



SHAKESPEARE'S *THE TEMPEST*: MEANING OF POLITICS AND DIPLOMATIC KILLING

Md. Shahjahan Kabir* and Md. Mehadi Awal

English Discipline, Khulna University, Khulna 9208, Bangladesh

KUS: 10/21-021110

Manuscript received: November 02, 2010; Accepted: April 04, 2011

Abstract: William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* gives some very realistic answers as to why the play cannot be indiscriminately termed blanket-comedic or romantic. The answer it draws from the very heart of the political matter says the play is a one-man political show wherein most of the characters, except Prospero, have to dice with political deaths. The play seems more like a backdrop of political mercy-killing and of the meteoric rise of a diplomatic Prospero as an author of the demise of much dysfunctional language, conscience, poetry, ethics, free-speech and the cumulative voices of the political-eunuchs such as Caliban. Regardless of any of the qualms of conscience, Prospero firmly relocates himself as a master of the isle which is not his, dispossessing Caliban, his 'abhorred' slave, killing Caliban's native language, naturalness and poetic spirit. Until he is done, Prospero keeps Ariel on his toes chastising Ariel and exerting a stranglehold on Ariel's 'liberty.' Reminding Ariel time and again of his past favour, the diplomatic Prospero helps Ariel translate self-service as imposition. Miranda, the only daughter Prospero has, is the pawn-instrument of Prospero's political-gains wherewith to bait Ferdinand or to succeed in making the enemy subdued or to regain the dukedom. This paper shows the nature and consequences of political on-upmanship and brings us close to the fullest comprehension of diplomatic killing.

Keywords: Mercy-killing, dysfunctional, conscience, diplomacy, stranglehold, imposition

Introduction

Perhaps, one of the best demonstrations of what Disraeli said of politics- There is no gambling like politics (Dev, 1963)] is found as the heart of the matter in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. Very frequently does this penultimate play-let of Shakespeare tend to teach us the truest and strangest meaning of politics which is never far away from the idea that politics is a gambling with power, with honour and very often with the human life as well. It says that life and the lives of people could very easily be made its pawn-instrument and capital. Like a gambler, the daredevil politician is maddened into the game of life-risking. Politics has always been suicidal in these days like the way it was before. It has always been associated with immolation and self-sacrificing. However, when Bernard Shaw, the Irish philosopher, lays bare the secret-Self-sacrifice enables us to sacrifice other people without blushing (Shaw, 1957), one unmistakable characteristic of politics appears more than explicit. A killing intuition or, in other words, a murdering streak probably is that very characteristic. However, a political killing could possibly be committed in two ways: overt and implied. The 'implied' political killing is more diplomatic

*Corresponding author: <shahjahanku1976@ymail.com>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53808/KUS.2010.10.1and2.1021-A>

and hegemonic than the 'overt' one. With its arsenal of diplomacy, politics is armed and is infinitely capable enough to throttle the language of freedom, free-speech, ethics, and conscience to death. *The Tempest* then can be re-read as a strategic demonstration of an implied diplomacy, politics and the peaceful killing undercurrent in politics.

A re-visiting of the pages of this play by Shakespeare can offer the readers with excellent chances of viewing the play as being infinitely more than just comedic or serio-comic or romantic. While the readers are aware of its nature as both as a comedy and a romance, they also understand that it is something more, since it readily ties us with the apocalypse of a diplomatic killing, a killing without blood-shed, without violence, a cerebral 'killing' of the free-speech of the political 'other'. Re-reading all the deeds done in the play at the sleight of hand and beckoning of Prospero, may provide us with clues to this intimate psychological and political killing.

At certain points, *The Tempest* manifests what we might call Prospero determinism. Like a demiurge, he determines what (there in the magic-circle of the isle) the code of conduct should be and what should not. Prospero does whatever he thinks is right and there is none to question it. Often, he is the sole decision-maker. He appears as the ultimate constitution of the island. And, in that constitution, he adds and subtracts shapes and reshapes things that he thinks are necessary. Ultimately, being amorally antinomian, Prospero makes unethical ethical, immoral moral and thereby, impossibility nothing. What Prospero forgets is that he is involved in the killing of expression, conscience and morality, the fundamental democratic rights of the others at his own hand.

Analysis

In the play (i.e. in Act 4, Scene 1), Prospero wonders and acknowledges how he is pretty unaware that the foolhardy trio (i.e. Stephano, Trinculo and Caliban) are planning to expunge him from the scene of the earth. Immediately after that, it is seen that Prospero has not forgotten either to punish the petty plotting or full-size criminalities; the possible reason of which may be that either of the malevolent activities can jeopardize his life or threaten the royal prestige. In fact, forgetting things is natural on the part of human beings. Then Prospero may have been in sheer oblivion of the fact that in ruling the land and in his treatment of others he has crossed the limit. At his age, his 'old brain' (4.1.) may have provided him with a mature thought that there is limit both of age and of power-practising. However, forgetting can be deliberate as well. When it happens, it pertains to one of the signatures of politics and diplomacy. Prospero seems to have applied forms of politics and diplomacy. Prospero, it can be guessed, has (deliberately?) forgotten that he should not free someone to enchain him again, that Ariel should be released of his back-breaking service as soon as the spell of Sycorax is cast off by him (i.e. Prospero), also that the parent-less Caliban could be treated in a much better way than he (Caliban) is usually treated by him.

The hegemonic nature of diplomacy is evident when Prospero gives others the impression that he is able to shower an indiscriminate mercy upon all, while in actuality the recognized 'others' rarely avail that mercy. Prospero here assumes the unquestioned authority and omnipresence of God. Bloom thinks: The role of Prospero, within *The Tempest's* visionary confines, is godlike; even the magus's angry and impatient outbursts parody, at a very safe distance, the irascible Yahweh of the Book of Numbers (Bloom, 1998). Moreover, if John Milton's *Paradise Lost* justifies the ways of God to man, *The Tempest* shows Prospero's diplomatic ways to justify his means- means to get both a disclaimer and a panegyric of this earthly god (i.e. Prospero) written by the subordinates. But, the holy relics of conscience say that just to have mercy at the penultimate part of the play is not enough- not enough to assuage the pain he inflicted upon the traumatic heart of Caliban or Ariel even though they do not finally pose any question to their master. After all, the proverb, "What cannot be cured must be endured", goes unchallenged. Both Caliban and Ariel must have to endure what is beyond their ability to cure. Actually, in no way can we contradict that, simply to have mercy upon others falls short for Prospero to whitewash the

murderous scar he has left upon the moral fiber of righteousness, conscience and ethics. Is it at all conscientious on the part of a magnanimous Prospero to firstly cajole Caliban with sweet words, learn the secret of the isle from him and then to disempowering him? Possibly, 'No' will be the answer to that. It was rather opportunistic and in no way conscientious. This was simply the royal insignia of treason and duplicity by which the royal brothers could be marked and recognized. It was not once that royal persons betray the royalties, the royalties the commoners. Antonio duped Prospero by seizing the opportunity of Prospero's state of being absorbed in the practices of magic. Yet again the nefarious treachery is repeated in action when Prospero did not let the first-hand opportunity- to supplant the other one's territory and be the 'King' -slip by. That is to say, Prospero capitalizes on Caliban's naivety and state of being a simpleton. He has managed Caliban to remain always at his service. However, his sweet timing with chance and the empowerment of himself is worth considering politics which is all diplomatic. But is it anyway ethical? It certainly is not. Rather it proves Prospero to be conscience-proof and outright antinomian. Or in other words, it was the killing of both conscience and ethics.

Furthermore, at a time when Antonio, a man of crooked character and political skill, cheats a learned and capable Prospero, Shakespeare's majestic Prospero after having his base cemented with a solid political experience, outsmarts and cheats the deformed, unlettered and incapable Caliban. There is no doubt that both the two activities are unfair and can be charged with the question of decency and ethics. Moreover, a comparison of the two activities also opens the readers' eyes to diagnose which one of the two is graver than the other. Then it readily appears that the latter one overtakes the former. In actuality, it does not make sense that the readers cannot call what Prospero has done an offense- an offence severe enough for Prospero to get enlisted in the row of the crooked and infamous. However, on the contrary, the exposure in *The Tempest* shows Antonio to be incurably villainous or malicious while Prospero saint-like. It so happens because Prospero suits the pharisaic face of diplomacy more than any other so called criminals could do; and also because the whole play is seen from a diplomatic Prospero-perspective that helps the play find its *dues ex machina*, deliverer or hero who is to restore peace, order and happiness apparently though and to manage all and everything to bring the play to a comedic denouement. As the play reaches its finale, both the divine forgiveness and the only numinous entity (person) to deserve it are brought into the limelight. Prospero deliberately forgives even those who he acknowledges are incurably criminals at heart. It is but a diplomatic smoke-screen by which to black-out all of his icy criminalities henceforth committed at ease. Or, in a sense, it is how Prospero can formulate the readers into enquiring why he should not be forgiven when forgiveness is so divine and yet, so very cheap. In the epilogue, he asserts: "As you from crimes would pardon'd be, / Let your indulgence set me free." Forgiveness is divine but still not so easy when it does not come from the heart. In the play when Caliban contradicts his master, he is instantly silenced by Prospero. And he is made to believe, he is a "fool" and he should "be wise hereafter" by being loyal to the master and always "seek for grace" (5.1.294-295). Ariel too is made scared stiff by Prospero when his "[My] liberty" (1.2.245) is demanded. So, it is might rather than forgiveness that Prospero uses to get an obliged response. Therefore, how could Prospero expect them to forgive him when he had made their lives difficult and when he is no more in the scene of power? The answer lies in politics and diplomacy. One of the effective means of Machiavellian diplomacy is to stir the public sentiment through pleadings. Machiavelli says that, above all, a prince should seem to be religious", that: "it is desirable to present an appearance of virtue before the ignorant public (Machiavelli, (qtd.in) Russell, 1961). The case is similar with that of Prospero. Moreover, the after-thought of Caliban or Ariel is not registered in the play. And if the after-thought had been given, they could have shown their hatred for him. In Thomas Hardy's *Tess of D'Urbervilles*, Alec's asking for forgiveness adds insult to injury, reminding Tess of his act of molesting her, the most life-altering event she experiences in her life. She says:

I feel indignant with you for talking to me like this, when you know—when you know what harm you've done to me! You and those like you take your fill of pleasure on earth by making the life such as me bitter and dark with sorrow; and then it is a fine thing, when you have had enough of that, to think of securing your pleasure in heaven by becoming converted! (Hardy, 2005).

Even though through these words she finds a likely voice to uncover all of her searing indictment against Alec, Tess, in the penultimate part of the novel, has to succumb to Alec and live in sin i.e. she has to finally live the life of a concubine with Alec. This act of volitional surrendering- to somebody who is very undesirable for one- is very likely to make oneself, of one's own accord, a sacrificial scapegoat at the altar of mercy-killing. Mercy-killing or euthanasia means the act of killing somebody out of pity, for example because they are in severe pain or because the disease from which they are suffering cannot be cured. However, Tess has got to know that she has no option left in front of her except living with Alec. Hence, on demand she has accepted the kind of existence which is very much like a living-death or for instance, the kind of agonizing living lived by Sibyl as mentioned in the very first lines of T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land*. It says: For once I myself saw with my own eyes the Sibyl at Cumae hanging in a case, and when the boys said to her 'Sibyl, what do you want?' she replied, 'I want to die (Abrams *et al.*, 1993).

In *The Tempest*, almost all the characters - Ferdinand, Miranda, Alonso, Antonio, Sebastian or Caliban - finally give way to Prospero knowing that they are in his grip. It seems that they have no choices except following the commands of Prospero. Now that they have got intricately involved in the pursuit of serendipity in politics, all the dramatis personae have to take Prospero for granted with the knowledge that, Prospero's civic atrocity is not fairly remissive. Prospero is like some of the modern people who claim to be the integral part of a civil society but unfortunately enough, they do not act civil. In other words, they make themselves suited to the guise of civility, but inside they remain ever cold, ever indifferent to the petition of humanity to such an extent that once their originality i.e. indifference flashes out, they can be recognized. In fact, villainy or atrocity means not merely to do unjust and unlawful or to do harm to the humanity; it also means being morose, cold, freezing indifferent and selfish. The Prospero whom the readers see in *The Tempest* seems to be one of them who pose very civil or civilized but are atrocious at heart. And, that civic atrocity flickers often and on when there appears the dire urgency to do that. As a matter of fact, in the end, the play ironically posits Prospero to be the pardoner and others as sinners.

The mercy-killing (of the collective voices) that takes place herein is political at heart. It shows that there are persons like Prospero who even with all their moral disabilities will forever be considered like the Aristotelian "philosopher king" while some political eunuchs there must have been to subside and be the scapegoat of mercy-killing. In the text of *The Tempest*, the readers can catch sight of the scenes where pops up the 'silences' and 'ideological repression[s]' of the subjects who belong to the grass-root level. It is these 'subjects' whom the readers can see as 'political eunuchs' who have neither power, nor any influence, nor voice, nor selves even, who do not have a dog's chance and who can only be used as yes-men or puppets pushed to and fro with the string at the hands of the political big-fish like Prospero. In a sense, their wishes and above all, their whole entity are made bound to guard against any disloyalty or disobedience to their master. Furthermore, their voices often fail to reach the royal conscience or are being quickly silenced because of the state of their being impotent, incapable and not worthy of making any sense.

Pierre Macherey, in *A Theory of Literary Production* (1966, trans. 1978), stressed the supplementary claim that a literary text not only distances itself from its ideology by its fiction and form, but also exposes the contradictions" that are inherent in that ideology by its "silences" or "gaps"- that is, by what the text fails to say because its ideology

makes it impossible to say it. Such textual "absences" are symptoms of ideological repressions of the contents in the text's own "unconscious (Abrams, 1999).

The readers can see while Miranda feels compassion for the ship-wrecked sailors, Prospero, the paternal paradigm of politics and diplomacy, says: "Be collected: / No more amazement: tell your piteous heart/ There's no harm done" (1.2.11-13). Miranda is thus silenced- silenced to the level of not having any power even to feel passion for the distressed. Often it is a reminder of the process of castration popular in the past in some eastern countries where it was intended to guard against feeling physically attracted to the women whom they are serving. In *The Tempest*, Miranda is seen emotionally castrated in order to prioritize a political will. Speaking of the fact that all of Prospero's enemies are now (i.e. in Act 5) in his power and are painfully confused, Ariel says: "if you beheld them now, your affections/ Would become tender" (5.1.18-19). Prospero replies: "Does thou think so spirit?"(20) And then Ariel responds: "Mine would, sir, were I human" (21). Here the phrase "were I" is important to look at. Ariel, for so long, caters to the human needs of Prospero. But the unmistakable matter is that he (Ariel) is not given the impression that he could have human feelings. It may be that he is not treated by Prospero in much a human or humane way. He wishes he were human. Or in other words, he, in vain though, wants to have compassion- for the wretched royalties- compassion he is not treated with. Thus the readers can see that Ariel often dares to feel for the wretched but he is too much a political eunuch to materialize it into a benevolent action. However, at this point Prospero delivers:

And mine shall.
Hast thou, which art but air, a touch, a feeling
Of their afflictions ...
Though with their high wrongs I am struck to th' quick,
Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury
Do I take part. The rarer action is
In virtue than in vengeance. (18-28)

Here, the imaginative sympathy for the sufferings of 'others' is but an eye-wash as well as a paradigm of his art of talking big and political on demand. Prospero goes on to 'kill' the voices of his subjects quite peacefully. By sharing the empathetic feeling for the ship-wrecked sailors with Ariel, he wants to prove his nobility and be one of the great of hearts. But the truth of the matter is: the tempest was Prospero's own manufacture with which to teach the nobilities a grave lesson which is overtly moral and implicitly political. First, he kills (i.e. petrifies) them in terror; second, with Ariel's assistance, he has their voices (i.e. screaming) pacified by letting them be possessed by a worthless sleep which is comparable to a second-death; and, finally, as the play progresses, he practically cripples and kills the rights to voice their very own protests and any moral bent to argue against him. He lets them get the political impression that once they are in possession of a political master, they would always be at his mercy or that they have to be prepared to get killed with kindness.

The pardoning of the incurable Antonio or Sebastian could be one event where Prospero kills them with kindness. By just giving them a bodily punishment and then hurriedly pardoning them, Prospero seems to have wronged them enormously. Moreover, this treatment on the part of Prospero is not enough; and it cannot ever be pretty much to quicken or by any means, regenerate them into living the life of the virtuous. The very possible meaning of having mercy upon them may be that Prospero opts for securing some political interests, i.e. , he wants others to get no chance to form any mental streak that wills to raise any question about the morality in ruling the subjects like Caliban or Ariel with an iron hand. Further, on the pretext of establishing virtue,

Prospero seems to have intended that none interrogates his present act of regaining the dukedom in Milan. Then approaches the question: why it is only Prospero and not Caliban who is going to regain the lost territory. Moreover, Prospero acknowledges that his second thought is grave. Then the question emerges is how does it so happen that his very next wish is to go to Milan. It is common knowledge that Milan or the isle is all the same to be a place where one can wish to breathe one's last. Then Prospero seems to have something different in his mind. The charm of dealing with politics may be that vying difference.

Prospero still cannot prove that the "rarer action" he has taken is virtue and not vengeance. Pardoning or having clemency can very often be the best form of taking revenge. Often, to have a blanket mercy upon the men who he (i.e. the pardoner) knows to be incurably villainous or beyond any regeneration is like to let them rot and be much the same as before. In fact, Prospero seems to have set an example how conspirators can shine in opportunistic form of politics. It shows that when politics is one's vocation, every other thing is secondary to him. Prospero pardons Antonio, Sebastian, Alonso but still, there remains the chance that they will thrive and regroup being treacherous if time and opportunity allows them. And who knows this time the form of intrigue may be even newer, even more serious than in the past. As a matter of fact, the diplomatic killing with kindness seems to take hold of the whole of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*.

As the play moves onwards, we come across the political eunuchs, by far, the scapegoats of politics such as Caliban, Ariel, Ferdinand and even Miranda. Gradually, they are going to embrace sheer powerlessness. Caliban is frequently stigmatized for his seemingly wrong activities. Prospero's argument for ruling him in such a torturous way may be that he has tried his best to civilize Caliban who attempts to rape Miranda and he (Caliban) still wants to rape. However, the other meaning it gives us is that the torturous ways are a reminder of Prospero's unquestionable authority and an emblem of the possible danger of any infidelity or insurgency against the master. Besides, here Caliban's worth is measured with a utilitarian scale. The undeniable fact that crops up is that Caliban's service has brought ease to Prospero's days. On one hand, it can be part of the diplomatic management of the subordinates but on the other, it truly means to pose a threat to and a killing of conscience on the part of the ruler as well.

Prospero teaches Caliban language with the intention that he will acknowledge the debt time and again. Caliban must have to say: "You taught me language" (1.2.365) while Prospero can only see Caliban degrade and vilify the debt. Ariel too must be thankful in serving him as he finds Prospero thankful in return of his service. After all, the disciple must follow the footsteps of the master who for so long spreads his sacrosanct footprints throughout. Thus as long as Prospero or Ariel lives, Ariel has to thank and be obedient to Prospero. Ariel promises to be more polite than before.

Ariel is chastised by Prospero as he asks for his acquittal from his abominable servitude. Ariel is instantly reminded of the grace he has been provided with when he was rescued by Prospero from the duress of Sycorax's spell. This process of reminding Ariel of Ariel's duties and that Ariel should be grateful to Prospero makes Ariel Prosperous virtual slave. At first, Ariel of his own accord served Prospero. But now this is a compulsion. The free-service is not free at all. Ariel is the one who in accordance with his master's will raises tempest in the sea for the "other" crews, and tames the sea. Ariel's duty, then also, is to punish the apparent evil-doers who too are of his own level and category. He is trapped in hegemony, a condition in which, according to the Marxist Antonio Gramsci- a social class achieves a predominant influence and power, not by direct or overt means, but by succeeding in making its ideological view of society so pervasive that the subordinate classes unwittingly accept and participate in their own oppression (Abrams, 1999).

The requirement then is that Ariel must be prompt enough to arrange pageants to please the eyes of the royals such as Ferdinand and Miranda. Ariel becomes, in the process, one of

Prospero's handmaidens of power, peace and happiness. Between Prospero and Ariel there certainly is an unwritten bond of master-slave or give-and-take relationship. Prospero praises Ariel because he is ever submissive; he always does what Prospero wants him to do. And the final award Ariel receives from Prospero for this is his "liberty" (1.2.245). Unlike Caliban, Ariel is dyslexic of the injustice done not only to him but also to Caliban and is finally freed. The diplomatic win-win policy is there at work between them. In fact, like his master, Ariel too is diplomatic and that diplomacy profits him.

Throughout the play, Prospero imparts lesson for all classes of society: for aristocrats like Ferdinand, for commoners such as Trinculo, and for his own daughter, a kind of education that ensures internalization of bonds of allegiance to confirm and maintain his authority. But in ensuring that bond, Prospero suppresses others' fundamental rights. In *The Tempest*, a stranglehold on language, free-speech and freedom is exerted. In *Robinson Crusoe*, Daniel Defoe's Crusoe snatched away the aboriginal tongue from Friday; Prospero too snatches away the aboriginal language from Caliban. In a sense, to teach the 'other' his own language which he considers is the standard language is to uproot them linguistically. Caliban too is uprooted now. He has learnt Prospero's language. But the fact is that he is going to detest it. Caliban is oppressed with the language he is taught. That language now has become an instrument of oppression for Prospero. So now, finding no other way, Caliban must have to think that with that arsenal of the same language he is taught, he can retort and defy his master. After all, Caliban is denied any and every language. That is to say, freedom and free-speech are what Caliban is not allowed. Prospero kills them all.

The Tempest exemplifies what Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak indicates in her "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988). The 'subaltern' or the subjugated cannot have any voice, nor can they be heard. The political silences are enacted here. For Prospero, the language may be a gift but, for Caliban, it may be an imposition, a common means of enforcing colonial rule on recalcitrant subjects. For Prospero, his values may appear priceless while, for Ariel, they may be insignificant and worthless. What a European like Prospero calls freedom may be enslavement for Ariel or the non-Europeans. Prospero's sense of ownership is expressed thus: "This thing of darkness I / Acknowledge mine" (5.1.275-276). However, when his experiment is finished, Prospero is well-off securing his and Miranda's future and leaving Caliban's fate unsettled. "Go, sirrah, to my cell; / Take with you your companions; as you look / To have my pardon, trim it handsomely" (290-93). These are the last words he delivered to his slave. However, his commanding tone is unmistakably oppressive. He reduces Ferdinand to an abject slave. Miranda too has been made his puppet and voice-piece that can express only her and Caliban's or Ariel's subservient roles.

In *The Tempest*, ethics seems to bite dust when, with the assistance of his (Prospero's) comprador spirit (i.e. Ariel), Caliban, Stephano and Trinculo were hunted down like animals. Prospero's attending spirits recall the hunter's ravenous dogs chasing the rebellious slave: "Fury, Fury! There Tyrant, there! Hark, hark! / Go charge my goblins that they grind their joints" (4.1.257-258). Again, when Prospero reasserts: "Let them be hunted soundly" (263), it turns out to be a reminder of his power-craze and the way ethics bites dust in that craze. A certain devaluing of humanity in general, as to disempowering the political eunuchs like Caliban or Trinculo or Stephano (who forever are designed to be the stuff of comedy) is proved to be the explicit picture here.

Another instance how Prospero's ethics seems to bite dust is when we take a look at the engagement between Ferdinand and Miranda. While on the surface, it appears to be the most meaningful thing that happens in *The Tempest*, it expresses more than just it intends. Prospero arranges things in such a way that both the two fall in love with each other and want each other. Prospero sends Ariel to lure Ferdinand into his cell. The upshot is thus as readymade as it is wanted. Miranda courts Ferdinand: "I am your wife, if you will marry me; / If not I'll die your

maid" (3.1.83-84). Prospero in the meantime calculates the profit he can gain from this. The engagement of Ferdinand and Miranda truly does work as an instrument of political armistice and negotiation by which to regain his dukedom. However, it lays bare the crooked diplomacy of a political armistice. History bears a better testimony to such. Emperor Akbar the Great too applied this formula as his tool for a political cease-fire. So to speak, the cross-stitch of a marriage is said to translate the old enmities into friendship and a sustainable political unity. It is said to secure peace and prevent further warfare on earth. The Montagues and the Capulets did not seem to have known or applied that formula in *Romeo and Juliet*. But the diplomatic Prospero at times experiments with it. What the sacrificial love cannot seem to do in *Romeo and Juliet* is easily done by the archness of a diplomatic politics in *The Tempest*. But the fact is that it demoralizes the ethics of wedlock. Prospero sacrifices his ethics on that. Miranda, the only daughter he has, is the pawn-instrument of his political gains wherewith Prospero could bait Ferdinand and make the enemy successfully subjugated. He forbids Ferdinand to untie the "virgin knot" of Miranda but induces him into entering into the "cell" alone to get moon-struck by Miranda's beauty and fall frantically in love with her. That is how the most unethical thing is tried by Prospero even though he overtly criticizes any unethical streak in human beings. Prospero poses in such a way that he cannot allow licentiousness or any form of indecency but the pleasures of the first night of a marriage are told and retold by him. That probably is how the most unethical and indecent becomes decent, ethical or legalized by Prospero, the sole protagonist of the play. Ethics for narration, ethics for the code of conduct seems to be on the verge of deviation and twist.

Besides, from the very outset till the end, the meaning of fraternity or brotherhood in *The Tempest* is subject to further twist and deviation manufactured by the diplomatic kind of politics. In a sense, fraternity, fraternal love and trust are sacrificed in the play. Prospero and Antonio are brothers not by virtue of their blood-kinship but by their being usurpers. Antonio unseated Prospero from his Milan and Prospero supplanted Caliban's 'land'. It is what one can call a Frankenstein or destructive fraternity, a kind of which is evident in *Henry VI*:

I have no brother; I am like no brother;
And this word 'love' which greybeards call divine,
Be resident in men like one another,
And not in me: I am myself alone... (5.6.80-83)

Furthermore, in *The Tempest*, we observe the death of the possibilities of being one of the truest of poets. Caliban had a skaldic genius innate in himself. His sensitivity to poetry is noticed when he says:

Be not afeard; the isle is full of noises
Sounds and sweet airs that give delight, and hurt not
Sometimes a thousand twangling instruments
Will hum about mine ears...
The clouds me thought would open, and show riches
Ready to drop upon me... (3.2. 133-136, 139-140)

All these lines as uttered by Caliban are very reflective of Caliban's high imagination, his being a sensuous lover of nature and at his best, a poet. Before Prospero's arrival here in the isle which really was a paradise of extra-mundane elegance and aesthetic beauty, Caliban seemed to have been the king to master it and enjoyed the gifts as a poet. However, soon Prospero arrived there in the island and snatched it away from him. It really was like he had snatched the charms away from him. It results in his losing vigour in creating poetry. And in turn, he was taught the language of cursing. He says: "You taught me language; and my profit on't/ Is I know how to curse. The red plague rid you/ For learning me your language" (1.2.365-367). However, Caliban's bent for poetry goes permanently (or who knows deliberately) unnoticed by Prospero. Apart from not caring for or tolerating what spark of brilliance Caliban has, Prospero darkens or sends that poetic bent to darkness and decay.

It can be assumed that Caliban cherished in his heart a kind of consolation for the only fair-sex he had ever seen. He might have loved Miranda in his very own way even though that was markedly corporal and so was instantly discarded by Prospero. However, what Prospero calls lasciviousness, might have spelt something different for the unlettered Caliban. Caliban, in the other sense, could seem to represent the inner-workings of Id that lies, for Freud, at the bottom of the every human heart (mind).

The readers know of John Keats, romantic of the romantics, mapping out sensuousness in his poetry. Furthermore, in his poetry, Lord Byron chalked out the feeling of an extravagant sensuousness that, in fact, is lasciviousness. Surprisingly enough, Caliban has the boldness of a poet to such an extent that he lays his straightforward feelings for Miranda bare and naked. He thought he could populate the isle with 'Calibans' by impregnating Miranda. Even a poet, markedly, cannot be that straightforward as Caliban is. The poets for instance, Swinburne or D.G. Rossetti or Donne can't seem to have ever been such expressive of what he actually feels in mind, in speech. Reduced to abject slavery, Caliban's spirit to creating rich poetry, in a sense, was totally spoiled by Prospero. Besides, like a rebel-poet, Caliban detests what is not freedom, what is not fair-play, what is not justice; and, being assertive; he raises his fiery voice of protest against the oppressor (Prospero). He claims his right in words that sound like poetry inspiring insurgency fearing no threat of punishment. The Augustan poet, Alexander Pope thought the life of a wit is warfare on earth [Pope, (qtd. in) Abrams et al (1993)]. Caliban seems to spark with the living incarnation of that thought. He (Caliban) is pinched and pricked because he has spoken the words that are true and that go against the mighty rulers. Yet, finally he has to give in to the image of the mighty politician, Prospero. That is the tragedy about him, and also a tragedy pertaining to the slow weakening and demise of the brilliant gift a poet is endowed with.

Conclusion

Shakespeare's *The Tempest* is a mapping of politics and thereupon it catalogues no absolute romance or comedy but politics and killing that is all diplomatic. However, *The Tempest* ends casually with a happy ending as is seen in a comedy even though the finishing was more exerted, more hurried and more abrupt that could actually be expected. The more the denouement is tried, the more repeated is the shock. The play thus is amply evocative of a scene wherein takes place the burial of the levitating voices of fair-play, ethical values and at length, conscience. The play starts its journey with the tempest and the concurrent enchanted sleep of the ship-wrecked sailors and high royalties. As the play ends, there also is a final journey, immediately after the engagement of Ferdinand and Miranda heading towards Milan. Actually, the readers may find it to be a journey of politics. They may also find that even though the play ends well, all is not resolved well. The readers cannot lose sight of another significant aspect of the play that the play cannot help being conscience-proof. The play resembles more of an awakening of a vision of politics and the realities of politics. And one of the facts about that politics is that the political imprint of diplomatic killing it has left upon the soul of the play is indelible. The play slowly moves on to the realization that the talks or claims about its being a comedy or romance end in a stalemate of politics, diplomacy and diplomatic killing. The play thus opens a broad expanse of political experiences that talk of the negative aspects of diplomatic politics.

References

- Abrams, M.H. et al 1993. *The Norton Anthology: English Literature*. Norton, New York
Bloom, H. 1998. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. Riverhead, New York
Bradley, A.C. 1992. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. Macmillan, London
Dev, A.T. 1963. *Student's Favourite Dictionary: English-To-Bengali & English*. National Press. Greenblatt, Dhaka

- Hardy T. 2005. *Tess of the D' Urbervilles*. Friend's Publications, Dhaka
- Knight, W. 2001. *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearean Tragedy*. Routledge, London
- Kott, J. 1966. *Shakespeare our Contemporary*. Methuen, Bristol
- Lever, J.W. 1979. *The Arden Shakespeare: Measure for Measure*. Methuen, London
- Marlowe, C. 1588. *Doctor Faustus*.
Abrams, et al., Norton.
- Russell, B. 1961. *History of Western Philosophy*. Routledge, London
- M. H. Abrams et al. 1993. *The Norton Anthology: English Literature*. Norton New York
- Russell, B. 1961. *History of Western Philosophy*. Routledge, London
- Shakespeare, W. 1996. *The Tempest*. Penguin, London
- Shaw, B. 1957. *Man and Superman*. Penguin, London
- Sophocles, 1979. *The Theban Plays*. Trans. B. F. Watling. Ed. Betty Radice. Penguin, New York
- Stephen, M. 2000. *English Literature: a student guide*. Pearson, London
- Stephen. 1988. *Shakespearean Negotiations*. Clarendon Oxford
- Tillyard, E.M.W. 1962. *Shakespeare's History Plays*. Penguin, Harmondsworth