore the textual relations. So, intertextuality for this project is a critical examination of textual relations in terms of critique of ideologies that have connections with social disparities. Accordingly, intertextual relations between the mainstream narratives and their alternative narratives are the relations of differences as the latter narratives interrogate the hegemonic belief systems represented in the former narratives.

I argue that disparities related to race, gender, class and nationality as represented in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* are the outcomes of belief systems. Since people live in ideologies, they are employed to justify the social organization. They help institutionalize the binary relations and social inequalities. Consequently, the problem of marginalization and social injustice prevail. So, it is necessary to deconstruct the dominant ideologies for the alternative relations and social justice. And deconstruction is possible through critical reproduction of knowledge. The attempts of Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys are to bridge the disparities by critiquing the narratives that represent the binary relations between the mainstreams and the marginal.

The problems with the mainstream narratives is that their representations fail to do justice to the marginal characters, like women, underclass workers, people of colour and non-

European nationalities. These narratives represent the binaries of unequal relations in the names of religion, race, gender, class, and civilization. So, it is essential to understand why such relations exist. To address the aforementioned problems, these research questions are crucial. Why do social disparities exist and what support them? What is the connection between the center-margin relations and the hegemonic ideologies in the mainstream narratives, *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*? What are the points of departure in the alternative narratives from the mainstream narratives to bridge the center-margin relations?

For the method of study, I use the critical-comparative approach from the postcolonial perspective. The ideas of intertextuality, drawn from Stanley Fish and Julia Kristeva and Linda Hutcheon, are applied in the examination of textual relations between the mainstream narratives and the alternative narratives. And the postcolonial-new comparative approach of Spivak is useful to locate the points of references for the examination of textual relations. Accordingly, I take ideologies as the points of debate between the narratives.

This is qualitative research; it analyses the primary texts and secondary resources, like articles and books critically. For data, I use the primary texts. The method of analysis of data/narratives is based on critical reading and interpretation. I use the comparative approach to locate the issues of debate in the narratives.

For the theoretical framework, I use the integrated approach by blending the concepts of intertextuality, ideology and the postcolonial-new comparative approach of Gayatri Spivak. The reason for the use of integrated approach is that this research attempts to address the diverse intersected issues. Spivak's theory is useful to interrogate essentialism of ideologies.

The textual review finds that the previous researches on *The Tempest* and *A Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Foe*, and *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* deal with institutional

oppressions, resistance against such oppressions, representation and reader's role in intertextual relations. However, they fall short to pay adequate attention to the problem of relation between mainstream and margin in relation to the hegemonic ideologies.

In representation, perspectives have connection with belief systems and power relations. Aime Cesaire, J.M. Coetzee and Jean Rhys change the perspectives while rewriting the narratives to contest the hegemonic belief systems. They attempt to deconstruct the binaries projected in the canonical narratives by changing perspectives, locations, roles and identities of the key characters. So, interpretation, appropriation and reconstruction of narratives are their political strategies to disrupt the mainstream-margin duality for the egalitarian relations and respect for diversity. They diversify their narratives to make them inclusive in contrast to the homogenous and centralizing mainstream narratives.

The implication of this research is that it opens an avenue to uncover the impact of hegemonic belief systems in human relations. It works as a critical awareness to address the problem of representation in the process of knowledge production. By drawing the illustrations from the literary narratives, it sends the message that justification of marginalization with the support of the mainstream ideologies is problematic.

Table of Contents

Letter of Recommendation	ii
Approval letter	iii
Acknowledgements	iv-v
Declaration	vi
Abstract	vii-ix
Table of Contents	x-xi
I. Intertextuality: Critiques of Hegemonic Ideologies	1-17
II. Review of Literature: Location of a Space for Alteration	18-63
Theoretical Review	
Textual and Critical Review	
Conclusion	
III. Reconstruction of the Mainstream Narratives from the Perspective of Peripheries	64-102
Narrative Shift from Center to Margin	
Contestation of Ideologies	
Politics behind Construction, Interpretation and Appropriation of Texts	
Conclusion	
IV. Intertextual Differences in Representations: Critical Perspectives in	103-140
Reproduction of Knowledge in the Selected Narratives	
Colonial and Postcolonial Representations: Disparities	
Representation of Classes: Human Relations under Capitalism	
Representation/Misrepresentation of Gendered Subaltern and Other	
Disenfranchised	
Conclusion	
V. Border Crossing to Bridge the Center-Margin Duality	141-182

Essentialization: Politics of Binaries	
Deconstruction of Binaries by the Alternative Narratives	
Negotiation across the Differences for Recuperation	
Conclusion	
VI. Deprogramming the Ideologies for the Egalitarian Relations	183-201
Works Cited	202-211

Chapter I: Intertextuality: Critiques of Hegemonic Ideologies

The purpose of this research is to examine the intertextual relations in terms of the debate on the roles of the hegemonic ideologies in the creation of the center-margin relations in the context of the literary representations of William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre*. I argue that the dominant ideologies play the key roles for the social disparities. Ideologies of race, gender, class and nationality operate through the literary representations or other means in the interest of the power centers. Therefore, to create the alternative relations between the mainstreams and the peripheries, knowledge is to be reproduced to deprogram the faulty belief systems by contesting the hegemonic ideologies. The problematic belief systems, that serve the interests of few, are to be deconstructed for the alternative beliefs that are helpful for every group and individuals in the societies. Aime Cesaire's *A Tempest*, J. M. Coetzee's *Foe* and Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* are the alternative narratives to critique the fault lines represented in the narratives of the aforementioned texts of William Shakespeare, Daniel Defoe and Charlotte Bronte respectively.

To examine how the hegemonic ideologies operate in terms of race, gender, class and nationality, this study focuses on the connection between such ideologies and social disparities or center-margin relations in the primary texts. To state theoretically about ideology, by subjecting people under the belief systems, the mainstream forces validate their actions to maintain the power hierarchies. With the intention of governmentality, they try to build consensus among people by means of belief systems. They are the old and established narratives that operate as programs in different names, like religion, nationality, morality, caste, and race. So, the ideologies work as the software to operate the social mechanisms. Accordingly, people are programmed to behave in particular ways. Ideologies are ideal to make people easily swayed under the spell of belief systems. Because of the deep-rooted

belief, people lose the critical awareness to safeguard themselves against the faulty programming. Consequently, the rigid belief systems promote essentialism and fundamentalism that cause the social divisions in the names of race, class, religion and others. Moreover, due to the idealistic bubbles of ideologies, that sound promising big, but a gap exists between their claims and practices. So, the possibilities are that people are misled by the oppressive belief systems. Similarly, the sense of superiority and inferiority in name of race, gender, class and nationality, result from the oppressive ideologies. Importantly, higher possibilities are for the misuse of ideologies, like religion, race, nationality and others, by the mainstream forces to draw the public support for maintaining the power hierarchies.

Once people are made to follow the particular belief system, it demands a lot of efforts to deprogram them or develop the critical awareness about the dominant ideologies. So, the consequences are far reaching. People live in psychological wars due to the ideological differences as the center-margin relations are essentialized and normalized. Ideologies subject people in such ways that in some situations, they even do not know that they are marginalized. It is important to uncover to what extent these theoretical views come true in case of the primary texts of this research.

Statement of the Problem:

Mainstream-margin relations are problematic in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* since the marginalized, from different race, gender, class and nationality, are made to pay for the privileged position of the mainstream. These problems have connections with representations. If the mainstream narratives of these texts do not have problems in representations in terms of projection of unequal relations, why do the authors, Aime Cesaire, J M Coetzee and Jean Rhys, express their disapproval against these narratives by reconfiguring them? Focusing on the problematic relations between the representative characters of different race, gender, class and nationality, in the context of the primary texts

of this study, I attempt to uncover how the marginalities are created at the multiple fronts. For instance, the underclass women in *Jane Eyre* have to bear the brunt of the politics of class and gender since these problems intersect. Similarly, in other context, like in *Robinson Crusoe*, race, class, and nationality coalesce; they produce the multiple problems for Friday, who represents the natives of the Caribbean. Similarly, Caliban in *The Tempest* has to battle against the ideologies of race, class and nationality to uphold his sovereignty. Likewise, Bertha Mason of *Jane Eyre* gets the liminal position due to the politics of gender and imperial nationalism as she belongs to Jamaica, previously colonized domain, for the British mainstream. I try to address these interwoven issues with research questions.

To detect the research gap for aforementioned issues, I have examined some key researches on the primary texts of my research.

In case of *Robinson Crusoe*, D N Deluna in the text, “Robinson Crusoe Virginal Hero of the Commercial North”, glorifies Crusoe as a mercantile hero of the North (73). Deluna’s perception is influenced by imperial heroism that has connection with economic strength. About its alternative text, *Foe*, G. Scott Bishop in “J.M. Coetzee’s *Foe*: A Culmination and a Solution to a Problem of White Identity” argues that Coetzee tells the story of oppression without pretending to speak for the oppressed (54). Bishop takes into account the critical position of Coetzee who is sympathetic to the marginal, like Friday, in *Foe* to critique the given position of Friday of *Robinson Crusoe*. Why does Coetzee speak for the marginal, like Friday?

The critic of *The Tempest*, Rachel Bryant, in his writing, “Toward the Desertion of Sycorax’s Island: Challenging the Colonial Contract,” claims, “Shakespeare challenges the cruel and corrupt imperial logic” (99). A question emerges, does Shakespeare question imperialism or approves it? About the role of Caliban in counter narrative of *The Tempest*, *A Tempest*, Steve Almquist argues that Caliban claims indigenous identity (597). What I

examine is that Caliban's position created in *The Tempest* is representational problem. So, it has to be addressed through alternative representation.

In "Surviving Thornfield: Jane Eyre and Nineteenth-Century Evolutionary Theory," Aubrey L Mishou interprets *Jane Eyre* as the struggle between unequal powers, Jane and Bertha for the existence as per Darwin's theory. The problem with this view is that it justifies the act of powerful, Jane. Consequently, the possibility for justice is compromised.

In order to address the limitations of the aforementioned explorations, the present researcher underscores the necessity of finding the strategy of representation that can challenge the problematic believe system for the alternative relations.

I try to address the key issues with these research questions.

Research Questions

- i) Why do social disparities exist and what support them?
- ii) What is the connection between the center-margin relations and the hegemonic ideologies in the mainstream narratives, *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*?
- iii) How do the alternative narratives depart from the mainstream narratives to bridge the center-margin relations?

Objectives

- i) To uncover the reasons for the existence of social disparities and identify the elements that support them.
- ii) To examine the connection between the center-margin relations and ideologies in the mainstream narratives.
- iii) To explore the points of departure in the alternative narratives from the mainstream narratives to bridge the gap of center-margin relations.

My thesis is that the hegemonic ideologies, established by the principle of essentialism, largely play the role to produce the disparities of center-margin, so knowledge

is to be reproduced by the alternative narratives in representations to interrogate the problematic ideologies with the purpose of exploring the possibilities for justice and egalitarian relations.

Without deprogramming or changing the faulty belief system, it is difficult to establish the egalitarian relations from the center-margin dichotomy. For the defiance and deprogramming of the hegemonic ideologies, they are to be deconstructed by exposing the contradictions within themselves in the process of the reproduction of knowledge. The use of 'deprogramming' in this study implies for changing the problematic belief systems. It is the critical observation of the new generation of authors who attempt to address the problems in the narratives of the earlier generations of authors. In this process, the critical authors offer new perspectives and visions which add new dimensions in epistemology. So, the narratives, like *Robinson Crusoe*, need revisions to address the contradictory relations projected in representations. In this respect, the attempts of Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys to revise the narratives of Shakespeare, Defoe and Bronte respectively are meaningful to address the disparities. So, to address the underlying cause of disparities, this study employs the critical approach supported by the integrative methods as it blends key theories under postcolonial theory of Spivak: feminism, poststructuralism, Marxism, deconstruction and postcolonialism.

To contextualize the research problem, *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* predominantly hold the Eurocentric perspective as they locate Europe as the point of reference. Despite their differences, they reflect the geo-political interests of the mainstreams of Europe. For instance, *Jane Eyre* draws the borders between the English and the Jamaican societies. It foregrounds the English nationality, White race, Christian religion and European civilization. Whereas, the location of Jamaica is used to rationalize the dominant roles of such elements. Therefore, the character, like Bertha, is the invention to represent marginality to devise the meaningful position for the European center. So is the case between *Crusoe* and

Friday in *Robinson Crusoe*. Crusoe defines Friday since the former searches his own identity by creating the identity for the latter. Crusoe is the product of the English cultural and imperial programming. His role as the White master from the English metropolis reflects it. So, the ideologies, like racism, colonialism and nationalism, seem to operate to rationalize his role. However, the center-margin relations are not limited between the European and the non-European Societies. They prevail within the non-European societies also. The problems of race, gender and class are the major causes for the social divisions and unrest in the colonized societies, like Caribbean, African and Asian. Despite the differences among societies based on their contexts, the common problems of center-margin relations bring them together.

In the intertextual relations, the contesting texts: *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* differ from the previous ones in terms of perspectives. These narratives give the significant space to the peripheries, like the Caribbean, the Central America and the Crusoe Island, since they try to recover the silenced voices. The contending writers use these locations to diversify the representations and challenge the mainstream representations that maintain mainstream-periphery dichotomy between Europe and others as represented in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*. Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys attempt to make their narratives inclusive. They prioritize the problems caused by race, gender, class and nationality, and faced by the marginal, like the Africans and the Caribbeans. So, they write from the perspective of peripheries to critique the mainstream narratives.

In the context of both the set of narratives as discussed above, it is important to examine the roles of the dominant ideologies to evaluate how far they antagonize the social relations and draw the borders between the mainstream and the margin. To address this problem, the contestant narratives need to bridge such binaries by deconstructing the suppressive ideologies if they are the underlying causes for the social division. Therefore, they have to be strategic, subversive and diverse in their narratives. They need to put their

efforts to recover the silenced voices from the debated narratives to critique the subjection of peripheries.

This research is necessary to unveil the underlying causes of social disparity in terms of race, gender, class and nationality. For this purpose, it evaluates the roles of oppressive ideologies for the development of the critical narratives in the literary forms to review the ideological fault lines and their impact in societies. It helps understand how the narratives are constructed and deconstructed as per the political interests and needs of the societies. Further, it studies the relation between power and dominant ideologies so that it is easier to understand what works for the cause of social disparity. Therefore, this study can be vital to explore the possibilities for addressing the social disparities and injustice.

In the present context, the problems of imperialism, racism and the extreme nationalism have deeper impact in societies. The social divisions and inequalities are the product of such elements. The gulf between the mainstream and the margin in terms of race, gender and class plagues the social relations. Though these are old challenges to the world, they continue to inflict the societies. The consequences are far reaching. In order to address these problems, debates on the fault lines that cause disparities, are undeniable. The possibility is that the intellectual altercations raise awareness and develop the critical insights to change the courses of knowledge for building the better societies.

With regard to the delimitation of this study, basically the research concentrates to investigate the roles of the hegemonic ideologies in shaping the center-margin dichotomies. The issues of race, gender, class and nationality are the concerns of this research in the context of the primary texts. The problem of representation is under investigation in the master narratives since the aforementioned issues make these narratives debatable as they are crafted from the mainstream perspectives.

The study of intertextual relations is limited within the realm of dominant ideologies in connection to the core issues as stated above. I examine the alternative representations in *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* in connection to their previous versions to identify the points of departure. To concentrate on disparities, the research explores the three key areas: intertextuality, to examine the mainstream-margin relations, how such relations are represented in the narratives and what strategies the contending authors employ while reproducing knowledge to contest such representations and transcend the center-margin relations. The assumption is that alternative narratives address the problem of center-margin relation by critiquing the asymmetrical relation as they reconstruct the narratives. So, the issues of race, gender, class and nationality come under their critical examinations.

For the method of study, I draw the theoretical concepts from these areas: intertextuality, ideology, and the postcolonial theory. Since the research focuses on the textual relations in terms of the ideological debate to address the problem of center-margin relation, these theoretical concepts are instrumental in grounding my research. So, the ideas of intertextuality, ideology and postcolonial theory build the theoretical framework for this research. Importantly, this research uses the critical-comparative approach that is well informed with the latest development of critical theories that question the master narratives and the discourses connected to them. Focusing on the significance of the critical approach, Gaile S. Cannella and Yvonna S. Lincoln in their text, “Ethics, Research Regulations and Critical Social Science,” examine:

Critical perspectives have called for the formation of alliances and attempts to join the struggle for solidarity with those who have been oppressed and inequitably treated. Patriarchal, racist, and colonizing forms of power are understood as historically grounded and recognized as never independent of cultural, political, and social context. (175)

These relevant theories: poststructuralism, deconstruction, feminism and Marxism are adequately utilized in Spivak's postcolonial theory. Her key contribution is strategic battle against essentialism. Therefore, her theory is useful to support my project as I uncover the connection between essentialism and ideologies.

Key words/phrases and concepts applied in this study:

intertextuality: relations between the mainstream literary texts and alternative texts on the issue of ideologies

ideologies: dominant belief systems that influence the ways people live

postcolonial theory: Spivak's theory of new comparative approach that examines differences rather than similarities in comparative study of literature. It underscores the necessity of recovering the silenced diverse voices of the marginalized, the Global South.

strategic essentialism: use of essentialist approaches to critique essentialism that tries to justify the essential qualities of social hierarchies and others, like racial supremacy and gendered relations

These concepts are essential to shape the methods of study of this research.

Most important, this study takes a departure to address the underlying cause of mainstream-margin hierarchies. As ideologies are the products of essentialism, the problem of latter cannot be addressed without dismantling the former since the dominant ideologies institutionalize essentialism. So, I propose to examine the produced narratives with critical perspective. After detecting the problems of ideologies that operate in narratives, we need strategies to fight them. One viable strategy that I find is to reproduce the narratives with critical lens in order to address the detected problems or critique the faulty belief systems that harm the human relations. So, in the alternative narratives, there is the possibility of offering the new relation that goes beyond binaries and hierarchies. However, we need to be mindful

that such alternatives may not be ideal to meet every expectation but they will be a breakthrough to build a society where differences are respected and voices are heard. So, it will be inclusive and egalitarian. With this proposition, I try to test my hypothesis in the literary narratives: *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* and their alternative narratives: *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* respectively.

To understand what is ideology and how it operates, I borrow the ideas from Louis Althusser. In “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses,” he defines, “Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence” (1498). It underlines that ideology is related to reality. So, it functions in the material condition or the practical life. About the practical impact of ideology, he states, “In every case, the ideology of ideology thus recognizes, despite its imaginary distortion, that the ideas of human subject exist in his actions, or ought to exist in his actions. . .” (1501). It means that ideology gets expressed through actions. So, Althusser claims, “there is no practice except by and in an ideology. . .” (1501). This interconnectivity between ideology and reality shows that to address the practical problems of the unequal relations, the problematic ideologies are to be questioned.

Althusser argues that ideologies subject the individuals and shape the social relations. He uses the term, ISA for Ideological State Apparatuses to refer to the use of ideologies by the state to control the people. He differentiates ISA from RSA (Repressive State Apparatuses). RSA adopt the repressive measures to control the people through the mechanisms, like police, army, law, administration etc. Whereas, ISA operate predominantly in a non-coercive way or build consensus among people. However, ISA also employ repressive measures in secondary ways. RSA employ ISA in secondary ways. It implies that the ruling class or those who are in power, employ hegemonic ideologies, like religion, morality, nationality and culture, to generate consent from the people for gaining as well as

maintaining power. State also employs the repressive forces, like police, army and administration to control and rule people. Therefore, without deconstructing the dominant ideologies, the center-margin relation cannot be altered since they support to maintain such relation.

Some ideologies play the positive roles but others have the negative roles to organize the social relations. In this work, I focus on the suppressive and divisive roles of the dominant ideologies. As they break the social relations, the disparities impact the societies. For instance, the conflicts between races, sexes, classes and nations are due to the oppressive ideologies and the ideological differences. However, the motivations behind the employment of ideologies are more significant than ideologies in themselves. For example, politics done in the name of nationalism may cause the social divisions and wars between the nations. Likewise, a religion may not be a problem in itself but if it is employed to fulfill the national and group interests at the cost of others, it becomes problematic. Therefore, such ideologies operate as agents to create the center-margin relations. With this view, rather than critiquing every ideology, the focus of this research is to identify the hegemonic ideologies that cause the social disparities and examine how the contestant narratives of the alternative texts challenge such ideologies for the egalitarian relations.

Another part of theoretical framework is the postcolonial theory of Gayatri Spivak. To address the diverse issues connected to the center-margin relations, Spivak's theory is broad enough since she employs the interdisciplinary approaches to address the intersected problems. In the text, *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*, she raises the issues of imperialism, colonialism, gendered subalterns, class inequalities, racial politics and others. With these, she not only attempts to address the problems between the nations and broader organizations but also the internal colonization within a society. The disparities within a society based on race, gender and class get her serious attention as the issues of

imperialism and colonialism between the nations. Moreover, Spivak's postcolonial-new comparative approach is instrumental in examining the intertextual relations in terms of ideologies. It differs radically from the traditional comparative theories that locate the Anglo-European values as the point of reference while comparing the European literature with other literatures of the world. The mainstream values of the French, the English and other Europeans were taken as the standards for comparison. In comparison, they would search for the similarities rather than differences. And the comparisons were constrained within the borders of disciplines. To address these limitations, Spivak devises the interdisciplinary approach to examine the textual relations. In *Death of a Discipline*, she claims, "Comparative Literature must always cross borders" (16). Spivak cautions that crossing the borders is not easy. She raises the pertinent issues related to the comparative approach and center-margin relations. Overall, in her postcolonial-new comparative theory, she raises these issues: searching the differences rather than similarities for comparison between the mainstream and marginal narratives, problem of essentialism, oppressive mainstream literary history, representations, use of heterogeneous languages of the Global South, defying borders, transforming hostility into friendship and making impossible possible in terms of addressing the problems of marginalized (4-52).

Strategic essentialism is the key element of Spivak's postcolonial theoretical modality. Other issues, like blurring the boundaries, representation, choice of heterogeneity and interrogating hegemonic literary history are related to the strategic essentialism. On essentialism, in her text, *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, Spivak argues, "So long as the critique of essentialism is understood not as an exposure of error, our own or others, but as an acknowledgment of the dangerousness of something one cannot not use. I would stand by it as one stands among many" (5). Though Spivak opposes essentialism on the ground that nothing possesses essential traits, she takes strategic essentialist position to challenge

essentialism. The concepts of essence are discursively constructed. So, the ideas of race, gender, class and nationality and so on possess no inherent traits. They operate ideologically. For instance, to work towards the solution of gender and subalternity, one has to believe provisionally that these problems exist in particular conditions. According to Spivak, one cannot work for intended change or deconstruct the dominant discourses without being strategically essentialist. She admits that the contextual needs make her strategic. Consequently, her position keeps on fluctuating. Why I need the idea of strategic essentialism in my project is that it is useful to deconstruct the problematic belief systems that cause social disparities. Further, I examine how the contending authors: Césaire, Coetzee and Rhys employ strategies, like solidarity among the marginal, and critiques of biased mainstream values to battle against essentialism of the dominant ideologies. Importantly, it is to be testified how strategic essentialism works in the context of this study.

To critique, the debatable texts are to be rewritten from the perspectives of the marginalized. As I locate the problems in the master narratives that represent the disparities, I underscore that such disparities are to be critiqued by rewriting the master narratives so that the alternative egalitarian relations can be explored. For instance, I uncover that the postcolonial authors, Césaire, Coetzee and Rhys expose the binaries of center and margin in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*, respectively and offer the alternative discourses to address them. Their subversive narratives reshape the domain of epistemology and produce an alternative literary history which is inclusive. So, in my study, I examine how the alternative narratives interrogate the master narratives which represent the problems of race, gender, class and nationality.

I find problems in representations in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* as they support the privileged at the cost of underprivileged. For the theory of representation, I draw the ideas from Spivak. She argues that while constructing the narratives, the authors are

under the influence of their sociopolitical institutions. If so, from which institutional positions they write and serve whose interests? In these contexts, Spivak draws the attention on subalterns or marginalized people who are historically neglected and their voices are not heard. Even those who claim that they are the advocates of subalterns, cannot represent them or they misrepresent. Even if the subalterns try to speak, socio-political structures do not let them do so. In the text, “Can the Subaltern Speak?,” Spivak writes, “If, in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow” (524). So, who claims to speak for them and how are they represented in the discourses? Can the writers be free from their privileged positions of race, class, gender and others as they represent the underprivileged? Or, can they keep their positions aside while dealing with subalterns? Spivak, in her “The New Subaltern,” argues that if we want upward mobility of the subalterns, one should be ready to learn from the disenfranchised or listen to their stories rather than impose one’s view on them (236). I contend that in the alternative narratives that develop as the critiques of old problematic narratives, the marginal get more space and their voices are mostly heard as they aim to bring change for the marginal. However, the alternative authors’ attempts may not be sufficient to meet the expectations of general public in terms of speaking for the marginal.

Language, in relation to ideologies, is one aspect of this study to examine the intertextual relations. One strategy to battle against the colonial politics and discourses is to employ indigenous languages of the peripheral against the monolithic English language, in the context of this research. To gain support for the justification of the power of local language to fight the oppressive ideologies, I draw the view of Spivak on “language” from *Death of a Discipline*. She underscores the necessity of the use of the languages of the Global South or heterogeneous languages to forge the solidarity to give articulations to their local experiences in the literary discourses (15). With this strategy, they can preserve their distinct

identities against the homogenous languages, like Anglophone, which intend to obliterate diverse languages. Heterogeneous languages mean the diverse languages of the indigenous people; in the context of this research, they refer to the languages of the colonized, like the African and the Caribbean. So, I argue that a hegemonic language has a strong tie with an ideology; to break such relation for the alternative relation, the use of languages of the oppressed or the indigenous languages can be one strategy.

In the context of the selected mainstream narratives, to alter the existing conditions under the oppression of race, gender, class and nationality, the categories constructed on the binary principle are to be blurred through the interdisciplinary practices. The new discourses question the binaries with the practice of deconstruction. The border-crossing creates the situation where the positionalities of center and margin collapse. The peripheral voices, like Caliban and Friday, can change their social positions if they are able to cross the borders constructed by race, nationality and others. So, border-crossing is one of the key strategies for the rise of the marginalized. I observe that the alternative narratives of contending authors, Césaire, Coetzee and Rhys, attempt to cross borders to critique the binaries shaped by the ideologies.

For Spivak, the aim of the postcolonial undertaking is to transform the society by addressing the concerns of the marginal, like the Third World societies, women and poor. To achieve this goal, the social conditioning must be changed. Though it sounds ideal, anticipation is that along with the disruption of suppressive and hierarchical relations, amicable relations will develop. It means social relations will improve as the causes of divisions are mitigated. Social justice is made possible. In the context of this study, I relate the hostilities between different groups with ideological differences. So, to end hostilities means to address the problem of dominant ideologies. For instance, the literary narratives of Césaire, Coetzee and Rhys illustrate that they are sensitive to the conflicts aroused by the

hostile relations under the interests of imperial politics and others. So, these authors seem to intend to end such unequal relations between the ruler and the ruled and establish the new horizontal relations based on the principles of coexistence and human dignity. Probably, they would wish to see in relation, not like master Prospero but friend and better guest of Caliban. Thus, the purpose of interrogation of ideologies through intertextual method in this research is to transform the antagonistic human relations into amicable ones so that better societies can be built.

I view that if we work with commitment for ending the social disparity, it is possible to create the better society. For it, we need to reconstruct the discourses for altering the binary relationship between the dominant and dominated so that the new egalitarian relation of coexistence is made possible. So, I observe how the contesting authors, while rewriting the narratives, change the given conditions in the narratives and offer the new possibilities for the peripheral voices to rise. For instance, Jean Rhys reconstructs *Jane Eyre* to project the intended transformation of Bertha Mason, a mad woman in the attic, into a woman with dignity and power.

As discussed above, intertextuality, ideology and the postcolonial theory-a new comparative approach of Spivak shape the theoretical framework for this study. These three theoretical elements, in combination, rather than in isolation, prepare a ground to build a critical approach to support my thesis. The strength of my methodology is that it synthesizes the critical method of intertextual comparative study with the postcolonial theory of Spivak which itself is the combination of feminism, Marxism, deconstruction and poststructuralism. The purpose behind the employment of the hybrid method in this research is to address the intersected problems of ideologies of race, gender, class, nationality and others. Moreover, the spirit of critical interrogation of this method is instrumental in deconstructing the ideological programming that sustains the disparity.

To develop this dissertation, I organize it into six chapters. The first chapter deals with the background of the study, second with the review of literature, third, fourth and fifth with textual analysis and the sixth chapter concludes the dissertation.

Chapter II: Review of Literature: Location of a Space for Alteration

The purpose of this review is to locate the space to critique the hegemonic ideologies by pinpointing the limitations of the previous research works. I focus on intertextual and postcolonial theories, and textual criticisms and critical receptions of the primary texts to devise the theoretical modality for the present research. I also intend to substantiate that intertextual study on ideological contestation remains the potential area in the primary texts: *The Tempest* (1623) and *A Tempest* (1969), *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and *Foe* (1986), and *Jane Eyre* (1846) and *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966). To take a departure from the previous positions of the researchers, I assume that the issue of intertextual relations based on ideological differences remains the unexplored and potential area in the primary texts of this research. Accordingly, I borrow the theoretical ideas from the theory of intertextuality in terms of ideological relations between the texts and the postcolonial theory of Spivak. So, this chapter presents the review on the basic concepts of this research: intertextuality, ideologies, hegemony, discourses and counter-narrative strategies. The basic concerns of the model of Spivak are: strategic essentialism, defying the borders, representations, learning from below, the choice of heterogeneous languages of Global South over the monolingual discourses of colonialism, undoing the hegemonic literary history shaped by the colonial texts, politics of friendship from the politics of hostility and making alternatives possible. In her model of Comparative Literature, differences and disagreements are more important than similarities. Taking these issues into consideration, I aim to identify the research gap in the previous researches for departure of this work.

Theoretical Review

Under theoretical review, I examine the perspectives on intertextuality and Postcoloniality to get the comprehensive pictures of various modalities so that I can justify

my theoretical position in relation to others and state why I need to adopt Spivak's postcolonial modality.

Dialogic of Intertextuality

On the issue of intertextuality or textual relations, critics and theorists have articulated their views. In this review, I present both the common as well as the divergent views of such critics. In addition, I organize them on the basis of trends and themes. For instance, those who believe in structure are structuralists and who critique the structure of the text belong to poststructuralism. The critics, like Julia Kristeva, Jacques Derrida, John Frow, Roland Barthes and Michael Foucault, under poststructuralism, give importance to textual process rather than taking a text as a finished product. Therefore, for them, a text contains many texts and remains in the process of transformation as a discursive practice as Foucault argues. Others who hold the different views, like Jonathan Culler and Stanley Fish, seem like structuralists. They value the social system or the signifying practices over the individual performances in the process of production as well as interpretation since they view that the performers follow the underlying socio-cultural patterns or conventions. Semiotics for Culler and interpretive communities for Fish are based on socially structured signifying system.

Critics, like Linda Hutcheon, Joel Weinscheimer, Monica Loeb and Jean Baudrillard raise the issue of imitation in the textual relations. They perceive the texts as imitation. However, for Hutcheon and Loeb, texts are not only imitations but also creations and transformations. Whereas, Baudrillard views a text as simulacra or a copy without original. But for Weinscheimer, a text is neither a copy nor an original rather something else: transformation. These overlapping and divergent views show that intertextual relations are based on textual dynamics since different aspects are taken into consideration while examining the textual relations. In this context, my attempts are to explore the crucial but less focused area by the previous researchers, intertextual relations based on ideological

contestations. My claim in the context of the primary texts of this research is that the authors rewrite the texts to challenge the dominant ideologies that bring social disparities or marginalization of underprivileged. Therefore, it is worthwhile to examine the critics' views on intertextual relations to draw the insight from them as well as take a departure to concentrate on the issue of ideology.

Textual Production and Reception: Social Conventions, Discursivity and Semiotic Practices

In the process of textual constructions and reconstructions, social traditions, discursive practices and semiotics play the key roles. For Kristeva, it is a discursive process. Mikhail Bakhtin underscores the role of dialogic behind textual formation. In terms of textual reception as well as construction, social conventions guide the textual interpretation for Fish. Whereas, Culler argues that semiotic practices determine the meaning. The common ground among these critics is that they approve social interaction as a driving force in the production as well reception of a text. Thus, the intertextual practices cannot be dissociated from society.

Julia Kristeva introduced the term 'intertextuality' for the first time as a theoretical concept. Kristeva, in her article, "Word, Dialogue and Novel", shapes her view on intertextuality by reflecting upon Mikhail Bakhtin's ideas of dialogic discourse, "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double" (37). Kristeva questions the originality of the author. She contends that authors inherit the concept for their texts from other texts. Kristeva locates the texts in the broader historical and social context. She perceives every text as embedded in the social texts. She gives credit to Mikhail Bakhtin for his concept of dialogic interaction, specially, in the discourse of novel where the author allows multiple perspectives of characters to interact. Mikhail Bakhtin claims that every concrete utterance is intersected by centrifugal and

centripetal, disunifying and unifying forces respectively. Both monologic and dialogic forces are found in any text (qtd in Worton and Still 15). Since a text contains many voices, it is constructed out of intertextual practices.

Texts possess no unified meaning rather meanings are associated with social and cultural processes. Therefore, texts are the consequences of other texts in society and cannot be separated from one another. In his text, *Is There a Text in This Class?*, Stanley Fish, like Kristeva, understands texts in relation to other texts of the communities. He argues that neither the authors nor the readers are independent to deal with the texts. As they are the members of “interpretive communities”, they are under the influence of the ideological and the institutional practices while producing and interpreting texts. For writing, “the thoughts an individual can think and the mental operations he can perform have their source in some or other interpretive community, he is as much as a product of that community (acting as an extension of it) as the meanings it enables him to produce” (14). The writer draws the ideas from the community. Consequently, he holds the assumptions derived from there which he expresses in writing. This is how intertextuality gets practiced.

Similar to Kristeva, Charles Bazerman, in his, text, “Intertextuality: How Texts Rely on Other Texts,” views that in the process of writing, “We create our texts out of the sea of former texts that surround us, the sea of language we live in. And we understand the texts of others within that same sea” (Bazerman 84). In intertextuality, Bazerman contends that each text has the relation with other texts that surround it. To see such relation, “Intertextual analysis examines the relation of a statement to that sea of words, how it uses those words, how it positions itself in response to those other words” (84).

Reading is another part of intertextuality. Readers also use intertextuality in the process of interpretation. Fish argues, “Interpretive strategies are not put into execution after reading; they are the shape of reading, they give texts their shape, making them rather than,

as is usually assumed, arising from them” (13). The meanings that readers give to the texts are guided by their assumptions and ideological practices in the society. Fish underscores the role of general community practices and influence of ideologies that construct the background of interpretation. However, ideologies and practices are also challenged by the authors who hold different ideological views and want social change. Like Fish, Jonathan Culler gives importance to social system of semiotics that plays the key role in understanding texts. In the debate of intertextuality, Culler contends, “The study of intertextuality is thus not the investigation of sources and influences as traditionally conceived, it casts its nets wider to include anonymous discursive practices, codes whose origins are lost, that make possible the signifying practices of later texts” (114). He underscores the necessity of understanding conventions, cultures and other practices that work within semiotic system in order to interpret any literary text. Like in the production, consumption of the text also undergoes intertextual practices. For Culler, the purpose of intertextuality is not to locate the sources of a text rather observe how the discursive practices work in signifying practices and how the texts emerge from such practices. Similar to Culler, Michael Riffaterre views that an intertext is one or more texts that the reader has to know in order to understand a work of literature in terms of its overall significance (56). By reading multiple texts, the reader can understand the literary phenomena as a text articulates a presupposition of intertext. After the observation of aforementioned views on textual relations, I argue that in signifying practices, due to ideological differences, contradictions emerge and ideas clash which generate new texts or former texts are given the new dimensions.

Creative Space in Intertextual Practices

One aspect of intertextual relation is creative act in adaptation. Linda Hutcheon, Michael Worton and Judith Still, Sean Hand, Gerard Genette and other see the creative space in adaptation. In various ways, the writers adapt others’ works. Linda Hutcheon, in the text,

Theory of Adaptation, puts her view on adaptation, “Works in any medium are both created and received by people, and it is this human experiential context that allows for the study of politics of intertextuality” (preface). Adaptation means not just reception from others but creation of something new by the adaptor. What changes take place due to interaction between reception and creation, can be the subject of intertextual study as Linda concludes, “Art is derived from other art, stories are born of other stories” (preface). In the process of reproduction, the strategy of appropriation, as a creative act, works as the effective means to disrupt the hegemonic discourses. For instance, the postcolonial authors employ this to subvert the colonial discourses.

As for Linda, for Michael Worton and Judith Still, imitation is not just repetition, but the completion of an act of interpretation and a mode of interpretation. Sean Hand also argues in the line of Hutcheon, Worton and Still, “the act of transference which this involves, creates an intertextual space in which the story changes as it is listened to and worked on” (79). She claims that in the narrative act, creativity adds new dimensions whereas some old elements are lost or modified. In this way, the narrator generates the new texts from the old ones. For Monica Loeb, “Intertextuality indicates boundary – crossing . . . disrespectfully traversing terrains of genre, time period, authors, subjects, art forms and nations. It must be remembered that any intertext appearing in another text has been edited, selected, transformed, even distorted by the writer, to suit her purposes” (44). The texts undergo change as they are adapted by writers to meet their purposes. The authors manipulate the ideas of others in favor of the former. Gerard Genette also stands no exception from aforementioned views on transtextual relationship. For him commentary is given by the critics on the previous works which Genett terms as ‘metatextuality’. Commentary is the key element to examine the intertextual relation in this study because it critiques the limitation of previous works as Coetzee does on Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*.

In contrast to Culler and Fish, these critics: Hand, Hutcheon, Worton, Still and Genette see the potential space to the writer to alter or add new dimensions to the existent work. I approve this view. As per the objective, the writer can use the potential space. For instance, J M Coetzee modifies the role of Friday in his *Foe*. He makes it possible to give different political reading to *Foe*'s Friday from *Robinson Crusoe*'s Friday. So, in this research, creativity is also valued as it is instrumental to devise the strategy to critique the oppressive ideologies.

Textual Status, Originality, Meaning and the Role of Language in Intertextual Relation

On the textual status, relations between texts, originality, role of language and structure, Jacques Derrida, John Frow and Roland Barthes, Joel Weinscheimer and Baudrillard, hold poststructuralist views as they question the structure, originality and stable meaning of a text. Derrida defines text, "A text that is henceforth no longer a finished corpus of writing, some content enclosed in a book or its margins, but a differential network, a fabric of traces referring endlessly to something other than itself, to other differential traces. . . ." (qtd. in Frow 49). A text is the intertextual fabric or network of various texts. Therefore, it cannot exist independent of other absent texts. In the fashion of Derrida, John Frow takes texts not as the structures of presence but traces of other texts which are shaped by transforming other texts. Likewise, for Barthes, ". . . any text is an intertext; other texts are present in it, at varying levels, in more or less recognizable forms: the text of the previous and surrounding culture" (qtd. in Mai 39). Texts are not always explicit in their presence; they are implicit also but they bear the previous cultural practices. Similarly, Joel Weinscheimer questions originality, "an imitation has no independent or autonomous essence . . . it is neither a copy nor an original (qtd. in Worton and Still 7). Joel's idea of imitation is like Baudrillard's simulacra, copies without an original, problematic relationship between physical reality and semiotic reality. These critics minimize the role of originality but Harold

Bloom underscores as he adopts Freudian model of Psychoanalysis and applies it in poetic creation. He interprets that later generation authors feel belated because they could not be original like father-poet. They have Oedipal like relationship. This dialectic also shows intertextual relationship. The later generation authors try to establish their autonomy but they are unable to overcome the anxiety of influence of their forerunners.

Cross-Cultural and Ideological Influences and Contestations

From the cross-cultural and ideological perspective on intertextuality, Richard Bauman stands closer to Foucault's view. Bauman claims “. . . the creation of literary texts depends in significant part on the alignment of texts to prior texts . . . ideological attention to reflexive dimension of discursive practice” (1). He points out how culturally and ideologically a text is linked to the prior text. Ideology and discursive practices play the prime role in the production of a subject. In *The Cambridge Introduction to Michel Foucault*, Lisa Downing brings Foucault's ideas in this respect and states that a subject is not the originator of a discourse but discursive practices operate in the production of a subject (67). Therefore, the author cannot be the original source of a text rather a text is shaped by ideological and discursive practices. In *Power/ Knowledge*, Foucault sees the author as “an ideological product” who comes into being through discursive practices (119). In this sense, he/she is the intertextual subject whose subjectivity is the consequence of discursive interactions.

Critical Examinations in Intertextual Interrogations

One of the key aspects of Intertextual practice is critical thinking. Critical thinking equips the authors to interpret and respond others' texts or ideas. Consequently, the new meanings are offered to the received texts. Other elements that contribute in the intertextual communication process are: writer (speaker), audience, reality, language and context (Marble

74). Critical thinking develops the skills of observing things from various perspectives.

Therefore, the authors can contest with different views which they do not approve.

The above discussed perspectives under intertextuality evidence how multiple forces interact in the forms of ideologies and discourses in the process of not only production but also reception of texts. In the act of reading, the reader's autonomy gets intervened by the conventional patterns as Stanley Fish and Jonathan Culler argue, since we are situated in the interpretive communities and follow the semiotics. They influence the ways we interpret the texts. Both readerly and writerly intertextual practices defy the monologic act of production and reception as they perform dialogically, like Bakhtin's example of heteroglossia in novelistic genre where diverse voices interact. The authors, like Jacques Derrida, Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes, hold the views that meanings of the texts undergo negotiations as the diverse texts interact. No final and fixed meaning is possible due to the disruptive nature of language and social discourses. So, no text is single and stable in its meaning but plural and open to unfold various possibilities. The critics, like Linda Hutcheon, Michael Worton and others find the creative space in intertextual practices. In the context of my study, I claim that intertextual relations are based on ideological practices since the authors rewrite the texts to contest the ideologies or due to the ideological differences, authors subvert the narratives so that they can be reshaped to give intended meanings. Specially, the hegemonic ideologies face interrogations from the side of margin.

The Emergence of Postcolonial Perspectives and Negotiations

The purpose of using the postcolonial theory as a theoretical perspective in this research is to draw the insight from it regarding the ideological debates that challenge the imperial and colonial discourses. For this research, I have adopted Gayatri Spivak's model of postcolonial theory-new comparative approach because her approach is interdisciplinary and attempts to address the major problems of subalterns and other marginal groups.

Significantly, her perspective is broad enough to incorporate diverse issues like race, gender, class and others. Since these ideological problems are the major concerns of this research, her postcolonial theory supports my projects. Significantly, her critique of essentialism is supportive to deconstruct ideologies. Despite my choice of Spivak's theoretical modality, I examine other perspectives, like Bhabha's, in postcolonial theories so that I can identify how Spivak attempts to address the issues overlooked by others. For this purpose, I have selected the major critics and theorists of postcolonial theories: Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Homi K Bhabha, Benita Parry, Ania Loomba, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Barbara Christain and others.

I examine the postcolonial theories of Bhabha and Spivak to explore their meeting points and departures. Beside them, Edward Said, the pioneer of the postcolonial theories gets my serious attention as he opens the avenue of criticism against the imperial discourses. Similarly, Frantz Fanon who launched the anti-colonial crusade, made a contribution in postcolonial studies. To observe the impact of his views on the later generations of authors, I have compared and contrasted his views with Spivak's and others'. In terms of trends, Spivak, Said and Bhabha can be associated with postcolonial-poststructuralist criticism as they critique the repressive political structures and question essentialism that brings the social divisions. Whereas, Fanon seems to hold modernist outlook as reflected in his nationalist agendas of decolonization and resistance. In his text, *The Wretched of the Earth*, he expresses these issues. In addition to these thinkers, I review the views of other critics to have the comprehensive picture of postcolonial perspectives and cross-currents that have emerged in response to differing views and ideologies. I assume that after the observation of diverse perspectives, they help me justify how Spivak's model of postcolonial-new comparative approach, that searches for differences rather than similarities in comparative studies, better suits for the application in my textual analysis.

The postcolonial theory emerged to confront colonialism. So, its orientations are politically and ideologically guided to subvert the discourses which are complicit to the imperial and the colonial enterprises. With the passage of time, it has gone a number of maneuvers due to its negotiations with diverse disciplines to tackle the emerging issues. As the challenges increase, so do the perspectives within the postcolonial theory.

As per the context and necessities, the theoretical perspectives develop. The postcolonial theory has broadened its horizons to accommodate the differences among the divergent and assimilative views within it through negotiations. For example, theories like, Deconstruction, Feminism, New Historicism and Marxism, constitute some perspectives within it. Due to the integration of these movements and perspectives, the postcolonial theory seems to have grown like a common house that can harbor various orientations and positions. Thus, it does not sound unexpected to hear that the postcolonial theory lacks specific agendas for its broad-based composition. Consequently, it is difficult to predict its direction. In this context, I aim to explore different modalities of postcolonial theories in order to have comprehensive picture of its development so that I use its strength to address the issues that I raise in this project. More importantly, the review will identify how Spivak's postcolonial theory is more useful than others for the present research.

Anticolonial Movement: Common Concerns and Departures

Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak voice against imperialism and colonialism through their criticisms and theories. Despite their agreement in the goal of decolonization, they differ in their priorities and strategies.

Frantz Fanon from Martinique championed the nationalist movement against colonialism. Probably, his lived experiences in Algeria, a French occupied territory, during the colonial era, aroused in him the spirit of radical nationalist thinking. His views generated agitations against colonialism for national liberation in different parts of the world. So, he

stood as the model revolutionary for the colonized societies. Besides, he tried to raise the national consciousness. Fanon as a psychiatrist, conducted research on the impact of colonial oppression in the psychology of people, specially, the Algerians. From this work, he gathered evidences that would support his project for decolonization both politically and psychologically. Physical and psychological violence on people provoked in him anti-colonial sentiment. In the following development, I place Fanon and Said ahead of others since they acted as the precursors of anti-imperial/colonial movement. Other major theorists and critics are compared and contrasted with them along with their key agendas. I believe that my exploration will uncover the concerns of the postcolonial theories.

Fanon in his work, *The Wretched of the Earth*, showed his vigilance against the miscreants within the nation who could exploit the situation in their personal favor when the colonial occupation is over. So, he cautioned for the possibilities of getting the situation worse. He wanted the people to neutralize the internal colonizers along with the outer ones. Internally, Fanon identified bourgeoisie capitalist system, a hostile force, that would operate against the underclass people. This illustrates, his struggle was multifarious as it crossed the national borders. For instance, he was mindful of woman's hardships and advocated for their social justice, "The underdeveloped country must take precaution not to perpetuate feudal traditions that give priority to men over women. Women shall be given equal importance to men, not in the articles of the constitution but in daily life, at the factory, in schools and in assemblies" (142). Despite his optimistic notes, the gap still exists between theory and practice.

Fanon's concern for the internal divisions and disparities in a nation seems to be like Gayatri Spivak's critique of nationalism that forgets the history of the contributions made by women and other underprivileged subaltern natives during the anticolonial war. In her work, *The Post-Colonial Critic Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*, she reminds that the condition of

the underprivileged people in India has not been upwardly mobile yet since they lack representations in the governance. Both Fanon and Spivak unveil the internal colonization of the marginalized under the ideology of nationalism. Fanon with his political commitment, would not be ready to accept the social disparities. So, he insisted, to “switch from a national consciousness to a social and political consciousness” (142). Despite his call for the social justice and national unity, the postcolonial societies, like Caribbean and African, still face the internal contradictions and injustices. Probably, because of these reasons, the poststructuralists lambaste the ideal concepts of social harmony and national Unity. They argue that totalizing concept of national identity, as advocated by Fanon, fails to hold its subjects together because of heterogeneity and contradictions among themselves.

Another critic of colonial discourses, Edward Said probes the western discourses that construct Orientalism. In his text, *Orientalism*, he contests the imperial orientalists who define the West in relation to the East. In the binary relations, according to Said, the Western discourses, project their own images as superior in contrast to their ‘other’, eastern societies. He decries the fabricated knowledge produced by the western scholars about the East. Like Michael Foucault, Said argues that through the discourses of knowledge, they exercise the hegemonic authority over the East. He rhetorically questions what intellectual, aesthetic and cultural energies made imperialist traditions and how the diverse discourses like philology, history, political and other theories and writing practices served the imperialist project of Orientalism (15). These discourses function as apparatus of empire for its survival. Their implications are far reaching as they operate in subtle ways or indirectly. Louis Althusser claims that a state maintains its control over its subjects through Ideological State Apparatus and Repressive State Apparatus. ISA, like religion, morality, education and so on control ideologically. RSA regulate using forces like police, court etc. So, the discourses and ideologies support empires and their projects like Orientalism.

Said launches the assault against the imperial tendencies. However, he exhausts his resources on the discussion of binary relation between the West and the East, specially how the unequal positions are constructed in the discourses. The loophole in Said's approach is that his excessive focus on binaries overshadows the heterogeneity and disparities within the East. Such as, the divisions based on nationality, race, gender and others get no space in his postcolonial criticism. He uniformly presents the East and the West but ignores the domestic issues.

Different from Said's focus on orientalism, Homi K Bhabha, in his text, *The Location of Culture*, theoretically ruptures the binaries with the concept of 'ambivalence'. It is the state of in-between-ness or hybridity where no totality exists but negotiations. For examples, the binaries based on structuralist principles: White and Black, West and the East are conceptualized to maintain domination by one element over the other. The White holds the dominant position over the Black. To dismantle this duality, Bhabha proposes 'ambivalence' since it challenges the features of fixity and uniformity. With this invasion, the concept of stable identity, the claim of superiority, like of colonial over the colonized, get disrupted and the new relations take place. Bhabha's poststructuralist inclination shapes his postcolonial theoretical paradigm that debunks the totalizing grand narratives and ideologies.

Bhabha's theory appears to be an ideal formula for all the problems. It falls short of historical and political orientations to deal with the context based challenges. From the postcolonial perspective, it fails to take into account the necessity of setting strategic priorities as per the contextual needs. For example, Ella Shohat evaluates that Bhabha's generalized use of the term, 'hybridity,' that fails to differentiate the diverse modalities of it. Like, she questions how it differentiates these conditions: forced assimilation, internalized self-rejection, political cooperation, cultural mimicry etc. (331). Shohat problematizes Bhabha's views on hybridity as he fails to specify the differential relations of elements that

form hybridity. Since some elements play more dominant roles than others in the hybrid status, they do not have proportional shares. But Bhabha's theory obscures such distinctions or positionalities in the location of 'in-between-ness. Like in cultural hybridity, people do not practice the values of diverse culture in the same society in a balanced way. He tries to clarify by stating that his attempts are to display the significance of hybridity of the political change. The transformational value that results from change depends on the rearticulation of elements which are neither one nor the other but something third or claiming the parts of both (28). These elements evidence how he locates the differently present elements under the homogenized term 'third space'.

Gayatri Spivak departs theoretically from both Said and Bhabha to a great extent. Though they share some common ground in terms of postcolonial response against the colonial and imperial ideologies, their areas of priority and strategies of engagement differ. Spivak uncovers the gendered blindness in the theories of Bhabha and Said. Unlike Said's investigation on the binaries between the West and the East, Spivak shifts the orientations of postcolonial perspectives from the traditional criticism of the engagement between the colonizer and the colonized in the international and regional levels. She calls for the examination of disparities within societies even within families. She draws the attention toward the plight of subalterns, underprivileged, like women, who have been neglected by the nationalist discourses and other representational institutions. In the Indian context, Spivak, in her text, "A Critique of Postcolonial Reason," questions, "How can we touch the consciousness of people, even as we investigate their politics? With what voice-consciousness can the subaltern speak?" (2202). The challenges that Spivak marks are how to communicate to the subalterns so that their political consciousness can rise and they get access to the political representation. But, "What is at stake when we insist that the subaltern speaks?" (2207). She seems to imply that if we force the subalterns to articulate their voices,

they may be silenced more as they refuse to speak in the hegemonic language. In that case, can they speak at all? Spivak indicates that they cannot as their social conditions do not allow them. Even if they try, they are not heard. With respect to such views of Spivak on subalterns, Benita Parry objects. Parry sees the possibilities for the subalterns to speak as they hold agency. She complains that critics and theorists, like Spivak, Bhabha and JanMohammed are not able to listen to the voice of the natives or they deny the agency of the natives. In “Poststructuralism, Marginality, Postcoloniality and Value,” Spivak defends against such accusation, “When Benita Parry takes us to task for not being able to listen to the natives, or to let the natives speak, she forgets that the three of us, post-colonials, are ‘natives’ too” (203). She admits that she holds the privileged institutional position in America. Thus, she cannot be the representative of the voices of subalterns. However, she is mindful of ethical responsibility as a teacher who can raise the issues of the marginalized.

Spivak’s complicated position, as a deconstructionist, Marxist, feminist and the postcolonial theorist, is difficult to locate. Since she defies the borders of disciplines and theories, she amalgamates the strands of the afore mentioned theoretical positions in the development of her Postcolonial theory. Therefore, she admits that her position keeps on changing as per the situation. She employs the approach of deconstruction in the political sphere to dismantle the authorities. In the same fashion, her Marxist insight assists her to detect the interconnection between the material condition and the division of labor, and the social positions. Similarly, Spivak reveals the limitation of the Western feminism which generalizes the specific realities of the Third World women. And above all, she brings the insights into postcolonial perspective in order to disrupt the hegemonic discourses and ideologies and address the problems of the marginalized subalterns.

Spivak rejects ‘essentialism’ on the belief that no entity contains essential traits. However, in *The Postcolonial Critic*. . ., she admits, “In fact I must say I am an essentialist

from time to time” (9). Rather than choosing universalist discourse, she chooses essentialist one because she contends that one cannot remain without being an essentialist. Moreover, she explicates that her essentialist position is strategic. Without it, she claims, we fail to understand the relations of difference. In order to work for the expected change, one must hold certain position and believe that variables exist. To illustrate, the critics agree that the disparities have consequences, like the conditions of subalterns. As we hold such views, we situate our positions in relation to them and can set the strategies to alter the unwanted conditions, like of subalterns. However, Spivak alerts not to hold the strategic position as a permanent since it can be repositioned as per the needs. So, one needs to be strategically essentialist to deconstruct the problematic ideologies that cause social divisions. To fight more harmful ideologies, one can use less harmful one. For instance, against imperial nationalism, indigenous nationalism can be employed.

In terms of impact on disenfranchised, Spivak detects the interconnection among imperialism, globalization and capitalism. As the critics perceive globalization as westernization, Spivak, in *In Other Worlds*, approves such views and illustrates how the Third World poor women are exploited as the cheap labor force for the economic rise of the western multinational corporations. She exposes the double suppression of subalterns within national territory by the patriarchy and capitalistic system and beyond in the transnational sphere by the multinational corporations of Empires. Mostly, the subaltern women are rendered vulnerable for exploitation due to the collusion between patriarchy and the transnational capitalism which configures the international division of labour for urban subproleterian women (300). In the like manner, Ania Loomba takes globalization as a new form of colonization since it “often reproduces the general effect of colonialism” (191). In addition, Spivak analyzes the global impact of the alliance between imperialism and capitalism. It divides the world between the Global-North and the Global-South. The Global-

North, like USA, subjugates the economies of the Global-South, like Africa and Latin America. In order to combat the hegemony of the Global- North, Spivak underscores the necessity of the collective efforts from the Global-South through their own languages and heterogeneous identities. In this context, she offers the concept of planetarity instead of globalization because the present globalization functions as the root cause of inequalities in the world, like the division between the prosperous North and the impoverished South.

In “A Critique of Postcolonial Reason,” Spivak takes into account the violence committed by the empires. Beside the physical violence, she probes into the sphere of knowledge and discovers that they try to maintain their hegemony through ‘epistemic violence’. She borrows the idea of ‘epistemic violence’ from Michael Foucault. In epistemic violence, in the context of colonization, the colonizers invalidate the indigenous knowledge of the native people as unscientific and validate their own knowledge as scientific. They disqualify others’ knowledge as inadequate and locate in the lower hierarchy (2197). Furthermore, the empires pirate the indigenous knowledge. For this, they employ the multinational companies to obtain the information from the natives through the native informants and use the data for research. In this way, they claim the ownership for the discovery of the new Knowledge. In fact, such knowledge has been practiced by the natives for centuries.

Both Spivak and Bhabha uphold the poststructuralist tenets since they question the center-margin relationship and any kind of binaries. Either in case of coloniality of empires or other hierarchy of class and gender, the poststructuralist views deconstruct the discourses that are complicit to structuralist organization. Despite these common inclinations, Spivak strategically departs from Bhabha’s apolitical and ahistorical approach. Ella Shohat argues that Bhabha celebrates hybridity that can jeopardize the cultural identities of the communities affected by colonization as they try to regain them (331). Spivak on the other hand, upholds

the political orientations in opposition to the dominant discourses like gender and class as well as the imperial hegemonies on the Third World. Her commitment for the cause of gendered subaltern brings the theory to the social context. There, she believes, one can listen to the voices of disenfranchised or can learn from the below.

The critic, Arif Dirlik, questions the earlier concept of postcoloniality. It needs to be updated in the context of global capitalism, according to Arif Dirlik. He argues that it transcends the location of the Third World and is understood as a discursive rather than structural. So, it reorganizes the scholars under the postcolonial discourse (297). Likewise, Ilan Kapoor finds that for Spivak our discursive constructions are interlinked to our social positioning e.g. gender, economy and so on.

Despite her efforts to address the limitations of other Postcolonial theorists, Spivak's postcolonial theory does have some constraints. She sounds ideal regarding the transformation of subalterns' positionality. The fundamental challenge to her view on subalterns is how to identify who are subalterns and how to gain the upward mobility for them. Since the issue of subaltern intersects with the categories of class, gender, race and others, it complicates to differentiate subalterns from others. For Spivak, mostly the disenfranchised women constitute subaltern group. Beside them, she incorporates other marginalized who lack agency for representation. So, it seems to be complex to locate the subalterns. Another problem is that she fails to offer concrete strategies to transform subaltern's conditions. Likewise, she identifies the institutional affiliation of the authors as a barrier for ethical engagement with the subalterns. How practicable it is for the authors to neutralize their complicities with institutions so that they can communicate fairly or ethically without any privileged position or prejudices. Connected to this, she does not differentiate between the institutional positions that are more harmful and less harmful to the subalterns. Finally, she suggests to work with no guarantee. For the upward mobility of the subalterns,

Spivak envisions making impossible into possible. But with what patience and strategies, they can work to see the subaltern speak and they are heard?

Debates on Representation

With regard to representation, Edward Said, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Spivak, and others express their views. However, they hold different perspectives as well as approve the common agendas. For instance, Spivak attempts to address the issues of subalterns and disenfranchised, overlooked by other critics.

Edward Said critiques the western ways of representation. Likewise, Chandra Talpade Mohanty disapproves the homogenization of the Third World women by the Western feminist. In her “Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses,” she denounces the ways of representation of the Eastern women by the Western women scholars in the name of global sisterhood. Mohanty problematizes the blurring of the heterogeneity of social conditions of the nonwestern world in the western discourses. She complains for mistaking the discursive consensus homogeneity of women for the specific material reality of women (176). Such misrepresentations ignore the diversity and distort the information to serve the representor’s interests. They produce the knowledge in order to construct the image of others. For this, they produce, publish and distribute information for consumption (175). For instance, they project the eastern women as “ignorant, poor, uneducated, tradition-bound”, but the Western women as modern, having control over their bodies and sexualities and free to make decisions (176). Mohanty, like Said, dissents the misrepresentation. Problem with Mohanty’s view is that she gives too much attention to the western representation of the eastern women but does not raise the issue of misrepresentation of eastern women in the eastern discourses by the eastern writers themselves. Therefore, both Mohanty and Said overlook the concerns of the marginal, like gendered subaltern, poor class

and others. These critics fail to examine the contradictions of the eastern society. Therefore, Spivak gets space to raise such issues.

History writing is another area of representation. In this discourse also, critics uncover the connection between the imperial politics and the ways of writing history. Dipesh Chakrabarty unveils the historical instances to demonstrate that the historical representations by European are motivated by the hegemonic interests of placing themselves at the center and the non-Europeans at the periphery. In the narrative of Europe, it remains the sovereign subject of all histories, like Indian, Chinese, and others. In relation to the histories from the peripheries, the European history claims its status as the master narrative (223). Europe sets the parameters of writing histories from the peripheries in relation to its master history. To deconstruct such truthful claim of history, Hayden White exposes the fictional element of history. He writes, “Properly understood, histories ought never to be read as unambiguous signs of the events they report, but rather as symbolic structure, extended metaphors. . .” (1721). If history contains metaphors, the reality which it claims to represent is open for interpretations. However, one must differentiate between more fictional history and less fictional history. Thus, the possibilities of the colonizer representing the colonized in history are more fictional than the colonized writing their own histories. Dipesh Chakrabarty’s assault on the western perception of history writing can be approved but as a historian and a contributor to Subaltern Studies Group, he fails to record the stories of gendered subalterns. So, Spivak questions the inclusiveness of Subaltern Studies Group as underclass women remain excluded.

In the context of Africa, Barbara Christian investigates the Western representations of Africa and uncovers that the terms ‘minority’ and ‘discourse’ are used in the Western binary form that takes non-West than the West as minor but asserts its own position as major. They generally do so through force and language (150). The judgmental West devalues the

intellectual and cultural assets of non-West to identify its discourses as better. In response to this, Barbara claims that the Africans hold the agency to define themselves without reference to the western framework. She sounds like Fanon for the African identity and nationality. Fanon reminds, “The responsibility of the African toward his national culture is also a responsibility toward ‘Negro – African’ culture (179). It is also like Spivak’s idea of ethical engagement or the sense of responsibility towards others. However, Christian, like Said and Mohanty, fails to expose the disparities within Africa. She does not seem to address the peripheral in Africa, like women and poor who suffer from the internal colonization.

Like Spivak, Kirsten Holst Petersen discloses the challenges that the marginal women are facing in Africa. They have to pay the price to the colonial and the imperial enterprises. On the top of that, African domestic disparities plague them. In literary representation, such issues are manifested. Petersen draws examples from Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart* to illustrate how women are positioned in particular African society and how Achebe represents them. She describes that women are presented as happy and harmonious members even though they are beaten and deprived from decision making power. They are also criticized in proverbs (253). This indicates that things are not fine for women in African society. Authors, like Achebe, could not shake the spell of patriarchal ideologies. Another critic, Ketu H. Katrak signals the dangers of the postcolonial authors reproducing the discourses that are complicit to the colonial practices. Particularly, she sheds light on the gap between the theoretical claim in the name of postcolonial societies and the actual intellectual practices. She dissents that a new hegemony is being established in the contemporary theory that ignores the postcolonial writers’ essays, interviews and other products (256). To address this, she underscores the necessity of taking social responsibility as the basis of theorizing postcolonial literature and the works of creative writers. She questions how to “make our study of postcolonial texts itself a mode of resistance?” (255). Indeed, it remains a challenge

for the authors. In “Three Women’s Texts and a Critique of Imperialism,” Spivak also feels “unfortunate when the emergent perspective of feminist criticism reproduces the axioms of imperialism” (269). She uncovers the collusion between the imperialists and the Feminists. In the same fashion, Benita Parry precautions not to repeat the flaws of colonialism in the name of postcolonial commitment otherwise we fail to alter the conventions and knowledge that we intend to challenge (84). She is vigilant as Fanon who warned to prevent from being another colonizer under the ideology of capitalism and patriarchy because he did not want the aspirations of people to be crushed under the interests of handful of opportunists. So, Parry affirms the objective, “the project of a postcolonial critique is designated as deconstructing and displacing the Eurocentric premises of a discursive apparatus which constructed the Third World not only for the west but also for the cultures so represented” (84). To fulfil this objective of the postcolonial project, she alerts to choose the appropriate model for resistance against the colonial discourses.

Colonial Programming and Postcolonial Deprogramming: Ideological Orientations

The colonial enterprises effected the colonized societies through educational programmes. They use them to propagate their ideologies. During the English colonial era in India before 1947, English model education was promoted. Thomas Macaulay used to orient the interpreters who could disseminate ideas to the natives so that they would remain “Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect” (430). John Docker comments on the Anglo centric assumption that demands to study the great tradition of English literature in order to maintain the standard. The colonizers impose their literature on the native and devalue the literary culture of the indigenous people pushing at the margin. Against such invasion and for the preservation and promotion of the native literary traditions, Ngugi Wa Thiong’o, counters the hegemonic literary discourses, like English. He advocates for the African perspective, “We have argued the case for the abolition of the present

Department of English in the college, and the establishment of a department of African Literature and Languages” (441). As much concerned as Ngugi, in terms of the language as a medium of scholarship, Philip G. Altbach argues that the colonial languages continue to dominate the educational system. Consequently, the native population feels the dearth of technical and scholarly books in indigenous languages (486). To address such problems of language and literature, Spivak calls for the collective efforts in the Global-South. The marginalized nationalities and indigenous communities through the production of their literatures in local languages can subvert the situation. In this way, she hopes heterogeneous identities can survive against homogenizing forces.

Necessity of the New Comparative Approach

The critical examination of various perspectives and criticisms under postcolonial theory unfolds that different strands emerge to address the contextual needs. Despite their overlapping, they still hold distinct features. Since no single approach is adequate to address the multiple issues, it demands to look at from various perspectives. Because of these possibilities, the postcolonial theory could adapt orientations from other theories and discourses. Consequently, it has developed as a flexible and interdisciplinary theory that can transform under any situation. Along with time, its agendas shifted. From national liberation struggle, like of Fanon, to the confrontation with complex global capitalism, the postcolonial theory has made a number of maneuvers. As it negotiates with the challenges that vary from the domestic to the transnational, the reconfiguration of its modalities continues. In addition, the new perspective emerges from the limitation of the previous one.

In the context of this research, the primary texts represent the diverse contexts. Because of the intersection of the issues, like race, gender, class and nationality, it demands a comprehensive modality. For this purpose, I select Gayatri Spivak’s postcolonial theory/new comparative approach for literary studies. My study aims to explore the intertextual relations

between the texts that have different ideological orientations. So, under the postcolonial perspective, the comparative method of literary studies propounded by Spivak serves this purpose.

For Spivak, the objective of the New Comparative Literature is to shift the point of reference of comparison from the Global-North to the Global-South. By relocating the point of reference, she aims to produce and study the literatures of the Global-South in heterogeneous languages in order to make constructive anti-globalizing networks of people's collectivity in the Global-South.

The old model of comparative literature is Eurocentric. It is mostly Anglophonic and Francophonic. Racially influenced, it places its literatures at the center to compare the literatures from the peripheries in its reference. The old dominant western models of Comparative Literatures are: the French School of Comparative Literature and the American School of Comparative Literature. The French model, in the early part of 20th century, used the Positivist and empiricist approaches that were based on the search of evidence of origin and influence, for instance, the detective works and the historical studies. After the French, the American School of Comparative Literature developed which prioritized literary criticism. Its focus was on aesthetic aspects and would search for similarities. Beside this, the American School practiced interdisciplinary methods of study. Both the American and the French models would look for similarities between their own literatures and others, like of the East. So, the points of reference were their own literary practices as the models for the peripheries. In such models, "the issue of the heterogeneity of the comparison is completely ignored" (Cao xxi). From the limitations of these models, Variation Theory emerges. This theory respects diversity of global societies. So, it is different from the European-French and American models of comparative study. Its cross – cultural perspective searches for differences rather than for similarities, like of old models. So, the variation theory of

comparison takes a departure from homogeneity and seeks heterogeneity. Cao claims, this model based on variation is Chinese since the Chinese scholars developed it. 'Heterogeneity', the main spirit of Variation theory applies to Spivak's new comparative approach also. She proposes that Area studies and Comparative Literature can work together to study the literatures of the Global-South which are written in indigenous languages. Spivak calls to take the language of the Southern hemisphere for the active cultural production than object of study (*Death of a Discipline* 9). She believes that through the language of the Global-South, a new relation can develop. In the new situation, the discipline of Comparative Literature can be brought outside the Euro-US location to unveil the traditions of languages rather than suppressing them.

I draw the insights from Spivak's postcolonial theory/new comparative approach for Literary Studies to fashion the theoretical framework for the present study. I delimit the study theoretically under this modality.

After the examination of diverse perspectives within postcolonial theory, I draw the conclusion that Spivak's views are updated and useful to make the theoretical framework for my research since she has developed them with her attempts to overcome the limitations of other theories, like of Bhabha. Importantly, her postcolonial visions reflect her negotiations across disciplines and theories as per the contextual needs. Finally, Why I use the postcolonial theory of Spivak, is to support my proposition that the problems of social disparities have connections with oppressive ideologies, like race, gender and class. So, to address the problems, knowledge is to be reproduced by the alternative narratives which critique the dominant ideologies as they reconstruct the old narratives. As Spivak's postcolonial theory challenges the social hierarchies constructed by essentialism, I locate essentialism in hegemonic ideologies. This is my point of departure. So, I reiterate that the

problematic ideologies are to be deconstructed through the intertextual practices as the alternative narratives aim for the egalitarian relations.

Textual and Critical Review

The purpose of this textual review is to examine the previous researches on *The Tempest*, *A Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe*, *Foe*, *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* in order to assess those works and identify the unexplored areas in these texts. In addition, I intend to form my view in relation to other critics who have interpreted the texts from the diverse perspectives. My assumption is that other researchers have overlooked the role of ideologies in the study of intertextual relations between the aforementioned texts. Moreover, the application of postcolonial-new comparative approach to literary studies of Spivak, blended with the concept of intertextuality, will be a different attempt to examine the role of ideologies in the production and reproduction of texts. So, the present study attempts to offer a different way of reading between the texts. Significantly, this work participates in dialogic interactions in the process of the production of knowledge. The following section of textual review is organized thematically.

Possession of Indigenous Knowledge and Native Resistance

As the colonizers possess the indigenous knowledge and act against the natives, the latter resist them. Rachel Bryant views that Caliban is disillusioned from the usurpation of Prospero. She observes how Caliban offers his assistance to Prospero and his daughter as the guests to his island home. He expects reciprocal relations from them so that Caliban himself and his guests would mutually benefit from each other. With this benevolence, he shares the secret of indigenous knowledge in order to make their survival possible on the island. However, Caliban's assumption turns out to be wrong as Prospero overtakes the island and enslaves Caliban, the host. Caliban, then, in his desperation tries to regain his lost authority over the land and his freedom from Prospero's captivity. For this, he uses his indigenous

knowledge against them (99). Spivak also critiques the imperialist-capitalist multinational corporations for pirating the indigenous knowledge and turning into data for research work to claim the authority over the knowledge. It seems like Prospero obtains information from Caliban and claims that he has taught him to civilize.

Steve Almquist examines the fundamental shift in *A Tempest* from the perspective of the use of the indigenous language, resistance against subjugation and the claim of identity. Césaire gives African voice to Caliban in Kiswahili language so that “Caliban voices his agitation with Prospero’s domination” (597). Unlike Shakespeare’s Caliban, this new Caliban can speak in his own African Language along with Prospero’s language. His language empowers him to fight the colonial master. So, he “does not gabble like a ‘thing most brutish’” (97) as Miranda humiliates in *The Tempest*. Almquist notices that Caliban’s radical resistance is supported by his native language. He keeps on articulating the word ‘Uhuru’. Even the Gods that Césaire invokes in his narrative are disruptive. For instance, Eshu acts like a trickster to challenge the convention. Another point that Almquist makes about the two plays is structural organization, specially, the ending of the stories. Shakespeare’s play ends in reconciliation as Caliban gets freedom and Prospero returns to Italy whereas in Césaire’s story, Caliban does not get aspired freedom and Prospero decides to live on the island with Caliban. In my view, probably, Césaire intends to express that colonial occupation does not end voluntarily itself rather it needs revolt strong enough to drive away from the natives. Though Caliban attempts, he fails since he lacks support from other fellow natives, like Ariel. Almquist’s comparative analysis between these texts offers a postcolonial interpretation based on differences or the points of departure.

Relation between *The Tempest* and “Caniballes”: Question of Originality

In terms of intertextuality, Kenji Go detects the source from where Shakespeare borrowed the ideas for *The Tempest*. He points out, “a number of significant parallels

between *The Tempest* and “Caniballes” that have gone unnoticed by recent commentators” (457). He cites that Shakespeare borrowed from Montaigne. For instance, he uses Sycorax and the mysterious location of Prospero’s island and Gonzalo’s utopian speech. Go even reports that Shakespeare replicated at the verbal level, not only ideas. These instances pose a challenge for the claim of originality of Shakespeare in *The Tempest*. They support the poststructuralists, like Derrida and Barthes, who question the concept of originality. Go demonstrates the direct ways of using other’s sources in case of Shakespeare. However, the authors may borrow the ideas and use them in more subtle ways so that it complicates to detect the sources. Despite the variations, in using others’ ideas, all of them have intertextual relations.

Shakespeare’s Disapproval of Imperialism: Does *The Tempest* Support It?

Different from the critics who link Shakespeare with colonialism and imperialism, Rachel Bryant interprets his works, Like *Macbeth* and *The Tempest*, “where Shakespeare challenges the cruel and corrupt imperial logic” that deals with native people and their belonging as marketable resources (99). Bryant understands that Shakespeare’s works disapprove the imperial argument of exploitation of the natives. But what Bryant fails to notice is that the characters, like Ariel and Caliban, are the product of Shakespeare’s imagination. If he wanted, he could create the plot where Caliban could drive Prospero out of his native island. In *The Tempest*, Prospero leaves the island voluntarily not due to his defeat with the natives. This evidences that Shakespeare’s texts were more complicit with imperialism than against them.

Divided Views on *Robinson Crusoe*: Critiques of Colonialism Versus Myth Making of Crusoe

Critics are divided over the role of Robinson Crusoe. Those in favor of colonialism, present him as a mythical hero. Whereas, others who are against colonialism and imperialism

critique his role. The colonizers try to maintain control on the colonized through the means of communication and ideological programming, like religion. Jason S. Farr examines the political meaning of gesture. Similarly, Geoffrey Sill and Jay Rajiva observe how religious ideology is employed to justify the control over the colonized.

Jason S. Farr observes the role of gestures in paralinguistic communication in *Robinson Crusoe*. He deciphers that gestures, like verbal expressions, may have political implications as they serve as a means to exercise domination and submission between Crusoe and Friday. Silently, the master can maintain his authority over the servant (555). Before Friday learns English language of Crusoe, their verbal communication fails since they belong to different language-background. However, they can employ gestures to express the motives. So, the gestures of Crusoe indicate command and control whereas Friday's gestures symbolize subservience to the master. The strength of the gesture is that it can overcome the limitation of verbal expressions across the languages and cultures. Yet, its implication depends on who uses for what purpose.

In terms of colonial orientation, Geoffrey Sill also like Jason, uncovers the political meanings of *Robinson Crusoe*. However, Sill investigates the text focusing on religious ideology that is used to serve the interest of the colonizer, Crusoe. He views that Defoe intended to narrate the story of Crusoe in order to present it as a model for colonizing America through the conversion of the native Americans (125). For instance, in the story, Crusoe tries to convert Friday into a Christian through his orientations. He claims, "The savage was now a good Christian, a much better than I . . ." (174). Sill underscores that like a language, religion becomes a means for the missionaries to colonize the natives. Therefore, Marx called the ideology of religion, an opium, that intoxicates the people so that the privileged few can maintain their control over the masses in the name of religion.

Like Geoffrey Sill, Jay Rajiva compares *Foe* with *Robinson Crusoe* in terms of complicity with the Christian ideology that plays the role in the colonial enterprises. He illustrates that the body of Friday of *Foe* is like the body of Defoe's Friday which remains the visible site of exploitation under the Christian-colonial project (3). Further, he argues that *Foe* exposes the connection between the colonial project and Christianity and Friday's refusal to speak is not only a refusal to follow the colonial hegemony but also a challenge for the Christian ethics (5).

Wolfram Schmidgen unfolds the spiritual dimension in *Robinson Crusoe* in contrast to the secular one. He identifies it as metaphysical transformation from the secular realm. He argues that obsession of *Robinson Crusoe* with the corporeal world, opens the possibility for metaphysical being. It questions the limited existence within the physical world and offers the potentiality for metaphysical transformation. Schmidgen makes an optimistic note on spirituality in the context of the modern world that promotes secular spirit as reflected in *Robinson Crusoe*. He believes that character, like *Crusoe*, can uplift with spiritual transformation from mere quest for survival in his isolation (101-104).

The critics, who support the imperial ideologies and project *Crusoe* positively, have glorified him as a mythical hero. Critics, like D.N. Deluna and Naomi Wood, have presented him in such way.

D.N. Deluna declares *Robinson Crusoe* as the mercantile hero of the commercial North. The eulogic expression of Deluna for the commercial enterprise of Europe evidences the Euro-centric mentality that perceives the economically prosperous colonizing North as superior in contrast to the impoverished, the 'Global-South' as Spivak calls it. Deluna associates *Crusoe* with European patrilineal heritage that fosters in him the spirit of mercantile adventure (73). As a tradition, adventure for economic gain was a man's job. So, *Crusoe* stands as a patriarch who inherits that legacy. Politically, the collusion between

Imperialism and Capitalism sets the social conditioning where a person, like Crusoe, can rise with colonial voice whereas others become the victim of it, like Friday.

Naomi Wood, in her review of Andrew O' Malley's article on Robinson Crusoe observes a shift noticed by O' Malley. The shift is that *Robinson Crusoe* had been changed since late 19th century from a model of bourgeois figure with self-dependence and industry to a fairy-tale person connected to childhood and simplicity (325). Malley identifies the departure since the writers have constructed different versions of Robinson Crusoe intertextually. He has been presented as a mercantile hero in some stories as Deluna glorifies and in others he stands as a mythical figure for children's story. For instance, *Foe* by Coetzee developed as the reconstructed narrative of *Robinson Crusoe*, which interrogates the role of colonial patriarch Crusoe. If so, why do they produce the different versions of a novel, like *Robinson Crusoe*? It seems that particular narrative generates various interpretations over the time. Some contest ideologically as *Foe* does; others differ thematically and structurally. Due to the spirit of creativity that can fashion the strategies to articulate the dissenting views, the specific narrative is reproduced in different versions by the authors.

Representation, Positioning and Authorship in *Foe*

The role of Crusoe and Friday have been transformed in *Foe* by Coetzee. In the context of challenging the binary between enemy and friend or exploiter and exploited, Spivak raises the issues of representation and positioning and Lewis MacLeod focuses on clash for authorship between Foe and Susan. Similarly, Chris Bongie notices the way Susan attempts to create a meaningful position for herself in contrast to her male counterparts, Cruso and Foe.

In "Theory in the Margin . . .," Gayatri Spivak illustrates the example of exploitation and domination of disenfranchised from the story of *Robinson Crusoe* and *Foe*. She calls Friday of Defoe's story, a colonial subject, who learns his master's speech and assists his

master in his work. Friday becomes loyal to him and accepts that the master's culture is better than his own. He compromises with his native 'self' in order to follow the European ways of living (14). Different from Defoe's Friday, Coetzee's Friday remains mute. However, he acts subserviently like the former one. It seems difficult to identify who acts as a foe in the story. Therefore, Spivak believes that Foe in history situates in such a location where the boundary between a friend and a foe is blurred. It means that the fluctuation between the position of a foe and a friend makes it possible for a foe to act like a friend and friend like a foe. Spivak sees the possibilities of deconstruction of any position as they are not permanent. So, a friend can be a foe and vice versa in the discursive practices. For Spivak, this ambivalent position can flip any side. In like manner, Brian Macaskill and Jeanne Colleran reveal, "according to several vocal and persuasive literary critics and cultural theorists within South Africa, Coetzee himself comes uncomfortably close to fitting the description of such foe (432). The critics argue that Coetzee ignores the political realities of Africa as he writes the story of *Foe*. Thus, they evaluate his role as a foe who does nothing useful to the African society. Beside this, inside the story, who is foe, Robinson Crusoe or Foe? The critics identify any of them or both with some reasons as Spivak underscores open-endedness.

With regard to representation, Gayatri Spivak admits that she cannot be the representative of subalterns since she works from a privileged position of the western academia. So, the gulf between her position and the disenfranchised subalterns stands as a barrier for their representation. She evaluates her position critically being self-reflective. Similar to this view, G. Scott Bishop forms his opinion about the position of Coetzee as the author of *Foe*, "He tells the story of oppression without pretending to speak for the oppressed. As a white man, an Afrikaner, he illustrates and questions his own voice as spokesman for the oppressed (54). Though Bishop claims that Coetzee holds the position of

neutrality, he fails to illustrate from the story of *Foe* how he does so. Likewise, Spivak holds the contradictory views regarding the representation of subalterns. In one hand, she questions her position to be the champion of underprivileged. On the other, she underscores the necessity of ethical engagement with the subalterns to listen to their narratives. Can privileged persons, like Spivak and Coetzee, detach themselves institutionally while communicating with the subalterns? The possibility of doing so seems to be low since it demands readiness and sacrifice. Who are ready to undergo the patience?

The line between fiction and fact easily blurs in representation. Though autobiography is generally associated with more facts than fictions, the element of fiction questions the concept of fact in it. Walter P. Rankin investigates how these elements work in Christa Wolf's *Kindneitsmuster* and J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*. He finds that both the texts focus on women writers who act as the narrator, and wish to author their stories. They fail to represent their experiences as they feel. So, they have to negotiate between fiction and fact while producing their autobiographical narratives (309). Like Spivak, Rankin challenges the binary principle. As the binary between fiction and fact ruptures since neither of it can work in its pure form, Coetzee in his interview about *Foe* questions the binaries between Susan and Friday, white and black, man and woman and others. He asks, "Which of these-what shall I call them? - identity pairs – is primary?" (Begam and Coetzee 424). He clarifies that this question sounds meaningless since he critiques the binary principle.

In *Foe*, Coetzee assigns the narrative role to Susan who acts as a key figure instead of Crusoe. So, from the initiation, the woman's voice gets space in the story. However, another male character, Foe, attempts to take over the authorship of the narrative that Susan shares with him to frame a story. In the story, he wants Susan to have a subordinate role. In this context, Lewis MacLeod interprets the struggle between Foe and Susan, and Susan and Crusoe, as the struggle for authorship so that the story can be fashioned as per the author's

will. So, MacLeod states, “To narrate “the world” is to gain power and authority, to be subject to outside pulses is to lose them” (3). Further, she argues that the conflict between Susan and Foe is not basically ethical or political but narratological (5). Likewise, Jennifer Rickel finds that Susan identifies herself in more powerful position than Friday as he cannot represent himself. In addition, she admits that her story framed by Foe remains incomplete without Friday in it. Thus, she attempts to break the silence of Friday in order to claim her own narrative power (164). Rickel implies that Susan searches her meaningful position through voiceless Friday as he needs someone to speak for him.

Chris Bongie reads *Foe* from feminist perspective. He perceives Susan Barton’s presence as disruptive on the male-controlled island. Beyond her physical presence on the island, she intends to construct a narrative discourse to place herself in a meaningful position. In this way, she plans to transform herself into an author of her own story. Bongie stresses that a feminist reader cannot ignore such discursive strife of Susan Barton (264).

Intertextual Relations and Textual Transformations: A Reader’s Role

Readers not only receive what is given in the texts but also add from their sides in the interpretation of intertextual relations. Tisha Turk examines the relation between *Foe* and *Robinson Crusoe* to study their intertextual narratives. She underscores that reader’s role is crucial in order to fill the gaps between the texts. However, such gaps can only be filled after examining the relationship between the texts (297). She reiterates that through rhetorical reading we can access the interpretive possibilities but such possibilities lie in the interactions between the texts not in their isolation. For instance, Susan’s attempt to construct her narrative in *Foe* becomes more meaningful to the reader if they relate *Foe* with *Robinson Crusoe*. As a reader, what gap I detect between these two texts is that *Foe* challenges *Robinson Crusoe* ideologically in terms of race, gender and nationality.

Like the intertextual relation between *Robinson Crusoe* and *Foe*, Readers can explore such relation between *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*. They not only read the given texts but also construct their own in the process of interpretation. Therefore, a text becomes a space for readerly and writerly contestations to give and get meanings. Debra Gottel sites an instance from *Jane Eyre* and argues that uncontrollable daydreams in this text becomes a zone of struggle between author's and reader's imaginations (559). This is the intertextuality between reader's and author's textualities.

Interpretations offer new dimensions or meanings to a text. So, they undergo transformation. Melissa Shields Jenkins reviews Abigail Heiniger's writing on *Jane Eyre*'s fairy tale legacy. She notes that critics adopt different approaches to respond to the source text, like *Jane Eyre*. They offer creative and sometimes deconstructive response to them (333). Consequently, the tale, like Cinderella, undergoes transformation as the new versions are produced because interpretations add new dimensions to the source story. Similarly, *Wide Sargasso Sea* is another version of *Jane Eyre*.

Reinforcement of Ideologies: Eurocentric Perspective in *Jane Eyre*

Though Bronte wrote *Jane Eyre* in response to the previous dominant ideologies and discourses, her text has drawn criticisms for overlooking some pertinent issues, like gender, race and others, and reinforcing hegemonic ideologies.

Chris K. Vanden Bossche, in "What Did Jane Eyre Do? Ideology, Agency, Class and Novel," argues that *Jane Eyre* which is supposed to subvert ideology and understood as the text of resistance, itself reinforces such ideology and repression (47). For instance, Bossche draws the views of critics: Gayatri Spivak and Cora Kaplan on *Jane Eyre* who argue that feministic orientation of *Jane Eyre* was based on white middle-class feminism developed by excluding the racial, class and other differences. In response to the interpretation of *Jane Eyre* by Gilbert and Gubar, Spivak and Kaplan contend that Bronte was not outside ideology

rather, her narrative of female upliftment was complicit with hegemonic discursivities (53). Bronte's identity was basically a female for Gilbert and Gubar but for Kaplan and Spivak, it was bourgeois as she shows her compliance to it through her literary discourses.

In response to Eurocentric perspective of Charlotte Bronte in *Jane Eyre*, Jennifer Gilchrist, interprets *Wide Sargasso Sea*, "Rhys wages a broader, anti-Enlightenment critique of European, masculinist rationalism, objectivism and Liberalism" (462). Jean Rhys exposes the contradictions within the ideal world imagined by the Europeans through her narrative as she is disillusioned with the promise of the enlightenment ideals that overvalue rationality and scientificity, mostly for men. Like Spivak, Gilchrist charges Bronte for practicing "eighteenth-century, bourgeois, feminist, woman/slave analogy" (463) in *Jane Eyre*. Gilchrist states that *Wide Sargasso Sea* promotes the traits that Bronte disregards. In this context, she links Bronte with Mary Wollstonecraft who undervalues the pleasure-seeking tendencies, like fondness for dress, immodest behavior and sexual urges. She associates these disruptive qualities with savages who defy the so-called rational principles (463). Gilchrist illustrates from the story, *Wide Sargasso Sea*, that Antoinette disregards abstract moral principles in contrast to Jane who upholds them. Antoinette goes for unbridled sexual pleasure and fetishizes the clothes she likes.

Katherine Malone also reviews *Jane Eyre* focusing on the 'Mad Woman in the Attic Legacy' of Gilbert and Gubar. She contends that if anything that we have got from Gilbert and Gubar is that myths produced in response to more pernicious myths, need interrogation. In other words, Gilbert's and Gubar's interpretations of *Jane Eyre* act as other myths which invite contestations as Spivak dissents with them for their use of Bertha Mason which reproduces patriarchal authority by muting the native other (112). What Spivak objects is their ignorance of Bertha who despite being a woman, remains forgotten by the women authors, like Bronte as well as Gilbert and Gubar.

For Yang- Hsing Wu, the Rise of Jane and her agency for individual decision making in contrast to Bertha are writerly choices. Bronte as the author frames the narrative with her decision to give what position to which character. Therefore, Wu takes Bronte morally responsible for Jane as she is the means for the author to articulate a female voice (83). Unlike Roland Barthes's declaration of the death of the author based on the argument that a text gets divorced from the authority of the writer as the readers interpret it. Wu associates the narrative with author in order to evaluate the role of the author behind the actions of the characters. For instance, If Bronte wanted, she could construct the better image of Bertha Mason than as a mad woman in the attic. Wu, like Bossche, implicitly connotes that ideological orientations of Bronte manifest in *Jane Eyre*.

To justify the abusive treatment to the unwanted vulnerable, the discourse of madness is employed. In the literary discourses, authors make use of it to portray the tarnished image of the neglected characters. In this context, Karen Beth Strovas critiques that "the relationship between vice and madness had so thoroughly pervaded British mainstream culture that Bronte chose to join rather than subvert its discourse . . ." (386). The then belief was that insanity is connected to moral degeneration and sinful acts. Bronte relates Bertha's illness with sinful nature rather than mental ailment (385). She constructs Bertha's image as unwanted other of Edward Rochester who uses the ideology madness to justify his actions against Bertha. Strovas also comments that Bronte aligns wakefulness of Bertha with madness. She reveals that the cultural histories of criminality and night-time wakefulness have been interconnected to construct the narrative of 'bad sleepers are bad people'. Unfortunately, Bronte does not attempt to disrupt such narratives at least through her creative discourses, rather follows herself.

Interpretation of *Jane Eyre* from Darwinian Perspective: Justification for the Act of Dominant

Aubrey L Mishou interprets *Jane Eyre* as the Darwinian exploration of sex and gender rather than a love story of Victorian principles. Mishou argues that Bronte creates the binary between Jane and Bertha to demonstrate struggles in evolution. As per Darwin's theory, the difference between Bertha and Jane occurs naturally as the powerful gets the privileged position. I dismiss this view of Mishou. If we approve this principle, the actions of the dominant get validated and the marginalized, like Bertha Mason, remain suppressed. I do not believe that Bronte created the disparity in the story following Darwin's theory. Rather, Bronte came under the influence of socio-cultural ideologies as she wrote the story.

Limitation of *Jane Eyre's* Battle

Despite its limitations in some respects, *Jane Eyre* represents as an example of an attempt to confront the hegemonic institutions and individuals, like Mrs. Reed's family, Lowood School led by Brocklehurst, and St. John Rivers. They attempt to deprive her freedom and turn into a servant of the 'wage labor economy' (Leggatt and Prats 169). The critics see Jane's condition at Mrs. Reed's and at Lowood School, like in a prison house. So, they believe, she resolves to confront the tyranny of Mrs. Reed. For this, Jane develops her fortitude amidst the hostile situations. The harsh conditions make her determined to stand on her own as autonomous (173). Leggatt and Park fall short of balanced views as they one-sidedly focus on Jane's individual accomplishment and overlook the injustice done to Bertha Mason. Thus, their perspectives are too narrow and exclusionary to incorporate Bertha's struggle for existence.

Protest against Oppression

The critics, Trevor Hope, Karen Ya-Chu and Missy Dehn Kubitschek denounce the imperial oppression as well as patriarchal in the context of *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*.

Trevor Hope reads *Wide Sargasso Sea* as subversive response to *Jane Eyre* whose gothic setting at Thornfield Hall supports the colonial discourse and its discursive structure that she calls the imperial archive (51). Hope finds that Rhys' postcolonial disruptive discourse contests with the imperial discourse.

The colonial subjugation generates the counter-discursive strategies from the colonized peripherals. Karen Ya-Chu Yang identifies the common ground between Rhys and Conde who, in terms of colonial impact, "criticize effects of European colonialism which stigmatized people" (8). Yang views that rewriting of *Jane Eyre* by Rhys and *Wuthering Heights* by Conde attempt to articulate voices for the marginalized. Both of them investigate the literary texts that have ties with hegemonic ideologies and in response they deconstruct such texts through their disruptive narratives.

Like the imperial colonization, patriarchy colonizes women internally in the postcolonial societies. So, Missy Dehn Kubitschek illustrates the analogy of 'Sargasso Sea' with patriarchy as both are deceptive. Sargasso Sea seems navigable but is dangerous ocean. Likewise, patriarchy apparently offers to entice "but its real substance chokes all progress" (23).

Like *Wide Sargasso Sea*, *The Tempest* is another example of the colonial oppression. Rita Banerjee studies the dialogic relation between *The Sea Voyage* and *The Tempest*. For her, "The Sea Voyage exposes the atrocities of European colonization" (293) and suppression in Prospero's world. Likewise, she identifies three types of colonization in *The Tempest*: control of Prospero in the island, sailors' imagined colony and imaginary plantation of Gonzalo on the island. These illustrations substantiate that colonial issue in this play is a major problem to be investigated. Though this issue seems to be apparent in the play, it needs to be explored since even at present, the colonial enterprises have been operating in new forms in the changing contexts and their impacts are far reaching.

Wide Sargasso Sea is an illustration of disruptive strategy that attempts to dismantle the collusion between imperialism and patriarchy. Rhys strategically frames the narrative to project the declining status of these hegemonic forces in the Caribbean context. For instance, Rochester feels castrated both politically and sexually.

Like Jean Rhys, Aime Césaire critiques and resists the imperial ideologies in his *A Tempest*. To forge solidarity for American identity and safeguard the native American heritage against racialized colonialist and imperialist hegemony on the Caribbean, Césaire launched the project of Negritude (Edmondson 95). In *A Tempest*, Aime Césaire reconstructs the narrative of *The Tempest*. He seems to have been motivated by the postcolonial humanist ethics for the counter discursive engagement against the suppression of peripheral people, like African-Caribbean. As the leader of Negritude that works to raise the awareness of Africanness, he “speaks for open-ended celebration of the black man’s mobility and contact with others” (10). Moreover, he underscores the necessity of ethical collectivity or solidarity (Hiddleston 88-95). His idea of ethical collectivity is like of Spivak’s who speaks for the betterment of the Global-South. Thus, Césaire’s humanity is the humanity of the oppressed that recognizes diversity of humanity.

Regarding the problems faced by the Martinicans, Césaire believes, “Martinican problems will be solved by Martinicans themselves” (Césaire and Miles 73). He also demands that what they want is Martinicans to be recognized as people. Césaire affirms that he does not believe in the false promises but asks for what is possible in the Martinican context to be accomplished by themselves.

Ricardo Castells finds that many critics interpret *The Tempest* as the clash between the colonial Prospero and the colonized, indigenous Caliban. So, the resistance of Caliban against Prospero is the symbolic representation of the native resistance against the western

imperial expansion (43). Similar to this interpretation, *A Tempest* itself is the outcome of the postcolonial response of Césaire to *The Tempest*.

Similarly, Joseph Khoury compares between *The Tempest* and *A Tempest* and finds that Shakespeare problematized the relation between the colonizer and the colonized, whereas Césaire wrote “for both the colonizer and the colonized” (23). Further, he argues that Prospero gains and maintains the position of power due to his capacity to construct a discourse which gets the recognition as truth. He employs the discursive strategy as a means to overwrite Caliban’s identity. Khoury also sees the possibility to deconstruct the position of Prospero by Caliban but to do so, he needs to make a new discourse. For instance, he uses the discourse of language i.e. Kiswahili since he discovers that language and knowledge are connected or they are power themselves (25-26). As Foucault views that the discourse of knowledge constructs power, Khoury acknowledges its potentiality in case of *A Tempest*.

Divided Self: Question of Belongingness

Lucy Wilson in her article, “European or Caribbean: Jean Rhys and the language of Exile,” writes about the difficult position of Rhys herself who is like Prospero and Caliban as a generation of white colonizer but colonized and marginalized by the language of patriarchy (68). Her position is like of Antoinette of *Wide Sargasso Sea* who belongs to the family of slave owner from father’s line but her present status is creole, belonging to neither side. In the similar fashion, Katherine C Henderson explores the dual heritage of Jean Rhys i.e. British by living and Caribbean by birth. Probably, owing to this sense of divided self, Rhys places her heroine, Antoinette, at the intersection of British and Caribbean heritage. Though Rochester tries to impose the English culture by pushing the Caribbean at the margin, he fails to convert her. He even imprisons her at Thornfield Hall, England but she escapes finally by stealing the key (104). H. Adlai Murdoch does not interpret *Wide Sargasso Sea* in binary relation. For Murdoch, Rhys problematizes the double identity. She dismisses reader’s and

writer's notions of dual relation between self and other through her character Bertha (257). So, Murdoch understands that Rhys deconstructs the binary between the self and the other. By the same reason, Antoinette holds the ambivalent position that does not fit any category. It means Antoinette remains in the location of 'third space,' as Bhabha calls it for in-betweenness.

Globalization: Challenges and Possibilities in the Postcolonial Societies

Due to globalization, the postcolonial discourse has compromised with the distinct values of the local cultures. Consequently, it tends to homogenize the Third World writings in one hand and on the other, promotes the cultural differences as they talk about hybridity of metropolitan context (Narain 497). The analysis of Narain shows that globalization offers both, the possibilities of the loss of local cultural identities of postcolonial states as well as maintenance of them as they feel threatened by homogenization so they raise the consciousness to preserve them. To support this, he cites the example of the post-colonial critics who have "invoked Caribbean creole as a symbol of the subversive possibilities of an indigenous language" (498). Specially, the oral language and other oral practices function as the means to preserve indigenous cultural identity. In addition, the rituals also serve as the means to resist colonial oppression. For instance, Matthew Cutter draws the example from *Wide Sargasso Sea* where Antoinette Cosway and Christophine use magic to confront a colonizing force (131). Therefore, the English authority identifies Christophine as an obeah woman who employs obeah as a tool to combat the oppressor. She fearlessly challenges the white man, Rochester. Like her, indigenous people sometimes search their agency through magic realism. Similar to Rhys, Salman Rushdie gives space to magic reality in his *Midnight's Children* to assist the vulnerable characters. Interestingly, both are the postcolonial authors who see the potentiality of magic rituals in the hands of indigenous to resist the dominant authorities.

Shakti Jaising expresses the mixed response to *Wide Sargasso Sea*. He approves its postcolonial prospective that foregrounds the marginal characters of the Anglo- American literary criticism. But he critiques for its failure to overcome “racialized typologies of liberal colonialist discourse” that operates in the novel (816-817).

Threat to Masculinity: Problem with Psychoanalytical Interpretation

Cristina-Georgiana Voicu interprets *Wide Sargasso Sea* from Lacanian perspective. According to Lacan, the law of the language in the symbolic order governs the subject so that he/she can get a position in social relation. In this process, the subject undergoes castration that cannot be avoided and must accept the subjected position. Voicu investigates the story with this theoretical insight and uncovers that Rochester remains in a marginal position and feels the limitation of his male subjectivity. “Rochester’s silence compromises his masculinity; he refuses to speak in order to assert his homogenous and hegemonic self” (Voicu 457). Why does Rochester feel castrated? He seems to feel so owing to his dislocation from his English home to the Caribbean-Jamaican setting where he feels threatened as the locals including Antoinette defy his command and refuse to recognize his power. Though he attempts to assert his imperial authority and masculinity by forcing Antoinette to follow his dictates, he fails to enforce it because they submit neither to his colonial legacy nor to his masculinity rather they play with him, like a man with the strangers. The problem with Voicu’s use of psychoanalytical perspective of Lacan for reading *Wide Sargasso Sea* is that it is male centric theory which worships phallic power and defines everything by taking it as a point of reference. Therefore, Spivak challenges the psychoanalytical models of Freud and Lacan since they subordinate women. Thus, to interpret *Wide Sargasso Sea* using Lacanian model is to revive the patriarchal ideologies.

The textual review on the primary texts of this research shows that substantial researches have been done on them. Diverse views of the critics have enriched the texts with

contesting interpretations. However, they seem to overlook the role of the dominant ideologies that shape the mainstream-periphery relations. As per the changing situations, certain aspects of the texts lose their currency whereas others remain alive. In case of ideologies, they are the prominent elements to organize the societies. Therefore, to change the societies for the better alternative relations instead of center-margin hierarchies, the problems of oppressive ideologies need to be addressed. The Previous researches fail to fill this gap.

The textual space works as a site for creativity as well as knowledge. With this view as well as the information of the prior researches on the primary texts, I argue that there is a possibility as well as necessity of an advanced research on these pair of texts: *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Foe*, and *The Tempest* and *A Tempest*. The necessity of doing research on these texts is that they contain the issue of ideological confrontation, specially, the later texts contest the prior ones in terms of problematic representations in connection with ideologies that serve the interest of the mainstream discourses. If we relate these literary problems with the present world, they are still crucial and grave enough to draw attention of the intellectuals. For instance, colonialism and imperialism operate in new forms; patriarchal and racial discriminations still persist. In this context, the theoretical insight of postcolonialism can be quite useful to deal with these problems in discursive ways. More importantly, for theoretical support, I am going to use the latest Postcolonial-New Comparative Approach for Literary Studies developed by Gayatri Spivak. Her perspective comes after the analysis of the global problems that the marginalized people are facing.

Conclusion

The theoretical reviews on intertextuality and postcolonial theory show that the concept of intertextual relations from the ideological perspective is applicable by remaining within the postcolonial perspective of Spivak in the analysis of the primary texts of this research.

From the textual and critical reviews, I have uncovered that the problem of oppressive ideologies remains the unaddressed issue as applied in analysis of the primary texts of this study. Moreover, methodologically, I employ a critical approach that is integrative as it draws different approaches to examine the textual relations between the pair of texts on the issue of ideology. So, the theoretical approach itself is broad-based to address the diverse issues around the center-margin relation. Therefore, the present study takes a departure as it addresses the dominant ideologies which are the root cause of the social disparity. This study attempts to address the contextual problems of the present time through the analogy of the literary analysis and discussions. And it comes as an attempt to participate in the dialogic interaction critically so that it becomes a step for the social cause and justice.

Chapter III: Reconstruction of the Mainstream Narratives from the Perspective of Peripheries

Aime Cesaire, J.M. Coetzee and Jean Rhys rewrite the mainstream narratives in order to contend the canonical literary discourses that comply with the hegemonic ideologies of mainstream. The postcolonial authors, Rhys and others, reframe the narratives from the peripheral perspectives so that otherwise silenced voices in the master narratives can rise for freedom and justice.

As the dominant ideologies influence the authors, they consciously or unconsciously reproduce the values associated with such ideologies in the literary discourses. For instance, Charlotte Bronte's narrative in *Jane Eyre* foregrounds the mainstream values. The two characters, Bertha and Jane, from different societies are not placed on equal footing. The idealized image of Jane from the English society stands in contrast to the denigrated image of Bertha Mason from Jamaica. Love is made possible between Jane and Rochester as they belong to the English society. For instance, Jane reveals, ". . . I had learnt to love Mr. Rochester: I could not unlove him now. . ." (162). But the matter is different with Bertha as Rochester declares, "Bertha Mason is mad; and she came of a mad family. . ." (257). The politics of the author is explicit in this differential and biased treatment to the characters of different background. To fight back this partisanship, Rhys in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, transforms Bertha into the protagonist, Antoinette, who replaces Jane for the Caribbean identity. In the spirit of the postcolonial political orientation, Rhys promotes the peripheral locations and cultures, like of Jamaica, in the novel.

To critique the mainstream narratives, Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys employ the narratives as strategic tools. Through them, they intend to shift the power equations represented in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*. So, these authors with the support of oppositional ideologies, contest the hegemonic ideologies, like racism,

Europeanism and others. They appropriate the texts with political motivation to transform them so that new relations on egalitarian principles are established. For example, Césaire appropriates Caliban of Shakespeare in *A Tempest* to confront the imperial Prospero from the side of Africa. The authors writing from the side of the margins shift the narrative voice from center to the margin to deconstruct the binaries. They attempt to establish the alternative relations.

Narrative Shift from Center to Margin

Césaire, Coetzee and Rhys write on behalf of the peripherals to subvert the Anglo-European perspectives projected in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*. Politically motivated undertakings of these authors devise the narratives to express the divergent views against the suppressive ideologies. As per the intention, it is authorial decision where to locate themselves and from whose perspective to write. Importantly, such choices are not devoid of ideological orientations since they aim to meet specific expectations. So, the Anglo-European authors, like Shakespeare, are entangled in the European social interests whereas the non-Europeans, like Césaire, forward their own social agendas through literary discourses. About the author's role in representation, in *Culture and Imperialism*, Edward Said argues that he does not believe that authors are mechanically limited by ideology, class and economic condition. However, they are influenced by history and they also influence it (xxii). I understand that Said takes ideology in the narrow sense. Whereas, I believe that authors are influenced by ideologies since they embrace the values that have connection with ideologies in one way or other. Furthermore, they critique the ideologies which they do not approve.

Shakespeare is Eurocentric in his *The Tempest*. So, his narrative foregrounds the colonial figure, Prospero who rules the island. Through the discourse of knowledge, Prospero is empowered. Shakespeare associates knowledge and civilization with an empire. So, he

privileges Prospero with knowledge which he employs for his personal gain by subjecting the inhabitants of the island: Caliban and Ariel. Prospero produces a discourse to exercise power.

“His discourse has effaced Caliban’s subjectivity in two ways. First, Caliban is an imposed name; second, Caliban’s history has either been denied or written over” (Khoury 25).

Khoury also sees the possibility of challenging Prospero’s authority by Caliban for which he “must initiate a new discourse that forces Prospero either into silence or into combat” (25-

26). Caliban knows the secret that Prospero gains power from knowledge and language.

Shakespeare constructs the discourse of master-slave relationship in his narrative. The distorted image of Caliban in a dehumanized condition raises the questions about the intention of the author. Does he not deserve a better image as the inhabitant of the island? The verbal abuse of Prospero, “Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself / Upon thy wicked dam, come forth” (117), is the expression of racial hatred from the protagonist of the play.

Though Shakespeare makes Caliban a rebellious figure who resists exploitation and oppression, he does not get justice. The freedom that he gets at the end of the narrative is due to the voluntary choice of Prospero to leave the island, not as a defeat. The author attempts to justify that Prospero acts this way because of kindness and goodness. But he fails to rise above the ideologies of race and nationality. Otherwise, the natives would not get the image of savage who need a master, like Prospero, to tame them to be better human beings.

Moreover, the European colonial greed for wealth and possessions is reflected in the narrative. For instance, Stephano plans about Caliban, “If I can recover him, and keep him tame, and get to Naples with him, he’s a present for any emperor that ever trod on heat’s leather” (150). What is the human dignity in the eye of the colonial figure? A person of different race can be subjected to the status of an animal as Stephano talks about offering Caliban as a present to the emperor.

Cesaire's *A Tempest* subverts the narrative of Shakespeare. The focus of the narrative shifts from Prospero to Caliban. Cesaire positions Caliban as a postcolonial hero who revolts against the colonial oppression. Probably, Cesaire finds his own image in Caliban who faces racial injustice and humiliation. As a black Afro-Caribbean, Cesaire experienced the racial discrimination. This might have motivated him to remodel Caliban as an African with the black complexion. Through Caliban, the author makes the disruptive political intervention to interrogate the imperial values of *The Tempest*. It is a disruptive political approach because it tries to alter the master-slave relation between Colonial Prospero and colonized Caliban into friendly one so that one respects the other.

In *A Tempest*, Caliban represents the indigenous people; his struggle for liberation from Prospero's rule is to decolonize the native land. To recover the lost heritage, he plots against Prospero with the help of Trinculo and Stephano. For this mission, Caliban prepares for any challenge, "Better death than humiliation and injustice" (23). His political consciousness arouses the will for liberation. Cesaire's emphasis on Afro-Caribbean identity is reflected in Caliban's rejection of name given by Prospero, "Call me X that would be best. Like a man without a name . . . a man whose name has been stolen. . ." (15). To gain the freedom, he feels the necessity of forging solidarity with his native fellows. For this purpose, he wants to make an alliance with Ariel as they have a common enemy, Prospero. Ariel admits it, "but after all we are brothers, brothers in suffering and slavery, but brothers in hope as well" (20). It sounds like Spivak's idea of collectivity for the protection of indigenous identities. She calls for the unity among the marginalized indigenous societies to safeguard their identities against the imperial incursion. She is strategic in her approach.

Cesaire critiques the master-slave opposition presented in *The Tempest*. Caliban attempts to defy the master Prospero. He questions Prospero's morality since he cheats him by presenting himself as an amicable person at the arrival on the island to obtain secret

information of the place but later enslaves him. The exposition of the deception by Prospero shows how the trust of the natives is exploited by the invaders to fulfil their interests.

To give the different political meaning, Césaire alters the ending of the play. In *The Tempest*, Prospero returns to Europe but in *A Tempest*, he decides to stay on the island with Caliban. So, Caliban does not get the aspired freedom. He continues to aspire, “Freedom hi-day! Freedom hi-day” (44). The unfulfilled promise of freedom by Prospero saddens him. Why does Césaire make Prospero stay with Caliban rather than leave for Europe voluntarily? Probably, he intends to express that the colonial occupation does not end voluntarily. What Shakespeare shows as a reconciliation or a happy ending in *The Tempest* does not seem likely to happen in the colonial relation. The colonialist, like Prospero, must be defeated so that the native, like Caliban, gets freedom. Overall, it is the author who frames the narrative and decides from whose perspective to write and for what purpose.

As there is a connection between *The Tempest* and *A Tempest*, one can observe the narrative maneuver from *Robinson Crusoe* to *Foe*. Coetzee refashions Crusoe’s story in the form of *Foe*. He values the overlooked issues in Defoe’s story. In this process, he gives space to a woman’s voice who narrates the story. In Crusoe’s world, a woman, intervenes and the mythical figure, Crusoe, a hero, of venture for the Europeans, does not remain the same as his masculine authority is compromised. For instance, in *Foe*, Susan in her conversation with Foe, claims that she is a part of Crusoe’s story, “I choose rather to tell of the island, of myself and Cruso and Friday and what we three did there. . .” (131). It means Crusoe cannot make the narrative the way he likes. Rather, he has to accept Susan’s presence and respect her view. Coetzee brings the radical shift as the story is narrated from Susan’s perspective. The author makes other modifications in the story to give a new political meaning. Unlike Defoe’s Crusoe, Coetzee’s Crusoe is fragile and dependent. He neither possesses guns nor confronts with the savages. He does not act like an imperial figure rather lives like an ordinary man

whose concerns go for food and safety in the wilderness. For example, Susan reveals that Coetzee's Crusoe has nothing special to offer to the world, "for the world expects stories from its adventures, better stories than tallies of how many stones they moved in fifteen years, and from where, and to where; Crusoe rescued will be a deep disappointment to the world" (34). He is so weak because of poor health that even rescue may be needed. But in case of Defoe's Crusoe, such rescue would not be expected for the colonial hero. Crusoe's diminished position is meaningful politically. Beside altering Crusoe's role, the author makes efforts to rupture the binary relation presented in *Robinson Crusoe*. Likewise, to address the gender issue, the author places Susan in a meaningful position. To neutralize the racial politics, he appropriates Friday. Therefore, a man's exclusive narrative of Crusoe undergoes the scrutiny to make it inclusive narrative in *Foe*.

Crusoe narrates the story in *Robinson Crusoe*. Like in *Jane Eyre*, Eurocentric perspective is reflected in his narration. Defoe seeks the European identity through the construction of the binary relation between the characters and values. For example, he associates Crusoe with civilization and Friday with Savagery. Crusoe clarifies, "my man Friday had formerly been among the savages. . ." (169). The author idealizes the Anglo-European values through Crusoe. The glorification for Crusoe's venture and perseverance in the unknown territories comes from the author's ideologically influenced view.

Karl Marx argues that bourgeoisie employ every means to safeguard their capitalistic interests; the world of literature cannot be free from their influence. In "The Communist Manifesto," Marx critiques bourgeoisie system, "It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of Science, into its paid wage-labourers" (771). The impact of capitalism is manifested in the narrative of *Robinson Crusoe*. So, Crusoe stands as a model for the Europeans as Deluna celebrates his glory, "Robinson Crusoe is a commercial hero by God's choice" (71). The imperial world's adventurous hero is perceived by the non-European

as a colonial figure who tries to involve in the slave trade for money. Capitalism feeds the imperial power. So, economy works as a key motivating factor for the colonial occupation. Generally, the dual relation between the colonizer and the colonized is understood in binary way, like in *Robinson Crusoe*. But Rey Chow questions this way of interpretation, “Contrary to the model of western hegemony in which the colonizer is seen as a primary, active ‘gaze’ subjugating the native as a passive object. I want to argue that it is actually the colonizer who feels looked at by the native’s gaze” (139). It means the colonizer feels threatened by the presence of the colonized or he has no confidence over his colonial authority. As Marx sees the possibility of dismantling capitalism by the workers, Ray Chow sees the potentiality of the colonized to threaten and overcome the colonizer. This is the anticipation for different egalitarian relation.

The collusion of ideologies between patriarchy and imperialism establishes the male’s authority in the colonial occupation. Crusoe works as the sole male authority on the island. Owing to the belief that adventure, mercantile and ruling as man’s jobs, Crusoe is entrusted with such works. What would be a woman’s role if she were in his place? Crusoe, an imperial figure, imagines himself as the lord of the place, “My island was now peopled, and I thought myself very rich in subjects. . . Secondly, my people were perfectly subjected: I was absolute law-giver. . .” (190). He supposes himself as the guardian of the poor savages. So, it is his responsibility to look after them and regulate them.

Crusoe’s success is taken into consideration in the organization of the plot of the master narrative. The ending part shows that he succeeds to rescue himself to return to England. Afterwards, he takes more adventures. So, Defoe’s English protagonist succeeds in his mission. So, the narrative gets its shape as per the expectation of the imperial mission. Otherwise, Crusoe would fail to return his homeland as presented in *Foe*.

Does *Foe* become a foe of *Robinson Crusoe*? What motivates Coetzee to entitle the narrative as *Foe*? It seems that the author explores the alternative political meaning for *Robinson Crusoe*. The ideological differences between the authors play the decisive role in giving the new political color to the colonial story of Crusoe. So, the focus shifts to the marginal characters in *Foe*. The characters, like Friday and Susan, get attention of the author. To improve their positions, Coetzee curtails the power of Crusoe in *Foe* who does not act like an imperial figure as in Defoe's story. Without guns and other important tools, he struggles to survive with primitive methods. He does unproductive works, like making terraces without seeds to plant. The entrepreneurial productivity of Crusoe and his hegemonic narratives to glorify his background are reduced in *Foe* to critique his imperial role.

Coetzee complements the exclusion of woman's representation in Defoe's narrative. "Barton's disruptive presence on the primordially male island, and her desire to make a story of her own heard, would appear to lay the foundation for an authentic retrieval of woman's hitherto silenced voice" (Bongie 264). Through Susan, the author tries to address the gender issue. The failure of Defoe to critique the ideology of patriarchy in *Robinson Crusoe* creates the space for the emergence of Susan.

To critique the duality between the primary and the secondary roles constructed in *Robinson Crusoe*, Coetzee changes the conditions of binary relations. For instance, he creates the confusion about the existence of savages in *Foe*. Unlike in Defoe's narrative, no clear evidences are presented to support the presence of savages in the story. Different from the previous story, Friday is not characterized as a savage or cannibal rather as an African slave. To illustrate, Susan questions the presence of cannibals, "No pirates landed on our shores, no freebooters, no cannibals save yourself, if you can be called a cannibal. Did Crusoe truly believe, I wonder, that you were once a cannibal child" (8). Crusoe's civilization defined in relation to savages, crumbles once the savages are removed. To rupture the dichotomy,

Coetzee remodels Crusoe who does not have any mission to accomplish, like in Defoe's narrative.

In the narrative manoeuvre, Coetzee portrays Crusoe's falling colonial power; he opens the avenue for the peripheral. Susan gains the opportunity to frame her own narrative as per her will rather than approving the narrative made by the male writer, Foe for her. She claims, "For I am a free woman who asserts her freedom by telling her story according to her own desire" (131). The woman claims the power of narrative discourse means the power shifts from a man to a woman. The author brings Susan and Friday together after the death of Crusoe. Politically, it is the solidarity among the marginal. The ending of the story has the political implication because the symbolic colonial figure, Crusoe, dies. Defoe's successful imperial hero is transformed into a failure who cannot return home. It is the strategy of Coetzee to alter the Crusoe narrative for the alternative relation between the controller and controlled.

Jane Eyre comes from the Anglo-based cultural-political perspective. The mainstream values of the British society that comply with the dominant ideologies, like imperialism and others, are presented in the narratives. Accordingly, the protagonist Jane represents the middle-class English women. Brontë empowers Jane with narrative authority; ideologically, they stand together or Brontë finds her reflection in Jane. Owing to this proximity, Yung-Hsing Wu charges the author, "Brontë is morally responsible for Jane. It's this dynamic that *The Madwoman in the Attic*, with its view that Jane was the instrument for Brontë's articulation of a female voice, would both put to use and reuse" (83). Brontë invites the criticisms from the Third-World feminists and other critics since she constructs the dichotomy between Jane and Bertha. She paints the image of Jane as stoic, progressive and independent whereas for Bertha, the negative portrayal as dependent, insane and wild. Bertha's constructed image and location becomes a literary archetype. The author complies

with the binary principle of the western structural belief. Consequently, she structures the narrative of center-margin relationship.

As Spivak examines the intersection of race, gender, class and nationality in the imperial discourse, *Jane Eyre* contains these embedded problems. As a middle-class feminist author, Bronte limits herself within parochial interests. Therefore, she does not rise above the national and racial ideologies. Her imagination of Bertha Mason reveals it. If she were a non-European author, role for Bertha would be different. In the line of my opinion, Barbara Smith views, “A black feminist approach to literature that embodies the realization that the politics of sex as well as the politics of race and class are crucially interlocking factors in the works of Black women writers is an absolute necessity” (2304). Thus, the tie of interlocking factors must be broken to neutralize the ideology of gender so that the woman, like Bertha, can get justice and liberation.

Bronte centralizes the values that she embraces through her favored character. Both Jane and her lover, Edward Rochester, get author’s sympathy but Bertha gets the treatment as if she is the embodiment of evil or unwanted ‘other’ who intrudes in the ideal Eden Garden. The author seems to celebrate the romantic love between Jane and Edward at the cost of Bertha’s deprivation and isolation. To justify Edward’s treatment to Bertha as a mad woman in the attic, the author employs the discourse of madness as Edward declares, “. . . I daresay you have many a time inclined your ear to gossip about the mysterious lunatic kept there under watch and ward. . . . I now inform you that she is my wife, whom I married fifteen years ago, - Bertha Mason by name . . .” (258). Owing to Bertha’s Jamaican nationality, such a derogatory image is constructed. Her revolt against her husband, Rochester, does not get approval from the author otherwise she would not be presented as committing suicide towards the end of the narrative. She remains like an alien throughout the story since the hostile world surrounds her. She is dumped as the symptomatic of insanity so that Rochester

can flirt with other young girls, like Jane. No attempts are made to cure Bertha's ailment if there is any. Rather, Rochester, an imperial patriarch, associates her insanity with her family. This shows that Bronte approves the ideological collusion between patriarchy and imperialism. Otherwise, Rochester would not be offered Jane like a reward for the abuse of Bertha and she would get his love or justice. A number of instances in the story illustrate that narrative centralizes the English characters: Jane and Rochester due to the identity politics. So, the nationalist and the sexist politics operate in the story. The difference is made due the English identity of Jane and Rochester and Jamaican of Bertha.

Why does the author entitle the novel as *Jane Eyre*, not Bertha Mason? It narrates Jane's story; Bertha is created to define Jane of European self. In the plot organization, narrative ends with the union between Jane and Rochester but Bertha commits suicide. Bertha's struggle is ended with defeat, without justice. The author orchestrates these fictional events under the influence of mainstream ideologies of nationalism and Eurocentrism.

To deconstruct the politics of center-margin, Jean Rhys reconstructs *Jane Eyre* in the subversive form of *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Written from the perspective of marginalized, Rhys's novel comes as an example of political consciousness that fights the suppressive ideologies in order to promote egalitarian values based on the principles of justice. For instance, she fields Christophine, a negro woman, who encourages Antoinette to be bold to face the challenges. Christophine affirms, "Woman must have spunks to live in this wicked world" (92). So, Rhys takes a radical political departure from the imperial legacy towards the construction of inclusive political culture that safeguards human dignity and freedom so that no new Bertha will emerge from the imperial mindset. Through the alternative narratives, the dissident authors, like Rhys, critically examine the hegemonic narratives that institutionalize the social disparities, and they explore the possibilities for addressing such problems.

In *Wide Sargasso Sea*, power shifts to Jamaican Antoinette who is transformed from Bertha of *Jane Eyre*. Unlike dehumanized position of Bertha, Antoinette holds meaningful position since she holds the dominant narrative perspective. Her husband gets limited space in the narrative unlike Rochester of *Jane Eyre*. She brings him to Jamaica who has to compromise his privileges of his homeland. Different from Bronte's monolithic and nationalized perspective in *Jane Eyre*, Rhys's narrative is dialogic since the narrative role shifts between Antoinette and the English man. Rhys allows the divergent views to flow. So, it seems to be polyphonic in Bakhtin's term. The discourse of the postcolonial novel is more heterogeneous and open in comparison to the monologic and close discourse of the colonial novel. Rhys frames the narrative to hit the imperial politics for the inclusive society where human dignity and freedom is respected. Her characters are creole, like Antoinette, black, like Christophine, and white, like Antoinette's husband. She allows all these voices to express their views. But in *Jane Eyre*, Bertha is a silenced figure who does not get space to hold meaningful conversation with others since insanity tagged against her invalidates for the discourse. Rochester discards her; he turns deaf ear to her plea. Whereas, in Rhys's story, all the characters get the privilege of expressing their views openly. Antoinette shares her views with the colonial man who does not love her. Both hold the freedom of expression. The marginal characters, black servants, like Christophine get the space to articulate their views. So, rather than excluding the differences, the inclusive narrative of Rhys creates the possibility of negotiation across the differences.

Rhys sets *Wide Sargasso Sea* in Jamaica otherwise a marginal location in *Jane Eyre*. To promote the Caribbean identity, she contextualizes the narrative in Jamaica. Rhys connects the character with the place as they have a reciprocal relationship. Like others, she chooses the peripheral place to set the priority. For instance, Bronte sets the story in England, whereas Rhys does so in Jamaica mostly. In *Wide Sargasso Sea*, the English man marries

Antoinette and stays in Jamaica; only later comes to Thornfield, England with her where she is confined. But in *Jane Eyre*, Bertha is brought to Thornfield after the marriage who lives there until her death. Identity politics motivates these different choices. As the story of *Jane Eyre* is reshaped, the creativity of Rhys makes space for the dissident voice. In this context, Linda Hutcheon's view is relevant, "Adaptation is repetition, but repetition without replication" (7). She sees the possibility of appropriation while using somebody's work. Further, she puts, "For every aggressive appropriator outed by a political opponent, there is a patient salvager" (8). The politically motivated appropriator anticipates a consequence of meaningful change through the narrative alteration as Rhys does in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. For the shift in location in comparison to *Jane Eyre*, the departure to address the problem of nationalism plays the key role. A place has a connection with identity. Accordingly, Rhys foregrounds the Caribbean identity through her place and characters. This way, she questions the peripheral position given to Jamaica in Bronte's narrative.

To change the narrative perspective, Rhys transforms some key elements of *Jane Eyre* and adds others. To illustrate, in Bronte's narrative, Rochester attempts to hide Bertha from social eyes, so confines to the attic, "of whose secret inner cabinet she has now for ten years made a wild beast's den- goblin's cell" (273). But this hidden marginal character of Bronte is transformed into Antoinette by Rhys. The suppressed peripheral figure in *Jane Eyre* gets the position of protagonist in *Wide Sargasso Sea* who not only lives in her native land but also brings the English man to live with her. So, unlike Rochester of Bronte's story, this man gets weaker role. "Being in a 'marginal' position, he cannot explore the possibility of a male subjectivity which does not participate in the masculine narrative of self-definition" (Voicu 457). As Christina-Georgiana Voicu investigates, this man who is not given any name by Rhys, feels severely limited or like castrated in psychoanalytical term. He fails to impose his imperial masculine authority on Antoinette and her black servant, Christophine. Owing to the

hostile situation, he feels like an alien among the natives. It is the location that empowers Antoinette but for the man, it diminishes his power. To question the suppressive role of Rochester, Rhys significantly alters his position and offers more space to Antoinette for her meaning role.

To address the problem of imperialism and its ideologies as represented in *Jane Eyre*, Rhys expresses her postcolonial views through the characters. Christophine from Martinique represents the indigenous identity; she supports Antoinette to defy authority of the man. Though English authority circulates an arrest warrant against her for practicing the magic, obeah, she shows no sign of fear rather challenges, “No police here. No chain gang, no tread machine, no dark jail either. This is a free country and I am free woman” (145). Rhys tries to justify the views and actions of Antoinette and Christophine for they represent the peripheral voices. Like obeah, native language empowers them. Christophine speaks Patois along with English, the imperial language, for the indigenous identity. Through language and ritual that the author locates in Jamaica, she seeks the Caribbean identity.

In *Jane Eyre*, Rochester acts like a wanton hero who places pleasure over moral expectations. He flirts with women that he likes. He gets money from Bertha’s family and indulges in lavishes. His amorous desires lead him to Italy, France and other parts of Europe where he makes the mistresses. He narrates about his romantic wanderings:

For long ten years I roved about, living first in one capital, then another: sometimes in St. Petersburg; oftener in Paris; occasionally in Rome, Naples, and Florence. Provided with plenty of money and the passport of an old name, I could choose my own society: no circles were closed against me. I sought my ideal of a woman amongst English ladies, French Countesses, Italian signoras, and German grafinnen. (274)

Finally, his eyes settle on Jane and gets crazy for her. This patriarch Rochester is

appropriated by Rhys in her narrative as a lonely figure in the strange land with the people of different race and nationality. The English man's weaker position in *Wide Sargasso Sea* holds political significance since Rhys strategically strips the privileges of the male imperial figure of *Jane Eyre*. For instance, Antoinette drugs him for sex and mocks his sexuality.

Rhys organizes the plot of the narrative differently from *Jane Eyre*. The ending of her story marks the success of her mission because Antoinette escapes from the attic of Thornfield. She steals the key; opens the door; escapes with a candle in her hand at night. Rhys presents her protagonist as victorious at the end since she gets liberation from the trauma of oppressive man who hates her. Unlike Bertha who commits suicide, Antoinette keeps her consciousness alive which leads her to freedom. Bronte's concern with her Anglo-centric nationality and identity produces the image of Bertha which undergoes transformation in Rhys's hand since she disapproves the biased representation. Furthermore, Antoinette's freedom holds the symbolic meaning as it is the consequence of the battle against the oppressive ideologies of regionalism, nationalism and gender.

Contestation of Ideologies

Ideologies influence our beliefs. So, Louis Althusser views that we live in ideologies. Intentionally or unintentionally the authors express the ideologies in the texts. Due to the inclination to different ideologies, societies are divided and clash against each other. The narratives develop for and against the ideologies. For instance, in the discourse of *Jane Eyre*, the imperial ideologies: race, gender, class and others intersect. The author seems to be sensitive to the expectations of the Victorian England in her expression because she constructs the roles of characters, like Jane, in the context of Victorian time.

Shakespeare draws criticisms owing to his compliance with the imperial ideologies. The *Tempest* narrates the story of European man's state affair. Like in *Robinson Crusoe*, Prospero, the white man, as a protagonist, stands against the distorted image of native

Caliban. Ideologies of race, gender, class and nationality intersect in this text. To illustrate, Prospero expresses his disgust of Caliban, with Ariel, “Dull thing, I say so: he that Caliban/ Whom now I keep in service” (115). This expression is racially motivated. It exposes the contradiction of master-slave relation enforced by the imperial power.

Shakespeare empowers Prospero with different means. As guns support Crusoe, bookish knowledge and magic discourse empower Prospero. In both the texts, the ideology of savagery is used to justify the actions of the protagonists in the name of civilization. For instance, In *The Tempest*, Prospero’s daughter, Miranda, claims the ownership of civilizing Caliban:

Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
 . . . when thou didst not, savage,
 know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like
 A thing most brutish, I endowed thy purposes
 With words that made them known. But thy vile race. . . (119)

Miranda reminds Caliban how was his condition before she taught him. He did not know how to speak. She affirms that how good she is for Caliban of vile race as she belongs to civilization.

Shakespeare adopts the belief of good versus evil to justify the colonial intervention. Prospero claims to be a good savior who releases Ariel from the prison of Sycorax. He states that he is kind to Caliban. Missionaries use artificial benevolence as a means to justify their presence in others’ places. So, in *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon argues, “When the colonialist bourgeois realizes it is impossible to maintain its domination over the colonies, it decides to wage a rearguard campaign in the field of culture, values, and technology etc.” (9). When other things face their limitations, the colonizer makes use of supernatural elements as ideologies. Prospero does so to terrorize the native and control. In the name of overcoming

the evils that exist beyond the civilized world of Europe, the imperialists disguise themselves as good. So, the good claims to neutralize the evils.

The ideology of morality also can be the useful means for the imperialists to legitimize their actions of self-interest. In *The Tempest*, morality is defined from Prospero's perspective. He takes his brother, Antonio's actions as immoral as he deposes him from the power of Dukedom. For this, he wants to take revenge against Antonio and the king of Naples who helped Antonio. He causes the tempest to punish them. But he does not feel immoral while taking over Caliban's island. He not only seizes the island but also abuses Caliban as a slave. So, the moral ideology that Shakespeare employs serves the interest of the colonizer, Prospero.

With regard to gender ideology, like in *Robinson Crusoe*, *The Tempest* is the narrative of men's perspectives. The actors of the conflict are men. Shakespeare builds the narrative around men's roles. So, it does not surprise that he chooses the male, Prospero, to colonize the island and perform other manly jobs. Political leadership is not for women in this play. So, the peripheral role that Miranda gets is under the regulation of her patriarch father. She does not have to face the man's challenges but remain modest, beautiful and submissive to meet the masculine expectations. Ferdinand as a man has to prove his manliness through corporeal strength, like lifting the logs of firewood, so that he can impress her and meet her father's conditions to get his approval for the union. So, Miranda shifts the role from Prospero's daughter to Ferdinand's wife. She is not made in the narrative to stand in her own rather under a man's care.

Cesaire's *A Tempest* is an attempt to bridge the divisions based on race and class by critiquing the hegemonic ideologies that operate in *The Tempest*. He reconfigures Shakespeare's narrative with the Postcolonial political orientation to subvert the colonial discourse of *The Tempest*. He appropriates it to make political intervention. Appropriation is

like an adaptation. Linda Hutcheon argues that works in adaptation are not only received but created on human experiential context and that allows the space for intertextuality (Preface). The political strategy of Césaire is to neutralize the discourse of race, gender and others.

To address racial injustice, Césaire radicalizes Caliban as African in *A tempest*. Owing to Prospero's subjection, Caliban awakes with consciousness for human dignity and freedom. His attempts are to decolonize himself and the island. By drawing African identity, Césaire seems to be concerned about the indigenous values that the invader, like Prospero, suppresses to promote the imperial culture. To protect them, he underscores the necessity of indigenous solidarity to fight the invader. To illustrate, Ariel expresses his solidarity with Caliban, "after all we are brothers, brothers in suffering and slavery, but brothers in hope as well. We both want our freedom" (20). This brotherhood, symbolically associates with Negritude, an African Movement, for their identity and interest. He raises the issue of black people in slavery through Caliban. This is likely the reason that unlike Shakespeare's Caliban, Césaire characterizes Caliban as a black man who stands as an evidence of slavery and colonization.

The intertextual critique is noticeable in *A Tempest*. The modified role of Caliban reflects it. He does not surrender to the authority of Prospero rather he makes the mockery of his power. For example, he passes the negative comment on Prospero who calls Caliban ugly, "with that big hooked nose, you look just like some old vulture" (11). When Prospero claims the ownership for teaching Caliban, he retorts, "that's not true. You didn't teach me a thing!" (11). So, the debate continues between them since Caliban refuses to accept Prospero's superiority based on his race and nationality.

In terms of class politics, Prospero acts as a ruling class dictator who seizes the resources from Caliban and converts him into an underclass slave who has to serve the master for his living. Césaire, through Caliban, aims at dismantling the class hierarchy between the

ruler and the ruled or master-slave relationship so that a person, like Caliban, may end his exploitation done by the ruler, like Prospero. Significantly, Caliban does not stop dreaming for freedom and his battle continues for it. The author gives open ending for the possibilities of liberation of the underprivileged from the oppressor.

Intertextuality between *Robinson Crusoe* and *Foe* is another example of ideological clash. Like in *Jane Eyre*, racial and other ideological issues of *Robinson Crusoe* invite contestation. Intentionally or unintentionally the authors express ideologies in their texts. In *The Foucault Reader*, Foucault argues, “One can say that the author is an ideological product, since we represent him as the opposite of his historically real function. . .” (119). Foucault believes that authors are not free from ideologies. Daniel Defoe is no exception from it. The role that he assigns to Crusoe reveals what beliefs surround the author. Crusoe’s story represents the Anglo-European values that are expressed through the colonial activities of Crusoe. So, it serves as a means to propagate the imperial ideologies.

Crusoe’s adventure from Europe to the Americas and beyond is associated with the imperial assumption that the White people hold the potentiality to penetrate the world and gain prosperity and other political success. Moreover, they can be useful to the non-Europeans in terms of learning the values from them. So, the narrative of Defoe works as a political discourse to institutionalize the imperial ideologies. Crusoe, shaped as a model figure, represents the European assumptions. For instance, he narrates what he shared with Friday, “I describ’d to him the country of Europe, and particularly England, which I came from, how we liv’d, how we worshipped God. . .” (175). Crusoe takes pride on belonging to the European world. The master-slave relation between Crusoe and Friday reflects the author’s colonial mentality that views the relation between the European and the non-European in terms of power hierarchy or ruler and ruled. To illustrate, what Crusoe said to Friday, “taught him to say master, then let him know that was to be my name. . .” (163). In

the wilderness, both need each other for the survival. Rather than taking him as a friend, Crusoe takes him as a slave and teaches him to internalize such relation. He cannot think beyond the ruler's role for the European self. The author creates Friday for this purpose. The implied meaning is that without European civilization, the savages would remain the savages. The author endeavors to justify the European political intervention in other parts of the world.

In various ways, Crusoe attempts to impress the slave, Friday, that he belongs to the better world. So, he pretends to do good for Friday. Crusoe wears the mask of idealized representations to project his better image. This mask is the embodiment of colonial ideology. Therefore, Antonio Gramsci argues that hegemony is maintained through consent rather than coercion. Crusoe talks about Christian God, European ways of living. They are not like savages who eat human flesh, rather grow their own food etc. Using such rhetoric, he tries to place himself above Friday. Probably, Friday would not recognize Crusoe's superior status if he did not wear the mask of civilization and possess the guns. For example, Crusoe describes how the gun scared Friday and he reacted, "he came and kneel'd down to me, and embracing my knees, said a great many things I did not understand. . . to pray me not to kill him" (166). Without gun, he is like Friday with primitive tools. This colonial weapon empowers him.

Like a gun, Christianity is used as an ideological tool to gain power and rationalize the imperial actions. As the missionary, they try to convert the non-Christian into the Christian so that the European cultures can be promoted. Crusoe takes the ownership of converting Friday, "The savage was now a good Christian, a much better than I . . ." (174). Defoe needs a savage, like Friday, to define a civilized and religious person, like Crusoe. Otherwise, how does he rationalize the imperial ideologies?

In case of gender inclusiveness, Defoe offers no space for women in a man's job, like adventure, colonial leadership and others. So, Crusoe's world is man's world. As a patriarch, he accomplishes the colonial project. What happens if a woman were given the job of

Crusoe? Defoe could not imagine in that line. Rather, his man is offered the challenges; he overcomes them; returns home as a hero. Thus, gender colludes with the imperial politics.

Another ideology that intersects with race and gender in *Robinson Crusoe* is class. The ideology of class nurtures a dream in Crusoe to be a master and rule the subordinate class. The division of labor based on capitalism builds imperial economy. This is reflected in Crusoe's relation with Friday. Crusoe subjects Friday since he does not own the means and resources, like weapons, live stocks, goats and shelter. He is subservient to Crusoe as the latter owns the resources. Behind Crusoe's venture, one of the key motivations is economic gain. This factor drives him to slave-trade, plantation in Brazil and other engagements. So, capitalism enhances colonialism since they are reciprocal.

Foe challenges the aforesaid ideologies that operate in *Robinson Crusoe*. Coetzee's disruptive narrative opens the possibilities for the new political relation that safeguards human dignity and freedom. In this sense, *Foe* is an attempt to break the tradition of orthodoxy that rationalizes the social disparities under the disguise of the political and the cultural ideologies. So, without combatting the oppressive ideologies, like racism and extreme nationalism, it is difficult to disrupt the asymmetrical relation between the mainstream and the periphery. Coetzee's attack on Crusoe's racist view and class politics is the manifestation of the former's disapproval of the hegemonic ideologies.

The male-centric Crusoe's story is intervened by a woman's voice in *Foe*. Coetzee positions Susan Barton in a leading role by minimizing the role of Crusoe. As Susan holds the narrative perspective, the power of Crusoe of *Foe* is diminished in comparison to the authority of Defoe's Crusoe. So, Susan is not just a castaway person struggling for the survival, she is conscious of human relationship across races and nationalities. Since Crusoe's narrative glorifies the English nationality and other nationals are defined in relation to it, a critique is needed on such relation. Coetzee does so through Friday of African nationality. Susan

attempts to frame her own narrative based on her experiences on the island with Crusoe and Friday. Through Susan, Coetzee exemplifies that a woman can also set out on adventure or certain mission and face the challenges, like a man. To compare with Crusoe, she is more conscious, dynamic in actions and more powerful. She rescues Crusoe when he falls sick. Coetzee breaks the masculine tradition of story writing. Conventionally in a narrative, a man sets out in search of a lost person or takes adventurous works, like Defoe's Crusoe does. But for a woman, this role would not be supposed as suitable. Susan sets out from Europe in search of her lost daughter; in this process, she confronts many challenges in the unknown territories. She proves to be brave enough to rescue herself since she has been discarded in the sea by the mutinous men of a ship. Consequently, she enters into the world of Crusoe and becomes the part of its narrative. She wants to give shape to her experiences in the narrative but she wants the narrative to be constructed in the way she likes not in the way Defoe wants to create, "It is still in my power to guide and amend. Above all, to withhold. By such means do I still endeavour to be father to my story" (123). Susan desires to give birth to a story where a woman, like Crusoe, does what she likes him to do. This compelling presence of a woman in men's world questions the gender barrier.

Beside gender, the ideologies of race and nationality come under Coetzee's scrutiny. For this purpose, he identifies Friday as a black African mute. To contest the ideologies of the mainstream, the author stands closer to the periphery. With the use of oppositional ideology of African identity, Coetzee assaults on the colonial enterprises, like slave trade presented in *Robinson Crusoe*. So, Coetzee's Friday is an example of a consequence of colonialism that practiced slavery. The author brings the marginalized and suppressed: woman and a black slave in solidarity against the colonial-patriarchal subjugation. He modifies Crusoe's role. He no longer sings the glory of his nation and race, like Defoe's Crusoe does with Friday. Rather, he remains silent most of the time and busies in making the

terraces without seeds to plant. His works seem nonproductive and absurd unlike of Crusoe's who is presented as innovative and productive as he produces food grains, manages livestock and does other works. Why does Coetzee make Cruso so dull and insensitive? Why is he detached from his European identity and power? Neither he possesses any guns nor any other important tools. He even does not keep the record of his stay-time on the island in the calendar. He does not seem to be conscious about these things. His imperial identity constructed by Defoe is stripped by Coetzee. He crusades for the justice of racially victimized, like Friday. Author's ironical depiction of Crusoe's actions and death symbolizes the declining strength of colonialism as it meets resistance across the world.

Defoe builds the narrative of duality between civilization and savagery. To obliterate this division, Coetzee modifies the roles of the characters: Crusoe and Friday. His Crusoe does not glorify his own race, religion, civilization and nation. But in Defoe's narrative, he scatters the images of savages to legitimize the role of Crusoe. Crusoe rescues Friday from the cannibals and inculcates the Christian values to transform him. But Coetzee removes this part of rescue and encounters with the savages. Rather, he creates uncertainty about the existence of savage-cannibals as Susan narrates, "No pirates landed on our shores, freebooters, no cannibals save yourself if you can be called a cannibal" (81). The ideology of savagery is employed in *Robinson Crusoe* which is questioned in *Foe*. Thus, the problems of dominant ideologies demand a political departure from Defoe's narrative.

In *Jane Eyre*, the ideologies of class and nationality surface in the choice of the protagonist, Jane, from the English background. In addition, the love affair between Jane and Edward succeeds but the marriage between Edward and Bertha fails. Ideologies seem to work either to make their marriage successful or failure. Since Bertha comes from Jamaica, it makes the difference in the marital relation. The wisdom and beauty of Jane contrasted with Bertha's insanity and grotesque image reveal the ideological biasedness of the author.

In terms of gender, even being a woman author, Bronte's feminism limits within the parochial interests. Therefore, Chris K. Vanden Bossche critiques *Jane Eyre* by mentioning the views of Spivak and Kaplan. Bossche examines, "Drawing on Post-Structuralist, Post-Colonial, and Marxist methodologies, they argued that the feminism of *Jane Eyre* was a white middle-class feminism built on series of exclusions of racial and class others. . ." (53). Probably, from the western women, Bronte gets admiration for the growth of Jane but from the non-Western world, she invites criticisms for drawing the division between the women characters. In one hand, she creates the gulf between the women of different nationality, on the other, she complies with the patriarchal ideology since she builds the narrative around Rochester who subjects women. Jane submits herself to him.

For Fredric Jameson, "Texts are made out of cultural and ideological norms" (qtd. in Frow 45); they bear the traces of ideologies. It applies in the case of *Jane Eyre*. Rochester reveals that monetary interest motivated his family for his marriage to Bertha Mason, "My father and my brother, Rowland knew all this; but they thought only of the thirty thousand pounds, and joined in the plot against me" (270). He blames his father and brother for the marriage as it is connected to money. They compromise on the nationality of Bertha for money. Consequently, the marriage fails; Bertha is made like dead in living condition. Bertha's commodification through monetary transaction uncovers the tie between patriarchy and capitalism that compromises Bertha's freedom to choose a partner that she likes. Moreover, the assumption that English man is superior for the Jamaican girl is expressed through monetary transaction for the marriage.

Capitalism promotes individualism. It gives recognition to individual achievements; social relations based on collective strength are overshadowed by individualism. Excessive self-centered orientation weakens social relationship and compromises with obligations. The author overvalues Jane's individuality and her personal achievements, like education from

Lowood, job of a governess and her love with Rochester. What are the social agendas that Bronte sets for Jane to accomplish? The author overlooks the social agendas as she concentrates on individuality. As a woman author, she fails to raise the socio-political agendas to fight against the gender ideology.

Jane Eyre idealizes Anglo-European cultural values; the narrative shows that European values are for others to learn from. For instance, St. John, a British missionary, advocates for the sacrifice to upgrade to spiritually, “Don’t cling so tenaciously to ties of the flesh; save your constancy and ardour for an adequate cause; forbear to waste them on trite transient objects” (346). However, St. John fails to implement this in his own life. He is desperately after Jane for marriage but she refuses to marry him. The author overlooks the internal contradictions within the European society. She foregrounds the hobbies, likes and dislikes of Mr. Rochester. Most important, he is offered the reward of love of Jane. Ironically, it seems that he gets a reward for dumping the Caribbean woman after marriage. The discourse of madness is used to justify Rochester’s actions. He declares, “Bertha Mason is mad and she came of a mad family. . .” (258). So, the gender injustice is practiced under the influence of national ideology.

Religious ideology also runs in the novel as a means to support the claim of European civilization’s values from which the world can benefit. Christianity becomes the means for the missionary to enter into the culture and politics of the Third World. Like Defoe in *Robinson Crusoe* and Shakespeare in *The Tempest*, Bronte invents savages to define the European civilization. To illustrate, St. Johns Rivers in *Jane Eyre* intends to travel to India to propagate Christian values so that the Indian can be transformed. But alone he does not want to go to the mission; he wants Jane to marry him and go with him. Jane refuses this proposal of marriage but may go as a sister. He argues, “How can we be forever together? Sometimes

in solitude, sometimes amidst savage tribes and unweid" (361). Here, he mentions Indian tribal people as 'savage'. And his mission as the white man is to civilize them.

Wide Sargasso Sea interrogates the ideologies that operate in *Jane Eyre*. Jean Rhys employs the oppositional ideologies to fight the ideologies that comply with imperialism. So, writing from the marginal perspective, Rhys investigates the narrative of *Jane Eyre* to uncover the hegemonic discourses that serve the European interests and promote its values. She fields Antoinette to resist the Victorian cultural codes that subject women. Bronte tries to meet those expectations but Rhys defies them. Unlike Jane who complies with cultural decorum, like modesty for women, religious education and skills for domestic courses, Antoinette lives in more carefree way. She drinks alcohol and expresses her sexual desires openly. She loves freedom and is sensitive to her identity and people around her. Through her, Rhys dissents the biased treatment against the marginalized women, like Bertha of *Jane Eyre*. To address this problem, she shapes the consciousness of her protagonist. Rhys raises the social agendas, like identity discrimination against Antoinette, her mother and others. Ideologically, Rhys attempts to combat against race, gender, class and nationality which intersect. So, her postcolonial text is disruptive; it is like that Helen Cixous's views on the power of woman's writing, "A feminine text cannot fail to be more than subversive. It is volcanic; as it is written, it brings about an upheaval. . . there's no other way" (2051). So, a woman's writing like of Rhys's does have the potentiality to shake the foundation of patriarchy.

Rhys makes use of indigenous agency to combat the imperial power. In the story, "Antoinette Cosway and Christophine use magic to fight back against a colonizing force" (Cutter 131). Rhys uses the ideology of magic power to challenge the colonial man. Christophine, the black obeah woman, represents indigenous identity of Afro-Caribbean people who have experienced the colonial brutalities. In the postcolonial context, they are

aware of their history and cultural heritage. Consequently, through the literary discourses, like *Wide Sargasso Sea*, they express their dissidence against the imperial subjection. For illustration, Rhys creates a hostile situation in Jamaica for the English man who undergoes suffocation, “I feel very much a stranger here. I feel that this place is my enemy and on your side” (117). He refers ‘your side’ for Antoinette. The man feels dislocated in Jamaica.

Rhys mocks some values which are idealized in *Jane Eyre*. For instance, the love between the white racial characters: Jane and Rochester is removed in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Rather, the man hates Antoinette owing to her Jamaican background. Antoinette reveals, “Christophine, he does not love me, I think he hates me” (99). Through this relation, Rhys projects that hatred is connected to the divisions among humanity brought by the parochial interests of imperialism. Love as an ideology can be used as a political tool to justify certain relations of people that one favors. Bronte employs this in case of Jane and Edward. Otherwise, why does the story end in reconciliation between them? Why is Rochester crazy for Jane but hates his wife, Bertha? He confesses, “I longed only for what suited me - for the antipodes of the creole and I longed vainly” (274). So, the author plays between love and hate relationship influenced by the ideologies.

Rhys attacks explicitly on the patriarchal values in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Antoinette’s husband has to compromise with his imperial masculine identity as he stays in Jamaica. Rhys does not give any name to him in the narrative. So, this man is like a fellow who has lost his name. He lives in crisis because neither he can love Antoinette nor he can forsake her. About Antoinette, she struggles for liberation from the subjection of the man at Thornfield and finally achieves it. Through her liberation, Rhys justifies the worth of ideological war fought to disrupt the binaries of unequal treatment done in *Jane Eyre*. She exposes the contradictions in Bronte’s text and undertakes the project of reforming it to address them.

Politics behind Construction, Interpretation and Appropriation of Texts

The succeeding authors politically interpret and appropriate the mainstream narratives to end the disparities represented in them. To address the problems of race, gender, class and nationality, they use strategies. They use indigenous identity, modify the role of characters and give them local language, and set the narrative in the marginalized societies, like the Caribbean.

Like *Robinson Crusoe*, *The Tempest* is not free from the imperial politics. Set in the contest of Shakespeare's time, it deals with the Anglo-European interests of essentializing the European values as universal model of learning for the non-European worlds. Like Defoe, Shakespeare fails to set his work free from the parochial interests of race and nationality. The role of Prospero in *The Tempest* shows this. The Eurocentric identity seems to motivate the author in the choice of the actions of the play. To illustrate, Prospero's concern is how to gain and exercise power. Though usurped by his brother, Antonio, from his dukedom of Milan, he does not forsake his desire for political power. This desire is expressed in colonial role at the island of Caliban. So, Caliban disapproves Prospero's tyranny and claims, "This island's mine by Sycorax my mother, / which thou tak'st from me" (118). Caliban reveals the colonial politics of Prospero who gains knowledge from the books and uses it to exercise power.

The one who owns the resources, gains the power. It applies with Prospero. He owns the material resources of the island as well as knowledge of sorcery to control others. But Caliban as a conscious rebel, does not accept Prospero's coercion silently. He confronts him verbally and hatches political conspiracy. For instance, he conspires with Stephano to murder Prospero, "There thou mayst brain him, / Having first seized his books; or with a log / Batter his skull, or Paunch him with a stake, / or cut his wezand with thy knife" (167). Though

Caliban fails to finish Prospero's life, he does not feel guilty for it rather admits his poor planning. His efforts are important as he tries to end the master-slave class politics.

Racial problem surfaces since the author constructs the image of Caliban as an ugly looking and filthy savage. As the projection of body tells about the view of the projector, the image of Caliban raises the question about the intention of the author. The imagination of Caliban as a character in this form reveals that ideologies influence the artistic creation. Why the native has to be aesthetically repulsive in characterization? To illustrate the racial hatred, Prospero abuses Caliban, "Thou most lying slave, / Whom stripes may move, not kindness! I have used thee, / Filth as thou art, . . ." (118). This is the colonial language of suppression. There are other instances in the story that show the problems of oppressive ideologies.

Gender remains entangled in imperial politics in *The Tempest*. Like Defoe, Shakespeare celebrates men's accomplishments. So, his narrative revolves around a man, specially a European man to meet the expectations of the then patriarchal society. He endows both corporeal and intellectual strengths to the man protagonist. For example, Miranda is characterized with beauty and remains docile and innocent whereas her father with his intellectual strength maintains his hegemony. He takes the risks and faces the challenges for the political leadership but Miranda's subjectivity is not shaped for such ventures. The question is why Shakespeare approves the convention of crafting the narratives upholding the gender values? It seems that he practices the ideologies in art intentionally or unintentionally. More important matter is what is the impact of such oppressive ideologies that run in the narratives in human relations.

A Tempest expresses the alternative view of Cesaire. He investigates *The Tempest* to uncover the political issues. To address the colonial politics, he appropriates the key elements of the narrative of Shakespeare, like characters, language, plot and others. He appropriates Caliban as African slave from a mere slave in *The Tempest*. In addition, the author empowers

Caliban with African language that he employs as a tool to demand his freedom. This Caliban holds the potentiality to argue for his liberation. To counter the racial oppression, he Africanizes Caliban. Probably the author finds his own reflection in the image of Caliban owing to his own experiences of racial subjugation. In this context, Locksley Edmondson views that Césaire's attack on the western world and its values is based on experiences of imperial dominations and racism (95). Césaire understands the necessity of radicalizing the oppressed Caliban to break free from the colonial shackles. Even the Gods act in radical ways in *A Tempest*. The God, Eshu defies the conventional moral code in his expression of sexuality with Goddess Ceres and Juno. He sings:

Eshu is a merry elf,
And he can whip you with his dick,
He can whip you,
He can whip you (48)

Juno poses the moral question for such expression; she calls it “disgusting”. Césaire's political protest touches mythical dimension. So, Eshu deviates from the European Godly norms since the African God can defy the European moral codes. It is a political satire against the mainstream narratives that try to universalize the European values.

To expose the tie between the colonial politics and power, Césaire ends *A Tempest* with the decision of Prospero to continue living on the island with Caliban. He shows his unwillingness to renounce the colonial authority. The power of subjecting the natives intoxicates Prospero. He imagines what would happen to the island without him, “This isle is mute without me / my duty, thus, is here, / And here I shall stay” (67). Like Prospero, the imperialists question, who take care of the natives without them? The political satire of Césaire aims at the oppressors who do not renounce the occupation voluntarily rather they need to be defeated. This way, Césaire's Postcolonial orientation scrutinizes *The Tempest* to

subvert the imperial politics. Moreover, he envisions the new relations between the divided societies that rise above the narrow ideological frame.

Politics in *Robinson Crusoe* is a major issue to explore. Defoe's Eurocentric view is expressed through Crusoe's roles. For instance, Crusoe narrates what he said to Friday, "I describ'd to him the country of Europe, and particularly England, which I came from; how we liv'd, how we worshipp'd God. . ." (175). The politics of nationality and race surfaces through the images of duality between Crusoe and Friday. Defoe imagines Friday as a savage to create a rescue mission for Crusoe. He goes to the extreme to shape Friday in human form but beast in his instincts. He eats raw food; has no idea how to cook. Human flesh is like another animal's flesh for him as he eats both. To illustrate:

Crusoe: Well Friday, and what does your nation do with the men they take, do they carry them away, and eat them, as these did?

Friday: yes, my nation eat man's too, eat all up. (169)

So, the belief of cannibalism that is supposed to exist among the tribal savages is the fabrication of the author to give the superior position to the colonial self. Crusoe takes the burden to teach Friday what is good and what is bad since he sets himself as a model for learning. The imperial politics constructs the defective world where savagery and ignorance exist so that it needs intervention from the ideal world that can mend its weaknesses, like of Friday's. The European good is supposed to neutralize the evils of alien societies.

Gender problem is another issue of *Robinson Crusoe*. Only the man is privileged to undertake the missionary adventure. So, Defoe's story is populated with men; women have no important role to play in Crusoe's story. For instance, Crusoe addresses the characters as "My men would fain have me given them leave to fall upon them at once in the dark . . ." (209). By using the term 'my men,' he hints that no women are present. So, an exploration was expected as a man's job. What would be if Crusoe were a female? Would she

be given the same role? In gender politics, a man writes the narrative from male's perspective and he makes a man protagonist. This is what Defoe does in *Robinson Crusoe*. As expected, in the world of savages also a male savage leads the group to adventure and wars. No female savage is present in Crusoe's story. For instance, Friday goes to the war not his wife and mother. Probably they are assigned to domestic courses.

Identity issue dominates the discourse of *Robinson Crusoe*. The character sketch of Crusoe and Friday illustrate whose identity the author promotes. Defoe constructs Crusoe's success story in connection to his nationality and race. For instance, Crusoe takes pride in his national products, "my goods being all *English* manufactures, such as cloth, stuffs, bays and things particularly valuable and desirable in the country. . . I bought me a *Negro* slave, and a *European* servant also. . ." (31). So, Crusoe's voyage transcends individuality of Crusoe and represents the European mission. His mercantile, plantation, survival on the island are dramatized to construct the image of European entrepreneurship and potentiality to face the challenges. Identity politics motivates the author to design the narrative around the European self.

Coetzee appropriates *Robinson Crusoe* as *Foe*. To question the Eurocentric perspective, he modifies the role of Crusoe and Friday. Through a new character, Susan Barton, he endeavors to break the male centric tradition of writing narrative from the imperial point of view. In *Foe*, Defoe's imperial hero Crusoe loses some colonial privileges. He is exposed to vulnerability, like disease, and dies. His death connotes the end of colonial occupation. As the European man dies, the masculine authority is over. Consequently, Susan's role gets prominence; she makes efforts to exercise power through the construction of narrative discourse. Despite Coetzee's explicit political intervention into the colonial narrative, some South African critics place a charge against him for being politically quiet and producing the novels that do not adequately address the historical-economic-political

realities (Macaskill and Colleran 432). The literary discourse of *Foe* may not meet the political expectations of the public but it is not devoid of politics as it disrupts the imperial discourse rhetorically. A number of instances from *Foe* support that events and contexts have political implications. Unlike in *Robinson Crusoe*, Coetzee disapproves the existence of savage tribes beyond Europe. Instead, to safeguard the native identity, he characterizes Friday as an African. Likewise, Susan's attempt to send Friday to his homeland indicates that Friday is no more slave and does have indigenous right to live where he belongs since he has been dislocated by colonialism. His dislocation from Arica has a political significance as it is the product of imperialism that is responsible for the enslavement of Africans. So, the narrative of *Foe* is a political protest against the historical subjugation of the Africans. It is an attempt to combat the racial ideology. Susan's support for Friday speaks about the solidarity between the marginalized blacks and women. Probably, Coetzee sees the possibility of justice for the marginal through the unity among themselves. The renarration of *Robinson Crusoe* by Coetzee explores the possibility of addressing the prime causes of marginalization.

Coetzee also assaults on capitalism which commodifies humanity into an object as they have to sell their labor. Human values are converted into monetary relation. It contributes for the loss of human dignity and harmony. So, money works as a motivating factor, a cause, of social disparity. Due to the disproportionate distribution of resources, the marginalized are exploited. So, Spivak lambasts the exploitation of disenfranchised, like Friday. Coetzee spotlights on the ills of Capitalism that motivates colonialism. For instance, master-slave relation between Cruso and Friday is its product. Friday, who lost his tongue under slavery, cannot articulate his own voice. Others misrepresent him in the way they like. Symbolically, Coetzee foregrounds Friday to express his political dissent against the imperial politics that subjects the interracial natives. Unlike Defoe's Friday who is transformed by the imperial teaching, his Friday is nonconformist who cannot be changed through teaching. He

remains as he is. So, the author seems to imply that the natives, like Africans, want to live in the cultural ways they prefer. They refuse to embrace the colonial civilization, like Friday does. Though symbolical, Friday's position gives the message that the marginalized societies should remain independent to decide what is good for them. The imposed values and identity contradict with the indigenous culture and identity.

Jane Eyre is also a subversive narrative as it opposes some orthodox practices. However, it embraces the ideologies that foster imperialism and colonialism. Brontë's European feminism partially succeeds to work for women since it exclusively works in the interest of the European women. Jane, an English girl, struggles against some cultural and institutional barriers, like abuse in the care-family, mistreatment at the orphanage school etc. Except such limited achievements, *Jane Eyre* fails to address the fundamental political problems like gender, class, race, and others. Brontë's political orientation is limited to the interests of white middle-class European society. So, Chandra Talpade Mohanty critiques the western women writers who are self-centered and ignore the problems of Third-World women. She argues that western feminism appropriates the Third World differences in order to colonize the women of distinct classes, religions, races etc. (260). In case of *Jane Eyre*, the author's feministic politics discriminates the Caribbean Bertha Mason who is made the victim of identity politics. She is characterized as excluded 'other' since she comes from the Third World. So, the author presents the divided worlds of two women and promotes one at the cost of other.

Jane Eyre reflects the connection between capitalism and a man's power. It values the Eurocentric capitalistic economy under the control of men. For example, Edward Rochester takes money from Bertha's parents and discards her. He confesses that he married Bertha for money. Mr. Mason, the father of Bertha "could and would give" to Rochester's family "a fortune of thirty thousand pound" (269). So, the matter was settled. Since Bertha is dumped

as mad, nobody questions Edward's treatment to her except Richard Mason, her brother, from Jamaica.

The European planters would use the Caribbean islands for plantation to earn. Capitalism empowered them to enforce imperialism. Though Mason family is an English one who owned plantation in the Caribbean, over the time, they lose tie with the mainland politics of Europe and became like other non-European islanders.

Beside the problem of class and nationalism, the problem of gender is explicit in Jane Eyre. While promoting Jane, she denigrates Bertha. The ideologies of nationality, gender and class intersect in the imperial politics. For instance, what support Rochester to act like a Byronic hero who flirts with women? His nationality and gender identity empower him to abuse his legal wife as mad. Bronte as a product of imperial society, internalizes its values. She fails to rise above the imperial ideologies, like narrow nationalism and the racial supremacy. Consequently, *Jane Eyre* represents such political color. Moreover, she does not make adequate efforts to break the collusion between patriarchy and imperialism. Rather, her feminism is entangled with the imperial politics. It is ironical that a woman author's novel fosters gender politics. In order to meet the expectations of the European society, the author compromises with women's agendas.

Identity politics is obvious in the narrative of *Jane Eyre*. The author searches her own identity through the story. She seems to be aware that she belongs to the 19th century British society that nurtures the mainstream values. Probably, she meets the reflection of her own image in Jane due to the identification of European self in her. But Bertha exists as 'other' of the creator as she represents another part of the world. The idealized image of Jane and distorted image of Bertha speak themselves about the author's politics. The political discourse of Bronte works under the influence of British Nationalism and imperialism. Though identity is not stable as Stuart Hall views, "not an essence but a position. Hence,

there is always a politics of identity, a politics of position, which has no absolute guarantee in an unproblematic, transcendental ‘law of origin’” (113), it is the driving motivation for the construction of *Jane Eyre*. Unlike Immanuel Kant’s advocacy for the aesthetic value of a text, devoid of politics, I argue that a text, like *Jane Eyre*, contains identity politics. Difficult to believe, how is it possible to construct a narrative, where Jane and Bertha exist, without political motives?

Jean Rhys’s political interpretation of *Jane Eyre* produces *Wide Sargasso Sea*. As Bronte expresses the influence of imperial politics, Rhys responds with the postcolonial political vision. For it, Rhys first interprets *Jane Eyre* then appropriates it so that a different political discourse can be constructed in the interest of the marginalized, like the Third World women, black people and others. Rhys strategically targets politics of race, gender and class which are in tandem with imperialism. Trevor Hope argues that Rhys’s subversive return to *Jane Eyre* in reference to Thornfield Hall is a review of the novel’s discourse as an example of colonial discourse (51). The politics of colonial discourse is challenged by the anticolonial political discourse of *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Therefore, Rhys’s narrative is an alternative narrative that attempts to bridge the gulf between the individuals and societies caused by the ideological differences. She uses anticolonial-nationalist ideology for the autonomy of Caribbean and critiques the ideology of patriarchy for the freedom of women. So, she makes use of both postcolonial theory against colonialism and feminist discourse to battle against the ills of patriarchy.

To neutralize the gender politics presented in *Jane Eyre*, Rhys changes the perspective to empower a woman from Jamaica, otherwise a marginal character in Bronte’s narrative. Through Antoinette, the author defies the patriarchal codes. Unlike Jane’s Victorian feminine virtues, Antoinette displays gender neutral behavior like, outspoken on sexuality, contradicting and debating with her husband on the issues that she does not

approve. Unlike Jane, she does not compromise much to please the man. She lives the ways she likes. Probably, for this reason, he abuses her verbally, “a drunken lying lunatic-gone her mother’s way” (149). Different from Edward of *Jane Eyre*, this man is not privileged with masculine strength. Neither he can enjoy the married life with Antoinette nor discard her, like Rochester does to Bertha to gain Jane, rather he has to compromise with his imperial choices. Since he and Antoinette do not feel attracted to each other, he feels like castrated in Jamaica. In order to force him to have sex with Antoinette, she drugs him. So, he feels, “I have been poisoned” (125). In another context, he reveals, “I did not love her. I was thirsty for her, but that is not love” (85). Why does the author detach a man from a woman? It seems that political differences determine such relation as their ideologies clash.

As Spivak uncovers the intersection between race, gender and class, Rhys investigates these issues in *Jane Eyre*. Rather than addressing gender in isolation, it requires a common approach to break the tie between these elements. For instance, in *Jane Eyre*, Bertha’s suppression is owing to Creole Jamaican nationality. Probably, the author chooses to add the defect of madness to her as she belongs to the periphery in the colonial relation. Even the author attempts to validate Bertha’s madness with the support of medical discourse as Rochester narrates, “And I could not rid myself of it by any legal proceedings: for the doctors now discovered that my wife was mad. . .” (271). So, Bertha is the victim of gendered nationalism.

Identity is the motivation behind the discourse of *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Set in the Caribbean context, it speaks for the Jamaican identity by relocating the place from the setting of England in *Jane Eyre*. Rhys configures a bond between Afro-Caribbean servants and Antoinette in order to present the Caribbean solidarity against the imperial politics. They get agency through indigenous language. So, the characters, like Antoinette and Christophine, use Patois language that the English man does not understand and dislikes it. In addition, the

title of the story, *Wide Sargasso Sea* is associated with the Caribbean context. As Bronte writes from the European perspective, Rhys does so from the Caribbean perspective. She appropriates *Jane Eyre* to meet the political aim. Characterization, setting and the title, *Wide Sargasso Sea*, reflect the postcolonial reading of the former text by Rhys.

Conclusion

This analysis focused on reconstructing the colonial texts from the perspective of the margin uncovers that the divergent authors attempt to subvert the hegemonic ideologies that comply with imperialism. Rhys, Cesaire and Coetzee endeavor to reconstruct the narrative of literary history so that the suppressed voices and visions can be uncovered. For this purpose, they employ various strategies guided by the disruptive political orientations. For instance, Rhys transforms Bertha Mason of *Jane Eyre* into Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea* to raise the suppressed woman for justice.

The Tempest, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* represent the problematic ideologies of race, gender, class and nationality. To address these political issues, the aforementioned texts have been appropriated as *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, respectively. These texts reflect the postcolonial political orientations of the authors. Their subversive narratives emphasize the grievances of the peripherals, like women, poor and the people of color of the Third World.

Rhys, Cesaire and Coetzee appropriate the given titles, characters, setting and other elements to reframe the narratives so that they can address the problems of race, gender, class and nationality. With changes, they envision the alternative relations. To illustrate, Rhys foregrounds the Jamaican woman, Antoinette; Coetzee curtails the power of Crusoe by adding a new woman character, Susan in *Foe*; Cesaire appropriates Caliban as an African to resist colonialism that enslaved the African blacks. So, the narrative shifts of the succeeding

authors aim to fight the dominant ideologies to create the new egalitarian relations that comply with human dignity and freedom.

Since the narratives are the effective means to express the views, authors employ them as the space for the representative voices. So, it is likely that the literary narratives harbor the political interests. It applies in the context of the primary text of this study. The narratives reveal the positions of the authors and their ideological orientations. Intertextual strategy becomes productive to address the problematic representations and critique the flaws committed under the influence of different ideologies, like race, gender and class.

Chapter IV: Intertextual Differences in Representations: Critical Perspectives in Reproduction of Knowledge in the Selected Narratives

The claim of neutrality in representation invites debates as authors face the limitations to maintain neutrality due to ideological influences. Therefore, representations become the means to express the ideological orientations. Both the colonial and the postcolonial representations serve the political interests. In this sense, the literary works are also critical works because they are not free from the politics of representation. Thus, Stathis Gourgouris claims that a “critical work is never neutral and always takes place in a field of contention, this may often be a polemical task. It is always a political task” (84). The primary texts of this research reflect such inclinations.

Colonial and Postcolonial Representations: Disparities

The mainstream authors, like Defoe, under the influence of imperial ideologies, devise the perspectives that foster the hegemonic relation. In the same way, the postcolonial authors, like Césaire, raise the agendas of critiquing the dominant ideologies, decolonization, subversion of mainstream perspective and the recovery of silenced voices. In the context of this study, in terms of representation, to rewrite the literary texts means to contest the ideologies and representations presented in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*. Therefore, this study attempts to uncover the intersecting issues: race, gender and class to investigate the role of ideologies behind the construction of these texts. I view that *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* contest the former texts based on these issues. So, these texts are the products of political disagreements caused by the hegemonic ideologies that operate in the former texts.

The postcolonial authors raise the voices on behalf of the marginal, like underclass women, workers and the third world nationalities. However, their representations also suffer from the parochial interests and disparities. Intentionally or unintentionally, they approve the

social contradiction due to their failure to address dichotomies of race and class. To address such disparities in the postcolonial societies, Gayatri Spivak questions the conditions of gendered subalterns, underclass poor and other indigenous people who remain overlooked by the postcolonial nationalism that serves the interests of dominant ideologies, like capitalism and patriarchy. In the text, *In Other Worlds*, she critiques:

If nationalism is the only discourse credited with emancipatory possibilities in the imperialist theatre, then one must ignore the innumerable subaltern examples of resistance throughout the imperialist and pre-imperialist centuries, often suppressed by those very forces of nationalism which would be instrumental in changing the geopolitical conjuncture. . . . (338)

As I approve the view of Spivak on the limitations of postcolonial theories, I argue that the traditional postcolonial approaches are not substantial to bridge the divisions in the societies. We need more inclusive approaches to reach the suppressed women and other excluded groups. In this sense, I try to expose not only the problems in the representations of mainstream literary texts but also examine the limitations of the alternative representations. The contending authors, Aime Cesaire, J.M. Coetzee and Jean Rhys face the limitations to make their narratives more inclusive for the peripherals. So, I intend to examine the inadequacies in the chosen works of these authors.

The Tempest presents the social division under the colonial politics. It is a political narrative because it revolves around Prospero's repressive rule on the island. Moreover, the author connects Prospero's past political background with his present status. A deposed European duke attempts to fulfill his political ambition beyond his homeland. So, the play, as a literary means, propagates the imperial ideologies. Otherwise, why does the author foreground this role of Prospero? The racial politics of Prospero is the reflection of politics of representation since without Prospero the narrative loses its point of reference. To

empower Prospero, Shakespeare attributes him with intelligence and knowledge. Though Prospero uses the discourse of knowledge for his personal gain, yet knowledge associates him with civilization. He employs it to sabotage Caliban and Ariel. For instance, though Caliban protests, he recognizes Prospero's power. This monologue reveals it, "I must obey; his art is of such power, / It would control my dam's god Stebos, / And make a vassal of him" (120). So, the colonialist abuses knowledge for the social division rather than construction. The depiction of Caliban as a slave of Prospero raises the question of representation since on what moral ground Prospero deserves the dominant role in the narrative. Through Prospero the author makes Europe the point of reference. So, he makes his judgment on the non-European society of Caliban and Ariel through Eurocentric perspective. Caliban's distorted image as an ignorant wild does not represent the indigenous people in true sense. However, the author constructs it to devalue the colonized society. Thus, *The Tempest* invites criticisms for misrepresentation.

In *The Tempest*, binary relations are projected. The master-slave relation shows that the author limits within binaries to conceive the relation between the people of different cultures and nationalities. In *The Tempest*, the First World and the Third World do not meet in the amicable relation rather in terms of exploiter and exploited. The author creates the background for Prospero to search a place for shelter as his brother deposes him from the dukedom of Milan. So, as a refugee he has to negotiate with the new world. Though Shakespeare attempts to draw sympathy for Prospero as he is displaced from homeland and bound to seek a place for survival, he fails to represent Prospero's ethics. For instance, Prospero betrays Caliban to fulfil his unfulfilled ambition of ruling. So, the author's decision to devise a colonial role for Prospero to show the European superiority over the native brings the author into controversy. The instances in the story show that attempts are made to universalize the European values. Caliban from a different culture and race is perceived as an

empty vessel to be filled up with European values (Bryant 100). So, how to believe that the author does not have a role for this perspective on the native. The ideologies of race and class manifest in the ways he presents Prospero and Caliban.

Cesaire reconfigures *The Tempest* as *A Tempest* from the critical perspective to contend the issue of representation. He explores the possibilities for developing different political discourse that is more inclusive in representation. By changing the identity of characters, Caliban and Ariel, the author tries to represent the voices of the colonized. The black Caliban and Mulatto Ariel speak the language of colonized; They struggle for freedom from the rule of Prospero. To illustrate from *A Tempest*, Caliban prepares himself to face any challenge for his dignity and justice, "Better death than humiliation and injustice" (22). This consciousness of Caliban arises out of the suppression of Prospero whose treatment to him as a savage from the barbaric world is no less than to an animal. This way he humiliates Caliban, "Cannibal would suit you, but I'm sure you wouldn't like that, would you? Let's see . . . What about Hannibal? That fits" (15). This distorted image of Caliban testifies that the European perception of the natives is guided by the superiority complex. And the ideologies of racism and regionalism are behind such perception. The self-idealization and derogatory presentation of other exposes the politics of representation. Cesaire appropriates the narrative of Shakespeare to express his dissent over the role of characters. In addition to the modification of Caliban and Ariel, he introduces the new God, Eshu, a trickster, who breaks Godly decency in his performance at the wedding ceremony of Ferdinand and Miranda. He lets loose the sexual expression before the Goddesses, Ceres and Juno. For instance, he vocalizes, "Eshu is a merry elf/ And he can whip you with his dick" (48). Cesaire even Africanizes the God, Eshu, who unlike other Gods, defies the taboos of moral order. So, in case of God also Cesaire questions the European expectations that comply with European myths.

The ending of *A Tempest* also signifies disagreement with *The Tempest* in terms of representation. For example, in Césaire's narrative, Prospero does not want to give up the colonial authority. So, he resolves to continue to live on the island with Caliban. With this event, Césaire exposes the quest of the imperialist for power who aims to exercise authority perpetually. Beside the plot, indigenous language is another means that Césaire employs to question the language of colonialism. For example, Caliban refuses to speak in the imposed language of Prospero. Caliban enunciates, 'Uhuru,' a native word for freedom in English. This becomes the cause of conflict between him and Prospero as the latter feels threatened by the foreign tongue. However, for Caliban, it works as an agency of identity.

Césaire uses dialogic technique or 'heteroglossia' in the word of Bakhtin for many voices, in his narrative to decenter the centralizing tendency of Shakespeare's poetic verse. Instead of using the poetic language that gives space to the domination of single perspective, Césaire's use of prosaic or more dialogic discourse allows the expression of multiple perspectives from the peripheries. This shift seems to be purposeful to disrupt the colonial narrative. The marginal character, Caliban, makes use of dialogic discourse to voice his political disagreement with the master, Prospero. For instance, he can express his protest to Prospero against the imposed name, Caliban, "I'm telling you that from now on I won't answer to the name Caliban" (14). There are other instances that illustrate that he can speak the language of protest.

Césaire does have some limitations in his representation. Though he attempts to be inclusive to represent the voices of the margins, yet fails to bridge the disparity in representation. His attention is not adequate to address the problem of race and class in case of Caliban. He needs some additional strategies to deal with such issues. For instance, the protagonist, Caliban, cannot gain freedom since Prospero continues to rule the island. Even the alliance between the colonized, Ariel and Caliban, fails to achieve the aspired freedom.

Prospero, like other colonial rulers, adopts the policy of divide and rule. Accordingly, he breaks their unity as he isolates Caliban from Ariel since the latter gets freedom but the former has to languish under the colonial master. Another overlooked area in *A Tempest* is gender. For example, Miranda remains more or less a puppet under Prospero. Her dependent role, like in *The Tempest*, continues in Césaire's narrative also. She acts as a silenced figure in the men's world. She cannot defy her father's dictate. Here, Césaire fails to overcome the influence of the patriarchal ideologies. So, he continues such legacy in the representation of Miranda. Similarly, with regard to language, the symbolic use of 'Uhuru' to defy the colonial language, does not seem adequate. More substantial use of local language would give agency to the colonized to claim their identity. These limitations in the representation of *A Tempest* illustrate that probably better version of *The Tempest* can address the overlooked but important issues.

Daniel Defoe, like Shakespeare, through *Robinson Crusoe*, aims to meet the expectations of the English society. Therefore, he constructs the narrative that valorizes the enterprises of the British empire. Like Jane of *Jane Eyre*, Crusoe represents the British middle-class family that values capitalistic gain as one of the parameters of success of life. As per the imperial fashion, Defoe sets a mission for Crusoe to venture the unknown territory for mercantile, like slave trade in Africa. Aparna Dharwadker examines Crusoe's journey to the outer world as "The non-European setting of his travel narratives also turn mercantile ventures into colonialist fictions whose protagonists must contend with geographical, racial, and religious others" (64). For Aparna, Crusoe's mercantile venture is entangled with regional, racial and religious identity. Politically, Crusoe acts as a colonial figure on the island. His practice of slavery, ownership of weapons, claim over the resources etc. characterize his imperial legacy. Defoe, under the influence of gender ideology, follows the tradition in which a man, not a woman is entitled with adventure. So, Crusoe as a man looks

after his business. His mission is a European mission for political and economic gains. The author positions Crusoe against the wilderness that Crusoe has to tame to justify his civilization. For example, Crusoe plans to enlighten Friday, “. . . plain instruction sufficiently serv'd to the enlightening this savage creature, and bringing him to be such a Christian, as I have known few equal to him in my life” (174). Defoe places Crusoe in a position from where he looks upon the world of Friday. The key terms: enlightening, savage creature, and a Christian, illustrate how Crusoe identifies himself in relation to these things. These are the means to set a mission for the Europeans.

To promote the European values and its ideologies, Defoe in *Robinson Crusoe* constructs the images of Europe that show its achievements in contrast to the images of outsiders who lack such achievements. For instance, Crusoe's gun symbolizes the power of European technology that is unknown to Friday's society. Friday's savagery is essentialized to justify Crusoe's civilizing mission. The binaries between the European goodness and outer evil are projected to idealize the image of self against the other. Therefore, Friedrich Nietzsche argues that concept of good and evil are matters of interests. In *Beyond Good and Evil*, he states, “it is the masters who define the concept ‘good’, it is the proud, exalted states of soul that are thought to distinguish and define the hierarchy” (154). To illustrate from the story, Crusoe describes the evil acts of savages as he prepares to punish them, “I had now not a moment to lose; for nineteen of the dreadful wretches sat upon the ground, all close huddled together, and had just sent the other two butcher the poor Christian, and bring him perhaps limb by limb to their fire. . .” (184). These images of savages feasting on human flesh in one hand and Crusoe's attempt to save the victim on the other, express Defoe's politics of representation in which Christian goodness is projected against the non-Christian-pagan. So, the ideology of Christianity is employed to rationalize the act of Crusoe.

The ideology of nationality is one of the key elements for Defoe to write in favor of imperial power. Since the individual identity is connected to the national identity, Defoe's outlook in the context of *Robinson Crusoe* is largely shaped by the ideology of his nationality. To identify his homeland nationality, he draws other nationalities with the subordinate role. For instance, the savage, Friday, and his native fellows come from the distant territory of alien nationality. Why does the author need them in his narrative? It is the mission of the colonial author to show the presence of the imperial authority in alien territories to solve the problems that they believe could not be solved by the natives. Crusoe believes that he is doing a great job on the island. He imagines that he owns the island and rules as his colony. Though Friday is his only human subject, Crusoe feels no less than an emperor. Defoe's imperial perspective is reflected in the way he handles the role of Crusoe.

Coetzee's *Foe*, a subversive form of *Robinson Crusoe*, is like *Wide Sargasso Sea* in terms of its interrogation of the discourse of Crusoe's story. The Postcolonial orientation of Coetzee shapes the narrative of *Foe* as it challenges the master narrative of Crusoe myth that circulates in the literary discourses as a model of European idealism that the philosopher, like Immanuel Kant, advocates for. For instance, Naomi Wood observes that in Children's story, Crusoe is projected as a mythical figure (325). In his representation, Coetzee uncovers the contradictions within such idealism presented in *Robinson Crusoe*. Coetzee modifies characters, setting, and plot to construct the new political meaning in *Foe*. He foregrounds the role of Friday who remains at the background in *Robinson Crusoe*. Crusoe is no more the imperial figure with an ideal image. Symbolically, with Friday's muteness in *Foe*, Coetzee illustrates how the colonial authority silences the subalterns, like Friday. Possibility is that as Susan speculates, "he was captured by the slave traders and lost his tongue" (57). The analogy of the loss of tongue clarifies that subalterns lose their agency due to the systematic deprivation from their rights to represent themselves.

To critique the representation in *Robinson Crusoe*, Coetzee shifts the narrative perspective. For this purpose, he adds a woman figure, Susan, whose presence challenges man's centrality in Crusoe narrative. She minimizes the role of Crusoe because her perspective dominates and she has a more prominent role to play. Through Susan, the author attacks the gender ideology of *Robinson Crusoe*. The only male authority in Defoe's narrative is downsized to recover the woman's lost voice. Similarly, Coetzee transforms Crusoe to offer the new political reading of his diminished status as an ordinary person. Without guns and other key tools, his survival goes in the primitive way. Unlike Defoe's Crusoe, this man does not seem to have high ambition. His images illustrate that the author strips off the colonial privileges that Defoe's Crusoe gets.

Coetzee makes efforts to address the intersected ideologies of race, gender and nationality. Accordingly, he places Susan and Friday in solidarity. A woman, and a slave of color get space in *Foe*. To carve the alternative relation between men and women, and people across races based on human dignity and mutual respect, Coetzee symbolically speaks through the characterization of Friday, Susan and Cruso. He explores the possibilities of deconstructing the colonial discourse of *Robinson Crusoe* as he sets a dialogic discourse, like Mikhail Bakhtin proposes, between a white man-Cruso, a woman-Susan and a black man-Friday. Though Friday is mute, Susan tries to speak on his behalf. With regard to gender ideology, she disapproves the male centric views of Foe and Cruso. These are significant changes in the narrative of Coetzee.

Despite Coetzee's attempt to represent the peripheral voices in *Foe* that emerge from the disparities of *Robinson Crusoe*, he fails to meet some of the expectations of the postcolonial societies. For instance, he presents the impact of colonization on Africans through Friday but offers him no agency for his mobility and rise. Even after being free from slavery, Friday cannot regain his homeland. So, he languishes in the state of nowhere. In

case of Susan, she has a voice to claim her identity but fails to write her own narrative as she depends on Foe for it. So, Foe gets space to impose his own perspective rather than Susan's in her narrative. Refusing this, Susan clarifies, "I was intended not to be the mother of my story, but to beget it. . . . Why should it be demanded of me?" (126). Though she wants her story to be written in her own way, she has to compromise in her position since she relies on Foe for her narrative to be written. Does Coetzee believe that a woman character, like Susan, needs a man's hand to write her story? Can she not do this job by herself? The author makes her partially independent rather than totally.

The narrative of *Jane Eyre*, like of *Robinson Crusoe*, shows its inclination to the mainstream culture. It is written from Jane's perspective who represents British nationality, middle-class and White family. Further, Jane and Rochester get more attention of the author and they hold the privileged position in comparison to Bertha Mason from the colonized Caribbean world. Bertha is placed under the category of non-European self. Accordingly, she is depicted as insane and lacking etiquette of the civilized society. So, Bertha is the other of Jane's and Rochester's self. The author portrays Bertha as a deformed figure with mental abnormality from the alien place, Jamaica. So, Chris K. Vanden Bossche concludes that *Jane Eyre* that is supposed to critique the hegemonic ideology and taken as a text of protest complies with such ideology and repression (47).

The author searches her identity through her protagonist, Jane, because Jane's perspective is dominant in the narrative. Therefore, the author delves substantially on the growth of Jane. But for Bertha, the author constructs a stereotypical image of a static figure who holds the liminal position behind Jane and Rochester.

The biased representation of a woman, Bertha, of different background evidences that the author fails to hold neutrality in the literary representation. For example, in contrast to Bertha's distress, Jane's optimism reveals this inclination. Romantic Jane anticipates, "My

future husband was becoming to me my whole world; more than the world: almost my hope of heaven” (242). Bertha’s isolation contrasts with this privilege, “In the deep shade, at the farther end of the room, a figure ran . . . it snatched and growled like some strange wild animal . . .” (258). It is not the individuality of Bertha that makes difference for author’s treatment rather Bertha’s Caribbean background.

In “Three women’s Texts and a Critique of Imperialism”, Gayatri Spivak views that Bronte’s white, middle-class based European feminism is entangled with imperialism. (243-244). Bertha’s characterization depicts this parochial interest. Likewise, Jane’s narrative perspective is Eurocentric perspective that fails to understand non-European views. In connection to this, the author shows the binary relation between Jane and Bertha. For instance, the ideologies of race and nationality play the key roles to bring Jane and Rochester together in love. Whereas, Bertha’s marriage fails due to the difference of nationality and culture. Bertha’s representation from the third world is juxtaposed with the first world of Rochester. As the hell is constructed to define the heaven, so is the case with the Third world and the First World. *Jane Eyre*’s narrative bears the traces of the colonial interest of the First World. To illustrate from the story, St. John tries to persuade Jane to marry him, ““God and nature intended you for a missionary’s wife”” (356). St. John plans a mission to civilize the Indians by indoctrinating the Christian values. The assumption is that the civilized Europeans should hold the responsibility of inculcating their values to the less civilized Indians. It is like Edward Said’s observation on Orientalism. He argues that the European culture got its power and identity by placing itself against the orient (3). In the context of *Jane Eyre*, the two worlds are brought in contact where the First World defines the Third World.

The conflict between Rochester and Bertha is the conflict between the dominant and the dominated. In this context, the marriage between the oppressor and the oppressed is bound to fail as the relation between them is not based on mutual respect and reciprocity

rather on hatred and animosity. So, Rochester and Bertha are the representatives of center and periphery respectively. They clash as one dominates the other and the periphery seeks justice. Author's choice of characters for *Jane Eyre* from such societies indicates that Bronte approves the legacy of colonial representation that searches identity in binary relations. For instance, Rochester acts as an imperial patriarch who colonizes Bertha through the legal framework of marriage. He uses marriage as an institutional license to control Bertha. So, marriage becomes the means to fulfill the interests of patriarchy and imperial politics in *Jane Eyre*. Under the legal protection, Rochester abuses Bertha. Though law does not allow him to marry another woman, Jane, without divorce to Bertha, it cannot regulate his behavior. So, he keeps on abusing Bertha in the name of her madness. This way, he goes unpunished by the laws. His actions reflect the collusion between patriarchy and imperialism. So, gender remains the overlooked issue in *Jane Eyre*. Irony is that the abusive Englishman who ruins the life of a creole woman, gets united with Jane at the end of the narrative. Consequently, Bertha's sacrifice goes unrecognized by the author as the narrative turns into a comedy of the English couple. These instances substantiate that *Jane Eyre* Speaks the language of colonial politics.

Wide Sargasso Sea critiques the representation of *Jane Eyre*. Rhys holds the marginal perspective to contest the imperial inclination of *Jane Eyre*. By appropriating the narrative of Bronte, Rhys makes space for the new political representation that attempts to explore the possibilities for dismantling the suppressive socio-political apparatus to blur the center-margin relation. For example, she recovers the voice of Bertha Mason of *Jane Eyre* in the form of Antoinette in *Wide Sargasso Sea* to question the role of Rochester from the Caribbean perspective. Moreover, Antoinette's battle against her English husband is the battle for justice as he tags madness on her and uses it as a cause for her subjugation and confinement at Thornfield. His views and Antoinette's views clash since they are under the

influence of ideologies of hegemonic and peripheral societies respectively. Similarly, identity issue is another cause of conflict between them. So, in Rhys's representation, othered party of *Jane Eyre* claims its identity. The key character, Christophine, stands for the Caribbean identity and challenges the imposed values of the British authority. She supports Antoinette and makes a claim for where she belongs. She can question the authority of the English man, "Who you to tell me to go? This house belong to Miss Antoinette's mother, now it belong to her. Who you to tell me to go?" (144). Through this black servant, Rhys underscores that the colonized world can rise for its autonomy and it can defy the hegemony of the colonizer.

Unlike the loyal servants of Rochester in *Jane Eyre*, the black servants of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, mock the white man. So, he feels surrounded by the strange people and intends to get rid of this hostile location of the Caribbean. Later, as he returns to Thornfield, England with Antoinette, he retaliates, by isolating her in the attic, like a prisoner. She describes, "There is one window high up-you cannot see out of it. My bed had doors but they have been taken away. There is not much else in the room" (161). After the short confinement, Antoinette escapes from the Thornfield with a candle in her hand. It means, she gets liberation. Therefore, the man fails to subject her as he expected. Consequently, the protagonist of Rhys succeeds to liberate herself whereas in Bronte's narrative, Bertha fails to do so as she burns herself to death at Thornfield. These differences are based on the politics of representation.

As a postcolonial woman-author, Rhys directs her attention to expose the ideological fault lines of *Jane Eyre*. To interrogate the ideologies that support the Racially and sexually divided textual world of Bronte, Rhys changes the narrative of *Jane Eyre*. For instance, the borderlines between Bertha and Jane, and Rochester and Bertha undergo a radical revision in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. In terms of hierarchies within the white race based on nationality and culture, Patricia McKee examines *Jane Eyre*, "As she reproduces in descriptions of Bertha

Rochester such interchanges of anatomical and cultural traits, Bronte also identifies Bertha with the threat of contamination conventionally assigned to Victorian blackness both in colonial locations and within Britain” (70). It means Bertha’s position is not accepted as pure White due to her Caribbean hybrid identity. So, she is differently treated in the narrative. In the revised narrative of Rhys, the British girl, Jane, does not exist. Contrary to the division between the women of different nationalities in *Jane Eyre*, Rhys’s narrative constructs the solidarity between the women of different backgrounds. Like, Antoinette from the white-creole family ties with Christophine from the black family. Their collective strength is like the strength of Sula Peace and Nel Wright, the characters of Toni Morrison’s *Sula*, a novel. They face the challenges together. Similarly, other girls of color stand together along with Christophine. Due to this solidarity among these women, Antoinette’s husband feels estranged and suffocated. Thus, as a woman-author, Rhys brings the marginalized women together to confront the subjection of the hegemonic man but in Bronte’s narrative, women are divided. Bertha and Jane do not share the same ground. They do not hold a meaningful conversation between them; Jane is kept in darkness about Bertha.

Though both Bronte and Rhys are women writers, their political orientations differ. Bronte, like George Eliot, in her narrative attempts to meet the expectations of the imperial-male centric Victorian society of the 19th century whereas Rhys does not approve such expectations as they are motivated by racial and sexual biasness. Rhys explores the alternative possibilities to neutralize the racist and the sexist political representation through the reconfiguration of *Jane Eyre*. Further, these possibilities emerge from the limitations of Bronte’s narrative. Rhys examines *Jane Eyre* critically to blur the boundaries set by the parochial interests. For this, she relocates the English setting focused by Bronte’s narrative to the Caribbean in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Furthermore, Rhys makes efforts to break the hegemony of the monolithic English colonial language. She employs the creole and

indigenous languages through the character, like Christophine, to seek agency. These are some of the strategies that Rhys uses to contest the representation of Brontë. In terms of criticism, Karen Ya-Chu observes that Rhys on *Jane Eyre* and Conde on *Wuthering Heights* “criticize effects of European colonialism which stigmatized people” (8). Karen notices that *Jane Eyre* reflects imperial politics against which Rhys develops her narrative in *Wide Sargasso Sea*.

Rhys puts her efforts to address the problems overlooked in *Jane Eyre*. However, her narrative also suffers from limited vision to be more inclusive and hold firm position for social justice. For instance, her protagonist, Antoinette, replicates the author’s image as an ambivalent, dual positionality of belonging to both the English culture and the Caribbean nationality. Similarly, on the problem of race, Shakti Jaising examines that *Wide Sargasso Sea* critiques imperialism but it uses the racialized colonial discourse in its narrative. Christophine’s role evidences it (817). Despite her anti-imperial rhetoric, she fails to raise the voice for the peripheral black servants in the story. They remain virtually as they are, like Caliban, no significant change in their social positions.

In response to the representations of *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*, the postcolonial authors critique these narratives. They put their efforts to address the major issues of representations, like Eurocentric perspective, the binary relation between the colonial self and the colonized other etc. The ideologies of race, gender, class and nationality come under the scrutiny of Aime Césaire, J.M. Coetzee and Jean Rhys. As the focus shifts from center to margin in the postcolonial literary narratives of these authors, the representations of the mainstream texts are altered and the new possibilities for the egalitarian relations are explored. In the process of contesting the representations, these authors employ the languages of disapproval. Thus, the character, like Caliban of *A Tempest*, Christophine of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, and Susan of *Foe* can speak the language of resistance. Through them,

the authors attempt to recover the voices silenced by the imperial politics. The contesting authors see the potentiality of awakening the spirit of humanity through the literary reconfigurations so that politically and culturally neglected disenfranchised can raise the voice for social justice and upward mobility. So, the reproduced texts work as the means to recover the silenced voices. Despite their attempts, these Postcolonial authors also, to some extent, face the limitation to be inclusive in their representations. The problem of race and class in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, gender and race in *Foe*, and class and race in *A Tempest* are partially addressed. So, more to be done. Against such limitations, Benita Parry alerts not to repeat the colonial tendencies by the postcolonial authors (84). Spivak also questions the inclusiveness of the postcolonial authors. Since they fail to be sensitive enough to the problems of subalterns, and marginal groups, to some extent, disparities exist in the postcolonial representations also. She critiques that problems of underclass women have not got adequate attention from the postcolonial critics and authors. So, she raises the issue of subaltern women whose voices are not heard. Like such women, other marginal as racialized people and workers, still remain out of focus. I view that she seems realistic largely in the present context. So, this research not only critiques the dominant ideologies of the mainstream but also the limitations of critical authors.

Representation of Classes: Human Relations under Capitalism

The ideology of class is one potential problem for study under representation. In the primary texts of this research, I intend to explore the connection between the authors the ways they represent classes in the narratives. I argue that ideology of class, like other ideologies, influences the authors. Therefore, they fail to rise above the class in representations. However, the ideology of class does not operate in isolation; it is associated with other ideologies, like imperialism and capitalism. So, it requires that interpretation of class relations is done in connection to them.

The authors who write in favor of imperial and capitalistic mode of politics fail to address the class disparities in their representations. Shakespeare in *The Tempest*, Defoe in *Robinson Crusoe* and Bronte in *Jane Eyre* fail to critique the imperial capitalism. To critique these representations, Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys reconfigure these texts. However, despite their attempts, they face the limitations to rise above class politics. In the context of *The Tempest*, the author presents the relation between Prospero and Caliban in terms of class contradiction. In this narrative, the European master-class, Prospero and the non-European slave-class, Caliban speak about the author's ideological orientation. The author fails to rationalize this division between Prospero and Caliban. Shakespeare's role is crucial to make the decisions on the roles of these characters. Therefore, it seems unlikely that an author abstains from the politics of representations of class or other issues. Only the difference between the authors is that from whose side they write. If Shakespeare writes from the master-class perspective, Cesaire can subvert it and hold Caliban's perspective.

The Tempest is an example of representation that reflects the social division based on class contradiction. As in *Robinson Crusoe*, the master-slave division is explicit in *The Tempest*. The imperial economic structure shapes Prospero's views about wealth and ownership. His longing for the treasure of the alien territory is the reflection of the craze of the ruler to possess the resources of the peripheries. Prospero discloses that his brother, Antonio, conspired to possess the map of Prospero so that Antonio could locate treasure to own. This materialistic quest of these brothers is the product of the capitalistic economy that nurtures the dream to amass property to exercise power. This ambition is expressed in the actions of Prospero as he deals with Caliban. So, Prospero's role as a master in relation to Caliban is the growth of his ambition.

The master-slave relation between Prospero and Caliban rests on the division of labor. Prospero and his daughter rely on Caliban for their survival as he collects firewood, fetches

water and manages logistic for them. However, Prospero claims that he is too good for Caliban, “. . . I have used thee, / Filth as thou art, with human care, and lodged thee / In mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate / The honour of my child” (119). Prospero exploits Caliban as he does not recognize his contribution of labor. Moreover, he abuses him, “For this, be sure, tonight thou shalt have cramps, / Side-stitches that shall pen thy breath up; urchins / Shall, for that vast of night that they may work, / All exercise on thee; thou shalt be pinched” (117). This brutality of Prospero upon Caliban illustrates the way the master-class treats the slave-class though the position of the master depends on the slave’s contribution. So, Caliban holds the right to question Prospero’s intrusion in his territory. More, his sovereignty is lost as he was independent to make the decisions about the uses of resources and the ways of living. Therefore, he sounds logical in his claim, “This island’s mine by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou tak’st from me . . .” (118). Caliban is a conscious slave who does not approve the foreign intervention. To safeguard his interests and nativity, he resists Prospero’s suppression.

Like the modern capitalists, Prospero aims to own the resources and control Caliban using both coercive and non-coercive strategies. In terms of Caliban’s exploitation, Rita Banerjee views, “Dramatizing a mode of colonization characterized by labour and temperance, it implicitly critiques the exploitation in Prospero’s colony” (293). He threatens Caliban to inflict torture for disobedience. Similarly, Prospero terrorizes him through Ariel with the magic power. Various noises trouble him. In this context, he is disillusioned about Prospero’s deception. He narrates how Prospero tricks him to take over the island. At the arrival to the island, he presents himself amicably but later turns out to be a foe. So, Caliban regrets for trusting this opportunist, “And then I loved thee / And showed thee all the qualities o’ the isle, / The fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile- / Cursed be I that

did so!” (118). This way, the imperial capitalist Prospero employs every means and tricks to rule the island.

A Tempest is an attempt to expose the class disparity and its impact on human relations. To critique *The Tempest*, Césaire examines the limitations of Shakespeare’s narrative. Like in Defoe’s story, master-slave binary is explicit in *The Tempest*. The dichotomy between the ruler, Prospero and the ruled Caliban come under the scrutiny of Césaire. Intentionally, Césaire seems to uncover the impact of colonial economy on the colonized societies. Through Africanized Caliban and hybridized Ariel, the author expresses that the people of color suffer from injustice inflicted by the racialized economic relation. For instance, Prospero controls Caliban along with means and resources; he exploits his labor. The double oppression of race and class provokes a rebellious spirit in Caliban. So, he intends to take revenge against Prospero. He doubts Ariel’s soft approach for their liberation, “What do you believe in, then? In cowardice? In giving up? In kneeling and groveling? That’s it, someone strikes you on the right cheek and you offer the left . . . Well that’s not Caliban’s way . . .” (22). To end the subjugation of the master, Caliban prefers the prompt, tit for tat approach, like Frantz Fanon’s strategy against the colonial violence.

Though Caliban works as a slave, he is conscious about class-politics. He knows that Prospero relies on Ariel and Caliban himself for his survival. His awareness of social injustice perpetrated by Prospero motivates him to explore the possibilities for liberation. Likewise, he knows how the master maintains his authority. Accordingly, he plots against Prospero. This way, through Caliban, Césaire expresses his discontent and sends the message that class disparity needs to be addressed.

Robinson Crusoe, like *The Tempest*, represents the class disparity. As Bronte, Defoe constructs the narrative from the middle-class point of view. Therefore, Crusoe is the representative of middle-class, who under the motivation of materialistic gain, sets out from

his English homeland. Crusoe's socio-cultural background shapes his dream to become rich and maintain the upper-class position. Accordingly, he goes for a voyage to start his entrepreneurship. His materialistic quest is not limited within prosperity; it becomes the means to attain his political ambition. This ambition is reflected in his colonial role on the island. The author presents Crusoe as the lord of the island though Friday is the only human subject for him. The role devised for Crusoe as a master and Friday as a slave are significant because they expose the inherent structure of the British society that believes in class differences. It is the upper-class that controls the economic resources. So, Master-Crusoe is positioned as a majestic figure who takes the ownership of resources. His role as a master is the manifestation of the impact of the ideology of imperial capitalism that nurtures the dream to be the master. Domesticated goats, agricultural products, like maize, guns and other tools are his property. Though Friday contributes with his labor, he holds no share for ownership rather should be grateful as a slave to Crusoe's resourcefulness and generosity. In terms of distribution of labor, Friday deserves ownership of his labor, but it is not recognized by Crusoe. Therefore, it is an exploitation of Friday. By presenting Friday as a dependent on Crusoe and latter's role as a savior, the author practices the biased politics of representation. To cite with examples how Defoe idealizes the role of Crusoe, Crusoe rescues Friday from the cannibals; he offers him food and shelter. He also teaches Friday how to shoot, cultivate crops, follow religion and do other things. Thus, it depends on the author how to shape the roles for characters. Crusoe and Friday are the illustrations.

Crusoe narrative overvalues monetary gains. Crusoe's voyage to overseas for mercantile proves it. However, overseas business has a connection with the colonial politics. It is applicable in the context of Crusoe as well as other historical European missions abroad. For them, the economic strength bolstered by capitalism supports for imperial missions. For instance, Defoe creates the background of Crusoe from the economic perspective. Crusoe's

plantation in Brazil, his attempts to bring the Negroes from Africa and his overseas-adventure for money are the instances that show the European interests for money. The quest for money causes the conflict between them and outsiders. So, the non-European societies have to pay the price both in economic and political sense. The European industrialists in the plantations exploit the African slaves. To supply the Negroes for plantations, Crusoe wants to involve himself in trade related to it. So, the economic enterprises and colonialism are interrelated as one supports the other.

To some extent, J.M. Coetzee, like Rhys, pays attention to the social division caused by the politics of class. He revises *Robinson Crusoe* from the perspective of addressing the problems of class differences. Coetzee foregrounds the intersected problems between race, gender, class and nationality. For this, he significantly modifies the role of Crusoe and Friday, and creates the additional character, Susan. So, he presents Crusoe with the weaker role who no longer acts like the imperial upper-class figure. Rather, his middle-class identity meets crisis as he does not hold the agency to maintain it. Neither he has entrepreneurship, like Defoe's Crusoe has, nor controls the means and resources. More important, he does not have an ambition to uphold colonial masterly position. Ideologically, Unlike Defoe's Crusoe, Crusoe's race and nationality almost remain unexpressed since he does not make efforts to justify his role on the basis of these ideologies. He stands simply as a symbolic figure of English society.

Despite the radical transformation in Crusoe's status, he still remains a master to Friday who serves him as a slave. However, Crusoe's futile work of making terraces without proper supporting tools shows that he is a master without meaningful project. He is like Sisyphus working in absurdity. Neither he owns guns nor possesses equipment. So, his position as a master is fragile that can collapse any time. Coetzee seems to question the master-slave relation by shedding light on the impact of colonization on marginal, like

Africans, through Friday. He sketches Friday as a black slave without tongue. So, he is represented as a silenced figure who has lost the voice due to the colonial oppression and slavery.

In the context of Friday's exploitation, Jay Rajiva compares between *Foe* and *Robinson Crusoe* and uncovers that in both narratives, Friday's body is a site of exploitation under Christian-colonial project (3). Like Cruso, he is a symbolic figure. Though he is free from the slavery, still dislocated from his homeland, Africa. Susan clarifies to the old man who asks about the status of Friday, "He is a slave whose master set him free on his deathbed" (107). She implies that Cruso set him free as he died on the way to his homeland. Cruso's death and Friday's liberation from slavery signal a political departure from Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* because in Defoe's narrative Crusoe succeeds to return homeland, like a hero, who overcomes the challenges on the way of adventure. So, he is presented as an imperial hero who accomplishes his mission.

But Coetzee's Cruso dies on the way to home. His death symbolizes the downfall of the colonial master-class in the master-slave relation between him and Friday. Similarly, the author brings the two marginal figures, Susan and Friday, together as Susan needs to tackle gender and Friday has to do with race and class. They are the victims of sexist and racist politics respectively. As the ideologies of patriarchy and race collude, like in the case of Cruso and Foe, the victims need the common approach to battle them. However, Susan and Friday differ in terms of the problems they face. The challenge for Susan is how to disrupt men's narrative legacy to shape women's narrative discourse. It means she has to fight the gendered role given to her. She is also sensitive to the impact of the ideologies of race and class on Friday. It makes her play the protective role to save him. Both are oppressed in one way or other. Probably, for this reason, the author places them together. It shows that Coetzee is informed with the development of women's movement for their rights and the blacks'

awareness against racial marginalization. These concerns are reflected in his critical narratives of *Foe*.

Jane Eyre is the production of the capitalistic society of the Victorian era in Britain. Like *The Tempest*, it fails to rise above the class politics in representation. It captures the 19th century rising industrial development in Britain and its impact on societies. Due to the influence of the ideology of capitalism, the author highly values the capitalistic gain in her narrative. For instance, Jane's struggle concentrates on how to earn money and become self-dependent. The author seems to connect Jane's success in life with her economic sustainability. Jane's middle-class background from her parental line fosters in her a dream to maintain that status as she loses that family status after her parents' demise. Along with the loss of her parents, she has to rely on others for survival. So, she falls under the care of Mrs. Reed, her aunt. Jane narrates the event, "my mother's brother – that he had taken me when a parentless infant to his house; and that in his last moments he had required a promise of Mrs. Reed that she would rear and maintain me as one of her own children" (11). So, the author connects Jane's troubles with her economic dependency and guardianship on Reeds' family. Jane has to pay heavily for this dependency in terms of abuses she has to bear. Mrs. Reed abuses her verbally and her son assaults her physically also. She lives in trauma as she is locked in the Red Room where the ghost haunts. The aunt justifies such treatment for Jane's defiance of her guardianship and abnormal behavior. Mrs. Reed's concern for money seems to be the root cause of abuse of Jane by the Reeds. It illustrates that the author is under the influence of the ideology of capitalism that associates human relation with material gain and loss.

Class disparity is explicit in *Jane Eyre*. It reflects the middle-class perspective of the author. She seems to approve the social division based on the material ownership. She takes the master-servant structure under the capitalistic mode of production of 19th century as a

normal phenomenon. For instance, in the story, Rochester owns several servants. His social prestige largely depends on the way he commands them within the periphery of Thornfield Hall. Moreover, the massive property of Thornfield that he owns defines him as a master in relation to his poor servants. His Thornfield site exists as a symbol of imperial capitalist-patriarch's oppressive domain where the woman, gendered subaltern, Bertha, has to pay the price. Therefore, Thornfield remains thorny for Bertha but for Rochester, it displays his pride. Similarly, he uses money to shut the mouth of Grace Poole who looks after Bertha in isolation so that outsiders would not know about secret abuse of Bertha. Using the economic privilege, Rochester roams to Italy, France and other countries to satisfy his desires. For example, he shares the memory of his heydays with Jane, "Provided with plenty of money and the passport of an old name, I could choose my own society: no circles were closed against me" (274). As a hedonist, he hangs out with the foreign women. On the other side, property has a key role to diminish Bertha's position as a married woman. The property that she gets from her parents is one-sidedly owned by Rochester. She does not hold any property since she is tagged as a mad woman. So, the capitalists, like Rochester, use money to maintain upper class status and subject the underprivileged. Not only Rochester but also his family value money highly. For money, they accept Bertha for the marriage of their son despite her creole, Jamaican background. Rochester reveals that Mr. Mason "would give the letter of fortune of thirty thousand pounds: that sufficed. When I left college, I was sent out to Jamaica, to espouse a bride already courted for me" (269). It shows what role money plays in the British society of 19th century.

Limitation with Bronte's presentation in *Jane Eyre* is that her middleclass perspective is reflected in the characterization of Jane and Rochester. She approves Rochester's views rather than writing from the marginal, Bertha's perspective. So, *Jane Eyre* complies with the main stream ideology. For instance, Rochester's master class position is the product of

capitalist culture that promotes individualism and the domination of upper-class elitist over the underprivileged. The author fails to keep the account of the social forces that shape the Victorian society. Her narrative revolves around the middle-class man and woman mostly; she overlooks the class dialectics under the capitalistic mode of production. This lack of observation of social dynamism shows that the author constructs the narrative under the influence of dominant ideologies. In this sense, *Jane Eyre* fails to represent the voices of the under-class people of the British society. The romantic story of white middle-class lovers, Jane and Rochester, overshadow the socially pertinent issue of class disparity.

Bertha's background is middle-class. However, she does not belong to that class anymore because after married to Rochester and tagged as an insane, she loses the privilege of being recognized as his wife. He does not want to identify her as his wife in her underground condition. So, she is a gendered subaltern. The collusion among patriarchy, capitalism and imperialism supports Rochester to legitimize his suppression against Bertha. Nobody but Bertha's brother raises the questions about Bertha's status and Rochester's treatment to her. Thus, Rochester's actions get approval even though they are malicious.

In *Jane Eyre*, the author portrays the human relations from the perspective of imperial Capitalism. The sketches of Mrs. Reed, Mr. Brocklehurst, Rochester and Jane show that the author is complicit with capitalistic values. For instance, though the author critiques the selfishness of Mr. Brocklehurst, she fails to critique him as the product of capitalistic society. He advocates for the reduction of material luxury to follow the path of salvation, but he does not renounce the luxury himself. He keeps the girl students in the missionary school; they have to remain underfed as he denies full meal to them. He argues that the contentment of food may lead them to luxury or they may deviate from the path of renouncement. Brocklehurst, a hypocrite, prescribes the rules of modesty for others but for his family, he approves the lavishness. Jane describes the appearance of the ladies of his family, "they were

splendidly attired in velvet, silk and furs . . . the elder lady was enveloped in a costly velvet shawl, trimmed with ermine, and she wore a false front of French curls” (55). This evidences that Brocklehurst cannot give up capitalistic lifestyle. He uses the missionary project to consolidate his own power and luxury under the protection of religious ideology. Similarly, capitalism plays the role in shaping Jane’s subjectivity. She struggles to maintain her middle-class background. Earning to become self-dependent gets attention in her narration. As the author focuses on the privileged class, she fails to represent the voices of the underclass servants. For example, Bessie works at Mrs. Reed’s family. Likewise, Leah, Grace Poole and other servants that serve at Thornfield remain overlooked. The author takes their roles for granted; they are taken to serve the master-class. In the narrative, Jane’s perspective dominates and these marginal characters remain under her shadow.

Though Jean Rhys critiques *Jane Eyre* on the issues of gender, race, nationality and others, she fails to address the class differences in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. For instance, Antoinette’s middle-class background contradicts with her black servants’ underclass positions. Christophine, the black servant, who supports Antoinette, remains in the underclass position throughout the narrative. Though she speaks against the gender and racial suppression of the English man, it does not bring any meaningful change for her. But it does something for Antoinette. Due to Christophine’s fearless expression and obeah practices, she is dragged into controversy. As an obeah woman, they want to arrest her. It is not obeah alone that determines her arrest rather her underclass position as a black servant does so. So, the intersected ideologies: gender, class and race are against her. Like Christophine, the author seems to take other black servants for granted for their roles.

With regard to the middle-class representation, both Bronte and Rhys belong to the same category as they focus on the interest of middle-class characters. Bronte promotes Jane and Rhys does to Antoinette. Both of these protagonists are from white racial middle-class

background. Similarly, Rochester of *Jane Eyre* represents the middle-class so is the case with the unnamed man, husband of Antoinette, in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. It shows that Rhys also writes under the influence of the ideology of capitalism. To look at the further illustration from the narrative of Rhys, the monetary transaction determines the marriage between Antoinette and the English man. The man confesses, “I have not bought her, she has bought me, or so she thinks. . . . The thirty thousand pounds have been paid to me without question or condition. No provision made for her (that must be seen to)” (63). This testifies the bourgeoisie mindset of the man who undervalues the human relation under the influence of the ideology of capitalism. His immediate concern for the possession of money, but no care with other aspects, spoils the marital relation with Antoinette. Beside the capital, the ideology of race, gender and nationality influence the view of the man. Accordingly, he deals with them. Only Christophine can interrogate his imperial master-class perspective. No surprise that his expectations are as per the imperial legacy that tries to build the empire on the labor of marginal, like Christophine, Baptiste and others from the marginal societies.

The expectations of Antoinette’s husband come in the line of European centralizing tendency. As they occupied the Caribbean and the African territories during the colonial era, it developed a colonial legacy that continues even after the colonization ends. The English man tries to uphold this legacy in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. The subjected positions of the black servants in the narrative remind the division of labor during the colonial era since the Afro-Caribbean slaves contributed for the growth of the European economy. Even in the postcolonial society, as represented in the text, such exploitation still continues. *Wide Sargasso Sea* written in the context of 19th century captures the hostility between the White, former slave owners, like Antoinette’s family, and the black people. Therefore, Antoinette’s position differs from those who were once colonized. However, her present family status is no more like the mainstream, British white, as her husband, as she belongs to the creole

family of Jamaica who have lost their power due to the Emancipation Act that empowers the colonized people. But from the perspective of class, Antoinette belongs to the middle-class as her husband, and the black servants represent the underclass who serve the interests of the former.

In *Jane Eyre*, Bronte depicts the class differences within the British society. The lower-class servants belong to the same nationality. With some overlapping, in case of gender and class, these servants' problems are different from the Caribbean servants of *Wide Sargasso Sea* because they have to bear the brunt of race, gender and others. Rhys's projection of the intersected problems illustrates that the colonized society has to face the additional problems than the colonial one.

Representation/Misrepresentation of Gendered Subaltern and Other Disenfranchised

The ideological and institutional affiliations of the authors influence the works of representation. In case of gendered subalterns and other disenfranchised, representations are more questionable as others try to represent them since they cannot represent themselves. For Spivak, those who claim to represent the subalterns fail to do so as they cannot bridge the gap between themselves and the represented. The gap exists because their social positions intervene in the act of representation. In the context of my study, some characters live in subaltern condition. Bertha Mason of *Jane Eyre*, Christophine and other black servants of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Friday of both *Robinson Crusoe* and *Foe*, Caliban and Ariel of both *The Tempest* and *A Tempest* represent the subaltern or underprivileged group. These characters do not have access to the mainstream discourses. So, they have to serve the interests of the dominant group. As their voices are silenced by the socio-political structure, they lose the agency of representation. Among the marginal, women characters, like Bertha, are the gendered subaltern due to the additional problem of gender. Other male characters, Friday and Caliban, are the victims of the ideologies of class and race. Therefore, the issues of

marginalization are crucial to address. I argue that the hegemonic ideologies play the key roles to cause the social disparity. So, without contesting such ideologies the social division cannot be bridged.

The Tempest reflects the social division. The colonial politics is explicit in the roles of the characters. Caliban and Ariel are the product of imperialism because the island of Caliban and his role are devised to justify the role for incursion. In the narrative, Ariel and Caliban are the subaltern characters since they live in slavery under Prospero and they fail to recover the sovereignty. Though finally Prospero leaves the island, it is not for the sake of these characters rather for his own dignity in Europe. As he mends the tie with his brother and regains the lost position in Milan, he voluntarily leaves the island. He adopts the policy of use and throw with regard to Caliban and Ariel. He employs Ariel to take revenge against his brother, Antonio and his colleagues. Similarly, he uses Caliban for his own survival. So, these slaves have to compromise with their freedom not for the sake of their social benefit rather to fulfil the interests of the imperialist. Thus, the exploitation of Caliban and Ariel by Prospero makes them subaltern characters. Ambitious Prospero betrays Caliban's trust and compassion. This expression reveals his oppression against Caliban:

If thou neglect'st, or dost unwillingly
 What I command, I'll rack thee with old cramps,
 Fill all thy bones with aches, make thee roar,
 That beasts shall tremble at thy din. (120)

Did Caliban offer the hospitality to the tyrant for this abuse?

The positive aspect of Caliban is that even in the dismal situation, he does not give up his mission for freedom. He continues his struggle. It is like, Spivak underscores the necessity of waiting patiently for the rise of subaltern since it takes time to change the sociopolitical structure that creates the subaltern condition.

Cesaire critiques the representation presented in *The Tempest*. Specially, he focuses on the impact of imperialism on the peripheral society of Caribbean. Therefore, Caliban is the representative of the colonized society who has paid the price of imperial politics. From the characterization of Caliban, it seems that Cesaire identifies himself in the image of Caliban in terms of Racial oppression. As a black author, he does not approve the colonial politics. So, written from the perspective of the underclass slave, Caliban, *A Tempest* is an attempt to represent the voices of the margin as Cesaire underscores the necessity of solidarity among the marginal, like Africans (Hiddleston 88-95). Cesaire gives Caliban an indigenous identity. With some change in his characterization from Shakespeare's play, Caliban gets the focus in the narrative. Cesaire highlights the impact of the colonial subjugation on the peripherals through Caliban. To signal the unity among the colonized subalterns, Cesaire associates Ariel with Caliban. Both intend to battle the common enemy, Prospero. Ariel assures solidarity with Caliban, "but after all we are brothers, brothers in suffering and slavery, but brothers in hope as well. We both want our freedom" (2). To approve Ariel's statement, Caliban declares, "Better death than humiliation and injustice" (23). This preparedness of these slaves for liberation illustrates how Cesaire constructs the discourse to represent the marginal voices.

Robinson Crusoe is another example of literary discourse that deals with center-margin relation. To justify the role of center from where Crusoe comes, Defoe constructs the role for the margin that needs support of the center. So, in the literary representation, some authors try to represent the social reality as it appears to them. They represent as realist, like Charles Dickens who exposes the social inequality of the 19th century in England in *Hard Times*. Others, like Defoe, construct the social disparity in art with the intention of searching the superior role of the self in connection with the racial and national identity, as in case of *Robinson Crusoe*. The role of the subaltern character, Friday, is the outcome of the politics of

representation that defines the privileged in relation to the subaltern. However, to examine the condition of Friday in the way he is represented, he is a slave from the savage society, who lives under the duress of the European master. Unlike Crusoe, he does not define himself. Neither he boasts about his nationality nor glorifies his religion and culture. But Friday listens to what Crusoe fabricates to raise his own self-esteem. In this communication, Friday has no voice to interrogate or disapprove the claims of Crusoe. Defoe has constructed Friday to listen, not to speak because Crusoe has a say. Therefore, in his subaltern position, somebody, like Crusoe, makes claim of working on behalf Friday. However, Friday becomes the means for Crusoe to search his own identity. For instance, Crusoe narrates, “for never man had a more faithful, loving, sincere servant than Friday was to me . . . like those of a child to a father; and I dare say, he would have sacrificed his life for the saving mine . . .” (165). Crusoe perceives Friday as a naive childlike who takes his master, like a father, and can sacrifice his life for the sake of master. Who knows whether Friday respects him, like a father, or intends to get rid of Crusoe’s suppression, like the son in Freud’s theory of Oedipal relation. In Oedipal relation, the son tries to murder the father to be with mother. Since the author gives the narrative voice to Crusoe, he holds the agency to define the relation as he likes. Further, to interpret this relation, Crusoe’s claim of guardianship takes Friday as dependent on him. It also illustrates vulnerability of Friday who is helpless without the father-figure. This way, the roles are created in representation as per the interest of the author.

As the disenfranchised cannot represent themselves, it gives space to somebody to do politics in their name. For example, Crusoe narrates how he could be useful to Friday, “I was greatly delighted with him, and made it my business to teach him everything that was proper to make him useful, handy and helpful; specially to makes him speak, and understand me when I spoke . . .” (166). In this statement, Crusoe makes his judgment on Friday as an

ignorant who needs a master, like Crusoe, to educate so that he can improve his lifestyle. So, Spivak believes that such self-claimed benevolence to subalterns fails to translate into reality because they are not sincere and fail to hold ethical responsibility. They prove to be the empty words of promise made for politics which do not bring the substantial improvement in the living condition of the subalterns, like Friday. So, Friday remains in the subaltern position no matter how graceful Crusoe pretends to be.

Authors roles cannot be ignored for what they represent in their narratives since it is difficult to maintain neutrality in representation as they are under the influence of ideologies that serve the interests of specific groups or societies. In case of Defoe's role for the narrative of *Robinson Crusoe*, he positions himself in close association with Crusoe in terms of British national identity, religion of Christianity and white racial background. The key element of the narrative, the point of view, is offered to Crusoe through which the author expresses his world view. For instance, Crusoe expresses a sense of duty to Friday because he is inferior to him. It reflects how Defoe perceives another part of the world that needs help from Europe. Similarly, Crusoe imagines what would be the condition of Friday without his teaching. He is also concerned about the future of Friday. Crusoe imagines what may happen if Friday comes in contact with his people and the primitive instinct overpowers his rationality developed by Crusoe. Crusoe questions Friday, "What would you do there, would you turn wild again, eat men's flesh again, and be a savage as you were before?" (177). What about Friday, did he not live meaningful life before he met Crusoe? Does he need to civilize under Crusoe? Why does Crusoe as a white man take this burden? What makes Defoe imagine that cannibals, like Friday, exist beyond Europe? These questions uncover the link between Defoe and *Robinson Crusoe*.

In master-slave relation, Friday does not hold an agency that supports for self-representation. Similarly, the master cannot represent Friday because he cannot forget that he

is a master to Friday. As Spivak underscores the importance of learning from below for better representation, Does Crusoe try to learn from Friday? He does not do so. Rather, Crusoe attempts to represent Friday as per his interests. Consequently, it becomes misrepresentation. To create the conducive environment for Friday's self-representation, the master-servant relation between Crusoe and Friday must change. The subjected position of Friday does not allow for his self-representation. Since Crusoe holds power and resources, his voice remains dominant. In front of his gun, Friday has to surrender. So, if the authors represent by learning from below, they are less under the influence of their ideologies as they try to see from the perspective of the represented rather than imposing from their sides.

Foe is an attempt to address the problem of representation projected in *Robinson Crusoe*. To highlight the issues related to subaltern, he modifies the role of Friday and characterizes him differently. For example, unlike Friday of *Robinson Crusoe*, this Friday is mute who fails to express through verbal language. So, he holds no agency for self-representation. Both his physical disability and the condition of slavery are hostile for self-representation. His muteness is connected to slavery because it is believed that the slave owner chopped his tongue. So, it is the socio-political structure that is responsible for his condition as the legalized slavery and colonialism produce a slave, like Friday. Symbolically, Friday's silence as the product of suppression cannot be broken without dismantling the socio-political structure that supports the social disparity. The long-term slavery has made Friday so insensitive that he cannot respond against harsh condition. In this context, Susan asks, "What had held Friday back all these years from beating in his master's head with a stone while he slept, so bringing slavehood to an end and inaugurating a reign of idleness?" (36). Such resistance that Susan imagines, demands courage and awareness. Friday lacks both. He even cannot express what he feels. This dumbness holds the secret of Friday. So,

Susan views that “the only tongue that can tell Friday’s secret is the tongue he has lost!” (67). Without Friday’s self-expression, somebody misrepresents him.

Foe deals with the problem of gender. Though Susan suffers from gender politics, she is not a subaltern character. Unlike Friday, due to her middle-class background and identity consciousness, Susan is in a more powerful position. She can analyze the situation in which she and Friday live. Susan has the agency for self-representation. She can raise the voice not only for her own identity but also for Friday’s freedom. For example, she expresses her concern about Friday, “inasmuch as Friday is a slave and a child, it is our duty to care for him in all things, and not abandon him to a solitude worse than death” (39). In her own case, she questions the authority of Foe who attempts to appropriate her story. Her claim for authorship evidences that she intends to construct a discourse to search her identity and question the gendered position given to her in the narrative. Susan argues that men’s ways of writing story differ from the ways women write as the men create the gendered role for the women. To illustrate, Foe expresses his surprise as Susan suggests her role as a castaway woman who struggles on the island for survival. Traditionally, this adventurous role is given to men, like Crusoe. So, Coetzee attempts to break the tradition by positioning a woman in place of a man. As *Robinson Crusoe* narrates the story of men, *Foe* is the story of a woman also. Through Susan, Coetzee underscores the necessity of raising woman’s voice to address the gendered relation. For this, the narrative role is given to Susan. The narrative role holds power as Lewis MacLeod views, “To narrate “the world” is to gain power and authority, to be subject to outside pulses is to lose them” (3). So, in case of Susan, she holds such power to some extent. But, to compare her with Friday in terms of subjugation, Patriarchy subjects her and colonialism does so to Friday. In colonialism, the ideologies of race and class are against him. However, both Susan and Friday are colonized in one way or other. Therefore, they need to decolonize themselves. Comparatively, it seems easier for Susan but for Friday, the

challenges are tougher as he is doubly suppressed. However, if he waits patiently and continues his aspiration, the hostile situation may improve and he will recover his voice to fight for justice, like Susan.

Charlotte Bronte, as a woman author, fails to meet the expectations of the marginal societies as they raise the questions about women's inclusiveness in her work, *Jane Eyre*. Her character, Bertha Mason, a gendered subaltern does not get justice in her narrative. Bronte's depiction of Bertha shows that she complies with the ideologies of empire and patriarchy. For example, Bertha remains suppressed for years in the secretive attic under the instruction of Rochester. The society beyond Thornfield does not know what goes with Bertha inside. A person who runs an inn near Thornfield discloses the secret about Bertha with Jane, "She was kept in very close confinement, ma'am; people even for some years was not absolutely certain of her existence" (377). Rochester admits that he isolated her, "She was only mad, and shut up in a lunatic asylum" (270). These instances support that the author treats Bertha differently for the lowly role she assigns to her. It is clear that Bertha's background makes difference for author's choice. Otherwise, why does she give the narrative perspective to Jane? If a woman-author creates a gendered subaltern character, who can speak for such character? Probably, another author attempts to do so. For instance, Jean Rhys tries to give voice to Bertha, the silenced figure of Bronte's narrative. How far she is successful to speak for the marginal, is a matter of evaluation.

Wide Sargasso Sea is an attempt of Rhys to address the problem of representation of *Jane Eyre*. As representations are connected to ideologies, Rhys critiques the ideologies of patriarchy, race and others by revising the narrative of *Jane Eyre*. However, Rhys's representation in *Wide Sargasso Sea* also invites debates as she fails to meet the expectations of the peripheral to some extent. Despite this, her efforts deserve recognition because some representations are better than others.

Rhys's attempt does not seem to be sufficient to address the problems of subalterns because she heavily concentrates on the criticism of imperial ideologies but overlooks the problems of the underprivileged characters. As they get less attention, her representation is not as inclusive as it should be. For instance, she foregrounds the problems of Antoinette who represents the creole, white middle-class but gives the secondary role to the underclass black servants. Christophine, Baptiste and other black servants are the marginalized workers. The narrative perspective shifts between Antoinette and her husband. However, her point of view is dominant in the narrative. So, the black workers' perspectives are overlooked. From the beginning of the story, the author focuses on Antoinette's family whose position in Jamaica is weakened as the Emancipation Act has been passed to empower the black people. Similarly, throughout the story, Antoinette and her relation with other people, specially, her husband, is given substantial space. The author is sympathetic to Antoinette and her family because she belongs to the minority group of European background people who no longer hold the powerful position as the colonial period is over. They are like the black majority, even weaker than them due the Emancipation Act that gave freedom to the black from the British colonial authority. So, Antoinette is different from the main stream European, like her husband. That is why it seems that the author creates a bond between Antoinette and Christophine, the black servant. Now both are in the similar situation. However, in terms of race and class, the problems of Christophine are different. So, the issues of the underprivileged, like her, need to be handled differently. Their representation could be the focus of the narrative but Rhys fails to do so.

As Bronte, Rhys constraints herself within the periphery of middle-class. Accordingly, she picks up the protagonist from such background. Probably, Rhys's creole middle-class position influences her to be concerned to the problems of the creoles rather than underclass. She not only sheds light on Antoinette but also on another generation, the

mother of Antoinette. For instance, Christophine serves the two generations of creole family. Antoinette's mother tells Antoinette about Christophine, "'She was your father's wedding present to me-one of his presents. He thought I would be pleased with a Martinique girl'" (19). The black woman could be the wedding present for the creole middle-class family. Christophine, mother's servant, is made daughter's family servant also. Though she serves as a family servant, Christophine is under the observation of city authority for practicing 'obeah', a ritual of magic spell. Previously, she was imprisoned on the accusation of such practice. A letter written to Antoinette's husband mentions it, "Indeed I have not forgotten the case. The woman in question was called Josephine or Christophine Dubois, some such name and she had been one of the Cosway servants. After she came out of jail, she disappeared . . . He'll send a couple of policemen up to your place and she won't get off lightly this time" (130). For practicing indigenous Voodoo, the authority intends to punish her. Due to the black racial background of Christophine, she comes under the scrutiny of the authority. In this context of oppression against Christophine, it is relevant to refer what Spivak views about gendered subalterns. She examines that there is double suppression against subaltern women due to the collusion between patriarchy and capitalism that configures the international division of labor for women (*In Other Worlds* 300). These instances illustrate that the fundamental problems of subalterns and disenfranchised raised by Spivak mostly remain unaddressed in case of *Wide Sargasso Sea*. However, Rhys's criticism on imperial politics and gender through her characters is commendable. In this sense, Rhys partially succeeds to address the problems of the marginal.

Conclusion

Representations are contentious as the authors have ideological orientations. The sociopolitical background influences their views. So, the literary texts, like *Jane Eyre*, *Foe* and others reflect the ideological inclinations. The text written from the perspective of the

imperial power center differ politically from the texts that try to represent the marginal societies. These texts: *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* reflect the Eurocentric views whereas others: *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* contend such views. Due to the institutional affiliations, authors' claim for neutrality and transparency in representation fail to be so. Since they live in ideologies, even unconsciously they are tilted to some ideologies. Therefore, Gayatri Spivak claims that it is quite difficult to speak on behalf of other as one fails to forget one's social position.

The analysis of the primary texts of this study uncovers that Shakespeare, Bronte, and Defoe write from the mainstream perspective whereas Rhys, Coetzee and Césaire try to represent the peripheral societies. Since they try to reconstruct the knowledge to disrupt the unequal relation between the mainstreams and the peripheries, the possibility is that their critical narratives become the means to create awareness for the egalitarian relation.

The politics of representation determines in what ways the narrative is constructed. So, the politics of class, gender, race and others infiltrate into the literary texts. Similarly, others who disapprove such political ideologies modify the narratives. Comparatively, Rhys, Coetzee and Césaire, who write in favor of the peripherals, draw themselves closer to the subalterns and the disadvantaged groups as they contest the hegemonic ideologies. However, they do have limitations as they are not free from the institutional affinity. Therefore, despite their attempts, these authors are not as inclusive as they are expected to be.

Chapter V: Border Crossing to Bridge the Center-Margin Duality

As the borders are drawn to marginalize, crossing them can open the avenue to end the center-margin relation. In *Death of a Discipline*, about the challenges to defy the borders, Spivak admits, “borders are easily crossed from metropolitan countries, whereas attempts to enter from the so-called peripheral countries encounter bureaucratic and policed frontiers, altogether more difficult to penetrate” (16). However, the authors from the peripheries attempt to blur the boundaries to redefine the relationship between the center and the margin. The narratives of *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* represent the controversial human relations under the binary principle. Due to the influence of ideologies, William Shakespeare, Daniel Defoe and Charlotte Bronte intentionally or unintentionally construct the disparities in their texts. So, the politics of representation is explicit in the narratives. Directly or indirectly these authors express their political orientations that reflect the socio-political structures which demand the conformity to their regulations. So, the hierarchal relations constructed in the narratives are parts of larger programs, like Imperialism and others. The aforementioned narratives reflect the Western tradition of understanding the world in binary relation. Shakespeare, Defoe and Bronte are not free from the political motivations in their binary presentations. They carve the borders to differentiate the identities in contradictory relations. Their stories reveal that to define the ‘self, they construct the ‘other. Moreover, to draw the lines between self and other, they use the ideologies, like racism, nationalism and others. Such ideologies operate as the borders between identities.

As Shakespeare, Defoe and Bronte use binaries as per their interests, Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys deconstruct them politically to redefine the center-margin relations. For Derrida, the claim for centrality or the point of reference that relies on the margin cannot remain central as the margin demystifies the illusion of centrality. Therefore, the attempts of the peripheral authors are to expose the paradoxes within the so-called main stream narratives

which fail to justify the problematic representations. The critic-authors unfold the mainstream narratives and rewrite them to show their disagreements in the ways hierarchies are constructed between the characters of different racial, national and geographical origin. The attempts of Césaire, Coetzee and Rhys to deconstruct the narratives Shakespeare, Defoe and Brontë respectively show that the paradoxical representations need critical examinations. The contesting authors try to demystify how the imperial discourses operate in the literary narratives. Beside the exposition of the flaws in the narratives of the foregoing authors, these writers explore the possibilities to bridge the disparities in such narratives for the egalitarian relation. For this purpose, they reconstruct the narratives with substantial modification in the roles of the characters and other elements. For instance, Coetzee transforms the roles of Crusoe and Friday of Defoe's narratives. Similarly, Rhys substitutes Jane with Antoinette, a Creole from Jamaica. These authors' political motivations work behind such changes. They express their political disapprovals in their new versions of the texts of the former authors. Therefore, *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* are the products of critical reviews of the former texts. Through these alternative narratives, they attempt to cross the borders of ideologies that divide the societies as center and margin. Thus, critical reviews are crucial to address the disparities in societies.

Essentialization: Politics of Binaries

Binaries represented in the narratives of *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* invite contestations since they create the hierarchies between societies, like the Europeans and the non-Europeans. Under the influence of essentialism, the authors of the aforementioned narratives produce the asymmetrical relations between the mainstream and the peripheries. So, binaries are the product of essentialism. Strategically, Césaire, Coetzee and Rhys expose the paradoxes within these texts and search the alternatives for binary relations of the master narratives. The purpose of the reconstruction of these narratives is to

configure the discourses that can contribute to build egalitarian societies. Putting justice above other concerns, these authors vociferate the languages of the margins, like of women, people of color and the underclass workers. Similarly, the issues of nationalities and races draw their attentions. Therefore, the center-margin relations between the societies are the matter of concern for these authors. To critique such relations, they investigate the problematic representations of the former authors.

The Tempest is not free from binaries. Like *Robinson Crusoe*, it draws the borders between Europe and others. The politics of class and race are interwoven in this narrative. So, the binaries operate in the complex ways. The worlds of Caliban and Prospero meet and contest due to the differences of the ideologies of race and nationality. Caliban's savagery, like of Friday, has a connection with his non-European identity as Prospero's is associated with the civilized European identity. Caliban's relation with Prospero is like a Devil's relation with the God. The God does not like the Devil but he needs the Devil to justify the Godly role. Similarly, Prospero searches his heroism by putting Caliban against him. Both Shakespeare and Defoe fail to break the European legacy of representation since they construct the oppositional relation between the European societies and others. They take Europe as a point of reference. So, like Crusoe, Prospero is an imperial figure. Though he does not leave Milan deliberately, he does not miss the opportunity to be the emperor of chance in Caliban's island. Prospero's desire to rule other is the manifestation of the imperial mission that explores the possibilities of controlling others. Through coercive ways or non-coercive ideologies, the imperialists gain power and maintain it. Prospero employs such strategies to contain his enemies. He uses sorcery to cast an illusion to bring his rivals under his control. For instance, he causes the shipwreck through Ariel. His rival brother, Antonio, is made to surrender to Prospero. Similarly, Caliban is tormented by the mysterious noises

and unseen forces. Symbolically, the illusion created by Prospero refers that the political strategies of the imperialists are deceptive.

The author draws the borders between the internal differences and external differences. To resolve the internal differences between Prospero and his brother, Antonio, the play ends with a compromise as Antonio asks for apology and Prospero approves it. As Prospero regains his dukedom, the enmity turns into brotherhood. However, matters are different with Caliban. Since Caliban does not become ready to compromise with his freedom, the hostility between him and Prospero continues. Prospero does not show readiness to give up his authority over the island. Yet, he leaves it because his differences with his brother are resolved as he regains the power of his dukedom. Only he shifts his attention from the island-colony to his domestic affair.

The powerful defines the weak one in binary relation. So, Prospero defines Caliban with the negative traits, "He is as disproportioned in his manners/ As in his shape" (216). This projected image of Caliban reflects how the colonizer perceives the colonized. Antonio sees Caliban like a fish from the alien territory. So, the question is pointed at the author. Why does he create such a degrading image of the native, Caliban? He could be presented in the normal shape of human unlike a fish. Like Caliban's, his mother's image is no better. She gets a form of a witch, named Sycorax who had control over the island. Different from this, Prospero gets the positive light. For example, he glorifies himself and his family. He narrates his history of a prestigious duke of Milan. Similarly, he gives self-admiration for his knowledge and expertise in sorcery. He takes pride of his beautiful daughter, Miranda, and the virtuous wife who lives no more. Likewise, the author gives much space to Prospero's self-reflection. For instance, Prospero tries to draw sympathy from his daughter, Miranda, over the loss of his position and honor at Milan. He tells the story of his dislocation. These illustrations evidence that the contradictions reflect power relations. Essentialism works here

to characterize people with different traits. As the mainstream define the marginal, like Prospero does so to Caliban, they naturalize the hierarchy of power relations. So, essentialism operates to normalize the unequal relations, in the name of beauty, higher race, civilization and other traits.

The hatred between Prospero and Caliban has a connection with the racial ideology. It is visible in the expressions of Prospero and his daughter. For example, Miranda reprimands Caliban as a “vile race”. The racial awareness of Miranda comes from her father’s practices of racial segregation. Since he repeatedly abuses Caliban, Miranda learns from him that abuse is the language they speak to him. The ugly expressions of these father and daughter expose their racist political biasedness against Caliban in whose island they take shelter. Since the problems emerge with the arrival of Prospero at the island, his departure from there can solve them. However, it is in the interest of the colonist to prolong the stay to rule. Accordingly, Prospero nourishes his ambition to remain the lord of the island where he wishes that every dweller and even the elements of nature follow his commands. Prospero believes in ideology that he belongs to the race of ruling class. Therefore, his assumption is that Caliban, from another race, exists to serve the master, Prospero, from Europe.

In the context of *The Tempest*, different binaries have connections with the major categories of the colonizer and the colonized. Therefore, the battle between Prospero and Caliban is the battle between the colonial imperialist and the colonized native. The subjectivity of Caliban and Ariel provokes them to act against the oppression of Prospero. So, Caliban sets a mission to decolonize the island from the colonial occupation. Due to Prospero’s imperial perspective, he fails to see the relation with the external society in terms of cooperation and equality. Rather than expressing gratitude for Caliban’s hospitality and generosity, Prospero plots to rule him. He betrays the trust of Caliban. So, he complains, “. . . And then I loved thee/And showed thee all the qualities o’the isle, / The fresh springs, brine-

pits, barren place and fertile- / Cursed be I that did so! . . .” (118). Caliban regrets for sharing compassion to the ruthless opportunist who is expected as a friend but turns out as a foe.

Prospero does not let the friendship grow with Caliban due to the fear of losing the colonial role. So, no friendship develops between Prospero and Caliban. Rather, against Prospero’s oppression, Caliban needs to plot the strategies. Caliban’s reactions against Prospero are the productions of Prospero’s actions themselves. For instance, Prospero abuses Caliban verbally, “Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself / Upon thy wicked dam, come forth” (117). To respond this, Caliban retorts, “As wicked dew as e’er my mother brushed / With raven’s feather from unwholesome fen / Drop on you both!”(117). He curses Prospero with bad consequences for the latter’s abusive expression. For the hostility between Prospero and Caliban, Prospero is responsible as he is the one who encroaches into Caliban’s territory and defies the courtesy of a guest. Caliban’s kindness to Prospero, who needs a shelter as a driven away refugee, falls in the wrong hand. So, it becomes counter-productive to Caliban. Therefore, the colonizer, Prospero, has lost the moral ground to claim his superiority over Caliban. These instances illustrate that the use of binary between the colonizer and the colonized in *The Tempest* is a political strategy to search an imperial identity.

In *Robinson Crusoe*, Defoe draws the borders between the differences. He projects them in binary way. The major separations are between the European and non-European societies. Similarly, the representation of master-slave relation, duality between the races, and between the colonizer and the colonized shows the political use of binaries in the narrative. Through Crusoe and Friday such contradictions are represented. The use of binary is one strategy to differentiate the identities of people in relation to their nationalities and cultures. The identification of Crusoe’s self in contrast to Friday as other is based on the binary principle. Traditionally, such binaries are employed in literary narratives to show hierarchies. *Robinson Crusoe* is one example among many.

The idealized image of Crusoe in contrast to the primitive image of Friday illustrates the politics of representation that searches the European identity in relation to others. Defoe keeps the imperial legacy alive by constructing the narrative that devises the primary role to the imperial representative, Crusoe, to engage with the peripherals. Defoe characterizes Crusoe as an adventurous man from England with the desire for prosperity and experiences. As an imperial hero, he has to meet lots of challenges. Similarly, Friday gets a role of a savage from the primitive society. These differences are the parts of the imperial narrative to project the hierarchies. For Defoe, it seems that without Crusoe, Friday does not exist as the latter is created to justify the role of the former. Similarly, in the narrative structure, Crusoe comes first and Friday joins later. To look at the binaries that the author associates with these two figures, Crusoe represents civilization, progress, rationality, scientificity and kindness. Whereas, Friday represents barbarity, backwardness, irrationality, superstition and cruelty. These classifications in the western discourses are common as they compare themselves with their colonized societies of Africa, Asia, Latin America and others. Therefore, Edward Said in his “Orientalism” vehemently critiques the western discourses that devalue and misrepresent the East. He lambasts, “. . . European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self” (1993). This imperial perspective is reflected in *Robinson Crusoe*.

In Crusoe narrative, to foreground the English identity, the identity of the outer society is created. So, the relations are perceived through the imperial political lens. The ideas of savagery and cannibalism in connection with Friday from the outer society is the product of imperial politics. For instance, Crusoe narrates about the feast of the cannibals, “. . . the victors having taken any prisoners, would bring them over to this shore, where according to their dreadful customs, being all *cannibals*, they would kill and eat them; of which hereafter” (130). How to approve these fabrications of Defoe intended to tarnish the

image of the people of alien society? Comparatively, some societies are more developed than others. But the projection of cannibalism of a savage society in contrast to the civilized self of Crusoe is to forget the ethics of representation. It illustrates that how much lie an author, like Defoe, can tell under the intoxication of the ideologies of race and others.

Prosperity is connected with entrepreneurship as an asset of Europe to claim for its productivity. They link entrepreneurship with development. So, it works as a defining feature of Europe's identity. They use this as strength against the backwardness of non-European societies to justify their role for the progress of the world. For instance, Defoe foregrounds Crusoe's entrepreneurship. Crusoe is shown to hold the potentiality to prosper and succeed. Whereas, Friday is still in the wilderness struggling for the survival. So, another duality is constructed in the narrative taking entrepreneurship as a reference point.

The Europeans knew the secret that through the construction of discourses, they could gain power. Accordingly, they produced knowledge about Europe and other parts of the world. The historical and the literary narratives and even the scientific discourses produced in the West about the Third World depict its subordinate position. They construct truth about the non-European societies to maintain the power hierarchy. About the relation between power and truth, in *Power/Knowledge*, Foucault states, "Truth is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it. A regime of truth" (133). For example, in *Robinson Crusoe*, Crusoe is presented as independent to make his decisions but Friday is made to depend on Crusoe for his survival and better life. Therefore, the roles given to these characters reflect that the European representative is to lead and other to be led.

The binary relation between Crusoe and Friday is the relation between the colonizer and the colonized. To fulfill the imperial political motive, Defoe constructs such relation. The divisive policy of imperialism draws the borders to justify its role. Due to the influence of

this ideology, the literary narrative of Defoe becomes the means to fulfil its political interest. By rising above such ideology, Defoe could give different meaning to the narrative. Rather than projecting the relation in binary way, he could fashion the story where Crusoe and Friday could have friendship and they would respect one another. Love and compassion would unite them. But the gulf between Friday and Crusoe cannot be bridged easily since the problem is not merely between the two individual members but between the societies which are divided politically and ideologically. The political mission for ruling motivates for such representation. To illustrate, Crusoe feels good to be a ruler. So, he expects Friday to surrender before him as he takes himself as the lord, "I was absolute lord and law-giver; they all ow'd their lives to me, and were ready to lay down their lives, if there had been occasion of it, for me" (190). So, like the God, he imagines being above everyone on the island. Ironically, he is the self-proclaimed lord of single subject, Friday. This ambition to be the lord invites troubles in the world. Colonies, slavery and other anomalies are its productions.

Racial duality is another marker in *Robinson Crusoe*. It causes the gap between Crusoe and Friday. So, in terms of race also, the author fails to rise above its ideology. It is explicit in the characterization of these figures. Crusoe comes from a White racial family of England. Whereas, Friday represents the non-White society of the cannibal world as depicted by Defoe. He gets his name from Crusoe who does not like to identify Friday with his local name. So, the role of Friday is to become what Crusoe intends him to be. He is not made to take his own decisions and claim his identity. His primitive instinctual ways of living come from the author's decisions. Another illustration of racial politics in Crusoe narrative is that Crusoe intends to involve himself in Negro buying trade. He sees profit for him if he goes to Africa and brings some Negros. In Europe, the blacks from Africa could be enslaved legally as a labor force. Crusoe follows the same legacy. So, Defoe's narrative approves the racial division as a part of imperial politics.

Class contradiction cannot be overlooked in Crusoe narrative. Defoe's middle-class perspective is reflected in the image of Crusoe. Economically, the motive of the imperialists is to own the means and resources of the peripheries for the former's prosperity. Crusoe's oversea adventure, his entrepreneurship in Brazil and attempts in negro-trade are parts of his economic motivation. The problem with Crusoe's capitalistic motivation is that he is conscious of his middle-class identity and aspires to maintain it. So, the master-slave relation between Crusoe and Friday is the product of capitalistic programming. Under Capitalism, marginalized are exploited systematically. Crusoe's control over the resources, like weapons, food stuff and other logistics, gives him the privilege of owning Friday as well. So, Friday's labor and his productions belong to Crusoe as a master. However, the problem has a connection with the socio-political structure supported by ideology as it validates the social disparity in terms of class. Crusoe, himself is made a slave once under a Moor and manages to escape. However, he keeps his temptation of becoming a master alive. He translates it into practice in his relation to Friday.

In terms of disparities in *Jane Eyre*, Bronte clearly presents the divisions between men and women, rich and poor, and British and non-British. Similarly, sane and insane is another hierarchy in the narrative. Such divisions are within a society as well as between the societies. The author portrays the contradictory pictures between Rochester, the English national and Bertha, the Jamaican. Similarly, Bertha and Jane do not get equal attention from this woman author; they are put in the binary relation. Even within the same racial background of Jane and Bertha, a border is drawn. The author makes the judgment on the basis of their identities. She presents Jane as a pure White English girl. Whereas, Bertha is depicted as a White but a creole. Similarly, the heterosexual relations and other contradictions are apparent in the narrative. Rochester and Jane try to uphold the heterosexual values. Similarly, Bertha suffers from the gender ideology. Beside the problem of gender,

discourse of madness is used against her since the opposition is constructed between a sane and an insane. So, the situation becomes worse as the discourse of gender is embedded with the discourse of madness. Though differently treated, Jane remains no exception in gendered relation with Rochester. Another disparity that is a part of *Jane Eyre* is the disparity between the classes. The class politics speaks about the ills of Capitalism that inflicts both the British and the Caribbean societies. Therefore, *Jane Eyre* is debatable in terms of binary relation projected in it.

The ideology of nationalism is a powerful programming that divides people under the national entities. Christian Fuchs in “Nationalism, Communication, Ideology” argues that nationalism is a modern ideology which rationalizes the construction and maintenance of a nation. It draws the political and cultural borders. What belongs to a nation is justified by what is outside of it. Nationalism plays the key role for the reproduction of capitalism and class ideologically (235). The ideology of nationality is explicit in *Jane Eyre*. Bronte writes in the language of the British mainstream culture. Rochester and Jane serve as the spokespersons for the author’s ideological orientation. To promote the English identity, the author shapes the contrasting role for the Jamaican national Bertha. So, she tries to identify the British ‘self’ in contradictory relation to the Jamaican “other”. For instance, instead of creating harmony between the marriage partners, marriage is dramatized to establish the contradictory relation between Rochester and Bertha. Their marriage is made a failure since they belong to different nationalities. Rochester reveals that he married a creole of the Caribbean, “You are not to suppose that I desired perfection, either of mind or person. I longed only for what suited me – for the antipodes of the Creole and I longed vainly” (274). This regret has a connection with Bertha’s creole identity rather than individuality. The gulf between Rochester and Bertha is so deep that he even does not want to expose his marital relation to the society. He fears that his image will be tarnished if he makes his relation with

Bertha public. So, he writes to his family not to disclose his relation with Bertha to the public. He admits it with Jane, “My father and brother had not made my marriage known to their acquaintances; because, in the very first letter I wrote to appraise them of the union . . .” (927). For monetary gain, Rochester compromises with Bertha’s background for marriage. However, he cannot resolve the differences with her as he suffers from the superiority complex of his imperial identity. Thus, he plots against Bertha and discards her as an insane.

The colonial legacy survives in the narrative of *Jane Eyre*. The references drawn from the Caribbean show that still the imperial mentality exist. To look back, Jamaica had to pay the price due to the British occupation during the colonial era. Even in the postcolonial time, the imperial legacy affects the Jamaican in different forms, like in literary narratives. For example, the contradictory images of Jane and Bertha in relation to their social identities illustrate that the politics of imperialism motivates for the biased representation of these characters. Bertha’s condition shows that things are not fair in her representation. For instance, servants’ mouths are shut at Rochester’s home about Bertha. Jane narrates, “there was a mystery at Thornfield; and that from participation in that mystery I was purposely excluded” (144). Like the public, Jane was kept in darkness about Bertha. Why does mystery surround Bertha, the legitimate wife of Rochester? Only the legal binding does not make Rochester and Bertha love each other. Other factors cannot be overlooked since they contribute to draw Rochester to Jane. The English social identity is the key element for it. For example, he becomes very sensitive to the security of Jane, “I must be careful of you, my treasure: nerves like yours were not made for rough handling” (251). But his language becomes harsh for Bertha, “The lunatic is both cunning and malignant; she has never failed to take advantage of her guardian’s temporary lapses . . .” (273). These instances show that the social identity in connection to nationality is one of the key factors that works in binary relation in *Jane Eyre*.

Beside the dichotomies based on the ideologies of imperialism and nationalism, gender is another issue of study to examine the binary relation in *Jane Eyre*. The author presents the unequal heterosexual relations as legitimate or normal. Moreover, the naturalization of gendered relation invites criticism against Bronte's narrative. It shows that she fails to be critical of the gender ideology that shapes the relation between men and women of the Victorian Society. Due to the compliance with the repressive mechanism that shapes women's role to meet the expectations of patriarchy, the story of *Jane Eyre* becomes another means to institutionalize the gender politics. The relation between Rochester and Bertha and between Rochester and Jane are heterosexual and gendered. Bronte characterizes Rochester with masculine traits. So, his expectations reflect the ideology of patriarchy that essentializes women's feminine traits. Moreover, his expectations are under the influence of other ideologies, like race. Therefore, the sexual relations become more complex. Further, the problems between Rochester and Bertha are not merely sexual in biological sense rather they are connected to the socio-cultural identities. Thus, it seems that Rochester's antipathy with Bertha develops due to her creole Jamaican identity.

The tradition of understanding men in contrast to women shapes the discourse of patriarchy. Accordingly, the patriarchal authors frame their master narratives. Bronte as a woman author fails to hold a critical position against such tradition. Therefore, in "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism," Spivak critiques her, "It seems particularly unfortunate when the emergent perspective of feminist criticism reproduces the axioms of imperialism" (243). *Jane Eyre* comes as another example of heterosexual narrative that draws the borders between men's world and women's world. To meet the heterosexual standard, Jane attempts to fit herself into the feminine model of the Victorian society. Her education, like that of other girls, aims to shape modesty through discipline. Likewise, dexterity for household works: sewing, mending, and sensitivity to aesthetic dimension of body to please

men are other contents of Jane's education. She prepares herself for such courses. For instance, she joins Lowood girls' school of missionary to learn the values; chooses the profession of a governess as recommended for a woman. Similarly, she tries to meet the expectations of Rochester with feminine modesty and submissiveness. On the other side, Rochester feels proud of his manly role. For instance, he takes pleasure in offering jewelry to Jane, "I will myself put the diamond chain round your neck, and the circlet on your forehead. . ." (228). In the context of the Victorian society, Rochester's masculine identity is based on his economic power and luxury. He spends money on women abroad. It defines his strength. In case of women, Bertha is one legitimate but others are the women for pleasure for him. As Bertha fails to meet his expectations, he tries to compensate from others. So, he follows glamorous women as a lady killer. Yet, who can raise the moral question against this man? He is privileged in the gendered relation. Unlike Bertha, he is free to make his decisions as per his interests.

National identity issue causes the clash between Rochester and Bertha. Their marriage fails due to it. Since Rochester becomes more conscious of his identity to meet the expectations of his society, he fails to compromise for the acceptance of Bertha's identity. The image of Bertha as a mad woman is the product of identity politics. Her Caribbean Creole background and the gendered position largely determine the hostile relation with Rochester. Detached from the mainstream English identity, Bertha gets the status of a second-class person in Rochester's domain. She is but an outsider due to her association with the periphery of the British Empire. Moreover, Rochester's imperial masculine outlook influences his relation with her. For instance, it reflects how he perceives Bertha, "In the eyes of the world, I was doubtless covered with grimy dishonour; but I resolved to be clean in my own sight – and to the last I repudiated the contamination of her crimes and wrenched myself from connection with her mental defects" (27). Rochester does not want to link his name with

Bertha since he feels dishonored to do so. Therefore, his aversion to Bertha is the product of his superiority complex developed from his way of understanding their relation in binary way. Rochester places himself in the primary role. Whereas, for Bertha, he assumes that secondary role suits as per her social identity. Similarly, he assumes that he holds the authority to judge on Bertha's insanity. He claims the legitimacy for his judgment against Bertha. Whereas, she is not in a position to delegitimize his declaration of her as insane. What empowers him to do so? Since Bertha does not have agency to defend herself against his offence, he tries to justify his actions by showing her mental abnormality. The binaries of sexual orientations compounded with national and cultural identities create the distance between Rochester and Bertha.

Binary of sanity and insanity is also used to create hierarchy in *Jane Eyre*. Rochester employs madness as a weapon against Bertha to tarnish her image and rationalize his actions against her. The projection of opposition between sane and insane is politically motivated. The stigma of madness on Bertha has a connection with identity politics. Foucault in his text, *Madness and Civilization*, writes, "Madness and non-madness, reason and non-reason are inextricably involved: inseparable at the moment when they do not yet exist, and existing for each other, in relation to each other, in exchange which separates them" (Preface x). Since sanity and insanity overlap or within sanity, insanity defies the rational order, it is difficult to separate them. Foucault argues that the discourse of madness is used to exercise power. So, the concept of madness goes beyond the condition of health as it is the product of power that can define who is mad who is not. With regard to Bertha, her gendered liminal position makes it easier for Rochester to categorize her under insanity. As they represent different societies, one tries to define the other. Rochester finds himself in a position to define Bertha as a manic. He is conscious that Bertha does not belong to his mainstream politics now. So, he treats her as the marginal. As a woman from the colony of Britain, Bertha gets a

subordinate position in the narrative. Gender ideology is another reason for her marginalization.

The relation between Rochester and Bertha is not based on mutual respect and coexistence rather Bertha is taken to satisfy his expectations. Therefore, he takes her for granted and abuses her. Rochester himself is the product of English socio-cultural structure that shapes his psyche. So, he tries to conform to the expectations of the British mainstream practices that follow the imperial and patriarchal ideologies. Madness in itself is less important. Rather, against whom it is associated is more meaningful. In the context of *Jane Eyre*, the binary of sanity and insanity is employed to differentiate the center from the margin. In other words, Rochester from the mainstream identifies himself as a sane whereas, peripheral Bertha is defined as an insane. In this contradiction, center gives validity to who is sane, who is not. The use of the discourse of madness in the binary relation is to define who holds the weak position in power relationship. Madness, connected with the negative meaning, works as a stigma against the subaltern figure, Bertha. So, the discourse of madness becomes a political tool in representation to degrade the one and upgrade the other.

Class contradiction is another problem in *Jane Eyre*. The projection of the binary relation between the classes as a normal part of life has a connection with class ideology. Bronte presents the British Victorian society under the capitalistic organization of the 19th century in her narrative. The disparity between the classes are normalized in the narrative. In this context, she seems to concentrate on the problems of the upper-class, specially, the middle-class but overlooks the concerns of the underprivileged. For example, the master-servant dichotomy at Thornfield of Rochester and the workers' condition at Mrs. Reed's home illustrate that the author seems to take the class disparity as accepted system in the English society. Her internalization of capitalistic socio-political structure is reflected in the narrative. Further, the narrative fails to offer explicit evidences in the story to show the

disapproval of the master-servant relation at Rochester's Thornfield. Rather, he gets the author's attention as a middle-class English man with the privilege of owning property and servants. With this power, he keeps mystery about Bertha. For this purpose, he transacts with Grace Poole who keeps vigilance on Bertha in the attic. He offers extra money to Poole to keep the matter about Bertha secret. So, Rochester employs unfair means as a master to use the servant-woman to imprison his wife inside his own house. He makes use of the poverty of his servant, Grace Poole to fulfill his interest. More, Rochester's luxury lies on his servants' labor. However, their contributions get no recognition except in monetary value that they get as payment. This illustrates that the master-servant structure of binary relation causes social injustice since it serves the interests of the upper-class at the cost of the working class. So, capitalism translates human relation into commodity. For example, Grace Poole has to follow as the master commands because he pays to her. So, Rochester claims that she must keep the matter confidential about Bertha. He assumes that it is the duty of Grace Poole to follow his order whether right or wrong since she draws money for it. This shows that class contradiction is problematic as it gives the privilege to the upper-class to use the resources in its favor which brings social disparity and injustice. Under the protection of Capitalism, such disparity survives. So, Capitalism gives legitimacy to the systematic exploitation of the underprivileged. Ultimately, all the binary relations serve the interests of the dominant. Politically or culturally, they try to maintain hierarchy to promote one at the cost of the other.

To disapprove the contradictory representations, like in *The Tempest*, the new versions of texts are produced. Therefore, Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys attempt to dismantle the binaries politically so that human relations can be redefined for the better society and justice.

Deconstruction of Binaries by Alternative Narratives

Since the binaries are constructed under the influence of ideologies with the political motivations, they are to be deconstructed politically to address the social contradictions. The binaries represented in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* are challenged in their new versions: *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* respectively. The concerns of Jean Rhys, J.M. Coetzee and Aime Cesaire seem to disrupt the hegemonic narratives that try to maintain the center-margin relations. These authors envision the egalitarian relations among the people of diverse backgrounds. So, rather than creating other binaries while working to upgrade the marginalized groups, they seem to underscore the necessity of recuperation by crossing the borders that separate people on the basis of ideologies, like race, class and others. However, in their attempts, they are partially successful to address the contradictions against which they aim their narratives. It is like Derrida's acceptance that while exposing the deconstruction of others' narratives, the critics themselves are not free from the contradictions in their statements. Their vulnerabilities surface in their narratives. Therefore, Spivak draws the attention of the critics that they should be ready for self-criticism or be vigilant where they fail to meet the expectations. She views that self-reflexivity offers the opportunity to recognize the limitation of one's statements. The claims without watchfulness ignore the vulnerabilities that lead to failure. In *The Post-Colonial Critic*, she writes, "Once you are aware that the only way in which you can deconstruct is by making the structure of that which you critique the structure of your own criticism, then you become conscious of the limitations of the total escape" (45). In this sense, the efforts of Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys are not adequate to avoid vulnerabilities. However, they are commendable as per the objectives of mending human relations for better societies. To end the binary of center-margin relation, the voices raised from the side of the peripheries by these authors are notable. Their approaches are deconstructive in the political sense. Without addressing the

political problems that cause the social disparities, the egalitarian societies cannot be created. Thus, the center-margin relations represented in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* are the political problems. They need political approaches for criticism.

Aime Césaire critiques the oppositional relations. He appropriates *The Tempest* to critique essentialism that draws the borders of race, class and nationality. So, he interrogates the duality between the colonial Prospero and his colonized subjects Caliban and Ariel. Like in *Robinson Crusoe*, the barriers between the representatives of the Global North and the Global South are visible in *The Tempest*. Here, the Global North means the European representation and the Global South means the representation of the marginalized from the Caribbean and other. The ideological differences between Prospero and his colonized subjects draw them apart. The ideologies of racism and nationalism shape the views of Prospero towards the non-European societies. To address these problems generated by the imperial politics, Césaire reconfigures the narrative of Shakespeare. He is more radical in his criticism against misrepresentation than Rhys and Coetzee. His resistance gets expressed through the voice of Caliban who revolts against Prospero's oppression. Like Coetzee, who identifies Friday as an African, Césaire Africanizes Caliban and Ariel. To foreground the impact of the colonial occupation on Africans, these authors associate their characters with Africa. In terms of racial oppression, it is the Africans who have to pay the price more than others. Probably, for this reason, Césaire seems more serious on racial issue than others. In this connection, in *A Tempest*, the spirit of decolonization speaks through Caliban. With regard to binary relations, they are connected to the center and the periphery. Therefore, the battle against Prospero's rule is to end the vertical relation between the colonizer and the colonized and set the new relations on the horizontal level where they stand on equal footing.

The political language of protest is stronger in *A Tempest*. So, it is the political deconstruction of the imperial hegemony expressed in *The Tempest*. In Césaire's narrative,

the role of Prospero is harsher than in Shakespeare's. Similarly, Caliban presents himself in more radical way as a rebel to topple the colonial regime of Prospero. For instance, in *A Tempest*, Prospero's racist and abusive language against Caliban illustrates the ugly image of the imperialist. He rebukes Caliban, "You, a savage . . . a dumb animal, a beast I educated, trained, dragged up from the bestiality that still clings to you" (11). Prospero puts Caliban at the level of animal and claims that despite Prospero's efforts to transform him into a human, he continues to live the wild life. This binary of human-animal relation is the product of racist politics. To protest this, Césaire fields Caliban. Caliban, without fear, demands his freedom, "You know very well that I'm not interested in peace. I'm interested in being free! Free, you hear?" (63). This voice of Caliban has the potentiality to make the colonizer hear his voice.

To critique the role of Prospero as a master and Caliban as his slave, Césaire consolidates the bond between Caliban and Ariel since both are slaves from Africa. Ariel expresses their unity, "but after all we are brothers, brothers in suffering and slavery, but brother in hope as well. We both want our freedom" (20). Here, Césaire forges the solidarity between the marginal to end the master-slave relation. They must fight Prospero together to end their slavery. Unlike Shakespeare's Caliban and Ariel, Césaire's characters believe in unity against oppression. As the colonial occupation needs resistance to decolonize the natives, the protest of Caliban is justifiable for his freedom. Shakespeare also presents Caliban as a rebellious slave. However, Shakespeare focuses on Caliban's individuality or the personal freedom. Whereas, Césaire presents Caliban as a representative of Africans colonized who fight to decolonize themselves. In this sense, Césaire writes *A Tempest* from the perspective of the marginalized. And his voice is the collective voice of Africa.

To highlight the role of the colonized to end the colonial condition, Césaire changes the last part of *The Tempest*. In this text, Prospero leaves Caliban's island voluntarily at the end. But in case of *A Tempest*, he decides to stay on the island and continue his rule. Why

does Césaire decide for Prospero to stay on the island at the end? Probably, he views that the colonizers, like Prospero, do not forsake the occupation voluntarily. They are to be driven away by the colonized themselves. So, it is Caliban who needs to do this job to decolonize his society. Prospero holds no moral ground to forsake his rule voluntarily. So, he declares, “This isle is mute without me. / My duty, thus, is here, / And here I shall stay” (66-67). This decision of Prospero invites a war against his occupation. For this mission of decolonization, Caliban becomes ready.

J. M. Coetzee, like Césaire, puts his efforts to deconstruct the binaries represented in *Robinson Crusoe*. In the political sense, his text *Foe* seems an attempt to take human relations beyond the binaries of ideologies of race, nationality and others. In search of alternative to the controversial model of representation that constructs hierarchy, Coetzee envisions a society where such borders collapse and the possibilities of better new relations emerge. With this vision, he reconstructs the narrative of *Robinson Crusoe* with the fundamental shifts in terms of roles of characters, change in the plot and the modification of the narrative.

Identity is the motivating factor to make unequal relation in Crusoe narrative. The contradictory roles of Crusoe and Friday are parts of it. Defoe presents Crusoe as an imperial hero from the British society in a mission of prosperity and individual autonomy. On the other side, a savage is placed in a position who is yet to learn how to accomplish the deeds like the master Crusoe does. This is a political choice of the author. It is significant to observe how Coetzee responds to such political misrepresentation. To critique the ideology of imperialism that influences Defoe to craft the binary societies, Coetzee downsizes the power of Crusoe and includes a woman’s voice. The role of Susan is important to make the narrative inclusive as Crusoe narrative becomes a woman’s narrative also. Similarly, substantial attention is paid to the role of Friday. Unlike Defoe’s Friday, he represents the African slaves

whose voice is silenced by the imperial colonizer. Among these changes, Crusoe seems as a lowly figure struggling to survive in a desolate island. Coetzee strips his colonial role by reducing him to a pathetic figure. He is vulnerable to disease unlike Defoe's Crusoe. So, he falls sick and takes long to recover. Finally, he dies due to fever. Beside his health, other vulnerabilities mock his imperial background. Without guns, he is like Friday. He relies on the primitive methods of hunting and survival. So, in this context, it is not easy to find where the duality works between him and Friday. This way, by changing the role of Crusoe, Coetzee tries to defy the borders between the colonizer and the colonized.

The ideologies of racism and nationalism play the key roles in the construction of *Robinson Crusoe*. Crusoe's White racial and English identity in relation to Friday's non-White Caribbean identity illustrates that the author defines one race and one nationality in contrast to others. Putting one race against the other is a racial politics that is apparent in Crusoe narrative. Since the representations speak themselves, the projection of unequal relations between Crusoe and Friday who are from the distinct societies shows that identity politics is behind the binary representation. How does Coetzee address the duality made on the basis of race and nationality in *Robinson Crusoe*?

To critique the ideologies of racism and nationalism, Coetzee focuses on the impact of these ideologies on the colonized societies. Accordingly, he appropriates the role of Friday. So, Friday gets the African identity in *Foe*. Probably, to show how the colonizers silence the colonized, he presents Friday as a mute character who has lost his tongue. Or symbolically, he refuses to speak in the colonial discourse. He wants to remain independent without connecting himself to others since they try to represent him. In this regard, Susan views, "Many stories can be told of Friday's tongue, but the true story is buried within Friday, who is mute" (118). Friday's absence in communication can be interpreted as a refusal to be a party of binary relation as represented in *Robinson Crusoe*. So, as a black slave

under the fragile master, Crusoe, Friday fails to meet the expectations of others and remains as he is. Different from Defoe's Crusoe, Crusoe of Coetzee makes no big claims about his English nationality and racial supremacy rather lives as an ordinary man struggling for life. He does not seem that much concerned about the difference between his identity and Friday's. So, Defoe's projection of binary seems to collapse in Coetzee's *Foe*.

In *Robinson Crusoe*, Crusoe takes credit for improving Friday by teaching him language, Christian values and neutralizing his cannibalistic instinct. He takes it as a duty of a master from the superior race and nation. But Crusoe in *Foe* makes no such efforts to change Friday. Even the most basic element of communication, language, he does not try to teach him. So, Crusoe lets Friday go in his own ways. He plays the minimum role as a master since he is occupied with his own business of making terraces and exploration of food. Neither he searches his identity through Friday nor takes credit for being good to him. Likewise, Crusoe plays no politics over Friday's savagery, and cannibalism of other savages. With these changes, in the narrative of Defoe, Coetzee makes *Foe* inclusive to disrupt the contradictory representation in *Robinson Crusoe*.

The master-slave opposition of Defoe's narrative comes under the scrutiny of Coetzee. In *Foe*, Crusoe does not seem like a master. He neither holds the privilege of terrorizing the slaves and savages with the sounds of Gun nor enjoys self-glorification in the name of his European descent and achievements of his civilization. His tall figure from the white racial family alone is not adequate to define him as a white master since he does not use ideologies to justify his masterly role. To question the master-slave binary, Coetzee erases the distinctive markers used in *Robinson Crusoe*. For instance, he has to manage with the primitive weapons rather than guns, he shows no expertise of building a boat to rescue himself from the island. He makes terraces but lacks seeds to plant. Similarly, he shares no stories about his past. Crusoe simply acts as an ordinary shipwrecked fellow searching his

future on the island. Coetzee presents him this way to make Crusoe unlike a master. To compare, Defoe's Crusoe shows his political ambition and attempts to maintain masterly position with the support of ideologies and narratives. Whereas, Crusoe does not display such inclinations.

Coetzee positions Susan, a woman, in the narrative to negotiate the divided zones between Crusoe and Friday of Defoe's narrative. Taking Friday under her care, she offers a new dimension to the Crusoe narrative. In order to divert the focus from Crusoe to her narrative, she attempts to craft a narrative about her journey into the world of Crusoe. So, through Susan's point of view, Coetzee attempts to break the binaries drawn between the world of Crusoe and other societies. Beside it, the author takes the decision of the death of Crusoe to give a new course to the narrative. Crusoe's death symbolizes the end of the imperial representation as its hero dies. So, Coetzee's Crusoe fails to meet the imperial expectations. Moreover, Susan offers the alternative perspective to see the relations between societies beyond the binary way. She acts as an eyewitness to expose the vulnerabilities of Crusoe and attempts to negotiate between the differences across races and sexes.

In *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Rhys attempts to defy the borders drawn in binary lines in *Jane Eyre*. In terms of issues, gender, class and nationality have the potential space for debate in Bronte's narrative. To address these issues, Rhys interrogates hierarchies projected in *Jane Eyre*. Though Rhys's efforts are not adequate to address these problems, they have symbolic implications. Through the political gesture, the author disapproves the controversial representation of *Jane Eyre*. As Spivak argues that one can be strategically essentialist to fight essentialism, Rhys may seem essentialist in her approach to battle essentialism of the dominant discourses.

To subvert the hierarchal relation constructed under the ideology of nationality, Rhys devises the prominent role for a creole woman from Jamaica. This way, she critiques the

problematic relation between Bertha Mason and Edward Rochester of *Jane Eyre*. Brontë's presentation of this couple in binary way provokes Rhys to alter the narrative. In *Wide Sargasso Sea* also, the English man and Antoinette represent different societies. However, they play the roles in different ways. Unlike Bertha who is a silenced figure in Brontë's narrative, Antoinette resists and reacts. She can articulate her voice in her defense. Her identity consciousness is reflected through her expressions. For instance, she foregrounds her place "We are alone in the most beautiful place in the world, it is not possible that there can be anywhere else so beautiful as Coulibri" (118). Though sometimes she worries about her in-between position between the British identity and the Caribbean one as a member of the migrant family of the British nationality, she feels marginalized and associates herself with other marginalized, like Christophine. Through Antoinette, Rhys questions the unequal relations between the mainstream British representation and its marginal Caribbean society. However, she does not seem to create another binary. Rather, she strategically uses the Caribbean belongingness to interrogate the imperial narrative.

The contradiction between the English and the Jamaican identities is the main cause of conflict between Rochester and Bertha in *Jane Eyre*. As the narrative is written from the European perspective, the other side of representation remains silent. This silence is broken in *Wide Sargasso Sea* since Rhys questions the perspective itself that draws the borders. For instance, Antoinette's husband identifies himself in relation to his British nationality and pure White racial background. He devalues the creole identity of Antoinette. To illustrate, he describes her, "I watched her critically. She wore a tricorne hat which became her. At least it shadowed her eyes which are too large and can be disconcerting. She never blinks at all it seems to me. Long, sad, dark alien eyes. Creole of pure English descent she may be, but they are not English or European either" (61). Despite her White racial background, he draws the line between himself and her in terms of identity. Rhys exposes this mentality of

Eurocentrism. To deconstruct this view, she employs her protagonist, Antoinette, and a black servant, Christophine, in a verbal war with the English man. Unlike Bertha of *Jane Eyre*, Antoinette can speak for self-representation and safeguard her identity. In her defense, she puts charges on the man, ““You abused the planters and made up stories about them, but you do the same thing. You send the girl away quicker, with no money or less money, and that’s all the difference”” (133). With these accusations, she differentiates herself from the man.

Though Antoinette is from the slave owner’s family, she at the moment associates herself with the black marginal. Like Antoinette, Christophine interrogates this man. She questions his morality with regard to his treatment to Antoinette, ““You want her money but you don’t want her. It is in your mind to pretend she is mad. I know it. The doctors say what you tell them to say . . . you do that for money? But you wicked like Satan self!”” (145). Fearlessly Christophine argues with him. These instances illustrate that Rhys protests the subordinate role given to Bertha in *Jane Eyre* as she raises the characters from the margin to question Bronte’s representation. Using the strategies, like alliance among the peripherals and the dialogic discourse between the mainstream and the peripherals, Rhys places them at negotiation. The challenge for Rhys is how to appropriate the narrative of *Jane Eyre* to deconstruct its binaries. To recuperate the division or turn the hostility into friendship, she uses the platform of interaction of differing views. So, the dialogue between Antoinette’s husband and Christophine is crucial to exchange the conflicting views and prepare for negotiation.

Another issue of debate is madness used in *Jane Eyre*. It comes under the scrutiny of Rhys. The tag of madness attached to Bertha becomes another ideology. It is disputable because it is politically used to stigmatize the woman of periphery. To falsify the claim of madness against Bertha, Rhys puts Antoinette in defensive role. Antoinette denies that she herself and her mother suffer from mania. On this matter, she clarifies to her husband that

Daniel Boyd, who claims to be a relative of Antoinette, must have implanted the rubbish idea of madness into the mind of her husband as Boyd intends to make money by blackmailing him. She denies this allegation and demands, ““You have no right to ask questions about my mother and then refuse to listen to my answer”” (117). Further, about her past, she states that due to the weakened position of her family in Jamaica, her mother had to suffer from anxiety. So, taking the advantage of such unfavorable situation, she was taken as insane and kept in isolation. In case of Antoinette herself, she proves that she does not suffer from insanity. To illustrate, at the end of the story, she breaks her confinement at Thornfield, England and goes out with a candle in her hand at night. It is not insanity that guides her for the liberation rather her sanity makes her conscious of her position and empowers her to take a decision to break the bondage.

Rhys demystifies that those who assume themselves as powerful use the discourse of madness as ideology to tarnish the image of another party that is in the weaker position. For instance, Rochester employs it against Bertha. Similarly, in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, the man, a new version of Rochester, uses the ideology of madness to delegitimize the status of Antoinette as insane and defines himself as a sane. Against the use of madness in binary relation, Rhys reconfigures the narrative of *Jane Eyre* and shows how it is employed to degrade the position of a creole woman. So, in Rhys’s narrative, Antoinette with her sanity outsmarts her husband at the end.

Rhys critiques the duality of gender ideology also as presented in *Jane Eyre*. Bronte presents men’s and women’s worlds in contradiction to each other. The heterosexual relation between Rochester and his women is the reflection of the values of the Victorian patriarchal society. As per Rochester’s expectations and cultural norms, Jane conforms the conventional role of a gendered woman with feminine gestures. Similarly, Bertha has to fit herself into such modality. However, due to the difference of the social background with Bertha, it is not

the sexual relation alone that determines her relation with Rochester. Rochester's relations with Bertha and Jane as well as with other women illustrate that in terms of sexuality, the author seems to approve the gendered relation between a man and a woman. Rhys attempts to critique such binary relation.

In *Wide Sargasso Sea*, through Antoinette, Rhys defies some patriarchal norms. Unlike Jane, Antoinette pays attention to her own desires even though they displease her husband and she looks unwomanly. For example, to attract her husband sexually, she intoxicates him with drug as he overlooks her expectations and maintains distance with her. Similarly, she argues with him if she cannot approve his views. For instance, her husband does not like her place. So, she responds, “Don't you like it here? This is my place and everything is in our side” (67). She explicitly states that situation is in her favor. Different from Jane who tries to please Rochester with her feminine appeals, Antoinette maintains a distance with the man as she does not surrender to his desires. So, in the climax, she lets her aggression fall on him. He describes her wrath, “She smashed another bottle against the wall and stood with the broken glass in her hand and murder in her eyes” (134). She is aggressive and tries to strike him with a broken glass. This is the explosion of suffocation she feels with him. To douse the fire generated by anxiety, she drinks liquor like a man. So, time and again, she becomes manly forgetting the gendered heterosexual role. Due to some serious differences related to identity with her husband, their marriage becomes the contact zone for the expression of grievances. Ultimately, the marriage fails as they separate. These instances demonstrate that Antoinette does not fit into the strict gender binary. She tries to cross the borders that Jane approves. Though not much radical, yet her role is strong enough to send the message that the gendered relation can be challenged.

Rhys devises stronger role to Christophine than Antoinette. Generally, the servant-women hold the weak position in the narratives. In case of the black women-servants, the

condition is worse. However, Christophine of *Wide Sargasso Sea* is exceptional. She holds the spirit that can defy the borders between the colonizer and the colonized in case of both imperial politics and gender relation. Confidently, she defends herself as well as Antoinette in confrontation with the English man. For example, Christophine uncovers the motivation of the man for his marriage to Antoinette, “Everybody know that you marry her for her money and you take it all. And then you want to break her up, because you jealous of her” (138). So, it is money that draws the man to Jamaica to marry a creole girl. Similarly, Christophine suggests Antoinette to drug the man so that he gets attracted to her as Antoinette asks her how to bring him to Antoinette for sexual intercourse. Christophine is made controversial due to obeah case also. In this regard, Mr. Fraser, a friend of Antoinette’s husband, writes a letter to him mentioning about the obeah practice of Christophine for which she is wanted by the police. He writes in the letter, “She is intelligent in her way and can express herself well, but I did not like the look of her at all, and consider her a most dangerous person” (130). Once she was kept in jail for obeah. Such view on Christophine reveals that they perceive her as a threat since she can employ obeah as an agency to fight oppression. This report shows that Christophine is bold and resistant. She does not fit into the conventional role of a black woman-servant. She defies men’s authority. In the colonial relation, she can challenge the imperial figure, like Antoinette’s husband, for the freedom and identity of the marginal, like herself and others. With this role of Christophine, Rhys questions the traditional role of women presented in the narrative of *Jane Eyre*. Thus, her women characters attempt to defy the borders of gendered relation and others.

Negotiation across the Differences for Recuperation

Aime Cesaire, J.M. Coetzee and Jean Rhys rewrite *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* respectively to contest the ideologies that support to maintain the hegemonies of imperialism and others. The attempts of these authors are to uncover the fault lines in these texts and offer the alternatives to the problematic representations. In this process, they adopt the path of negotiation across the differences. Unlike the perspectives of Bronte, Defoe and Shakespeare, the succeeding authors raise the issues of peripheries. They seem to have the purpose of ending the center-margin relations as represented in the texts of the former authors. So, rather than creating another binary relation by subverting the hierarchies, they envision egalitarian societies where the differences are acknowledged and essentialism is questioned.

The characters, like Caliban of *The Tempest*, Bertha Mason of *Jane Eyre* and Friday of *Robinson Crusoe* provoke the critical authors to redefine the relations projected in these narratives. Rhys, Coetzee and Cesaire choose their rhetoric to negotiate across the differences of race, nationality and others. The purpose is to address the issues of the marginalized and explore the better relations. Campbell Jones examines Spivak's views on negotiation between different school of criticisms, "Avoiding easy and intellectually undemanding pluralisms, she stresses the discontinuities and disagreements between practicality, Deconstruction, Feminism and Marxism while also stressing the need to continue to negotiate between these" (232). As Spivak underscores the necessity of transforming hostility into friendship for the upward mobility of the socially excluded, these authors seem to anticipate the positive outcome of negotiation across the differences. Through their literary forms with the fictional colors, they hold the potentiality to raise the social awareness against exclusion and marginalization.

As *Foe* is another version of *Robinson Crusoe*, *A Tempest* is a contested version of *The Tempest*. Césaire critically interprets Shakespeare's narrative to contest the debatable issues. Against the language of hegemony used in *The Tempest*, Césaire uses the language of negotiation. In *A Tempest*, African Caliban's resistance against Prospero's occupation on the island is one of the ways for Césaire to negotiate between the racial and other differences. The imperial and the racist politics of Prospero meets contestation since it develops consciousness in Caliban and Ariel. So, their consciousness explores the possibilities to minimize the differences for justice and friendship. Because of the political ambition of Prospero, Caliban's and Ariel's freedom is compromised. Thus, to address this problem, Caliban speaks the language of protest. So, Prospero is bound to listen to them though he shows his disapproval for Caliban's freedom.

Caliban uses the political language and memory to defend his heritage through his narratives. So, the narrative serves him to justify his resistance against the suppression of Prospero. He tells stories to connect his present with the past. In his narrative, he refers to the independent status of his mother from whom he inherited the island. In this regard, he tells Stephano, "Well, you see, this island used to belong to me, except that a man named Prospero cheated me of it" (43). This is the strong point to justify his claim that it is his right to defend his territory and identity. His language of protest compels Prospero to hear his grievances. So, the struggle of Caliban continues for his mission of liberation. However, in Césaire's narrative, Caliban fails to get liberation since at the end of the narrative, Prospero acknowledges that he needs Caliban as his company because his daughter, Miranda, gets married to Ferdinand and leaves for Europe. So, Prospero says, "Well, Caliban, old fellow, it's just us two now, here on the island . . . only you and me" (68). It shows that without Caliban, Prospero cannot manage himself. He accepts the importance of Caliban as Prospero plans to live together. Unlike Shakespeare's narrative in which Prospero returns to Milan, in

A Tempest he stays on the island at the end of the play. Therefore, he speaks the language of negotiation with Caliban. It shows that Césaire aims to bridge the gap between the colonizer and the colonized to create a society where the ideological differences are minimized for the egalitarian relations.

To negotiate, Caliban does not approve of the imposed identity on him by Prospero. Due to the political consciousness, Caliban explores the possibility for decolonization. As Prospero calls him 'Caliban,' which he rejects, "I've decided I don't want to be called Caliban any longer" (14). Caliban reminds Prospero that he has his own name and identity. Therefore, he refuses to accept the given identity. Like Prospero, Caliban represents his own society. He demands that his identity be recognized. Putting the condition for recognizing identity is a way to hold one's position for negotiation. However, "Rigidly bounded identities do not allow for imagination or dialogue that might highlight the potential intersections among a variety of hybrid nations, groups, and individuals. A discourse of the possibilities becomes limited and truncated when we do not think of identity in unstable, processual terms" (Martinez 63). Though identity is in flux, people have to assume that something belongs to them so that they can hold their position for negotiation. So, it is the matter of strategy to empower oneself. Otherwise, humanity loses its spirit for the growth of self.

Despite the constant assault from Prospero, Caliban continues his battle for his sovereignty. He gives a message to the colonized societies that it is the spirit of resistance that keeps the hope for freedom alive. However, one has to be ready to pay the price for freedom as it is not easily granted. Another aspect of Caliban's identity is language. Through his African native language, he demands freedom. His use of "Uhuru" for freedom holds the symbolic meaning. It is not simply a word rather a political weapon against invasion. Therefore, Prospero smells conspiracy in the use of this term. He reacts, "Mumbling your native language again! I've already told you, I don't like it" (11). Does Prospero simply

dislike Caliban's language or feels afraid of the native resistance through the agency of language? Language contains power; it can support as an agency to challenge the imperial authority. Probably, Prospero understands its potentiality. So, he feels threatened when Caliban uses his mother tongue. Unlike Friday of *Robinson Crusoe* who is made to speak the master's language, Caliban of Césaire symbolically rejects the colonial language. So, the local language as a part of identity equips Caliban as a weapon for negotiation. Like his name, language speaks his nativity.

For the African mythical representation, Césaire presents a rebel God, Eshu, who as a trickster defies the decorum of the European mythical discourse. To mock the mythical tradition of Prospero, Césaire adds the political color to the mythical dimension. So, the God, Eshu, of African people presents himself as a revolutionary before the Goddesses: Juno, Iris and Ceres. His language on sexuality is disruptive as he goes loose, "Eshu plays a trick on the Queen? / And makes her so upset that she runs / Naked into the street" (48). Rather than approving the conventional roles of the Gods and the Goddesses, Césaire presents the God of the oppressed people as a political rebel who speaks the language of deviation. Through such role of Eshu, Césaire sends a message that the Africans follow their own mythical tradition. They do not have to conform to the European mythical tradition. It is also the part of their cultural identity. Thus, culturally, Césaire seems to claim that the African values cannot be overlooked.

In *A Tempest*, the language of protest used by Caliban, Ariel and Eshu indicates that without ending the oppressive condition created by the imperial political incursion, the new friendly relation between the invader and the invaded is not possible. Césaire uses protest as a political rhetoric to exert the pressure on the dominant imperial power center to make them hear the narrative of the subjected people and be ready for the political settlement. For such settlement, from the side of the dominant, the flexibility of self-criticism and the

acknowledgment of the identity of the contesting party contribute. For instance, if Prospero becomes self-reflexive to accept his weakness and its impact on his colonized subjects, it creates a condition for the friendly relation with Caliban. Without such flexibility, the hostility continues. Ultimately, the protest of the colonized, like Caliban, demands justice and the better human relation by ending the hostile condition that causes division in society. In this sense, Césaire attempts to justify the language of protest for negotiation through the narrative of *A Tempest*.

Like *Wide Sargasso Sea*, *Foe* is an attempt to cross the borders of racism, nationalism and others. To question Defoe's politics of representation, Coetzee critically examines the flaws in Crusoe narrative and attempts to address them in *Foe*. Coetzee, like Rhys, speaks the language of negotiation across the differences. With his innovation, he changes the narrative of Defoe to minimize the gaps between Europeans and others. So, the issues of gender, class and others are the focus of negotiation. For instance, the changes in the roles of Crusoe and Friday, addition of a new character, Susan, and some other changes in the narrative are some of the strategies used to alter the problematic relationship. It seems that Coetzee explores the possibilities to end the center-margin relation.

In comparison to *Robinson Crusoe*, *Foe* explicitly expresses the language of negotiation. To reduce the gap between Crusoe and Friday, Coetzee tries to neutralize the markers that show the contradictions between races. For examples, in *Robinson Crusoe*, the references of savages are widely used to justify the role of civilized Crusoe. To devalue the practices of the natives, the savages are associated with cannibalism and brutality. Crusoe narrates, "I presently found there was no less than nine naked savages, sitting round a small fire, they had made, not to warm them, for they had no need of that, the weather being extreme hot, but as I suppos'd, to dress some of their barbarous diet of human flesh . . ." (144). This cannibal image of savages is fed into the narrative to draw the division

between civilization and wilderness. The savages in barbaric act is the fabrication of the author to idealize the European sophistication and decorum. Unlike this depiction, in *Foe*, Coetzee raises the questions about the existence of such savages. For example, Susan doubts the presence of savages, "As for cannibals, I am not persuaded, despite Crusoe's fears that there are cannibals in those oceans" (54). In this statement, Susan denies though Crusoe sometimes worries about the savages. So, doubting about the savages means questioning the binaries between the savages and Crusoe. The denial of binary is for acknowledging differences in the positive light.

To address the problem of women's exclusion, Coetzee creates a meaningful role to Susan. Through her, he draws the man's world of *Robinson Crusoe* in interaction with a woman who makes difference in terms of representation of excluded other in Defoe's narrative. Susan as a castaway woman, ventures into a voyage of uncertainty that is traditionally assigned to a man rather than to a woman. So, her encounters with a number of challenges that men are meant to face, put her beyond the feminine role. To illustrate, she sets in a mission to find her daughter; rescues herself on the island; tries to save the life of Crusoe. Similarly, she rescues Friday and produces her narrative discourse about her journey in relation to Crusoe. These instances show that she defies the traditional role of a woman.

Susan tries to balance the relation with men. In one hand, she contests with men to strengthen her position. On the other, she maintains friendly relations with them. Therefore, her debates and differences with men, Crusoe and Foe, are oriented to seek her role for addressing the problems of gender politics in a man's narrative. Along with this, she sees the possibility of building cooperation and trust with men. For example, after the discussion between Susan and Foe, he has to be ready to shape her narrative as per her wish rather than imposing his own perspective in her story. A negotiation takes place between them. So, he has to respect her views. Unlike the traditional women who are kept silenced to hear the

men's voices, Susan gets space to express her concerns. To illustrate, she claims, "I am a free woman who asserts her freedom by telling her story according to her own desire" (131). This assertion compels Foe to listen to her voice. Similarly, Susan presents her views to Crusoe. She critiques the futile terrace-making project of Crusoe and Friday as they lack seeds to plant. Likewise, she inquires why he could not save some weapons and tools from the wrecked ship as they could be useful to him. In the same manner, she tries to uncover why Crusoe failed to teach language to Friday. Though these questions are not related to herself, they reflect her views on different issues. Despite her differences with Crusoe, she extends her hands to friendship. She nourishes him as he remains bedridden with fever and rescues him with the help of a ship. However, he dies on the way to his homeland, England. Further, she approves the suggestion of the captain of the ship that she should be called Mrs. Crusoe to make the legal matters easy in England. These show that Susan's position is stronger than Crusoe's. She succeeds to balance her relations with both Crusoe and Foe as she engages with them by crossing the borders customarily drawn between a man and a woman. Yet, she explores a common ground with them. That is the ground of friendship.

Beside gender, Coetzee critiques the master-slave relation in Crusoe narrative. Though implicitly, he attempts to negotiate between the classes. In this regard, he signals that class politics invites its own dissolution. In *Foe*, Crusoe's diminished position and Friday's liberation from slavery after death of Crusoe illustrate that Coetzee critiques class politics. Similarly, Susan's advocacy on behalf of Friday for his liberation and reunion with his homeland shows that Coetzee takes a departure from Defoe's representation of classes. In order to address the class differences of the master-slave relation in the narrative of *Robinson Crusoe*, Coetzee changes the political role of Crusoe. So, his Crusoe does not seem to hold the imperial perspective. Crusoe's flexibility to flow with time and situation illustrates that for him the present is more important than the past. Unlike Crusoe who defines his present status

by drawing the references from the past in terms of national history, culture and development, Crusoe does not narrate the glory of his past heritage rather engages himself with the present business of survival on the island. It shows that Coetzee strips Crusoe's political mission as an imperial capitalist representative. Without the imperial role, Crusoe's master-class position is quite ordinary. For instance, Susan puts her queries to Crusoe why he has not built a boat for his rescue and why he does not keep a record of his living on the island in a journal. For the imperial society, this role of Crusoe saddens as Susan states, "Crusoe rescued will be a deep disappointment to the world; the idea of a Crusoe on his island is a better thing than the true Crusoe tight-lipped and sullen in an alien England" (35). They want to hear the adventurous tale of Crusoe with a political role, not about a miserable figure who needs a rescue by a woman who is shipwrecked. It shocks the imperial society to read such story where the imperial master collapses. With such changes in the role of Crusoe, Coetzee fails to meet their expectations.

For the departure from Defoe, the political rhetoric of Coetzee comes from the side of the marginalized. So, he minimizes the gulf between Crusoe and Friday. Since Crusoe holds nothing special for the role of master, he offers himself at the accessible distance to Friday. Though Friday is mute, it offers the possibility of communication between them.

Rhys's reconstruction of *Jane Eyre* into *Wide Sargasso Sea* is an attempt to negotiate across the differences of identities. To disapprove the political segregation of the marginalized, Bertha Mason, Rhys deploys Antoinette and Christophine. Through them, she interrogates the problematic representations, like the role of Rochester. Antoinette also stands for the Caribbean identity that is systematically marginalized in *Jane Eyre*. So, Rhys explores the possibility of negotiation on the multiple issues. Negotiations between the English and the Caribbean identities and between a man and a woman are explicit in the narrative. Though Rhys writes from the perspective of the Caribbean-peripheral, yet she tries to balance the

relation of duality presented in *Jane Eyre*. Thus, rather than searching a solution through another contradiction, she attempts to minimize the fissures through negotiation.

To address the duality of identities in *Jane Eyre*, Rhys places Antoinette and Christophine in interaction with the English man. In this process, they present their views. These women narrate their Caribbean experiences to the man. In terms of social identity, Antoinette is different from both her husband and Christophine. She neither belongs to the English mainstream values nor to the Afro-Caribbean ethnic values because she comes from the White English family residing in Jamaica. They are no more powerful in Jamaica as the Blacks have got freedom through Emancipation act. In the changed situation, Antoinette's position is weaker than the Black Caribbeans. For instance, Antoinette reports what somebody said about her mother's second marriage, "Then why should he marry a widow without a penny to her name and Coulibri a wreck of a place? Emancipation troubles killed old Cosway?" (26). This view reflects the weakened position of Antoinette's family. Probably, due to this condition, Rhys forges a bond between Antoinette and Christophine since both are marginal at the moment. About Christophine, she is from Martinique and represents Afro-Caribbean identity. Known as an obeah woman, she lives with rituals and the cultural practices. About Christophine's obeah magic ritual, Antoinette describes, ". . . there was a dead man's dried hand, white chicken feathers, a cock with its throat cut, dying slowly, slowly, drop by drop the blood was falling into a red basin and I imagined I could hear it. No one had ever spoken to me about obeah . . ." (28). This is one example of her practices.

Unlike Bronte, Rhys gives substantial space to the Caribbean identity and its practices so that it no longer remains marginal in relation to the European identity in the narrative. It is for negotiation between the imperial masculine identity and the Caribbean women's identity, Rhys draws Antoinette and Christophine together in alliance. So, it is not like Bronte's discourse where the single imperial perspective dominates and other, peripheral side is

silenced. In *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Rhys's characters do not just give up. They bargain and finally get what they want. For instance, Antoinette gets her liberation from the prison house of Thornfield.

The role of Christophine is crucial for negotiation between Antoinette and her husband. With the support of Christophine, Antoinette attempts to balance the power relation with her husband. She can resist and disapprove her husband's views that devalue Antoinette's family and her status. For example, Antoinette confronts the man on her mother's case, "You have no right to ask questions about my mother and then refuse to listen to my answer." (117). As he puts allegation of madness on her mother, she defends her family. Christophine is behind her courage. Moreover, she observes in what ways the man tries to overtake her. For instance, he calls her 'Bertha' and she rejects, "My name is not Bertha; why do you call me Bertha?" (122). He intends to treat her like Bertha of *Jane Eyre* which she resists. Unlike Bertha who does not get social support in her defense, Christophine is with Antoinette. Similarly, Bertha does not have her own voice to negotiate with Rochester. Nowhere in the narrative of *Jane Eyre*, Bertha gets access to hold conversation with Rochester. Stigmatized as a mad, her potential role is dumped into the ditch of mania. This way, she is forbidden to communicate in meaningful manner. She is not given any legitimate ground to put her disagreements in the acceptable language. So, her revolt and aggressive expressions are interpreted as the language of madness. But Antoinette's voice gets legitimacy in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. She articulates her views; expresses her approvals and disapprovals.

Christophine plays the role of a mediator for interracial negotiation also. As an Afro-Caribbean woman, she holds a meaningful position in relation to the White Europeans, the colonizers of the Caribbean. Unlike the ordinary black servants that serve the white masters, Christophine is conscious of her cultural and political identity. Against the suppression and to

safeguard her identity, she speaks the language of resistance. She does not fail to criticize Christophine's husband for his capitalistic motivation behind his marriage to Antoinette as he marries for money. Similarly, she does not stop practicing obeah though police are after her. About police, she comments, "No police here, . . . no dark jail either. This is free country and I am free woman" (145). She defies the imperial authority and claims that she herself and the country both are independent. She signals that no more colonialism in the Caribbean. On another occasion, she is critical of some habits of the English people. For instance, she compares coffee that English people drink and the one she offers to Antoinette's husband, "Not horse piss like the English madams drink, I know them. Drink drink their yellow horse piss, talk, talk their lying talk" (77). She claims that her coffee is better than theirs and these people gossip on baseless things. However, her expressions evidence that she intends to turn hostility into friendship. For instance, she begs to Antoinette's husband that he should be reciprocal to Antoinette's compassion. She wants them united and make their marriage successful.

In terms of the language, Christophine uses Patois, her local language, beside English to communicate to the English man. So, he reacts, "her language is horrible" to disapprove her tongue. She does not try to please the man being sweet in his language rather demonstrates that she speaks her own native language. Since the language holds power, the use of local language symbolizes that they have their local identity and the outsiders have to listen to them in their local language itself. This way, the privilege of the colonial English language is questioned as it can be balanced by the native tongue. Despite the imperial intrusion, their language and culture survive. So, it is the matter of self-esteem and identity for the colonized. Moreover, they have a right to declare themselves independent from the colonial occupation.

Rhys's narrative unfolds the differences of ideological orientations between the English and the Caribbeans. The reservations of the marginalized, like Christophine, are the parts of negotiation across the ideologies. It seems that through negotiation, the center-margin relation can be deconstructed to shape the new relation between the oppressor and oppressed in terms of race, gender and others. In other words, Rhys representation is an attempt to transform hostile relations into friendly relations.

Conclusion

The borders carved by the ideological orientations of race, gender, class and nationality in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* are to be crossed to negotiate across the differences so that the possibilities for social inclusion and justice emerge. To defy the borders of dominant ideologies, Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys, uncover the fault lines in the aforementioned texts and try to address them in *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* respectively. So, they contest the problematic and politically motivated representations of Bronte, Defoe and Shakespeare. For this, the succeeding authors employ various strategies as per the contextual needs. For instance, they modify the roles of characters, alter the narratives and reconfigure the plots. Importantly, their battles concentrate on the ideological fault lines. Therefore, they deconstruct the contradictions politically and try to negotiate across the differences for recuperation.

To project the hierarchal relations, binaries of different types are used in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*. The notable contradictions represented in the narratives are related to race, nationality and others. The biased representations with parochial interests are the products of the ideological programming that promote conflicts between the societies. The hierarchy between the Europeans and non-Europeans in the literary representations, like *Robinson Crusoe*, is a part of imperial program that influences the literary works. Therefore, the binary relations are the relations between the mainstream and the periphery as represented

in the narratives. For examples, the contradictions between Jane and Bertha, Crusoe and Friday, and Prospero and Caliban illustrate the power relations.

In response to the contradictory representations of Bronte, Defoe and Shakespeare, Rhys, Coetzee and Césaire respectively reproduce their texts with significant changes. They attempt to deconstruct them politically. Consequently, their narratives: take the political departures from the center-margin relation. They seem to envision that through the political deconstruction, the contradictory representations can be critiqued and it opens the avenue for negotiations across the differences. And the anticipation is that negotiations create space for the egalitarian relations. However, without battling the oppressive ideologies, such change is not possible. In the changed context, since the borders between the center and margin are crossed, they respect each other's existence and identities. For instances, Christophine's negotiation with Antoinette's husband, Caliban's with Prospero and Susan's with Foe are for ending the center-margin relations and turning hostilities into friendships.

Chapter VI: Deprogramming the Ideologies for the Egalitarian Relations

The study concentrates on the problem of mainstream-margin relation in connection with the hegemonic ideologies that operate in the literary discourses of *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*. Basically, I examine the mainstream-margin relations in terms of the intersected problems of race, gender, class and nationality in the aforementioned narratives. The analysis of these texts shows that the dominant ideologies play the key roles for the social disparities since they institutionalize the power relations by subjecting people through the ideological programming. These literary representations reflect the ideological orientations. They reveal the ties between the hegemonic ideologies and the authors' positions.

The study uncovers that the hegemonic ideologies are problematic since they rationalize acts of the mainstream forces. They are employed as the means to generate consent for the maintenance of hierarchies and subject people with the purpose of control and regulation. Consequently, the employment of ideologies, like religion, nationality and race, has a connection with the parochial interests that draw the borders between the mainstream and periphery. For instance, Prospero attempts to justify his incursion over Caliban's island in the name of civilizing the native. He claims that Caliban needs Prospero's intervention to transform bestiality into humanity. So, he justifies his acts with the mission of civilization to achieve the goal of control. This illustrates the tie between ideologies and power. The former consolidates the latter. The mainstreams programme people through the belief systems so that they are psychologically prepared to internalize the unequal relations, like the relation between a master and a slave. Consciously or unconsciously, people live in ideologies. In the context of representation, *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* are debatable due to their compliance with the dominant ideologies, like imperialism. The projected binary relations in these narratives illustrate the ties between representations and ideologies. So, the

respective narratives of William Shakespeare, Daniel Defoe and Charlotte Bronte need the political deconstruction to combat the ideologies of race, gender, class, nationality and others to disrupt the center-margin relations and go for the egalitarian relations.

Essentialism tries to establish the hegemonic ideologies since without essentializing certain values, the mainstreams fail to rationalize the asymmetrical relations and the social disparities. The cultural construction of the racial identity, gendered relation and class disparity have connection with essentialism. Further, it constructs the barriers for the social mobility and changes in belief systems. Consequently, dogmatism perpetuates and they employ the suppressive ideologies to rationalize the hierarchical relations. The problem of essentialism that establishes ideologies is a key element in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*. Due to the belief in ideologies, the problems of race, gender, class and nationality exist in these narratives. Moreover, they cause the social divisions by drawing the borders. The gulf between Prospero and Caliban in *The Tempest*, master-slave relation in *Robinson Crusoe* and the hatred between Rochester and Bertha in *Jane Eyre* are the examples of divisions brought by ideologies of race, class, gender and nationality.

To address the aforementioned problems, my thesis is that the dominant ideologies, established by essentialism, mostly play the roles for the hierarchies of center-margin as projected in representations, so the alternative narratives contest the mainstream narratives to neutralize the oppressive ideologies with the objective of exploring the possibilities for the egalitarian relations. After the examination of the rival narratives, I find that *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* are the illustrations of the disapproval of essentialism and universalism that divide societies to fulfil the political interests of the mainstream elites. Therefore, the disparities based on race, gender and class need the political solutions. In this regard, the attempts of Césaire, Coetzee and Rhys through their representations, are

significant. They are critical, revisionary and constructive in their expressions for the deconstruction of hierarchies and the construction of the alternative relations.

Representations become problematic as they carry the influences of divisive belief systems. Due to the compliance of representations with the oppressive ideologies of imperialism, capitalism, patriarchy and others, they create a space for debate. Since they are Eurocentric in their perspectives, the politics of imperialism is explicit in these master narratives. In these narratives, the politics of imperialism, is entangled with the politics of nationalism, race, class and gender. To centralize the values of the mainstream forces, the binaries are constructed between the mainstreams and peripheries. For instance, the Crusoe narrative is a gendered and racist narrative about the imperial man who rationalizes his venture in relation to the colonized Friday. The ideology of colonial nationalism supported by capitalism is one of the driving forces for the marginalization of the natives, like Friday.

The narratives of *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, maintained by the belief systems, emerge from the limitations of the previous narratives to address the problem of misrepresentation and to deconstruct the hierarchies. To transcend the center-margin duality, these alternative narratives make use of strategies, like the change of the perspectives, diversification of voices and the shift of location from center to periphery. It seems that these attempts are to recover the voices from the margins to defy the imposed borders of the suppressive ideologies. So, the characters, like Friday in *Foe*, Christophine in *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Caliban in *A Tempest*, represent the oppressed but the potential voices from the peripheries. Through these voices, the authors explore the possibilities for the egalitarian relations.

The concept of 'intertextuality' as applied in this study unfolds that textual relations become productive when the new versions of narratives hold the potentiality to alter unequal social relations represented in the older versions. The alternative narratives, *A Tempest*, *Foe*

and *Wide Sargasso Sea* take a departure in terms of breaking the tradition that shapes the borders between the societies under the influence of ideologies. So, the theory of intertextuality, with its key features: adaptation with creativity envisioned by Linda Hutcheon, impact of community practices in the production and reception of a text by Stanley Fish and text as a social product by Julia Kristeva, has become meaningful. It foresees the better relations between people of different societies and background through the deconstruction of faulty belief systems.

Insight drawn from the postcolonial theories acknowledges that Spivak's idea of strategic essentialism, Bhabha's critique on purity of entities and Said's criticism on representation are instrumental in interrogating ideologies which work as the underlying cause of social disparity. In addition, Postcolonial-New Comparative Approach of Spivak offers the potentiality to respect the differences based on race, gender, class and nationality. It explores the possibility of diversification and articulation of voices from the margin. Moreover, the new comparative approach defies the disciplinary and political borders. The present research, after utilizing these potentialities in the analysis of the primary texts, draws the conclusion that ideologies survived by essentialism can be deconstructed by changing the belief systems. So, we need new versions of narratives that go beyond the borders of dominant ideologies. The alternative narratives of this study defy the borders of race, gender, class and nationality to build society without essential borders.

It is significant to mark what is the outcome of the application of the theoretical concept of intertextuality and postcolonial new comparative approach in the selected narratives of this research. I highlight the findings with illustrations of narratives as I have examined them.

First, imitation and creativity: in the alternative texts, *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, the authors not only reproduce the narrative of the previous texts but also add

the new dimensions to them to create the new meanings to address the problematic issues, like racial discrimination, biased treatment to the women of different nationality and culture. In intertextual interaction, creativity makes space for the skills of the author to shape the narrative that emerges with spirit of social transformation. Without creativity, the authors feel the constraints to offer the alternatives for the existing practices human relations. For instance, Caliban's new identity as an African slave in *A Tempest* draws the attention of the readers to give importance to racial suppression against the Africans. In case of *Foe*, introduction of a woman's role in Crusoe's world and Friday as an African slave under Crusoe are the innovative attempts of Césaire to highlight the pressing issues of minority.

Reproductions give continuity to the earlier narratives and rupturing the narratives by innovations make space for exploring the possibility of change for better social relations.

Second, the roles of conventions, discursivities and semiotic practices cannot be ignored in the textual production and reception. Both the mainstream and alternative texts reflect the social conventions and semiotic practices. They uphold certain values and try to meet the social expectations. However, the alternative narratives venture to break the traditions by critiquing the beliefs and values that justify inequality and binary relations. For instance, in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Antoinette's behaviour with the English man defies the conventional role of a woman. She drinks alcohol and challenges the man; she drugs him for sex and intimacy. This act has political implication. A woman no longer accepts the subordinate role and submits to the wishes of her authoritative husband. She questions such authority through rebellious acts. She also claims her Caribbean-Jamaican identity in contrast to his British belonging. So, Antoinette tries to meet the Caribbean expectations as the man does for his British society. Even the individual choices of these characters have connections with social practices.

Third, the originality and stable meaning of a text are questionable. Moreover, the

role of language in the production and reception is crucial. For example, alternative texts are the outcome of reproductions. So, one can raise the issue of originality. However, these texts are reproduced with specific purpose of addressing the social issues, like racism and classism. So, they are not merely reproduction but come with strategies to address the political problems through the textual representations.

Fourth, texts are connected culturally and ideologically. Ideologies and ideological differences largely motivate for the construction and reconstruction of narratives. These are applicable in the context of the selected narratives: *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* and their alternative texts respectively. In *The Tempest*, the ideology of racial supremacy is claimed by Prospero. He defines himself in relation to the vile race of Caliban. It illustrates the imperial political culture that shapes the psychology which creates such characters. *Robinson Crusoe* follows the footpath of *The Tempest* as Crusoe establishes the binary relation between civilized himself and Friday as a savage. So is the case with *Jane Eyre*. The relation between Jane and Rochester in the milieu of English Culture sharply contrasts with creole identity of Bertha Mason. So, the dominant beliefs related to culture and racial identity influence the construction of such narratives.

In the alternative narratives, the cultures and beliefs of the marginalized are foregrounded. The Caribbeans and Africans get space in the narratives; their voices get prominence. Christophine of *Wide Sargasso Sea* articulates Afro-Caribbean voice using her native language. She is conscious of African identity and culture. In *A Tempest*, Caliban also speaks in his African native tongue and rejects the name given by Prospero. These representations have deeper connections with their culture and nationalities. With the help of minority cultures and beliefs, the alternative authors question the hierarchies of the mainstream narratives.

As the theories of intertextuality, the postcolonial theories have developed various strands and perspectives to incorporate the diverse issues. To address the emerging problems, like globalization, neo-imperialism and westernization, the postcolonial theory has shifted its priorities. So, it has grown as flexible, interdisciplinary and inclusive theory. In the process of devising the theoretical framework for this research after review, I find these major trends and perspectives under postcolonial theory.

For the anticolonial movement, Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak as the postcolonial critics and the theorists respectively hold some common views. However, they differ from each other in terms of priorities and strategies to deal with the diverse issues. Fanon focuses on the liberation of a nation from colonialism. Accordingly, he devises the framework of resistance against imperialism. Whereas, Said substantially delves into the asymmetrical relations between the West and the East as he critiques the West for constructing discourses about the East. Unlike Said, Bhabha proposes the position of in-between-ness or hybridity to dismantle the concept of totality, like unified identity, racial purity and gendered relations. With the concept of 'third space', he claims to disrupt the binaries between the dominant and dominated. Going ahead of Bhabha, Said and Fanon, Spivak raises the context specific problems overlooked by them. She prioritizes the problems of gendered subalterns, socially excluded or internally colonized in different societies in the name of caste, race, gender, class and others. She launches her assault against both external colonization by imperialism and internal colonization of gendered women, and other marginalized groups. She claims that subalterns and other marginalized groups have been neglected by the nationalist discourses, like the mainstream history, political discourses and the institutions of representations. To address these problems, Spivak attempts to employ deconstruction in politics. Her complex position as a deconstructionist, Marxist, feminist and the postcolonial theorist explores the possibilities to address the aforementioned diverse

issues. Spivak argues that without altering the socio-political structures, the disenfranchised, like the subalterns do not get space to represent themselves.

Unlike Bhabha's approach to deal with the problems of center-margin relations, Spivak seems to hold the politically viable approach that examines the contexts and adopts the strategies to deal with the disparities that plague the societies. So, her theory defies the disciplinary borders to tackle the intersected problems of race, gender, class and nationality. Similarly, she critiques essentialism and universalism. She questions essentialism since it rationalizes the social hierarchies as pre-given. However, she argues that one needs to employ strategic essentialism to combat essentialism so that the problem of marginalization can be addressed. Though Spivak denies that she is the advocate of subalterns and other marginal, her strategic battle against the dominant discourses demonstrates that she is for the rise of the socially forgotten, like the gendered women.

Another part, the textual review, unfolds me the track of the earlier works on the primary texts of this study for the purpose of addressing the significant but overlooked issue. To my knowledge, no previous researcher has adequately explored these pair of texts: *The Tempest* and *A Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Foe*, and *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* to address the problem of center-margin relation in connection to the dominant belief systems. They fall short of the critical and comprehensive approach to offer the alternative relation. Importantly, they miss to examine the connection between essentialism and ideologies. I argue that the problem of mainstream-margin relations represented in the narratives has a connection with essentialism as it operates through ideologies. Therefore, to address this issue, the dominant ideologies are to be contested through the reproduction of knowledge so that alternative relations are possible. The strength of my methodology is that I use the critical-comparative approach supported by the theories of intertextuality, ideology and postcolonial criticism to critique the underlying cause of social disparities. Moreover,

intertextuality is a comparative approach used in this study to pinpoint the issues of contestation. For the overall picture of the previous works related to the aforementioned narratives, I present some major lines of arguments from the researchers. Basically, I organize the views of the critics under these key issues they raise: institutional oppression, resistance against different types of subjections, reader's role in intertextual relations, and representation.

Jason S. Farr, Geoffrey Sill and Jay Rajiva limit their studies within the issue of colonization in *Robinson Crusoe*. Farr argues that physical gestures, like language, have the political implications as Crusoe employs them to subject Friday. Likewise, Sill and Rajiva examine the connection between the religious ideology and the colonial politics. They view that in Crusoe narrative, religious ideology is employed to rationalize the colonial act of Crusoe. Likewise, *The Tempest* is no exception in terms of colonial oppression. Rita Banerjee claims that there is suppression in Prospero's world. This suppression has ties with imperialism. Edmondson also draws an illustration from *A Tempest* of Césaire in which Césaire exposes the racialized imperialist hegemony and calls for the African awareness to safeguard their heritage and identity.

In contrast to the views of Farr, Sill and Rajiva, other critics, D.N. Deluna and Naomi Wood, project Crusoe in the positive light. They present him as a mythical figure.

Jane Eyre draws criticisms due to its compliance with the dominant ideologies. Chris K. Vanden Bossche, Gayatri Spivak, Cora Kaplan, Jennifer Gilchrist et al. contend that *Jane Eyre* is controversial because it reinforces the imperial and other ideologies rather than battling against them.

In the contexts of *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, the critics, Trevor Hope, Karen Ya-Chu Yang and Missy Dehn Kubitschek protest against the imperial and patriarchal subjugation. Similarly, in terms of resistance, Matthew Cutter examines *Wide Sargasso Sea*

to show how Christophine's obeah practice becomes the agency for her to resist the racial oppression. Similarly, Ricardo Castells and Joseph Khoury examine the power of resistance in the context of *The Tempest* and *A Tempest*. They perceive the potentiality with Caliban to resist against the colonial oppression of Prospero. For instance, Khoury sees the potentiality of native language to assist Caliban to combat Prospero's imperial language. It means the indigenous practices have the potentiality to defy the threat of imperial oppression and homogeneity. However, Shakti Jaising gives mixed response on *Wide Sargasso Sea*. He appreciates the foregrounding of the marginal characters but critiques the problem of racism that still runs in the narrative. This is applicable in case of Christophine and other black servants. I view that though *Wide Sargasso Sea* tries to address the problems of dominant ideologies that run in *Jane Eyre*, it is not free from the controversies as Jaising pinpoints.

In the context of establishing connection between *Robinson Crusoe* and *Foe*, Tisha Turk highlights the reader's role for the interpretive possibilities to fill the gaps in intertextual relations. Like Turk, Debra Gottel and Melissa Shields Jenkins in the context of *Jane Eyre* argue that a reader can create a new dimension to the text in the process of interpretation. Similarly, in terms of the textual production of *The Tempest*, Kenji Go detects that Shakespeare borrowed the ideas for this text from "Caniballes" of Montaigne. So, he questions the originality of *The Tempest*. This is an important discovery as it indicates the different possibilities in intertextual relations.

Indigenous Knowledge is a key element for the survival of the indigenous communities. In the context of *The Tempest*, Rachel Bryant observes the disillusionment of Caliban who shares his indigenous knowledge about the island with Prospero. But Prospero betrays Caliban and enslaves him. Therefore, Spivak alerts about the possession of indigenous knowledge by the imperial capitalists from the natives to turn into data for research. This way, they take ownership of the indigenous knowledge.

Gayatri Spivak compares between *Foe* and *Robinson Crusoe* focusing on the issue of representation. She critiques the positioning of the characters. Similarly, Lewis Macleod and Chris Bongie expose the issue of gender in *Foe* which is also suppressed in *Robinson Crusoe* as it denies the meaningful role to a woman. So, these critics are gender sensitive and connect gender with colonialism.

From the textual and critical review, I find that the critics: Farr, Sill and others, uncover the problems of different types of oppressions against the marginalized. Other critics, Hope, Yang and Cutter, see the possibility of addressing the issue of oppression through resistance. The third type of critics, Spivak and Macleod, detect the issues, like gender, in representation and they explore the possibility of addressing them through representation. And the fourth type of critics, Turk and Gattel, give importance to the readers in establishing the relations between the texts and reception of texts as the readers can add new dimensions to the texts. After examining these views, I draw the conclusion that these critics fail to address the underlying cause of social disparity. They fail to detect the root that supports for various marginalization. Without addressing the fundamental problem of essentialism established by ideologies, they concentrate on the symptomatic issues. Moreover, they lack the integrated critical approach that is broad enough to address the intersected issues. Similarly, the interwoven problems demand more sophisticated but concrete strategies to solve. In this respect also, I do not find these critics offering practical strategies. So, I propose the critical comparative approach of intertextuality to examine the departures made by the contending authors which are supportive to address the problem of hegemonic ideologies.

Perspectives play the key roles in representations. I examine the primary texts of this research, *The Tempest* and *A Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Foe*, and *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, in pair with the comparative approach to uncover the perspectives in

representations. For instance, I find that *Robinson Crusoe* is written from the imperial and the Eurocentric perspective. To critique this, Coetzee changes the perspective in the reconfigured form, *Foe*, where he foregrounds the peripheral figures, like Friday.

The critical authors shift the narratives from center to margin. My investigation of the narrative perspectives gathers evidences that there is a connection between the perspectives and power. On the basis of evidences gathered from the investigation, I argue that perspectives reflect the power relations. For instance, Eurocentric perspective searches the central role for itself in representation in *Jane Eyre*. Therefore, it is crucial to change the perspectives to address the problem of center-margin relation caused by the politics of empire, race, class and gender. Since the perspectives reflect ideologies and the power relations, the examination of perspectives can be one way to find out how the authors contest the oppressive ideologies by changing the perspectives.

After the evaluation of the roles of ideologies for intertextual debate, the study shows that the contestations against the dominant beliefs have implications. Moreover, my reading of the politically charged stories unfolds that the motivations behind the debate on the dominant ideologies are for the alternative relations.

Politics operates behind the construction, interpretation and appropriation of texts. There is a connection between politics, art and ideology. So, I view that politics employs ideologies to establish the power relationship. Without connecting politics to ideologies, it is difficult to make sense how the ideologies become the means for the political end. The illustrations from this study reveal that the politics for the egalitarian relations motivates the dissident authors for the construction of the alternative narratives with innovative resistance to address the issue of center-margin dichotomy. So, interpretations and appropriations are the strategies to express the political disapproval against such relation.

Representations have problems since the ideologies are practiced through representations. It shows that representations are not free from the ideological influences and biases. For instance, the literary narratives that contain misrepresentations invite interrogations. Since some narratives institutionalize the oppressive ideologies, like imperialism and racism, such representations need revisions to demystify the connection between power and ideologies. So, the critical authors rewrite the narratives that generate controversies as they are complicit to the dominant ideologies that support the mainstream to marginalize the others. Representations become contentious because they hold certain ideological perspectives. For instance, to critique the narrative representation of *Robinson Crusoe*, Coetzee alters the narrative of Defoe in *Foe*. Likewise, Jean Rhys questions the representation presented in *Jane Eyre*. So, *Wide Sargasso Sea* is a testimony of contesting narratives for the alternative relations.

Colonial and postcolonial representations have disparities. I find the differences between the colonial and the postcolonial representations. The representations in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* reflect the centralizing homogenous and the imperial perspectives. In this sense, they come under the colonial representations. On the other hand, the contestant narratives, *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* have the postcolonial orientations. So, they are centrifugal or they have decentralizing objectives. To a large extent, the alternative narratives try to incorporate the diverse voices from the peripheries to make the representations inclusive. To illustrate, in these narratives, the voices of the underclass, gendered women, people of color and the societies out of the imperial power-center get space. Therefore, in comparison to the exclusionary representations in the contested narratives, the alternative narratives are diverse and inclusive. However, despite their attempts, to some extent, they face the limitations. So, the disparities exist even in the narratives of the dissident authors.

To address the problem of marginalization of underclass people, it is crucial to examine the connection between the class and representation. Largely, the ideology of class shapes the human relations in the capitalistic system. So, I investigate its role in the social relations. Moreover, it is significant to explore how the ideology of capitalism creates the social disparities. Regarding the literary narratives, they also serve as the means to institutionalize the class politics. In the same fashion, they become instrumental to deconstruct such politics. Importantly, the problem of the class-contradiction is one of the key issues in this study.

Representation of gendered subaltern and other disenfranchised needs a critical review. I examine the connection between the authors' positions and their narratives. Due to such connection, representations become debatable. I find out that the differences in representations are due to the authors' institutional affiliations or their positions under the socio-political organizations. Moreover, institutions are under the influence of ideologies. If the authors are influenced by ideologies and institutions, the crucial question is: who can represent the subalterns, like the gendered women, who do not have agency for self-representation? Is it possible to represent them fairly by someone who is not subaltern? If so, under what conditions? The study of the primary texts unearths that the roles of ideologies cannot be ignored since they shape authors' positions. Some authors openly embrace ideologies; others live in them though they do not embrace them purposely. Thus, I underscore the necessity of investigating the problems of imperialism, racism, gender, class and other issues of marginalization under 'representation'.

The study finds that borders are constructed by essentialism. The use of ideologies in the literary narratives for the justification of binaries of hierarchy need interrogation. The textual evidences illustrate that the contending authors: Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys use the strategies to critique essentialism and its binaries. As the binaries have connection with the

dominant ideologies, it is necessary to devise some strategies to deconstruct them. According to Spivak, one needs to be essentialist strategically to fight essentialism because without holding a position though provisionally, we cannot work to deconstruct essentialism for the alternative relations.

There are intersected problems of gender and class in the case of subaltern women. The ideologies of racism, nationalism and class act against the Afro-Caribbeans. So, it is necessary to speak from the side of the peripheral to battle the oppressive ideologies. So, Spivak argues that by crossing the borders of disciplines we can open the avenue for alternative relations. I believe that without dismantling the oppressive ideologies, the center-margin relations cannot be disrupted. So, the ideological borders are to be crossed. But the challenge is that borders are not easily crossed. In representations, borders are created while producing narratives. Therefore, I propose that to blur the borders or address the problems of representations, knowledge is to be reproduced by altering the old narratives. The narratives of Cesaire, Coetzee and Rhys illustrate that the alternative narratives hold the potentiality to battle against essentialism and the oppressive ideologies for the egalitarian relations.

The politics of binaries relates with the problem of essentialism. The study uncovers that essentialization which causes the center-margin relations or the binaries of hierarchies, serves the interest of the mainstream. Whether it is the case of imperial politics or the politics of gender and others, essentialism constructs the social positions. Ideologies regulate and institutionalize such positions through the belief systems. So, the projection of binaries is a political strategy of the dominant to subordinate the peripherals. In the contexts of *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* study finds that binaries are created to centralize the mainstream values and marginalize the others. The contradictions based on class, gender, race and nationality as projected in these narratives are the outcome of the politics of binaries and essentialism. For instance, Crusoe defines himself in the primary role of the master from

Europe in contrast to Friday, his slave, from the barbarian society. Thus, politics employs ideologies and binaries for creating the power hierarchies. The narratives of Shakespeare, Defoe and Bronte reflect such hierarchies. The Eurocentric perspectives of these authors attempt to homogenize the diversity of the non-European societies.

To deconstruct the binaries, the alternative narratives critique the hierarchal relations. The study examines the textual relations between the rival narratives and finds the differences on the issue of binaries. I gather the evidences that the contestant narratives, *A Tempest*, *Foe* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* attempt to deconstruct the hierarchies of binaries that operate in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* respectively. The dualities of misrepresentations need contestations for the alternative egalitarian relations. By using the strategies, like changing the perspectives, the dissident authors politically deconstruct the essentialist hierarchies projected in the narratives. However, they have to be strategically essentialists to battle against essentialism.

Negotiation is required to bridge the differences for recuperation. The study finds the possibilities to minimize the problems that arise due to the deep-rooted belief systems. Narrative evidences reveal that the authors adopt the strategies for negotiation to bridge the gulf between the mainstream and the peripheral. They make attempts to transform the hostile relations into the friendly ones. They seem to view that by deconstructing the hegemonic ideologies of race, nationality and others, better societies can be built. In this sense, the political deconstruction is for recuperation so that the concerns of the underprivileged, like subalterns can be addressed. To negotiate, Rhys, Coetzee and Césaire seem to be flexible since their narratives foreground the diversities. They are dialogic in their expressions in contrast to their predecessors who hold the monolithic approaches in representations. Their open-ended narratives question the rigidity and the homogeneity of the previous narratives.

So, they make the attempts to disrupt the binaries between the mainstreams and the margins for the egalitarian relations rather than exploring the possibilities for other new binaries.

To focus on the research questions, these significant findings emerge from the investigation.

- i) Social disparities exist due to the interest for power and privilege. The hegemonic ideologies support them.
- ii) The connection between the center-margin relations and the hegemonic ideologies in the mainstream narratives, *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre* is that ideologies serve as the most effective social machinery to rationalize the social hierarchies and unfair treatments to the marginal. As people use them and live in belief systems, they help normalize the center-margin relations.

iii) The points of departures in the alternative narratives:

The language of Representation: They articulate the voices of the underprivileged who are silenced in the mainstream narratives.

Perspective: These narratives are written from the perspective of the marginalized. So, they pay attention to the problems of peripheral, like women, people of colour and slaves.

Appropriation: They appropriate title, character, setting, plot and other elements to alter the mainstream narratives with the purpose of critiquing problematic relations.

Deconstruction of Binaries: Alternative narratives try to bridge the center-margin binary relations represented in the mainstream narratives as they defy the borders between them.

The originality of this research is that it offers the alternative relation to address the mainstream-margin hierarchies in the context of the selected narratives. Its value lies in its identification of the way to address the problem. Based on my investigation, I find that the hegemonic belief systems established by essentialism hold the major share in institutionalization of asymmetrical relations in terms of imperial domination, racial

hierarchies, gendered relation and class contradiction. These chosen issues of concentration are but few dominant in the respective narratives. Beside these core issues, a number of other problems, like impact of capitalism in human-nature relationship, degeneration of human values, trauma and psychological warfare and the social divisions have connection with faulty belief systems. Specially, the wrong use of dominant ideologies to reap the political benefits has far reaching consequences. So, this study critiques the rationality of the irrational oppressive ideologies. For instance, what are the justifications for the supremacy of one race over the other, men over women, rich over the poor and one nationality over another nationality? I argue that through the critical awareness, it is possible to battle against the faulty programming of belief systems. So, the spirit of this work lies in deprogramming and reprogramming to create the better societies with the egalitarian relations. Moreover, this study not only pinpoints the underlying causes of the social disparities, but also envisions the strategies to overcome the barriers. So, the reproduction of knowledge or the reconstruction of narratives is one strategy to deprogram the faulty software of ideologies.

The limitation of this research indicates the direction for the future research. It leaves these key questions that can be thought provoking for the future researchers. What may be other elements beside the belief systems that naturalize the asymmetrical relations and disparities? What may be other strategies, beside reproduction of knowledge, to deconstruct the problematic belief systems? Why does the author's subjectivity intervene in the construction and reconstruction of narratives? Center-margin relation is old problem for humanity; it keeps on surfacing in different forms, like in literary narratives, in history writing and others. So, it has been drawing substantial resources to end the binary. In this context, what may be other ways, beside the deconstruction of faulty ideologies, to bridge the center-margin binary relations? Probably, these questions are helpful for the future researches to unfold other possibilities to address the mainstream-periphery relations.

With regard to the contribution of this work, it attempts to unveil the underlying mechanism behind the center-margin relations. To address the problem of the social disparities in terms of race, gender, class, caste and ethnicity in different contexts, the study investigates representations and attempts to capture the debates on representations. Largely, the literary representations both reflect and influence the social relations. Therefore, it is crucial to address the problems in representations. Since the societies are divided due to the ideologies of race, gender, class, nationality and others, it is essential to deconstruct them politically so that such divisions can be bridged. Importantly, this research attempts to demystify how the power centers survive and try to rationalize the center-margin relations. Moreover, it explores the possibilities for the alternative relations to the hierarchies through the deconstruction of the dominant ideologies since they have key role in social disparities in the context of the primary texts. The issue of hegemonic ideologies is applicable in the context of the Nepali society also since the beliefs, like caste hierarchies, divide the people. So, this research can be useful to understand the caste, gender, class and ethnicity based problems in Nepal. The thesis of this study may be applicable to address them.

Works Cited

- Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. Routledge, 2002.
- Almquist, Steve. “‘Not Quite the Gabbling of’ ‘A Thing Most Brutish’: Caliban’s Kiswahili in Aime Cesaire’s ‘A Tempest.’” *Callaloo*, Vol. 29, no. 2, 2006, pp. 587-607.
- Altbach, Philip G. . “Education and Neocolonialism.” *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft et al., Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2003, pp. 452-456.
- Althusser, Louis. “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses.” *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, W.W. Norton and Company, 2001, pp. 1483-1508.
- Ashcroft, Bill et al. . *The Empire Writes Back*. 2nd edition, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2004.
- Banerjee, Rita. “Gold, Land, and Labour: Ideologies of Colonization and Rewriting The Tempest in 1622.” *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 110, no. 2, 2013, pp. 291-317.
- Bauman, Richard. *A World of Others’ Words*. Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Bazerman, Charles. “Intertextuality: How Texts Rely on Other Texts.” *What Writing Does and How It Does It?*, editors, Charles Bazerman and Paul Prior, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., 2004, pp. 83-97.
- Begam, Richard and J.M. Coetzee. “An Interview with J.M. Coetzee.” *Contemporary Literature*, Vol. 33, no. 3, 1992, pp. 419-431.
- Bhabha, Homi K.. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
- Bishop, G. Scott. “J.M. Coetzee’s Foe: A Culmination and a Solution to a Problem of White Identity.” *World Literature Today*, Vol. 64, no. 1, 1990, pp. 54-57.
- Bongie, Chris. “‘Lost in the Maze of Doubting’: J.M. Coetzee’s Foe and the Politics of (Un)Likeness.” *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*, Vol. 39, no. 2, 1993, pp. 261-281.

- Bossche, Chris R. Vanden. "What Did Jane Eyre Do? Ideology, Agency, Class and the Novel." *Narrative*, Vol. 13, no. 1, 2005, pp. 46-66.
- Bronte, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. Wordsworth Classics, 1999.
- Bryant, Rachel. "Toward the Desertion of Sycorax's Island: Challenging the Colonial Contract." *ESC: English Studies in Canada*, Vol. 39, no. 4, 2013, pp. 91-111.
- Cao, Shunqing. *The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature*. Springer, 2013.
- Cannella, Gaile S. and Yvonna S. Lincoln. "Ethics, Research Regulations and Critical Social Science." *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 5th edition, Sage publications, 2018, pp. 172-194.
- Castells, Ricardo. "From Caliban to Lucifer: Native Resistance and the Religious Colonization of the Indies in Baroque Spanish Theatre." *Hispanofila*, Vol. 182, 2018, pp. 41-54.
- Cesaire, Aime. *A Tempest*. Translated by Richard Miller, Ubu Repertory Theatre Publications, 1991.
- Cesaire, Aime and William F.S. Miles. "'Metaphysical Considerations Can Come Later, But the People have Children to Feed.': An Interview with Aime Cesaire." *French Politics, Culture and Society*, Vol. 27, no. 3, Special Issue: Aime Cesaire: Man of the World, Master of Word. 2009, pp. 63-75.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for Indian Past?." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory A Reader*, edited by Padmini Mongia, Oxford UP, 2013, pp. 223-247.
- Christian Barbara. "The Race for Theory." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory A Reader*, edited by Padmini Mongia, Oxford UP, 2013, pp. 148-157.
- Coetzee, J.M. . *Foe*. Penguin Books, 2010.
- Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2005.

- Cutter, Matthew. "Finding Your Own Magic. How Obeah and Voodoo Provide Women Agency in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Tiphonie Yanique's *Land of Love and Drowning*." *Journal of International Women's Studies*, Vol. 17, no. 3, 2016, pp.130-135.
- Defoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe*. Penguin Classics, 2001.
- DeLuna, D. N.. "Robinson Crusoe Virginal Hero of the Commercial North." *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Vol. 28, no.1, 2004, pp. 69-91.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Spivak, Johns Hopkins UP, 2016.
- Dharwadker, Aparna. "Nation, Race and Ideology of Commerce in Defoe." *The Eighteenth Century*, Vol. 39, no.1, 1998, pp. 63-84.
- Dirlik, Arif. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism". *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory A Reader*, edited by Padmini Mongia, Oxford UP, 2013, pp. 294-321.
- Docker, John. "The Neocolonial Assumption in University Teaching of English." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft et al., Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2003, pp. 443-446.
- Downing, Lisa. *The Cambridge Introduction to Michel Foucault*. Cambridge UP, 2008.
- Edmondson, Locksley. "Aime Cesaire (1913-2008): Architect of Negritude." *Nka: Journal of Contemporary African Art*, n. V., no. 24, 2009, pp. 92-97.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Richard Philcox, Grove Press, 2004.
- Farr, Jason S.. "Colonizing Gestures: Crusoe, the Signing Sovereign." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, Vol. 29, no. 4, 2017, pp. 537-562.
- Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class?*. Harvard UP, 1980.
- Foucault, Michael. *The Foucault Reader*. Edited by Paul Rabinow, Pantheon Books, 1984.
- . -. *Madness and Civilization*. Vintage Books, 1988.

-- -. *Power/ Knowledge*. Edited by Colin Gordon, Pantheon Books, 1980.

Free, Melissa. "Un- Erasing 'Crusoe': Farther 'Adventures' in the Nineteenth Century."

Book History, Vol. 9, 2006, pp. 89-130.

Frow, John. "Intertextuality and Ontology." *Intertextuality Theories and Practices*, edited by

Michael Worton and Judith Still, Manchester UP, 1990, pp. 45-55.

Fuchs, Christian. "Nationalism, Communication, Ideology." *Communication and Capitalism*,

UP of Westminster, 2020, pp. 235-257.

Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts Threshold of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E Lewin,

Cambridge UP, 1997.

Gettleman, Debra. "'Making out' Jane Eyre." *ELH*, Vol.74, no. 3, 2007, pp. 557-581.

Gilchrist, Jennifer. "Women, Slavery, and the Problem of Freedom in Wide Sargasso Sea".

Twentieth-Century Literature, Vol. 58, no. 3, 2012, 462-494.

Go, Kenji. "Montaigne's 'Canibals' and 'The Tempest' Revisited." *Studies in Philology*,

Vol. 109, no. 4, 2012, pp. 455-473.

Gourgouris, Stathis. "The Poiein of Secular Criticism." *A Companion to Comparative*

Literature, edited by Ali Behdad and Dominic Thomas, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.,

2011.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory A Reader*,

edited by Padmini Mongia, Oxford UP, 2013, pp. 110-121.

Hand, Sean. "Missing You: Intertextuality Transference and the Language of Love."

Intertextuality Theories and Practices, edited by Michael Worton and Judith Still,

Manchester UP, 1990, pp. 79-90.

Henderson, Katherine C.. "Claims of Heritage: Restoring the English Country House in Wide

Sargasso Sea." *Journal of Modern Literature*, Vol. 38, no. 4, 2015, pp. 93-109.

- Hiddleston, Jane. "Aime Cesaire and Postcolonial Humanism." *Modern Language Review*, Vol. 105, no. 1, 2010, pp. 87-102.
- Hope, Trevor. "Revisiting the Imperial Archive: Jane Eyre, Wide Sargasso Sea and the Decomposition of Englishness." *College Literature*, Vol. 39, no 1, 2012, pp. 51-73.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. Routledge Taylor and Francis group, 2006.
- Jaising, Shakti. "Who is Christophine?: The Good Black Servant and the Contradictions of (Racial) Liberalism." *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*, Vol. 56, no. 4, 2010, pp. 815-836.
- Jenkins, Melissa Shields. "Jane Eyre's Fairytale legacy at Home and Abroad: Construction and Deconstruction of National Identity by Abigail Heiniger." *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 60, no. 2, 2018, pp. 333-334.
- Jones, Campbell. "Practical Deconstructivist Feminist Marxist Organization Theory: Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak." *Sociological Review*, n. vol., 2005, pp. 228-244.
- Kapoor, Ilan. "Hyper-Self-Reflexive Development? Spivak on Representing the Third World 'Other.'" *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 25, no. 4, 2004, pp. 627-647.
- Katrak, Ketu H.. "Decolonizing Culture: Toward a Theory for Post-Colonial Women's Texts." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft et al., Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2003, pp. 255-258.
- Khoury, Joseph. "The Tempest Revisited in Martinique: Aime Cesaire's Shakespeare." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, Vol. 6, no. 2, 2006, pp. 22-37.
- Kristeva, Julia. *The Kristeva Reader*. Edited by Toril Moi, Columbia UP, 1986.
- Kubitschek, Missy Dehn. "Charting the Empty Spaces of Jean Rhys's Wide Sargasso Sea." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol. 9, no. 2, 1987, pp. 23-28.
- Leggatt, Judith and Christopher Parkes. "From Red Room to Rochester's Haircut: Mind Control in Jane Eyre." *ESC: English Studies in Canada*, Vol. 32, no. 4, 2006, pp. 169-188.

- Loeb, Monica. *Literary Marriages: A Study of Intertextuality in a Series of Short Stories by Joyce Carol Oates*. Peter Lang AG, 2000.
- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. 2nd ed., Routledge Taylor Francis Group, 2007.
- Macaskill, Brian and Jeanne Colleran . “Reading History, Writing Heresy: The Resistance of Representation and the Representation of Resistance in J. M. Coetzee’s *Foe*.” *Contemporary Literature*, Vol. 33, no. 3, 1992, pp. 432-457.
- Macaulay, Thomas. “Minute on Indian Education.” *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft et al., Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2003, pp. 428-430.
- Macleod, Lewis. “Do We of Necessity Become Puppets in a Story? Or Narrating the World: on Speech, Silence, and Discourse in J.M. Coetzee’s *Foe*.” *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*, Vol. 52, no. 1, 2006, pp. 1-18.
- Mai, Peter Hans. “Bypassing Intertextuality, Hermeneutics, Textual Practice, Hypertext.” *Intertextuality*, edited by Heinrich F Plett, W De G, 1991, pp. 30-60.
- Malone, Katherine. “The Madwoman in the Attic Legacy.” *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920*, Vol. 54, no.1, 2011, pp. 111-114.
- Marble, Meredith. “A Critical Thinking Heuristic for the Argumentative Composition.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, Vol. 16, no.1/2, 1986, pp. 67-82.
- Martinez, Regina L.. “Beyond Mexico’s Woman: Negotiating Gender and Race in Dominant Narrative of Nation.” *Social Justice*, Vol. 24, no. 2, Reconfiguring Power: Challenges for the 21st Century, 1997, pp. 45-64.
- Marx, Karl. “The Communist Manifesto.” *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, W.W. Norton and Company, 2001, pp. 769-773.
- Mckee, Patricia. “Racial Strategies in *Jane Eyre*.” *Victorian Literature and Culture*, Vol. 37, no.1, 2009, pp. 67-83.

- Mishou, Aubrey L.. "Surviving Thornfield: Jane Eyre and Nineteenth-Century Evolutionary Theory." *Ren*, Vol. 66, no. 4, 2014, pp. 255- 272.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory A Reader*, edited by Padmini Mongia, Oxford UP, 2013, pp. 172-197.
- Murdoch, H. Adlai. "Rhys's Pieces: Unhomeliness as Arbiter of Caribbean Creolization." *Callaloo*, Vol. 26, no. 1, 2003, pp. 252-272.
- Narain, Denise Decaires. "Writing 'Home': Mediating between 'The Local' and 'The Literary' in a Selection of Postcolonial Women's Texts." *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 26, no. 3, 2005, pp. 497-508.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Oxford UP, 1998.
- Parry, Benita. "Resistance Theory/ Theorizing Resistance, or Two Cheers for Nativism." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory A Reader*, edited by Padmini Mongia, Oxford UP, 2013, pp. 148-157.
- Petersen, Kirsten Holst. "First Things First: Problems of a Feminist Approach to African Literature." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft et al., Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2003, pp. 251-254.
- Rajiva, Jay. "Secrecy, Sacrifice, and God on the Island: Christianity and Colonialism in Coetzee's *Foe* and Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*." *Twentieth- Century Literature*, Vol. 63, no.1, 2017, pp. 1-20.
- Rankin, Walter P.. "Autobiographical Fiction vs Fictional Autobiography Christa Wolf's *Kindheitsmuster* and J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*." *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol. 36, no. 4, 1999, pp. 306-319.
- Rhys, Jean. *Wide Sargasso Sea*. W.W. Norton and Company Inc., 1982.

- Rickel, Jennifer. "Speaking of Human Rights: Narrative Voice and the Paradox of the Unspeakable in J.M. Coetzee's *Foe* and *Disgrace*." *Journal of Narrative Theory*, Vol. 43, no. 2, 2013, pp. 160-185.
- Riffaterre, Michael. "Compulsory Reader Response: The Intertextual Drive." *Intertextuality Theories and Practices*, edited by Michael Worton and Judith Still, Manchester UP, 1990, pp. 56-78.
- Said, Edward W.. *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books, 1994.
- - -. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1979.
- - -. "Orientalism". *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, W.W. Norton and Company, 2001, pp. 1991-2012.
- Schmidgen, Wolfram. "The Metaphysics of Robinson Crusoe." *ELH*, Vol. 83, no.1, 2016, pp. 101-126.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Cambridge UP, 2012.
- Shohat, Ella. "Notes on the Post-colonial." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory A Reader*, edited by Padmini Mongia, Oxford UP, 2013, pp. 322-334.
- Sill, Geoffrey. "Defoe's America." *The Scriblerian and Kit-Cats*, Vol. 44, no. 2, 2012, pp. 124-125.
- Smith, Barbara. "Toward a Black Feminist Criticism." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, W.W. Norton and Company, 2001, pp. 2302, 2315.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Death of a Discipline*. Seagull Books, 2004.
- - -. "A Critique of Postcolonial Reason." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, W.W. Norton and Company, 2001, pp. 2197-2208.
- - -. "Can the Subaltern Speak?." *Global Literary Theory*, Routledge, 2013, pp. 521-529.
- - -. *In Other Worlds*. Routledge Classic, 2006.

- - -. *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. Routledge Classics, 2009.
- - -. "Poststructuralism, Marginality, Postcoloniality and Value." *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory A Reader*, edited by Padmini Mongia, Oxford UP, 2013, pp.198-222.
- - -. "The New Subaltern." *The Cultural Studies Reader*, edited by Simon During, Routledge 2007, pp. 229-240.
- - -. "Theory in the Margin: Coetzee's Foe Reading Defoe's 'Crusoe/ Roxana.'" *English in Africa*, Vol. 17, no. 2, 1990, pp. 1-23.
- - -. "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism." *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 12, no. 1, "Race" Writing and Difference, 1985, pp. 243-261.
- - -. "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft et al., Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2003, pp. 269-272.
- - -. *The Post-Colonial Critic Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. Edited by Sarah Harasym, Routledge, 1990.
- Still, Judith and Michael Worton. Introduction. *Intertextuality Theories and Practices*, edited by Michael Worton and Judith Still, Manchester UP, 1990, pp. 1-45.
- Strovas, Karen Beth. "No Rest for the Wicked: Immoral Implications of Insanity and Sleeplessness in Jane Eyre." *CEA Critic*, Vol. 78, no. 3, 2016, pp. 384-392.
- Thiong'O, Ngugi Wa. "On the Abolition of English Department." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft et al., Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2003, pp. 438-442.
- Turk, Tisha. "Intertextuality and Collaborative Construction of Narrative: J. M. Coetzee's 'Foe.'" *Narrative*, Vol.19, no. 3, 2011, pp. 295-310.

- Voicu, Cristina-Georgiana. "The Law of Language and the Law of Structure in the Dominant Masculine Discourse of Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*." *Linguistic and Philosophical Investigations*, Vol. 13, 2014, pp. 454-460.
- White, Hayden. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, W.W. Norton and Company, 2001, pp. 1712-1729.
- Wilson, Lucy. "European or Caribbean: Jean Rhys and the Language of Exile." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 10, no. 3, 1989, pp. 68-72.
- Wood, Naomi. Review of *Unseasonable Youth: Modernism, Colonialism, and the Fiction of Development* by Jed Esty, and *Children's Literature, Popular Culture, and Robinson Crusoe* by Andrew O' Malley. *Children's Literature*, Vol. 42, 2014, pp. 325-331.
- Wu, Yung-Hsing. "Jane Eyre Identified." *Reception: Texts, Readers, Audiences, History*, Vol. 9, 2017, pp. 82-86.
- Yang, Karen Ya-Chu. "Rewriting Canonical Love Stories from the Peripheries." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, Vol.15, no. 4, 2013, n. pp.

