INEVITABLE POLITICS: RULERSHIP AND IDENTITY IN *ROBINSON CRUSOE*

FRANK DONOGHUE

During his stay on the island, Robinson Crusoe resorts to several politically expedient though still perplexing impersonations. Although he is in reality a plantation owner and part-time slave trader, he spends his first solitary years indulging in half-joking fantasies that he is a king. He continues this pose even after the native he names Friday, Friday's father, and a Spanish sailor arrive on the island. Once a group of English mutineers and their deposed captain appear, however, Crusoe is suddenly transformed into the island's "governour." And when, in the process of restoring the captain to power, the dishevelled Crusoe must address the imprisoned mutineers, he does so as the governor's jailor, threatening them with the awful wrath of his fictional superior. This odd series of transmutations, as I hope to show, is compounded by Crusoe's conflicted sense of his public self. Though he dearly wishes to be idealistically (and Puritanically) self-sufficient, he is repeatedly confronted with the unsettling sense that he is connected to the European world. The first of these self images has intrigued those who find in Crusoe's isolation an attractive myth of the self-sufficient man. But the rapid escalation of political and economic engagement between Europe and the Americas made the world of the seventeenth century an increasingly inclusive place, one that left less and less room for the kind of autonomy about which Crusoe fantasizes. I hope to rectify what I see as an imbalance in the critical history of *Robinson Crusoe* by making the case that Crusoe is never so solitary as he imagines himself, and moreover that the individual identity that he does possess is in a sense produced by the mercantilist world that he denies. That identity no sooner appears than it is immediately regularized and incorporated into an all but universal political network that erases earlier notions of privacy.[1]

By the end of his adventures, Crusoe is not only forced to acknowledge political authority and to compromise his behavior accordingly, but he is also forced to impersonate the figure of that authority on the island (by becoming

"governour") in order to survive. In other words, Crusoe participates alternately on both sides of the political-economic forces that polarized the world during the second half of the seventeenth century: the egoistic impulse towards commerce on a global scale (along with the renegade absolutism that Crusoe finds so appealing), and the corresponding desire to consolidate the state power to which that commerce posed a threat. Crusoe's identity, then, hovers in a kind of political limbo. He is not the king of the island, nor is he the island's governor, or the governor's jailor; his readiness to abandon each of these offices suggests that he never really inhabited any of them in the first place. His efforts to define himself privately are thwarted, while his attempts to define himself politically—the playful as well as the desperate—are necessarily multiple and inauthentic.

The history of mythic interpretations of Crusoe originates with Defoe himself, who, in *Serious Reflections* (1720), the third installment of the series of books he wrote about Crusoe, presents his hero's adventures as allegorical. To treat Crusoe as an allegorical figure is to perceive him as a free-standing gloss on civilization rather than as an individual embedded in it and answerable to all its customs and conventions. The danger in treating Crusoe as a type, in other words, is that one can be led into the mistaken assumptions that he exists independently of the European civilization that he attempts to reproduce and that the island comes for the duration of his stay simply to replace the world. Such a view authorizes the idealized terms in which Crusoe creates his own political fantasy. During the first third of the novel, when he most frequently represents himself as king, the issue of rivalry figures as the chief threat; Crusoe is virtually obsessed with reassuring himself that everything in his political world is his property, and that everyone is properly subjected and completely under his control. Before the island is populated, he states:

> I was Lord of the whole Mannor; or if I pleas'd, I might call my self King, or Emperor over the whole Country which I had Possession of. There were no Rivals. I had no Competitor, none to dispute Sovereignty or Command with Me.[2]

And after the rescue of the Spaniard and Friday's father he reiterates his claim:

> My Island was now peopled, and I thought myself very rich in Subjects; and it was a merry Reflection which I frequently made, How like a King I look'd. First of all, the whole Country was my own meer Property; so that I had an undoubted Right of Dominion. *2ndly*, My People were perfectly subjected: I was absolute Lord and Law-giver; they all owed their Lives to me, and were ready to lay down their Lives, *if there had been Occasion of it*, for me. (p. 241)

Crusoe's vaunting is an attempt to reaffirm the status that so many of his readers all too readily grant him: that of being singular, independent, and self-

determined. But I would suggest instead that he makes his assertions in response to a well-founded and politically pragmatic set of fears. For the island is not Crusoe's and its inhabitants are not his subjects. The island is located not far from the mouth of the Oroonoko River, and East-Southeast of Trinidad (p. 215), and is therefore almost certainly in the domain of either Spain or Portugal.[3] As Peter Hulme points out, "the only uninhabited land in America [in the mid-seventeenth century] tended to be uninhabitable . . . the Amerindians would certainly not have ignored Crusoe's remarkably fertile island unless they had been driven off by the European competition for Caribbean land which was in full swing by 1659."[4] Thus Crusoe's possessiveness of the island is an expression of his fantasy of isolation and an attempt to suppress his more plausible suspicions that someone else owns it. His full awareness of the identities of his potential rivals becomes clear as soon as a European lands on the island. During his ambush of the savages who have brought three victims to feast upon, Crusoe shrewdly addresses the white man among the prisoners in Portuguese and shows no surprise when the man turns out to be Spanish (p. 235). Later, Crusoe attempts to establish legitimate authority over the English mutineers who land on the island by addressing them in Spanish, that is, in one of the most likely languages of a colonial government in that area (p. 254). These choices suggest that Crusoe harbors specific suspicions that his real situation differs fundamentally from the absolutist reverie in which he so often indulges. Moreover, they establish the pattern of compromise which characterizes the last part of the narrative, in which Crusoe consistently trades imaginary sovereignty for real political leverage.

Crusoe seems *least* aware of his status as a member of the imperialist European economic community, from which he is never for a moment excluded. Even during his twenty-eight year exile on the island, his estate in the Brasils, entrusted to a far-reaching, benevolent, conscientious mercantile network, continues to make money. Upon his return, Crusoe is astounded by the remarkable capacity of the economic system to include him as a member even while he has been physically absent from his own property:

> I was now Master, all on a Sudden, of above 5,000 £. *Sterling* in Money, and had an Estate, as I might well call it, in the *Brasils*, of above a thousand Pounds a year, as sure as an Estate of Lands in *England*: And in a Word, I was in a Condition which I scarce knew how to understand, or how to compose my self, for the Enjoyment of it. (p. 285)

The transitivity of capital insures that Crusoe's estate is interchangeable with any of comparable value in England, and that its value increases at a stable rate independently of his active management of it. Crusoe's astonishment at worldly economics leads Hulme to conceive of him as two characters rather

than one: the benevolent ruler of a simple, moral economy on the island and, at the same time, an enterprising slave owner in the world market. These divided selves, Hulme argues, are "a technique for negating the inseparable—and eventually uncloseable—gap between the violence of slavery and the notion of a moral economy." This constitutes what he calls the "colonial alibi," which serves to vindicate imperialism into the nineteenth century.[5]

But if we acknowledge that *Robinson Crusoe* functions as a denial of the reality of global economy, I think it is equally important to notice Crusoe's liminal understanding of the political conflicts implicit in his precarious situation on the island. The ever expanding boundaries of imperialist Europe repeatedly impinge upon and complicate Crusoe's naïve dreams, frequently forcing him to adjust his political self-image. He willingly abandons the office of benevolent sovereign when circumstances require it late in his stay. That is, Crusoe readily revises the "simple and moral" government that parallels the island's utopian economy—he appears at least on the verge of admitting that he is implicated in the global politics that are inevitably in force on the island. *Robinson Crusoe* is hardly anxious to excuse its hero through recourse to a "colonial alibi"; rather it seems eager to justify Crusoe's crimes as expedient police actions. Crusoe is forced, by the arrival of fellow Englishmen, to negotiate the closure of the gap that separates his "divided selves" and to reinsert himself into a universal imperialist narrative.

Or, perhaps more accurately, Crusoe *is inserted* into that narrative. His political status is destabilized from the moment he and Friday rescue Friday's father and the Spaniard from the band of savages that has taken them to the island. First he is mistaken for a god. After the rescue, made possible by the use of firearms, Crusoe polls his "two new Subjects" for their assessment of the surviving natives' reactions (p. 242). Friday's father's opinion is that they will thereafter consider Crusoe and Friday "Heavenly Spirits or Furies," a guess borne out by the fact that "the Savages never attempted to go over to the Island afterwards; they were so terrified . . . that they believ'd whoever went to that enchanted Island would be destroy'd with Fire from the Gods" (p. 243).

Though the notion that Crusoe transcends politics by being a god is short-lived, it is nevertheless the first impression that he evokes among the English captain and his two mates, victims of a mutiny, who are the next to arrive on the island. Crusoe dwells on his appearance as he approaches them:

> my Figure indeed was very fierce; I had my formidable Goat-Skin Coat on, with the great Cap I have mention'd, a naked Sword by my side, two Pistols in my Belt, and a Gun upon each Shoulder. (p. 253)

In a bizarre combination of political self-consciousness and outright fantasy, Crusoe, enjoying the thought of his other-worldly "*Spectre-like* Figure," nevertheless demonstrates once again a surprisingly shrewd awareness of his

place in this world: he addresses the men in Spanish, and speaks English only when they begin to flee. At this moment of greatest confusion, Crusoe does admit the fragility and insubstantiality of his "kingdom." When the captain, bewildered by Crusoe's wild appearance, asks, "*Am I talking to God, or Man! Is it a real Man or an Angel!*" Crusoe responds with uncharacteristic candor, "I am a Man, an *English-man*, and dispos'd to assist you, you see; I have one Servant only; we have Arms and Ammunition; tell us freely, Can we serve you?" (pp. 254-55). But in the military maneuvers that ensue, during which Crusoe, Friday, and the captain and his two mates are joined by three "Prisoners of War" who have come over to the captain's side, Crusoe assumes the quasi-official position of "*Generalissimo*" (p. 267).[6] As they surrender, one of the mutineers raises a mild objection, to which the captain replies by decisively placing Crusoe in a preexisting, readily available imperial hierarchy:

> the Captain told him he must lay down his Arms at Discretion, and trust to the Governour's Mercy, by which he meant me; for they all call'd me Governour. (p. 268)

Crusoe readily acquiesces to the role of governor that the Englishmen assign him, even though it represents a demotion from his previous rank of king. He soon demotes himself even further when he actually comes to deal with two of the mutineers who have surrendered to him:

> When I shew'd my self to the two Hostages, it was with the Captain, who told them, I was the Person the Governour had order'd to look after them, and that it was the Governour's Pleasure they should not stir any where, but by my Direction; that if they did, they should be fetch'd into the Castle, and be lay'd in Irons; so that as we never suffered them to see me as Governour, so I now appear'd as another Person, and spoke of the Governour, the Garrison, the Castle, and the like, upon all Occasions. (p. 271)

These improvisations are made seamlessly, without hesitation, as moves that require no explanation. Indeed, all that is left unsaid leaves the impression that Crusoe has never forgotten a cosmopolitanism borne of years of instantiation in the global political culture.

How can we account for the fluctuation in Crusoe's political self-representation once other people begin arriving on the island? My contention has been that we must keep in mind that the island, remote as it is, is nevertheless in and of the civilized world and not simply a replica of it. Crusoe demonstrates his awareness of this fact when he addresses the first refugee, the Spaniard, in Portuguese. During the brief interlude in which Crusoe has only three "Subjects"—Friday, Friday's father, and the Spaniard—he continues to think of himself as king. Only when Englishmen appear is Crusoe jolted from

his utopian monarchism. Since both Crusoe and the ship's captain owe allegiance to the king of England, Crusoe is forced to occupy a different role.[7]

But this does not completely solve the problem. There is considerable ideological over-determination associated with this transfer of power from the fantasy king, Crusoe, to the real king of England. As "Governour," Crusoe takes on the task of restoring the captain to his rightful place as ruler of the ship, an echo, perhaps, of the Restoration of Charles II in 1660. But Crusoe brings about the captain's restoration by means of a treacherous bluff. He has himself no legitimate authority over the mutineers and can get them to surrender only by lying about his military strength (saying he has fifty men armed and ready). That lie is relayed to the seamen by an ex-mutineer who shares Crusoe's name, Robinson (p. 267).

Crusoe's political allegiances are also highly ambiguous. As Michael Seidel observes, at the time of his shipwreck (September 30, 1659), the Protectorate was being reformed through one constitution after another, and the Restoration was imminent.[8] At the time of Crusoe's dealings with the mutineers James II was king but he was about to be deposed and replaced by William III, who would become England's ruler a year after Crusoe's return home on June 11, 1687. Given his place on the time-line of the late seventeenth century, it is very hard indeed to imagine what Crusoe's ideological position might be. He simply missed thirty of the most turbulent years in British political history, a period during which the proper relationship between king and subject was twice redefined, and during which the open secret of the king's divided loyalties (Charles' and James' Catholicism) was a constant subject of criticism.

Moreover, the chief instrument by which Crusoe negotiates his place in the political world outside the island—the contract—is always highly unstable. From the start, Crusoe's understanding of the nature of contracts is irrational. The contractual relationships into which he enters are absurdly lopsided, and all of them leave Crusoe himself undefined and his behavior unregulated. In the first of these arrangements, Crusoe enlists the help of Xury, a Moslem youth, in his escape from the Captain of the Turkish rover. With a loaded rifle in his hands, Crusoe says to the boy,

> "*Xury*, if you will be faithful to me I'll make you a great Man, but if you will not stroak your Face to be true to me, *that is, swear by* Mahomet *and his Father's Beard*, I must throw you into the Sea too." (p. 23)

In an astonishing display of naïve faith in the conventions of oath-taking, Crusoe firmly believes the boy's promise, even though it is a heathen oath sworn under palpable duress. He reveals an almost desperate hope that the contract will in effect define the boy. But Crusoe's own intentions and

behavior are nowhere to be found in this bond or in the subsequent developments in this episode. He places no restrictions on his own behavior except for a vague promise, and he breaks even that promise almost immediately, selling Xury into slavery as soon as he is rescued. His relationship with Xury anticipates all the ensuing social contracts that assume, with little or no warrant, Crusoe's unregulated dominance over other people. Friday is so named to remind the native of the day on which Crusoe saved his life, and Friday's first instructions are to call Crusoe "*Master*" (p. 206). Once the titles and hierarchy are established, Crusoe proceeds to reshape much of Friday's identity, a process that begins in earnest with instruction in Christianity and extends even to a meticulous concern with the native's new (non-cannibalistic) diet (p. 212). As more people arrive, Crusoe demands more and more oaths to assure himself that he is still in power and can control his chances for survival and rescue. The Spanish sailor, if he hopes to get off the island, must swear allegiance to Crusoe over his own countrymen (p. 245); the sixteen Spaniards shipwrecked on the mainland would, if there had been pen and ink available, have had to sign written promises of obedience to him (p. 248). Crusoe extracts a variety of commitments from the English prisoners, and when he decides to leave them on the island—over the captain's protests—he asserts:

> Upon this I seem'd a little angry with the Captain, and told him, That they were my Prisoners, not his; and that seeing I had offered them so much Favour, I would be as good as my Word. (p. 276)

Crusoe's "word," of course, in no way affects his behavior and actions except in the proper disposal of the prisoners who have, in his mind, come to be exclusively his own property. Moreover, the curious phrase, "I *seem'd* a little angry" reminds us that we are in the dark not only about how Crusoe will act, but also about how he really feels. Seidel argues that Crusoe is willing to step down from his fantasy of kingship and become an ordinary national subject "once certain conditions are met, certain contracts arranged, certain powers displayed."[9] But in fact, while Crusoe is obsessed with contracts, conditions, and arrangements, he uses these instruments to guarantee a degree of reliable behavior, indeed stable identity, which he is (with the one exception) never willing to manifest himself. Even part of Crusoe's presentation of himself to the English captain, namely his admission that he too is an Englishman, is far more ambiguous than it may first appear. Defoe had long ago exploded the notion that the term "Englishman" signifies a self-evident, homogenous national identity. He writes in *A True-Born Englishman* (1700):

> A true-born Englishman's a contradiction,
> In speech an irony, in fact a fiction
> . . . .
> A metaphor invented to express
> A man akin to all the universe.[30]

Crusoe's status as an Englishman can almost be seen to warrant the multiplicity of political stances he takes during his adventures. If there is no such thing as essential Englishness, then Crusoe's claim to his countryman is simply one more fiction that he employs to regulate, and possibly dominate his relationship with yet another kind of visitor to the island.

The fictionality of Crusoe the Englishman is compounded in his encounters with the mutineers. In every situation, he seems intuitively to gauge the credulity of his audience and then to assume the very political office they would expect him to occupy. These theatricalizations by which Crusoe consolidates his power are all, paradoxically, displacements of power—assertions that the *real* authority on the island lies elsewhere, outside himself. Crusoe convinces the mutineers that he, as governor (the representative of the king), commands a militia of fifty men, and thereby persuades them to surrender. Once they are his prisoners, Crusoe persuades them that he is the governor's jailor and has been put in charge of them. In each case, the ultimate authority—the king, whose office Crusoe had once playfully assumed—is placed at one farther remove.

Crusoe's decision to take the captain into his confidence and admit his weakness paradoxically leads to his political success: he luckily (or providentially) chooses the right confessor. Given Crusoe's habitual practice, however, the choice seems to make no sense at all; and as an anomaly, it leads us to reconsider the issues of identity and self-presentation that have long been central puzzles in Defoe's fiction. I have argued thus far that a host of political pressures combine first to bring the autobiographical subject into existence in Defoe's narrative, and then to make it vanish. Nowhere is this process more lucidly illustrated than in the encounter with the English captain. The arrival of the captain tests the capacity of the political dreamworld that Crusoe has constructed for himself and that has until that point defined him as king. The crisis marked by their conversation, in effect, produces the conditions of sincerity that we associate with the notion of a private self. In other words, the collision of the two political contexts in which Crusoe had heretofore defined himself (the island on which he is king, and, before that, the England in which he was a subject) force him to describe himself to the captain in yet another way, one that we would characterize as honest, candid, sincere. Though it includes features of public self-definition—the claim to be an Englishman (however ambiguous that may be), and the offer of service—the scene

generates the impression that Crusoe has laid himself bare. He admits his "real" self and situation in a moment of panic when any exclusively political identity is suddenly unavailable to him.

But that self exists only for a moment, since Crusoe no sooner confesses it than he is denominated "governour." That is, he is absorbed into a new political fantasy, which, while it is different from the one he has hitherto rehearsed, is also fictional. The conditions of Crusoe's existence, even on the remote island, are so completely entrenched in civilized European society that "sincerity" is no sooner required of him than it is annihilated.

Defoe seemed at least partially aware that the boundaries of an older social and political order were being stretched thin during his age by an assortment of modernizing forces, and he represents perhaps the most powerful of those forces in *Robinson Crusoe*. Specifically, England's expanding empire, defined by an emergent mercantilist ideology, forced Defoe to furnish Crusoe with more complex answers to questions about his political identity than would have been required of an Englishman in an earlier age.[11] For, in a mercantilist view of world economy, directive political authority is constantly pitted against individual or corporate commercial speculation.[12] Ideally, commerce is subordinated to politics, and all individuals and institutions are rendered secondary to state power. But as Joyce Appleby observes:

> Despite the unchallenged assumption that the English government had the right and the responsibility to regulate economic activities in the interest of the common good, the ambit of private initiative widened considerably during the middle decades of the seventeenth century. Circumstances—usually in the form of a political crisis—permitted men to pursue their private profit with little official interference.[13]

Ultimately this dichotomy raises disturbing questions about the proper relationship between the individual and the state because it implies that individual agency is disorganized and potentially subversive, and stands in constant need of justification and correction. Crusoe's attempts to define himself thus can be seen as a series of experiments (none of them completely successful) to get that relationship right.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

NOTES

1 Since its publication in 1719, Defoe's narrative has typically been characterized as a paradigm of the political and economic dimension of human nature, and early readings tended to alter Defoe's narrative in a way that enhances rather than questions this image

of its hero. Rousseau claims that his imaginary pupil, Emile, will benefit from his study of *Robinson Crusoe* "beginning with Robinson's shipwreck near his island, and ending with the arrival of the ship which comes to take him from it" (*Emile*, trans. Allan Bloom [New York: Basic Books. 1979], p. 185). But of course these points are not the beginning and end of Crusoe's adventures: Rousseau abridges the narrative in a way that disentangles its hero from all his associations with civilization, deleting among other things his disobedience to his father, his brief stint as a slave, and his triumphant return from the island as a wealthy plantation owner. Marx makes the somewhat misleading claim that "the relations between Robinson and the objects that form the wealth of his own creation . . . contain all that is essential to the determination of value" (*Capital*, trans. Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling [Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1921], 1:88). In fact. though, virtually all the "wealth of his own creation" would have been unattainable if Crusoe had not salvaged so much from the shipwreck, including an assortment of tools and weapons. The ship is Crusoe's umbilical cord to European civilization; Marx omits it in order to reinforce an image of Crusoe as isolated individual. Even the most powerful psychological readings of *Robinson Crusoe* tend to take Crusoe's fantasy of isolation at face value. See Leo Braudy. "Daniel Defoe and the Anxieties of Autobiography," *Genre* 6 (1973): 97, and Homer O. Brown, "The Displaced Self in the Novels of Daniel Defoe," *ELH* 38 (1971): 562-90.
Only recently have there appeared alternatives to uncritical acceptance of Crusoe's singularity. Peter Hulme largely succeeds in his attempt to "return *Robinson Crusoe* to the Caribbean," correctly calling attention to all the points at which Crusoe's fantasy collides with the realities of imperialism (*Colonial Encounters* [London: Methuen, 1986], p. 176. See also Manuel Schonhorn, *Defoe's Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 1991), especially pp. 141-64; Michael Seidel, *Robinson Crusoe: Island Myths and the Novel* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991), and Seidel's earlier, "Crusoe in Exile," *PMLA* 96 (1981): 363-74; and Carol Kay, *Political Constructions: Defoe, Richardson, and Sterne in Relation to Hobbes, Hume, and Burke* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1988). pp. 75-91. These studies establish precedent in Defoe's canon for the political stances that Crusoe takes while on the island. An important source of my thinking in this essay is Philippe Aries' conclusion that public and private life were radically redefined by the development of centralized state authority in the late Renaissance. As a result, by the eighteenth century, "what mattered was no longer what an individual was but what he appeared to be, or, rather, what he could successfully pass himself off as being" (Arthur Goldhammer, trans., and Roger Chartier, ed., *A History of Private Life* [Cambridge, MA: The Bellknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1989]. 3:2-3).

2 Daniel Defoe, *The Life and Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (New York: Oxford Classics, 1973), p. 128. All further references are included parenthetically. Schonhorn connects Crusoe's thoughts about kingship to his conversion, asserting that after the conversion "Crusoe appears to be a king by God's immediate design, his reign certified by the deity" (p. 155).

3 For a brief useful survey of the balance of power in the West Indies at the time of Crusoe's shipwreck, see Pat Rogers, *Robinson Crusoe* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1978), pp. 39-40.

4 Hulme, *Colonial Encounters*, p. 186. See also, John H. Parry, "A Secular Sense of Responsibility," in F. Chiapelli, ed., *First Images of the New World: The Impact of the New World on the Old* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1976), 1:289.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 222.

6 According to Schonhorn, Prince William of Orange was given the title "generalissimo by sea and land" by James II (p. 152, n. 51), though it is uncertain that Defoe, writing some two generations later, would have intended the title as an allusion.

7 These distinctions are somewhat obscured by the fact that Woodes Rogers, in his account of Alexander Selkirk's island exile, reports that Selkirk's rescuers called him "governour"; Rogers himself calls him the "absolute monarch" of the island. See Michael McKeon, *The Origins of the English Novel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1987), p. 492, n. 28.

8 Seidel, *Robinson Crusoe: Island Myths and the Novel*, p. 46.

9 Seidel, *Exile and the Narrative Imagination* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1986), p. 42. Schonhorn argues that "the political component of Crusoe's condition-making activity, comprised of a sovereign monarch and a grateful and dependent community, resembles that of a constitutional monarch" (p. 152).

10 George de Forest Lord, ed., *Anthology of Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse 1660-1714* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1975), pp. 633-34, lines 372-73, 375-76. Though it may seem dubious to draw conclusions about Defoe's political opinions in 1719 from a polemic poem written nineteen years earlier, I am persuaded by Schonhorn that "Defoe the novelist evolved out of Defoe the journalist." A constant component of Defoe's belief in the ideal of the warrior-king, epitomized by William III, is that "the sword-bearing sovereign was made necessary by England's variegated society" (p. 4). That variegation, largely a function of trade, is precisely what makes the true-born Englishman a contradiction. Crusoe himself is divided between the model of the warrior-king, which for a while he is able to emulate, and the variegated English society of which he has always been a representative part.

11 I have chiefly followed the lead of James H. Bunn, "The Aesthetics of British Mercantilism," *New Literary History* 11 (1980): 305-06, though it is important to note that "mercantilism" was not a term in circulation in Defoe's time but rather a scholarly concept first systematically explicated in Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* (1776). After receiving its most encyclopedic treatment in Eli Heckscher, *Mercantilism* (1931), it has undergone serious revaluation; the most recent responses range from skepticism in D. C. Coleman, "Mercantilism Revisited," *Historical Journal* 23 (1980): 774-85, to outright dismissal in John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1788* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989) pp. 168-70. I believe that the term, loosely employed, can help make sense of what is clearly an ideological crisis.

12 Bunn describes the esthetic developments that this opposition produced, and explores the questions that must be asked about the many objects—"bric-a-brac"—that were removed from their point of origin and reconstructed in another culture.

13 Joyce Oldham Appleby, *Economic Thought and Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1978), p. 99.

Copyright © 2002 EBSCO Publishing