

Gender, Sexual Violence, and the Reconfiguration of Power in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*

Papanna S.

Associate Professor of English
Government First Grade College, Doddaballapur
Bengaluru Rural Dist. – 561203

DOI:10.37648/ijrssh.v15i02.017

¹ Received: 16/05/2025; Accepted: 20/06/2025; Published: 25/06/2025

ABSTRACT

J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace* (1999), set in the unsettled landscape of post-apartheid South Africa, brings gender, sexuality, race, historical memory, and political transition into an uneasy relationship. This paper examines the novel's two central episodes of sexual violation: David Lurie's coercive sexual relationship with his student Melanie Isaacs and the gang rape of his daughter Lucy. Rather than treating the two episodes as identical, the paper argues that Coetzee places them in a disturbing structural relation in order to expose different forms of gendered power. Lurie's conduct reveals the persistence of patriarchal and institutional privilege even after political structures have changed, while Lucy's rape demonstrates how sexual violence can become entangled with racial history, land, fear, and the redistribution of power in post-apartheid South Africa. Particular attention is given to Lucy's refusal to report the rape. Her silence cannot be satisfactorily explained either as passive surrender or as an acceptance of rape as historical retribution. It is instead presented as a difficult attempt to retain control over the meaning of her own experience while negotiating a future in a society whose power relations are being radically reorganized. The paper therefore reads *Disgrace* as a novel that refuses simple moral binaries. It shows that political liberation does not automatically end gendered domination and that historical injustice cannot ethically justify new violence. Through Lurie and Lucy, Coetzee asks how individuals inhabit a society in transition when older forms of authority have lost legitimacy but new forms of justice and belonging remain uncertain.

Keywords: *gender; sexual violence; post-apartheid South Africa; power; race; postcolonialism*

Introduction

This paper argues that *Disgrace* investigates the reconfiguration of power after apartheid by showing that political transformation does not necessarily produce an equivalent transformation in gender relations. Race and gender intersect in the novel, but neither can be reduced to the other. The transition from white political dominance to democratic rule destabilizes Lurie's inherited sense of authority, yet male entitlement continues to operate across racial divisions. The novel's deepest irony is therefore that historical power may change hands while the vulnerability of women to sexual domination persists. This approach also requires caution about the language of postcolonialism. John McLeod emphasizes that postcolonial criticism is not a single method but a field concerned with the continuing cultural and political consequences of colonial power (McLeod). In *Disgrace*, the "post" in post-apartheid similarly does not indicate that the past has disappeared. The past remains active in land ownership, racial suspicion, institutional memory, and ideas of entitlement. At the same time, the novel warns against treating every present act as a transparent expression of historical conflict. Sexual violence has political meanings, but it also has specifically gendered meanings that cannot be absorbed into a racial allegory.

¹ How to cite the article: Papanna S.; (June, 2025); Gender, Sexual Violence, and the Reconfiguration of Power in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*; *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*; Vol 15, Issue 2; 177-180; DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v15i02.017>

Desire, Entitlement, and the Crisis of Masculine Authority

At the beginning of the novel, David Lurie imagines himself as a man who has achieved a workable arrangement with desire. He is educated, articulate, culturally sophisticated, and accustomed to interpreting his own conduct through the language of aesthetics and instinct. Yet his sophistication repeatedly becomes a means of avoiding ethical responsibility. His relationship with Melanie is the clearest example. She is not simply a woman with whom he happens to have an affair; she is his student, much younger than he is, and subject to an institutional relationship in which he possesses authority.

The language through which Lurie understands sexuality is crucial. He repeatedly treats desire as something natural, almost sovereign, and therefore resistant to moral regulation. Later, when speaking about punishment, he compares himself to an animal following its instincts (Coetzee 90). Such language appears to remove choice and responsibility from sexual action. If desire is merely instinct, then the desiring subject can imagine himself as acted upon by nature rather than as a person making choices that affect another human being.

Coetzee, however, does not allow Lurie's self-description to settle the ethical question. Melanie's relative silence, hesitation, vulnerability, and subsequent withdrawal from the university make the episode deeply troubling. The narrative is focalized largely through Lurie, and this itself matters: the reader receives an elaborate account of the man's desire but comparatively little access to the young woman's experience. Lucy Valerie Graham argues that the "hidden" stories of both Melanie and Lucy are central to the ethical difficulty of reading rape in *Disgrace* (Graham). The absence of full access to the women's interiority should therefore not be mistaken for the absence of injury. Instead, it exposes how easily a powerful male narrative can occupy the space in which the woman's account might otherwise appear.

The university inquiry further reveals Lurie's peculiar understanding of responsibility. He is prepared to admit that he is guilty of the charges, but he resists the institutional demand for repentance. His refusal is not simply courageous resistance to bureaucracy. It also shows his determination to retain interpretive authority over his own actions. He will acknowledge that he broke a rule, but he resists a language that would require him to understand the event from Melanie's position. Elleke Boehmer identifies the refusal of confession as one of the important structural parallels in the novel: Lurie refuses the expected public apology, while Lucy later refuses to narrate her pain publicly or lay charges against her attackers (Boehmer). The two refusals, however, are ethically different. Lurie's silence protects his conception of himself; Lucy's silence emerges from the position of a victim trying to decide what can be done with an experience that others are eager to interpret.

Lurie's *Disgrace* is therefore not merely the fall of a white man in a new political order. It is also the crisis of a form of masculinity accustomed to translating desire into entitlement. Simone de Beauvoir's foundational feminist argument that woman has historically been constituted as the "Other" to a masculine subject remains relevant here: Lurie repeatedly experiences women in relation to his own needs, fantasies, artistic ambitions, and self-understanding (de Beauvoir). Melanie's subjectivity becomes secondary to the drama he constructs around desire.

Yet Coetzee does not leave Lurie unchanged. His later work with animals, his growing awareness of vulnerability, and his inability to control Lucy's choices gradually weaken his confidence in mastery. The novel does not provide him with a simple moral conversion, but it forces him into encounters with forms of existence that cannot be possessed or fully interpreted. His loss of institutional status is thus only the beginning of his education in powerlessness.

Sexual violence in a racialized history

The attack on Lucy's farm is the most disturbing event in *Disgrace*. It is also the event most likely to invite allegorical interpretation. Three black men attack a white woman on land in post-apartheid South Africa; her white father is beaten and burned; property is stolen; dogs are killed; and Lucy is raped. Given the country's history, it is almost impossible to read the episode without thinking about race, colonial possession, land, and the violent structures of apartheid. Yet precisely because the scene carries such historical weight, criticism must resist turning the rape into a simple symbol.

Lurie himself initially seeks the familiar language of law and justice. As Lucy's father, he wants the attackers identified, arrested, and punished. His question — "Am I wrong to want justice?" — is emotionally understandable (Coetzee 119). The new South African state, after all, formally promises equality before the law. His demand cannot simply be dismissed as colonial nostalgia. A woman has been raped, and the fact that she is white does not make her right to justice less legitimate.

At the same time, Lurie gradually begins to interpret the attack historically. He senses that what happened was “personal” even though the attackers did not know Lucy personally. This paradox suggests the possibility of inherited historical hostility: Lucy may be unknown as an individual while still being legible to the attackers as white, female, and a landholder. Frantz Fanon’s account of colonialism is useful in understanding the historical background against which such hostility becomes imaginable. Fanon describes colonial society as a world structured through racialized violence and unequal possession, a world in which domination penetrates social relations and produces counter-violence (Fanon). But Fanon cannot be used to convert the rape into a morally legitimate act of decolonization. Historical explanation and ethical justification are not the same thing.

This distinction is essential. If Lucy’s rape is described as repayment for colonial violence, Lucy becomes responsible for crimes she did not personally commit, while the rapists are transformed into representatives of history rather than perpetrators accountable for their actions. Such a reading also risks repeating a patriarchal logic in which women’s bodies function as territories upon which conflicts between groups of men are enacted. The woman becomes the medium through which one racial order communicates with another.

The central issue, then, is not whether race or gender provides the “correct” explanation of Lucy’s rape. The violence is gendered because men rape a woman and use sexual violation as an assertion of power. It is racialized because it occurs within a society in which black and white identities have been violently organized by history. It is also connected to land and changing authority because Lucy’s future on the farm becomes increasingly dependent on her relationship with Petrus. These dimensions overlap without becoming interchangeable.

Silence, Agency, and the Right to Interpret Suffering

Lucy’s refusal to report the rape is the most difficult decision in the novel and the point at which the original paper’s central insight can be most productively developed. Lurie cannot understand why she refuses the conventional route of complaint, investigation, and punishment. He assumes that silence will leave the crime unanswered and the perpetrators free. Lucy, however, insists that what happened to her is her business and that she possesses at least one right: the right not to be placed on trial by her father or compelled to justify herself (Coetzee 133).

This declaration is vital because it relocates the question of agency. Lucy could not control the attack, but she attempts to control what happens to its meaning afterward. Lurie wants her experience to enter his narrative of crime, justice, racial danger, and paternal protection. The police would necessarily translate it into the institutional language of evidence and prosecution. Public discourse might turn it into proof of the failure of the new South Africa. Lucy refuses these appropriations.

Her silence should therefore not be equated automatically with passivity. At the same time, it should not be romanticized as empowerment. Silence can preserve a victim’s control over disclosure, but it can also arise from fear, trauma, social pressure, or lack of faith in institutions. Boehmer’s discussion of “not speaking pain” is valuable precisely because it places Lucy’s refusal beside the novel’s wider concern with confession and public speech (Boehmer). In a South African context shaped by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, speaking, confessing, witnessing, and acknowledging injury had acquired major public significance. *Disgrace* complicates the assumption that truth necessarily appears through compulsory confession. A victim may refuse speech without thereby denying that violence occurred.

Lucy’s decision becomes even more troubling when she discovers that she is pregnant and chooses to continue the pregnancy. Lurie regards her position as increasingly intolerable and urges her to leave. His suggestion that she go to Europe reveals a difference between father and daughter that is both generational and political. For Lurie, Europe remains imaginable as an alternative space of security and belonging. For Lucy, South Africa is home. She does not understand herself simply as a temporary European presence in Africa.

Her determination to stay, however, comes at a severe cost. She eventually contemplates an arrangement under Petrus’s protection that would reduce her formal independence and alter her relation to the land. The language of accommodation becomes almost feudal: she is prepared to accept a diminished position if she can remain. It would be too easy to celebrate this as successful assimilation into a new South Africa. Her choice is made under conditions of vulnerability. Agency here does not mean freedom from constraint; it means choosing within a field in which every available option carries loss.

This is why Lucy should not be made into an allegorical sacrifice for white historical guilt. Lurie imagines that she wants to “humble” herself before history (Coetzee 160), but this remains his interpretation. The novel never gives the reader sufficient grounds to declare that Lucy accepts rape as deserved punishment for apartheid. Indeed, her

remarks about sex, hatred, and male violence move the event away from a purely racial explanation. When she asks Lurie whether trapping and overpowering a woman can resemble killing, she identifies a structure of masculine violence that exceeds the black/white opposition (Coetzee 158). Her words indirectly illuminate Lurie's own inability to understand the coercive dimensions of his relationship with Melanie.

Lucy's silence thus performs two functions at once. It refuses her father's authority to interpret her, and it confronts the reader with the limits of interpretation itself. We are forced to ask what it means to respect a victim's agency when her choices are painful, constrained, and politically ambiguous.

Melanie and Lucy: parallel violations, unequal narratives

One of Coetzee's most provocative structural choices is to place Melanie and Lucy within the same novel. The temptation is to make the two women mirror images: Melanie, a black or racially marked student violated by a white professor, and Lucy, a white woman raped by black men. Such symmetry can make *Disgrace* appear to stage a reversal of power in which racial domination returns upon the former dominant group. But this reading is inadequate if it treats sexual violence as a mechanism of historical balance.

The two episodes are not equivalent. Melanie's experience occurs within a university relationship shaped by age, institutional authority, and Lurie's capacity to influence her academic life. Lucy's rape is a violent group assault accompanied by physical attack, robbery, and terror. To call both episodes simply "rape" without qualification may erase important differences in circumstance, legal characterization, and narrative representation. Yet to separate them completely would also miss Coetzee's design. Both involve men who act upon women while the women's own accounts remain partially inaccessible.

The asymmetry of narration is particularly important. We know what Lurie thinks before, during, and after his involvement with Melanie. We know his rationalizations, literary references, resentment, and refusal to repent. We do not receive Melanie's equivalent interior narrative. Similarly, after Lucy's rape, much of the reader's access to the event is mediated through Lurie's questions and anxieties. Lucy speaks more forcefully than Melanie, but she deliberately withholds the story of the rape itself.

This narrative pattern makes the reader confront a recurring problem: male interpretation expands while female experience remains partly unsaid. The silence is not empty. It becomes an ethical demand not to confuse narrative access with truth. Graham argues that the concealed or inaccessible stories of Melanie and Lucy have unavoidable implications for the reader (Graham). The reader must therefore resist completing those stories too confidently.

The comparison also exposes Lurie's moral blindness. He is horrified by what happened to Lucy but has difficulty recognizing the violence embedded in his own sexual entitlement. His paternal outrage is genuine, yet it does not immediately generate self-recognition. He can understand violation when it happens to the woman he loves as a daughter more easily than when he himself occupies the position of the powerful man. The novel thereby makes gender a crucial test of his ethical imagination.

Conclusion

Seen in this light, *Disgrace* is not simply a story about the decline of white authority. It is also a story about the persistence of patriarchal habits across political change. The old racial hierarchy has been formally dismantled, but women's bodily autonomy remains vulnerable. The perpetrators are racially different, the social circumstances are different, and the degrees of violence are different; nevertheless, both episodes expose the assumption that male desire or male power can override a woman's will. *Disgrace* presents post-apartheid South Africa not as a society that has simply exchanged one stable order for another but as a space of difficult transition. Legal and political structures have changed, yet the past continues to shape race, land, identity, and social authority. Within this transition, Coetzee places gender at the centre of the question of power.

Works Cited

Boehmer, Elleke. "Not Saying Sorry, Not Speaking Pain: Gender Implications in *Disgrace*." Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies, vol. 4, no. 3, 2002, pp. 342–351. Taylor & Francis Online, doi:10.1080/1369801022000013770.

Coetzee, J. M. *Disgrace*. Secker & Warburg, 1999.

de Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Translated by H. M. Parshley, Vintage Books, 1972.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington, Penguin Classics, 2001.

Graham, Lucy Valerie. "Reading the Unspeakable: Rape in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*." *Journal of Southern African Studies*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2003, pp. 433–444. Taylor & Francis Online, doi:10.1080/03057070306207.

McDonald, Bill, editor. *Encountering Disgrace: Reading and Teaching Coetzee's Novel*. Camden House, 2009.

McLeod, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. 2nd ed., Manchester UP, 2010.