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Abstract

This paper aims at exploring the relationship between pedagogy and colonial power as discourse instances in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* which dates back to the early seventeenth century. A brief historical study is given focusing on the variety of forms and purposes in pedagogical life of England during 1540 to 1560 and emergence of the Reformation period. It is revealed, for example, that *The Tempest* is recognized as a model of colonial relationship and as a metaphor of educational history. The concept of power discussed in *The Tempest*, is not shaped just by supreme authority of the kingdom, but is influenced by its relationship with knowledge as an instrument of power in Foucaultian eye. The paper seeks to investigate how Prospero, the master of the colonial prison of his island, makes use of his magical books, the symbols of knowledge, so as to teach all the characters dramatized in the story as all classes of the society, from aristocrats to commoners. In particular, it focuses on Prospero’s reliance on his colonized power presented by verbal and physical punishment toward Caliban, the colonized misshapen creature on the one hand, and homeschooling of Miranda, Prospero’s daughter, on the other hand. The article ends by resembling Prospero’s magical power and his god-like control into a Foucaultian reading of history as he argues that power will inevitably result in some form of resistance. *The Tempest* suggests an expanding threat of disruption, treason and rebellion as the reaction to the power.
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Résumé

Cet article vise à explorer la relation entre la pédagogie et de la puissance coloniale comme des instances de discours dans La Tempête de Shakespeare, qui remonte à début du XVIIe siècle. Une brève étude historique est donné en se concentrant sur la variété des formes et des buts dans la vie pédagogique de l’Angleterre au cours de 1540 à 1560 et l’émergence de la période de la Réforme. Il est révélé, par exemple, que la tempête est reconnu comme un modèle de la relation coloniale et comme une métaphore de l’histoire éducative. Le concept de pouvoir discuté dans La Tempête, n’est pas en forme juste par l’autorité suprême du royaume, mais est influencée par sa relation avec la connaissance comme un instrument de pouvoir dans l’œil foucaldien. Le document vise à étudier comment Prospero, le maître de la prison coloniale de son île, fait usage de ses livres magiques, les symboles de la connaissance, de sorte que d’enseigner à tous les personnages en scène dans l’histoire comme toutes les classes de la société, des aristocrates aux roturiers. En particulier, il met l’accent sur le recours Prospero sur son pouvoir colonisé présenté par la punition verbale et physique envers Caliban, création difforme du colonisé d’une part, et l’enseignement à domicile de Miranda, la fille de Prospero, d’autre part. L’article se termine par ressembler à un pouvoir magique de Prospero et son dieu-comme le contrôle dans une lecture foucaldienne de l’histoire comme il fait valoir que le pouvoir va inévitablement entraîner une certaine forme de résistance. La Tempête suggère une menace croissante de la perturbation, la trahison et la rébellion comme une réaction à la puissance.
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Shakespeare's *The Tempest* was probably written in autumn of 1610 and may date early in 1611. The play was first printed in Folio in 1623, seven years after the dramatist's death. The playwright was born in Warwickshire town in April 23, 1564. His attendance at free grammar school was his only formal education. This school had a highly developed curriculum so that the boys came out of them with a good smattering of the best ancient and modern Latin authors. His life as a dramatist can be divided into three main parts. The first period includes his early plays, King Henry IV, Richard III, and a group of comedies like Midsummer Night's Dream. The next phase starts from 1594 and extends to 1599. In this period, Shakespeare's apprentice days were over. This part belongs to his first Roman play Julius Caesar, and his great comedy Twelfth Night. During the closing years (1600-1611), he wrote *The Tempest* which was a charming fantasy in Shakespeare's commentary on the civilized educated man vs. the savage.

No direct source has been found for the main plot of *the Tempest*. Shakespeare may have picked of various sources; he has woven them very artfully into a background suggested by the Bermuda voyage. But it is more probable that the theme of a shipwreck on an enchanted island was certainly suggested to Shakespeare by a series of events that he aroused great interest in London. Several accounts of the shipwreck and of islands appeared in 1610 which the playwright certainly used. Shakespeare got his information from a drunken sailor whom he later introduced as Stephano into the play.

*The Tempest* differs from Shakespeare's other plays in its observation of a stricter, more organized neoclassical style. The clearest indication of this is Shakespeare's respect for the three unities, taking place in separate locations miles apart and over several days or even years (Hirst, 1984, p.34-35). The play's events unfolds in real time before the audience; Prospero even declaring in the last act that everything has happened in, more or less, three hours (*The Tempest*, V, I, p.278). All action is unified into one basic plot: Prospero's struggle to regain his dukedom; it is also confined to one place, a fictional island, which many scholars agree to be located in the Mediterranean Sea (Vaughan and Vaughan, 1999, p.4). Another reading suggests that it takes place in the New World, as some parts read like records of English and Spanish conquest in the Americas (Vaughan and Vaughan, 1999, p.98-108). Still others argue that the Island can represent any land that has been colonized (Orgel, 1987, p.83-85).

Reading the play as a central work of the colonial and educational experience could find significant support from the text those days. For some scholars, this play is thought to be an early post-colonial work. It is remarkable that Shakespeare had intended to criticize the European seizure of new lands to the West, furthermore, the theme of colonialism is no doubt present on *The Tempest*. In Shakespeare's day, most stories were coming back from distant islands, with myths about Cannibals of the Caribbean, and distant tropical Utopias. With the character Caliban (whose name rhymes with “Cariban”), Shakespeare may be offering an in-depth discussion into the morality of colonialism. Beginning in about 1950, with the publication of Psychology of Colonization by Octave Mannoni (1990), *The Tempest* was viewed more and more through the lens of postcolonial theory. This new way of looking at the text explored the effect of the colonizer (Prospero) on the colonized (Caliban). Frank Kermode (1938) argues in the introduction to his Arden edition of the play that “the usurpation of Prospero's position as the governor of Milan, for example, represents one of the violent use of colonial power” (p.xxv).

Shakespeare's *The Tempest* is remarkably interesting in examining the relationship between English pedagogical developments and colonized natives. Set on an island off the European mainland, and connected by historical and verbal links to the new English colonies in the Virginiats, *The Tempest* has been recognized as presenting a model of colonial power relationships and a metaphor of pedagogical history. Colonial and pedagogical systems were a formative part of the experience of hundreds of millions of people and spread European languages, culture, economics and eventually, nationalism across the world. Many post-colonial educational systems in Africa, Latin America and Asia continue to follow patterns established during the colonial period. So colonial schools and educational systems in conquest countries thought European languages, culture, and administration to non-European subjects.

In this study, it is attempted to identify the connection of pedagogical and colonial power discourses in the interactions and dialogues of characters and also how this colonial education is viewed in the light of Foucault's “Disciplinary Punishment” theory. The rest of the article will be organized around the related literature followed by the discussion and analysis of findings. In order to paraphrase Foucault (1979), I conclude in the last part that colonialism imposes its ideal educational power everywhere it is present.
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Reading literature without a view to historical trends and the shape of the world as we know it at present can lead us to underestimate the capability of literary artists and to trivialize the act of literary interpretation. As a case in point, the connection between colonialism and pedagogy during Shakespeare’s life, to the contemporary post-colonial educational systems seems to be noticeable. According to Carey-Webb (1999):

Prospero can be seen as a figure of English sovereignty who shapes the knowledge and develops the obedience of his subjects through a pedagogical process. By inquiring into the language and practices of education that pervade this literary work, the connection between schooling and national citizenship, a connection made at least as long age as the sixteen century by the educational reformers themselves. In The Tempest, Shakespeare attempts to narrate a common English past through the magical, utopian projection of New World romance that we find best illuminated formal and informal processes of education that have much to do with developing the sense of citizenship and national identity that influences the countries to follow. (p.4)

Just as the connection between education and authority was contemporary to The Tempest, a link between colonial and pedagogical relationship is also an outlet to post-colonial theory. References to Englishmen and Europeans as having responsibility for instructing colonized natives were common in the 16th and 17th centuries, as well as in later periods. Speaking of an event that took place just two years before The Tempest was first performed, John Gillis (1986) notes:

In 1609, the Revered William Crashaw, who was serving as a sort of director of publicity for the company, imagined ‘Virginia’ as a young woman being schooled by an older and male ‘England’ in an important sermon to the Counsel. (p.677)

Joan Pong Linton (1998) has argued that intention to educate and christianize Amerindians was contemporaneous with The Tempest and served to justify English “husbandry” of Virginia, leading to abduction of native children and Amerindian resistance (pp.160-166). As David Cressy in Education in Tudor and Stewart England (1975) points out:

Sixteenth-century education advocates promoted new schools, unified instruction in grammar, and now orthodoxy in education. Standardized text books were imposed in 1540s and closely with Shakespeare’s life time, there was a boom in the founding of schools. Despite a great variety of forms and purposes in the educational life of England, 1560-1640 has been characterized as a period of “educational revolution” when the English education system was more vigorous, more purposeful, better funded and better equipped at this time than ever before. (p.9)

In the mid-sixteenth century, 1550s-1560s, the Reformation Period emerged, when education was first religious instruction to create loyal citizenry. The reformers interpreted the Bible to the process of individual salvation. Thomas Bacon (1559) praised education highly in the following terms:

Through the schoolmaster the youth of Christian commonwealth is brought up in the knowledge of God and of his holy word, and also in the science of good letters and virtuous manners; and afterward become the faithful servants of God and profitable members of the commonwealth, and good citizens of the country where they inhabit. (p.21)

Although understanding of The Tempest is enlarged when we read it within the historical interplay of colonialism, schooling, and other national consciousness, it should be reminded that even if there was an ‘educational revolution’ in the sixteenth century the great majority of English citizens remained illiterate, and as a percentage of the population only a relative few attended the expanding school system. (Carey-Webb, 1999, p.10). During the mid-1980s, The Tempest has been a focal point for exploring colonial discourse in literature. Carey-Webb argues that “The plot of the play has been derived from the ‘New World’, and drawing on European conceptions of ‘New World’ peoples, the play is wildly accepted a colonial one”(p.5).

Indeed the play has served a unique role in the analysis of colonial history by twentieth century intellectuals, from the Uruguine Jose Enrique Rado Ariel (1967) to the Italian Octave Mannoni writing about Madagascar Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonization (1990) to the Cuban Roberto Retamar Caliban: Notes Toward a Discussion of Culture in America (1989) (Carey-Webb, 1999, para.5).

In The Tempest days, English monarchs ruled not only through their persons and intrigue of the court and the parliament, but also through new means that reached an increasingly national audience, both literate and illiterate. Christopher Hill (1971) argues that “In the early seventeenth century the king ceased to exhibit himself to his subjects... and royal protagonists began deliberately to use control of pulpit and printing press to project a new image of monarchy”(p.41).

Many post-colonial theorists and literary critics tend to focus on the post-colonial theme of The Tempest: “Since the play is tied to Caliban as the West’s image of the native: bizarre in appearance, objectified and determined and one in nature, it is viewed more through the lens of post-colonial theory” (Brathwaite, 2008, p.1).

To identify pedagogical discourses in The Tempest, it seems necessary to enlarge our reading within the interactions between principal characters: Prospero as an instructor, charismatic speaker and a teacher who plays a role of school master to his pupils, his daughter Miranda, and his slavery Caliban. As an Island sovereign and colonial administrator, Prospero becomes eminently a scholar and a teacher.

In Foucault’s sense (1979), knowledge is an instrument of power and the aim of knowledge is not just to know something but to have power over something and govern it. So as the plot begins Prospero has prepared a lesson plan appropriate to all those who lane on his island. Just
as with students new to school, Prospero prepares his “pupils” to gain the knowledge by separating them from the others, disorienting them from their past knowledge, and providing them with knowledge of his authority. Just as in sixteenth century England, where according to historians education was more socially mixed than at any time before or after, Prospero develops education for all classes of society, for aristocrats (such as Ferdinand) as well as for commoners (such as Trinculo); an education that internalizes bonds of allegiance that confirm and maintain Prospero’s authority.

Prospero’s role in controlling all his possessions on the island is armed with his supernatural power. His Colonial Pedagogy resitutes individuated subjects in a reinforced social order. The central action of the play could thus be seen as the carefully re-education of the principal characters by Prospero.

Prospero plans to perpetuate his authority through a marriage between his daughter and Ferdinand. Since Ferdinand, the future ruler, must come to recognize Prospero’s magic and Prospero’s role as a master and a teacher, he orchestrates his influence over Ferdinand through Miranda, and Ferdinand’s first words to Miranda invoke an educational relationship: “Most sure, the goddess/ On who, these air attend. Vouchsafe my prayer/ May know if you remain upon this island/ And that you will some good instruction give/How I may bear me here” (I, ii, p.422-426).

When Ferdinand attempts to resist Prospero with his sword, Prospero responds: “My foot, my tutor?” (I, ii, p.470)

The mixed metaphor of the school/body establishes the proper hierarchy between the two. Drawing on the image of the king’s two bodies, Prospero identifies himself as “the head of state” and at the same time as the “teacher/ruler” (I, ii, p.470)

Ferdinand’s respect for Prospero’s superior power prepares him for his future son-in-law status. Prospero says that the trials he puts Ferdinand through are meant to make him value Miranda all the more: “Too light winning / Make the prize light” (I, ii, p.452-423).

Yet the course Ferdinand must follow serves a pedagogical purpose. By taking Caliban’s job of pulling wood. Ferdinand (son of the king) accepts an apprentice role that subordinates him to Prospero. Apprenticeship was an important pedagogical practice in Shakespeare’s day affecting education both in and outside of school; for girl’s education within the family, or for the wealthy, a private tutor in the home. As a responsible patriarch and father Prospero attends closely to Miranda’s education. On the island he is her teacher: “Here in this island we arrived, and here/ Have I, thy schoolmaster, made thee more profit/ Than other princes can that have more time/ For vainer hours, and tutors not so careful”(I, ii, p.171-174).

Prospero’s words to Miranda about his library evoke a self-image of the solitary schoolmaster to his pupil in the system of home education, a role he will soon play to Ferdinand and which he plays to Caliban throughout the play. The profit from education in Prospero’s memory outweighs the power of governing: “My own library with volumes that/ I prized above my dukedom” (I, ii, p.167-168).

While Renaissance humanists’ advocacy was the same-sex mentor system, Miranda’s education lies in the hand of her single father. From post-colonial perspective this unconventional style of education is a plea for seizing colonial power. Despite the period’s bias against this style of education, Prospero’s education produces not only feminine but also masculine attributes. Furthermore, The Tempest has only one female character, Miranda. Other women, such as Caliban’s mother Sycorax, Miranda’s mother and Alonso’s daughter Claribel, are only mentioned. Because of the small role women play in the story in comparison to other Shakespeare plays, The Tempest has not attracted much feminist criticism. In other words, The less-prominent women mentioned in the play are subordinated, as they are only described through the men of the play. Most of what is said about Sycorax, for example, is said by Prospero. Further, Stephen Orgel (1984) notes that Prospero has never met Sycorax – all he learned about her he learned from Ariel. According to Orgel, Prospero’s suspicion of women makes him an unreliable source of information. He suggests that he is skeptical of female virtue in general, citing his ambiguous remark about his wife fidelity (p.83-85).

Miranda is typically viewed as being completely deprived of freedom by the father. Her only duty in his eyes is to remain chaste. Ann Thompson argues that Miranda, in a manner typical of women in a colonial atmosphere, has completely internalized the patriarchal order of things, thinking of herself as subordinate to her father (Coursen, 2000, p.87-88). The French philosopher Michel Foucault describes this omnipotent, god-like control as one of the most nightmarish fantasies of power ever designed by the human mind. That’s what Rabinow (1984) refers to it as “Panopticon: a prison where the jailer can see and hear every thing but, conversely, he can not be seen or perceived by the prisoners” (p.206).

By 1611 the African slave trade was 170 years old. Shakespeare was obviously aware of the slave trade and presence of slaves, both Africans and native Americans in Caribbean plantations.

Caliban is Shakespeare’s most strong character. Yet in the content of European travelogues, the description of Caliban is seen as a figure of pedagogical discourse, the reluctant student. The unwilling student is a familiar image in Shakespeare whether identified by Jaques as one of the stages of men, “Then the whining school-boy, with his satchel/ And shining morning face, creeting like snail/ Unwilling to school”, or metaphorically by Ramo, “Love goes toward love as schoolboys from their books/ But love from love, toward school with heavy looks”. Pedantic teachers of Latin and classics were clearly targets of
In the Tempest, Caliban is referred to by Prospero as his “slave” on some occasions. For example, in order to demonstrate the master/slave relationship between Prospero and Caliban, this exclamation has been uttered by Caliban: “I shall be pinched to death!” (V, i, p.276).

While Prospero is in fact a hero exercising his power in his colonial prison of his island to attain the perfection of Superman, Caliban is professed enemy of books, the symbols of the cultured world of learning in Milan.

Carey-Webb (1999, p.21) has made a rich comparison between Shakespeare’s depiction of Caliban’s educational relucrance and Thomas Nashe’s 1600 portrait of Will Summers, Henry VIII’s jester (Nashe, 1958, p.279): Both Caliban and Summers personify as figures of evil and source of their punishment. Caliban’s education is focused on the acquisition of language i.e. English, but for Summers, Latin. There is a similar patriarchal pattern in the enforcement of learning for both of them. As Summers is beaten by his master and father, Caliban is beaten by Prospero, and both of them appeal to female goddesses for protection: Summers personifies his “destinie”; Caliban worships the god of his witch mother, Setebos. Their outrage against a disciplinary pedagogy is understandable, even convincing.

Caliban instructs the shipwrecked courtiers how to seize Prospero’s power again, which gives Caliban freedom.). Carey-Webb (1999) refers to Caliban’s dislike of prison and of being ruled by Prospero. “He would prefer to be out-of-doors, under a hedge” (p.21). In “Discipline and Punish”, Michel Foucault (1977) claims that “power is exercised rather than possessed and freedom is both the condition and the effect of power” (p.26). In examining the construction of the prison as the central means of criminal punishment, Foucault builds a case for the idea that:

prison became part of a larger “carceral system” that has become an all-encompassing sovereign institution in modern society. Prison is one part of a vast network, including schools, military institutions, hospitals, and factories, which build a panoptic society for its members. This system creates “disciplinary careers” (p.300). It is operated under the scientific authority of medicine, psychology, and criminology. Moreover, it operates according to principles that ensure that it cannot fail to produce delinquents. (p.266)

Here is Caliban:

’tis a custom with him
I’th afternoon to sleep. There thou maysr brain him,
Haveng first seized his books; or with a log
Batter his skull, or paunch him eith a stake,
Or cut his weasaned with thy knife. Remember
First to possess hes books; for without them
One spirit to command—they all do hate him
As rootedly as I. Burn you his books. (III, ii, p.85-93)

At this moment, Caliban is self-serving, not. His eloquent indulgence in the language of violence, in imagining Prospero’s head being smashed with a log, echoes in a perverse way how Prospero’s brother, Antonio, dreamed up the outcome of a plot to murder Alonzo, King of Naples, with an “obedient steel” (II, i, p.281) three inches deep into the body of the victim. In Caliban’s horrific fantasy, violence involves not only beating and stabbing, but also the burning of books. Books are also the source of Prospero’s magic and hence power; they are symbols of knowledge. But they also signify Prospero’s commitment to education, his role as a “schoolmaster”, and even as an exemplification of the utility of printed books in “educational revolution” in the early sixteenth century. When Caliban suggests burning Prospero’s book, he tries to destroy the core of Prospero’s power. In fact, “Prospero’s supernatural power, based on linguistic supremacy is transmitted through teaching his system of values, the knowledge that will perpetuate his power, although he never lets his pupils share his hermeneutic magic. This results in an unapproachable power which can not be fully acquired by other characters” (Baldic, 1987, p.12).

In the Tempest Caliban fears that he may lose his intelligence and may turn into a beast. In a warning to Trinculo and Stephano about what may happen if their plot is found out. Caliban suggests that Prospero will transform them into creatures farther down on the natural scale: “We shall loose our time/ And be turned to barnacles, or to apes/ With foreheads villainous low” (IV, i, p.248-250).

Fury, Fury! There Tryrant, there! Hark, hark!
Go chageme goblins that they grind their joints
Than pard of cato’ mountain.
With dry convulsions, shorten up their sinews
Ariel]Hark, they roar.
Let them be hunted soundly. (IV, i, p.257-264)

Carey-Webb (1999) avers:

Ironically, Prospero’s “civilizing” discipline produces brutish behavior, and Caliban’s fear of being reduced to bestiality is justified. When Prospero and Ariel catch Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo they are hunted down, like animals. Prospero’s attending spirit recall the hunter’s ravenous dogs chasing the rebellious slave. (p.30)

Body punishment plays an important part in the discourse of pedagogy in The Tempest. In the response to Caliban’s cursing, Prospero administers “cramp” and “pinches”:

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
As thick as honey comb, each pinch more stinging
Bees that made ‘em. (I, ii, p.325-330)

Again: “If thou neglect’st, or dost unwillingly/ What I command, I’ll rack thee with old cramps/ Fill all bones with aches, make thee roar/ That beasts shall tremble...
at thy din” (I, ii, p.367-370). Such violence was seen as proper and necessary to the business of educating Caliban and relates to the role of punishment within the pedagogical structure of Prospero’s and English power. Both the success and failures of Caliban’s education serve to legitimate European cultural domination and ratify assumptions about “uncivilized” others. Once the master’s language is learned by Caliban, it becomes evident that this “failure” seems from “deeper” shortcomings. If the development of modern pedagogy allows the internalization of authority, the incomplements of Early Modern absolutism is evident in the need for the direct and public use of violence. In the colonial context violence may be particularly cruel. It is in Caliban’s nature which no amount of nature can cure:

Abhorred slave,
Which any print of goodness wilt not take,
Being capable of all ill! I pitied thee,
Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
One thing or other. When thou didst not, savage,
Know think own meaning, but wouldst gabble like
A thing most brutish, I endowed thy purposes
With words that made them known. But thy vile race--
Though thou didst learn-had that in’t which good natures
Could not abide to be with; therefore wast thou
Deservedly confined into this rock,
Who hadst deserved more than a prison. (I, ii, p.357-359)

For Foucault (1979) “any exercise of power will inevitably results in some form of resistance as the reaction to power” (p.26). Through out The Tempest, disloyalty, treason, and rebellion emerge from a utopian dream of freedom. This dream is present in Gonzalo’s imaginative utopia, in Ariel’s reiterated request for freedom, in Miranda’s and Ferdinand’s desire for each other, in the natural beauty of the island, in the relationship of Caliban and the nature and in his recollection of Prospero’s independence, and above all, in Stephano’s, Trinculo’s and Caliban’s treasonous rebellion. Their plan to kill Prospero, burn his books, marry Miranda, take over the island and insure that “thought is free”(III, ii, p.121) lead to the interruption of the wedding masque and render Prospero more “distempered” and “angry” than Miranda has ever seen him. This vision of Utopia serves to encourage New World colonization. The surprising difficulty of survival in the New World led to desperate conscription first of native Americans and then African slaves into forced labor.

Prospero instructs Miranda that Caliban’s services are necessary:

[ Miranda] ’Tis a villain, sir,
I do not love to look on.
[ Prospero] But as ’tis,
We cannot miss him, He does make our fire,
Fetch in our wood, and serves in offices
That profit us. What ho, slave! Caliban! (I, ii, p.308-313)

The “failure” of the native to welcome the settlement of the European with open arms leads to the European’s use of force.

Incidentally Colonial pedagogy has contradictory effects. From Prospero’s view Caliban is disobedient, and his education thus wasted. Acquiring is not sufficient to alter his nature. And, as subsequent history has shown, racism and colonialism make more likely the native’s rejection of colonial teaching. At some point, then, the native turns the colonizer’s language against him and adopts Caliban’s stance: “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!” (I, ii, p.362-364). Even Caliban’s awareness of Prospero’s Presence does not inhibit his rebellious actions. Though he has been schooled to know that Prospero’s tortures are waiting for him, he is undaunted: “His spirits hear me, / And yet I need must curse” ( II, i, p.4-5).

Caliban’s rejection of Prospero’s pedagogy points to the danger of the unruly pupil. This reading of The Tempest suggests that the link between education and control is not new: attempts to formulate a disciplinary colonial pedagogy had analogs as early the seventeenth century. Thomas Hobbes (1688) advises English crown:

The core of rebellion, as you have seen by this and read of other rebellions, are the universities; which nevertheless are not to be cast away but to be better disciplined, that is to say, that the politics there taught be made to be, as true politics should be, such as are fit to make men know that it is their duty to obey all laws whatsoever that shall by the authority of the king be enacted. (p.236)

The Tempest offers one of the earliest representations of English colonial education. It is full of various types of power such as political, physical, social power and even lingual power. In 1611, colonial pedagogy was new in that it was to be organized by the English in their own vernacular; the ability to impose the learning of one’s language onto others had been the hallmark of imperial rule for centuries. While the educated in Renaissance Europe had to learn Roman Latin, the colonized in the New World and elsewhere had to learn Spanish, Dutch, or later on, English. Stephen Greenblatt (1990) calls this process “linguistic colonialism” (p.16-39). So the analysis of training Caliban receives on the island is relevant to the assumptions that will come to underlie European/native encounters, most particularly European effort to ‘educate the savages’ in ensuring countries of English colonialism. In this sense, The Tempest offers one of the earliest representation of English colonial education (Carey-Webb, 1999, p.22).

The teaching of language to Caliban holds up to the audience a mirror in which they can recognize their own (London) vernacular English as “colonizer”. In the Globe Theater then, audience can see itself as a nation united on linguistic lines.

Caliban tells Stephano and Trinculo: “I am subject to a tyrant, a sorcerer that by his cunning hath cheated me of the island” (III, ii, p.40-2). Here, the relationship
between Prospero’s education of magical power is clearly identified by Caliban.

Writing and book are frequently identified as critical technologies in the establishment of colonial authority; Caliban’s animosity toward education and the book is paradigmatic of the relationship between colonized and colonizer. When Caliban plans revolt he advises Stephano and Trinculo to capture Prospero’s books:

Remember
First to possess his book; for without him
He’s but a soot, as I am, nor hath not
One spirit to command—they all do hate him
As rootedly as I. Burn but his books.
He has brave utensils, for so he calls them,
Which when he has a horse, he’ll deck withal. (III, ii, p.90-5)

The struggle between Caliban and Prospero is over the ownership of books, the technology of power, magic and the implements of educational practice. For Caliban, the book is not the vehicle to knowledge but the tool of authority. Colonial schools and educational systems in the conquest centuries taught European Languages, culture, and administration to non-European subjects; much like the schools of sixteenth century England as the colonial administrative units. Macaulay (1835) in Minute on Indian Education writes: “Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect” (p.729).

CONCLUSION

In The Tempest, Prospero’s magical power and knowledge can be associated to Foucaultian reading of history. By accepting Prospero’s connection of knowledge and power, we can recognize the way in which Prospero’s book-learned magic is necessary to his rule on the island. His island does become a cell, laboratory, and classroom, where the isolation and manipulation of characters allows authority to “carry out experiments,” “alter behavior,” “train” and “correct” individuals. Michel Foucault (1979), in his now classic work Discipline and Punish explicitly draws connections between prisons and educational.

Drawing on examples from both the seventeenth and eighteen centuries, Foucault makes his famous argument: “Power increasingly makes itself everywhere present and visible; it invents new mechanisms; it separates, it immobilizes, it partitions; it constructs for a time what is both a counter-city and the perfect society; it imposes an ideal functioning...” (p.205). He shows that the state becomes more and more like a laboratory:

A machine to carry out experiments, to try out different punishments on prisoners, according to their crimes and character, and to seek out the most effective ones..., to try out pedagogical experiments— and in particular to take up once gain the well-debated problem of secluded education, by using orphans. (p.203-204)

The emergence of prison as the form of punishment for every crime grew out of the development of discipline in the 18th and 19th centuries, according to Foucault. He looks at the development of highly refined forms of discipline, of discipline concerned with the smallest and most precise aspects of a person’s body. Foucault argues:

Discipline, developed a new economy and politics for bodies. Modern institutions required that bodies must be individuated according to their tasks, as well as for training, observation, and control. Therefore, he argues, discipline created a whole new form of individuality for bodies, which enabled them to perform their duty within the new forms of economic, political, and military organizations emerging in the modern age and continuing to today. (p.197)

Along with the tendency toward internalized control, the representation of education in The Tempest suggests an expanding threat of disruption. Prospero knows well Foucault’s idea that freedom is both the condition and the effect of power and all those in his power (Caliban, Miranda, Ferdinand, Ariel, and the shipwrecked Italians) are no better than slaves under his control. Many of them want to resist or even revolt, but they are overpowered and therefore without freedom to things at will (I, ii, p.376). Pedagogical colonization is only one piece of broader process of modernization. Yet Foucault’s analysis can also become monolithic and unidirectional, calling for modification in specific textual and historical contexts.

Reading the works of Shakespeare causes to clear up the mystery of the universe forcing one to explore other unknown mysteries existing in the universe. Shakespeare’s genius can be fully appreciated if his works are studied as “Literature”; to read them with care, welcoming the advice of the critics where they bring us closer to the meaning of the work, and shunning them divert out attention from it. Shakespeare has enriched the world with his thoughts and his creation, and he never dies because his works are ever green.
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