



Postcolonial Insights into Cultural Representation and Colonial Ideology in Robinson Crusoe

1. Saniya Fatima Gilani
2. Dr. Muhammad Sarwar

¹Lecturer in English, Department of English, University of Southern Punjab, Multan

saniya.gilani876@gmail.com

²Associate Professor, Department of Arabic, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan

sarwar@bzu.edu.pk

Abstract:

This paper examines Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe's with a postcolonial perspective. The novel is considered a classic of early English literature and reflects European colonial ideology. Characters, events, and power interactions in the tale are examined to determine how European culture is better and justified in controlling non-European peoples and territory. Crusoe claimed the island as his own, designated numerous regions, prepared the soil for agriculture, and monopolised its resources, demonstrating his idea that Europeans can live in alien countries. This echoes European conquests of Indigenous territory as untapped resources. Another important aspect of this study is Crusoe and Friday's relationship, which shows colonial power imbalances. Friday is devoted, obedient, and grateful to Crusoe, reflecting the colonial view that non-Europeans needed European supervision, control, and education. Crusoe renames Friday, teaches him English, and shapes his religious and cultural views. These activities show how colonial ideology shapes colonised people's identities and steals their land. Friday is mostly identified by his help to Crusoe; his voice and history are understudied. This unequal link reinforces the idea that European culture is the best, devaluing other civilisations. The analysis shows that the novel illustrates colonial ties' complexity. Friday helps Crusoe with physical, emotional, and daily survival, showing that colonial authority was sometimes more complex than control. Crusoe remains in charge while Friday remains subservient, following the narrative pattern. This work uses postcolonial theory to show how Robinson Crusoe affected race, culture, and empire. The work reflects colonial ideology and shapes readers' views of cultural diversity and power. This study shows how the book uses narrative to legitimise dominance and control by implying European supremacy in simple language.

Key words: Postcolonialism, Cultural Representation, Colonial Ideology, Othering, European Imperialism, Hegemon

Introduction

Colonialism was manifested in various forms globally throughout human history. Each colonial authority implemented distinct methodologies for engaging with its colonised subjects and devised specific ways to communicate and exert control over the colonised territory. Nonetheless, they had a common perception that the colonisers sought to exploit the colonised populations economically, monetarily, and culturally. The fundamental objectives of colonialism are to conquer and subjugate other civilisations. Colonialism commenced in the 15th century and attained its zenith in the late 19th century. It was perceived as a conventional and inherent aspect of Western politics by the populace of Western nations in the 19th century. European nations were governing and exerting control over diverse civilisations across continents. During that century, most of the world was governed by European powers. The riches and power of colonised territories were exploited by the colonisers to augment Western wealth, while the colonised populace endured oppression, cultural assimilation, and sometimes enslavement by their masters.

The primary justification presented for the legalisation of colonial actions was the assertion that colonised territories exhibited 'savage' lifestyles that necessitated intervention through a civilising mission (Buell, 1992). European nations perceived other cultures as inferior, believing that colonialism was the sole means to assist those 'barbaric' societies and facilitate their intellectual advancement by supplanting their indigenous traditions, customs, lifestyles, and religions with Western counterparts. Colonialism seldom exploits an entire nation. It focusses on revealing the natural resources it extracts and exports to satisfy the demands of the home country's industries, thereby enabling specific sections of the colony to attain relative wealth. However, the remainder of the colony continues its trajectory of underdevelopment and poverty, or, in any case, descends further into it. To perpetuate colonialism, the Western colonisers employed several techniques, with assimilation being the most significant. The colonising nations understand that colonised subjects will not resist their sovereignty provided these individuals embrace and revere the colonizer's culture. When individuals completely abandon their indigenous culture, they become more amenable to colonisation. Nonetheless, the circumstances altered for the majority of the colonisers at the onset of the 20th century. Colonies commenced insurrection against the hegemony of European nations in pursuit of their freedom. The uprising of India is one of the most renowned struggles for independence. Under Mahatma Gandhi's leadership, colonised Indians orchestrated a non-violent revolution against British rule and achieved freedom in 1947.

Academics in the social sciences predominantly assert that colonialism has not been entirely eradicated. Former colonies, including India, Canada, and other African nations, achieved political independence; nonetheless, their social, cultural, and psychological enslavement persists to this day. This modern colonialism is frequently referred to as neocolonialism, which will be examined in the subsequent sections of this chapter. The previously mentioned former colonies, notably Canada and New Zealand, endeavour to counter imperial dominance and compete with their economically robust neighbours. They remain under the influence of their former colonisers and cannot disregard their substantial connections with them. Nonetheless, they may concurrently be perceived as neocolonial in their policies and attitudes towards indigenous populations, or in their efforts to mask white dominance under the pretext of accepting ethnic diversity.

The European Enlightenment established a definitive perception of modernity. Based on this standard criterion, society has started to be classified as 'civilised vs. uncivilised' or 'West vs. non-West.' These notions were identified, enlarged, and redefined through Western colonial actions. The colonial ventures of European nations fostered preconceptions of outsiders, attributing attributes such as laziness, hostility, violence, avarice, sexual promiscuity, bestiality, primitivism, innocence, and irrationality to these 'others'. Consequently, postcolonial theorists like Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, and Homi K. Bhabha designate the colonised as the colonial other, or merely the other. In this context, postcolonialism presents many challenges to colonial modes of thought and literary production, opposing these perspectives, while postcolonial studies seek to transcend the binary of coloniser and colonised. The psychology of the colonised, their societal integration, sense of otherness, and discontent provide the foundation of contemporary postcolonial studies. Prominent works appeared that examined the psychological harm endured by colonised individuals who embraced colonial ideologies.

Research Questions

The study is aimed to answer the following questions:

1. How does Robinson Crusoe reflect cultural representation and colonial ideology from a postcolonial perspective?
2. In what ways can postcolonial theory help analyze power, identity, and cultural dominance in Robinson Crusoe?

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it provides a postcolonial perspective on Robinson Crusoe, one of the most influential novels in English literature. By analyzing cultural representation and colonial ideology, the research helps readers understand how literature reflects and reinforces historical systems of power and domination. It highlights the ways in which European superiority, identity construction, and cultural hierarchies were promoted through storytelling. The study also contributes to literary criticism by applying postcolonial theory, showing how the ideas of thinkers like Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, and Gayatri Spivak can be used to uncover hidden power dynamics in texts. Furthermore, it encourages critical reading, allowing modern audiences to question traditional narratives and recognize the lasting effects of colonial attitudes on culture, identity, and literature. Overall, this research deepens the understanding of the intersections between literature, history, and ideology, emphasizing the relevance of postcolonial analysis in contemporary scholarship.

Literature Review

Literary works originating from the colonial era are inherently distinct from those produced in the postwar period. Postcolonial studies are inextricably linked to the dynamics of colonialism, specifically the concepts of "coloniser" and "colonised." Postcolonialism was a subset of postmodernism. The principal theory of postmodernism was "deconstruction," aimed at dismantling the linearity of modernism. To reinstate a conscious necessity beyond hegemonic discourse, there existed an alternative. Postmodernism demonstrated the concept of cultural relativity. There was no cultural supremacy, no centrality, and no Western orientation. Postmodernism is characterised by a rejection of a singular, absolute grand narrative and a unified ideology. Representatives of modernism in structuralism adhere to a fundamental idea of binary opposition, whereas post-structuralism is grounded in the principle of deconstruction.

The perspective of post-structuralism is one of equality. Postcolonialism represents a transformation of modernism that remains inextricably linked to postmodern theory: the deconstruction of the coloniser and the colonised (Patke, 2013). Whether acknowledged or not, individuals possess varying perspectives on an object, contingent upon the paradigms they employ. No history is objective. History was a reconstruction, a selection, and then reconciled with dominant groups. Postcolonial analysis, in addition to examining concealed aspects to understand the mechanisms of power, can also deconstruct disciplines, institutions, and ideologies as their foundational context.

Language, literature, and culture served as potent instruments employed by the colonisers. Ramadhan et al. (2024) stated that the physical imperialism and colonialism of the West towards the Orient has been ended. However, in the economic, political, educational, and cultural domains, this trend continues to operate and is experienced by the majority of Oriental countries. In *The Philosophy of History*, Hegel asserted that Africans possessed no history, paralleling Marx's observation that India similarly lacked a historical narrative. According to them, the West must undertake a destructive mission to facilitate the emergence of new growth: to dismantle traditional Asian civilisation and to propagate the material foundations of the West throughout Asia. The emergence of problematic ideologies in the West, which assert freedom, remains framed within a Eurocentric context.

Western knowledge has been constructed to encapsulate all aspects of existence under a great narrative, so restricting the free expression of "the other" outside of its defined framework. The West, equipped with scientists, philologists, extensive library collections, esteemed institutions, and published intellectuals, is tasked with wholly representing the Orient. This represents the authentic essence of Orientalism. The postcolonial approach aims to deconstruct, dissolve, and methodologically and critically reconceptualise the monolithic domain impacted by orientalism, historicism, and what may be termed essentialist universalism. In this context, postcolonial refers to the deconstruction of Western concepts and authority, as well as the rejection of being defined by Western frameworks. In other words, post-colonialism signifies independence from the homogeneity imposed by imperialism. Edward stated in *Orientalism*, utilising Michael Foucault's discursive technique, that the Orient is a construct of Western representation, first intended for domination, but ultimately reflecting the circumstances and conditions of Western humanity. European civilisation derived its force and identity from the Oriental world. Moreover, orientalism has facilitated ethnocentrism, wherein Western bias towards "the other" confines the Orient within an essentialist framework, rendering it an object to be narrated via the storyline and logic of Western thought. In this scenario, Said (1978) posits that the condition of the "silent other" must be addressed, since they are misrepresented, lose their capacity for resistance, and succumb to a lack of critical consciousness, ultimately neglecting their potential as historical subjects.

For Said (1978), the paramount concern is to endeavour to communicate from a standpoint of particularity and ethnocentrism, so creating a critical space to subvert totalising systems through contrapuntal reading. Conversely, it posited that rejected nativism was not a solution to colonialism and imperialism, as it merely evidenced the successful structure of dialectical European intellectual conflict. He intended to depart from politics characterised by animosity and contempt towards the West, seeking to transcend superficial provincialism and nationalism (Simon, 1998). Said (1978) envisioned an alternative humanism that transcends ethnocentrism and nationalism, promoting a global approach while simultaneously opposing and defending local identities within the Western context. Consequently, new expressions of local culture will emerge that affirm diversity. This articulation presents an opportunity to capture the moment

of enunciation that complicates any simplistic comprehension of culture. In the aforementioned scenario, there is an endeavour to connect with the indigenous cultural elements of the West, avoiding a binary perspective, thereby identifying ourselves as hybrid entities.

The hybrid in this context is a minority individual who is both a native and not a native. The hybrid strategy can be achieved by mimicry, specifically ambiguous mimicry of colonial inheritance, which not only rejects it but also perpetuates it while exploiting that colonial legacy. Unlike anti-colonial theorists who delineate rigid boundaries, the pioneers of post-colonial thought emphasise interactions characterised by ambivalence and contradiction, thereby providing opportunities and platforms for all parties, particularly the indigenous and colonised, to articulate and advocate for their own critiques of power. Modernism and the experimentation with artistic formats, which were abruptly influenced by the prevailing bourgeois ideology, akin to realism at the close of the 19th century, predominantly emerged as a product of alternative cultural paradigms from non-European contexts.

In addition to possessing distinct aesthetic and cultural frameworks, these cultural forms fundamentally challenged the prevailing assumptions of European civilisation. European individuals were urged to recognise that their culture is merely one of several frameworks for comprehending reality and organising diverse representations in social life and art. The interaction with African culture during the period known as the "struggle of Africa" between the 1880s and 1890s held paramount significance. When brutally oppressed, 'primitive cultures' in Western and Oriental Africa had their perspectives on alternative worlds, embodied in masks, carvings, African jewellery, and other artefacts, appropriated by the dominant European culture. Most of these items were subsequently housed in the subterranean collections of European anthropological and ethnological museums. The materials were then showcased in the early 20th century, serving as inspiration for modernists and motivating them to conceive pictures of alternative arts that were fundamentally non-representational. Movements that established the foundation for the interest in collecting artefacts from primitive civilisations originated long ago, anchored in a pre-romantic perspective that valued the multicultural "ur-volk" of European nations. This intriguing phenomenon was well demonstrated by primitive movements that emerged in the late 19th century.

These movements seemed to be prompted by the discovery of stimuli from various cultures that possessed distinct cultural artefacts. Although I was not a novel concept, the intrinsic qualities of art fundamentally diverged from the foundational assumptions of European aesthetics. The European assertion on the nuanced universality and usefulness of art was undermined by these alternative cultural artefacts. The advantageous geographical position of this society rendered them a significant participant in the movement that challenged contemporary cultural ideals. They incorporated one of several new indicators of being "the other," which operates as a source of both positive and negative power inside cultural notions, characterised as "unique" and reflective of European values. This phenomenon was evident in various art forms during the close of the 19th century and the onset of the 20th century, including the poetry of Russian Symbolist poet Blok, the music of Smetana and Dvořák, and the artwork of Bakst and Goncharov. Alongside artworks from comparable cultures such as Guinea, the South Sea archipelago, India, and the Inuit of North America, as well as the Maori of New Zealand and Australian Aborigines, artefacts of African culture were regarded as exemplars of cultures perceived as primitive, reflecting intrinsic human motivations. That artwork represented a progression in the evolution of cultured art. This perspective had been contested early on by a more radical, apprehensive, and intricate viewpoint that regarded

primitive art as an expression of the "other side" of the European soul, which was deemed "civilised" as the "darker aspect" of humanity.

This sentiment was articulated in works such as "Heart of Darkness" by Conrad and "After Us, The Savage God," as well as in Yeats' notes upon his reading of "Ubu Roi" by Jarry. Yeats's comment held enormous importance, as he was a prominent player in the primitivism movement, striving to uncover the origins and sources of civilisation. In his commentary to Jarry, he implicitly distinguished between identifying the legal origins of culture and the alternate perception of the fearful visage of "the other" in primitive culture, represented as the "wild and primitive animal." Despite being ultimately conscious, the others try to undermine "Highly European Civilisation." The formatting of primary modernist writings, particularly those seeking to destroy modernity's stability and authority, necessitated critical engagement with non-European cultures. Since then, identifying cultures with developmental foundations distinct from European culture has become a fundamental factor significantly influencing the production and reproduction of European art. The integration of post-colonial art within the framework of European art has not been a distinct aspect of the radical process that shaped the evolution of both European and non-European cultures.

Theoretical Framework

This theoretical framework is based on postcolonial theory, which studies how colonization shapes culture, identity, language, and power. Postcolonial theory examines the long-lasting effects of European colonial rule and helps explain how ideas of superiority and inferiority are created and sustained. A major foundation of this theory comes from the work of Edward Said (1978), especially his concept of Orientalism, which describes how Western cultures create stereotypical images of non-Western societies to justify control and domination. This idea shows how knowledge and representation can become tools of power. Another important contributor is Homi K. Bhabha (1994), whose ideas about mimicry, hybridity, and cultural negotiation explore how identities change when different cultures meet under unequal conditions. His work explains how colonized people may adopt elements of the colonizer's culture while still keeping parts of their own, creating identities that are mixed and complex rather than fixed. Gayatri Spivak also plays a key role in postcolonial theory, especially with her term "subaltern," which refers to groups who are socially, politically, and culturally marginalized. She raises questions about whether these marginalized groups are allowed to speak for themselves or whether their voices are controlled or replaced by dominant powers. Her work helps highlight the problems of representation and the difficulty of hearing the true voices of oppressed people. The theoretical framework also uses general ideas from colonial discourse theory, which studies how language and writing can spread colonial beliefs, such as the idea that one culture is naturally superior to another. This framework helps explain how literature, history, and culture can support or challenge systems of domination. By using these key ideas, this study examines how postcolonial theory reveals deeper power structures, cultural hierarchies, and the construction of identities within colonial and postcolonial contexts.

Analysis

The story starts with Crusoe opposing his father's suggestion. His father prohibited him from sailing due to Crusoe's age of eighteen. In this instance, Crusoe's father exerted his dominance over Crusoe as a coloniser, attempting to dictate Crusoe's future. In succinct terms, Crusoe was a "silent other" (Defoe, 1719, p. 9). Another instance illustrates how Crusoe coerced and threatened the Moor to prevent him from approaching with the boat where Crusoe and Xury

were located. In this instance, Crusoe demonstrated dominance over the Moor. Crusoe was capable of coercing and intimidating the Moor without restraint. Crusoe compelled the Moor to conform to his strategy. Under these circumstances, the Moor assumed the role of a colonised individual, whereas Crusoe adopted that of a coloniser (Defoe, 1719, p. 24).

The story also reveals how Crusoe resorted to coercion and intimidation. Crusoe coerced and intimidated Xury. "Xury, if you remain loyal to me, I will elevate you to greatness; however, if you do not affirm your fidelity by swearing by Mahomet and his father's bread, I will cast you into the sea." Crusoe's demeanour exemplified his assertion of dominance. His role as captain enabled him to achieve all his desires. Xury was denied the opportunity to select or negotiate Crusoe's policy. Crusoe seems resolute regarding Xury's existence. In this instance, Xury was a tacit counterpart. Crusoe was a coloniser, while Xury was a colonised individual (Defoe, 1719, p. 10).

The evidence indicates that the description compelled one group into a disadvantageous position, resulting in a loss for another group. The phrase "the truly barbarian coast" reflects the perspective of the West as coloniser in relation to the natives as the colonised. An endeavour was made to resist colonisation by the colonisers through verbal communication media. The coloniser was described as a civilised individual, while the indigenous person was portrayed as uncivilised (barbaric) (Defoe, 1719, p. 11).

Similar to the previous example, the phrase "the truly barbarian coast" also shows a controlling influence of the dominant power. The term "wild man" was selected by colonisers as part of European colonial rhetoric directed against Native populations. Indeed, "wild" pertains to Crusoe's viewpoint, which was not always aligned with that of the Native worldview. The notion of "wild," according to Crusoe, may have differed from theirs. One example indicates the occurrence of linguistic colonisation. Crusoe was a coloniser, while the Native constituted a colonised group (Defoe, 1719, p. 28).

Crusoe referred to Xury as "boy" (Defoe, 1719, p. 35). Crusoe selected the term "boy" rather than "friend," implying that the phrase "boy" was intended to characterise Xury as still young, naïve, and uninformed. Using the term "friend," for instance, would convey greater appreciation and equality. Crusoe evidently attempted to assert his dominance over Xury through his description of him as a youngster. Crusoe restrained Xury from articulating his thoughts. Crusoe, as the prevailing authority, dictated the realisation of Xury. Xury was the "mute counterpart," and Crusoe was the coloniser.

Crusoe stated, "For being in the latitude of 12 degrees 18 minutes..." (Defoe, 1719, p. 42). This indicates that the island where Crusoe resides is not part of England. It signifies the expansion of English colonies in the Pacific Ocean, as though Crusoe intended to assert that the islands were the possession of England. In truth, there were residents on the island, such as Indigenous tribes in America and Aboriginal tribes in Australia. They were, in fact, the legal proprietors of the islands. It shows how the predominant authority (Crusoe) exhibited his hegemony.

Crusoe attempts to construct a defence to safeguard against local assault. Crusoe employed the term "savages" to refer to the Indigenous as a means of exerting control over them. Crusoe, as the prevailing authority, freely constructed negative representations of the other (Defoe, 1719, p. 58). Crusoe, in an indirect manner, likewise constructed a favourable self-image. Similar to the previous example, it is depicted that the outsider (Crusoe) was more cultured than the Indigenous people. It was evident that Crusoe subjugated the Indians through language,

referring to them as "savages." The Indigenous population was the colonised (voiceless other), and Crusoe was the coloniser.

"I went to my country house" (Defoe, 1719, p. 104) can be inferred to mean that Crusoe proclaimed the island as his own. A chapter was recorded in the annals of colonisation. Crusoe's perspective exemplified the colonial mindset that perceives newly encountered islands as their own, akin to Columbus's approach upon discovering America—he asserted it to be Spain's. No opportunity existed for the native to articulate. Crusoe epitomised the prevailing authority. Another example illustrates how the prevailing authority indiscriminately diminished the other (Defoe, 1719, p. 105). All matters pertaining to others were consistently evaluated within the framework of the prevailing authority. All matters that did not align with their framework, experiences, or histories were deemed foolish, barbarian, wild, and uncivilised. Crusoe stated, "for they are cannibals or man-eaters..." (Defoe, 1719, p. 105). Nonetheless, he was unaware of any cultural significance beyond the custom of cannibalism. Crusoe regarded himself as more civilised than the Indians.

Crusoe regarded Spaniards and Americans as barbaric, uncivilised, and non-modern. Indeed, it did not ensure that Crusoe's notion of civilisation was suitable for theirs. Crusoe compelled them to adhere to the civilisation model he proposed. Crusoe asserted that the values he presented were universal principles acknowledged by all peoples. The aforementioned rationale exemplified a distinctive trait of how the dominating power asserted its hegemony. In this context, Crusoe is depicted as a dominant force (the coloniser), while the Spaniards and American individuals are represented as the "silent other" (the colonised) (Defoe, 1719, p. 161).

Crusoe referred to the native with a derogatory term, labelling these individuals as savages. Crusoe classified individuals who were either adjacent to him or incompatible with his beliefs as uncivilised. Crusoe believed they were nonexistent and disregarded their presence. They were the "invisible counterpart." Crusoe was a coloniser, whereas the Indigenous population was subjected to colonisation (Defoe, 1719, p. 164). Crusoe employed the term "savage" once more to refer to the native. He used the term to construct an image of the Aboriginal people as barbaric and uncivilised. In other terms, Crusoe intended to convey that he was a cultured individual. Crusoe exerted authority over the Indigenous people through means of communication. The Indigenous population was colonised, and Crusoe assumed the role of a coloniser (Defoe, 1719, p. 170).

The smile shows Crusoe's treatment of the vulnerable individual. Although Crusoe implicitly offered him a smile, it was, in reality, a smile of colonial condescension. Crusoe's perception of others' weaknesses demonstrated his own strength. The line states, "This, it seems, was a token of swearing to be my slave forever" (Defoe, 1719, p. 190). It elucidated the process of colonisation. Crusoe necessitated that a native, whom he had assisted, refer to himself as Friday and address Crusoe as Master. Crusoe instructed Friday in the English language. The colonisation occurred. Why did the native refer to himself as Friday, a peculiar term from his culture? Why was he required to address Crusoe as Master rather than friend? Crusoe did not afford the native an opportunity for self-determination. Crusoe attempted to dominate him by using the terms Friday and Master. Both terms originated from Crusoe's culture, not that of the natives. It also indicated that the coloniser culture (English) was regarded as superior to the native culture (other). The Indigenous individual was the "silent other" (Defoe, 1719, p. 193).

Another instance revealed that Crusoe inadvertently colonised Friday. Crusoe perceived Friday not as a buddy or companion, but rather as a subordinate or servant. By the phrase "I take my

man Friday with me,” Crusoe was a settler and Friday was a subjugated individual. It also revealed that Crusoe was successfully asserting dominance over Friday. “...his affections were bound to me...” Crusoe attempted to justify his colonisation of Friday by characterising their relationship as akin to that of a child to a father. Crusoe exerted a dominating influence over Friday. Crusoe was a coloniser, while Friday was subjected to colonisation.

Another example reveals that Crusoe instructed Friday in the activities of "civilised people," implying that Crusoe saw Friday's culture as uncivilised. By instructing Friday in bread-making, Crusoe believed he had enhanced Friday's civilisation. The salient notion here is that Crusoe, through his various endeavours, sought to assert that his civilisation was more sophisticated than that of the natives. Crusoe's desire to ascertain the extent of Friday's proficiency in the English language implicitly shows that Crusoe invited Friday to converse about his homeland, but he also sought to gauge the extent of his influence over Friday. In other words, Crusoe sought to determine the extent of English cultural influence on native culture. Consequently, Crusoe devised subsequent techniques to perpetually dominate Friday.

Crusoe also tries to commence imparting religious knowledge to Friday. European colonists pursued three objectives in their colonisation: wealth, prestige, and the dissemination of religion. Aside from the veracity of Christ for Christians, it indicated a semblance of religious imposition. Crusoe asserted that only his religion was the most reliable. Furthermore, he contemplated that Friday's conception of God was erroneous. Consequently, it was imperative for Crusoe to convert him to Christianity. Crusoe perceived Friday as misguided in his beliefs due to their incongruence with Crusoe's own convictions.

The story also reveals that Crusoe recounted his travels, trade, plantation, and European nations to Friday. Crusoe sought to demonstrate his fervour in the presence of Friday. This is akin to Crusoe asserting that he was more cultured than Friday. Crusoe appropriated Friday's experience and history. It suggests that Crusoe referred to the Indigenous people as wild men. This shows that Crusoe intended to convey that he was not a savage individual. The Indigenous individuals were the wild men, not him. This method was the unique approach of the coloniser to impose his dominance. Crusoe referred to the other as native within his framework. Crusoe established a definition based on his worldview.

It also shows that Crusoe labelled those who did not align with his interests and enterprises as barbarians. This is similar to Crusoe asserting that he was not a barbarian himself. The term "Barbary" represented the assertion of a superior authority to subjugate another people. Crusoe epitomised the prevailing authority. Another instance illustrated Crusoe's perception of the island he inhabited as his exclusive domain. Furthermore, he regarded himself as a sovereign ruler. It is revealed that Crusoe's colonisation was exemplary. All that he desired had been attained on an island that was not his place of origin. It also indicated that Crusoe possessed a distinctive perspective on colonisers. They consistently acknowledged that peculiar islands were their possession. They were unaware of the existence of individuals residing on these peculiar islands. For instance, Columbus asserted that the American islands belonged to Spain, notwithstanding their prior occupation by Indigenous groups. The Englishmen asserted that the Australian island belonged to them, despite the Aboriginal tribes having existed for many years.

The story illustrated how Crusoe, utilising his authority, referred to Friday's father as the old barbarian. Crusoe continued to perceive Friday's father as a barbarian; however, he did not view Friday in the same light. Discrimination occurred. Crusoe likely referred to Friday's father as the old savage due to his incomplete assimilation, in contrast to Friday's greater degree of

influence. The colonisers assigned a pejorative label, "savage," to individuals or groups that had not been subjugated. Those subjugated by the coloniser experienced a semblance of agreeable treatment (Friday). Crusoe used both labels to exert influence over each group.

Crusoe epitomised the prevailing authority, both in relation to the natives and among other sailors, by exerting his influence on the island to intimidate the sailors. He unequivocally asserted his demands to the seamen. Crusoe was a coloniser, while the sailors were subjected to colonisation. Crusoe attempted to maintain his dominance over the island despite his impending departure. He disclosed every personal detail to others to garner their allegiance. Crusoe doubted their efforts to survive. This suggests that they could not achieve greater civility in his absence. In other words, Crusoe anticipated that his dominance would continue to prevail over them despite his physical departure. Crusoe later visited the island where he had previously resided. His expedition to the island aimed to assess the extent of his influence on its inhabitants. Crusoe epitomised the prevailing authority.

Discussion and Conclusion

The story shows how Crusoe often treated others as less important than himself. He used certain words and labels to show power over the Indigenous people and Friday. Crusoe acted as if his own culture and beliefs were the only correct ones. Many scenes reveal how he controlled others and shaped their identities to fit his worldview. Overall, the book highlights the strong imbalance between the coloniser's power and the silence of the colonised. The analysis shows that the coloniser consistently sought superiority over the colonised. The coloniser consistently sought to subjugate "voiceless others." The strategies employed to subjugate "silent others" were imperceptible, rendering them unaware of their colonisation. Moreover, "silent others" permit colonisers to dominate them due to their inferiority complex. Data analysis indicates that the majority of instances depict Robinson Crusoe as a coloniser. Robinson Crusoe was subjected to colonisation alone, as the coloniser was his father. Crusoe assumed the role of coloniser for the Moor, for Xury, for the Spaniards and American populace, for the sailors, and for the Natives.

The hegemony of Robinson Crusoe is substantial as he could assess his surroundings to ensure suitability for his enterprise. Robinson Crusoe employed various methods to assert dominance over the "silent other." Crusoe's mastery over the communication channel facilitated his dominance over the colonised individuals, specifically to frighten or coerce, to construct representations that he considered himself to be of a superior status. In addition to regulating the communication channel, Robinson Crusoe appropriated the "silent other" through seized proprietary resources and provided a semblance of positive gratification. The confiscation of proprietary rights entails the occupation of other properties where Crusoe asserted his ownership of the island. Whereas, providing a pseudo-positive pleasure pertains to Crusoe's treatment of the powerless guy through compliments that indirectly subjugate him. Colonisation is exemplified in Daniel Defoe's novel Robinson Crusoe, where the protagonist serves as the primary coloniser. The dominating authority employed various methods to subjugate the "silent other," as depicted by the author in the novel. They involve regulating communication channels, seizing proprietary rights, and providing a false sense of pleasure. Crusoe's behaviour shows how one person's power can shape the lives of others. The story reminds us that colonisation leaves a strong and lasting impact on everyone involved.

References

- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Routledge.
- Buell, L. (1992). American Literary Emergence as a Postcolonial Phenomenon. *American Literary History*, 4(3), 411-442.
- Defoe, D. (1719). *Robinson Crusoe*. Penguin Classics.
- Lazarus, N. (2012). *The Postcolonial Unconscious*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the Postcolony*. University of California Press.
- Nayar, P. K. (Ed.). (2016). *Postcolonial Studies: An Anthology* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nforbin, G. N. (2023). Identity, power and otherness: A postcolonial-Oriental reading of Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 10(7), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.107.15028>
- Patke, R. S. (2013). *Modernist literature and postcolonial studies*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books.
- Simon, D. (1998). Rethinking (post) modernism, postcolonialism, and posttraditionalism: South—north perspectives. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 16(2), 219-245.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- Ramadhan, J., Ulu, M., & Normuslim, N. (2024). Critiques to the Nation-State Model: Representing Muslim and Islamism in the Post-colonial Era. *Bandung*, 11(3), 448-479.