



Identity, Power and Otherness: A Postcolonial-Oriental Reading of Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe

Nforbin, Gerald Niba

Department of English and Foreign Languages,
University of Douala, Cameroon

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a postcolonial-oriental reading of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. The study employs the postcolonial theory, principally, Edward Said's orientalism and his concept of contrapuntal reading, which investigates the contextual circumstances of a text's production. Such a reading demonstrates that, in plot, setting, thematic content and characterization, *Robinson Crusoe* is a prototypical colonial narrative, shaped by colonial discourse and reflects the dominant imperialist ideologies of its time concerning race, identity and otherness. British colonialism informs nearly every feature of *Robinson Crusoe*, and, in its orientalist rhetoric, the novel clearly reproduces the imperialistic ideology of its time. Friday's existence in the text generates oriental 'othering' (which establishes his identity as the colonized) and serves both as a reminder of the colonial expansion of the British Empire and of the era's dominant, imperialistic discourse and perceived superiority of Englishness. Imperialism started to influence English national identity as colonizer as early as the eighteenth century with the English thinking more highly of themselves on account of their contact with colonized peoples, as epitomized in the character and personality of Defoe's protagonist, Robinson Crusoe. As narrator, Crusoe's attitude towards non-Europeans and his use of racial slurs are clearly in line with the era's orientalist rhetoric, which traditionally attributed traits outside British ideal values and accepted norms to the colonized or Eastern other.

Keywords: Identity, Power, Otherness, Orientalism, Daniel Defoe

INTRODUCTION

Featuring a British trader as its hero and set on a distant Caribbean Island Robinson Crusoe cries out for study in its colonial contexts. Indeed, British colonialism informs nearly every feature of Daniel Defoe's first novel: spatially... religiously... economically, and psychologically.... In short, Robinson Crusoe... owes characteristic traits to the colonial context' (McInelly, 2003:1) 1).... 'Not surprisingly, contemporary readers commonly regard Defoe's novel as the prototypical colonial novel of the eighteenth century, if not in all of English literature. Yet, the colonial elements of Robinson Crusoe have not been as thoroughly treated as we might expect in either eighteenth-century studies or postcolonial theory and criticism (McInelly, 2003:2)

This study is a response to McInelly's (2003:1, 2) invitation for a study of *Robinson Crusoe* in its colonial context. The main goal is to engage the colonial and contextual elements of the text in a sustained way, demonstrating the extent to which 'othering' in the context of colonialism shapes identities and power relations in *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). The novel was written at a

time when the British Empire like other colonial empires of Europe was extending her imperial rule in America, Africa and the West Indies, and gaining colonies in these areas which Britain saw as delicious sources of raw materials and slave-labour acquisition, hence like any other colonial novel, imperialism and colonialism are central concerns in *Robinson Crusoe*. An excellent example of a colonial text, *Robinson Crusoe* generates 'Othering', not only through Crusoe's exploration of the supposedly 'strange' landscape, but even more significantly, through Friday's presence as a colonized subject. Friday's existence serves both as a reminder of the colonial expansion of the British Empire and of the era's dominant, imperialistic discourse and perceived superiority of Englishness. The novel clearly reproduces the imperialistic ideology of its time. The narrator's use of racial slurs is clearly in line with the era's orientalist rhetoric, which traditionally attributed traits outside British ideal values and accepted norms to the colonized or Eastern other. It should be remembered that in the colonial era, the British saw themselves as 'humane masters' over all 'dark peoples and thought of the black race as dependent and less capable in all aspects of intelligence and morality, and was often quick to show prejudice against any difference in religion and culture. *Robinson Crusoe* replicates the mentality of imperial Britain, which produced degrading stereotypes to describe 'the other'. When Defoe wrote *Robinson Crusoe*, the notion of white superiority over colonized indigenous people was already strong in popular culture and this notion continued through the nineteenth century, culminating at the end of the century in a total justification of Britain's imperialist rule over its colonies as evident in Rudyard Kipling's poem, 'The White Man's Burden' (1899). Defoe's characterization of Friday and his representation of the Island Landscape disturbingly expose his colonialist mentality and his racist position toward the racial other from the British colonies. Yet, however disturbing these representations may be, given the historical context of the era in which the dominant ideological discourse promoted imperial ambitions, the right to rule over indigenous peoples and the racial superiority of whites, Crusoe's thoughts and actions concerning 'the other' are understandably bounded in the norm that uniformly inculcates a Eurocentric view of the racial and ethnic other.

Defoe's novel replicates the dominant, Eurocentric colonial ideologies of the eighteenth century concerning the racial other. As a colonial discourse, *Robinson Crusoe* embodies a plot, characters, settings, and themes, images (metaphors) that trigger memories of the British Empire's essentially dehumanizing and racially prejudiced views of non-European areas and their native inhabitants prior to the period of colonialism and imperialism. From this perspective, the novel is a historiographic metafiction and can be read as a part of Britain's political history

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: POSTCOLONIAL THEORY

Identity, Power and otherness are key concerns in the 'context of postcolonial studies which focuses on the power relations between colonizer and colonized' (Fludernik, 1996: 266). A theoretical position common within postcolonial thinking is the argument that colonial discourses are institutional structures of power in which identity and difference (otherness) are produced and propagated, and in turn used as the basis by which given individuals, cultures, and groups define themselves in relation to others. Despite the centrality of identity, power and otherness in postcolonial theory dealing with the ways identities are constructed, the dearth of studies on othering in colonial texts from the West, especially pioneer novels like *Robinson Crusoe*, is surprising, given that the novel is a glaring example of how Identity and othering occur in colonial discourses of power. It is for this reason that this paper focuses on the ways

otherness is used as the basis for constructing colonial identities and power relations in the chosen text. In other words, identity and othering are found in discourses of power, one of which is 'colonial discourse'.

Theories of power in discourse are mainly inspired by Foucault's notion of power. Foucault argues that 'discourse' signifies a combination of the linguistic and pragmatic means of power by which social control is enacted, adding that power resides in discourse (Qtd in Doring, 2008: 25). A further summary of Foucault's concept states that 'power does not work negatively by forcefully dominating those who are subjects to it; it incorporates them... it shapes and 'retools' them to fit with its needs.' This understanding of power inspired the analysis of Defoe's narrative, *Robinson Crusoe* as a colonial discourse. In postcolonial studies, specifically within the colonial and postcolonial contexts, narrative plays a central role in the construction of identity and power relations, especially as expressed in notions of 'self' and 'other' in Edward Said's concept of orientalism.

Orientalism and/or Colonial Discourse Theory

Edward Said's major contribution to Postcolonial theory, specifically, to the analysis of power and colonial identities is best illustrated in his concept of orientalism which is central to the process of othering and identity construction. Edward Said's work, *Orientalism* (1978) played a great role in bringing to the fore what is known in postcolonial criticism as 'colonial discourse', a term that is very instrumental to our understanding of othering and in the construction of colonial identities in Defoe's novel. To better understand the notion of othering and the construction of colonial identities in colonial discourse, it is important to briefly revisit the concept of Orientalism.

In *Orientalism* (1978), Edward Said initiated a hitherto unprecedented area of theoretical inquiry called 'colonial discourse' which has also become known as 'colonial discourse theory'. In this seminal study which established a revisionist look at the roots of imperialism in European culture and which has become one of the canonical texts of both postcolonial criticism and cultural studies, Said provides an overview of European representations of, and attitudes towards the Middle East (Nunning and Nunning, 1996: 10). According to (Nunning and Nunning, 1996), Said tried to reconstruct the ways a Eurocentric mind-set shaped both the Western conceptions of the Orient and also a tradition of academic study of the orient. Said draws attention to Western attitudes towards the East (Orient), and how the West constructed and continues to represent the East or Orient as its 'Other' by means of style including figures of speech, narrative devices, images (like metaphors), structures of thoughts, plot, setting and textual stereotypes (which serve in this study as representations of colonial discourse).

Following his belief that the West created a false narrative about the Orient in which the latter is considered and treated as 'the other', Said introduced the term, 'orientalism' to describe the ways by which 'the West's othering of the East in terms of knowledge, power, and status' (Fludernik, 1996: 267) is orchestrated. The key point of his theory was to show that the Orient was subjected to a completely disempowering (robbed of power, authority, and autonomy) status by the West or Europeans. Within the orientalist framework, people residing in the East as a whole were perceived as the same. Colonial knowledge pictured them as 'racially, morally, intellectually, and culturally inferior'. Such narratives which have come to be known in postcolonial theory as 'colonial discourse' or 'colonial discourse theory' provide a false or

distorted image of the native 'other'. The native other was not only perceived as inferior. The belief in the inferiority of the native other served as an excuse, a pretext or justification for disregarding these people's cultural achievements and for violating their civilizations by imposing British (or French) cultures and languages on them, subjecting them to the position of colonies reliant on the apparently wiser and benevolent mother countries (Fludernik, 1996: 267). Tenets of high imperialism similarly claimed that oriental civilization had entirely nothing to offer.

Seen as such, Orientalism as a theme has come to be understood as the way by which imperialism was constructed by the West as a pretext for their imperial project (Doring Tobias, 25). Some practitioners of Postcolonial criticism have analysed orientalism as a thematic representation of the East by the West, as the 'Other', and the 'inferior'. From the above perspective, while the Colonizer was epitomized by knowledge, power, authority, civilization etc., his colonized other was textually inscribed by discriminating images, metaphors, clichés/stereotypes and other forms of textual structures. In short, the Orient was associated with the values, perceptions and also a mind-set which the West do not associate with themselves, some of which are vile, cruelty, barbarism, uncivilised, irrational, etc. What became the upshot of Said's analysis of textual devices and stereotypes by which the West had continued to represent the East and other cultural products of European empires was 'colonial discourse'.

In view of the above, it is safe to concur with others that colonial discourse or colonial discourse theory originated from Orientalism, specifically when the term is viewed as a theme. The term has been defined as the set of codes, stereotypes, and vocabulary employed when the power relationship between a colonial power and its colonies is written, or spoken about (Nunning and Nunning, 2004: 10). Lois Tyson (1999:366) also relevantly opines that colonial discourse, inherently Eurocentric, was the language by which colonialist thinking or ideology of innate superiority and civilised culture of the West which was contrasted with the inferiority of the indigenous people, was expressed. An analysis of colonial discourse therefore needs to consider 'the variety of textual forms by which the West produced and codified knowledge about the non-metropolitan areas and cultures, especially those under colonial control (L. Chrisman and P. Williams, 1993: 5). In view of its potential in breeding fictions of Empire, the analysis of images and ideological metaphors of empire including stereotypes and any form of linguistic and perceptual representations is essential to our understanding of colonial discourse and of the othering of the identities of both the colonizer and the colonized. The 'fictions of empire' (images, myths ideological metaphors, stereotypes, and other form of linguistic and perceptual representations of the colonizer-colonized relationship) that are contained in *Robinson Crusoe* and which are essential in any investigation of the role that othering can play in the textual reproduction of British imperial identity and the identity of the inhabitants of its colonized territories will be the focus of the analytical sections of this study.

Mimicry

Like Said's *Orientalism*, Homi Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* is an important text which has provided relevant terminologies for an analysis of the colonial context. Drawing on the insights of theorists like Franz Fanon, Homi, Bhabha suggests terms for describing the perceived relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. These terms include mimicry, ambivalence, and hybridity. We will however focus only on one, (mimicry) which is manifested

in *Robinson Crusoe*. According to Bhabha, mimicry happens when the native would like to be accepted as an equal by the colonizer and so, tries to mimic the colonizer, but is never accepted as quite the same. In other words, mimicry describes a situation where the native, who wants to become the same like the colonizer adopts or imitates colonialist habits. However, he is never accepted on quite the same level.

From the above, it is clear that the postcolonial 'other' is the native. It is also clear that one cannot talk about the other in postcolonial theory without recourse to the self-other dialectic. The self-other dialect refers to the conflict between the colonizer and the colonized which is basically about the clash of ideologies and cultures.

ROBINSON CRUSOE AS A COLONIAL DISCOURSE

Plot and thematic Content

Like most colonial texts, Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* for instance, the plot of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* consists of features of the adventure novel and the picaresque tradition. The novel relates the oversea adventures of a White British man. It is on this adventurous plot structure that Defoe hangs his colonial discourse of (British) exploration, discovery, colonization, annexation and arrogation of power and ownership of a supposedly uninhabited island, including its natural resources and his rule and education of the supposedly rudimentary human beings (natives) found on this strange land. Like in the early stages of Britain's colonization of overseas territories which generally began as business projects conducted by private enterprises, Crusoe's journey is a supposedly business journey turned into a colonizing project with its concomitant mission of bringing civilization to an ignorant population.¹ On arrival at the supposedly inhabited island, Defoe discovers with great satisfaction that the Island has 'delicious' natural resources including trees, timber and animals, which like other humans whom he encounters on the Island (especially Friday), he immediately proceeds to colonize and to tame. Crusoe's perception of himself as sovereign ruler and of all those around him as his subjects reveals the Britain empire's colonizing agenda in the eighteenth century. With such an attitude, Defoe's protagonist and narrator, Robinson Crusoe projects himself as a British colonizer with capitalist tendencies, thereby putting *Robinson Crusoe* squarely within the corpus of narratives on imperialism and colonialism. It is significant to note that as Defoe leaves the Island after his rescue, he does not relinquish ownership of his colony (the Island), rather, like the British imperialists, he institutes a form of colonial administration; he therefore returns to England leaving behind the English and Spanish sailors he rescued/captured as his colonial administrators. Thus, in terms of the plot proper, the novel is about imperialism and colonialism, involving the adventures of an English man, Crusoe, and culminating in his shipwreck and survival in an uninhabited Island which he colonizes and rules as his overseas colony for 28 years before returning to England as colonizer with an overseas colony.

1 It is important to note that Britain made its first tentative efforts to establish overseas settlements in the 16th century. It was maritime expansion driven by commercial ambitions that resulted in the establishment of these settlements. Nearly all of these early settlements arose from the enterprise of particular companies and magnates rather than from any effort on the part of the English crown. The crown exercised some rights of appointment and supervision, but the early colonies were like Crusoe's, Island essentially self-managing enterprises. The formation of the empire was thus an unorganized process based on piecemeal acquisition, sometimes with the British government being the least willing partner in the enterprise ('British Empire: History, countries, Map, & facts'. <https://www.britannica.com>).

Against the advice of his father, mother and friends, and motivated by the love of seafaring and adventure, Crusoe runs away from home and travels abroad to seek adventures. First, the narrator leaves Hull for London in a ship, on the first of September 1651. The travelers survive a strong storm at Yarmouth. Against the advice of the sailors he meets, he embarks on another voyage to the Coast of Africa where he gets acquainted with a ship Captain who had been to the Coast of Guinea where he had been involved in some kind of commercial dealings. From the ship captain, Crusoe learns much about commerce and also how to become a sailor and in due course, he gains wealth through mercantile dealings. They embark on another voyage in the course of which they are captured by the Turkish Pirates of Sallee in North Africa and turned into slaves. The pirate becomes Crusoe's new master and one day he sends Crusoe with some boys to go and catch fish. With the boat at his disposal, Crusoe plans his escape. During the fishing expedition, Crusoe casts the unsuspecting Moor into the sea and manages to escape, taking along Xury who, under threats, pledges to serve Crusoe faithfully in the way a master would expect from his slave or dependent.

After a lingering sail, they pass through the Barbarian Coast, Morocco, and an 'unknown' and 'uninhabited country; (except by wild beasts, (40)) which they resolve to 'discover' (36). This country is said to be 'barren' (40) and here nothing is heard except the 'howlings and roarings of wild beasts.' They navigate towards the Coast of Guinea where they meet people 'quite black and naked' (44) with whom Robinson Crusoe talks in sign language. The people they meet here are rudimentary humanity; they wear animal skins, and use, not knives, but sharpened pieces of wood (48). Navigating towards the Coast of Guinea, they meet a Portuguese Ship Captain who rescues them. Crusoe sells Xury to the Ship Captain on condition that 'he would give the boy an obligation to set him free in ten years if he turns Christian' (52). From here, they travel and settle in Brazil where Crusoe secures a letter of naturalisation and sets up a prosperous plantation. Although in Brazil Crusoe increased his business and wealth and becomes successful, like Oliver Twist, he wants some more; besides, he needed hands for his farms, and, as he himself says, the 'buying of Negroes was a trade at that time' (60). The thought of trading in Negroes propels Crusoe to embark on another voyage to the Coast of Africa in the company of a master and his boy.² Like all the arears of the Congos that Marlow passes through in his journey up the river Congo, everything about the territories (Islands) that Crusoe passes through point to the fact that it is uninhabited and thus waiting to be colonized. As Crusoe tells us, 'We knew nothing where we were, or upon what land it was, what island it was, whether inhabited or not...' (68). A ship wreck occurs in which Robinson Crusoe survives and is cast on the shore of an uninhabited island. His first home becomes a tree (75). Thereafter, Crusoe surveys the land. He then discovers that the Island is 'barren' and 'uninhabited' except by wild beasts (82): 'I saw fowls, could not tell what was fit for food, and what not. I shot at a great bird which I saw sitting on the side of a great wood. I believe it was the first gun that had been fired there since.'

Crusoe is very contented with the discovery. The loneliness that accompanies Crusoe in this Island is described as a 'melancholy relations of a scene of silent life' (100). There are no houses but wood and animals. Crusoe builds his habitation including a country house which he fortifies against invasion from man and creatures of the wild. His view of the island as 'uninhabited' and

2 It is important to note that, from 1700 to 1810, British merchants are said to have been responsible for dislocating almost three million Africans from their homelands to be sold as slaves in the Americas, including the West Indies.

barren is strikingly similar to Marlow's view of the Congo in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. It is important to note that Marlow starts his own narrative of adventure by describing his childhood fascination with an empty map of the continent and its big rivers (22), which he, as a boy promises to explore. As he tells us, as a child, he used to look at maps portraying colonialist conquest, noting that he enjoyed looking at the 'blank spaces'. These perceptions of foreign lands as empty, uninhabited or unpossessed provided justifications for colonialist conquests. While on the uninhabited land, Crusoe rescues a savage and names him Friday and educates him in the Christian religion and in British values. In due course, Crusoe and Friday overpower some mutineers and rescue some of the men in their captivity one of which is a Ship Captain. In connivance with Robinson Crusoe, the Ship Captain tells the captured mutineers including the English and Spanish sailors that the Island is an imperial territory ruled by a Governor, granting a lee way for Robinson Crusoe to rule Friday and the people in the Island as subjects. Crusoe then poses as Master or colonizer on whom the lives of the subject including the fate of the Island depend. In order to have people guarding the Island against intrusion, Crusoe cunningly presents two options to the Spaniards and the others he rescued: returning to England to face justice or remaining in the island to obviate justice. The latter option is adopted. He later on returns to England, sells his plantation in Brazil and revisits the Island to discover with satisfaction that the Spaniards are ruling it well.

The Colonizing Project: The Arbitrary Claim of an Island as Colony

The cultural myth of the imperial era symbolized Europe as autonomous, so that the civilized European nations were then seen to 'discover' new lands and to civilize primitive peoples who had hitherto, lived without a civilization. Crusoe's colonizing project begins in the discovery of a supposedly new or uninhabited land.

When Crusoe first finds himself on the Island, he proceeds in a typical colonialist style to survey the land and to make sense of his environment. First, he climbs on a hill top to survey the land and after surveying it and discovering that he was in an uninhabited island, he identifies 'a proper place for [his] habitation....' This move to survey the Island was a common practice in colonialist literature (Rebecca Weaver-Hightower, 2002: 201). His emphasis on the uninhabited state of the land is significant. In stressing the 'uninhabited' and 'barren' nature of the land, Crusoe convinces himself and his fellow whites that the island is available to be 'inscribed' into his or Britain's (imperial) properties. Such representations casts foreign lands in the British imperial imagination as places that need to be civilized or lighted up.

Like Conrad, Defoe arbitrarily 'inscribes' the Island in colonial properties through the use of empire metaphors. Conrad represents the Congo as the 'heart of darkness'. In like manner, Crusoe perceives and represents the [Is]land he occupies as 'naked' and 'barren', and only waiting to be peopled and fertilized, a justification which he advances for colonizing the land. Like the 'darkness' or blankness of Africa in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, the 'naked', 'barren' and 'uninhabited' images of the land in Defoe's narrative clearly indicate that Crusoe is the one to fertilize it as well as transform the rudimentary humans (natives) of this area by clothing them literarily and figuratively with the civilization they lacked prior to his annexation and colonization. The land itself is perceived in dominant empire metaphors and other highly stereotypical images: it is a 'naked' and 'barren' land with an 'excessive[ly] hot' weather (58), but with delicious valleys and wild forest.

I HAD now been in this unhappy island about ten months...I firmly believe that no human shape had ever set foot upon that place. Having now secured my habitation,...I had a great desire to make a more perfect discovery of the island, and to see what other productions I might find, which I yet knew nothing of (139).

In this 'unhappy' and 'uninhabited wilderness' (161) where Crusoe feels 'locked up with the eternal bars and bolts of the ocean' (161), and where 'no human shape had ever set foot' (141), he does not know 'what part of the world this might be'. Like Marlow who gets lost on his journey up the river Congo, Crusoe does not know 'what part of the world this might be': 'It must be part of America, and, as I concluded by all my observations, by my guess it could not be less than fifteen or twenty leagues off' (154). Convinced that the island is an 'uninhabited wilderness' (161), Crusoe secures a habitation and, like a typical colonialist infected with the zeal for land grabbing and the arrogation of ownership over foreign territories and their native inhabitants, Crusoe is filled with unbridled desire to make more 'discovery' of the land and its other resources. With this in mind, his colonizing spirit is set in motion.

...travelling nearly four miles, as I might judge from the length of the valley... I came to an opening where the country seemed to descend to the West; and a little spring of fresh water, which issued out of the side of the hill by me, ran the other way, that is, due east; and the country appeared so fresh, so green, so flourishing, everything being in a constant verdure or flourish of spring that it looked like a planted garden. I descended a little on the side of that delicious vale, surveying it with a secret kind of pleasure,...to think that this was my own; that I was king and lord of all this country indefensibly, and had a right of possession; and if I could convey it, I might have it in inheritance as completely as any lord of a manor in England (141-142).

Just like rich mineral resources attracted the British Empire and the colonial Empires of other European powers to Africa and other continents which they colonized, so does the 'fresh' and 'flourishing' island with its 'delicious vale' stir up a 'secret pleasure' in Crusoe, and enkindle in him a kind of colonizing agenda. The supposedly uninhabited state of the land now seems to give him 'a right of possession'. From henceforth, Crusoe acts as the colonizer and owner of the island ('lord of a manor in England') assuming total control over the land and its native inhabitants: '...I was the king and lord of all this country indefensibly, and had a right of possession;...I have it in inheritance as completely as any lord of a manor in England.' Notice that Crusoe's standard of reference for everything on this Island is England. While his ownership of the Island is compared to that of the English Lord of the manor, Crusoe severally refers to his home on the island and his defence as 'my castle' (198, 210, 238, 262). This reference recalls the popular English adage that 'a man's home is his castle' and shows the extent to which Crusoe has colonized the Island. The simile by which Crusoe compares his possession of the Island to the possession of an estate by an English Lord of the manor is also significant as a fiction of empire and foreshadows Crusoe's colonising agenda. The English manor system refers to a system of agricultural estates in the Middle Ages, owned by a lord and run by serfs or peasants. The Lords provided safety and protection from outside threats and the serfs or peasants provided labor to run the manor. There is therefore no doubt that in claiming the land, Crusoe also intended to get the serfs or peasants (the slaves/colonized) who will then tend the land. What Crusoe's motives, desires and eventually, his actions on the island provide is a retrospective remembrance of Britain's imperialism during which, foreign lands were claimed for colonies owing to their rich mineral resources and the cheap labour they

provided. The island thus becomes a metaphor for colonization and the usurpation of indigenous lands by British or European colonizers.

With the discovery of the 'fruitfulness of that valley' (146), Crusoe decides to extend his colonizing tentacles to a more 'fruitful part of the island' (146) which is 'tempting' (146) and where he erects another habitation: 'I had my country house and my sea-coast house.' In that respect, the uninhabited island with its rich resources becomes modelled on the imperial versions of the lands the British Empire colonized in Africa and elsewhere. Even the animals that Crusoe tames are colonized: 'I was much surprised with the increase of my family.' (146). The use of 'family' metaphors is a significant aspect of empire metaphors to which I shall return. Crusoe's behavior on the island replicates that of the (British) colonial masters. He arrogates ownership of everything in the island including animals and even begins to tame the animals and to educate the natives in the English language and English manners:

I diverted myself with talking to my parrot, and teaching him to speak; and I quickly taught him to know his own name, and at least to speak it out pretty loud, 'poll', which was the first ever word I heard spoken in the island by any mouth but my own (170).

Crusoe's discourse, which replicates features of colonial discourse is characterized by the colonizer's assumption of their inborn sovereignty, hegemony and the power to annex and rule which they contrasted with the barbarism and inferiority of the native inhabitants of the countries they colonized on grounds of their savagery: 'I was the lord of the whole manor; or, if I pleased, I might call myself king or emperor over the whole country which I had possession of: there were no rivals; I had no competitor, none to dispute sovereignty or command' (184). In the manner of an imperialist, Crusoe perceives himself as 'King', 'emperor' and sovereign ruler who wields command over his subjects including pets. The use of metaphoric images such as 'lord', 'king', 'emperor' and 'sovereignty' to refer to Crusoe only portray him as a colonizer with subjects under his dominion and control; by thinking of himself in terms of a sovereign king (the monarchy), Crusoe also reflects the English or British attitude towards the land and natives they colonized and assimilated. While the same words provide a representation of Crusoe as a colonizer, they replicate features of colonial discourse and structure the relationship between Crusoe and the island he colonizes as a colonizer-colonized relationship, requiring the duty of a ruler from Crusoe and that of a dependent from the natives or colonized 'others'. The greed for more land which is an inherent aspect of (British) colonial narratives is further reinforced in the following line: 'At last, being eager to view the circumference of my little kingdom' (196). Again, the metaphor of the island as a 'kingdom' alludes directly to Britain as a monarchy. This, together with the reference, 'the sixth year of my reign' (196) further testifies to Crusoe's imperialist vision for the island as a vision that is representative of the imperial attitudes of the British monarchy, which arrogated the right of possession and of authority over colonized lands and their subjects. Crusoe represents the spirit of British colonialism in his desire to acquire more and more areas of the island. This desire to extend his rule to more and more territories around the island reflects the extension of the power of the British Empire to more and more colonized territories in Africa, the West Indies and the Caribbean.

The most articulate portrayal of Crusoe's colonizing attitude finds expression in his use of metaphors that represent the British Empire as a family in the following passage:

It would have made a stoic smile to have seen me and my little family sit down to dinner. There was my majesty the prince and lord of the whole island; I had the lives of all my subjects at my absolute command; I could hang, draw, give liberty, and take it away, and no rebels among all my subjects. Then to see how like a king I dined, attended by my servants! Poll ...was the only one permitted to talk to me. My dog...sat always at my right hand; and two cats, one on the other side of the table and one on the other, expecting now and then a bit from my hand, as a mark of special favour (213).

One of the ideological fictions of British imperialism which projected the view of the British Empire as a family with colonies is replicated in the above excerpt specifically in Crusoe's perception of himself and in his relationship with his subjects, as a family.³ The use of family metaphor features in the word, 'family'. The head of this 'family' is his 'majesty', 'lord', and 'king': Crusoe. Such family metaphors which can also be described as Empire metaphors assign to the colonizer (Crusoe) the role of political dominance over the colonial children represented in the metaphors of a 'dog', 'Poll' and 'cats' who, as the colonized, are assigned the role of 'children dependent on the tutelage of the [father] country' (Nunning and Nunning, 1996: 15). There is no doubt therefore that the colonial children (metaphorically represented in the animal images of 'Poll' and the cats) depend on crumbs falling from the hands of their colonial mother/father for their welfare, and are totally subjected to her/his absolute command. In the words of the above critics, the widespread dissemination of the ideology of empire as family justifies the image of the British Empire as a world-wide family, one of the metaphors that popular imperialism lived by.

Like in the other excerpts above, Crusoe visualizes himself the way Britain as a nation visualized itself vis a viz its colonies: he is a 'king', 'majesty' and 'lord of the whole island' surrounded by his pets which he describes as his 'subjects, and whose lives he commands. These pets are clearly metaphors for the colonized subjects. The relationship between Crusoe and his subjects is depicted as that of a master and his servants. He rules his subjects in the way a tyrant does. He dispenses justice to his servants 'I could hang'; he could dish out liberty as well as withdraw it at will. When he sits at his table to dine, his subjects attend to him as a servant does to a king. In the spirit of colonialism, he creates a kingdom where he has servants attending to him. The above description of Crusoe's imperialist attitude replicates English imperialism and seems to constitute a memory of British political history.

Racism in *Robinson Crusoe*: The Non-European Others:

It is interesting to notice Defoe's false representation of the non-Europeans he encounters in *Robinson Crusoe*. Defoe's characterization of these non-Europeans replicates features of 'colonial discourse', (that is, the discourse through which the colonized become 'othered' by the colonizers, as first identified by Edward Said who conceives of this type of discourse as '[...] a

3 'Kinship' or 'family' is a frequent source domain for empire metaphors. The word, 'family' semantically replaces 'Empire' (which, from the perspective of the colonizer, seems too military and despotic) as a description of the relation of a mother country to its colonies. The family metaphor euphemizes this relationship by instead emphasizing a supposed 'natural' bond that obtains between the metropolis and its widely different colonies. The family trope therefore charts out a relationship of intimacy that conceals difference as well as conceals the force with which the colonies were yoked to the mother country. From the 'family' metaphor then comes the metaphoric expression of 'mother country' that attributes the role of a colonial mother to Great Britain and also links the complex dimension of the term, 'family' with the phenomena of colonization and imperialism.

collective notion identifying 'us' Europeans as against all 'those' non-Europeans, whether it be intellectually, morally, technologically, or economically (Erhard Reckwitz, 1996: 122)). Defoe's depiction of the non-Europeans in *Robinson Crusoe* is not different from Conrad's in *Heart of Darkness*. In this regard, most postcolonial critics have argued that colonialism is not only/necessarily a straightforward military procedure of taking over or conquering a weaker territory (colony). Colonialism involves various procedures, the main elements of colonialist discourse being 'the concepts of racism and otherness.' Abdel W. and Ahmed G. E. (2003:12-13, 14) state it more succinctly when they assert that, 'Racism and colonialism are... associated to each other, since both are grounded upon the same logic of binarism.' English colonialists were indeed, self-referential men in that they saw more of themselves in spite of their increasing contact with a diverse range of cultures. To put it more accurately, colonialists saw more of themselves through their contact with colonized peoples, and Crusoe's character fully illustrates this view in that, no experience validates his self-image and culture more than his relationship with non-European characters in general and Friday in particular. Indeed, 'racial stereotypes and the image of the racial other who is the colonized inferior (like Friday) consolidated the identity formation of the colonizer as the superior self/master. As part of the colonizing process, the colonizer introduces hierarchical structures based on race and class divisions. Crusoe's interaction with non-Europeans, especially the black characters in the novel reveals this racist sentiment. The novel includes prejudices concerning racial differences and the superiority of the white race through abundant references to the blackness, savagery and cannibalism of the natives. These racial slurs strongly hint of the possibility that, to Defoe, all things 'black' symbolized inferiority and evil.

In their journey southward, to what Crusoe calls the 'the truly barbarian coast', he feels his flesh creep at the thought of being in a place 'where whole nations of Negroes were sure to surround us with their canoes and destroy us; where we could never once go on shore, but we should be devoured by savage beasts, or more merciless savages of humankind' (48). Crusoe likens the awful spectre of being caught by Negroes to being devoured by lions or tigers: 'for to have fallen into the hands of any of the savages, had been as bad as to have fallen into the paws of lions and tigers' (50). When he finds the footprint on the shore of the Island, Crusoe gives us a monstrous and ugly image of the natives as cannibals and man-eaters. He immediately remembers he 'had heard that the people of the Caribbean coasts were cannibals or man eaters... and that they might kill him, as many Europeans who had fallen into their hands' (163). All of a sudden, he is 'filled with thoughts about [his] danger from the appearance of savages' (201). His fear of coming into contact with Negroes is compared to the fear of seeing a devil for, he was 'as fearful of seeing them as of seeing the devil himself... [he can] think of nothing but how [he] might destroy some of these monsters in their cruel, bloody entertainment, and ... save the victim they should bring hither to destroy' (213,215). Here is an excellent example of the association of blackness with evil in colonial discourse. It is clear that Defoe's demeaning view of blackness functions as a means of racial othering. The association of blackness (Negros) with evil (devils) here situates them as the racial other, exemplifying the power of the dominance of ideas regarding colonized people's supposed inferiority in eighteenth century England. Blackness is really repulsive and frightening to the author, but his is not an individual perspective. Such sweeping racial descriptions of colonized people were imprinted in the minds of the English people at the time of British imperialism. Whether consciously or unconsciously, Defoe's association of blackness with devilishness or evil illustrate how the English maintained ideas of racial superiority over dark people, which is important in understanding the enduring effect

of the racial prejudices of the time and their incorporation in texts. The implication of these racial statements is that the British saw themselves as the humane masters over all 'dark peoples' who needed to be civilized.

When Crusoe is taken as a slave, his treatment of his fellow slaves, Ishmael (Moley) and Xury, demonstrates that he is full of a sense of his own racial superiority. When he finally frees himself, he takes Xury with him, not as a fellow slave who like himself needs freedom, but as his servant. In a typical fashion of British subjugation of others, Crusoe keeps a Master-slave relation with Xury, just as he does with Friday later. This attitude exemplifies the British colonial subjugation of others. As Wheeler (1995: 381) points out, 'Crusoe's relationship to Xury has been interpreted typically as a relation of master to slave, and certainly Crusoe's selling Xury to the Portuguese captain confirms this idea.' In spite of Xury's faithfulness and loyalty, Crusoe, who has himself suffered slavery and had only freed himself from slavery a few hours ago, sells Xury into slavery. In fact, Crusoe treats these moors with otherness. The master-slave relation between Crusoe and Xury clearly 'foreshadows' his relation to Friday.

Crusoe's racist linguistic register continues in his description of the monstrous and ugly scene of the natives' cannibalism as evident in this passage:

When I came down the hill to the shore... I was perfectly confounded and amazed...to express the horror of my mind, at seeing the shore spread with skulls, hands, feet, and other bones of human bodies... where I supposed the savage wretches had sat down to their inhuman feastings upon the bodies of their fellow-creatures'... all my apprehensions were buried in the thoughts of such a pitch of inhuman, hellish brutality, and the horror of the degeneracy of human nature' (209).

From then on he suffers from nightmarish fantasy as he 'often dreamed of killing the savages' (233). Throughout this passage, Crusoe's perceives himself as the superior humane European who finds himself in a strange and hostile world. Crusoe sees nothing wrong with a European selling his fellow man (Xury) into slavery. Contrarily, he sees everything wrong with the killing and eating of human flesh, and nothing wrong in killing them as punishment. For Defoe, this is justice inasmuch as it is done by an Englishman or a European. Crusoe's perception and description of the natives who visit the island replicates British perceptions of the inhabitants of the colonies they colonized, a perception that legitimized British imperial agenda. To Crusoe, these Africans were simply cruel, brutish and primitive savages. This is evident from the following excerpt:

*I presently found that there were no less than nine naked **savages** sitting round a small fire they had made...I could see marks of horror which the dismal work they had been about had left behind it-viz. the blood, the bones, and part of the flesh of human bodies eaten and devoured by those wretches with merriment and sport (265).*

This description of colonized people as cannibals and 'naked savages' was a staple in the dominant public discourses about the colonial subjects. A further description of the savages informs that they 'were all dancing, [making] barbarous gestures' (292). Words like 'naked savages', cannibals and barbarians were a staple of colonial discourse. Thus, while the voice through which we get this negative perception of Africans seems to be Crusoe's, the perspective is the collective perspective of British people. Such a perspective is further illustrated as the

voyage takes Crusoe toward the south of Africa: 'people stand upon the shore to look at us... quite black, and stark naked'. As he tells us, he 'kept at a distance, but talked with them by signs... for something to eat' (54-55). But this racist colonial othering is most explicitly illustrated in the Crusoe-Friday relationship.

Friday as the Colonized and Racial 'Other'

When he frees Friday, Crusoe's provides a very dehumanizing description of his first encounter with him: '... he came nearer and nearer, kneeling down ... kissed the ground, and laid his head upon the ground, and, taking me by the foot, set my foot upon his head. This, it seems, was in token of swearing to be my slave forever' (245). Crusoe strikes a similar note on another occasion:

he came to me, laying himself down again upon the ground, with all the possible signs of a humble, thankful disposition ... he lays his head flat upon the ground, close to my foot, and sets my other foot upon his head as he had done before... he made all the signs to me of subjection, servitude, and submission imaginable (256-257).

This image of submission seems to take away all of Friday's humanity, autonomy or self-worth. Having freed Friday, Crusoe takes him in, not as a free man, but as his slave/servant. This raises a puzzling question: If Crusoe had needed a servant, why then had he sold Xury with whom he was more acquainted than Friday? In other words, why does Crusoe prefer Friday over Xury? In fact, Crusoe's choice of Friday further exposes his racially prejudiced character. In a nutshell, Crusoe accepts Friday as servant because he is not black. Friday is not a Negro and thus possesses quite different racial features from Xury as evident in this passage:

[Friday] was a comely, handsome fellow, perfectly well made, with straight, long limbs, not too large, tall, and well-shaped, and about twenty-six years of age. He had a very good countenance, not a fierce and surly aspect, but seemed to have something very manly in his face, and yet he had all the sweetness and softness of a European in his countenance... his hair was long and black, not curled like wool; his forehead very high and large, and a great vivacity and sparkling sharpness in his eyes. The colour of his skin was not quite black... but of a bright kind of a dun olive colour, that had in it something very agreeable... His face was round and plump, his nose small, not flat like the Negroes, a very good mouth, thin lips, and his teeth fine, well set (258).

It is clear that Crusoe's choice of a servant is based on race. In his profiling, he finds Friday racially closer to the European than Xury. Friday, he explains has the

...sweetness and softness of a European in his countenance... his hair was long and black, not curled like wool.... The colour of his skin was not quite black... but of a bright kind of a dun olive colour, that had in it something very agreeable... [and] his nose small, not flat like the Negroes' (258).

However, in spite of the fact that Friday has preferable racial features, Crusoe treats him as 'the other'. Anthony James (1972:79) maintains that Crouse's initial concerns are almost wholly how he can use Friday 'to implement his dream of power and domination'. A greater part of the 'othering' in *Robinson Crusoe* is generated by Friday's presence as a colonial subject. The introduction of Friday as the colonial and racial other is poignant in terms of reflecting the

dominant ideologies concerning race in England in the eighteenth century. An important aspect of colonial discourse is the alleged superiority of the colonizer and the inferiority of the colonized as well as the civilizing agenda of the colonizers involving the imposition of British culture including Christianity, education and English language on the colonized subjects (represented in the text by Friday). According to Brett Mcinelly (2003:1), 'Robinson Crusoe...owes characteristic traits to the colonial context', one of which is cultural assimilation/transformation, which constitutes part of British (colonial) political history. When Crusoe rescues Friday, he (Friday) is said to be 'stark naked', barbaric, and a savage. Hence, immediately after rescuing Friday from the supposed savages, Crusoe proceeds to colonize him culturally, first by clothing him. Crusoe gives Friday clothes and as we are told, Friday 'was glad to see himself almost well clothed as his master' (303). After clothing him, Friday is (re) named and a new language, (the English language) and religion (Christianity) imposed on him; he is also soon taught English table manners. The assimilation of Friday takes many forms beginning with his clothing, (re)naming and the teaching of the English language:

I began to speak to him; and teach him to speak to me: and first, I let him know his name should be Friday...I likewise taught him to say Master; and then let him know that was to be my name: I likewise taught him to say Yes and No and to know the meaning of them (299).

In 'Friday: or, the Power of Naming', Novak (1997:117) argues that, naming is itself an act of taking possession. By naming Friday, Crusoe assumes ownership and control over him: 'By (re)naming [Friday], Crusoe assumes possession of him in the same way that Columbus assumed possession of the land by his namings'. As Friday's acculturation process continues, Crusoe teaches Friday table manners and a proper diet; this, as a means of rescuing him from cannibalism:

After I had been two or three days returned to my castle, I thought that, in order to bring Friday off from his horrid way of feeding, and from the relish of a cannibal's stomach, I ought to let him taste other flesh; so, I took him out with me one morning to the woods. I went, intending to kill a kid out of my own flock; and bring it home and dress it...Having thus fed him with boiled meat and broth, I was resolved to feast him the next morning by roasting a piece of the kid: this I did by hanging it before the fire on a string...This, Friday admired very much; but when he came to taste the flesh, he took so many ways to tell me how well he liked it...[At] last he told me...he would never eat man's flesh any more, which I was glad to hear (307).

Colonialism is also replicated in the novel when Crusoe teaches Friday his own religion, a thematic content that not only reflects the colonizer's attitude towards the native inhabitants of the territories they colonized, but relevantly contributes in drawing attention to the colonizer's attempts to legitimize their colonizing agenda by framing it as a 'civilizing' mission. Commenting on colonization in *Robinson Crusoe*, Mcinelly (2003: 1) asserts, 'Religiously, the novel demonstrates that a spiritual awakening can take place... when an Englishman subordinates and converts a non-European Other', After clothing and teaching Friday both the English language and a new diet, the next stage in the taming process constitutes the teaching of Crusoe's religion, that is, Christianity, to the latter; an aspect of thematic content that replicates the teaching of Christianity to the colonized by the colonial masters when they first colonized African territories. When Crusoe meets Friday, we are told that the latter does not believe in God but in Benamuckee, a force that dwells in the mountains, and to whom all things

bow. As Friday explains, 'O'; Benamuckee, 'made the seas, the ground we walk on, the hills and the woods', and only the old go to him (314). Crusoe denies this and rather teaches Friday his own religion:

I began to instruct him in the knowledge of true God; I told him that the Maker of all things lives up there, pointing to heaven; that He governed the world...that He was omnipotent, and could do everything for us, give everything to us, take everything from us; and thus, by degrees, I opened his eyes. He listened with great attention, and received with pleasure the notion of Jesus Christ being sent to redeem us; and of the manner of making our prayers to God, and His being able to hear us, even in heaven (318).

One thing worthy of note is that, in spite of this cultural transformation which is intended to elevate Friday from his savagery and barbaric ways, the relationship between him and Crusoe does not change. Crusoe has taught Friday to call him, 'master' and not, friend'. One deduces that Crusoe rescued Friday not out of love for humanity but out of his own need for power and dominance. He rescues Friday only to make the latter his slave. Robinson Crusoe's relationship to Friday is structured in the light of a master-servant/slave relationship. Crusoe is a typical capitalist characterized by the spirit of colonialism and selfish individualism. His relationship with Friday is capitalistic and thus lacks human touch. This master/servant relationship with Friday which truly embodies colonization and slavery is disguised in family metaphors: '...never man had been so faithful, loving, sincere servant than Friday was to me...perfectly obliged and engaged; his very affections were tied to me, like those of a child to a father' (303). Friday is wholly dependent on Crusoe, and as a man easily led, he does whatever Crusoe asks him to do. In fact, Crusoe's attitude toward Friday and Friday's doglike attachment to him do not only resemble a colonizer-colonized relationship but also a slave-master relationship. Subjugated and enslaved in his own land, Friday exists as a symbol of a colonized people along with their lost land and natural resources. In this analogy Crusoe's relationship to Friday can be read as a metaphor for colonial appropriation, or seizure of indigenous people's lands and the corresponding enslavement of the indigenous population. The Crusoe-Friday relationship replicates the history of British imperialist domination and the role of Britain in slavery. The encounter between the colonizer and the colonized often led to a loss of the colonized's identity and Friday strikingly embodies this loss of identity. One is tempted to think that by naming the savage (which is itself a sign of possession), Crusoe gives Friday a new identity. But what is this identity? Crusoe himself cannot identify Friday. Crusoe teaches Friday to call him 'master', but he (Crusoe) also refers to himself as Friday's father and even expresses keen jealousy over Friday's joy at reuniting with his own father. Crusoe also variously refers to Friday as a 'faithful, loving, sincere servant' (260), 'poor savage' (201), 'poor, honest Creature' (258), 'my Companion of all my sorrows and solitudes' (269), 'Christian' (273), 'my Man Friday', (282), 'the poor... Creature' (294) etc. Crusoe's multiple contradictory labels for Friday clearly demonstrate the difficulty he has in finding an appropriate label or identity for him. It is not clear if Friday is his slave, his son, his companion or simply a redeemed savage. This plethora of labels for Friday alone, the result of being colonized, illustrate in concrete terms the difficulty of defining Friday's identity and the identity of all colonized people. Friday's loss of identity is the direct result of the rigorous process of colonization and acculturation to which Crusoe has subjected him. Crusoe realizes that it is not only the island that needs to be refashioned and refurbished with a government. Friday also needs to be culturally transformed. Like the colonialist that he is, Crusoe 'civilizes' Friday to the extent that the latter is not willing to depart

from his master. Friday acknowledges his doglike attachment to his colonial master in the following words, 'You do great deal much good [...] you teach wild mans be good, sober, tame mans; you tell them know God, pray God, and live new life (329) ... Me die when you die, master' (336).

Two things emerge from Friday's acknowledgement of his position as a colonized subject. When Crusoe transmits Friday's discourse, he consciously transmits its uniqueness and also colonial discourse which is characteristic of imperialism as a set of attitudes that stereotyped Africans as inferior, lacking in culture, history and most specifically, language (an idea they used to justify their civilizing mission). Crusoe depicts Friday as one who had no knowledge of the English language and manages to speak in broken English even after going through the learning process: 'you teach wild mans be good, sober, tame mans; you tell them know God, pray God, and live new life...' Secondly, Friday's discourse transmits his lack of knowledge about Christianity which is a typical trope by which imperialism is remembered in colonial texts: 'you tell them know God, pray God, and live new life'. Thirdly, the description of Friday's discourse consciously or unconsciously transmits his fundamentally rudimentary humanity with hints of barbarism and cannibalistic tendencies and constitutes, a further metaphor by which imperialism survives: 'you teach wild mans be good, sober, tame mans'. Notice that Friday acknowledges that he was barbaric and wild and has been tamed or civilized. The description of Friday in the above and in numerous other excerpts is not different from Marlow's/the narrator's stereotypical prejudiced and dehumanizing image of Africans and their environment in *Heart of Darkness*. It might be argued that since the portrayal of Friday reproduces colonial discourse, notably the British assumption of their innate superiority and of the inferiority and barbarism to which the colonized countries and their natives were associated, it is intended to represent British perception of Africa and Africans, and thus, to delineate the relationship of Britain and its colonies in terms of a civilizing mission.

The description of Crusoe's relationship with Friday structures the latter as either a formerly colonized subject or an allegorical of colonized nations. Daniel Defoe seems to project Friday as a representative of the countries or people formerly colonized by Britain. It can also be inferred that Defoe also wants to draw attention to the effects of colonial domination on the colonized cultures using Friday as textual representation. There is an insinuation that Friday replicates features of what postcolonial critics describe as 'cultural colonization', justified by Crusoe's inculcation in him of British culture and values in key areas like Christian religion, the English language, table or feeding manners, morals, ethics and physical appearance (as Friday is taught to wear clothes). This leads us to understand the identity of Friday, an apparently formerly subjugated or colonized, as a hybrid. In terms of identity, Friday is cast as a colonial subject. Adopting the words of Lois Tyson (1999:368) in her general perception of postcolonial subjects, Friday does not resist colonial subjugation. He believes in British superiority and his own inferiority, accepts and acknowledges his taming, and imitates Crusoe, the colonizer, in dress, behaviour, table/feeding manners and lifestyle, a situation that the post-colonial critic-Homi Bhabha, for instance, would describe as 'mimicry'.

As earlier mentioned, after 'civilizing' him, Crusoe still maintains dominion over Friday as his subject by maintaining the master-slave paradigm. Colonialism which forms a large component of British political history is particularly remembered in the way Crusoe continues to treat Friday after taming the latter. It illustrates Anthony James (1972:79)'s view that Crouse's initial

concerns are almost wholly how he can use Friday 'to implement his dream of power and domination'. Once they leave the island, he continues to see Friday as his colonial or overseas possession. This, he does by referring to the latter in possessive phrases like 'my man Friday'. The phrase: 'My man Friday' has power for, it structures Friday as a colonized territory and suggests a sense of subjection on the part of Friday, and ownership and dominion on Crusoe's own part. The phrase goes further to imply that Crusoe tames, assimilates or inculcates English manners in Friday so that he can become part of Britain's overseas colonies. In his continuous reference to Friday in possessive pronouns, Crusoe also foreshadows a British post-independence attitude. Crusoe's attitude after they have been freed from the Island replicates Britain's reluctance to relinquish control of her former colonies even after independence as evident in the formation of cluster political families like the Commonwealth of Nations with the English crown as head. Crusoe's commanding utterances additionally reflect his colonialist attitude towards his formerly colonized island and the people he meets there. Crusoe does not address his subjects including Friday as 'friends' or 'children' even though there are hints that he perceives himself as a father to them. Crusoe's commanding utterances all go to testify to his characterization as a 'bloody colonizer', a radicalized colonizer with an extravagant ambition to be treated as a sovereign ruler. In many of his references either to the island or to Friday, the reader hears his repeated use of the possessive pronoun, 'my island' (343), 'my man Friday' (362), 'I ordered Friday' (369), 'I ordered Friday' (385). He has earlier compared his possession of, and role in the Island to that of an English Lord of the manor. Although when he finally attacks the cannibals, he perceives himself more as governor, the resemblance to the lord of the manor is striking. As Tavor (1987:18) asserts, 'When Robinson does attack the cannibals, he does so as a governor responsible for the life, liberty and possessions of his subjects, whom he is defending against direct attack'. Crusoe describes this attack in his own words thus, 'I immediately advanced with my whole army...myself, generalissimo; Friday, my lieutenant general, the captain and his two men, and the three prisoners of war' (389), 'they all called me governor...I kept myself and one more out of sight for reasons of state' (391). The image of 'master' and 'governor' that Crusoe arrogates unto himself in addition to owning an army with generals pledging total loyalty to him recalls the English attitude toward the natives of the territories they colonized and assimilated. *Robinson Crusoe* replicates colonialism and imperialism in all its ramifications. Let's examine for instance a passage in which Crusoe perceives himself as king and the others as his subjects:

My island was now peopled, and I thought myself very rich in subjects; and it was a merry reflection, which I frequently made, how like a king I looked. First of all, the whole country was my own property, so that I had undoubted right of dominion. Secondly, my people were perfectly subjected-I was absolutely lord and law giver-they all owed their lives to me, and were ready to lay down their lives, if there had been any occasion for it, for me. It was remarkable too, I had but three subjects, and they were of different religions-my man Friday was a protestant, his father was a pagan and cannibal, and the Spaniard was a Papist. I allowed liberty of conscience throughout my dominion (351-352).

Whenever Crusoe speaks about the land and Friday, emphasis is on key issues: his position as 'master', 'lord and law-giver', with subjects and a 'dominion' on which he not only retains absolute and unchallenged power and right of 'possession', but also exercises unrestricted power to ensure total 'subjection' from his subjects. Defoe might have no other reason for untiringly reminding the reader of Crusoe's new found dominion and absolute right of

possession over the land, its resources and subjects apart from (re)staging British colonialism. There is no doubt therefore why he obliges the Spaniard he has rescued and kept as his subject to go out and fish out and bring to him other stranded Spaniards. These Spaniards, in Crusoe's instructions, must 'swear upon the holy sacraments and gospel to be true' to him (Crusoe), must agree to 'go to such Christian country' of only Crusoe's choice, and be directed wholly and absolutely by his orders (357-358), and this, Crusoe desires should appear in the form of a written contract. With such views, the absolute allegiance Crusoe desires from the Spaniard he rescues is guaranteed:

Then he told me he would first swear to me himself that he would never stir from me as long as he lived till, I gave him orders; and that he would take my side to the last drop of his blood, if there should happen the least breach of faith among his countrymen (357-358).

From the above, it is clear that Crusoe is a colonizer who replicates British imperialists. Satisfied that he has the lives of his subjects at his command, and with their loyalty guaranteed, Crusoe conducts himself as a colonial administrator or a 'Governor' (362), and, like a governor, he dishes out instructions to his subjects: Friday and the Spaniard are charged 'not to bring' to the island:

any man who would not first swear in the presence of himself and the old savage that he would in no way injure, fight with, or attack the person he should find in the island, who was so kind to send for them in order to their deliverance; but that they would stand by him and defend him against all such attempts, and wherever they went would be entirely under and subjected to his command; and that this should be put in writing, and signed in their own hands (362).

Notice that in all of Crusoe perception of the land and the people he rescues, attention is drawn to ownership and loyalty. He perceives himself as the sovereign ruler and as the representative of the Queen of England. He imagines that the island is his kingdom. Selfish individualism which is a typical aspect of imperialism has led to Crusoe's colonizing spirit in the island in the same way it led the colonizers (Britain and France) to Africa under the pretext of a civilizing mission. Many references are made to land and Friday as Crusoe's possessions and this needs further attention. The 'land' as well as the references to the imperial power as 'master', 'majesty', 'king', 'lord', 'sovereign', etc., are dominant metaphors of Empire in colonial discourse. The metaphor of the uninhabited island as a wilderness and of the colonizer as savior of the natives have roots in imperialism and colonialism. Metaphors such as 'master', 'king', 'lord', 'sovereign', and notably 'majesty' are used to represent the British Empire. They structure the Empire as a Master, and thus foreground a Master-servant relationship which replicates the relationship of England to its dependent colonies. As a metaphor, 'master' for example, suggests power and political dominance and thus imposes the duties of obedience on the colonized 'children' or colonies. Crusoe's colonialist attitude toward the land where he is cast off after a shipwreck, and toward the savage he 'colonizes', and on whom he imposes a name, a language and a religion, replicates British colonialism, and draws attention to *Robinson Crusoe* as a historiographic metafiction (understood to mean writing history in arts). The novel and especially, Crusoe's relation to Friday, the pets, the Spaniards, and the uninhabited land, impress us as an allegory for colonialism or imperialism.

At the end of the novel, the island which is now populated and ruled by colonial administrators designated by Crusoe symbolizes the prototypical English colony. Like most British men of his time, Defoe believed that Britain's overseas colonial activities were perfectly legitimate. In his *The Complete English Tradesman*, Defoe explains how a prototypical English colony is constructed:

We have not increased our power ... by subduing the nations, which possessed those countries and incorporating them into our own, but have entirely planted our colonies, and peopled the countries with our own subjects, natives of this island; and, excepting the negroes, which we have transported from Africa to America, as slaves to work in the sugar and tobacco plantations, all our colonies ... are entirely peopled from Great Britain and Ireland ... the natives having either removed farther up into the country or by their own folly and treachery raising war against us, been destroyed and cut off (Qtd. in Mcinelly 11, 13).

It was thus a common practice among the British to associate British wealth with a rather peacefully constructed empire based on supposedly free trade. Like the prototypical British colony that Defoe describes above, Crusoe's Island is initially uninhabited and barren, but is later peopled by Europeans—the British mutineers and Spanish castaways—and a handful of 'converted' natives. In Defoe's view, this legitimizes Crusoe's activities and projects his colonizing enterprise as a relatively peaceful project. The island Crusoe leaves behind thus symbolizes the prototypical English colony that Defoe articulates in *The Complete English Tradesman*. We can therefore say that, *Robinson Crusoe* is about a fictional island colony arbitrarily claimed by an Englishman and incorporated into the British Empire. In anticipation of the British government coming in to now claim the Island he has constructed, Crusoe explains at the end of the novel that he,

[I] never so much as gave the place a name, but left it, as I found it, belonging to nobody, and the people under no discipline or government but my own; who, though I had influence over them as a father and benefactor, had no authority or power to act or command one way or other' (330).

This statement no doubt can be read as Defoe's expression of a desire to see the British government step in to legitimize this region as its colony. As mentioned earlier in a footnote, British overseas settlements began as private self-managed enterprises with the British government only stepping in later. As Edward Said (1978:70) puts it, *Robinson Crusoe* is 'a work whose protagonist is the founder of a new world which he rules and reclaims for Christianity and England'; of course, Christianity was always an excuse for imperialistic behaviour.

CONCLUSION

From the above, Defoe's position in the dominant Eurocentric, imperialist discourse is disturbingly evident. If Conrad is (as Achebe describes him in 'The Image of Africa'), a 'bloody racist' because of his prejudiced portrayal of Africa and its native inhabitants, Defoe is a bloody imperialist/ colonialist and his narrative, a colonial discourse. What is particularly important in the analysis of the plot, thematic content, characterisation and the physical setting of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* is its focus on the images by which the British Empire perceived her colonies and its colonized people. By putting the people from Britain's colonies in a state of backwardness; by rendering them bestial beings; by portraying them as less-than human and lastly, by stripping them of any normalcy, colonialists validated their presence in a foreign land

to their fellow countrymen. In view of this argument, *Robinson Crusoe* is a colonial discourse that reproduces colonialism and the very ideology of imperialism. It is therefore impossible to read the narrative without remembering imperialism which was a crucial part of the cultural representation of England to the English. The prejudices about colonized people that the text reproduce were imprinted in the minds of the English public in the imperial era.

References

All references from Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* are taken from a publication by Planet PDF, Website: <http://www.planetpdf.com>

Abdel, W. and Ahmed G. E. (2003). 'Colonialism and postcolonialism in Selected Works by Burgess, Conrad and Naipaul.' Diss. The University of Ain Shams.

Doring, Tobias. 2008. *Postcolonial Literatures in English*. Stuttgart: Klett, Broschiert.

Fludernik, Monika. (1996). *Towards a Natural Narratology*. London and New York: Routledge.

Chrisman, I, & Williams, P. 1993. Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theor", In: *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: An Introduction*. New York and London. L. Chrisman, P. Williams (eds.) 1-20.

James, E A. (1972). *Daniel Defoe's Many Voices. A Rhetorical Study of Prose Style and Literary Method*. Rodopi NV: Amsterdam.

McInelly, B. (2003). Expanding Empires, Expanding Selves: Colonialism, the Novel, and Robinson Crusoe. *Studies in the Novel*. 35 (Spring 2003): 1-21

Novak, M. E. (1997) Friday: or, the Power of Naming. *Augustan Subjects: Essays in Honor of Martin C. Battestin. Albert*. J. Rivero (ed.). Newark: Univ. of Delaware Press, 110-22.

Nunning, Vera and Ansgar Nunning 2004. *An Introduction to the Study of English and American Literature*. Stuttgart: Klett.

Nunning, Vera and Ansgar Nunning. 1996. Fictions of Empire and the Making of Imperialist Mentalities: Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Criticism as a Paradigm for Intercultural Studies. *Intercultural Studies: Fictions of Empire*. Vera and Ansgar Nunning (eds.). Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter. 7-31.

Reckwitz, Erhard. 1996. Colonial Discourse and Early South African Literature. *Intercultural Studies: Fictions of Empire*. Vera and Ansgar Nunning (eds.). Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter. 121-147.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf.

Tavor, E. (1987). *Scepticism, Society and the eighteenth-Century Novel*. London: The Macmillan Press.

Tyson, Lois. 1999: *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc.

Waeaver-Hightower, R. (2002). Decolonization of the Island Mind: Counter-Discourse and Postcolonial Revision. *ELH* 28.

Wheeler, R. (1995). My Savage, My Man: Racial Multiplicity in *Robinson Crusoe*. *ELH* 62: 821-61.