

A peer-reviewed open-access journal indexed in NepJol

ISSN 2990-7640 (online); ISSN 2542-2596 (print)

Published by Molung Foundation, Kathmandu, Nepal

Article History: Received on 4 December 2025; Accepted on 5 June 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/mef.v16i2.97684>

Critical Narratives: The Voices of Negotiations across the Differences

Niran Khanal

Tribhuvan University

Author Note

Niran Khanal, PhD  <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1207-9549> is an Assistant Professor of English at Padmakanya Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal. His areas of interest are creative writing, philosophy, and research. He received a PhD Fellowship from the UGC, Nepal, in 2075 BS and has presented papers at international conferences and published several research articles and poems in journals and periodicals.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Niran Khanal at Padmakanya Multiple Campus, Bagbazar, Kathmandu. Email: nirananda22@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper deals with the problem of representations in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Jane Eyre*. The divisions under race, gender, class, and nationality as projected in these narratives raise questions about the binary relations that organize the societies to empower certain groups or individuals and subject others. To identify the points of departure in the alternative narratives, the study has used the critical comparative approach as a method. The paper argues that problems of representation in the mainstream narratives reflect the underlying belief systems that influence the authors. Therefore, rather than dealing with the problematic representations in isolation, it critiques the underlying cause, hegemonic ideologies, and their connections with representations. After examining the alternative narratives, *A Tempest*, *Foe*, and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, respectively, the study uncovers that the critical authors of these texts put their efforts into bridging the binaries by altering the narratives. They diversify their narratives. Aimé Césaire, J M Coetzee, and Jean Rhys change the plot, modify the roles of the characters, change the setting, and alter other elements to break the hierarchies of binaries of the master-narratives. They empower the marginal and suppressed voices of the master narratives and place them in dialogue with the dominant figures of the mainstream narratives. The attempts of the critical authors are to dismantle the asymmetrical power relations between the representatives of different groups and explore alternative relations for integrated societies.

Keywords: representations, ideologies, binaries, negotiations, center-margin, critical narratives

Critical Narratives: The Voices of Negotiations across the Differences

The representations of binary relations in the master narratives, *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Jane Eyre*, are the reflections of divided societies under the burden of race, gender, class, and nationality. Accepted as parts of cultures or traditions, the mainstream-margin relations tell the stories of social exclusion, marginalization, and unfair treatment of the subordinated group. To address these issues, this paper underscores the necessity of some constructive interventions.

The efforts of Aime Cesaire, JM Coetzee, and Jean Rhys to mend the social relations by the alternative narratives: *A Tempest*, *Foe*, and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, respectively, arouse optimism for the plural and diverse societies where human dignity and freedom are placed over negation and control. Through the language of diversity, they negotiate between the extremes of racial hatred, underclass exploitation, and gendered roles. Their deconstructive approach against the divisions carved in the mainstream narratives is constructive for social well-being.

As this study concentrates on the problem of disparities under binaries as represented in the mainstream narratives, these questions help uncover the reality and demystify the reasons for the existence of such disparities. Why are the binary relations constructed in the mainstream narratives? How do the alternative narratives bridge the binaries under race, gender, class, and others? What is the language of alternative representation to negotiate in the context of this study?

The thesis of this study is that mainstream-margin hierarchies represented in the master-narratives have ties with deep-rooted ideologies that influence the authors; to end the binary relations, the problematic ideologies that support them are to be neutralized by the alternative narratives.

The theories of feminism to examine gender issues, Marxism for class-related problems and deconstruction to critique the suppressive structures make the theoretical framework for the study. Besides them, ideas of ideology borrowed from Louis Althusser help understand how ideologies operate in different selected narratives.

In this method, the aforementioned theories are applied critically to the comparative study of pairs of mainstream and alternative narratives. So, it is qualitative research.

The significance of the research lies in its attempt to explore the possibilities for justice through the critical reading of literary representations. It also envisions building inclusive societies where diverse identities get space, and they collaborate for the common good. To make it happen, it is necessary to deconstruct and reconstruct the faulty narratives that bring divisions among humanity.

Literature Review

A few critics have made their efforts to address the problems of identities, gender, racism, imperialism, and others as represented in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Jane Eyre*. The new versions of these narratives, *A Tempest*, *Foe*, and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, respectively, are the outcomes of disapproval of center-margin relations as projected in the master narratives. In this review, the study examines whether the critics made any attempts to uncover the underlying factors that give birth to such problems.

In the context of *The Tempest*, the colonial relation between Prospero and Caliban is explicit. As the colonizers possess the indigenous knowledge and act against the natives, the latter resist them. Rachel Bryant views Caliban as disillusioned by the usurpation of Prospero. She observes how Caliban offers his assistance to Prospero and his daughter as the guests to his island home. 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 (Bryant, 2013). It seems like Prospero obtains information from Caliban and claims that he has taught him to civilize. So, Bryant raises the issue of colonialism and imperialism. However, she does not incorporate what empowers Prospero to rationalize the hierarchy between himself and Caliban.

Joseph Khoury compares *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" (Khoury, 2006, p. 23). Further, Khoury argues that Prospero gains and maintains the position of power due to his capacity to construct a discourse that gets recognized as truth. He employs the discursive strategy as a means to overwrite Caliban's identity. Khoury also sees the possibility of deconstructing 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 . As Michael Foucault views that the discourse of knowledge constructs power, Khoury acknowledges its potential in the case of *A Tempest*. This paper's argument is that without ideologies of race, class and nationality, Prospero fails to justify his superiority.

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 means to exercise domination and submission between Crusoe and Friday. Silently, the master can maintain his authority over the servant (Farr, 2017). Before Friday learns the English language of Crusoe, their verbal communication fails since they belong to different language backgrounds. However, they can employ gestures to express their motives. So, the gestures of Crusoe indicate command and control, whereas Friday's gestures symbolize subservience to the master.

Readers not only receive what is given in the texts but also add from their own side in the interpretation of intertextual relations. Tisha Turk (2011) examines the relation between *Foe* and *Robinson Crusoe* to study their intertextual narratives. She underscores that the 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. 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* to *Robinson Crusoe*.

To justify the abusive treatment of the unwanted vulnerable, people in power employ the discourse of madness. In literary discourses, authors make use of it to portray the tarnished image of the neglected characters. In the context of *Jane Eyre*, Karen Beth Strovas (2016) 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 . . ." (p. 386). The then belief was that insanity is connected to moral degeneration and sinful acts. Charlotte Brontë relates Bertha's illness to sinful nature rather than a mental ailment . She constructs Bertha's image as the unwanted other of Edward Rochester, who uses the ideology of madness to justify his actions against Bertha. Strovas also comments that Bronte aligns the 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, but rather follows herself. Strovas critiques the hierarchical relation between mad and sane as represented in *Jane Eyre*. However, she does not answer why Brontë represents this way.

In response to the Eurocentric perspective of Charlotte Brontë in *Jane Eyre*, Jennifer Gilchrist interprets *Wide Sargasso Sea*, “Rhys wages a broader, anti-Enlightenment critique of European, masculinist rationalism, objectivism and Liberalism” (Gilchrist, 2012, p. 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 Brontë for practicing “eighteenth-century, bourgeois, feminist, woman/slave analogy” (p. 463) in *Jane Eyre*. Gilchrist states that *Wide Sargasso Sea* promotes the traits that Brontë disregards. In this context, she links Brontë 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. 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.

The review uncovers that despite their attempts to address the fundamental issues, race, gender, class, and imperialism, as represented in *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Jane Eyre*, and their alternative versions as mentioned before, the critics fail to evaluate the roles of ideologies behind these problems. Moreover, I try to answer why binary relations exist and what may be their alternatives.

Representations: Transcending the Duality of Center-Margin

Aimé Césaire, J.M. Coetzee, and Jean Rhys rewrite *The Tempest*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Jane Eyre*, respectively, to uncover the fault lines in representations and offer alternatives to them. In this process, they adopt the path of negotiation across the differences. Unlike the perspectives of Brontë, Defoe, and Shakespeare, the succeeding authors raise the issues of the peripheries. They seem to aim to end 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 Césaire 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 better relations. Campbell Jones (2005) examines Spivak's views on negotiation between different schools of criticism, "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" (p. 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.

The Language of Suppression, Resistance, and Negotiation

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 of the island is one of the ways for Césaire to negotiate between racial and other differences. The imperial and the racist politics of Prospero meet contestation since they develop 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. And Prospero is bound to listen to them, though he shows his disapproval of Caliban's freedom.

Caliban uses 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" (p. 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 achieve 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” (p. 68). It shows that without Caliban, Prospero cannot manage himself. He recognizes Caliban's importance 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.

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” (p.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, 1997, p. 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 a 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 native African language, he demands freedom. His use of “Uhuru” for freedom holds a symbolic meaning. It is not simply a word, but 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” (p. 11). Does Prospero simply dislike Caliban’s language or feel afraid of the native resistance through the agency of language? Language contains power; it can serve as an agency to challenge the imperial authority. Probably, Prospero understands its potential. 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, the language he speaks reflects 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 a political dimension to the myth. 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” (p. 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 a 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.

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 example, in *Robinson Crusoe*, references to 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 . . .” (p. 144). This cannibal image of savages is fed into the narrative to draw the division between civilization and wilderness. The savages in barbaric acts are the fabrication of the author to idealize the European sophistication and decorum. Unlike this depiction, in *Foe*, Coetzee raises 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” (p. 54). In this statement, Susan denies that Crusoe sometimes worries about the savages. So, doubting the savages means questioning the binaries between the savages and Crusoe.

Marginal with the New Roles to Dismantle the Hierarchies

To address the problem of women’s exclusion, Coetzee creates a meaningful role for Susan. Through her, he draws the man’s world of *Robinson Crusoe* in interaction with a woman who makes a difference in terms of the representation of the 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 out on a mission to find her daughter, rescues herself on the island, and 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. On one hand, she competes with men to strengthen her position. On the other hand, 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. 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" (p. 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 her, they reflect her views on different issues. Despite her differences with Crusoe, she extends her hand in 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 in balancing 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 common ground with them. That is the ground of friendship.

Besides gender, the problem of class remains a contested issue in *Foe*. Coetzee critiques the master-slave relation in the 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 the 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*, in *Foe*, Coetzee changes the political role of Crusoe. So, his Cruso does not seem to hold the imperial perspective. Cruso'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 references from the past in terms of national history, culture, and development, Cruso does not narrate the glory of his past heritage; rather, he engages himself with the present business of survival on the island. It shows that Coetzee strips Crusoe's political mission of its imperial capitalist representative. For instance, Susan puts her queries to Cruso about 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 Cruso saddens as Susan states, "Cruso rescued will be a deep disappointment to the world; the idea of a Cruso on his island is a better thing than the true Cruso tight-lipped and sullen in an alien England" (35). They want to hear the adventurous tale of Cruso with a political role, not about a miserable figure who needs rescue by a woman who is shipwrecked. It shocks the imperial society to read such a 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 Cruso and Friday. Since Cruso holds nothing special for the role of master, he offers himself at an accessible distance to Friday. Though Friday is mute, it offers the possibility of communication between them.

To address the duality of identities in *Jane Eyre*, in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Rhys places Antoinette and Christophine in interaction with the Englishman. 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 a White English family residing in Jamaica. They are no more powerful in Jamaica than the Blacks have got freedom through the Emancipation Act. In the changed situation, Antoinette's position is weaker than that of 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?" (p. 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. Christophine is from Martinique and represents Afro-Caribbean identity. Known as an obeah woman, she lives with rituals and 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 . . ." (p. 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 of 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." (p. 117). As he puts an 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?'" (p.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* does Bertha get access to hold a conversation with Rochester. Stigmatized as mad, her potential role is dumped into the ditch of mania. This way, she is forbidden to communicate in a meaningful manner. She is not given any legitimate ground to put her disagreements in 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 and expresses her approvals and disapprovals.

Unlike the ordinary black servants who 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 a free country, and I am a free woman" (p.145). She defies the imperial authority and claims that she and the country are both independent. She signals that there will be no more colonialism in the Caribbean. On another occasion, she is critical of some habits of the English people. For instance, she compares the 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" (p. 77). She claims that her coffee is better than theirs, and these people gossip about baseless things. However, her expressions evidence that she intends to turn hostility into friendship. For instance, she begs 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, besides English to communicate with the Englishman. So, he reacts, "her language is horrible" (p.77) to disapprove of her tongue. She does not try to please the man by being sweet in his language, but rather demonstrates that she speaks her own native language. Since the language holds power, the use of the local language symbolizes that they have their local identity and the outsiders have to listen to them in their local language.

Rhys's narrative unfolds the differences in ideological orientations between the English and the Caribbeans. The reservations of the marginalized, like Christophine, are part of the 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 the oppressed in terms of race, gender, and others.

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 hierarchical 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 promotes conflicts between societies. The hierarchy between the Europeans and non-Europeans in literary representations, like *Robinson Crusoe*, is a part of the 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 example, 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 Cesaire, respectively, reproduce their texts with significant changes. They attempt to deconstruct them politically. Consequently, their narratives take 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 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.

References

- Bryant, R. (2013). Toward the desertion of Sycorax's island: Challenging the colonial contract. *ESC: English Studies in Canada*, 39 (4), 91-111. <https://doi.org/10.1353/esc.2013.0047>
- Cesaire, A. (1991). *A Tempest* (Richard Miller, Trans.). Ubu Repertory Theatre Publications.
- Coetzee, J.M. (2010). *Foe*. Penguin Books.
- Farr, J.S. (2017). Colonizing gestures: Crusoe, the signing sovereign. *Eighteenth- Century Fiction*, 29 (4), 537-562. <https://doi.org/10.3138/ecf.29.4.537>
- Gilchrist, J. (2012). Women, slavery, and the problem of freedom in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. *Twentieth-Century Literature*, 58 (3), 462-494. <https://doi.org/10.1215/0041462X-2012-4003>
- Jones, C. (2005). Practical deconstructivist feminist Marxist organization theory: Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. *Sociological Review*, 53(1), 228-244. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00552.x>
- Khoury, J. (2006). The Tempest revisited in Martinique: Aime Cesaire's Shakespeare. *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, 6 (2), 22-37. <https://doi.org/10.2979/JEM.2006.6.2.22>
- Martinez, R. L. (1997). Beyond Mexico's woman: Negotiating gender and race in dominant narrative of nation. *Social Justice*, 24 (2), Reconfiguring power: Challenges for the 21st century, 45-64.
- Strovas, K. B. (2016). No rest for the wicked: Immoral implications of insanity and sleeplessness in *Jane Eyre*. *CEA Critic*, 78 (3), 384-392.
- Turk, T. (2011). Intertextuality and collaborative construction of narrative: J. M. Coetzee's *Foe*. *Narrative*, 19 (3), 295-310. <https://doi.org/10.1353/nar.2011.0019>