

## I. General Introduction

J(ohn) M(axwell) Coetzee, a South African novelist and critic who was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 2003, often writes directly or indirectly on the colonial issue. The present research is an inquiry into J.M. Coetzee's novel *Foe* (1986) equally taking into consideration Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). The inquiry is basically related to the subversion of colonial discourse of Defoe's very novel by representing the characters, incidents and narratives in Coetzee's masterpiece *Foe*. The narrative of the both novels is presented from different perspectives. The narrative of *Robinson Crusoe* is presented through a male's perspective, whereas the narrative of *Foe* is presented through a female's perspective. Through this female character, Coetzee introduces and evaluates the events and the other major characters as well. Since Defoe is the representative enough in the canon of colonialist discourse, the present researcher focuses on his novel *Robinson Crusoe*, and also examines a work of a postcolonial South African novelist, Coetzee's *Foe* as parallel to Defoe's very novel. The critique of canonical works has been a strong current in postcolonial writings. J.M. Coetzee's *Foe* is one of such postmodernist and postcolonial attempts to engage in dialectical intertextuality with existing canonical works that present negative stereotypes of Africa and the Africans. This present research further reveals how the male-centered (phallogentric) narrative of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* is countered in Coetzee's *Foe*.

The South African white author J.M. Coetzee in *Foe* explores an alternative telling of Crusoe's story. Coetzee in *Foe* retains some of the Eurocentric ideas about the black world. *Foe* as the feminist, postmodernist and postcolonial rewriting of Daniel Defoe's classic novel *Robinson Crusoe* with the deliberate motive rejects its canonical formulation of colonial encounter. The presentation of a female narrator in

*Foe* is a dramatic contrast to the presentation of the male narrator in *Robinson Crusoe*. Not only this, Coetzee again, countering Defoe's very novel, turns the story and the characters to get the marginalized trust and truth introduced. In his text, Defoe portrays the African 'Other' as inherently primitive, irrational and codeless being.

On the other hand, the essence of Coetzee's novels is based on African reality carrying a plurality of meanings. In *Foe*, Cruso is obviously the master with power, and Friday is the powerless servant. As Coetzee's *Foe* is a radical revision of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, it dismantles allegorical and canonical myth of Robinson from different perspectives. In this respect, Crusoe, Friday and Denial Defoe are supplemented by Cruso, black Friday, and Foe respectively. Susan Barton, a female character and the protagonist of the novel replaces Crusoe as a narrator. Cruso came to be a stranger to what was to become his island, just as the Afrikaners came to South Africa as strangers. Though Friday is a physically strong and is able to endure the hardships, he is denied one of the most powerful implements for securing and expressing freedom: speech, his tongue has been cut out and his mutilated mouth is a major cause of his remaining a slave. His inability to understand English is another cause of remaining imprisoned. So, it is obvious that the whites and the non-Whites' relationship is master-slave relationship.

The South African whites have silenced the black majority by denying the right to be represented in parliament and even the inalienable rights of the blacks were confined and limited by the whites. Friday, a representative of non-White characters, cannot express himself through his speech since his tongue has been cut out. It shows how the blacks like Friday were not given even chance to speak. He practices passive resistance. He expresses or releases himself by singing, i.e. humming and by playing a primitive reed flute. In this way, Coetzee establishes himself as a postcolonial writer

by presenting the victimizer-victimized relationship and resisting against the victimizers.

J.M. Coetzee is a writer who is strongly influenced by his own personal background of being born and growing up in South Africa. Although a white writer living in South Africa during apartheid, Coetzee grew to believe in and write with strong anti-imperialist feelings. Many of Coetzee's personal experiences and beliefs can be seen in his books. He writes in his autobiography and his novels about the laws that divided himself and others into racial categories that served to further alienate him. In '*Disgrace*' Coetzee deals with a South African professor named David Lurie who goes out to visit his daughter, 'Lucy'. Once, three rapists rape his daughter, then he demands justice from 'Petrus', Lucy's neighbor. But instead Petrus promises protection from further attacks to Lucy only if she marries him. The issues raised in this very novel deal with many of the current plights of South Africa. Not only the crime, rape, lack of police protection but also the racial divides are the themes of the novel and problems in South Africa

Regarding *Disgrace* a critic, Leusmann comments *Disgrace* as portraying a negative picture of South African society. He suspects whether Coetzee does so intentionally. Novelist Salman Rushdie has similar view about the dark picture portrayed in *Disgrace*. Rushdie further offers a pessimistic reading of *Disagree*:

Nobody in *Disgrace* understands anyone else. To the whites the black are essentially a threat- a threat justified by history. Because whites have historically oppressed blacks, it's being suggested, we must now accept that blacks will oppress whites. (qtd. in Cornwell 54)

So, according to Rushdie, because of historical oppression of the whites over the blacks, now, the turn goes to the blacks to threaten the whites. In this way, the conflict

between these two races continually goes around providing the clues of the pessimism.

Another critic Debra A. Castillo in his article "Coetzee's *Dusklands*: The Mythic Punctum" presents Coetzee's novel *Dusklands* in her own way. According to her, "Coetzee's primary purpose in providing shock photos of an untenable reality is to release the silenced, unimaginable other, the pictorial 'ghosts or absence of themselves'" (114). In this regard, she again comments, "*Pierce, wound, bruise, poignant, points*-these terms are central in *Dusklands*; the concept they designate expand as the novel progresses, indicating its ideological thrust, its intent to puncture the pretensions of colonialist discourse with short, incisive stabs" (1115). According to Castillo, *Dusklands* contains the author's implicit response to criticism advocating a moratorium on metaphysics and encouraging more "realistic" writing.

Similarly, another fine piece of literature by Coetzee is *Waiting for the Barbarians* (1982). In this novel, humanity has been clearly divided into oppressor and oppressed. For years 'the Magistrate' has served the empire, evidently at the expense of the 'barbarians', the name given to black people. At the time of peace, he was not fully aware of his oppressive role. When war came, initiated by the Empire, the brutalities of the empire towards the native black population became too obvious, too harsh. Since the Magistrate was a sensitive human being, he was shattered by the new realities, and in many ways lost his mind. The book mercilessly drills on the impossible situation of a sensitive person who is a part of an oppressive system.

Many critics have paid their attention on J.M. Coetzee and his different novels since their respective years of publication. Although Coetzee's novels are so distinctive in their styles, most of his works are dependent upon the same materials of his own country, South Africa. Even being a white writer from South Africa during

apartheid, Coetzee writes with strong anti-imperialist feelings and his writings were said to be mostly influenced by the postmodernist writers of Europe and America. These writers also contained many anti-imperialist sentiments as a reaction to the Vietnam War. All of Coetzee's writings are similar in that they often center on solitary characters. No direct moral is even given, but rather situations are set up for the reader to think about. Coetzee's aim is not to provide solutions but to highlight problems and help the readers interpret for their own conclusions.

Many critics and reviewers have analyzed *Foe* from different perspectives like postmodernist, anti-racist, existentialist, linguistic and deconstructionist. These approaches, no matter whether they are language-oriented or author-oriented or reader-oriented, have tried to interpret and invest this novel with meanings. Coetzee's *Foe* is a fictional riposte to Defoe's classics. It answers back to the imperial and colonial culture, which Defoe celebrates in his text. From whatever perspective it is read, Coetzee's *Foe* is self consciously written against the cultural stereotypes and representations commanding the field of postcolonial African literature.

Commenting on this novel, G. Scott Bishop presents *Foe* as a text being affected by the political realities. In this respect, G. Scott Bishop remarks:

Coetzee, as a writer, is morally compelled to speak at the same time that he is aware of the suspect nature of representation, authorial voice and even language. The figure of Susan deals most directly with the divided identity of the oppressor and the paradoxical nature of authorship. Friday illustrates the effectiveness of language as a political tool and deals with the nature of the blacks' unspoken and unmediated story. *Foe* finally presses the novel to unprecedented limits as it deals with the silence of the blacks' story, the identity of the

oppressor, the questionable political power of language, and the nature of authorship and authority. (56)

The critic here finds out that the writer Coetzee, because of the political and moral lessons, displaces his own authorial voice. He attempts to tell a story of the then society of South Africa without asserting himself in the novel. The above-mentioned remarks by Bishop also adopt the political and moral entanglements found throughout novel, *Foe*.

Dana Dargunoiu, another critic, gives the existentialist reading to Coetzee's *Foe*. Her remark certainly opens the existentialist reading that being into relief the previously ignored but significant aspect of *Foe*:

My aim is to add to the existing feminist postcolonial and post-modern reading of the *Foe* as an existential critic that addresses important aspect of the novel left unexplored by these readings. In many ways, existentialist thought has anticipated those late twentieth century theoretical models, particularly in rejecting absolutes, in prevailing existence, freedom and self-determination, and in analyzing ideology, language and the gaze. On a more particular level, existential philosophy helps to explain the mysterious figure of Crusoe. (309)

The above-mentioned remark of Dana Dargunoiu highlights the separate reading of existential protagonist, without appeal.

Robert M. Post quoting this line from the novel *Foe*, "while you are under my roof you will do as I instruct" (20) which is expressed by Cruso when Susan Barton goes on exploring on the island without his permission, opines his rebellious thought: "He (Cruso) is as stubborn as the Afrikaner government"(qtd in Rober M. Post's article "The Noise of Freedom": J. M Coetzee's Foe 146). In this way, Robert M. Post

seems to have been expressed the diseased African government, which is also symbolized by the recurring fever of Cruso. Now it is obvious that Coetzee's novel *Foe* is largely based on South African materials, the socio-political condition of South Africa.

John Rees Moore provides us a major review on different issues of Coetzee's *Foe*. Within this close analysis of *Foe*, Moore compares several aspects of the text to that of other novels as well. He uses examples of Coetzee's fiction to illustrate the ways in which the South African dilemma is discussed or omitted from them. These examples also demonstrate how Coetzee has shown actual awareness of the powers and limitations of language within various discourses of society. Moore, in "J.M. Coetzee and *Foe*", demonstrates the question of language as being the central subject of the book: "What does narrative need to be convincing? Can the writer create truth by the force of rhetoric? If words can never pluck out the heart of the mystery, is outright fiction the best that the writer can do? In this self-consciousness about writing, his metafiction, Coetzee displays in modernity"(1-6). Asking the series of questions, critic John Moore opines his structuralist perspective towards the book *Foe*, as he expresses the force of rhetoric through which the writer can create the truth. And he further presents the quality of *Foe* as a metafictional.

The afore-mentioned reviews and criticisms indicate that though J.M. Coetzee's *Foe* has been approached through various perspectives which clearly display and demonstrate the fact that Coetzee's novels are entirely based on the raw materials provided by his own country, South Africa, its social and political conditions of the then society, in fact, it has not been analyzed from postcolonial perspective. No major research has been purely made on subversion of colonial discourse in the novel. Therefore, the chief objective of this research is to examine

closely the novel *Foe* with regard to dismantling and countering the colonial discourse of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* by J.M. Coetzee in his novel *Foe* by applying postcolonial perspective.

As mentioned earlier, the classification of the postcolonial literature is not only a work or the works produced by a previously colonized nation but also by the style of writing and its political and social impact on society. If one defines a literary movement not only by the era and location in which the movement occurred but also by the style of the writing and its political and social impact on society that is the postcolonial literature. Here are some terms related with postcolonialism:

Colonial discourse, a concept popularized by Edward Said, refers to knowledge of the orient constructed by the West to bolster its colonizing interests. It prioritizes the divide between the west and the rest. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin emphasize, Said's *Orientalism*, which examines the ways in which colonial discourse operated as an instrument of 'colonial discourse theory', that theory, which in the 1980s, saw colonial discourse as its field of study.

Colonial discourse tends to exclude, of course, statements about the exploitation of the resources of the colonized, the political status accruing to colonizing power, the importance to domestic politics of the development of an empire, all of which may be compelling reasons for maintaining colonial ties. Rather it conceals these benefits in statements about the inferiority, the primitive nature of other races, the barbaric depravity of colonized societies, and therefore, the duty of the imperial power to reproduce itself in the colonial society and to advance the civilization of the colony through trade, administration, cultural and moral improvement. Such in the power of colonial discourse that individual colonizing



subjects are not often consciously aware of the duplicity of their position, for colonial discourse constructs the colonizing subject as much as the colonized.

Colonial discourse is greatly implicated by ideas of the centrality of Europe, and thus in assumptions that have become characteristic of modernity: assumptions about history, language, literature and technology. Colonial discourse is, thus, a system of statements that can be made about colonies and colonial people, about colonizing power and about the relationship between them. It is a system of knowledge and beliefs about the world within which acts of colonization take place. Although it is generated within the society and cultures of the colonizers, it becomes that discourse within which the colonized may also come to see themselves. At the very least, it creates a deep conflict in the consciousness of the colonized because of its clash with other knowledge about the world.

Rules of the inclusion and exclusion operate on the assumption of the superiority of the colonizer's culture, history, language, art, political structures, social conventions, and the assertion of the need for the colonized to be 'raised up' through colonial contact. In particular, colonial discourse hinges on notions of race that begin to emerge at the very advent of European imperialism. Through such distinctions it comes to represent the colonized, whatever the nature of the then social structures and cultural histories, as 'primitive' and the colonizers as 'civilized'.

Discourse is a much used word in contemporary theory and in postcolonial criticism. It is mostly employed in such terms as colonial discourse, which is specifically derived from Foucault's use of the concept. Discourse was originally used from about the sixteenth century to describe any kind of speaking, talk or conversation, but became increasingly used to describe a more formal speech, a narration or a treatment of any subject at length, a treatise, dissertation or sermon.

More recently, discourse has been used in technical sense by linguists to describe any unit of speech longer than a sentence.

However, the Foucauldian sense of the term has little to do with the act of speaking in its traditional sense. For Foucault, a discourse is strongly bounded area of social knowledge, a system of statement within which the world can be known. The key feature of this is that the world is not simply there to be talked about; rather, it is through discourse itself that the world is brought into being. It is also in such a discourse that speakers and hearers, writers and readers come to an understanding about themselves, their relationship to each other and their place in the world. It is the 'complex of signs and practices which organize social existence and social reproduction.'

Discourse is important because it joins power and knowledge together. Those who have power have control of what is known and the way it is known, and those who have such knowledge have power over those who do not. This link between knowledge and power is particularly important in the relationship between colonizers and colonized, and has been extensively elaborated by Edward Said in his discussion of *Orientalism*, in which he points out that this discourse, this way of knowing the 'orient', is way of maintaining power over it.

Gradually, the 'will to truth' came to dominate discourse and statements were required to be either true or false, when this occurred, it was no longer the act of discourse but the subject of discourse that became important. The crucial fact for postcolonial theory is that the 'will to truth' is linked to the 'will to power' in the same way that power and knowledge are linked. The will of European nations to exercise domination or control over the rest of the world, which led to the growth of empires,

was accompanied by the capacity to confirm European notions of utility, rationality, and discipline as truth.

Counter discourse is a term coined by Richard Terdiman to characterize the theory and practice of symbolic resistance. Terdiman's account of counter discourse begins from a notion of language functioning in practice and usage. He identifies the "confrontation between constituted reality and its subversion" as "the very locus at which cultural and historical change occurred" (qtd. in *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies* 56).

Representation and resistance are the broad areas of contestation where the colonialist relations and postcolonial examination and the subversion of those relations take place. Both in conquest and colonization, texts and textuality played a major part. European texts captured the non-European subject within European frameworks and the representations were reprojected to the colonized through formal education as authoritative pictures of themselves. Such texts, the representations of Europe to itself and the representation of others to Europe, were not accounts of different peoples and societies, but a projection of European fears and desires pretending as objective knowledge. Counter discourse has been a form of postcolonial resistance to such colonialist representation. It looks at the way societies are organized by powerful dominant views, and how people create space for alternative opinions within the frame of domination. Every dominant view creates an opportunity for opposition, for argument and for subversion. As the domination grows more total, counter discourse grows more intricate and subtle, still carving out the space of their expression.

The concept of counter discourse within postcolonialism, thus, raises the issue of subversion of canonical texts and their inevitable transcription in this process of

subversion. Eleke Boehmer in her *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* expresses her views about colonialist discourse saying that it refers to symbols and images to understand the apparently unintelligible strangeness and images of the orientals. In her own words:

Colonialist discourse can be taken to refer to that collection of symbolic practices, including textual codes and conventions and implied meanings, which Europe deployed in the process of its colonial expansion and, in particular, in understanding the bizarre and apparently unintelligible strangeness with which it came into contact. Colonialist discourse, therefore, embraced a set of ideological approaches to expansion and foreign rule. (50)

According to Boehmer, counter discourse is possible, i.e. people living in colonized or semi-colonized countries are capable of constructing images of the west that reinforce the culturally imperialist discourse of orientalism. Rather, such images have become powerful instruments of liberation and oppression.

Counter discourse is one in which a postcolonial writer takes up a character or charts the basic assumptions of the British colonial or imperialist text and unveils those assumptions, subverting the text for postcolonial purposes. J.M. Coetzee's *Foe* explores the problem of white South African settler literature in relation to the continuing oppression by whites of the black majority.

Postcolonial novels have become veritable weapons used to dismantle the hegemonic boundaries and the determinants that create unequal relations of power, based on binary oppositions such as “us” and “them”; “first-world” and “third world”; “white and black”; “colonizer and colonized” and so on. So, the present research attempts to look at the very apex of the emerging counter-canon in *Foe*. This paper

seeks to examine how postcolonial novelists like Coetzee use their novels to facilitate the transgression of boundaries and subversion of hegemonic rigidities previously mapped out in precursor literary canonical texts about Africa and its people.

## II. Postcolonialism

The term colonialism is important in defining the specific form of cultural exploitation that developed with the expansion of Europe over the last 400 years. Colonialism is a practice of domination, which involves the subjugation of one race of people by another. World history is full of examples of one society gradually expanding by incorporating adjacent territory and settling its people on newly conquered territory. The ancient Greeks set up colonies, as did the Romans, the Moors, and the Ottomans, to name just a few of the most notorious examples. Colonialism, then, is not restricted to a specific time or place. Nevertheless, in the sixteenth century, colonialism changed decisively because of technological development in navigation that began to connect more remote parts of the world. Fast sailing ships made it possible to reach distant ports while sustaining closer ties between the colonial center and colonies. Thus, the modern European colonial project emerged when it became possible to move large numbers of people across the ocean and to maintain political sovereignty in spite of geographical dispersion.

One of the difficulties of defining colonialism is that it is difficult to distinguish it from imperialism. Frequently, two concepts are treated as synonyms. Like colonialism, imperialism also involves political and economic control over a dependent territory. According to Edward Said, "imperialism means the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory: colonialism is almost always a consequence of imperialism is the implanting of settlement on distant territory (*Orientalism* 46). In short, "imperialism" for the ideological force, and "colonialism" for the practice. Elleke Boehmer in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* makes the distinctions between imperialism and colonialism:

Imperialism can be taken to refer to the authority assumed by a state over another territory. Colonialism involves the consolidation of imperial power, and is manifested in the settlement of territory, the exploitation or development of resources, and the attempt to govern the indigenous inhabitants of occupied lands. (2)

According to Boehmer, imperialism draws attention to the way that one country exercises power over another, whatever through settlement, or direct or indirect mechanisms of control. Colonialism, on the other hand, gives the sense of direct exploitation and domination over the native people and their lands.

Colonialism is a broad concept that refers to the project of European political domination from the sixteenth to the twentieth century that ended with the national liberation movement of the 1960s. Turning to the etymology, the term colony comes from the Latin word- *colonus*, meaning farmer. This root also reminds us that the practice of colonialism usually involved the transfer of population to a new territory, where the new arrivals lived as permanent settlers while maintaining political allegiance to their country of origin. Frantz Fanon in his *The Wretched of the Earth* provides us the similar view in his own words, "In the colonies, the foreigner coming from another country imposed his rule by means of guns and machines. In defiance of his successful transplantation in spite of his appropriation, the settler still remains a foreigner"(33). These mentioned remarks suggest how a new settler or the foreigner dominates or colonizes the people conducting his own rules and regulations forcefully over the native people, and the land owned by them.

The scale and variety of colonial settlements generated by the expansion of European society after the Renaissance shows why the term colonialism has been seen to be a distinctive form of the more general ideology of imperialism. Although Said's

formula which uses 'imperialism' for the ideological force and 'colonialism, for practice, is a generally useful distinction, European colonialism in the post-Renaissance world became a sufficiently specialized and historically specific form of imperial expansion to justify its current general usage as a distinctive kind of political ideology.

The European post-Renaissance colonial expansion which was furthered with the development of a modern capitalist system of economic exchange meant that the perception of the colonies as primarily established to provide raw materials for the burgeoning economics of the colonial powers was greatly strengthened and institutionalized. It also meant that the relation between the colonizer and colonized was locked into a rigid hierarchy of difference whether economic, cultural or social.

In colonies where the subject people were of different race, or where minority indigenous people existed, the ideology of race was also a crucial part of the construction and naturalization of an unequal form of intercultural relations. The negative construction of self was as important a feature of self-representation for settler colonies as for colonies of occupation where race and the idea of an alien or decayed civilization were a feature of colonial discrimination. The area ruled by the settler is well and easy-going area. It is full of good things. The settler's area is one of white people and full of foreigners in contrast to the land owned by the natives. Their area is starved of food and they have to struggle hard to make a living. So, Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth* further elaborates the colonizer-colonized relation by saying: "The colonized man is an envious man"(32). Because of their miserable and harsh life, the colonized wish to pose all those owned by the colonizers. By the end of the nineteenth century, colonialism had developed into a system of a historical



categorization in which certain societies and cultures were perceived as intrinsically inferior.

In Britain, by the end of the nineteenth century, a domestic programme for the function of Empire could be clearly perceived or known, as Victorian society faced increasing internal disagreement and division. Empire became the principal ideological unifier across class and other social divisions in Britain. It was to be the principal icon of national unity in the face of the widely perceived social threat of class unrest and revolution that had arisen in post industrial British society. The colonialist system permitted a national idea of improvement for the colonized via such metaphors as parent/child, tree/branch, and so on which in theory allowed that in some future time the inferior colonized might be raised to the status of the colonizer. But in practice this future was always endlessly deferred.

It is significant that no society ever attained full freedom from the colonial system by the involuntary, active disengagement of the colonial power until it was provoked by a considerable internal struggle for self-determination or, most usually, by extended and active violent opposition by the colonized.

The legitimacy of colonialism has been a longstanding concern for political and moral philosophers in the western tradition. In the nineteenth century, the tension between liberal thought and colonial practice became particularly acute, as dominion of Europe over the rest of the world reached its zenith ironically, in the same period when most political philosophers began to defend the principles of universalism and equality, the same individuals still defended the legitimacy of colonialism and imperialism. One way of reconciling those apparently opposed principles was the argument known as the "civilizing mission", which suggested that a temporary period of political dependence or tutelage was necessary in order for "uncivilized" societies

to advance to the point where they were capable of sustaining liberal institutions and self-government.

Racial discrimination was a direct extension of colonial policy and continued to receive both overt and covert support from the ex-colonial power as well as from the newly emerging power of America throughout the period up to and even after the Second World War. Such policies of racial discrimination reached their highest point in South African apartheid, which had its roots in earlier colonial discriminatory policies. British India and European African colonies had to engage in a long and frequently bloody process of protest and rebellion to secure their independence. The nationalist government in South African was able to survive only because it was supported by the investment of those countries who were supposedly opposed to the regime. Thus, colonialism, too, merely modified and developed into the neo-colonialism of the post-independence period.

The boundaries of colonialism, like those of many literary eras, are difficult to draw. The history of colonialism as a policy of practice goes back for centuries, and arguably the story of colonialism is not over yet. Thus, literature of several ages reflects concerns about colonialism in depiction of encounters with native people and foreign landscapes. As colonial activity gained momentum in the late nineteenth century, so the reflection of that activity, as a celebration of European might or as fears of what lay in the wilderness, grew in intensity. Thus, rough boundaries for the literary movement of colonialism would begin in 1875, when historians date the start of "New Imperialism", though the waning empires of World War I and up to the beginning of World War II, around 1939, although the years after World War I reflect primarily nostalgia for an era that was rapidly coming to a close. Colonialism is primarily a feature of British literature, given that the British dominated the imperial

age; even colonial writers of other nationalities often wrote in English or from an English setting. The literature of colonialism is characterized by a strong sense of ambiguity: uncertainty about the morality of imperialism, about the nature of humanity, and about the continuing viability of European civilization; colonial literature is also full of high adventure, romance, and excitement.

As we know that the battle against colonialism does not run straight away along the lines of nationalism. For a long time the native devotes his attempts to the ending of certain definite abuses as taught by the colonial system: forced labor, corporeal punishment, inequality of salaries, limitation of social and political rights and so on but this attempt against the oppression of mankind will be in any case only an empty shell because there are some loop-holes of the natives: the unpreparedness of the educated classes, the cowardice and laziness at the decisive moment, the lack of practical links between the educated class and the mass of the people.

So, it is not only colonialism that hinders the way of national unity but the intellectual laziness or the above mentioned cracks also are the equally responsible for the purpose. So, "Colonialism hardly ever exploits the whole of a country" (129) as expressed by Frantz Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth*.

The fight engaged upon by races and tribes, and the anxiety to get the posts left vacant by the departure of the foreigner equally gives rise to religious rivalries: Islamic and Catholicism. Before the advent of European colonialism, the great African empires were disrupted by the Arab invasion. So, it was the Arab occupation which paved the way for European colonialism.

The religious tension may be responsible for the revival of racial feeling. Africa is divided into black and white, and the names that are substituted, Africa,

South of the Sahara, Africa, North of the Sahara, show the racism. White Africa has a thousand- year- old tradition of culture and is a continuation of Europe, also white Africa shares in Greco-Roman civilization. Black Africa is looked as savage, brutal and uncivilized. Even in certain regions of Africa, the loathsome idea derived from western culture that the black man is impervious to logic and the sciences reign in all their nakedness. Now, it is common that a black African citizen hears himself called a "Negro" by the children when walking in the streets of white Africa. In this way, racism was the characteristic of the colonial period.

European colonialism in Africa was so bad that colonialism has destroyed the traditional way of living; colonialist enforced their own culture on aborigines, exploiting local people in every way and making them as servants in their own land. They also have made themselves financially strong on expenses of themselves financially strong on expenses of aborigine culture and people. Racism is not a mere 'psychological defence' of the colonialist, created for the needs of the cause, it is in fact 'Other Thought' produced objectively by the colonial system. Through the upper-exploitation, man is defined by the wage and by the nature of labor, and therefore, it is true that wages and labor policy of the colonial system reduce a colonized person to the sub-human. The same kind of view is also expressed by Elleke Boehmer in her *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*, "Process of othering is fundamental in colonization" (79). The colonized made up the subordinate term in relation to which European individuality was defined. Always the colonized peoples were represented as less civilized or savage or in Boehmer's word "headless mass" (79).

In South Africa, the apartheid policy was legalized from 1948 onwards. The sense of remaining insecurity in white society in African as being minority group made the whites dominate blacks by making racial ideologies. Apartheid movement

was applied for showing white superiority in South Africa. Two different sets of laws were practiced on the basis of color of skin. The blacks were deprived of education, opportunity for employment and so on. Political, economical and social power was dominated by the whites. So, before 1994, white superiority was legitimized there. The blacks were marginalized. In this way, the settler-native relationship is a mass relationship. The native is trapped in the tight links of the chains of colonialism. So, the originality of the colonial context is that economic reality, inequality and the immense difference of ways of life never come to mask the human realities. Frantz Fanon in his *The Wretched of the Earth* says, "In the colonies the economic substructure is also a super structure" (32). When a native is denied his rights and opportunities, it is white who is all in all. He becomes rich because of his white skin and he becomes white-skinned person because of his remaining wealthy.

In the colonial system, the colonizers run the rules and regulations that are beneficial for them. The settlers exploit the natives. It is the settler who has brought the native into existence and who perpetuates his existence. When the native is confronted with the colonial order of things, he finds his state in a permanent tension. Whatever it is, the native is always the envious of the world of settler. The native never leaves him without dreaming of putting himself in the place of the settler. He is always in confrontation with the settler's rules that has dominated him. The native is always presumed guilty. But there is no guilt that the native accepts rather, it is "a kind of curse" (42) as Fanon expresses. The native is treated as inferior but he is not convinced of his inferiority. So, the native is an oppressed person whose permanent dream is to become the persecutor.

In the colonies everything is owned by the settler. The Church is the white people's Church, the foreigner's Church. The natives are given strict rules and are

demanding to follow them as the Christian rules. So, the colonized are given the intolerable values by the colonizers in the name of the religion and Christianity. Not only through the racial segregation but in the name of religion, i.e. Christianity also, the Africans seem to be dominated and exploited. Christianity is also responsible for the decimation of the tribal structure in South Africa. There is a widespread notion that Christianity in Africa has been merely an instrument of colonization. Conversely, some have believed that Christianity brought progress to African peoples by supplanting traditional religions that were bound by superstition. African cultures that have adopted Christianity view religious practice and salvation quite differently from European cultures. A respectful understanding of the difference can help to ensure the viability of the Christian church in Africa. European and American Christians tend to separate mind and body and to view salvation as a phenomenon solely of the afterlife: Jesus died on the cross so that we might have even lasting life. African Christian cultures, in contrast, view salvation as a phenomenon both of the hereafter and of the here and now. Earthly life and after-life are parts of the same continuum; far less emphasis is placed on the afterlife than in Western Christian cultures. Africans look for evidence of God's love and protection in their daily lives, for example, in the form of deliverance from present evil. African Christians hope for earthly peace and deliverance from enemies as well as protection against curses and malevolent spirits. Historically, Africans have looked to religion for practical demonstrations of protection against the ills like injury, infertility, starvation, and lack of rain for crops or water to drink. Similarly, traditional African churches practiced faith healing, and of course some denominations in the West have done likewise. Faith healing can be confused with belief in magic, which westerners may dismiss as superstition. People of Africa have much to contribute to the meaningful of Christianity. Traditional

Africans have long had a practical religion that permeates all aspects of their daily life.

Colonialist literature was consistently set in the colonies from a European point of view, colonial territory was singular: colonized land and people all fell in the category of "other", even for the Europeans living in the colonies. Politically, geographically and culturally, however, the colonies were widely different. For example, England's relationship with India began with the spice trade in the sixteenth century, but England did not venture into the African interior until the nineteenth century. In literature, one of the most significant aspects of European self-projection was its representation of the people who inhabited the lands they claimed: the natives, the colonized. The process of othering is fundamental in colonization. The colonized made up the subordinate term in relation to which European individuality was defined. Colonized people were always viewed from the lower and lesser perspective. In this regard, Elleke Boehmer in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* says, "Always with reference to the superiority of an expanding Europe, colonized peoples were represented as lesser: less human, less civilized, as child or as savage, wild man, animal, or headless mass" (79). So, according to Boehmer, the colonized people made up the subordinate term in relation to which European individuality was defined. By placing the colonized people on the lower status, European colonizers always led themselves towards the civilized direction.

Therefore, the characterization of colonized people as secondary and weak-"the other" handed over by the West, thus, conceived of its superiority relative to the perceived lack of power, self-consciousness, or ability to think and rule of colonized people. The ugly incident of colonialism in Africa has effects on languages, education, religion, artistic sensibilities, popular culture and the like. The African

novel occupies a central position in the criticism of colonial portrayal of the African continent and its people. The average African novelist responds to the urgency and inevitability of the historic mission.

A general consensus among African historians is that colonialism is morally wrong. It is not difficult to understand its conclusion. Colonialism, after all, is a political system in which an external nation takes complete control of a territory in another area of the world. Moreover, the colonized people do not invite the colonial power, nor do they have any way in how they are governed. Colonialism is by definition and practice un-democratic. In spite of the universal recognition that colonialism is morally reprehensible, there are differing opinions on the social, economic, and political consequence of colonialism. Since colonialism was practiced differently throughout Africa, the consequences of colonial rule would differ from colony to colony.

We know that colonial domination has marked certain regions out for privilege. The colony's economy is not integrated into that of the nation as a whole. It is still organized in order to complete the economy of the different mother countries. Frantz Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth* expresses that "colonialism hardly ever exploits the whole of a country"(129). In fact, it satisfies itself with bringing to light the natural resources as the essential matters for the fulfillment of the needs of the mother country's industries and thus allowing certain sectors of the colony to become relatively rich. So, the colony is planted with settlers and exploited at the same time. Thus, European has multiplied divisions and opposing groups, have fashioned classes and sometimes even racial prejudices.

After the World War II, many territories from Asia and Africa became independent from colonial domination. Theorists developed a new kind of theory



different from the former theories, theories concerning colonialism, to solve the problems constructed by colonialism. Viewing this concept, it can be said that 'postcolonial theory' is an attempt to understand the problems created by European colonization and its aftermath; or it can be argued that postcolonial theory is related to the "Third World" as it is constructed as a political category. Since the term "Third World" came to designate those states distinct from the West and the Soviet bloc. Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin define that "the term 'Third World' was first used in 1952 during the so-called cold war period, by the politician and economist Alfred Sauvy, to designate those countries aligned with neither the United State nor the Soviet Union" (*Key Concepts* 23). With this Third World concept, postcolonial theory furthermore came into light as an attack to the claims made for Euro centric values and norms. Culler emphasized, "In this legacy, postcolonial institutions and experiences, from the idea of the independent nation to the idea of culture itself, are entangled with the discursive practices of the West" (131). As a result, many literary theorists, artists, critics and literary figures have emerged with new approaches to look at the world. Their new approaches further more developed from the Bandung conference held on Indonesia in 1955. By the conference the entire orient had gained its political independence from western empires and confronted a new configuration of twenty-nine nations of Africa and Asia planning economic and cultural co-operation to create their own kind of identities.

Postcolonial theorists critically study both colonial texts and texts written after colonialism. The term "postcolonialism" refers broadly to the ways in which race, ethnicity, culture, and human identity itself are represented in the modern era, after many colonized countries gained their independence. However, some critics use the term to refer to all cultures and cultural products influenced by imperialism from the

moment of colonization till today. Postcolonial literature seeks to describe the interactions between European nations and the peoples they colonized. By the middle of the twentieth century, the vast majority of the world was under the control of European countries. At one time, Great Britain, for example, ruled almost fifty percent of the world. During the twentieth century, countries such as India, Jamaica, Nigeria, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Canada and Australia were colonized by European colonizers. Literature and art produced in these countries after independence has become the subject of "postcolonial studies", a term coined in and for academic, initially in British universities. This field gained prominence in the 1970s and has been developing ever since. Palestinian-American scholar Edward Said's critique of Western representation of the Eastern culture in his 1978 book, *Orientalism* is a seminal text for postcolonial studies and has spawned a host of theories on the subject. However, as the currency of the term "postcolonial" has gained wider use, its meaning has also expanded. Some consider the United States itself a postcolonial country because of its former status as a territory of Great Britain, but it is generally studied for its colonizing rather than its colonized attributes. In another vein, Canada and Australia, though former colonies of Britain, are often placed in a separate category because of their status as "settler" countries and because of their continuing loyalty to their colonizer.

Postcolonialism is the social, political, economic and cultural practice which arises in response and resistance to colonialism. Postcolonial texts will incorporate culturally specific details, often not offering translations or explanations of non-European practices, decentering the European-based reading. In addition, the texts very often decenter the white character, who becomes faceless, nameless representative of a dominating power, shifting the power relationship within the text.

Finally, it is perhaps most important to stress the ever changing nature of postcolonialism as a defining term, as it responds to the material conditions under which people live in colonial and neocolonial situations. As expressed by Elleke Boehmer "Colonialist literature was informed by theories concerning the superiority of European culture and the rightness of empire. Its distinctive stereotyped language was geared to mediating the white man's relationship with colonized people" (3). The remarks unveil the sense that as the "colonialist literature" suggests to literature written during the colonial period by the writers from western world about non-European lands occupied by them, always superiorizing the European culture and regarding the empire as 'good', the Europeans create the different stereotyped language to dominate and present the colonized people as 'inferior' and 'other'. So, postcolonial literature is that which critically and carefully examines such stereotyped colonial relationship. It is a writing that sets out in one way or another to resist colonialist perspectives. And postcoloniality is a condition where the colonized people forcibly seek to take their place.

Most postcolonial critics analyze the ways in which a literary text reinforces or resists colonialism's oppressive ideology: "A text can reinforce colonialist ideology through positive portrayals of the colonizers or negative portrayals of the colonized, or the uncritical representation of the benefits of colonialism of the colonized" (374) as mentioned by Lois Tyson in her *Critical Theory Today*. Analogously, texts can resist colonialist ideology by depicting the misdeeds of the colonizers, the suffering of the colonized, or the detrimental effects of colonialism on the colonized.

As Robert J.C. Young expresses in his *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction*, "Postcolonial theory is not in fact a theory in the scientific sense" (6). It comprises a related set of perspectives, which are juxtaposed against one another. It

involves issues that are often the preoccupation of other disciplines and activities--the position of women, of development, of ecology, of social justice, of socialism in its broadest sense. Postcolonialism seeks to force its alternative knowledge into the power structures of the West as well as the non-West. It seeks to change the way people think, the way they behave, to produce a more just and equitable relation between the different people of the world. Postcolonialism, as a term, describes practices and ideas as various as those within feminism or socialism. For much of postcolonial theory is not so much about static ideas or practices, as about the relations of conflict, generative relations between different people and their culture. Postcolonialism is about a changing world, the world that has been changed by struggle and which its practioners intend to change further.

Truth is the creation of power. And the truth which is represented in the form of texts, travel narratives, paintings, and films is inseparable from power. Foucault considers that 'truth' is itself a product of relations of power and of the system in which it flows; and also that it changes as system changes. He emphasizes that discursive practices are interwoven with social practices through the circulation of power. His view is that 'truths' are not original essences, but are historical and political consciousness that is embedded in the relation of power.

Foucault classifies two aspects of power: the productive and repressive. But his prime emphasis is his stress on the productive nature of power's modern exercises. This main aim is to form a negative conception upside down and attribute the production of concepts, ideas, and structures of institutions to the circulation and exercise of power in its modern forms. He argues on why he disregards negative concept of power, and emphasizes positive aspect of power in his own words:

If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it?

What make power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it does not only weigh on us as a force that say no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms of knowledge, produces discourse. ("Truth and Power", 1139)

This means that we no longer accept the power if it is repressive, or if it forbids to do anything. Why we accept power is, it produces us pleasure, forms knowledge, and relates discourse. His conception of discourse is indispensable for an understanding of the role of 'power' in the production of knowledge. So, discourse provides information to give knowledge about the things. If the power changes through certain resistance, truth and knowledge also get changed.

The core problematic of postcolonial theory is an examination of the relationship between power and knowledge in the non-Western world. Some scholars have approached this through historical research rather than literary or discursive analysis. The most influential movement is the subaltern studies group, which was originally made up of South Asian historians who explored the contribution of non-elites to Indian politics and culture. The term subaltern suggests an interest in social class but more generally it is also a methodological orientation that opens up the study of logics of subordination. Whereas Said raises the broad issue of orientalism, the Subaltern Studies group dismantles particular hegemonic narratives of Indian colonial history.

From the perspective of world system theory, the economic exploitation of the periphery does not necessarily require direct political or military domination. In a similar vein, contemporary literary theorists have drawn attention to practices of

representation that reproduce a logic of subordination that endures even after former colonies gain independence. The field of postcolonial studies was established by Edward Said in his path-breaking book *Orientalism*. In *Orientalism*, Said applies Foucault's technique of discourse analysis to the production of knowledge about the Middle East. He draws attention to the relationship between knowledge and power. By foregrounding the cultural and epistemological work of imperialism, Said is able to undermine the ideological assumption of value-free knowledge and shows that "knowing the orient" was part of the project of dominating it. Similarly, another quasi-canonical contribution to the field of postcolonial theory is Gayatri Spivak's "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Spivak works within Said's problematic of representation but extends in to the contemporary academy. By posing the question "Can the Subaltern Speak?", she asks whether the scholarly interest in non-Western cultures may unwittingly reproduce a new kind of orientalism whereby academic theorists mine non-Western sources in order to speak authoritatively in their place. Even though the goal is to challenge the existing Eurocentrism of the academy, postcolonial studies is particularly vulnerable to the risks associated with any claim to speak authoritatively on behalf of the subaltern. Thus, the field of postcolonial studies is haunted by its own impossibility. It was born out of the reorganization that representation is inevitably implicated in power and domination yet struggles to reconfigure representation as an act of resistance.

Postcolonialism claims the right of all people on this earth to the same material and cultural well-being. The reality is that the world today is the world of inequality, and much of the difference falls across the broad division between people of the West and those of the non-West. This division between the rest and the West was made fairly absolute in the nineteenth century by the expansion of the European

empires, as a result of which nine-tenths of the entire land surface of the world was controlled by the Europeans. Colonial and imperial rule was legitimized by anthropological theories which portrayed the people of colonized world as inferior, childlike or feminine, incapable of looking after themselves. The basis of such anthropological theories was the concept of race. In simple terms, the West and non-West relation was thought of in terms of white versus the non-White races. Postcolonial critics and theorists attack the claims made for Eurocentric art and literature as having universal validity, and relegating non-Western cultural form to margins. They try to dismantle the binaries constructed by colonizers.

The binaries constructed by the colonizers regard the orient as 'inferior', 'other', 'indigenous', 'uncivilized' 'feminine', 'patient' whereas it places Westerners as 'superior', 'universal', 'masculine', 'doctor', 'civilized' and so on. These epithets promote awareness in the part of the non-Westerners to create their own existence. These kinds of binary oppositions constitute a gap between what the Westerners say and what actually they do or write. Texts sometimes represent the unconscious basis of the writers as clarified by Said in *Orientalism*:

In any instance of at least written language, there is no such thing as a delivered presence, but a represent or a representation. The value efficacy, strength, apparent variety of a written statement about the orient, therefore, relies very little, and cannot instruct mentally depend, on orient as such. On the contrary, the written statement is a presence to the reader by virtue of the having excluded, displaced mode supererogatory, any such real thing as "the orient." Thus, all of orientalism stands forth and away from the orient: that orientalism makes sense at all depends more on the west than on orient... And

these representations rely upon institution, traditions agreed upon codes of understanding for their effects, not upon a distant and amorphous orient. (21-22)

Said shows a gap between the orient the way it actually is, and the orient that is represented through novels, paintings, travel narratives and so on. Sometimes, as later writers or travelers got to orient and their perception of the orient is already shaped by what they read about the orient in those books or texts. He further clarifies about misrepresentation of the orient for the Westerners or the travelers who have never seen the orient that they find gap between what they read in books and what they actually find about it.

Westerners represent the orient what they want it to be, but not the orient as it is. For example, Said gives the example of Joseph Conrad's *Nostramo*, which shows the misrepresentation involved in narrating other nations. As Conrad is an European, he can neither understand that India, Africa and South American also have their own histories, lives and cultures with integrities not totally controlled by imperialists and reforms of this word, nor allow himself to believe that anti-imperialist independent movements are not all corrupt and in the pay of puppet-masters-in London or Washington. Said clarifies about Conrad and his representation as:

Conrad seems to be saying 'we Westerners will decide who is a good native or bad, because all natives have sufficient existence by virtue of our recognition. We created them, we taught them to speak and think, and when they reveal they simply confirm our views of them as silly children, duped by some of their western masters.' (*Culture and Imperialism XX*)



This above quotation shows that Joseph Conrad as an imperialist thinks that imperialism is a system since he is the product of his own time, and brought up and educated from the Western colonial heritage. Thus, his representation of Africa is filtered through the stereotypes of Africanist discourse "as a 'symbolic narrative' in which the major features of the movement of the narrative are all held to refer symbolically to some action or situation" (*Key Concepts*, 9). The story of *Foe* is a symbolic narrative which in many ways resists the imperial domination.

As the control of the means of communication is so pronounced in Africa, it provides one of the clearest and most extreme examples of how the political condition of colonized people is bound up with language. In effect, all writing in Africa is by definition a form of protest. Most of the writings of blacks and, to some extent, the writing of whites opposes the South African apartheid, their writing's foundation is protest, and engages in resistance to the oppressive regime. So, a postcolonial allegory contests and disrupts the narrative assumptions of colonialism including the Eurocentric view of 'the real'.

Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin also agree that "representation and resistance are very broad arenas within which much of the drama of colonialist relationships and postcolonial examination and subversion of those relations has taken place" (41). Representation usually refers to us using one thing to stand for another. A key component of cultural studies, representation is embedded in the object of study (text) or its preferred framework (discourse). Meaning is connected with representation and they are better understood under specific social context. Said's *Orientalism* is a prime example of how western discourse was formed stereotypical images of East to gain control and govern the orient. Through western discursive practices, it tries to gain

power over the orient which Foucault has suggested ‘discourse as representation and is a form of power.’

Giving textual representation or textualizing events, beliefs, traditions and languages of the subjugated communities, i.e. of colonized has always served the colonial purpose. Colonial discursive practice enriches this trend more and fosters in the post-colonial era. Eurocentrism, thus, was not covert during colonization to the extent that the concept of European superiority was made very salient in most colonial writing mainly in travel writings. Colonial literature then is assumed to be literature reflecting the ethos of the colonial settlers and of the natives. But as the writings become less canonized and become so heterogeneous, only delineates the perceptions of colonizer as a dominant world power. Eleke Boehmer in *Colonial and Postcolonial Studies* writes, “Colonial literature, which is the more general term, will be taken to mean writing concerned with colonial perceptions and experience, written mainly by metropolitans, but also by creoles and indigenous during colonial times” (2). Thus, the writings during the colonization or writings related with the colonial era, by the colonizer Europeans about non-European lands dominate by reinforcing their own perception. The writings only embodied the imperialist’s point of view and their ways of perception towards natives.

Representation in postcolonial studies is a much debated topic. In cultural studies, it focuses on how the world is socially constructed and represented to and by us. But the cultural representations and meanings have certain materiality, they are embedded in sounds inscriptions, objects, books, magazines and television programs. They are produced, enacted, used and understood in specific social contexts. In contemporary postcolonial theory, ‘representation’ is closely related with Foucauldian

concept of 'discourse as representation'. As in Foucauldian notion discourse is inseparable from power, representation also conjoins with power.

Discourse is produced and guided through power in order to maintain the sense of superiority and authority over the 'other' because in Foucault's consideration, the practice of discourse has no universal validity but is historically dominant way of controlling and presenting social relation of exploitation. The representation of the 'blacks' is regarded as the economy of discourse, domination and power. It becomes mere a medium of play or domestic weapon in accomplishing the task of colonizers. The colonized are considered as a population of degenerated types on the basis of their race and origin, but that justification is to show the conquest, victory and administration by colonizers on their native land. Thus, the constructed reality by exercising power produces colonized as 'other', 'unknowable' and 'invisible'.

The dichotomy between 'self' and 'other' is inevitable for the colonizer because the existence of the self is possible or gets determined by the images of the other. The colonizers create other as inferior and barbaric to prove themselves superior and civilized. In that sense, colonized or other is a mirror where colonizer self reflects its positive image. The object other is important in defining the identity of the subject. The other is crucial to the subject because the subject exists in its gaze. This concept of subject formation is clearly defined by the prominent psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan. In *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies* elaborating the ideas of Lacan, Ashcroft, Griffith and Tiffin write, "All desire is metonym of the desire to be because the first desire of the subject is the desire to exist in the gaze of the other" (170). The subject colonizers form their identity when they look colonized object, like the child discovers identity when it looks in the mirror and becomes aware of itself, as a

separate being. Thus, it is the colonizer's discourse or power that characterizes colonized as other.

The way of representing blacks as inferior and keeping them in the position of subordination is an intrinsic feature rooted in the psychology of Western scholarship. Edward Said, in his *The World, The Text and The Critic*, rightly observes, "Oriental texts come to inhabit a realm without development or powers one that exactly corresponds to be position of colony for European text and culture" (47). The conflict in between master and slave, colonizer and colonized, white and black has the fundamental significance in colonial discourse. The colonizer's so-called superior sense constructed the discourse on colonized as inferior', 'barbaric', 'lethargic' and 'other'. The tendency of constructing colonized as 'different from colonizer remains throughout colonial and postcolonial era. The colonized were judged by their outer appearance. The black men/women on their outer black biological features are considered as inwardly black, too.

Associated with the issue of indigenous minorities is the question of race. Race has always been an issue in postcolonial studies. Race raises the issue of representation which has always been central to postcolonial studies: the representation of the colonial other. Race encompasses a phenomenon much larger than postcolonial experience. Due to its remaining as a central and unavoidable 'fact' of modern society that race is taken as the dominant category of daily discrimination and prejudice. So, in practical terms, race remains a real issue in contemporary personal and social relations. It includes multi-cultural perspectives all together and represents a multiplicity of experiences as described by Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin:

Postcolonial theory involves discussion about experience of various kinds: migration, slavery, suppression, resistance, representation,

difference, race, gender, place, and responses to the influential master discourses of imperial Europe such as history, philosophy and linguistics, and the fundamental experiences of speaking and writing by which all these come into being. None of these is 'essentially' post-colonial, but together they form the complex fabric of the fabric of the field. (*Postcolonial Studies Reader*, 2)

This means that postcolonial theory is not a single index of linguistics, philosophy, literature, and culture. It is, rather, a mixed identity of these items all together.

Gayatri C. Spivak is another prominent figure in the field of postcolonial theory and criticism. She formulates different terms to indicate the colonized people as constructed by colonizer as subaltern, secondary, object, weak, feminine and other. In her critical theory *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*, she raises a question "Can the subaltern speak?" she goes back to the history and different methodology to depict women's position and finds their position repressed between patriarchy and imperialism. She radically sketches women's position:

Between patriarchy and imperialism, subject constitution and object formation, the figure of woman disappears, not into a pristine nothingness, but into a violent shuttling which is the displaced figuration of the 'third world women' caught between tradition and modernization. These contradictions would revise every detail of judgments that seem valid for a history of sexuality in the west: 'such would be property of repressions that which distinguishes it from prohibitions maintained by simple penal law: repression functions well as a sentence to disappear, but also an induction to silence, affirmation

of non-existence, and consequently states that of all this there is nothing to say, to see, to know.' (102)

She shows the pathetic position of women caught between patriarchy and imperialism. In colonialism, women's voice is repressed more than men. In such a context, she raises a question whether women could speak for themselves or not, pointing to the fact that racial and gender discrimination that silences the women. For the figure of women, the relationship between women and silence can be plotted by women themselves. If in the context of colonial production, the subaltern cannot speak or it has no history, the subaltern is even more deeply in shadow. Spivak further elaborates the figure of woman as trapped between patriarchy and imperialism. Similarly, she further opines in "Can the Subaltern Speak?": "For true subaltern group whose identity is its difference, there is no unrepresentable subaltern subject that can know and speak itself" (32). Therefore, Spivak declares that "[t]he subaltern cannot speak" (32). Coetzee's *Foe* is the portrayal of those marginalized, colonized, non-Whites which clearly depicts the inability of the subaltern people and his character, Friday is the representative of those people. By representing him as a tongueless black protagonist, Coetzee tries to expose that speechlessness or silence of the colonized like Friday resists with colonizer, Crusoe even not speaking with him. In this way, silence of the colonized could be the resisting tool in the context of the eighteenth century colony against the inhuman colonizer.

Language is a fundamental site of struggle for postcolonial discourse because the colonial process itself begins in language. The imperial center controls over the language by displacing native languages calling to it as standard. It remains the most potent instrument of cultural control. It is language through which reality may be constituted. It is the system of values upon which social and economic and political

discourses are grounded. Language is the medium through which conceptions of 'truth', 'order' and 'reality' become established. Such power is rejected in the emergence of an effective postcolonial voice because "to name reality is to exert power over it, simply because the dominant language becomes the way in which it is known" (107) as expressed by Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffin in *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*.

There are several responses to this dominance of the imperial language. The process of radical decolonization proposed by Ngugi Wa Thiong'o is a good demonstration. His critical essay *On the Abolition of the English Department* is the most prominent writing also for the construction of postcolonial theory. As the title suggests, he wants to abolish English department and wants to build up an African department of literature and linguistics. In his own words, "We have argued the case for the abolition of the present department of English in the collage, and the establishment of a department of African literature and languages. This is not a change of names only. We have to establish the centrality of Africa in the department" (441). This expression constructs a new tradition in the field of education and culture to dismantle the European tradition that has forced textual embodiment. Ngugi's programme for restoring an ethnic or national identity embedded in the mother tongue involves a rejection of English, a refusal to use it for his writing or a refusal to submit to the political dominance its use implies.

The nineteenth century in Europe was a time of industrialization. Factories in Europe required raw materials to be manufactured into marketable products. As a result, Europeans sought both a source of raw materials, as well as, a market for manufactured goods in Africa. This economic motivation played a large role in the colonization of Africa.

European colonization of Africa underdeveloped the country. Europeans had exploited the resources throughout the nation without making much progress in developing the colonies it controlled. Due to the slave trade and the virtual slavery in many of the European colonies in Africa, the number of inhabitants in Africa dropped significantly, leaving an insufficient number of natives to cultivate and develop the country. Many Africans also did not have a sufficient education to rule a country.

Irony can be used as a weapon to deconstruct and decenter the dominant discourses. The subversive political function of irony is a tool for the structure where the unsaid meaning is related to the repressed, marginalized and colonized. In this regard, Linda Hutcheon says, "The subversive function of irony is often connected to the view that it is a self critical, self knowing, self reflexive mode that has the potentials to offer [...] transformative power" (30). So, it is very difficult to sort out or to understand the subversive political function of irony. As irony has intimate relationship with dominant power, it gives strength to the oppositional. When irony becomes provocative its politics is conservative and when it is used by oppositional it becomes subversive. Coetzee rewrites Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* as *Foe*. He has the sympathies for the colonized, nonwhites and the subaltern people. He is in opposition of Defoe's oriental images which increase the gap between the West and the rest. To dismantle the stereotypes created for the colonized, marginalized and the subaltern people, Coetzee ironically subverts those stereotypical images in his *Foe* adopting the subversive function of irony which gives voice to the voiceless colonized like black Friday.



### III. Subversion of Colonial Discourse in Coetzee's *Foe*

#### Valorization of Colonial Discourse in Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*

*Robinson Crusoe* is the original adventure novel by Daniel Defoe who published it in the year 1719 when the position of the colonial people was no different from cattle. The colonizers-- the whites and males were the leaders of the world. The period, eighteenth century was under the grip of colonization. The very novel takes place during the time when it was the dream of many young Englishmen to go overseas and to spread the British Empire. *Robinson Crusoe* is the novel that regards colonization as a civilizational enterprise.

*Robinson Crusoe* is the first person narrative of a fictionalized character- Crusoe who, after his initial journeys to the sea and South America, finds himself washed up on the shore of a deserted island. Through his resourcefulness he survives and even thrives, especially in the areas of farming and raising goats. Crusoe travels with a young African boy named Xury and makes his way to Brazil. Before starting his journey, Crusoe becomes sure of Xury's faithfulness to him: "Xury, if you will be faithful to me I'll make you a great man" (16). Again, Crusoe is ready even to kill Xury in case of not being faithful to him: "I must throw you into the sea" (16). Crusoe's boastful nature and his superior attitudes towards a poor African boy can be felt in the aforementioned lines. The colonizer's mastery upon the colonized is reflected here: "I let the captain have him"(25). Crusoe does not have any rebellious thoughts towards the proposition of the captain to buy Xury's freedom. Rather he takes it as a chance or an opportunity for something for the captain in return as on the way to Brazil, they were rescued by the captain. The deal is sealed when the captain promises to allow for Xury's freedom after ten years converting the slave into a Christian. In this way, we may visualize the scene of buying and selling of freedom of

a poor boy. In this regard, we can say that *Robinson Crusoe* follows the trend of racial superiority of the then European society.

Crusoe uses money to buy some land in Brazil and begins a successful farming operation. Again, he decides to become a Slave trader in order to get cheap labour for his plantation. He is reduced from his settled life. He builds home, strong fortifications, ploughs the land, carefully and methodically overcomes starvation and illness, loneliness and doubt, frustration and discomfort: "I sought for a moister piece of ground to make another trail in, and I dug up a piece of ground near my new bower, and sowed the rest of my seed in February" (80). After not growing Crusoe's first seeds, he attempts for the next chance and the mentioned line shows Crusoe's laborious activities for making a living on the uninhabited island. Through hard work, common sense and ingenuity, he improvises approximation of the comforts he remembers from his English home.

While passing through *Robinson Crusoe*, we may encounter with several examples that show Crusoe living in a cozy cave instead of shelter. His furniture is no longer rough, he also employs himself in making baskets for the various purposes to make a work easier: "I employed myself in making, as well as I could, a great many baskets both to carry earth, or to carry or lay up anything as I had occasion. And..., yet I made them sufficiently serviceable for my purpose" (82). And, though he is unskilled in making pots, with great labor (in about two months labor), he makes two larger earthen pots. In short, his life has settled into a quiet routine of work and worship. These are a few examples through which we come to know about the valorization of eighteenth century individualism. In this regard, *Robinson Crusoe* glorifies the eighteenth century individualism, patriarchy, and capitalism in Crusoe's stay on an island for twenty-eight years with a complete homely environment

discloses the secrecy of the then European society which even glorifies the norms of alienation. Despite his dwellings, he has a small field of grain; goats to supply milk and even pet parrot down of catching a young parrot (he knocks the parrot down with a stick and recovers it) and his teaching him to speak his name glorify him as an imperialist Englishman who colonizes not only the island but gets even the creature to speak and repeat his name: "Poor Robinson Crusoe! When are you? Where have you been? How come you here? And such things as I had taught him" (19). In this way, Crusoe trains and civilizes the native creature.

As we go through the novel- *Robinson Crusoe* we come to encounter with another African- Friday, a loyal servant and companion to Crusoe. As the novel written from true British imperialist fashion, we may find the sense of Crusoe's superiority, i.e. each Englishman desired to be superior and to spread the British Empire: "He came close to me, and laid his head upon the ground and taking me by the foot, set my foot upon my head" (150). The first person narrative of a fictionalized character in the afore-mentioned line, regards Crusoe as a lordly figure, which clearly differentiates the two human figures- Crusoe and Friday.

As the imperialist dream is the theme of the novel, it takes place during the age when new colonies were being established and the explorers were being idealized. So, Crusoe is the representative of the Englishmen who has the desire to colonize the island and to civilize the native: "I likewise taught him to say master, and then let him know that was to be my name" (158). Crusoe wants to be called master all the times as he hides his real name. Crusoe's superiority over Friday further stretches when Crusoe teaches and civilizes Friday. He teaches Friday to say 'yes' and 'no' and to know the meaning of them. He gets Friday to do so and have it. Though called a companion, Friday is really no more than a servant whom Crusoe civilizes in every

way- dressing him in English fashion, giving him a British name and turning him into a Christian: "[...] And I gave him a cap, which I had made of a hare skin, every convenient and fashionable enough [...]" (159).

A description of the average Englishmen of the early eighteenth century can be elaborated when Crusoe begins to instruct Friday in the knowledge of the true God. He tells Friday, pointing up towards Heaven: "The great Maker of all things lived up that..." (166). Not only this but also Crusoe further differentiates between God and Devil, which Friday listens seriously as if he knows nothing about them. Friday's innocent questions regarding God and Devil to Crusoe prove that *Robinson Crusoe* is the product of the eighteenth century English bigotry and chauvinism. The novel really regards the natives like Friday as innocent and uncivilized and Crusoe's descriptions and answers of each question regard him as civilized and intellectual colonizer. In this way, Friday gets answers and knows the difference between God and Devil: he is Christianized by Crusoe. Crusoe's attempts to turn Friday into a Christian show his colonizing mentality: "The savage was now a good Christian" (169). The line expresses how Friday is inferior in regards himself as a master and his mission is to "civilize" the savages.

*Robinson Crusoe* is the product of the then European society which lacks the sufficient role for the minorities. Defoe's novel excludes the voice of females- his wife, daughter, sister and so on, which can be found in Crusoe's narration but all of them are forgotten to provide any significant role. Only Crusoe is master of Defoe's narration. Subaltern are excluded from the famous legendry of eighteenth century. In this way, we can say that Defoe's very novel was built upon the male ideologies, which glorify individualism, and male chauvinism, which totally disregards the inclusion of female, non-Whites and the subaltern people.

On the uninhabited island, Crusoe takes stock of available resources and his beginning to design himself as an Englishman as he feels superior to all those unfortunates or the darker-skinned races, like other Englishmen, he believes it is his duty to civilize all non-Europeans. The novel can be taken as an example of eighteenth century English imperialism and materialism. Although Crusoe never abandons Friday, even taking the slave with him to England, he never thinks of offering Friday his freedom.

### **Politics Behind the Use of a Female (Susan Barton) as a Narrator in *Foe***

South African white writer, J.M. Coetzee in 1986, published a novel entitled *Foe*. Coetzee's *Foe* is a radical revision of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*: it dismantles allegorical and canonical myth of Robinson from different perspectives. Coetzee explores an alternative telling of Crusoe's story. *Foe* is the feminist, postmodernist and postcolonial rewriting of Defoe's classic novel *Robinson Crusoe* with the deliberate aim of rejecting its canonical formulation of colonial encounter. The presentation of a female narrator in *Foe* is a dramatic contrast to the presentation of the male narrator in *Robinson Crusoe*. Susan Barton, a female character and the protagonist of the novel replaces Crusoe as a narrator.

Coetzee's *Foe* parodies *Robinson Crusoe* in order to subvert colonial discourse valorized in *Robinson Crusoe*. Susan Barton- the narrator cum protagonist of the novel *Foe* appears to encounter with Cruso, his servant- Friday and the author- Defoe. She tries to explore the loopholes of their ideologies into flash. She challenges Crusoe for his remaining indifferent towards the sufferings of colonized Friday who has been portrayed as a tongueless non-White African and has been living with Crusoe for fifteen years as his servant: "It is a terrible story [...] where is the justice in it? First a

slave and now a castaway too. Robbed of his childhood and consigned to a life of silence. Was Providence sleeping?" (*Foe* 230).

Coetzee's *Foe* gives adequate role to the female. The myth is changed from male centralism to female centralism. Susan Barton passes through different modes of life. While going through her journey in search of her lost daughter, she is shipwrecked on an island which has already been inhabited by Crusoe and Friday. The island story is dominated by her. On the island, she adopts a masculine identity: "I am a castaway, not a prisoner" (20). The voice of Susan has potentiality of modern woman status. She is a prisoner of the island but not of the man who rules the island. Coetzee portraying Barton as a radical feminist unravels the historical oppression upon women on the one hand, and shows that woman should be treated as human not as slave, on the other hand. So, Coetzee through his female narrator cum protagonist spreads the impression that both male and female have equal rights and responsibilities. In this way, giving a central role to a female, Coetzee tries to deconstruct the phallogocentric images of *Robinson Crusoe* and giving voice to the marginalized, he tries to uplift those who had been shadowed. Coetzee always takes the side of the marginalized and the subaltern people. So, he makes Susan Barton deliberately enter the fictional world and replace Crusoe as the narrator. This is the major variation from Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*.

In *Foe*, Coetzee portrays Crusoe as a cruel and inhuman colonizer who cuts out Friday's tongue: "Crusoe cut out Friday's tongue" (*Foe* 68). Instead of treating Friday as a fellow human being, Crusoe treats him as an inanimate object or thing regarding his position insignificant to him. Crusoe does not listen to colonized Friday and he is indifference towards Friday's individuality, justice, equality and freedom. Capturing the very inhuman aspect of Crusoe, Susan attacks him for his cruelties inflicted upon

the colonized: "It seemed to me that all things were possible on the island, all tyrannies and cruelties though in small"(37). Not only this but Susan further elaborates Crusoe's self-centredness: "If your master truly wished to be a colonist and leave behind a colony, would he not have been better advised to plant his seed in the only womb there was?"(83). From this line, we can assume that Susan regards Crusoe as a foolish and the short--sighted colonizer.

If we deeply analyze the text, we can find the metaphorical significance of the colony. The whole colony stands for the female body. The male's colonization can be compared to the exploitation of the female body. It is the male domination over the female. Crusoe-the power of white male does not want any changes on the island: "[...] the simple truth was, Crusoe would brook no change on his island" (27). It shows that Crusoe tries to continue traditional power of male domination but Susan's consciousness presents herself modern woman demanding her rights and seeking to accomplish her needs.

Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* was written in the eighteenth century which valorizes the European values. Position of women, colonized and the blacks was no different from the cattle. The very novel excludes the voice of female, colonized and the blacks. In this way, subalterns are excluded from the famous legendry of eighteenth century. But, Coetzee by counting one of the representative texts of European Enlightenment project, *Robinson Crusoe* points out the exclusive politics, Eurocentricism and racial bias in the so-called Enlightenment rationalism and advocates for the marginalized people--women, non-Whites and the subaltern people--and in so doing, Coetzee tries to give importance to femaleness and challenges not only the inherited worldview of patriarchal structures and tries to deconstruct the male oriented discourse of *Robinson Crusoe* but also tries to give the voice to the

marginalized and protagonist. In order to counter patriarchal hegemony, Coetzee deliberately replaces the earlier narrator of *Robinson Crusoe* and gives adequate role to his female, Susan Barton, making her narrator in *Foe* points out not only racial prejudice but also gender bias of *Crusoe* and Defoe. While recounting male domination: "Foe kissed me again, and drew away. But he held me close and I felt him suck my wound" (139), it shows that Coetzee's *Foe* satirises colonialism not only for valorization of racism but also for its exaggeration of the patriarchal values during the colonial era. Moreover, *Robinson Crusoe* valorizes individualism and alienation, *Foe* takes such values as the products of selfishness. Therefore, Susan regards Daniel Defoe as foe because of his indifference to the pain and sufferings of non-Whites and subaltern people.

Coetzee portraying Susan Barton as a major character of his novel does not hesitate to provide her all the responsibilities. From the very beginning of the novel, Susan is closer to Friday. She observes and examines each and every activity performed by Friday. She is much concerned with Friday's speechlessness. She feels compassion for him. She thinks it is her duty to take care of him in all things: "I tell myself I take to Friday to educate him out of darkness and silence [...]" (60). The line shows human treatment of Susan towards Friday. Her desire to educate a black male shows her greatness: "He is not free, but he is not in subjection, he is his own master, in law, and has been since *Crusoe's* death" (150). It is Susan's compassion that she tries to send him to Africa offering his freedom.

As Coetzee's *Foe* is a parody of *Robinson Crusoe*, it critiques colonial discourse valorized in Defoe's allegory of colonization. Coetzee parodies it in order to show the weakness and loopholes on *Robinson Crusoe*-- one of the classics of English literature which was built upon a society constructed by the male ideologies. Coetzee,



by making his female narrator, Susan Barton, parody *Robinson Crusoe* subverts the false ideologies asserted by Defoe such as colonialism, racism, capitalism sexism and so on. As Defoe writes the very novel being based upon the patriarchal values, the novel also takes place during the period when it was dream of many young English whites to go overseas and to spread the colony. So, Defoe's novel is written from the perspective of white colonizer as if Defoe himself is also one of the members of those colonizers. So, it is essential for Coetzee to counter such colonialist discourse. Therefore, he writes his novel *Foe* from the perspective of marginalized people like female, Susan Barton who represents the pain of colonized Friday.

In contrast to the male traditional values found in *Robinson Crusoe*, Coetzee introduces *Foe* in which a female character, Susan Barton, a narrator cum protagonist of the novel through whose perspective and position events and other characters like Crusoe, Friday and Foe are introduced and evaluated. In this way, by making his female narrator--Susan Barton resist against Crusoe and Foe, Coetzee tries to deconstruct the phallogentric images of *Robinson Crusoe*. Not only this but he also turns the story, characters and subjective position of Defoe's novel on their heads to disrupt the notions of truth, trust and story. The presence of female discourse and female narrative voice is a major variation from Defoe's narrative which lacks even a female character and a female discourse.

### **Crusoe's Island As an Allegory of Colony**

J.M. Coetzee's *Foe* is a radical rethinking of Daniel Defoe's desert island myth *Robinson Crusoe* which is largely based on the superiorizing European values that always disregard the sufferings of the colonized, marginalized and the subaltern people and for the very cause, Defoe has been reintroduced as a Foe because of his indifference towards the sufferings of those marginalized people. To draw a new

framework so that all the dominated people could be included, Coetzee revisits Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and serves us his masterpiece *Foe*. The novel represents the major events including the characters- Crusoe and Friday, and specially, the desert island carries allegorical significance as Paul de Man opines.

Coetzee's writing is very much allegorical and that allegory is deeply rooted in the reality of his country. Coetzee parodies the allegory of colonialism, *Robinson Crusoe* as the allegory of every colony but not only of South Africa. Crusoe is the typical representative figure of the Englishmen-- the colonizer and poor Friday stands for the non-White African-- the colonized. Friday represents all of the Afrikaners who were denied even to speak. Here, it is symbolic significance to mention Friday's tonguelessness: Coetzee's deliberate aim to represent Friday as victimized in the hands of cruel colonizer. It is not important by whom Friday was made tongueless. His tongue might have been cut out or not literally, but, Coetzee representing Friday as a tongueless non-White tries to show the colonizers' cruelties upon the colonized. The colonizers white have silenced the black majority as cruelly as Crusoe does or according to him, the slaves silenced Friday. Now, it is obvious that the communication gap between the whites and the non-Whites is intensified. The Blacks are taught only a few English words as Crusoe teaches Friday, they need to know to be functioned as servants or the employers of the English whites as George Orwell says in his masterpiece *Nineteen Eighty Four*. Similarly, the literal action of the white woman riding on the back of a black man is analogous to the figurative action of whites' progression exploiting the non-Whites: "The Negro offered me his back, indicating he would carry me" (6). Many of the African blacks have not really been taken from their country of origin, but, in a sense, many of them are just as dislocated as Friday. Friday is still a prisoner on this island as he was on Crusoe's island as

Crusoe once said: "The world is full of islands" (71). African blacks are basically non-citizens in their own country. The homelands are prison--like islands where many more fruitful dreams were deferred many times, to which blacks are assigned. A reflection of Friday's sexless life also carries a symbolic meaning-- the black mine workers often lived far away leaving their children and wives behind. This removal of blacks from where they have settled is to make way for the whites.

As Friday is speechless, he has no capacity to come to be an equal with his master. It seems that it is Cruso's mercy upon Friday which makes him exist. Friday is waiting all the time to take the orders from Cruso as he has really been regarded a wordless and therefore, worthless creature. In spite of his becoming a human being, he is treated like an animal- a dog, faithful to his master: "My first thought was that Friday was like a dog that heeds but one master [...]'" (21). Friday obeys his master without any delay: he brings firewood" he hums for Susan Barton and he opens his mouth obeying the orders of his master as his responsibility" shows that the relation between Cruso and Friday is like that of colonizer and the colonized. It is Coetzee's politics to represent Friday as a poor and dominated creatures to show that the colonized and dominated creature to show the colonized like Friday were deprived of their freedom.

While parodying *Robinson Crusoe*, Coetzee represents Crusoe as a cruel and inhuman colonizer who treats colonized like Friday as a tongueless fellow in metaphorical sense. He is so obedient and faithful to his master--Crusoe that he deserves no punishment: "He has known no other master. He follows me in all things" (37). Friday has been represented as an electronic device whose key is with Crusoe. He operates that machine as he wishes. How Friday has been commodified in the hand of Crusoe is clear from this line: "Friday lost his tongue before he became mine"

(37). The world “mine” in this expressed line shown that Friday is Crusoe’s belonging. Regarding Crusoe’s indifference towards Friday’s individuality justice, equality and freedom, Susan attacks Crusoe for his cruelties. She takes him as a foolish, short-sighted and self-centered colonizer: “if your master truly wished to be a colonist and leave behind a colony, would to he not have been better advised to plant his seed in the only womb there was?” (83). Rather he creates stereotypes about colonized Friday to justify his colonization: “I found Friday has still a hankering stomach after some of flesh and was still a cannibal in his nature (*Robinson Crusoe* 159). Therefore, in order to counter and subvert Crusoe’s stereotypes on Friday, Barton says: “I saw no cannibals” (*Foe* 54). Further she opines colonization as a barbaric act and the colonized like Friday should achieve independence from colonization: “[Friday] is his own master [...] and has been since Crusoe’s death” (*Foe* 150). In this way, we can say that the relation of Crusoe and Friday is like the relation of colonizer and the colonized.

Coetzee tries to subvert the European values which were valorized during the colonial era and especially the eighteenth century and the novel *Robinson Crusoe* is inclusive for the valorization. Coetzee, by countering one of the representative texts of European Enlightenment project, *Robinson Crusoe* points out the exclusive politics and racial bias in the so-called Enlightenment rationalism and advocates for alternative modernities in favour of such deliberate changes to symbolize the supposedly diseased African government, and Crusoe's death carries one of the most meaningful significance-- his death is the death of the barbaric colonization and this is the hope of overturning that government.

### **Friday's Resistance Against Colonialism**

J. M. Coetzee's *Foe* which is radical revision of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, among many other things, is about colonialism and the part it plays in the

creation of a personal as well as national identity. It is a novel about making out masculine space and defining its limits and parameters. It is a tale of a language of white Englishman, as that language is used as an instrument which plays significant role to carry out the theme directly or indirectly, slave-master relationship and the need of freedom.

As mentioned earlier, the relationship between Crusoe and Friday is the relation between colonizer and the colonized, here the way, how Friday resists against colonialism will be the primary concern in this research.

As Coetzee's *Foe* parodies *Robinson Crusoe* in order to subvert colonial discourse valorized in *Robinson Crusoe*, he points out the Eurocentrism, racial bias and the exclusive politics and also advocates for the alternative modernities in favour of the marginalized, non-Whites and subaltern people. From the very beginning of the story, Friday has been represented as a tongueless or speechless non-White. His silence is the major cause of his being oppressed. He is further imprisoned by his inability to understand English. Of course, he has no voice against the domination but it does not mean that he has no means of resistance. Friday parodies his author, Foe both in dress up and voice: "The man seated at the table was not Foe; it was Friday with Foe's robes on his back and Foe's wig, filthy as a bird's nest on his head" (151). Moreover, Friday's resistance with subversive purpose can be realized when he appropriates colonizer Crusoe's standard English: " "La-la-la," said Crusoe and motioned to Friday to repeat. "Ha-ha-ha," said Friday from the back of his throat" (22). Such mimicry is a powerful means of resistance against colonizer. Friday's laughing by producing 'ha-ha-ha' sound towards Crusoe reflects his mockery towards the colonizer. In this regard, Friday's mimicry is a mode of resistance against colonization.

One of the ways of resistance against the colonization is to remain silent all the time. Yes, Friday also has the passive resistance. He endures the hardships without any reaction. He obeys his master and behaves as a faithful dog does. He becomes commodified in the hand of Cruso- the colonizer. Cruso exploits Friday in every manner. Friday, too, does not forward himself in any kind of active disagreement with Cruso. When Susan Barton says: "[...] his mutilation was secret"(24), of course, a kind of secret should have resided behind his lips. This secrecy is beyond the approach of everyone's knowledge and at a time, all of sudden, this secrecy will blast with loud noise carrying all the unfair activities to an end.

Time and again, Friday plays his reed flute, always the same. As Susan speculates: "[...] [h]e would play over and over again oh his little reed flute of six notes, always the same" (28). The little reed flute is Friday's weapon which protects him from being dominated. It is one of his means through which he liberates himself from Cruso's grip. He does not bother to play the same "damnable tune" (29) continuously, whereas Susan and Cruso appear to consider Friday's tune as boring, it means that they are not conscious about Friday's liberation. But, Friday repeating the same tune, releases himself from the colonized domination and symbolically advocates for the preservation of African cultural heritage. He tries to resist the colonizing mentality of Cruso creating a kind of boredom inside him: "Friday ceased his noise" (29), expresses Susan's inability to understand the meaning of that noise. The same tune expresses his pain and suffering that liberates him to his native land, Africa.

As Friday's playing of his little reed flute carries deep symbolic significance as his one of the protesting means, his 'dance' is also worthy to mention as another medium to release him from the colonizer's grip: "All the while he dances he makes a

humming noise in his throat, deeper than his usual voice; sometimes he seems to be singing" (92). Along with his dances, his humming noise is also a significant aspect. In his humming, he might have rebuked Cruso, the colonizer for treating him as worthless creature or he also might have prayed to god to release him from this painful moment. Whatever the speculation can be, the important point lies here when Susan discovers the secret of Friday's dance: "I understood why Friday had danced all day in your house; it was to remove himself, or his spirit, from Newington and England, and from me too" (104). His dance is the representative of African blacks as they are famous for their dances. And, when Friday dances, his dance appears to represent his custom, which can be the most effective means to resist the colonization and also to assert his freedom.

Friday's playing of the little reed flute continuously, always the same tune, his dances humming within against Cruso's domination and his desire for freedom are reflected in his desire to liberate himself to his native land-Africa. As Susan thinks "[...] writing is the manifest of a speech spoken within ourselves or to ourselves" (142). Friday's such activity is also the reflection of his desire to free himself from Cruso's colonization. When Friday lost his tongue, the powerful implement of speech to resist against the domination, his means of resisting has become effective activities. Friday's tongue might have been cut out thinking that there will remain no means to resist the domination. But, it is not the case always. There may appear various means as Friday has adopted to resist the domination:

Speech is but a means through which the word may be uttered, it is not the word itself. Friday has no speech, but he has fingers, and those fingers shall be his means. Even it has no fingers, even if the slavers

had looped them all off, he can hold a stick of charcoal between his toes, or between his teeth, lime the beggars on the Strand. (143)

Of course, speech can be the strong means to raise the voice, but it does not mean that speech is lost, every means to resist is lost. There are still so many means left behind for the resistance as Friday has got. The "fingers", "toes" and "stick of charcoal" are the source of means through which one may rise against any kind of domination and colonization.

As Coetzee's *Foe* is largely based upon counter reading of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, a lot of attention should be paid to it. *Robinson Crusoe* valorizes the colonial discourse; it regards colonial activity as a civilizational mission. As the novel affected by the eighteenth century English imperialist fashion, Defoe has presented himself as one of the members of the colonizers. But Coetzee's *Foe* subverts that valorization spreading the impression that *Robinson Crusoe* depends upon the exclusive politics. Coetzee further asserts that colonization is not a civilization mission but a barbaric act. Therefore, Coetzee through Susan Barton wants to express that human beings should not be separated in terms of color race and gender. human is human and there is no exception of it. From the time of being castaway on the island, Susan's primary concern becomes Friday. Crusoe's each and every activity against Friday is in humane. But she regards him only as a human being. Coetzee again gives us the impression that the caged bird and the colonized humans are the same because each of them has the desire of freedom: "Friday's desires are not dark to me. He desires to be liberated, as I do too. Our desires are plain, his and mine" (148). So, Coetzee's novel *Foe* valorizes the need for freedom, not the colonization which is the major variation from Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, which regards colonial discourse as a civilizational enterprise.



For his valorization of European colonialism, Defoe has been represented as Foe, an enemy of the colonized. Coetzee points out Defoe's power politics behind the (mis)representation of the colonized. To counter colonialist discourse, Coetzee writes his novel from the perspective of the marginalized female Susan Barton and about the untold suffering of the colonized Friday. As Friday has been represented as tongueless non-White, it is Coetzee who tries to give voice to the voiceless Friday. Coetzee further asserts the fact that during the period- eighteenth century, the so-called age of Enlightenment, silence or speechlessness of colonized Friday could be the strongest resistance against colonization. Again, by showing Crusoe cut out Friday's tongue, Coetzee wants to forward the message that colonization is the cruel and barbaric act. It never can be for the purpose of civilizational purpose.

Freedom is a word- a name that everyone desires to get. One does not need to know the meaning; it is the desire that matters: "Freedom is but the name we give to the desire you speak of, the desire to be free. What concerns us is the desire, not the name" (*Foe* 149). The importance of freedom is equal even to Friday though he cannot spell out even his name. Regarding Freedom as essential desire for human beings, Barton provides Friday his freedom taking him to his native land, Africa: "This is a place where bodies are their own sings. It is the home of Friday" (157). Placing individual freedom many steps ahead Coetzee wants to clarify that colonization is a barbaric act and it never carries any civilizational aim. What regards most is freedom.

#### IV. Conclusion

Through the comparative study between Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Coetzee's *Foe*, we come to know that Coetzee's *Foe* creates the impression that Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* is one of the classics of English literature built upon a society constructed by the colonial male ideology where there are no women and in so doing, *Foe* reminds us of historical oppression upon women. *Foe* which is largely based upon *Robinson Crusoe* subverts the colonial discourse which was valorized in the original text. In other word, *Robinson Crusoe* valorises Eurocentricism and racial bias and the so-called Enlightenment rationalism which have been subverted by Coetzee in *Foe*. Coetzee points out the exclusive politics of *Robinson Crusoe*. Likewise, Coetzee counters patriarchal hegemony of *Robinson Crusoe* and tries to give voice to the marginalized or colonized such as female and the black people. Again, *Robinson Crusoe* takes place during the time when it was the dream of many young Englishmen to go to overseas and to enlarge the British Empire; the very novel also reminds us of historical oppression of the whites upon the non-Whites. In this regard, Coetzee's *Foe* subverts the false notion of Robinson myth and establishes awareness that colonization is a barbaric act.

Coetzee's *Foe* is the parody of *Robinson Crusoe*. Coetzee makes Susan Barton, the narrator cum protagonist of the novel counter patriarchal ideology and colonialist discourse. For that purpose, Coetzee deliberately replaces the earlier narrator of *Robinson Crusoe* and gives Barton adequate role to counter the cruelties of the colonizer inflicted upon the colonized. The female narrator, Barton points out the racial prejudice and the gender bias of *Crusoe* and (De)foe. To compete with the Enlightenment rationality, Barton's role as a representative of victims advocates for alternative modernities.

He makes Susan Barton deliberately parody *Robinson Crusoe*. It is either through him or the narrator, Susan Barton is responsible for the images created in the novel. Not only the narrative of *Foe* is presented through Barton's perspective but she also understands male domination and tries to revolt throughout the novel. Being the only narrator of the novel, all the characters and the events are filtered through her consciousness. Therefore, Barton has been presented to counter Crusoe's narrative of *Robinson Crusoe* which is based upon the false male ideologies which disregard the importance of female characters, whereas the narrative of *Foe* is fully presented through Susan's determination and consciousness. In other words, Coetzee's *Foe* is an alternative narrative to Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*.

Of course, the narrator and the incidents are taken from *Robinson Crusoe*. But they are represented from different perspective in *Foe*. Both Crusoe and Defoe, the narrator and writer of *Robinson Crusoe* are presented with ironic touch. By adding Cruso's death before reaching England which carries the symbolic significance of the end of colonialism. Therefore, Coetzee tries to minimize the roles of Cruso(e) and (De)foe in his novel *Foe*, whereas Susan Barton presented as a conscious, determined and desirous person is capable to struggle with Cruso and Foe for her and colonized Friday's existence.

In this regard, Crusoe's island is the allegory of colony where Cruso is the representative of the white colonizers whereas Friday stands for the non-White colonized. In *Foe*, Coetzee portrays Cruso as well as (De)foe as cruel and inhuman beings. Cruso does not care Friday's individuality, justice and freedom. Throughout the novel, Susan's primary concern is Friday's tonguelessness. She is haunted by the problem faced by Friday. Every time, she tries to know the essence of this secrecy behind his tonguelessness. For this regard, her struggle in the novel can be understood

not only for the sake of women. Rather, her personal attachment with Friday proves that she is fighting for humanity.

Coetzee subverts the old structure of discourse and serves us with new one from the victimized's position which provides free role to female and colonized like Barton and Friday respectively. Coetzee, thus, advocates for 'strategic essentialism' from the side of the victims.

## Works Cited

- Achroft, Bill; Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.  
London: Routledge, 1989.
- . *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse."  
*The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994. 85-92.
- Bishop, G. Scott. "J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*: A Culmination and a Solution To a Problem  
of White Identity." *World Literature Today*. 64.90 (Winter 2004): 54-57.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford: Oxford  
University Press, 2005.
- Castillo, Debra A. "The Mythic Punctum." *Modern Language Association* 105.5  
(1990): 1108-22.
- Coetzee, J.M. *Foe*. London: Penguin Books, 1986.
- Cornwell, Gareth. "Realism, Rape and Disgrace." *Critique* 43.4 (2002): 307-19.
- Culler, Jonathan. "Post-Colonial Theory." *Literary Theory*. New York: Oxford  
University Press, 1997.
- Darguniou, Dana. "Existential Doubt and Political Responsibility in J.M. Coetzee's  
*Foe*." *Academic Source Premier* 42.3 (2001): 309-27.
- Defoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe*. 1719. London: Wordsworth Editions Limited,  
2000.
- Foucault, Michel. "Truth and Power." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams.  
Fort Worth: Harcourt, 1992.

- Hutcheon, Linda. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Leusmann, Harold. "J.M. Coetzee's Cultural Critique." *World Literature Today* 78.3 (2004): 60-65.
- Moore, John Rees. "J.M. Coetzee and *Foe*." *Sewanee Review* 98.1 (winter 1990): 1-5.
- Post, Robert M. "The Noise of Freedom: J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*". *Critique* (1989): 143-54.
- Said, Edward. Introduction. *Cultural and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 1994. xi-xxxii.
- . *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.1-136.
- Thing'O, Ngugi Wa. "The Abolition of English Department." *The Postcolonial Studies*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin: 438-52.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1999.