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**ABSTRACT**

In this paper, my purpose is to focus on the underlying reading of *The Tempest* in the 21st century attempt with a view to revealing the colonizing attitudes of human psychology and embittered experiences of nations, ethnic groups and race. Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* during the late 20th century and early 21st century has been influenced by “post-colonialism” from the point of view of either Prospero or Caliban. Post-colonial criticism is dealt with Western colonialism of different nations, creed, and caste with the colonial relations of hegemony and submission, especially with regard to race and gender. Shakespeare has drawn upon the language of prayer and religion as a storehouse of emotion and symbol for which his audience and reader are readily responsive as a mode of intensified expression for the feelings and values. Shakespeare’s curses are the language of fury, hatred, helplessness, and despair wrought to its uttermost. The language of prayer is used in expressions of love, kindness, and gratitude, in outbursts of joy and wonder, and in countless eloquent pleadings for mercy, forgiveness, and compassion. The discourse of prayer, elegant and artful thought is an attempt to euphemize the 21st post-colonial domination of the island. Prospero’s ideas and thoughts extend the discourse of prayer into the life of audience. Caliban’s curses are regarded as an integral part to the dialectical structure and the discoursing of prayer in the play for which they belong as cataplectic threats of Prospero. Ariel is being held to his side of a bargain at a time of desperate need; Ferdinand is being tested in self-control and in his respect for Miranda; Prospero’s enemies are subjected to corrective punishments designed to bring them through suffering to self-knowledge and a change of heart.
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**INTRODUCTION**

The 20th century and 21st century have witnessed a proliferation of critical commentary on Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*. This play is admired as an epoch making creation to modern readers, audience and interpreters. Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* during the late 20th century and early 21st century has been influenced by what can broadly be called “post-colonialism.” Postcolonial criticism is dealt with Western colonialism of different nations, creed, and caste with the colonial relations of hegemony and submission, especially with regard to race and gender. Such criticism has been reflected in *The Tempest* with the prejudice of historical fact and the mysterious truth. Thus, many underlying readings of *The Tempest* in the 21st century attempt to reveal the colonizing attitudes of human psychology and embittered experiences which have been impacted upon the conflicting psychology of nations, ethnic groups and race.

**21st Century Post-colonialist Analysis**

Critics and theatrical productions have emphasized upon the close reading of *The Tempest* by deconstructing process as imperial, racist, or patriarchal and then, reconstructing the text to contribute to a decolonizing project. Bloom (2008) and Cobb (1984) have used postcolonial approaches as strategies to investigate *The Tempest* rather than as absolutes that enable to discredit and dismantle the play. Tom McAlindon has distanced himself from orthodox postcolonial reading of very early 21st century, when he has evaluated the “colonization” that Prospero and Miranda undertake. As a colonialist, Prospero loves much of his persuasiveness while his word, prayer and act are designed to effect the protection of his daughter from a place where they never decide to reside. It is difficult to conjecture how critical judgments and critical theories will be applied upon the close reading of *The Tempest* during the 21st century. The play’s past attraction for critics suggests that scholarly interest in
The Tempest will continue as time passes by and new critical thoughts and imagination will be emerged.

Vaughan (1991), McFarland (1972), and Nuttal (1967) have attached special significance to Ferdinand's mildly pious exclamation. Caliban's outburst is significant, and its meaning is more or less fixed. They regard it as the most important utterance in a play whose dominant discourse seeks to euphemize colonialist oppression, and fails to suppress contradictory attitudes. The protest of reality itself and the curse produces a moment of moral victory for the enslaved native of the island and is so potent in its devastating justness that it casts a shadow on the final scene, determining the effect on our overall conception of the play, The Tempest. In the persuasive post-colonialist interpretations, Caliban's malediction on his language-teacher is taken as a proof that language functions in the play with the alleged pronouncement of the bishop of Avila in 1492: “Language is the perfect instrument of empire.” Such types of underlying readings do not consider the play's many other allusions to language and how they might strengthen or weaken the post-colonialist interpretation of Caliban's curse. These allusions function as a part of a specific discourse: the language of prayer; Caliban's curse (like Ferdinand's pious exclamation) belongs, and from which we must unveil its significance. The discourse of prayer is conspicuous in all romances: it is inter-involved with their providentialist ideology, their special fondness for the numinous, and an idealist mode of characterization that associates the noble characters, especially the female protagonist with sainthood and divinity. But, the discourse of prayer as reflected in The Tempest, where it is distinguished by its paradoxical and dialectical character and its central involvement in the play’s close-reading. By an analysis of the way in which prayer functions in The Tempest that language functions on the island not only as a colonialist tool but also the notion of an egoistic and tyrannical Prospero and finally, an unconciled Caliban; no less controversially, instead of legitimizing an oppressive hierarchical order, the play, while not dispensing with the hierarchical model of society, advances a leveling, horizontal ethic of interdependence and reciprocity. Despite initial underlying reading, it will entail reference to the way in which the text encodes certain aspects of early modern culture ignored by critics and historicist. Nevertheless, I shall be implicitly endorsing humanist conceptions of The Tempest as a work that is intentionally and effectively trans-historical as well as contemporary significance. Although we can acknowledge that it is deeply engaged with problems of power, authority, and domination, my study is not toward political but rather toward religious, affective, and rhetorical aspects of Elizabethan culture. Since politics and religion are so intimately related to the 21st century, this difference might seem to be problematic, but we sense that religion should be understood solely in terms of power and domination.

The main context of Caliban's malediction is a conceptual antithesis that runs throughout the play, an antithesis in which the other term is blessing. Curse and blessing are intimately related and unstable opposites since each is a form of prayer, in religious and popular thought, what commences as a curse becomes a blessing, and vice versa. Blessing and curse are not the only forms of prayer in The Tempest. There is ardent prayer and the prayer of worship or adoration. Prayerful and prayer-like forms of expression are classified as figures of speech in rhetorical tradition. The curse, the blessing, and the fervent prayer are grouped among the so-called “figures of speech” which are commonly applied to utter vehement affections in style and form. A figure in the same group is closely related to curse, and one to which Prospero is often inclined in which the speaker abandons the threatening against people, commonwealth or country through declaring the certainties or likelihood of plagues and punishments to fall upon them for their wickedness as stated in the Bible. A figure is closely related to the blessing, where the speaker expresses his joy that some good has been obtained or some evil rejected: not a prayer, but an utterance in which he thinks that he or she is blessed, that something providential has occurred in the textual discourse.

In Shakespeare’s language of prayer, formal and informal, calculated and impulsive curses abound in histories and tragedies. His curses are the language of fury, hatred, helplessness, and despair wrought to its uttermost. But, the language of prayer focuses on the contrary aspects of human feeling, emotion and experience. It is used in expression of love, kindness, and gratitude, in outbursts of joy and wonder, and in countless eloquent pleading for mercy, forgiveness, and compassion. Although his plays are secular, Shakespeare sheds lights on the language of prayer and religion as a storehouse of emotion and symbol for which his audience and reader are readily responsive as a mode of intensified expression for feelings and values. Of special significance in The Tempest is the parental blessing versus the parental curse. Thus, a daughter or son kneels and a parent blesses in the most emotionally charged moments in the romances.

The most offensive curse in The Tempest is neither Prospero’s nor Caliban’s. In the opening scene, the word “plague” in the boatswain’s outburst, “A plague upon this howling” is followed in the Folio by a long dash; this must have replaced a blasphemous oath or string of oaths which is heard on the stage. The boatswain is condemned as a “blasphemous, incharitable dog,” an “insolent noisemaker” (I.ii.39, 43); and when he reappears in the last scene in a dumbstruck condition; he is greeted as a loud-mouthed blasphemer chastened by experience:

Now, blasphemy, That swear’st grace o’erboard: not an oath on shore? Hast thou no mouth by land? (V.i.221-3)
But, the boatswain's outburst is forgivable, since he is being obstructed and distracted by the passengers in his attempt to keep the chain of command between the master and servant. He is well-intentioned, dutiful, and beyond serious reproach. Although blasphemous, his excretions are comparable to Prospero's catatptic outbursts against the revolt of Caliban, Ariel, and Ferdinand. But, it should be observed that in the opening scene, the boatswain's blasphemies are eclipsed by the desperate pieties of others. From the beginning, the discourse of prayer is symbol of a sense of interdependence of human beings as well as of their common dependence on powers which they cannot control. It conspires with the emblematic nature of the opening scene to reinforce the universal implication of the play. The imperiled ship, with its fearful storm and fractious passengers, recalls not only the ship of state, any state, but also human nature. The long and complex second scene includes Caliban's first curses and a wide range of prayers together with references to unsolicited blessing or grace. Miranda, one of the play's two main voices of charitable compassion, pleads on the voyagers' behalf with Prospero, the surrogate deity who commands the storm. Her prayers are answered because she is addressing someone to whom "the very virtue of compassion" outweighs the desire for vengeance (I.ii.27): "Tell your piteous heart / There's no harm done" (I.ii.14-5). Ariel reports that everyone on the board has survives shipwreck and lands on the island with "not a hair perished" (I.ii.218).

At the end of the scene, Prospero plays the implacable god in response to Miranda's triple appeal for pity on Ferdinand's behalf: "Speak not you for him!" (I.ii.158). The reason for his harshness is that he has a blessing in store for Miranda that is buried in his cryptic but emphatic, if not impassioned, response to her question as to why he raises the storm that he has done nothing but in care of his dear daughter. Like any powerful ruler, white magician, or saint, Prospero is no deity but a dependent mortal, and he knows it. In the second scene, his story of survival duplicates experience of the first scene. He tells Miranda that he is blessedly helped by Providence divine. Providence operates first through Gonzalo who supplies him with the material necessities for journey as well as his books out of his charity; and secondly, through Miranda herself, who is to her despairing father what the comforting angel is to the storm-tossed Paul:

O, a cherubin,
Thou wast that did preserve me. Thou didst smile,
Infus'd with a fortitude from heaven,
When I have deck'd the sea with drops full salt
which raised in me
An undergoing stomach, to bear up
Against what should ensue (I.ii.152-8).

Also in the second scene, Ariel's angry is protective and Prospero's catatptic responses. Prospero's outbursts are hardly distinguishable from Caliban's. His angry words are not curses, the true sense, but threats. Although they suggest furious severity and a harsh, inflammable nature, there are mitigating circumstances which are ignored. In the first place, Prospero works desperately against time when his two servants erupt rebelliously. More important is the way in which Ariel, being reminded that Prospero frees him from an eternity of pain, acknowledges his own ingratitude, begs "pardon" for his outburst, and promises to complete his tasks. Caliban, who stands accused of ingratitude, requires more than threats before he will ask for pardon and grace. The second scene also contains lovers' expressions of mutual wonder and worship. Each lover is divine to the other; the divine symbolizes humanity in its ideal form. To Miranda, who carries wonder and admiration in her name, Ferdinand is like a thing divine lover to her. To him, she is like a goddess, and he prays to her for "some good instruction" on how he should conduct himself on the island: "Vouchsafe my prayer" (II. ii. 28). Worship is the play's metaphor for love and admiration; it is what makes service acceptable and desirable. So, it is relevant to Caliban, who figures as Ferdinand's antithesis in one of the two juxtaposed, semi-emblematic scenes: the truculent logman who curses his master, "All the infections that the sun sucks up / From boos, fens, flats, on Prosper fall" (II. ii. 21-21) is contrasted with the "patient logman" (III. i. 67) who blesses and feels blessed by his mistress in his menial task:

I do beseech you—
Cherly that I might set it in my prayers—
What is your name? (III. i. 34-6)

Caliban once loved, and is still in awe of his master; but his hatred of Prospero that he loses what judgment he has, Stephano accepts as master, and kneels in idolatrous admiration of a gross fool, his man in the moon. No more maladies for the time being: "whilst thou liv'st, keep a good tongue in thy head" (III. ii. 113) is his new master's injunction. Also antithetical to Caliban is "holy Gonzalo," as Prospero calls him (V. i. 62). Where he is ridiculed by Antonio for being spendthrift of his tongue, he is motivated almost in everything what he says by a compassionate desire to distract his master from despairing thoughts about his son’s possible death comparing with Miranda’s role as the smiling Cherubim who saves her father from despair. Correspondingly, Gonzalo criticizes Sebastian for feeding Alonso's gloom by suggesting that he is responsible for his son's death:

My lord Sebastian,
The truth you speak of doth lack some gentleness
And time to speak it in. You rub the sore
When you should bring the plaster.
(II. i. 141-4)

Thus, Antonio’s attempt to seduce Sebastian into a usurpation plot focuses attention on a courtly perversion of speech’s archetypal and rhetorical function. Antonio comments sarcastically on Gonzalo’s benevolent chatter, when he himself tries to talk Sebastian into murder. Thus, against Antonio’s evil
persuasions, the naive-sounding speech of garrulous Gonzalo is rendered by its prayerful dimension. His abrupt waking from the sleep shared by himself and Alonso saves both of them from death, and his first words on waking as if the exclamatory words themselves awaken him. His last words in the scene are a prayer for the missing son designed to lift the father’s sinking spirits: “Heavens keep him from these beasts!” (II.i.322).

In the mysterious spiritual economy of the island, the fate of the king and his missing son is wholly dependent on Prospero’s prayer for his daughter. Prospero watches, unobserved, the blossoming relationship between Miranda and Ferdinand that he appears to oppose and exclaims: “Heavens rain grace” (III.i. 75). With this prayer, we begin to see what the play is centrally about: a father’s blessing for a daughter who is herself a blessing. Sebastian comments sardonically on the marriage of Alonso’s daughter in Tunis: “‘Twas a sweet marriage, and we prosper well in our return” (II.i. 77) meaning that it was a bitter marriage and that they are cursed on the return voyage for he adds accusingly: “you would not bless our Europe with your daughter” (II.i. 130). In Prospero’s wedding masque, Juno says to Ceres:

Go with me
To bless this twain, that they may prosperous be,
And honored in their issue (IV.i. 103-5).

During the Elizabethan Period, the word “prosper” was so commonly attached to the idea of blessing as to be almost synonymous with it. To pray for someone’s well-being—to bless that person—was to ask that he or she would prosper; and to be blessed by heaven or the fairies was to be prospered by them. The spirit to the paradoxical temper of The Tempest, from Bacon’s essays should be noted: “Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament; adversity is the blessing of the New; which carrieth the greater benediction, and the clearer revelation of God’s favor” (22). This quotation implies that the name of Prospero, a name historically associated with the dukedom of Milan on four occasions, becomes “Prosper” is so deployed by Shakespeare as to signify blessing. Above all, it signifies the blessing of marriage and children. Prospero’s last-act promise of “calm seas, auspicious gales” and “expeditious sail” (V.i.317-9) evokes the conventional description of favorable winds and trouble-free voyages as prosperous.

This identification of “the name of Prosper” dealing with the idea of blessing suggests that Caliban’s name may have been affected by the play’s discourse of prayer and its antithetical and paradoxical principle. In the most thorough examination to the date of the various theories that have been advanced to account for this name, Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan have cast doubt on the “cannibal” etymology. They have found the “carib” / “Caribana” etymology quite persuasive, and more persuasive still the claim of Albert Kluyver in 1895 that the name derives from the gypsy word for “black”—cauliban or kaliban (they note that the gypsy language flourished in the 16th century England). Kluyver’s theory persuades the structural identity of the name and Prospero calls Caliban a “thing of darkness” and a “demi-devil” (V.i.278, 275). Act II. Scene i ends with Gonzalo’s prayer for his master’s son; Act II. Scene ii opens with Caliban’s fit of cursing against his master and ends with his drunken, word-playful song: “Ban, ‘ban, Cacaliban / Has a new master” (II.i. 183-4). We are alerted to the fact that cursing is a part of Caliban’s name. Caliban prefixes the word “ban” with an appropriate echo of the Greek word for “bad” or “evil.”

Prospero and Caliban are involved in dialectic of blessing and curse; and at the heart of relationship is the fate of Miranda. Looking into “the dark backward and abym of time,” Prospero tells Miranda that her presence on their dangerous voyage turns into a foul play and troubles into a blessing. But, her future on the island can hardly seem to be auspicious to him; he can assume that after his death, her fate will be rape and motherhood to a brood of little Caliban. By his presence, Prospero, who is on the passing ship, sees that the voyage home and the future for Miranda would be prosperous if a genuine peace is established between himself and his old enemy, and sees that the best way to such a peace would be to conciliate two kingdoms through marriage. Everything he does on the island once he has secured the safe landing of the shipwrecked voyagers—separating the mariners and servants from the royal party, isolating Ferdinand from the rest of that party and engineering his “fair encounter” with Miranda, bringing Alonso through despair and remorse to say, “I . . . do entreat thou pardon me my wrongs” (V.i.120-1): all these fall into place as being subordinate and auxiliary to the plan for Miranda’s salvation. Thus, it is incorrect to say that “Miranda’s marriage . . . is designed by Prospero as a way of satisfying himself,” “a means of preserving his authority,” as it is to claim that the storm is part of a “revenge plan” abandoned in a “fifth-act conversion” inspired by Ariel. The most important aspect of Prospero’s plan is his tacit acknowledgement that the first prerequisite for a blessed marriage is mutual attraction and choice; he knows that he cannot enforce this, and he sees himself blessed when it happens spontaneously as his “soul prompts it” (II.i.423). Another complementary prerequisite that he has in mind, which he considers to be necessary to society as a whole, and which he articulates very explicitly, is restraint, the willed curtailment of freedom, something he himself has to practice when he has his enemies in his power and may become the tyrant Caliban. Without evidence of restraint, he believes that Ferdinand’s attraction to Miranda will not be a love based on respect, but rather tyrannous, Calibanesque lust. If Ferdinand seeks to consummate his union before “all sanctimonious ceremonies” and “full and holy rite” are ministered, it will be cursed with sterility and conflict. Given Ferdinand’s solemn assurance that his passion is under control, almost all the emphasis in the betrothal
masque and its aftermath is on blessing. In the “Solemnization of Matrimony” as established in the Elizabethan Prayer Book, the following blessings are conferred upon the wedded couple:

Thy wife shall be as the fruitful vine upon the walls of thy house.
Thy children like the Olive branch round about thy table.

Prospero's wedding masque translates these blessings into a classical idiom complicated with suggestions of an English climate and landscape in a Mediterranean world. Passing Cyprus en route, Iris arrives to inform Ceres, goddess of earth's plenty, that she has been called “some donation . . . freely to estate / On the blessed lovers” (IV.i.85-6). Juno, goddess of marriage, tells Ceres, “Go with me to bless this twain that they may prosperbe,” and sings:

Honor, riches, marriage-blessing,
Long continuance, and increasing,
Hourly joys be still upon you!
Juno sings her blessings on you
(IV.i. 106-9).

Her companion sings of “Earth's increase” and “vines with clust'ring bunches bowing” and ends her song: “Ceres' blessing so is on you” (IV.i.103-17). In the last scene, Alonso and Gonzalo add their voices to the prosperous marriage theme and to the ancillary theme of the prosperous voyage. Believing Ferdinand is dead, and hearing Prospero has lost his daughter, Alonso exclaims: “O heavens that they were living both in Naples, / The King and Queen there” (VI.i. 149-50). His discovery that this despairing prayer is to be answered gives an ecstatic quality to the blessings uttered by himself and Gonzalo, adding blessing:

Alonso. I say amen', Gonzalo.
Gonzalo. Was Milan thrust from Milan that his issue
Should become kings of Naples? O rejoic
Beyond a common joy (V.i.204-18).

Gonzalo reinforces a paradoxical idea already made explicit in the first exchange between the reunited Ferdinand and Alonso, “Though the seas threaten, they are merciful, / I have cursed them without cause,” said the son, to whom the father responds antiphonally: “Now all the blessings of a glad father compass thee about!” (VI. 181-3). The same paradox is operative earlier when Alonso’s “great guilt” provoked by the tempest that followed the vanishing banquet, prompted him to think that he is cursed forever by Prospero when he has been subjected to an experience designed by Prospero to lead him through “heart sorrow” to “a clear life ensuing” (III.iii.81-2). Asked by Gonzalo — “T' th' name of something holy”— why he stood in a “strange stare,” Alonso replied with an acute sense of the sacred and its different languages:

O, it is monstrous, monstrous!
Me thought the billows spoke and told me of it,
The winds did sing it to me, and the thunder,
That deep and dreadful organ-pipe, pronounced
The name of Prospero (III.iii.93-97).

Symmetrically, the notion of a curse transforming to a blessing first appears in Prospero's account of his own and his child's exposure to the elements in their terrible voyage. The blessing celebrated at the end is qualified by Shakespeare's dialectical sense and by the pressure of the scenes ceremonial and literary intertexts. The contingent nature of the lovers' happiness is acknowledged within the masque by reference to the myth of Proserpina and Pluto and without by its abrupt termination by the “thing of darkness” and his plots. This recalls the Prayer Book's marriage ceremony in which the central blessings are followed by reminders of Satan and the Fall. In prayers, shared between minister and congregation, for the Lord to the wedded pair “from the face of their enemy” (126); it recalls the warning motif of tradition enumerating the perils that threaten the marriage being celebrated. Furthermore, Prospero confesses that the blessed marriage of his daughter is a “dear loss” which he can endure—convert to another resolved paradox—by praying to Patience for her “soft grace” and “sovereign aid” (VI.144).

Prospero's concluding speech extends the discourse of prayer into the life of the audience. An epilogue's conventional appeal for a gracious response blends with a variation on the Lord's Prayer, a humble acknowledgement that Prospero is dependent on sinful others for pardon and prosperous winds if he is not to remain unredeemed, accursed, and imprisoned. Prospero expresses that he must acknowledge Caliban as his own, and indeed, there is a curious parallelism between the two at the end. Caliban admits that he is an ass to worship a dull fool and decides to “seek for grace” and “pardon” from his master; Prospero buries the book that he once prized above his dukedom, reduces himself to a common player, and prays to common mortals like ourselves. Caliban’s curses, we may conclude, are regarded as an integral part to the dialectical structure and the discourse of prayer in the play to which they belong as are the cataleptic threats of Prospero who kneels for pardon. They are part of a structure of thought that insists on human limitation, interdependence and on the consequent need for self-restraint, self-knowledge, repentance, forgiveness, generosity, and co-operation.

There is an abundance of textual evidence in The Tempest to suggest the presence of a playwright in control of his material and to question the negative accounts of Prospero and his actions that political critique so abstract from the play by means of strategic quotation and deconstructive allegations of textual self-contradiction. Some might claim that the discourse of prayer, elegant and artful thought is an evidence of an attempt to euphemize the 21st post-colonial domination of the island. The language of prayer in The Tempest is focused on the travelers’ consciousness of their
creatural weakness and dependence on their desire to overcome misfortune—shipwreck on an island that none of the nobility wants to colonize: “Some heavenly power guide us / Out of this fearful country!” (V.i. 107-8). Because it contains undoubted echoes of the New World in its richly allusive, symbolic, and universalizing design because it is clearly concerned with control and self-control, we can easily understand why the play has been appropriated as a post-colonialist allegory, especially by inhabitants of the Caribbean islands. But, the conception of Prospero as colonist loses much of its persuasiveness—has to be located near the periphery of the play’s range of semantic possibilities—when we perceive that his every word, prayer, and act is designed to affect the escape of his daughter and himself from a place they never choose to inhabit.

The 21st post-colonialist reading of The Tempest is mutually exclusive, that we must see the play from the point of view of either Prospero or Caliban. This submission has already alluded to the harshness in Prospero’s exercise of power. Thus, it concedes that his punitive treatment of Caliban has a vindictive and personal edge to it. It should be remembered that Prospero’s harshness extends to his own kind that it varies from the involuntary to the carefully calculated that it is never without reasonable or benevolent intent. Caliban is gleefully, unrepentant about the attempted rape and he will try again if he possesses his freedom; Ariel is being held to his side of a bargain at a time of desperate need; Ferdinand is being tested in self-control and in his respect for Miranda; Prospero’s enemies are subjected to corrective punishments designed to bring them through suffering to self-knowledge and a change of heart; and all these intents are part of an overall plan for Miranda’s happiness in a world elsewhere.

CONCLUSION
To conclude, we may express that Shakespeare’s The Tempest is the manifesto of the 20th century and the 21st century post-colonialism through portraying Prospero, Caliban, Ferdinand, Miranda and Ariel. I have also applied critical judgments of several numbers of critics and scholars with a view to focusing on very recent post-colonialist analysis as impacted in my submission. Shakespeare, with the art of male and female characterizations, has skillfully created the colonizing process which bears the testimony of today’s post-colonialism as well.
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