academicresearchJournals

Vol. 5(3), pp. 65-72, May 2017
DOI: 10.14662/IJELC2017.021

ISSN: 2360-7831
http://www.academicresearchjournals.org/IJELC/Index.htm

International Journal of English Literature and Culture

Research Paper

Lifting the Veil off Crusoe's Empire in Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*

Shagufta Parween

1-8-501/8, Second Floor, Opposite Dr Bhaskar Raga Clinic, Prakash Nagar, Opposite Begumpet Airport
Hyderabad-500016, Telangana, India. E-mail: daisyazim@gmail.com

Accepted 29 May 2017

The aim of this research paper is to offer a postcolonial interpretative reading of Daniel Defoe's magnum opus *Robinson Crusoe*. For years the text has been appreciated as a classic text of adventure, a tale of individualism, capitalism and also of spiritual growth. It has been studied as an exemplary text representing the liberal, adventurous and progressive spirit of the age. And while postcolonial elements in the narrative have been discussed before, critical readings of the text have not laid enough focus on the extreme denigration and essentialization of the native culture and religion and the repeated acts of assault on nature and animals that the ruler/colonialist, Crusoe engages in the fiction. This paper seeks to explore this gap in the field of critical inquiry with respect to the text of *Robinson Crusoe*.

Keywords: Postcolonial, colonialism, exploitation, Caribbean, native, land, people, culture

Cite This Article As: Parween S (2017). Lifting the Veil off Crusoe's Empire in Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. Inter. J. Eng. Lit. Cult. 5(3): 65-72

INTRODUCTION

Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), a narrative of the adventures of a man shipwrecked on an island in the mouth of the River Orinoco and near the island of Trinidad, was followed by two lesser known sequels, *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and *Serious Reflections During the Life & Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, With His Vision of the Angelic World* (1720). Its popularity is attested by the fact that reaching the third century after its publication, *Robinson Crusoe* continues to be imitated, translated and adapted into various literary, cinematic and other art forms, and has also spurred an entirely new literary genre popularised by the name of Robinsonades. The fiction has also attracted a lot of critical attention from various sides of the spectrum as the economist, the feminist, the colonial, the moral and the philosophical, and the religious, with the novel often being considered as representing the universal man (with particular focus on man's isolation, survival and progress). Its enduring status has led critics like Ian Watt, Margaret Drabble and Michel Tournier to regard Robinson Crusoe as a myth. While there are many prisms through which *Robinson Crusoe* may be analysed, this paper seeks to lift the veil off the Crusoe Empire and discern the empire's strategies and myths in the novel. It looks at the distortions and the falsities and the exploitation of land, nature, animals and people around the central character that exist in the text merely for furthering the colonising agenda of the hero. The plot of the text follows the footsteps of colonialism where the discovery of land of the non-Europeans by the Europeans led first to settlement or conquest and then to rule and coercion of the natives. James Joyce in his lecture on Daniel Defoe, which he delivered in Italy in 1912, rightly said: "The true symbol of British conquest is Robinson Crusoe" (quoted in Manganiello, 1980, p. 109).

DISCUSSION

Historically, the landing of Christopher Columbus on (yet to be called) America in1492 was the inaugural moment for colonialism which transformed the reality of what would be soon called the New World. The irresistible pull of sea-adventures that the increase in geographical knowledge, technological and naval sophistication had made possible; the fascination of strange lands, people and culture (that dominated much of the travel literature of the age and affected the ordinary public imaginary); the lure of territorial possessions, material success and the expectation of treasures in the lands newly explored, had incited a flurry of European expeditions to the Americas. Following the success of Spanish and Portuguese colonial missions, England and France followed, with Jamestown, Virginia being the starting point of the British Empire in the Americas, being first settled by the British in 1607. The Caribbean islands, the setting of the novel, with its location and its infamous cannibalism, became particularly relevant in the geopolitics of the colonial venture, leading to conflict among the rival Western colonialists which reached its height during the mid-seventeenth century (Hulme, 1986). Noticeably, this is the time (1659) when the fictional hero is cast ashore on the island and his empire begins.

As history is witness and as postcolonialism has incessantly highlighted that the discovery, exploration, trade with and conquest of these lands meant that the Empires flourished and their people prospered but these were achieved by a ruthless pillaging of the colonised lands, exploitation of their resources and brutalities committed on their people. So, while for Europe, the Age of Discovery (from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century) signalled wealth and advancement, offering prospects for more success, for the people who were colonised, the age came to connote an era of suffering, humiliation, subjugation and perpetual trauma. For, colonialism was not only an alien invasion of virgin lands, drastically altering the demographics of the places conquered and settled, but made assaults on the language, culture and religion of the indigenous people and on their very existence. It led to oppression, slavery, disease and the death of millions. It shook the very foundations of the lives of the natives by dehumanising them, taking away their rights and trampling upon their identities and lives. These became evident with the very first phase of colonisation, beginning with the arrival of Europeans in America. Joseph Conrad remarks in “Geography and Some Explorers”, that “the discovery of America was the occasion of the greatest outburst of reckless cruelty and greed known to history” (2010, p. 4). In the essay, Conrad says that the initial phase in the history of geographical exploration, the *Geography Fabulous* gave way to *Geography Militant* (2010, p. 14).[1] Thus, the lure of the unknown and the zeal for adventure that had marked sea-voyages gave way to greed and the lust to conquer which was achieved at the cost and defeat of the other. A similar trajectory appears in the novel where Robinson’s initial fascination for the sea soon turns into *Geography Militant* as his journeys become marked by a desire to possess more wealth and subjugate the others and culminates in his rule of the island and the living beings there (humans, birds and animals).

In his essay, Conrad regards Vasco Núñez de Balboa’s crossing of the Isthmus of Panama to the Pacific as the “great moment” which “opened an immense theatre for the human drama of adventure and exploration, a field for the missionary labours, of, mainly, Protestant churches, and spread an enormous canvas on which arm-chair geographers could paint the most fanciful variants of their pet theory of a great southern continent” (2010, pp. 5-6). In *Robinson Crusoe* while the initial impetus comes with the protagonists refusal of his father’s advice to refrain from seafaring life and be content with the ‘middle-station’ of life, the ‘great moment’ comes with the shipwreck when Crusoe loses all his human companions and arrives as a castaway and begins painting his version of the island and restructuring and moulding it and the lives it sustains. *Robinson Crusoe* not merely locks the narrative in a singular perspective of the colonialist protagonist where the voices of the others are stifled, but also provides a one-sided biased story of the island and the people solely through the words of Crusoe, the uncontested ruler of the narrative, thereby, effecting an erasure of any probability of contesting history. It gives the readers a colonialist narrative of the island where Crusoe shrewdly manipulates the story of others’ exploitation and subordination and presents them as a story of his survival and settlement and presenting himself as the saviour of other peoples and the valiant Englishman fighting evil and malice and ensuring an era of justice and liberty. On close observation, the irony becomes manifest as Crusoe emerges as a typical self-aggrandizing colonialist subjecting the land, nature and living beings according to his needs and desires – their existence and liberty becoming dependent on Crusoe’s power and will.

In the near three decades that Crusoe spends, marooned on what he calls the ‘Island of Despair’ he carefully builds up an empire for himself. He digs the earth, cuts down trees, tames animals, shoots them at will, kills men whom he deems threatening, enslaves a savage and becomes a commander or captain of the other Europeans. His power manifests physically in the fortifications he builds for himself and which he calls his “castle” and his “country seat” (Defoe, 1994, p. 164). The fenced fortress he builds on the hill, with all its “riches”, “provisions” and “ammunitions” like a ‘city upon a hill’ becomes the centre of governance and civilisation on the island and a concrete signifier of his power, authority and

might (p. 63).[2]

Crusoe initially believes that he is the sole person on the island and this leads him to regard himself as a king and consider the island as his property. Historically, given the geographical description of the island, this is an improbability for the islands which the text describes were not uninhabited in the seventeenth century, the time period of the novel. As Peter Hulme states, "The only uninhabited islands in the (extended) Caribbean were the unapproachable Bermudas (1986, p. 185). Fictionally also, the illusion is shattered with the discovery of a man's footprint and the knowledge of the savages' presence even during Crusoe's period of residence. The necessity of an adventure fiction of a solitary individual might seem to justify it, but, in view of the colonial ideological underpinning of the story, other crucial factors should not be ignored, such as – the need to hide the reality of the violent penetration of native lands, the displacing of indigenous inhabitants and the undesired rule to which they were forced, the glossing over of any possibility of local resistance or challenge to sovereignty, and any threat from other competitors for the same territory, that Crusoe might have encountered. The unpopulated territory enables the advent of the white Englishman, look not as an unwanted intrusion but as an urgent necessity for dispelling the darkness and primitivism of the island, heralding the dawn of civilisation and the marking of a new progressive era. The arrival of the hero, thus becomes a work of Divine "Providence" (a word that resonates throughout the text), and Providence that benefits only the white man/men and which seems to work only for the enslavement or removal of the non-white and which works unremittingly to disempower and disengage the natives from their family, nation, religion and culture. Crusoe's arrival on the desolate island might further reflect the unconscious desire for the English to have first discovered, settled or colonised the islands alluded (Trinidad and Tobago), for while Christopher Columbus discovered Trinidad in 1498, his pilot Juan de la Cosa along with Alonso de Ogeda arrived in Tobago in 1502, much earlier than the British (Huyghues-Belrose, 2007, para. 16). The Spaniards were thus already present and had colonised those places in the sixteenth-century. The rivalry for the British Empire's prime competitor in the region evinces in Crusoe's contempt towards the colonial Spaniards. Interestingly, the condemnation of their rule as "unjustifiable either to God or man", in no way denounces the colonial project. Rather it serves to project the English as the true Christian possessing virtues of which the Spaniards are bereft – kindness, pity and generosity, and thus as abler, rightful and benevolent rulers of the barbarous, the heathenish, the savage, the wretched, the uncultured and the uncivilised natives (Defoe, 1994, p. 169). The possibility of moral and physical resistance to Crusoe is thus carefully eroded. The narrative withholds Crusoe's first encounter with another man for more than two decades, allowing him immense time to fully consolidate his empire, so that when he finally meets a man, there is no disputing his rule and kingdom, either through contenders or through local resistance. Surely, authority would have been difficult to assert and empire difficult to build, had Crusoe been cast ashore in a helpless condition – shipwrecked, hungry, thirsty, without the gun and without any shelter on a land already inhabited or already colonised.

Crusoe's kingdom differs only in degree and not in kind from the Spanish colonialists whom he condemns. A considerate ruler he settles for no less than absolute autocracy and easily considers resort to violence in case of any opposition:

> [T]here 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. (Defoe, 1994, p. 147)

His first visit atop the hill begins with the shooting of a hawk-like bird, a kind of a sacrificial ritualistic prelude to the beginning of his empire which relies much on the military might, symbolised by his firing of the gun and the first sign of destruction. That his arrival was not only new and foreign but also violent, undesirable, shocking and fearful can be construed from Crusoe's own words:

> I believe it was the first gun that had been fired there since the creation of the world; I had no sooner fired but from all parts of the wood there arose an innumerable number of fowls of many sorts, making a confused screaming, and crying every one according to his usual note. (p. 56)

If the gun announces the coming of the militaristic power, the transference of things which Crusoe salvages from the shipwreck onto the island augurs the imposition of a new culture and civilisation on the island. Initially retrieved to aid his survival and then to expand his empire, the tools, arms and ammunition, compasses, dials, charts, ink, pens, paper, and the three Bibles become potent indices of Western (British) superiority over the others, in terms of military might, maritime discoveries, rationality, enlightenment and knowledge of the 'true' religion. This superiority aligns itself with a clear mark of distinction with and essentialization of the others – the Caribs who form the true subject-slaves of Crusoe's kingdom. Crusoe arrives on the island with his own set of essentialist and stereotypical notions about the Caribbean and the Caribs, who are present as mere caricatures and whose sole purpose of existence in the tale is to aid Crusoe's rule by subjecting themselves to it.

THE EMPIRE'S ESSENTIALIZATION OF THE OTHER

Edward Said while debunking the idea of 'geographical essentialism' considers it as a myth and as a product of Western discourses which aided Western colonialism and imperialism. Said contends the assumption that "there are geographical spaces with indigenous, radically 'different' inhabitants who can be defined on the basis of some religion, culture, or racial essence proper to that geographical space", but adds that this geographical essentialism allied with the hierarchical racial binary created by the West, not merely accentuated the division between people but justified the dominance of the colonised by the whites (2001, p. 322).[3] Geographical essentialism and racism works vigorously in the text and this is evident in the way the text differentiates between the English, the Spaniards, the Portuguese and the non-whites (homogenised into the category of the 'dark' other). So while difference is fore grounded between the rival empire seekers and boundary carefully drawn between the exceptional, kind, tolerant, god-fearing and the deserving ruler (English) and the cruel, intolerant, merciless and therefore unfit rulers (Spaniard), the superiority of the Europeans over the non-Europeans is always asserted. Even as opponents in trade and colonial missions, they, thus, become companions in distress – loyal to and helping each other (the widow, the Captain of the ship, the traders, the merchants, even the white mutineers). From individuals and institutions to entire nations, the whole of Europe, the colonial epicentre, towers morally, physically, technically, rationally and humanly, over the ruled. In stark contrast, the indigenous races are barbarous and devoid of any sign of humanity, conscience or feeling of neighbourliness or sympathy, for they feast upon each other and flee from each other. The fictional denial of according of any equal human status comes out in the favourable way the fiction addresses the Europeans and the continual use of the pejorative epithets for the non-white islanders. Thus, we have the Portuguese, the Spaniard and the English on the one side (namings that define national affiliations); and the savage, the wretched, the Negro (prejudicial namings that define skin colour) – literally, "creatures", on the other side of the binary.

The gradations that work to differentiate the Europeans are absent in case of the natives for their heterogeneity is homogenised unto a point where their primitivism, their backwardness, their strangeness, their incivility, their barbarism becomes concentrated in their defining characteristic – cannibalism. This is the text's chief rationale for rule over the savages, for the monstrosity that is highlighted with their innate cannibalism portrays them as in urgent need of redemption and regeneration from their animalistic condition. Cannibalism not merely differentiates them from the enlightened and moralistic whites, it at the same time terrifies, creates disgust and horror – physically manifest in Crusoe's vomiting after he witnesses the remains of the cannibalistic feast. The islanders are consigned to the lowest end of the spectrum, almost outside the borders of humanity, bestial – for they relish each other's flesh. The bestiality is carried to its utmost deplorability in the horrid ceremonial spectacle of their human feast. Cannibalism becomes not only a practice, but a cause of celebration – feasting on the other humans and savouring the flesh with dance and merriment. Terror and revulsion reaches its extreme. Without doubt such deviants need to be controlled, regenerated, morally reformed and brought back into the fold of human normalcy.

HISTORICAL REFUTATIONS AND TEXTUAL CONTRADICTIONS

The presumption that the Caribbean people were cannibals is hugely debated by historical anthropologist Nicola Foote in *The Caribbean History Reader* (2013) and Basil A. Reid in *Myths and Realities of Caribbean History* (2009). Neil. L. Whitehead asserts that the accusations of cannibalism of the Caribs must be comprehended as a "form of imperial propaganda" against the Caribs who resisted colonial conquests with many of the accounts of cannibalism based on rumours and second-hand reports and distortions (1984, p. 69). He notes that the tendency of the imperialists to identify various Amerindian groups as cannibals increased after Queen Isabella's decree in 1503 which allowed the legal enslavement of virtually any Amerindian identified as a cannibal. Neil does not negate the possibility of cannibal practice among the Caribs but relates them to war rituals and funerary practices. Historian, William Para Riviere, argues in a similar vein in "Historical Notes on Carib Territory" that such myths were used as "strong justification for military strategies aimed at extermination of a stubborn and wily enemy" ("Journeys into our Past—The Myth of Carib Cannibalism," n.d. para. 3). Riviere also proposes a contesting view of the French priest, Pere Labat who argued that the killing and the boucanning of the enemies were done to keep them as reminders of the conflict and as signs of their triumph against the foe. Riviere quotes Labart's views that such instances expressed "impotent rage and not custom that urged them to commit this excess after being hunted from the islands and done to death with un-heard of tortures" ("Journeys into our Past—The Myth of Carib Cannibalism," n.d., para. 5).

Even if historical proofs are set aside, the fictional duality in context of Carib cannibalism cannot be ignored. Friday clearly states that "They no eat mans but when make the war fight" (Defoe, 1994, p. 219). Yet, it works as the haunting force throughout the story and becomes the cause of undue suspicion negating Crusoe's

experiential evidences. The Negroes provide Crusoe and his companion with “dry flesh”, “roots and corn” and Friday’s community gives the European shipwrecked survivors “victuals to live” (pp. 34, 35, 219). Still, Crusoe’s misconception and colonial narcissism does not allow him to think of the possibility of any other mode of the natives’ eating habit. Earlier, in the story, Crusoe is quick to return the generosity of the Negroes with the flesh of the two beasts he had bravely killed for he finds that they “were for eating the flesh of this creature” (pp. 34-35). These are conveniently forgotten by the ruler who teaches Friday to drink milk and eat bread and gives him animal meat to dissuade him from eating human’s flesh. Strangely, the member of a community charged with relishing barbecued flesh of humans, is presented as being surprised when offered the roasted flesh of animal. Stranger still, the natives seem to have no connection with agriculture or any method of preparation of food barring the grilling of man’s flesh. Denigration of the ‘other’ could not have been taken further. Again historically, these can be countered for the Carib diet consisted of fruits and vegetables such as yams, guava, papaya and cassava and also of meat and fish (“Origins of Caribbean food,” 2013). Caribs were known for hunting and fishing and were familiar with agriculture. In “Historical Notes on Carib Territory”, William Riviere mentions that fish, like eel and crab constituted the favourite dishes of the Carib society and sweet potatoes, bananas and many root crops were cultivated. Riviere also mentions that “roasting under the ashes of a fire, by barbecuing or by boiling in a pot over a fire” were the Carib methods of cooking (“Journeys into Our Past—The Myth of Pre-history,” n.d., para. 5). They were also adept at weaving, pottery making and building canoes. Refuting all historical and even the textual proofs, the ruled in the narrative are portrayed as devoid of any skill, or knowledge of any of these. Crusoe, the ruler, on the other hand, learns everything on his own and succeeds at each. Not only that, he even excels at things which the Caribs were famous for and taught the Europeans, such as the building of canoes or the method of barbecuing meat (Hulme, 1986). The English are, thus, raised to the epitome of excellence, worthy to be gloated over, their values and ideals taught and emulated whereas the native are bereft of any sense of food, community or language.

CRUSOE-FRIDAY (KING-SLAVE)

The ruler-ruled binary comes out strikingly in Crusoe-Friday relationship. Crusoe who had yearned for at least “one companion” all the years does not even contemplate the possibility of friendship with Friday when provided with the opportunity (Defoe, 1994, p. 185). This is essential for Crusoe’s empire, for any prospect of comradeship with Friday would lead to the conferring of some sense of equality on the native. This would both deflate the colonial mythical hierarchical binary and render Crusoe’s dominance questionable. Crusoe, hence, shrewdly becomes Friday’s ruler instead of a friend, with their first encounter. His rule begins with the act of his naming – a kind of a baptismal initiation into the kingdom of Crusoe. The naming is immensely significant for, Crusoe never asks Friday’s name, he *gives* him one. The naming acts as a negation of the previous (human and individual) identity of and the thrusting of the new (slave) identity on ‘Friday’. Soon the master gestures to Friday, “to run and fetch” like a dog — the animalisation of the primitive subject is complete (pp. 207, 208). The narrative smoothly effectuates a transformation of a free man into a slave who performs like a tamed animal. Crusoe’s efforts to present their relationship in terms of a father-child bond are subdued by the overt signs of slavery. Friday appears a willing servant, offering, pleading for his own servitude, running to the master till he:

> lays his head flat upon the ground, close to my [Crusoe] foot, and sets my other foot upon his head, as he had done before; and after this, made all the signs of subjection, servitude and submission imaginable, to let me know how he would serve me as long as I lived;” (Defoe, 1994, p. 202)

How contrary is this to Labat’s description of the real-life Caribs?

> [T]here is not a nation on earth more jealous of their independency that the Charaibes. They are impatient under the least infringement of it; and when at any time, they are witnesses to the respect and deference which the natives of Europe observe towards their superiors, they despise us as abject slaves; wondering how any man can be so base as to crouch before his equal. (qtd. in Riviere, “Journeys into our past—The myth of pre-history,” n.d., para. 6)

The idea that the text strives to build up, of the native eager for and offering his own servitude, can be countered by another latent motif that runs throughout the text, that of violence. Crusoe is obsessed with his possession of the gun, the “wonderful fund of death and destruction” (Defoe, 1994, p. 208). Friday seems to offer his service in gratefulness, but the fear created in him through the spectacle of violent death (the shooting of the kid and the earlier shooting of the Caribs who pursue Friday), is very much apparent as Friday kneels down and pleas for his life. And, Crusoe, the ruler-god, verily believed that Friday would have “worshipped me and my

gun" (p. 208). In fact, Crusoe reigns over all, like an all-powerful, life-granting and life-taking god, solely through the life-destroying power of his gun.

Once dominance is established, Crusoe, beset with the 'white man's burden' sets on the enlightening and proselytizing mission. The language, culture and traditions of the other are not even acknowledged as existent and there is a unidirectional flow of ideas, knowledge and values. Friday becomes the prototype of the colonised subject, his actions and behaviour exuding a psychology so aptly described by Frantz Fanon in *Black Skin, White Masks* (1967). It begins with the devaluation of one's own culture and appreciation and emulation of the culture of the ruler. Friday becomes the mimic man, disengaging himself from his own belongingness and failing to become one of the master's community. While Friday is eager to learn, he is taught only those things that are necessary for Crusoe's rule. The education is selective and regulated for while so much of morality is sought to be instilled in him by his ruler, nothing of individual freedom or personal rights is taught to him by the person, who himself is an embodiment of individual liberty. The knowledge given to Friday is even distorted and suspect. Crusoe teaches Friday to say "Master" and tells him "that was to be my name;" (p. 203). The reader is well aware, that Crusoe's name is in actuality 'Robinson Crusoe' and not 'Master'. The implications of teaching the word 'Master' cannot be missed, for the very word of address establishes the highly unequal equation between men. Knowledge and education in *Robinson Crusoe*, like that in colonial societies becomes vicious tools for perpetuating the ruler's authority. It is also intriguing given Crusoe's fixation with numbers that he does not teach numerals to Friday who tries to convey them through signs and gestures.

In respect to religion, too, the text shows Crusoe spiritual progress and his coming closer to his own religion. Friday, in contrast, moves away from his religion, and easily accepts its vilification by Crusoe. The scenes narrating the attempt to convert Friday, reveals the inability at the heart of colonialism to accept other belief systems and religious practices other than that of the ruler. This has been evident everywhere, with the disparagement of other different religions being particularly severe when they were not monotheistic, were pagan and included idol worship. Crusoe not only persuades Friday about Christianity as the true religion, but associates Friday's god with darkness, immorality, deceit and evil:

> I endeavoured to clear up this fraud to my man Friday, and told him that the pretence of their old men going up the mountains to say O to their god Benamuckee was a cheat, and their bringing word from thence what he said was much more so; that if they met with any answer, or spoke with anyone there, it must be with an evil spirit. And then I entered into a long discourse with him about the Devil, the original of him, his rebellion against God, his enmity to man, the reason of it, his setting himself up in the dark parts of the world to be worshipped instead of God, and as God; (Defoe, 1994, pp. 213-14)

CONCLUSION

As the analysis above has shown, that Robinson Crusoe is not the brave philanthropist he portrays himself to be, but a ruler, who albeit more considerate than the cruel Spaniards, is always motivated by a desire to profit and rule. He establishes his authority by the threat of violence. Not only this, he continually exercises his authority and frames the servitude of others as for their own deliverance. He repeatedly hankers for the promises of and contracts with others for ensuring their life-long service, without any compulsion placed on him and easily dispenses off with them when they are no longer needed. Xury, who had assisted Crusoe in escaping from his own slavery and offered to sacrifice his own life and protect Crusoe's ("If wild mans come, they eat me, you go wey"), is sold for less than the price of a boat (Defoe, 1994, p. 30). Crusoe does not wait for the Spaniard and Friday's father who had gone to fetch aid for them when Crusoe leaves the island.

Friday, like a true silent slave follows his master and does not wait for his father. Master-slave paradigm rules over the father-son bond.

Unlike Prospero in Shakespeare's *Tempest*, Crusoe does not renounce his power or right over the island. Rather he leaves his kingdom, secure with the caretakers and takes his willing servant Friday on his journey to England and Europe. And while Crusoe exults in his wealth and estate, finding his riches increase manifold; Friday toils and remains the dependent and destitute slave. He literally vanishes from the narrative after their departure from the island, until at last his entry is needed to fight the wolves, which Crusoe's group encounters while crossing the snowy mountains. The text is an embodiment of colonial narcissism and rule hidden under the garb of adventure and the 'white man's burden', and aptly conveyed through the megalomania and dominance of the protagonist. This adventure fiction, thus, despite possessing the attributes of cultural intermingling and human friendship, becomes a tale of servitude and exploitation by the ruler Crusoe, who is the sole lawgiver.

NOTE

1. In "Geography and Some Explorers", first published in the *National Geographic* in 1924,

Joseph Conrad calls the first phase in the history of geography as the *Geography Fabulous*. He says that this phase was impelled by curiosity and was a "phase of circumstantially extravagant speculation". This phase was followed by *Geography Militant* in which the navigation of the unexplored landmasses "were prompted by an acquisitive spirit, the idea of lucre in some form, the desire of trade or the desire of loot, disguised in more or less fine words" (2010, p. 9).

2. The phrase "city upon a hill" has a biblical reference and can be traced to the "Salt and Light" parable from Jesus Christ's Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5: 14-16). The words are "You are the light of the world. A city set on a hill cannot be hid" ("A shining city upon a hill," n.d., para. 7). The phrase was popularised by John Winthrop of Massachusetts Bay Colony and has been quoted by the Presidents of the United States, John F. Kennedy and Ronald Regan. In 1630 on the ship Arabella, Winthrop stated: "we shall be as a City upon a Hill, the eyes of all people are upon us;" ("A shining city upon a hill," para. 9). The phrase gained popularity after it was quoted by the arrival of the Puritan settlers to the "new world" implying that the new city would be tolerant, charitable and merciful and that there would be freedom to practice one's religious beliefs. But the assumption can be disputed for Winthrop avowedly did not tolerate religious dissenters like the Quakers. The Polity that was brought into existence under Winthrop's influence introduced the ghastly and archaic practice of the trials and execution of the witches into America. A dissenter like Anne Hutchinson was labelled as a heretic and an "American Jezebel" and banished from the colony, for her reliance solely on belief and her deviation from the strict Puritan credo of faith and hard work, both being necessary for a person's deliverance. In the text, Crusoe's abode appears very much as a "city upon a hill" – model, ideal and exceptional city with others looking up to it. Yet, the liberal and sympathetic nature of the city's creator hero, Crusoe that the text continually strives to build is challenged by his intolerance of any form of dissent and by his efforts to convert Friday to Christianity.

3. Edward Said's *Orientalism* includes America and Europe in his category of the West as complicit in Orientalising the East for their own imperialism and colonialism. He is referred to here for the justifications and rationalisations made during the initial phase of colonisation of America, including the Caribbean, ran along similar contours as they did in other colonial lands, i.e. by taking recourse to 'geographical essentialism' and the 'othering' of the other. One must, however be, cautious of the contradictions inherent in and the heterogeneity of colonialism for despite the apparent similarity there were radical disjunctions. As for instance, in the Caribbeans or in Africa slavery became rampant, whereas in India, colonisation took a very different route.

REFERENCES

Conrad, Joseph. (2010). Geography and some explorers. In: Harold Ray Stevens, J. H. Stape (Eds.), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Joseph Conrad: Last Essays*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, pp 3-17. (Original essay published 1923)

Defoe, Daniel. (1994). *Robinson Crusoe*. London: Penguin. (Originally Published 1719).

Fanon, Frantz (1967). *Black Skin, White Masks* (Charles Lam Markmann, Trans.) New York: Grove. (Originally published 1952)

Foote, Nicola. (Ed.). (2013). *The Caribbean History Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Hulme, Peter. (1986). *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492- 1797*. London: Metheun.

Huyghues-Belrose, Vincent. (2007, December 8). The early colonization of Tobago: Bibliographical and archival material in Martinique and France. *Etudes Caribeennes*. Retrieved February 4, 2017, from https://etudescaribeennes.revues.org/1032

Manganiello, Dominic. (1980). *Joyce's Politics*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Origins of Caribbean food. (2013, August 19). Retrieved April 3 2017, from http://phillyreef.com/origins-of-caribbean-food/

Reid, Basil A. (2009). *Myths and Realities of Caribbean History*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama Press.

Riviere, William Para. (n.d.). Historical notes on Carib territory. Retrieved April 4 2017, from http://www.da-academy.org/caribhist.html#myth1

Said, Edward. W. (2001). *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. New Delhi: Penguin. (Originally published 1978)

Shakespeare, William. (1964). *The Tempest*. Frank Kermode (Ed.). London: Routledge. (Original work published 1623)

A shining city upon a hill: Troubling information about a famous quote: The Puritan tradition of intolerance and John Winthrop. (n. d.). *www.worldfuturefund.org* Retrieved April 3 2017, from http://www.worldfuturefund.org/wffmaster/Reading/Religion/John%20Winthrop.htm

Whitehead, Neil L. (1984) “Carib cannibalism. The historical evidence.” *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 70: 69-87. Retrieved April 3 2017, from http://www.persee.fr/doc/jsa_0037-9174_1984_num_70_1_2239