

POLITICAL (UNDER) CURRENTS IN COETZEE'S *DISGRACE**

Lisa-Jane Roberts

UNED

lisajane_r@hotmail.com

Taking as point of departure the essay “Westernization/Eurocentric Discourse” by Jude N. Uwalaka, this paper argues that Coetzee, in his novel *Disgrace*, is making a subtle comment on the political possibilities for South Africa in the post-Apartheid era. An exploration of his characters shows that they can be read as metonymic representations and allegories of the social forces in post-Apartheid South Africa: Lurie represents the Eurocentric approach and the failure of its agenda, Pollux represents Afrocentrism and Lucy and Petrus embody a new hybrid identity for South Africa. The conclusion reached is that Coetzee ultimately rejects both the Africanist and the purely Eurocentric agendas, moving beyond the scopes of Négritude and Post-Africanism, to suggest that the future of South Africa (and by extension, Africa at large) does not lie in a return to anti-western Africanism and an idealised tribal past, nor in an exclusively Eurocentric westernisation at the expense of the African identity, but in a hybridisation between European modernity and African heritage.

Keywords: Coetzee; *Disgrace*; Eurocentrism; Africanism; Cultural hybridism.

Tomando como punto de partida el ensayo titulado “Westernization/Eurocentric Discourse” de Jude N Uwalaka, argumentamos que Coetzee, en su novela *Disgrace*, ofrece un sutil comentario sobre las posibilidades políticas de Sudáfrica en la era post-Apartheid. Una exploración de sus personajes demuestra que pueden ser leídos como representaciones

metonímicas y alegorías de las fuerzas sociales en el Sudáfrica del Post-Apartheid: Lurie representa el enfoque eurocéntrico y el fracaso de su agenda, Pollux representa Africanismo, y Lucy y Petrus juntos representan una nueva identidad híbrida para Sudáfrica. Concluyo que Coetzee rechaza tanto la agenda africanista como la eurocéntrica, yendo más allá del Négritude y el Post-Africanismo para sugerir que el futuro de Sudáfrica (y por extensión, África en general) no yace en una vuelta al Africanismo antieuropeo con su idealización de un pasado tribal, ni tampoco en una occidentalización exclusivamente eurocéntrica con perjuicio a la identidad africana, sino en una hibridación que abarca la modernidad europea y el patrimonio africano.

Palabras clave: Coetzee; *Disgrace*; Eurocentrismo; Africanismo; Híbrido cultural.

“What is lacking to me is what is lacking to Africa since the death of Négritude: a vision of a future for Africa that is not a debased version of life in the west.”

J.M. Coetzee ⁱ

1. INTRODUCTION

In a 2014 essay critiquing “Westernization/Eurocentric Discourse”, Jude N. Uwalaka notes that there are “three grand currents in the building of the modern African mind”, and describes them as a colonial or neo-colonial “modernization [...] and westernization project”, a return to “African traditional culture” and a movement towards “contemporary globalization” and “cultural hybridism and anarchy”. (41)

In this paper I will attempt to show how J.M. Coetzee, in his 1999 novel *Disgrace*, includes all three as undercurrents to his narrative. I will also argue that the author subtly rejects both the Africanist and

the purely Eurocentric agendas, moving beyond the scope of both Négritude and what Dennis Ekpo has termed Post-Africanism, to suggest that the future of South Africa (and by extension, Africa at large) does not lie in a return to anti-western Africanism and an idealised tribal past, nor in an exclusively Eurocentric westernisation at the expense of the African identity, but in a hybridisation between European modernity and African heritage which will take the best of both worlds to create a new socio-political milieu that allows South Africa to progress and develop with dignity.

While *Disgrace* can be read on a superficial level as a highly personal account of an individual – David Lurie – as he negotiates the complexities of professional and personal relationships and is transformed by his experiences, it can also be read figuratively, with characters as metonymic representations of a greater whole, and seemingly everyday objects and situations being used symbolically to explore the dynamics of a society in the throes of socio-political change. Coetzee uses what is essentially an allegorical mode to suggest the failure of both the Eurocentric and Africanist projects, and to mark cultural hybridity as the way forward for South Africa.

2. THE FAILURE OF EUROCENTRISM

Uwalaka writes that today's "Eurocentrists and their African converts" (43) claim that Africa's survival and development depend on its wholesale acceptance of "the revolutions of European modernity: the intellectual revolution of materialism, the political revolution of equality and above all, the scientific and technological revolution" (43). This view, which Uwalaka goes on to contest, is expounded by Dennis Ekpo in "From Négritude to Post-Africanism" which claims that a "first tentatively colonial [African Enlightenment] was interrupted by premature decolonisation" (183) and urges Africans to "celebrate the fact that we were once colonised and [so] happily fast-forwarded into the theatre of world history." (182). While Ekpo suggests that his Post-Africanist subject should ideally be freed from "paranoid Africanism [and] mesmerised worship of Western idols" (184) and apparently rejects the imposition of the Western democratic political agenda, stating that "the so-called globalised political or social

modernities of the West must be regarded with a philosophy of robust suspicion” (185), he actually claims that “dignity, prosperity and *democracy*” (187, emphasis added) are the ideal goals for Africa, and that the most important step towards the future involves Africa divesting itself of any vestige of Africanism and treading a very Western path towards a very Western-style modernisation.

That Coetzee disapproves of a solely Eurocentric approach for the construction of a new South African identity and society is clear in the consistent failures and overwhelming problems he assigns to the characters in *Disgrace* that represent this approach, first and foremost among whom is his protagonist, David Lurie.

As a white male, a university professor and a father, Lurie represents a patriarchal position of authority that we can imagine aligns with the European patriarchal colonial authority in Africa or more specifically, with white Apartheid authority in South Africa. He shows himself, initially at least, to be inflexible – “not prepared to be reformed” (Coetzee, 77) and “beyond the reach of counselling” (49), the undertones of which smack of the rigidity and arrogance of the white rulers of South Africa during the Apartheid era, and set Lurie up as a metonymic representation of Old (European) South Africa.

The character suffers many failures throughout the novel. To start with, his classes on the Romantic poets, so fundamentally European in focus and so representative of how “colonial education sought to instill a sense of deference to all that was European” (Uwalaka, 43) in a colonised people, raise little or no enthusiasm in his students and are shown as belonging to a previous era (that of Apartheid and colonialism), unnecessary and unwanted in the new South Africa whose universities, after a “great rationalization” eschew the very European centred subjects such as “Classics and Modern Languages” for the culturally unmarked “Communications 101 [and] 201” (Coetzee, 3).

Early on in the novel Lurie is also toying with the über-European idea of writing a chamber opera about Lord Byron’s time in Italy. Over the course of the story the opera slowly dwindles from “soaring arias” (180) into a “halting cantilena hurled [...] into empty

air" (214) accompanied not by a chamber orchestra but by a toy banjo. The failure of the project is such that even Lurie admits it was "misconceived" (171) and "will never be performed" (215).

Of course Lurie himself loses his job when he is accused of sexual harassment by a student. The harassment of Melanie – or, suggestively, "Meláni: the dark one" (18) – can be read as a criticism of white colonial and Apartheid abuse of power, and reinforces Lurie's allegorical role as the West. Interestingly, Coetzee further cements this role with a parallel between the university inquiry and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission hearings that were set up in South Africa when Apartheid was abolished. The TRC "operated by allowing victims to tell their stories and [...] perpetrators to confess their guilt, with amnesty on offer to this who made a full confession" (Wikipedia, 2016) and in *Disgrace* Melanie tells her story to the committee while Lurie openly confesses his guilt. However, in what could be taken as authorial criticism of a process which allowed the perpetrators to get away with their crimes by simply confessing to them, Coetzee has Lurie's colleagues insist not just on confession but on all out "recantation, self-criticism, public apology" (66). Lurie's refusal to yield to the "thirst for abasement" (56) and his claim that "repentance belongs to another world, another universe of discourse" (58), is what ultimately leads to another failure – the loss of his job and his subsequent self-imposed exile to the Eastern Cape.

As the novel progresses, Lurie does begin to change and admits that he is "a moral dinosaur" (89), "an old man" (107), and that new, post-Apartheid South Africa is "no country, this, for old men" (190). In the pivotal attack scene of chapter eleven, Lurie feels the violence and disgrace so long perpetrated on black South-Africans turned against him, a white authoritarian figure. That he emerges from this experience "tired to the bone, without hopes, without desires, indifferent to the future" (107), represents the ultimate failure of the imposed Eurocentric agenda and, together with Lurie's own decision to cede to his daughter's beliefs and needs (representing those of the New (European) South Africa), and his portrayal of himself as nothing more than "an old lag serving out my sentence" (216), this failure shows that Coetzee does not believe that the imposition of European authority and socio-political systems is the

way for South Africa to establish its new national identity in the post-Apartheid era.

Of course the ever-complex Coetzee does not base his anti-Eurocentric argument only on one character. There are several images throughout the text that reinforce the demise of European supremacy and show that blind, unquestioning support of “Western rationality and cultures in the re-invention of Africa” (Uwakala, 45) is not the best way forward. One of the recurring symbols in the book is that of the dog and through Katy, Coetzee uses an iconographic image of Britain (the bulldog) to symbolise a socio-political British colonialism which “is in mourning. No one wants her, and she knows it” (Coetzee, 78). When, in an act reminiscent of Apartheid “whites administering violence” (Shattuck, 144) Lurie attacks Pollux, Katy is there too and her role as a symbol of white power, be it colonial or Apartheid, is reinforced as she too attacks, “mounting the boy’s body, tugging grimly at his arm” (Coetzee, 207). As Sandra Shattuck notes “the parallel [with Apartheid violence] is inescapable: the terrifying use of attack dogs by minority whites against their black neighbours” (144).

Criticism of imposed westernisation is also seen in Coetzee’s portrayal of Ettinger, who with his colonial, gun-toting heels dug firmly in to resist any change or compromise with the upcoming rural population of black Africans is, according to Lucy, doomed to end up “with a bullet in his back” (204). A subtler image is that of the “wooden and unsmiling” (72) Afrikaaner couple at the Saturday market, who in contrast to Lucy and the African women on her other side do not manage to sell all of their produce and tellingly “do less well” (72) than their more flexible market-neighbours. We also see evidence of the failure of western modernisation in the episode which sees Lurie stuck on the N2 as he returns to the Western Cape, with traffic (representing western modernity) brought to a near standstill by “a child with a stick” (175) (representing old Africa) herding a single stray cow.

Finally, it is language itself which signals the failure of a solely western agenda for the future of Africa. Lurie himself notes that “English is an unfit medium for the truth of South Africa” (117), and he is shown to be wanting, in comparison to both Lucy and Bev Shaw,

when he is unable to understand or express the most rudimentary sentiments or ideas in any African language.

3. THE FAILURE OF AFRICANISM

Dennis Ekpo opens his essay “From Negritude to Post-Africanism” with the affirmation that “[t]he death of Negritude has long been virtually on every lip” (177) and Coetzee, as seen in the epigraph to this paper, clearly understood back in 1983 that a staunchly anti-West paradigm that simply replaced one “compulsive race hubris” (180) with another and that rejected any social, political or technological ideas or advances born from European modernity simply because they were European, without considering whether they were beneficial to the African people, was no longer a contending ideology for the successful rebuilding of any African nation’s identity after the demise of both colonialism and Apartheid. Coetzee shows his disapproval of this anti-European Afrocentrism most clearly when Lucy, pregnant to one of her African rapists asks “Should I choose against the child because of who the father is?” (198), a sentiment which is echoed by Jude Uwalaka, who writes: “good and beneficial ideas and practices do not become bad because we do not like the face, race or the past activities of its original inventors or creators” (52).

Much has been said about the negative and often violent consequences of the Africanist agenda. Ekpo comments on a “desire for impotent vengeance” (180), Uwalaka on a “hatred for the west [that] creates in the African a combative state” (45). Coetzee, in order to show that Africanism and its inverted racism, which in the words of Frantz Fanon “failed to expand a vision of humanity and thus replicated the evils of [the] racist colonial masters” (127), cannot be a successful nation-building ideology, exposes this hatred and thirst for revenge in the attack on Lucy and her father which, as Lucy later comments “was done with such personal hatred” (156).

Given that the character Pollux, one of the black youths responsible for the rape and attack at Salem, is placed by Coetzee in direct – perhaps we could go so far as to say binary (black/white, young/old, ignorant/educated, attacker/attacked) opposition to David

(who, as we have seen, represents Eurocentrism), we can conclude that he is to be accepted as the embodiment of Africanism. In exploring this relationship, some critics, such as Sandra Shattuck (2009) and Malvern van Wyk Smith (2014), have noted that the Pollux of classical literature, born from an egg after Leda was “visited” by Zeus disguised as a swan, cannot exist without his twin Castor, and that in *Disgrace* the only candidate for this role is in fact David Lurie himself, whose white bandage is said to resemble the fragments of eggshell that inspired the helmet-like caps that the Dioscuri twins are usually portrayed as wearing in classical art. Evidence of this parallel can be seen in the fact that both the twins and Coetzee’s two characters force themselves upon women, the former as depicted in “The Rape of the Leucippides” by Rubens, the latter in their respective sexual encounters with Melanie and Lucy. A further parallel between the characters in the novel and the Dioscuri is that the latter (in many, though not all accounts) share their immortality, which means that they cannot both be immortal at the same time and their states of being therefore, are mutually exclusive. While neither Pollux nor Lurie are immortal in any way, Coetzee uses the concept of mutual exclusivity of being to show that Africanism and Eurocentrism cannot coexist and that to impose either one of these ideologies automatically reduces the world to “simplistic binary terms” (Eze, 409) and renders impossible the formation of a national identity that contemplates, respects and supports the complex realities of South Africa’s many peoples. Through this it is clear that Coetzee’s answer to David Lurie’s musings on whether a way can be found for the two opposed realms of “pure ideas” and “sense-experience” – European rationality and African earthiness, respectively – to coexist (Coetzee, 22) is a resounding no.

While Coetzee does explore positive aspects of traditional African culture – discussed in the next section – it is clear that the novel is suggesting that both Africanism and Eurocentrism fail as socio-political blueprints for the rebuilding of a South African identity in the post-Apartheid era. According to Uwalaka’s three currents, this leaves us with cultural hybridism and anarchy as a possible way forward. The following section will show how Coetzee explores and supports this particular current in *Disgrace*.

4. THE SUCCESS OF CULTURAL HYBRIDISM

There are two characters in *Disgrace* who best embody the idea of a new, hybrid identity for South Africa as a nation and they are Lucy (and inextricably her unborn child) and Petrus, taken both individually and together.

We see Lucy, a white woman living alone in the rural Eastern Cape, as able to “bend to the tempest” (Coetzee, 209) that has ensued after the abolition of Apartheid. It is her ability to adapt that marks her out as a candidate for future success in the new South Africa. Not only has she learnt to speak some Xhosa, she is aware and respectful of African customs, as seen at the party Petrus throws to celebrate his newfound prosperity. Even more astounding to Lurie, the old guard, is her attempt to justify her own rape, and her apparent understanding of the crime against her as “the price one has to pay for staying on” (158). The child that results from this “payment” is, of course, a very literal symbol of hybridity with its white mother and black father, but it is also a symbol of the future identity of South Africa as a nation, as discussed by Malvern van Wyk Smith in his paper entitled “Rape and the Foundation of Nations in J.M. Coetzee’s *Disgrace*” (2014). While Van Wyk Smith’s article provides a compelling argument for the allegorical identification of the child with the nation, it is in how the child will be received by the different characters in *Disgrace* that we can see the potential success of a future open to cultural hybridism. Lurie, who initially rejects the idea of the child, suggesting Lucy abort, comes around to the pregnancy, calling the expected baby “a child of this earth” (217) and becoming almost whimsical as he wonders about his grandfatherly role. Petrus, though not explicitly shown to have an opinion about the child must have, Lucy claims “put two and two together” (203) and still willingly proposes marriage to her, albeit one of mutual convenience rather than love. Lucy herself is also pragmatic about her situation and understands that despite the child’s origins she will, thanks to Mother Nature, come to love her child, the new nation. Coetzee here seems to be pointing to cultural hybridity as the *natural*, least violent and most humanly satisfying way for South Africa to seek its post-Apartheid identity as a nation.

Returning to what may be considered a small detail, I believe it is worth noting here that the image of three market stalls can be seen as symbolic of the three political currents under discussion here. Lucy's stall (hybridism) is located right between that of the Afrikaaner couple (Eurocentrism) and the group of African women (Africanism). The success of the different stalls highlights the potential success of cultural hybridism – “Lucy takes in nearly five hundred rand” (71) – and also hints at one of the more positive aspects of African traditional culture, which Coetzee clearly believes should play a role in the future of South Africa, that of collectivism in opposition to Western individualism, as the group of African women also enjoy “plenty of trade” (71) in opposition to the previously mentioned lack of success for the Afrikaaner couple. This particular point is also explored through the different family dynamics of David Lurie and Petrus, the former divorced and living alone, the latter with two wives and a large extended family. Uwalaka mentions how the “westernization/modernization paradigm” has led to the loss of “social solidarity and community feeling, [...] of warm family ties, of the culture of contentment” (50) and Coetzee suggests, in his portrayal of Petrus's family dynamics that this European tendency towards capitalist individualism is less attractive than the African community-mindedness. As far as Uwalaka's mention of anarchy (41), it is quite clear that the extended African family unit, represented by Petrus's large family in *Disgrace*, functions as a self-governing cell and its apparent success in comparison to Lurie's very Western and quite dysfunctional family unit, can be taken as an implicit criticism of the “dogmatic insistence by both Africa and the West that democracy must work [in Africa]” (Ekpo, 185) and of the concept of a Western-style nation-state and democracy in general.

To quote David Lurie, “it is hard to say what Petrus is, strictly speaking” (116). This suggests that Coetzee is attempting to break down the essentialist, stereotypical Western view of black Africans in his portrayal of this character. It is important to realise that Petrus is ultimately the most successful character in the book, and that his success is born of his ability to meld his African heritage with Western modernity. He has a good command not only of his native language, but of English too, and when he uses Western technology, he suddenly becomes “[a]ll very swift and businesslike; all very unlike Africa”

(Coetzee, 151). We, as readers can only conclude, as Lurie does, that “against this new Petrus” (151), i.e. against this competent melding of two cultures, the mutually exclusive ideologies of Africanism and Eurocentrism have no chance of survival. Though we might take Lurie’s claim that “Petrus has a vision of the future in which people like Lucy have no place” (118) as evidence that the character is following, and representing an Africanist agenda, it becomes clear as the novel progresses that he is not, and that Lucy is in fact very likely to have a place in Petrus’s vision of the future, as explained below, while Petrus will only take what he knows will best serve him from his African heritage, condemning the hatred and violent acts of Pollux as “bad” (201) but also understanding that endlessly focussing on the crimes of the past (perpetrated by blacks or whites) cannot help anyone, least of all himself, in any way.

Coetzee also, interestingly, manages to use the character of Petrus, and to a lesser degree that of Isaacs, to criticise the Eurocentric Africans who attempt to imitate Europe at the expense of their own culture. He does this through the recurring image of these two men, neither of whom are white, dressed in apparently uncomfortable or ill-fitting European suits. Petrus’s suits, the first “too tight for him” (113) the second, “garish”, and Isaac’s “too large for him” symbolise the way in which Eurocentric Africans try (or tried) to imitate the West and in doing so, as shown by their discomfort and apparent ridiculousness of appearance when wearing the suits, “robbed Africa of its dignity and identity and turned her into a slave of an alien world with an alien way of thinking, naïve and consumption-oriented” (Uwalaka, 48). While these claims may appear exaggerated for the humble image of the suit, I do believe Coetzee is using the trope to subtly draw attention to the inadequacies of the wholesale adoption or imitation of Western culture.

As seen here, both Lucy and Petrus as individuals offer representations of cultural hybridism, but it is when we look at them together that the clearest manifestation of Coetzee’s vision for the future of South Africa becomes apparent. Evidently, their lives are to be intertwined from now on as Lucy agrees to enter into an “alliance, a deal” (Coetzee, 203) with Petrus, ensuring her own safety and his continued prosperity. If we study the etymology of their names, it

becomes clear that what Coetzee is proposing here is a marriage of convenience between Lucy, whose name comes from *Lucius* in Latin, meaning “of light” and Petrus, whose name comes from the Greek *petros*, meaning rock. Extending the metaphor, we have European enlightenment married to African bedrock. European modernity to African tradition. That this cultural melding, together with the birth of Lucy’s child, who represents a new hybrid identity for South Africa, takes place in a place called Salem is no accident, as the place name’s etymology lies in the Hebrew *Shalem*, which means “peace”. Hence Europe and Africa combine in Peace to bring forth a new Nation, a new identity for South Africa and its people.

5. CONCLUSIONS

It becomes clear upon reading *Disgrace* with the intention of discovering the political undercurrents to the novel, that Coetzee has managed to write a great deal about the state of South Africa in the post-Apartheid era, and to offer his own opinion about what the best path forward may be for his native country, and for Africa in general, without being overtly or stridently political at any given moment. His ability to write on different levels means that readers need to engage more fully with the book in order to reveal his ideas, but that upon doing so are rewarded with a fascinating exploration of the three major currents open to South Africa in its quest for a new national identity after the abolition of Apartheid. His own predilection for a future nationhood based on cultural hybridity and a “marriage” between the best African traditions and the best European modernity is quietly but clearly expressed in his characters and sometimes complex symbolism, and I believe that we can affirm with some degree of surety, that *Disgrace* posits a future for South Africa that goes beyond the limitations of Négritude and beyond the impositions of a Eurocentric model of Western modernization to find a middle ground that will, in the words of Jude Uwalaka, result in

Africans having a critical engagement with what western civilization has offered and continues to offer, with a view to appropriating only those ideas, visions and methods which, in combination with relevant African heritage, will unleash her

indigenous potentialities in order to ensure a progressive path, respectable well-being and dignity for her people in the future. (41)

WORKS CITED

- Atwell, D. 2001 "Coetzee and Post-Apartheid South Africa". *Journal of Southern African Studies* 27.4: 865–67. Accessed on 30/12/2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/823418>.
2016. *J. M. Coetzee and the Life of Writing: Face-to-face with Time*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Cass, J. 2013 "Rape as Debt: The Incineration of Romanticism in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*." *College English Association. CEA Critic* 75.1: 36–43. *ProQuest*. Accessed on 30/12/2016. DOI: 10.1353/cea.2013.0009.
- Coetzee, J.M. 2000 *Disgrace*. London: Vintage.
- Cooper, P. 2005 "Metamorphosis and Sexuality: Reading the Strange Passions of *Disgrace*." *Research in African Literatures* 36.4: 22–39. Accessed on 04/01/2016. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3821380>.
- Easton, K. 2010 "Teaching Coetzee's *Foe* and *Disgrace*: Intertextuality and the Question of Canonicity". *SOAS Research Online*. University of London. Accessed on 30/12/2016. http://www.eprints.soas.ac.uk/11013/2/kai_easton_-teaching_coetzee's_foe_%26_disgrace.pdf.
- Ekpo, D. 2010 "From Negritude to Post-Africanism", *Third Text* 24.2: 177–87. Accessed on 10/10/2016. DOI: 10.1080/09528821003722108.
- Eze, C. 2015 "Decolonisation and its discontents: Thoughts on the postcolonial African moral self". *South African Journal of Philosophy* 34.4: 408–18. Accessed on 30/12/2016. DOI: 10.1080/02580136.2015.1113822.
- Fanon, F. 1967 *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington. London: Penguin Books.
- Harper, D *Online Etymology Dictionary*: <http://www.etymonline.com/>
- Lowry, E. 1999 "Like a Dog", *London Review of Books* 21.20: 12–14. Accessed on 30/12/2016. <https://www.lrb.co.uk/v21/n20/elizabeth-lowry/like-a-dog>
- Sarvan, C. 2004 "Disgrace: A Path to Grace?" *World Literature Today* 78.1: 26–9. Accessed on 30/12/2016. DOI: 10.2307/40158353.

- Saunders, R. 2005 “Disgrace in the Time of a Truth Commission”, *Parallax* 11.3:99–106. Accessed on 30/12/2016. DOI: 10.1080/13534640500134003.
- Shattuck, S. D. 2009 “Dis(g)race, or White Man Writing”. In: Bill McDonald (ed.) *Encountering Disgrace: reading and teaching Coetzee’s novel...* New York: Camden House: 138–47
- Uwalaka, J. N. 2014 “Knowledge Growth and the Re-Invention of the African Mind for a Philosophy of Progress in Africa: A Critique of the Westernization/Eurocentric Discourse” *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 19.1.VIII: 41–54. Accessed on 30/12/2016. DOI: 10.9790/0837-1918415.
- Van Wyk Smith, M. 2014 “Rape and the Foundation of Nations in J. M. Coetzee’s Disgrace.” *English in Africa* 41.1: 13–34. Accessed on 30/12/2016. DOI: 10.4314/eia.v41i1.2.
- Wikipedia contributors “History of South Africa (1994–present).” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Accessed on 30/12/2016. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_South_Africa_\(1994%E2%80%93present\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_South_Africa_(1994%E2%80%93present))

ⁱ Box 10, *Foe MSS*, 5, vn 4 (1 Dec. 1983), J.M. Coetzee Papers, qtd in Easton, 2010 (cited here with kind permission from the author).