



The Question of Moral Disengagement in Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Judith Thompson's "Pink"

Doaa Sayed Abdel Azim Mostafa*

PhD, Lecturer of English Literature - Faculty of Languages - October University for Modern Sciences and Arts
doagallad@hotmail.com

Abstract:

Many scholars and researches have discussed the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized and the effect of colonialism on both of them. Yet, there are a very few researches that deal with the psychological impact of colonization upon colonizers. The aim of this study is to shed light upon the question of moral disengagement that colonizers need to justify their immoral and inhumane actions against the colonized. The study discusses the issue of creating moral reasons as a necessity for colonizers to face many psychological challenges by applying a psychoanalytical reading of the protagonists of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Judith Thompson's "Pink." These protagonists show the unconscious of the colonizers that tends to employ some psychological defense mechanisms to avoid feeling guilty. The study reveals that the protagonists who represent colonizers have psychologically applied some specific defense mechanisms such as providing moral justification, creating advantageous comparison, and blaming or dehumanizing victims to avoid having a sense of guilt.

I. Introduction

The problematic relationship between the colonizer and the colonized has been tackled by various psychiatrists and intellectuals trying to show the effect of colonialism on the colonized nations and to some extent on the colonizers themselves. Recently, some Arab countries like Iraq and Syria have been invaded by some foreign troops that refuse to leave, providing many excuses such as searching for chemical weapons or helping the Arabs to be on the right track of democracy, and so on. Definitely, many Arab citizens realize that these are fake excuses and false moral justifications that occupiers provide for their occupation. The question is: why do colonizers provide moral reasons for colonialism or neocolonialism? Do they try to convince the native colonized of the necessity of their existence or convince themselves that they are not guilty?

According to Nadine Gordimer, a South African writer and an activist, a colonizer “is a settler in the conquered territory, coming from another country but taking up residence and citizenship (usually granted after a period specified by the colonialist power). He occupies and owns, either under a settler dispensation to extend the “mother” country’s domains, or purchased from it, land taken by that colonialist power from the indigenous people. The colonizer regards himself as a permanent inhabitant” (31). Albert Memmi, a French writer of Tunisian origin, introduced three different terms of those who represent colonization: the colonial, the colonizer, and the colonialist. “A colonial is a benevolent European who does not have the colonizer’s attitude toward the colonized” (Memmi 54). He adds that the colonial does not exist because all those who live in the colonies are privileged, so as long as the colonial lives in the colony, he will become a colonizer who is “a privileged being and an illegitimately privileged one; that is, a usurper” (53). Yet, Memmi explains that the colonizer may accept or reject the role of usurper. The colonizer should decide whether or not he will affirm the oppression and injustice to the colonized natives. Memmi asks, “Will he (the colonizer) accept being a colonizer under the growing habit of privilege and illegitimacy, under the constant gaze of the usurped” (62)? Some colonizers who discover the disgraceful situation of colonization may choose to leave the colony. Others prefer to remain and vow against colonization. In this case, they face the dilemma of rejecting the ideology of colonialism while reaping its fruits. “What he (the colonizer) is actually renouncing is part of himself, and what he slowly becomes as soon as he accepts a life in a colony” (Memmi 64). Yet, if the colonizer chooses to defend the colonized, he will be rejected by his fellow men and after all will not be loved by the colonized. The problem of the colonizer is to create that balance between his own privileges and his conscience. Finally, a colonialist is “only a colonizer who agrees to be a colonizer” (Memmi 89). Therefore, the term “colonizer” has become the most suitable label for those who live on the lands of other nations and need to justify the process of colonization for moral and psychological reasons.

The question that discusses the association of psychology and colonialism is deeply rooted in the western culture. Some psychiatrists have been worried about the psychological reactions of the colonized while some others were obsessed with the psychological health of the colonizer or the relationship between both, the colonizer and the colonized. Frantz Fanon was the first psychiatrist who discussed the effect of colonialism on both the colonizer and the colonized; yet he mostly stressed the effect of colonialism upon the colonized who became violent. He examined many cases of mental disorder of the native Algerians and a few of the French colonizers concluding that the colonial war in Algeria had become “a breeding ground for mental disorders” (182). Among the cases of colonizers, there was a case of a European officer who was suffering from hallucinations of hearing screams similar to those of the tortured Algerians. Fanon briefly referred to the French that condemned torture in Algeria as the group that wanted to “protect French youth from moral degradation” (183). Mannoni, a French psychoanalyst, went further when he tried to analyze the psychology of colonization and discussed the psychology of colonizers, for he was worried about the flawed psyche of colonizers. He suggests how the savage, or the native, is identified in the unconscious of the white man “with a certain image of the instincts- of the id, in analytical terminology. And civilized man (European) is painfully divided between the desire to “correct” the “errors” of the savages and the desire to identify himself with them in his search for

some lost paradise;" (21) in other words, as he represents primitivism, the savage or colonized embodies the earlier instincts of the colonizer which are stored in his unconscious. Finally, Mannoni advises his readers to study "the structure of personalities typical of the group" (26) as an inner reflection of the whole social group. Lately, Halperin et al, Israeli professors of psychology, noted that researchers did not pay much attention to the perspective of the occupants who have to comply with the fact they live in. They admit that occupation negatively affects the occupying society. They add that the society of the state of occupation faces some psychological challenges which necessitate employing some mechanisms "in order to avoid negative experiences resulting from those challenges" (60). They suggest that "for an occupation to persist the occupying society must be driven by deep and significant motives to maintain it" (61), and conclude that justifying occupation, stressing the illegitimacy of the occupied population, and improving the collective self-image of the occupying society are very much required for the continuation of occupation. As occupation is so much similar to colonization, one may safely conclude that colonizers are also psychologically affected by colonization and a psychoanalytical approach to their attitudes might be needed to know how it is possible for the occupier/colonizer/ oppressor to live peacefully with his/her ego without feeling guilty.

Freud's theory of psychoanalysis has tackled the conflicts between the three components of the human psyche: id, ego, and superego. The id seeks pleasure; the ego tries to control the id and selects what is acceptable by society, and the super ego makes value judgements regarding human behavior. The ego unconsciously employs some defense mechanisms to defend the psyche or mental system against some undesirable thoughts. Freud had also referred to the different psychological defense mechanisms that human being adopts to achieve the required harmony between the ego and ideal ego. "There is always a feeling of triumph when something in the ego coincides with the ego ideal. And the sense of guilt (as well as the sense of inferiority) can also be understood as an expression of tension between the ego and the ego ideal" (Freud 106). If any human being fails to respond to the moral requirements of the ego ideal, he/she will have a sense of guilt leading to anxiety and depression. The ego ideal represents the ideal self- image that each person aspires to have. Applying psychological defense mechanisms protects those who commit some inhumane or immoral actions from having a sense of guilt. "In its broadest sense, *psychological defense* refers to the process of regulating painful emotions such as anxiety, depression, and loss of self-esteem. *Defense mechanisms* are usually defined more narrowly, as mental processes that operate unconsciously to reduce some painful emotion" (Paulhus *et al.*, 543).

In 1999, Albert Bandura, a Canadian-American psychologist, referred to the high self-esteem and sense of self-worth that people have when they cope with the moral standards and the painful self-condemnation that people have if they fail to prevent behaving in ways that contradict the moral standards. He also studied many of the psychological maneuvers that man applies to achieve moral disengagement. Moral disengagement centers on "the reconstrual of the conduct itself so it is not viewed as immoral" (Bandura 2-3). In other words, there are some psychological devices that are employed by those who participate in any inhumane or unethical process to achieve moral disengagement, and consequently keep the harmony between their own ego and ego ideal. So, by reaching moral disengagement, those who participate in any inhumane deed would seem to be innocent and civilized in themselves rather than their community. Bandura suggests, "The moral disengagement may center on the cognitive restructuring of inhumane conduct into a benign or worthy one by moral justification, sanitizing language and advantageous comparison; disavowal of a sense of personal agency by diffusion or displacement of responsibility; disregarding or minimizing the injurious effects of one's actions; and attribution of blame to, and dehumanization of, those who are victimized"(1).

Freud was the first neurologist who applied his psychoanalytical theories "to the interpretation of religion, mythology, art, and literature" (Dobie 55). Not only had Freud established the basics of psychoanalysis, but he had also drawn the attention of many literary critics to a new approach of literary

analysis through which readers may find an explanation of the attitudes and behaviors of some individuals and consequently some groups. Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Judith Thompson's "Pink" are two fictional works that reveal a lot about the psychological predicament of colonizers. Defoe's "troubled conscience that gives his characters their depth" (Bloom and Martin 2) is similar to Thompson's interest in Freud's psychology that made her "more absorbed in the psychology of her characters than in their actions" (Nothof 1). Daniel Defoe's *The Life and Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, published in 1719, displays the adventures of Robinson Crusoe, the protagonist of the novel who represents the European colonizer who seeks accumulating wealth by seafaring travels. Thompson's "Pink" was published in 1986, and it is a short monologue said by Lucy, a white child, to her black dead Nanny, Nellie. The matured Robinson and the little girl, Lucy, adopt and reflect the culture of their colonizing societies. Both Robinson and Lucy do not doubt or think to question the policy of colonization that their European societies apply; on the contrary, they live peacefully with the system of colonization in spite of its unethical practices. According to Freud, "Each individual is a component part of numerous groups, he is bound by ties of identification in many directions, and he has built up his ego ideal upon the most various models" (101). Therefore, these two protagonists of *The Life and Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* and "Pink" represent their colonizing societies. So, I argue that a psychoanalytical approach to the psyche of the protagonists of both texts may display how they could achieve moral disengagement by applying specific psychological defense mechanisms to cope with the politics of colonization and how colonizers and occupiers need to provide moral justifications and rationalization for their colonization to avoid anxiety and depression. Moral justification, advantageous comparison, and blaming or dehumanizing victims are the major psychological defense mechanisms employed by the protagonists of *Robinson Crusoe* and "Pink"

II. Moral Justification

Although Daniel Defoe wrote *Robinson Crusoe* to describe that conflict between keeping morality and growing prosperity from a Protestant view, he could draw an effective psychological portrayal for the colonizer's personality. Robinson who decided to desert his family and country to look for wealth, turning a deaf ear to the advice of his father followed the fashionable path of seafaring exploration which his contemporary acquaintances were following to make money. Defoe wrote his novel at the peak of the British Empire's growth. Robinson who embodies the European colonizer adopts many of the views of colonization. Robinson who has to stay as a prisoner in Salle, and is enslaved by a Turkish master, decides to escape by sailing on one of his master's ships. Xury, a Moorish slave who accepts to help Robinson to escape and to sail together to another place, becomes Robinson's slave. When Xury and Robinson are rescued by a Portuguese ship, Robinson who considers Xury his own slave decides to sell him to the master of the Portuguese ship. The moral justification is clearly shown when Robinson narrates the incident to readers:

He offered me also sixty pieces of eight more for my boy Xury, which I was loth to take; not that I was unwilling to let the captain have him, but I was very loth to sell the poor boy's liberty, who had assisted me so faithfully in procuring my own. However, when I let him know my reason, he owned it to be just, and offered me this medium, that he would give the boy an obligation to set him free in ten years, if he turned Christian: upon this, and Xury saying he was willing to go to him, I let the captain have him. (Defoe, 52)

Robinson has given himself the right to enslave Xury who seems very submissive to the idea of becoming a slave for the Europeans. Robinson, as a materialistic person, wants to sell Xury and get money, yet his conscience irritates him. So the narrator, Robinson, mentions in detail how he did not like the idea, in the beginning, as it seems unethical to deprive the faithful boy from his liberty, but he is relieved when the Portuguese Captain provides the choice of converting Xury to Christianity. Psychologically, Robinson's ego ideal and morality of super ego rebuke him for such unethical deed; therefore, his unconscious has to employ a psychological defense mechanism to achieve moral disengagement. Moral disengagement would enable him to

reconstruct the unethical behavior of depriving Xury of his freedom to become acceptable and right. Definitely, the religious justification is considered the best moral justification provided by Robinson who represents the civilized Christian European colonizer. When readers realize that Xury, the heathen, will become a true Christian, if he is sold to the European Captain, they conclude that Robinson has taken the right decision. According to Bandura, "People do not ordinarily engage in harmful conduct until they have justified to themselves the morality of their actions. In this process of moral justification, detrimental conduct is made personally and socially acceptable by portraying it as serving socially worthy or moral purposes"(3). Thus, vending Xury becomes an acceptable behavior for Robinson, for it aims for moral goals by the end.

Similarly, Lucy, the little white girl and protagonist of "Pink," expresses her agony for the death of her black Nanny who was shot in a march against the Apartheid in South Africa. In her monologue, Lucy expresses the ideology that her white colonizing community adopts to justify the Apartheid policy in South Africa. Lucy innocently repeats the points she has learnt and inherited from her community. She talks to her dead Nanny and says, "I told you that what you guys don't understand, what you didn't see is apartheid's for YOU.IT'S FOR YOUR GUYS FEELINGS" (Thompson 10). Lucy then provides different justifications for the types of racial segregations applied by the European colonizers such as having separate washrooms because blacks like to spit and if whites express their disgust that may hurt blacks' feelings. When the little girl asks her mother about the reason for which blacks get paid less for the same job done by whites, the mother provides a justification which is that blacks do not like money; they just like to sing and dance. According to Halperin *et al.*, there is a "basic need of society members to view their group positively, including a perception of the group as moral, because their personal self-esteem draws from the esteem of groups to which they belong" (61). Although the reasons mentioned by Lucy are very humorous, they stress the importance of finding a moral justification for the immoral practices of colonizers. Lucy as well as her mother do not admit their injustices against blacks when they follow the apartheid policy, for that would negatively affect their ego; thus, they claim that apartheid is applied to respect blacks' feelings.

Thus, the rationalization of the immoral or unethical deeds to seem acceptable and reasonable is a pattern adopted by colonizers from the 18th century up till now. Defoe's protagonist reflects the European perspectives about the image of the European as a civilized man having his moral motives to do what he wants towards the colonized, for he certainly has his own rationalized morality. Despite causing sarcasm, the justifications that the little Lucy mentions are colored with moral rationalization, stressing the fact that colonizers educate their children how to justify colonization. The matured colonizers have to provide moral justifications for their behavior although they may seem sarcastic.

III. Advantageous Comparison

Moral justification defense mechanism is also mingled with the rationalization of advantageous comparison, shown in both narratives. "Advantageous comparison is another way of making harmful conduct look good. How behavior is viewed is colored by what it is compared against. By exploiting the contrast principle, reprehensible acts can be made righteous"(Bandura 4). Robinson Crusoe, once again, enslaves another native after saving him from the savages who were going to feast on his body after killing him. Robinson names him Friday, teaches him English, and converts him to Christianity. Robinson informs readers about the inner conflict he has earlier had between his desire to get a savage into his possession and his hate of and doubts about the lawfulness of "shedding too much blood" (Defoe 318), for he should attack the savages first. Robinson declares that he thought of saving Friday to get himself a servant on the isolated island he inhabits. He finally decides to take the risk and attack the savages to get Friday into his hands, "cost what it could" (Defoe 318). However, Robinson employs the advantageous comparison as a psychological defense mechanism to vindicate his decision of attacking the savages to enslave Friday. Logically, Robinson and readers may abhor the idea of saving someone to become a servant for the person who saved him, but when Friday's

savagery is exposed, the alternative that Robinson has chosen for Friday by helping him to be a normal servant rather than a free cannibal becomes a better choice. Robinson narrates: “I caused Friday to gather all the skulls, bones, flesh, and whatever remained, and lay them together in a heap, and make a great fire upon it, and burn them all to ashes. I found Friday had still a hankering stomach after some of the flesh, and was still a cannibal in his nature; but I showed so much abhorrence at the very thoughts of it, and at the least appearance of it, that he durst not discover it: for I had, by some means, let him know that I would kill him if he offered it” (Defoe 331). Comparing Friday’s previous condition as a free cannibal and savage with his recent civilized condition as Robinson’s civilized servant or slave, leads readers as well as Robinson himself to be convinced that it is better for Friday to become Robinson’s servant rather than staying as a cannibal, as Robinson initiates him to his European civilized world. Besides, Robinson’s conscience will not suffer, as he became convinced that has chosen a better alternative for Friday.

Like Robinson Crusoe, Lucy, the little girl and protagonist of “Pink,” believes that her family has given Nelly, the black Nanny, many advantages, and that was supposed to be appreciated by her. As the little girl is fully convinced that her family is right and they did not cause Nelly any harm, she expresses her astonishment, “I don’t understand why you weren’t happy with us, Mummy let you eat as much sugar as you wanted, and we never said anything to you, some days, Mummy says it was up to a quarter pound...and we even let you take a silver spoon...and you had your own little room back there, and we even let your husband come once in a while ... , so how come you weren’t grateful” (Thompson 10). Although Lucy’s sentences may arouse sarcasm for some readers, she believes that Nelly, the black poor nurse, got many advantages when she was working for them. Lucy has her logical reasons because she makes a comparison between Nelly’s poor condition in the slums of the black South Africans and her living as a nurse with a white family. Lucy knows that Nelly enjoyed a better life style with whites, and she should be grateful to them for that advantageous social level that she did not enjoy within her community. Lucy once more compares Nelly’s neat appearance with her white family and her shabby appearance with her own black family, Lucy adds, “When I saw you downtown with your husband and four children ... I hated the way you looked without your uniform, so brown and plain, not neat and nice anymore, you looked so pretty in your uniform, so pretty” (Thompson 10). Once again the little protagonist compares Nelly’s deplorable conditions among her own black family and her neat tidy appearance with Lucy’s rich family, represented by her neat nice uniform.

Therefore, making a comparison between the worst and worse will lead anyone to choose the worse. The advantageous comparison that shows the privileges that the colonized have got after colonization helps colonizers, like Robinson and Lucy, to feel that they have done the ethical and moral deed when they decide to enslave blacks. So, the colonizers do not feel guilty, on the contrary they may expect to be rewarded for the humane steps they have taken towards their victims. Once again both protagonists free themselves from any unethical behavior, believing that they have taken the right decision while they unconsciously apply the advantageous comparison as a psychological defense mechanism to achieve moral disengagement.

IV. Blaming and dehumanizing victims

A third psychological defense mechanism has been traced in the attitudes of the protagonists of *Robinson Crusoe* and “Pink” which is dehumanizing or blaming victims for their behaviors. “Self-censure for cruel conduct can be disengaged by stripping people of human qualities. Once dehumanized, they are no longer viewed as persons with feelings, hopes and concerns but assubhuman objects. They are portrayed as mindless “savages,” “gooks,” and the other despicable wretches.” (Bandura 8). Robinson informs readers that Negroes are considered cannibals, so by dealing with them as if they were items to be bought or sold or even killed, it would not be a big mistake. Robinson first narrates how his Brazilian neighbors make a deal with him to bring Negroes from Guinea, and he accepts to have his share of Negroes, “so they desired to make but one voyage, to bring the negroes on shore privately, and divide them among their own plantations; and, in a word, the question was whether I would go their supercargo in the ship, to manage the trading part upon the coast of Guinea; and

they offered me that I should have my equal share of the negroes, without providing any part of the stock"(Defoe, 61). Readers may raise some questions about such unethical and inhumane deal in which human beings are dealt with like items. But earlier in the novel, Robinson tells readers about the inhumane behavior of Negroes, "we were sailed on to the southward, to the truly Barbarian coast, where whole nations of negroes were sure to surround us with their canoes and destroy us; where we could not go on shore but we should be devoured by savage beasts, or more merciless savages of human kind" (Defoe, 35). Thus, if these Negroes are savages and cannibals seek to destroy innocent human beings like Robinson, in such a case, neither the protagonist nor readers may show sympathy towards them. It is not unethical to show no respect or inhumane attitudes to beasts that may attack human beings

While Robinson gives many details about the inhumane behavior of the savage Negroes, Lucy, in "Pink" puts blame on Nelly, who was shot by whites in a march of blacks against Apartheid. Lucy blames Nelly who is now dead in her coffin for sharing in marches: "I told you not to go in those marches" (Thompson 10). Lucy does not blame those who killed Nelly, but she blames the victim herself. "By fixing the blame on others or on circumstances, not only are one's own injurious actions excusable but one can even feel self-righteous in the process" (Bandura 11). If Lucy attributes the murder to the white community that she belongs to, she would suffer psychologically, so it is much easier and safer to blame Nelly, the victim.

Finally, both narratives have been narrated directly by the protagonist, as *Robinson Crusoe* is narrated by the first-person point of view and "Pink" is a monologue delivered by Lucy. Such narrative techniques enable both protagonists to reveal their thoughts directly to readers, they had been given a large space to express themselves freely. Defoe's realism and Thompson's indirect satire reveal the psyche of their protagonists that exposes the same issue about the role of applying some psychological defense mechanisms by colonizers to continue in their mission of colonization. Both of Robinson and Lucy represent their colonizing communities and show the culture they believe in. "Furthermore, additional lines of research indicate that societal beliefs and ideologies may be employed in order to justify a group's advantage over others and portray it as legitimate. Hence, it will not be too far-reaching to suggest that in certain situations, societies face common psychological challenges and use collective mechanisms in order to address them (Halperin et al., 62). It is also noted that Lucy's psychological defense mechanisms become broken down by the end of the monologue and anxiety emerges. She terribly laments Nelly's death and regrets that she has been responsible for that death. Lucy declares, "I made you go in that march and I made you die. I know that forever, I said I was sorry, I am sorry, I am sorry, I am sorry" (Thompson 11). According to Lois Tyson, sometimes our defenses momentarily break down, and this is when we experience *anxiety*" (16). When Lucy's defense mechanisms stop doing their function, the moral disengagement, which has been employed to reconstruct what is unethical to seem ethical, vanishes and she faces the unbearable truth which is that her white community is responsible for her Nanny's death. Thus, anxiety appears and Lucy's core issue represented by her fear of being abandoned by her Nanny whom she loved so much and is now dead makes her hysterically weep. On the contrary, Robinson did not express any regret towards the immoral behaviors he involved in against blacks as his psychological defense mechanisms lasted effectively, and moral disengagement played its role till the end.

V. Conclusion

There are many psychological defense mechanisms that human beings unconsciously apply to avoid having a sense of guilt that may lead to some core issues, anxiety, or depression. Colonizers/occupiers/oppressors need moral disengagement which is manifested in some psychological defense mechanisms to psychologically adjust to colonization. Moral disengagement is unconsciously applied through various devices such as: moral justification, advantageous comparison, and dehumanizing or blaming victims.

Although Defoe uses a realistic style in his didactic novel, *Robinson Crusoe*, to teach readers some values and concepts about man's original sin, materialism and spirituality, he has unintentionally showed the

question of moral disengagement throughout his novel. Robinson's unconscious psychological defense mechanisms enable him to accomplish moral disengagement, justifying all the immoral acts he has done against the colonized.

Despite the fact that Judith Thompson's "Pink" is a stinging satire on the former Apartheid policy in South Africa, it could show the psyche and mentality of the colonizer throughout the portrayal of the little girl Lucy. Reflecting unconsciously the views of her white community, Lucy could practice moral disengagement while she displays the conditions of colonization that her dead Nanny was living in. She has unconsciously applied many psychological defense mechanisms to believe her community's moral disengagement. Yet, in the end her defense mechanisms are broken down and she hysterically confesses her responsibility for the death of her nurse.

The subconscious of the protagonists of both literary works, *Robinson Crusoe* and "Pink" could apply moral justification, advantageous comparison, and dehumanization or blaming victims as psychological means of moral disengagement to mainly deceive themselves about the perfection of their moral agency. It is clear that colonizers, occupiers, and oppressors apply some psychological defense mechanisms to keep their ego ideal and avoid having a sense of guilt, which may cause low self-esteem and depression.

المستخلص:

**مسألة التحلل الأخلاقي في "روبنسون كروزو" لدانيال دفو و"الزهري" لجوديث تومبسون
دعاء سيد عبدالعظيم**

العديد من الباحثين والأبحاث قاموا بدراسة العلاقة بين المستعمر والمستعمر وكذلك تأثير الاستعمار على كليهما. ولكن قلة من الأبحاث هي التي تناولت تأثير الاستعمار على المستعمر من الناحية النفسية. تهدف هذه الدراسة الى القاء الضوء على مسألة التحلل الأخلاقي التي يحتاجها المستعمرون لتبرير التصرفات الغير أخلاقية والغير أنسانية ضد المستعمرين. تتناول الدراسة معضلة خلق الأسباب الأخلاقية كضرورة للمستعمرين لمواجهة التحديات النفسية عن طريق تطبيق قراءة نفسية تحليلية لبطل "روبنسون كروزو" لدانيال دفو و"الزهري" لجوديث تومبسون. يعرض هذان البطلان الاوعى الخاص بالمستعمرين الذى يميل لتوظيف بعض وسائل الدفاع النفسية لتحاشى الشعور بالذنب. وتكشف الدراسة أن الأبطال ممثلى المستعمرين قد قاموا بتطبيق وسائل دفاع نفسية بعينها مثل إيجاد المبرر الأخلاقي، وخلق المقارنة التفضيلية، ولوم وتجريد الضحايا من أنسانيتهم وذلك لتحاشى الشعور بالذنب.

Works cited

- Bandura, Albert. "Moral Disengagement in The Perpetration of Inhumane." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol.3. PP. 193-209.
- Bloom, Harold, and Martin Price. "The Divided Heart: Defoe's Novels." *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Daniel Defoe*, 1987, pp.31-43. www.ebscohost.com. Accessed 3May 2009.
- Defoe, Daniel. *The Life and Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. London, 1719. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/521/521-h/521-h.htm>
- Dobie, Ann B., *Theory into Practice: An Introduction to Literary Criticism*. 3rd edn, Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2012.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Richard Philcox, 1963, Grove, 2004.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Group Psychology and The Analysis of the Ego*. Translated by James Strachey, The Hogarth Press, 1949.
- Gordimar, Nadine. Introduction. *The Colonizer and The Colonized*, by Albert Memmi, 2003 3rd ed., Earthscan Publications, 1974, pp.27-44.
- Halperin, Eran, et al., "Socio-psychological implications for an occupying society: The case of Israel." *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 47, no.1, 2010, pp.59-70.
- Mannoni, Octave. *Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonization*. University of Michigan Press. 1990.
- Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and The Colonized*. 3rd edn, Earthscan Publications, 1974.
- Nothof, Anne. "Thompson, Judith." *Canadian Theatre Encyclopedia*, 1July 2018, <http://www.canadiantheatre.com/dict.pl?term=Thompson%2C%20Judith>.
- Paulhus, Delroy L., et al., "Psychological Defense: Contemporary Theory and Research." *Handbook of Personality Psychology*, edited by Robert Hogan, John Johnson, and Stephen Briggs, Academic Press, 1997.
- Thompson, Judith. "Pink." *Postcolonial Plays: An Anthology*, edited by Helen Gilbert, Routledge, 2001.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today*. 2nd edn, Routledge, 2005.