

Tribhuvan University

Ethical Dilemma in Coetzee's *Disgrace* and Gordmier's *The House Gun*

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Central Department of English in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Masters of Philosophy in English**

By

Min Prasad Rijal

Symbol No.: 1321

T.U. Regd. No.: 9-1-240-1037-2000

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

January 2022

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

It is recommended that the dissertation entitled "Ethical Dilemma in Coetzee's *Disgrace* and Gordmier's *The House*" in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the M. Phil Degree in English by Min Prasad Rijal has been completed under my supervision. I recommend it for final evaluation.

.....

Dr. Shiva Rijal

Supervisor

Date:

Letter of Approval

This dissertation entitled "Ethical Dilemma in Coetzee's *Disgrace* and Gordmier's *The House*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the M. Phil Degree in English by Min Prasad Rijal has been approved by the under signed members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

.....

Dr. Shiva Rijal

Internal Examiner

.....

Prof. Dr. Dhruva Karki

External Examiner

.....

Prof. Dr. Jib Lal Sapkota

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deepest and sincere gratitude to my internal supervisor Dr. Shiva Rijal for his comprehensive suggestions and guidance whose unveiled support makes me exploring newness in the dissertation. I gratefully acknowledge with my reverence Guru and external research supervisor Prof. Dr. Dhurba Karki whose scholarly suggestions and insightful guidance forwards me to explore more in research. I am equally obliged to my respected teacher Prof. Dr. Beerendra Pandey for his immense support on theoretical analysis.

I am great privileged to have teachers who assiduously educated us and towering their skills on transformation to their pupils softly and gently whom I owe to oblige deepest sense gratitude to my teachers Prof. Dr. Jib Lal Sapkota, the Head of the Department of English for his approval of this dissertation, Prof. Dr. Abhi Subedi, Prof. Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Prof. Dr. Anirudra Thapa, Prof. Dr. Ram Chandra Poudel, Dr. Hari Adhikari and all teachers at the Department of who taught me and whom I taught with.

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my much-loved parents Narahari Rijal, Balika Devi Rijal and also like to dedicate my brothers Balkrishna Rijal and Ashok Kumar Rijal. I am thankful to Mrs. Indrawati Poudel for her kind support and keen interest in my research.

January 2022

Min Prasad Rijal

Abstract

This study examines the ethical and humanistic aspects in the two post-apartheid novels of South Africa *Disgrace* by J.M. Coetzee and *The House Gun* by Nadine Gordimer. Each text presents the traumatic experience of African black and white under the racism along with their struggle towards the redemption. The rapist Lurie and murderer Duncan are male protagonists of these novels, is built on embodied acts of sexual and racial violence stranded on the legacy of ethics and humanistic concern raising the ethical dilemma. Lucy in *Digrace* and Karl Jespersen in *The House Gun* represent the South Africa's atrocities of white and black. The promotion of revengeful action raises the question in human rights. In terms of the lens of human rights and ethics Lucy forgives the black and Motsamai who advocates on white guilt-Duncan murder case shows failing to promotion human rights arouses ethical concern. The spotlight in these ethical dilemma testimonies is on the collective memory of the victims maintaining relationship between and among narration, subjectivity of the black and white violence. The research draws on Emanuel Levinas concept of social moralist of contemporary thought and Lynn Hunt theory of truly equal in rights. This study aims at exploring on the humanistic and ethical engagement for balancing both victims and sufferer without condemning them and their ethics being inflicted with the humanistic perspective. The finding of this study is that transitional society gives rise to ethical dilemma and subsequently cripples the promotion of human rights.

Contents

Contents	Page No.
Letter of Recommendation	i
Letter of Approval	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	v
Chapter I: Human Rights and Ethics	1-25
Chapter II: Ethical Dilemma in Coetzee's <i>Disgrace</i> and Gordimer's <i>The House Gun</i>	26-58
Chapter III: Ethical Impotence in Transitional Society	59-61
Works Cited	

Chapter I

Human Rights and Ethics

Both J.M. Coetzee and Nadine Gordimer are the influential white South-African writers who fairly represent violence and the complicated dynamics of South African transitional society and life style through their novels *Disgrace* (1999) and *The House Gun* (1998) respectively. To be more specific, Coetzee in his *Disgrace* and Gordimer in his *The House Gun* overshadow the South African post-apartheid violence and its terrific ramification against humanity. With such very backdrop, these narratives serve as ideological apparatus to reconcile differences between the white and the black through Truth Reconciliation Centre (TRC).

However, postulating ethical questions from the optics of human rights in *Disgrace* what Coetzee highlights is a burning investigation of racial tension envisioning it with South African Apartheid legacy sensitizing the background of postcolonial literature. In the same vein, Gordimer in *The House Gun* describes the symbolic representation of violence of post-apartheid Africa. This dissertation seeks to examine the muted voices and unspeakable pain inflicted with sexual and murder case– of victims or sufferer that becomes means to unite and bring justice to them by TRC. As such, the study attempts to study the above mentioned primary texts through the lens of 'human rights and ethics' of the transitional society of South Africa so as to establish on promoting human rights, human dignity, social justice and strong ethical sense in humanity.

At one point, Coetzee in his *Disgrace* foregrounds on gendered based violence of post-apartheid South Africa capturing the complexities of white and the black's transformation. Yet, he anticipates South Africa throughout its rise from eras of colonialism and immigrant racism and reflects on the notion of being in post-

apartheid South Africa. In line with this, he is showing such a picture of South Africa narrativizing the story of David Lurie, Lucy, Melanie Isaacs, and Petrus. Coetzee, hence, contends that this sort of apartheid has brought deformity and devastating consequences against the humanity in South Africa.

Moreover, David Lurie claims that *Disgrace* unfolds “rights to desire...practical challenges to human rights discourse” (Anker S. Elizabeth 234). Similarly, Anker S. Elizabeth highlights that desires of Lurie's words brings confusions in human right discourse and his passion of sex raise an ethical question. He opposes his “rights of desire” to human rights raising ethical problems. *Disgrace* discloses not only the contingency of justice but also the deeply racialized nature of this contingency, whether the response to rape occurs in black South Africa or in the white liberal context of the university. Specifically, the novel reveals that rape is not primarily a gendered crime that is then complicated by considerations of race or class. There is the discrepancy between the responses to the two rapes in the novel is only naturalized when insufficient attention is paid to the workings of narration, narrative, and racial politics. The characters of the novel portray how the South African people have suffered from races. In *Disgrace*, Lurie's violence and sexual assault on Melanie appears to be increasingly contingent case that cannot be understood only in the locus of ethics and normative values. Lurie's invincible passion crosses the boundary of ethics and normative value. Such a positioning of authorial stand hardly makes readers aware of violence that spirals upwards adding fuels to the wounds and injuries of innocent victims.

Like, Gordimer's *The House Gun* examines the incidents of racial disintegration between two races. She further points out that portrays complicated bisexual nature of Duncan's South Africa's transitional society. Similarly, Duncan

commits a murder and the whole novel is focused on impact of the murder of Jespersion on Duncan's parents. *The House Gun* beginning lines is “something terrible happened” (3) embodies uncomfortable stances insider in the South African society. Gordimer intends to make people aware of how crimes are committed for ego gratification and how innocents' rights are violated. She mutes her voice and gives readers an inkling of how a fresh angle should be explored to look into this murder. Gordimer in her novel *The House Gun* symbolically represents how South Africa is fighting against the violence. For her, there is no such belief between races. The way they used is, mysterious and suspects in the eye of humanity.

Gordimer valorizes mental instability, violent and politics of race were the root-cause fueling atrocities in South Africa. The novel title is *The House Gun* as a symbolic representation of domestic violence in the nation. It marks a significant alteration in Gordimer's writing, taking it into the territory of the new, post-apartheid South Africa. Gordimer tries to establish fresh perspective to look at desire and actions of a few characters beyond good and evil, or beyond ethics and politics. This novel showcases how the post-apartheid society accommodates violence or normalizes it. Duncan kills Carl Jespersion when he sees Jespersion sleeping with his girlfriend Natalie. The novel concentrates more on the impact of murder committed by Duncan on his parents. Only the pros and cons of the murder in the transitional context are highlighted in the novel. Such an unimaginable horror is not condemned by the novelist outright. Just by exploring fresh and new perspective on violence, no novelist can contribute to the dissemination of human rights.

The significance of the study is how the human rights and ethics are coined in literary discourse. The study explores the new zone of human rights and ethics in South Africa when the violence was rapidly going on between the two races. Both

novel are possessed the neutral quality and narrativizing the plots in terms of locus of ethics. In the eye of Coetzee's *Disgrace*, it does not condemn those who are under the investigation of sexual assault of Lurie, Melanie Isaac, Petrus and Lucy. Though, Melanie's sexual discourse by Lurie and Lucy's brutal attack for the sex by the blacks is beyond the humanity. The novel tries to keep them muting their voices both Melanie and Lucy that is an ethical question in human rights discourse. Though, it has beyond the humanity, Coetzee's novel does not condemn them instead it breaks thorough the human rights acts in order to stop the explosion of violence in between two races i.e. white and black. Similarly, in, *The House Gun*, Karl Jespersen is murdered by Duncan Lindgard. There is mysterious scene which evokes stills, there is conflicting in between white and black. The lawyer Motsammi (Black) charges his ethical notes towards the white that reflects humanity still breathes in the novel. The middle class white lady Claudia spends her time on the treatment of black that unmasks the discrimination in between the races. The enigmatic nature of kidnapping by Duncan reveals that death of Karl Jespersen is held in the house which provokes the symbolically "Gun" is a domestic violence that loses the humanity in South Africa during post-apartheid era.

Coetzee and Gordimer both dwell upon various problems that arose in South Africa. Their writings deal with issues and subjects that range from colonialism and apartheid to ethics and communal riots. Coetzee's *Disgrace* produces narrations with an eye of an outsider whereas Gordimer's *The House Gun* provides a keen sense of being an insider who is aware of various ills and evils that lurked in post-apartheid society. By documenting their atrocities and violence, these novels not only mute the voice of voiceless but also shrink the scope and expansion of human rights.

The study focuses on how these two novels *Disgrace* and *The House Gun* represent the ethical and humanity concerns in between white and black. This dissertation also seeks to study the texts under discussion as fallen state of society comes up with balancing their lives without condemning anyone else. As these novels deal with two races i.e. black and white, this dissertation also tries to delve into the ethical and humanitarian bondage between sufferer and perpetrator through TRC.

The research assumes that the narrativization of human rights and ethics in Coetzee's *Disgrace* and Gordmier's *The House Gun* reveals the importance of forgiving the atrocities and murdered case for the purposes of stopping the violence in the society where black and white have bonding relationship as a sisterhood and brotherhood. By documenting their discrimination, torture and trauma, these writers not only function to ease their discrimination but also effectively take control of their discrimination, transferring themselves from mute object to undermine the dehumanizing effect of torture and trauma.

The primary objective of reading Coetzee's and Gordmier's text with the lens of human rights and ethics in the dissertation is to clarify two things: (a) Coetzee's and Gordmier's emphasis on the humanistic and ethical engagement for balancing both victims and perpetrators without condemning them in the above mentioned novels, and (b) their ethics being inflicted with the humanistic perspective.

This dissertation draws on Lynn Hunt's concept of "self evident" respect equally to all in her *Inventing Human Rights*. She asserts that "all men" are created equal and having no equal in every respect. She further claims that political liberties and religious freedom are basic rights gifted by birth. Emanuel Levinas notion in his *Ethics and Infinity* focuses on "sole moralist of contemporary thought" which link with the moral principle and normative values. Ethical dilemma on the part of the

narrators in Coetzee's *Disgrace* and Gordimer's *The House Gun* is the most noticeable issue. The study focuses on how the two novels *Disgrace* and *The House Gun* illustrate the ethical questions in human rights.

Alice Brittan notices the representation of the phenomenon of "*Death and J.M. Coetzee's Disgrace*". Brittan makes the following remarks concerning death as ambiguous phenomenon:

To be unthinkable is to be as good as dead, which is why *Disgrace* is a novel of necromancy populated by ghost and...begin by proposing that after a brutal, racially motivated attack, David Lurie and his daughter Lucy become as evanescent as the dead, and like the dead, they cannot speak because they have no selves to speak of. (8)

She exposes that unthinkable is good as dead. David and Lucy resemble as dead figures because they are unspoken. David attempts to recover to from this exhaustion of being by undertaking a journey into the world. The life he discovers among the dead is not shareable. It creates the circle of reciprocal acknowledgment called grace.

June Unjoo Yang notices a flaw in the concluding section of the novel, *The House Gun*. The ending is dubbed as facile by Yang. The lack of boundary between the author's critique and the character's indecisive posture spoils the artistic integrity of the novel. In a concise term, Yang makes the following revelation on this subject:

The most salient flaws of *The House Gun* are the conclusion, which feels rather rushed and facile, and the portrayal of black characters like Hamilton Motsamai. At times I have trouble discerning where the liberal white protagonists' stereotypes around race leave off and where the author's critique begins. The whites of Hamilton's eyes are described as strikingly clear-cut in his small mahogany face as the glass eyes set in ancient statues. It is difficult

to ascertain who is equating the man with an object of art. (2)

It is difficult to guess what the novel intends to communicate. At one level, it wants to show how violence is normalized or accommodated in post-apartheid society of South Africa. At another level, it tends to make people aware of how basic right to survive is threatened in a transitional society. The lack of clarity in the intended message is stupefying to readers.

Stephen Clingman *Surviving Murder* reposes the murder mystery. The ambiguity of the murder cases is not trying to deal with the thematic aspect of the novel. Focusing on this aspect of the novel, Clingman makes the disclosure:

The House Gun is not a novel that tackles its post-apartheid setting directly, in the sense that one might consider it a social or political work. Indeed, in focusing on a murder mystery...*The House Gun* is much quieter, more intimate, more introspective, and it might appear that Gordimer has at last been freed from the constraints of writing within and against the context of apartheid to explore a wholly different genre. (3)

This novel is on one level a murder mystery. It is even a thriller of sorts. It may account for its wider appeal. In its very intimacy, its turning away, it may also be turning toward something. Much more emphasis is given to the introspective world of character enmeshed in murder. Sufficient clarity is not easily found.

Although all these critics and reviewers examined *Disgrace* and *The House Gun* from various perspectives and arrived at different findings, none of them raise the issue of ethical dilemma in which both the narrators of these novels find themselves. Due to the discursive and complex nature of violence and rape that occurs in transitional society, it is challenging to probe any case of violence or assault just within the bound of ethics and normative concerns. Such specificity gives rise to

ethical dilemma in which any critical youth, or narrator or author finds himself or herself engrossed and enmeshed. Since literary works are inherently tailored to condemn violence, make people aware of burgeoning violence and thereby contribute to the acceleration of human right regime, there is bound to be a close nexus between literature and human rights. No matter how radical a work might be, it intends, in subtle way or manifest way, to implant in readers human rights and rights to life. The survey of erstwhile and current novels of high fame justifies the fact that the bond between fictions and human rights is implicit sometimes and direct occasionally. Rather they tend to make readers aware of the fresh need to look into violence with minds free from ethical and normative concern. Such an unexpressed pleading on the part of novelists try to accommodate violence or normalize it as part of everyday life. Or such an authorial audacity romanticizes violence disregarding how harmful such narrative account is to the full-flowering of human right regime. Hence, the bond is ruptured audaciously by Coetzee and Gordimer.

In the first chapter, the study undergoes with J.M. Coetzee's unwillingness to condemn violence connives at its accommodation or normalization which threatens human rights regime. Discursive nature of violence renders ethical concern entirely complex phenomenon. Condemnation of violence and bloodshed through narrative accounts paves the way for the promotion and consolidation of human rights regime. Coetzee's *Disgrace* does not condemn Lurie's violence and sexual assault on Melanie. Rather it subtly appeals us to explore new vantage point to probe this violence.

In the second chapter, *The House Gun* sparks the controversy of shocking type that appeals readers to engage in debate. She depicts the domestic violence and brutality of the human beings which are beyond the normative ethics and humanity. This novel is on one level a murder mystery. It is even a thriller of sorts. It may

account for its wider appeal. In its very intimacy, its turning away, it may also be turning toward something. Much more emphasis is given to the introspective world of character enmeshed in murder. Though, she does not complain anyone just she is showing the connectivity of the black and white in the South Africa. Claudia and Herald who are in touch with the Black lawyer Motsammi for their son Duncan's murdered case to Karl Jespersen. Gordimer puts her words neither what Claudia nor Motsammi does on neither releasing her son from the prison nor condemning Duncan's violence. Muting the voice on that issues shows that there is a way of bringing all the South African people to stop the violence in one side in another side it raises a questions in human rights.

The last chapter proposes the conclusion of the dissertation placing a highlight on ethical dilemma in transitional society. This chapter concludes the research task by comparing and foregrounding Coetzee's lens of ethics and human rights point of view on sexual violence in his *Disgrace* and Gordimer's ideology of domestic violence — murder case (inner conflict between races) upon homosexual relationship in her *The House Gun*.

Eleni Coundouriotis and Lauren M. E. Goodlad are theorists who study various ways in which fictions and human rights are inherently bonded. They are of the view that scholarship on human rights are promoted and diversified by literary works. In the very beginning of their writings, they raise a question-What have literary studies contributed to scholarship on human rights? In the present day world, financial crisis is worsening the material foundations of social justice. Bankrupt states underfund higher education. In this scenario, opportunities to discuss literature and human rights have arisen. In the words of Coundouriotis and Goodlad, "What seems likely, nevertheless, is that human rights will remain central to many contemporary

debates—from the global economy to the environment, gay marriage, human trafficking, and cultural and religious nationalism" (1). They highlight the human rights scope expanded from global economy to religious nationalisms. As topics like these continue to engage researchers across the disciplines, scholarship becomes more comparative in probing the historical, philosophical, rhetorical, and aesthetic contexts of human rights. The multidisciplinary attention to human rights in the humanities and social sciences today explores the exchanges between political, legal, and ethical discourses on human rights and cultural texts including literature, the visual and performing arts film and popular culture.

In *Inventing Human Rights*, Lynn Hunt makes the argument that the human rights movement was made possible by "evolutions in narrative practice" (5). She unfolds that human rights evolutions and movement are ejaculated by the narrative way. She claims that modern conceptions of human rights are derived from "the principles of the eighteenth-century Western Enlightenment, which in turn were made possible by (or developed the way they did because of) changing practices of storytelling: namely, the rise of the epistolary novel" (4). When thinking about the relationship between novels and human rights, people often conceptualize novels (like non-fictional narratives) as "tools for making new sympathetic or empathetic connections between subjects suffering from human rights abuses and subjects in a position to help alleviate this suffering" (Bystrom 8). Such connections may eventually lead to action on the part of the sympathizers and/or relief on the part of the sufferers.

The matters of interest in the present study revolve around the bonding relations within human rights and ethics. Enhancing access to justice and promoting human rights for all means to protect other without any political influence. We believe

that all humans have the right to access the same basic essentials no matter what their status and other auxiliary portfolios are. In this sense, human right becomes the pivotal entity regarding the case of such aforementioned traits of rights.

Lynn Hunt claims that human right as the utmost universal reality in which “men are born and remain free and equal in rights” (17). She argues that treating to anyone has to be same. Moreover, she argues that “everyone” is “truly equal in rights” and it adopts the sensibility of “self-evidence” being “crucial to the history of human rights.” To be more specific, “human rights have become so ubiquitous in the present time that they seem to require an equally capacious history” (18-20). Thus, the gravity of human right is immense. Likewise, she further avows:

Human rights only become meaningful when they gain political content. They are not the rights of humans in a state of nature; they are the rights of humans in society. They are not just human rights as opposed to divine rights, or human rights as opposed to animal rights; they are the rights of humans vis-à-vis each other. (21)

As with the aforesaid reference, what Hunt emphasizes is on the two basic entities of human right– not becoming the right of human in state of nature and becoming the right of human in society.

Lynn Hunt enumerates the reference of Africa to foreground the attribute of human right. She states that “violations of human rights which have been so long continued... unoffending inhabitants of Africa” in which the morality, the reputation, and the best interests of” the country and citizen, have felt the sense of human right is losing (22). According to Lyn Hunt claims that human rights only become meaningful when they gain political content. She further points out that human rights could only flourish when people learned to think of others as their equals. If such situation, as

Hunt arises, justice for the loss of human right becomes ejaculated in the way Sara Joseph and Joanna Kyriakakis notes in their book *Research Handbook on International Human as:*

The promotion and protection of human rights is not only a concern of the specialized human rights bodies, that is the African Commission, the Court and the Committee established under the Children's Charter. According to the *AU Constitutive Act* one of the objectives of the Union is to 'promote and protect human and peoples' rights in accordance with the [ACHPR] and other relevant instruments' (Article 3(h)). The Union shall function with respect for democratic principles, human rights, the rule of law and good governance.

(406-409)

Both their statements assert that human rights promotion and protection not only in body but it covers all the dimensions like democratic principles, rule of law and good governance. People can define the human rights in various ways but the essence of human right is to "Promote" and "Protection" human and peoples from any sorts of discriminations.

According to Andrew Clapham the rights values weighs up the respect and the dignity of humanity that ensures "everyone is treated with respect for their inherent dignity and human" (1). It rectifies all sorts of injustice. He claims that "human rights law in court is almost always contested" which is always takes two position in justice i.e. dilemma. Lynn Hunts states that "human right is at issue when we feel horrified by its violation" that loses the eminent energy of justice. She asserts that human rights becomes an issues when it fail to convey the right information at right times. For her saying "human rights are not just a doctrine formulated in documents; they rest on a disposition toward other people" this affirmation blows the rights is "to be truly self-

evident” (26-27). Emphasizing the humanities and its unleashing debates in human rights, Eleni Coundouriotis and Lauren M. E. Goodlad jointly give articulation to the probable connection between human rights and literary discourse. Their view is cited below:

...Human rights will remain central to many contemporary debates....Scholarship on human rights will become more comparative in probing the historical, philosophical, rhetorical, and aesthetic contexts of human rights. The multidisciplinary attention to human rights in the humanities and social sciences today explores the exchanges between political, legal, and ethical discourses on human rights and cultural texts. (121)

As Coundouriotis and Goodlad state that human rights is remaining the central point of discussions. They further focus that multidisciplinary attention to human rights are approaching to explore the exchanges between political, cultural and ethical texts.

In addition to Lynn Hunt argues that “human rights automatically excluded”(28) from the law of justice. What Hunt focuses here is to “individual autonomy hinges on an increasing sense of the separation and sacredness of human bodies: your body is yours and my body is mine” (29). She further points out that individuality increases “sense of the separation” (ibid) which brings the justice in each individual.

Moreover, Joseph Wronka in his book *Human Rights and Social Justice* stresses on human rights as the “Bedrock of social justice” (xliii) which resembles as “cornerstone” (Wronka 4) of justice. In order to giving the feelings of justice to the human being, there are standing social justices as like a rock in the human rights. Wronka opines that “human rights for every person, everywhere” (Wronka 24) is plausible for all individuals. Wronka asserts that rights to live and rights to survive

put the prudential remarks in the equity and equality discourse of human rights. Likewise, Hunt's straight forward her opinions towards the solidarity of the human beings. Her view is cited below:

Human rights could only flourish when people learned to think of others as their equals, as like them in some fundamental fashion. They learned this equality, at least in part, by experiencing identification with ordinary characters who seemed dramatically present and familiar, even if ultimately fictional. (58)

As her arguments claims that people have a sensibility of the treating equals to others. So as learning the driven force of human beings and noted that equality is a part of human rights. She further points out that equality is one part but it has to present dramatically to every character of the being.

Likewise, Pheng Cheah posits in her view is “human rights mean that one set of rights cannot be used to bargain for another”(157). What Cheah expresses here is human rights cannot alienate from any kinds influences. It brings justice to everyone equally. Hunt articulates that “there are certain rights of Human Nature which are unalienable” (123). She further says “rights did not disappear in either thought or action” (176) it has own specific national frameworks. Furthermore:

Needless to say, human rights are still easier to endorse than to enforce. The steady stream of international conferences and conventions against genocide, slavery, the use of torture, and racism, and for the protection of women, children, and minorities shows that human rights remain in need of rescue. (208)

Lynn Hunt stresses that human rights need of rescue in terms of protecting who are under the line of seeking justice. As her voice, she claims that human rights are not

the subject of discussion. It is easier to endorse than to enforce. “The history of the juridification of human rights is frequently put in terms of generations” (A. Reis Monteiro 112) is the universal issues. In the same way, Cheah *Inhuman Conditions* points in her book:

The point I am making is that an irreducible because systemic contamination occurs in the very court of claims in which the voice of the oppressed can be heard, although it is in this court alone that justice can be done, and we cannot not want this justice-in-violation. The impossibility of locating a pure voice of the subject of oppression or a genuinely popular voice, and therefore of any vision of human rights claiming an all-encompassing universal validity. (167)

Cheah exclaims her thought of complexities of the justice and contamination that occurs in the jurisdiction in the court which subdues the pure voice of oppressors. She contends that every now and then, rights may be violent gifts. They can be the necessary nexuses within immanent global force relations. She points out the impossibility of locating the pure voice of oppressor has to be subject of discussion in human rights for its universal validation.

Hunt stresses that “the notion of human rights thus brought in its train a whole succession of evil twins” (212). She claims that notion of human right will be meaningless if it promotes evils thoughts. In addition to it, she points out that “the truths of human rights might be paradoxical in this sense, but they are nonetheless still self-evident” (214). Pointing towards the rights issues, it has a binary role which provokes issue-based meanings in rights that brings confusion in humanity and questions on “truths” and “human rights”. Furthermore, rights have not to be questionable in a sense of promoting humanity.

This assortment deals a synoptic view of current debates concerning the

relationships between human rights and ethics, bringing together an extensive range of advocates committed to testing the validity of this binary opposition, exploring justice, and evaluating their implications. John Rawls asserts that “each liberty can be measured on its own scale” (178) shows there is room for questioning on justice. It is the subject to be discussion about the human rights. Koen De Feyter has different opinion regarding Human rights, he says, “human rights mean different things to different people” (1). It evokes that there is questioning in human rights. What he contends here is to rights is a personal matter. It has deformity in justice. Furthermore, he asserts that “the legitimacy of human rights suffers from their selective use” (Feyter 73). It is big questions in human rights why human rights are using as a need of people? The legitimacy of the human rights is bringing the conflict. Such a deformity and controversy is not practicing in human rights. This tendency has built the discontinuity of right based approach.

Susan C. Mapp portrays in her book *Human Rights and Social Justice in a Global Perspective* is “the basic human rights guaranteed to all humans” (23). This is what Mapp is intending to claim that human right cares everyone and behave equally. She further points out that “all people should be equal under the law and should have equal opportunities to develop to their potential” (24). In such traits at human rights evokes that there is no room for discrimination in-between the people whether people status is inferior or superior. In the article-2 of Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UNDHR) point out that rights are not judging by color, race, language, religion and so on. There are no such remarks for discriminating the people. In the Article-2 of UNDHR is:

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion,

political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty. (Susan C. Mapp 166)

UNDHR proclaims that Human Rights as a free from biased and prejudice. It has set forth a common standard to everyone. It is believing that human beings are intending to be out from any scar of discrimination. This statement asserts that human rights protect by the rule of law.

In rights based approach, the conflict and controversy is gradually increasing. To some extent it manipulates the conflict and in another site it has created ethical problem. This is due to break up the system of moral principles. In humanity and human rights, these moral principles catch up the two possible options of conflict and if not it brings ethical dilemma. This ethical concern is arising in human rights discourse. Gagari Chakrabarti and Tapas Chatterjea in their book *Ethics and Deviations in Decision-making: An Applied Study*, posit that “the term ethics originates from the ancient Greek phrase *ethicos* that finds its origin in the word *ethos* that means *custom* or *habit*...Ethics ascertain the rules and standards that govern the moral behaviour of individuals” (16). They address that ethics stands for moral character and it follows the moral values and beliefs.

At one point, Chakrabarti and Chatterjea contend that “ethics is the branch of philosophy that delves into human morality and appraises human actions” (17). They note that ethic is a branch of philosophy where moral values and human well-being is ultimate objective of ethics. They mention that philosophical ethics not to obfuscate itself with the dominant basis of religion and laws or the individual partiality and

arbitrariness. Chielozona Eze in his book *Ethics and Human Rights in Anglophone African Women's Literature* defines what ethics and morality is:

Ethics, broadly defined, is a science of morality. Morality, in turn, deals with what is good or bad, permissible or forbidden. Whereas morality might be personal, ethics is always about the quality of one's relations with others.

Ethics defines right or wrong ways of being or relating to others. Ethics as relationship is intrinsically a recognition of the other. (3)

He argues that ethics is a science of morality. The morality confines into "good" or "bad" so as he argues that morality will be personal and ethics is concerning to relation of others. For him, ethics is connecting with globally in terms of defining right or wrong ways of being relating to others. Jon S. Bailey and Mary R. Burch define the types of ethics are "normative ethics, meta-ethics, and practical ethics... these core ethical principles guide our everyday lives and play a significant role in basic decision making in the practice of our profession" (25). These core ethical principles can be addressed, explored and verified out in a manner that is often playing the significant role in day to day lives and sphere of profession.

Ethics has a set of beliefs, David Copp in his book *The Oxford Hand Book of Ethical Theory*, states that "normative ethics makes moral claims in its own right" (5).

Believing on set standards, human being is following the norms in a right way.

Margalit posits that "ethics addresses the large question of how one should live one's life ethics also cover the axiological domain whose fundamental concepts are goodness and badness" (71). The way of living by the human beings raises an ethical question how they should be living. Does he or she follow the moral values or beyond it? What he wants to claim here is "goodness" covers the axiological domain.

Emmanuel Levinas in his *Ethics and Infinity*, defines ethics is "sole moralist of

contemporary thought” (viii). Levinas suggests that ethics involves the “subjectivity” and for him subjectivity is “responsibility”. At one point in his article, *"Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's of The Good: Ethics Without Metaphysics?"*, Gerasimos Santas reposes that "The most important concept in ethics is not the Form of the Good-there is no such Form-but the good for man. Nor can ethics be an exact science like mathematics, but a rational discipline" (137). Santas claims that ethics is neither exact science nor a good man only but it is a rational discipline.

Taking up the concept of ethics, he claims that form of good is not shaping the ethics discipline but should be the good for man is important. He distinguishes between form of good and good for man is the concerning issues of ethics. Furthermore, he adds on regarding the ethic, it is neither exact like mathematics but it deals to morality and true for the most part Avisahi Margailt, in his book *The Ethics of Memory* contends that “memory breathes revenge” (5) Margalit unfolds that revenge remembers what we keep in memory and it inhales through revenge.

In addition, reaching to the one point of ethics and memory, Magalit states that “while there is an ethics of memory, there is very little morality of memory” (7). His attempts of concluding ethics of memory hinges morality are in the line of ethics that avows reflection of normative principles of humanity. According to Hunt human rights only become meaningful when they gain political sensibility. The political sensibility drags the morality of memory in a sense of knowing to the others from ethical point of view. She further points out that human rights could only thrive when people behaves others as equals. Furthermore, Margailt describes ethics and memory is;

Ethics is typically short on geography and long on memory. Memory is the cement that holds thick relations together, and communities of memory are the

obvious habitat for thick relations and thus for ethics. By playing such a crucial role in cementing thick relations, memory becomes an obvious concern of ethics, which is the enterprise that tells us how we should conduct our thick relations. (8)

Aforesaid statement of Margalit represents memory as like cement that holds thick relations whereas ethics holds both long terms i.e. “memory” and short term i.e. “geography”. He evokes that thick relations are in general our relations to the near and dear. What Margalit expresses here is to memory is playing crucial role for keeping the relations and it becomes a “noticeable concern of ethics”. Furthermore, Margalit is thinking about the ethics and morality and how the humanism defines in terms of ethics and morality. He states that "I take humanism, however, to consist of two claims and not just one: first, that human beings are the only source of justification for ethics and morality; second, that humans are a sufficient source for the justification of ethics and morality" (183). He highlights that human being itself the prime source of justification and it is incorporated with ethics and morality.

Here, consisting two claims is bringing confusing in humanism. This would be an ethical issue which takes two stands for justifying ethics and morality. The foremost statement evokes that human beings are the only source of justification of ethics and morality. So as the second is too sufficient source for justification of ethics and morality. Both claims are rational and reciprocal. Being subjectivity concept, it accepts both foremost and second ones. Here, what Margalit connotes is to humanism is the influencing character for defining both ethics and morality. Ethics has broad spectrum though it has variance in its voices. The variance like subaltern ethics “confronts such a responsibility by engaging with those issues and voices” (Stefanine Lehner 1) that are usually consigned to the margin sheets of humanity.

Placing his own Logic, Levinas insists on ethics, on a “metaphysical responsibility” (3) which constitutes as a characterized of being and rights to be. The term “metaphysics” is concerned with “existence”. Similarly, ethics is concerned with the goodness of person or appropriateness of action. He further points out that “What, we must ask again, is the status of ethics in a post metaphysical age?” (3). The remarkable question raises by Levinas regarding ethics and post metaphysics, what he wants to explain here is, metaphysics and ethics is a topic that offers replication on the normativity or neutrality of being. Levinas borrows Socrates thought of essence of human being and existentialism which is:

We insist on asking and knowing what something is before committing ourselves to action or belief. Indeed, such caution has become our very action, our reserve and wariness. Knowledge of the essence, essential knowledge, precedes the existential: Socrates thought before he acted, he pauses before the symposium, to contemplate, to deliberate, to ask what's what. "To know the good," he taught, "is to do the good"; so tied were thinking and human being. (5)

Emanuel Levinas states that insists of asking and knowing is to recognize what something is before committing ourselves our action or belief. The belief and action is preceding the existence of the human being. For him, it is metaphysical relation. His concern evokes that “To know the good” is about the assigning into moral principles. This is what he calls ethics which is always “do the good”.

According to Levinas contends that “ethics is better than being” (8). He points out that ethics locates for moral character and it pursues the moral values and beliefs. These moral values and human well being is ultimate objectives of ethics. At one point Levinas describes ethical questions, whereby he marks the contrast of questions

and essence of ethical question does not merely contrast with the question of essence, as if ontological and ethical questions operated on the same horizon, under the same light; they are not on the same plane. He claims that ethics is better than being and it is not purely different from accepted wisdom, in which case it would eventually be absorbed by thinking's play of difference, it cuts across ontology, it is radically and irreducibly otherwise than being or beyond spirit. He argues:

More-over, the question of essence "What is ethics?" — Positively and precisely *excludes* the force of the ethical question. It collapses the "what ought to be" of ethics into the "what is" of ontology. I almost said it *obscures* the ethical question, but the point is that the very standards of obscurity and clarity are already standards of being and essence... it cuts across ontology, it is radically and irreducibly "otherwise than being or beyond essence. (8-9)

The notion of ethics is "subjectivity", it does not merely contrast with the question of essence. The subjectivity notion of ethics sparks the multi-dimensions' thoughts which contends essence, normative values and ontological. Furthermore, Levinas posits that ontological and ethical questions function on the same shape but they are not on the same line.

Ethics connotes "what ought to be so as ontology is "what is". Levinas adds that the deformity of thinking obscures "ontology" and "essence." He further questions that "what is ethics really" means a metaphysical realm. This metaphysical realm presents "prior to essence and being" (9) which is onto-theo-logical metaphysics that yields ethical answers. Moreover, Levinas views that ethical questions always have a righteous answer. It seems that ethics not to go beyond against the normative principles which is set by religion and humanism. He argues:

Ethics occurs as an-archy, the compassion of being. Its priority is affirmed

without recourse to principles, without vision, in the irrecoverable shock of being-for-the-other-person before being-for oneself, or being-with-others, or being-in-the-world, to name some of the contemporary philosophical formulas of post-metaphysical thought. Ethical priority...occurs as the moral height of the other person over being, essence, identity, manifestation, principles, in brief, over me. (10)

His saying on ethics affirms “there is more to being than being” which emblem as an arch that justify ethics should have a moral height. The essence, identity, manifestations and principles highlights the compassion of being to others.

Levinas argues that totalizing the problem of the self and the other is to disappearance or subsuming of the other within the matrix of self unfolds the larger convergence which he finds to come a long way of shaping the nature of ethics. At one point, he contends that there is no other that is made to remain as other. The traits of others without resource principles and visions get shock in ethical discourse.

Levinas adds:

To know the good is already not to have done it. One does the good before knowing it - ethics lies in this "before," eternally scandalous to thought...the crux of ethics lies in the non- encompass able yet non-indifferent relation between the "better" and "being." It is a relation like no other, "a distance which is also proximity. (11)

It is true that the knowing well before and someone does the good before unknowingly has created the room of confusing. For him, this is immoral thought which raise an ethical question. He evokes that in ethical dogma has a belief of doing good whether knowingly or unknowingly though ethics lies “before”. Levinas on his ethical discourse, he defines the crux of ethics remains on “rightness” and “being”. He

further points out distance of being and goodness has proximity to others. He claims that “the infinite responsibility of being-for-the-other before oneself-the ethical relation” (12) is a solipsistic idea.

Levinas envisages about the laws of human rules which emphasizes the human being as always does good. His statement proves that “the power of ethics is entirely different from the power of identities, whether poetic or political, whether knowledge or administration” (13). Levinas argues that ethics has not influenced from power. It has own set of norms that is applying in all humans equally. Similarly, Levinas adds that “moral force is not stronger than the powers of being and essence, the totalizing, synthesizing powers, it is *better* and this is its ultimate strength” (14). The driven force like “moral” is belonging to oneself. What Levinas claims here is, the strength lies in powers of being and essence. He posits that the relation of oneself and other can be pursued “as an irreducible intentionality even if one must end by seeing that it ruptures intentionality” (32). Rupturing the relation between oneself and other intentionally raises the ethical question. Levinas states that such a rupture by intentionally should be removed to establish strength relationship in between to others.

Human rights is one of the healing capsules of the victims who are suffering from torture, pain, violence, exploitation and underestimate from races, classes and languages. In the way, Lynn Hunt focuses on emphasizing socio-cultural evolution in the emergence of human rights. She contends that logic of rights has a “bulldozer force” (175) which speaks on behalf of the humanity. The growth of humanity is allowing us to live freely without any torture because each and every individual possesses the rights what it has practice in the laws of human rights. Peace and calmness is laid the foundation in humanity that posits how the human beings are

enjoying of their livings freely. Human rights constitute the very source of all rights of human beings. Pheng Cheah argues that “human rights are a crucial part of politics and international relations, ethical and political philosophy, law, and even comparative history and anthropology” which sought human rights has global connection that “juxtaposes the plurality of cultures with the universal validity that makes human rights normative” (146). She further states that “all claims to human rights within the force field of global capitalism requires us to rethink the understanding of normativity that is the basis of currently existing human rights discourse” (149). Henceforth, human rights discourse explicitly gives the message to all human beings; every individual is decent to live free from any sorts of prejudices and biasness. The connection between human rights and ethics has two entities but both are correlated each other. Ethics studies the rightness and wrongness of a human action. Levinas argues that “genuine thinking itself an ethics” (2). He further says that we all are different in terms of our own genesis but we should be responsible for each other.

Chapter II

Ethical Dilemma in Coetzee's *Disgrace* and Gordimer's *The House Gun*

Coetzee's *Disgrace* and Gordimer's *The House Gun* are South African post apartheid novels. These novels minutely figure out the South Africa's violence, guilt, forfeit, racial conflict, sexual assault and murder cases. The authors' willingness to stop the conflict between black and white races has brought ethical questions in the texts. The characters speak in the novel shows that the voices victims are muted and perpetrators are not penalized. These novels authors have not taken any clear-cut position as far as the moral necessity of condemning violence is concerned. *Disgrace* portrays a fifty-two-year-old Professor David Lurie of the Cape Technical University. He is an ordinary, rather unhappy white man. He hankers after sensually and sexually appealing things. He is twice divorced. Prior to having an affair with Lucy, Lurie was involved in an intimated relation with Soraya. Regarding the Lurie's perspective on fleeting disposition of Soraya is:

During their sessions he speaks to her with a certain freedom, even on occasion unburdens himself. She knows the facts of his life. She has heard the stories of his two marriages, knows about his daughter and his daughter's ups and downs. She knows many of his opinions. (3)

Soraya has no longer held Lurie's sexual affinity intact. Rejecting her aside, Lurie turned to Melanie. Currently he has been living with one grown-up daughter Lucy. He is obsessed with sex. Once he attempts his weekly sexual relationship with a prostitute. This sexual encounter with a prostitute ends abruptly. But he does not lament over the sudden termination of his passionate encounter with a prostitute.

Lurie is fond of changing sex partner. Dumping down Soraya, he turns to Dawn, a modest girl with keen sense of dedication to interpersonal relationship. Like

Soraya, Dawn too fell into the net of his romantic appeal and attraction. He enjoys with her and makes up his mind to cast her aside. The following extract is illustrative of how inconsistent Lurie is in his sexual adventure:

Her name is Dawn. The second time he takes her out they stop at his house and have sex. It is a failure. Bucking and clawing, she works herself into a froth of excitement that in the end only repels him. He lends her a comb, drives her back to the campus. After that he avoids her, taking care to skirt the office where she works. In return she gives him a hurt look, and then snubs him. (9)

Dawn has expected from Lurie dedication which every romantic relation generally demands and dictates. But upon seeing Lurie's momentary romantic spree, she makes up her mind to turn away from Lurie's selfish gesture.

David persistently searches for the right word, shown by his hesitant verbalization: “a moderate bliss, a moderated bliss” (6), “A ready learner, compliant, pliant” (5), “this daughter, this woman” (62), “to pass him tools—to be his hand anger in fact” (136), “Her hips and breasts are now (he searches for the best word) ample” (59). He argues:

He thinks of Emma Bovary, coming home sated, glazen-eyed, from an afternoon of reckless fucking. So this is bliss! Says Emma, marvelling at herself in the mirror. So this is the bliss the poets speak of! Well, if poor ghostly Emma were ever to find her way to Cape Town, he would bring her along one Thursday afternoon to show her what bliss can be: a moderate bliss, a moderated bliss. (5-6)

The reference to Flaubert's classic, *Emma Bovary* is just one of many literary references in the novel. Immediately after his encounter with her, he has been

involved in an affair with a student thirty years younger than him. She is Melanie Isaacs. The affair leads, to a scandal. At first Melanie and he were intentionally involved in physical relationship. But as Lurie's sexual hunger reached beyond limit, she exposed it assuming that the very exposure of his immoral advance puts moral pressure on him.

Melanie Isaacs is “[an] emblematic of the relations of power that pervades South African Society as a whole” (Isiodore, Dala 56). She is informing how the South African girls surviving. Lurie is quick to draw the attention of any girl he comes upon on the way. The following extract reveals how Lurie makes use of the typical feature of a playboy to bring Melanie in the grip:

Her name is Melanie Isaacs, from his Romantics course. Not the best student but not the worst either: clever enough, but unengaged. She is dawdling; he soon catches up with her. 'Hello,' he says. She smiles back, bobbing her head, her smile sly rather than shy. She is small and thin, with close-cropped black hair, wide, almost Chinese cheekbones, large, dark eyes. Her outfits are always striking. Today she wears a maroon miniskirt with a mustard-colored sweater and black tights; the gold baubles on her belt match the gold balls of her earrings. (11)

With a host of romantic trick and passionate trick, Lurie succeeds in bringing him under his grip. Then he goes on exploiting her financially. Melanie too cannot save herself from Lurie's alluring tricks. For Lurie, it is the right of desire that matters most. Lurie comes to closer with Melanie for her persistently producing in her the best side of his romantic self; he succeeds in establishing physical relationship with her. At first, though Melanie is reluctant to give in to his passionate motive, she surrendered to him finally. Observing her nude body, he talks to himself "Her body is

clear, simple...the girl is lying beneath him, her eyes closed, her hands slack above her head, a slight frown on her face" 19. Lurie himself has desire for sex and she keeps his hands are under her coarse-knit sweater her breasts. Lurie's unethical practices raise the questions in essence and morality principle. What he does to Melanie, it is irrespective and crosses the ethical essence of human being.

The right of desire is holy notion to Lurie. He works in the direction of getting his desire fulfilled heedless of what would be the aftermath of his immoral involvement. He seldom thinks if his immoral venture is becoming or unbecoming of a man like Lurie involved in an academic profession. He does not hesitate to take Melanie to her daughter's bed when Melanie gets ready to yield to him sexual hunger. Lurie locates it beyond in mere performance:

He makes love to her one more time, on the bed in his daughter's room. It is good, as good as the first time; he is beginning to learn the way her body moves. She is quick, and greedy for experience. If he does not sense in her a fully sexual appetite, that is only because she is still young. When she hooks a leg behind his buttocks to draw him in closer: as the tendon of her inner thigh tightens against him, he feels a surge of joy and desire. Who knows, he thinks: there might, despite all, be a future. (29)

Every desire is holy. What matters most is its fulfillment. What would happen if it is left uncurbed lies beyond the realm of Lurie's perception? Gratification is important. Aftermath of his seemingly immoral liaison does not shake Lurie. It is this heedless of his liaison's outcome that is difficult to explain.

The scandal expands like wildfire. Consequently, it damages Lurie's reputation. The investigation committee offers a chance for Lurie to apologize. But Lurie's rigid manner prevents him from accepting his mistake. He is too headstrong

to ignore his mistake. As a result, he has to lose his teaching position at the university. His own account emphasizes his refusal to accept the terms of the disciplinary committee's requests. He justifies his behavior by claiming allegiance to the rights of desire. He expresses his refusal to the committee's demand for a written confession. Following the loss of his position at the university, he goes to live with his daughter Lucy. While insisting on his loyalty to his immutable style of living, he rejoins "All right, I'll do it. I am not prepared to be reformed. I want to go on being myself I'll do it on that basis.' His hand still rests on her foot; now he grips her ankle tight. 'Understood?' (77). It appears Lurie is a man bent on living his life on its own terms, endorsing the belief that uncompromising attitude paves the way for the peculiar style of existence.

Two black men and a boy arrive on the farm where presently Lurie and his daughter, Lucy, live. They attack the father and daughter. They set him on fire. Thereafter they take turns cruelly raping Lucy. Lurie reacts to this violence horrifically but Lucy goes into loneliness. Lurie wants to legalize the case but Lucy goes to the contrary. Lurie does not understand what takes place in the mind of Lucy. Yet he does what Lucy tells him to do. Lurie takes it as a serious case but Lucy takes it in an ambivalent way. The following extract sheds spotlight on the apparent disparity between Lurie's horror at the rape of his daughter and Lucy's meaningful taciturnity and loneliness resulting from her rape:

Lucy's refusal to report her rape is particularly significant in this respect. In response to her father's incessant entreaties that she explains her decision, she simply says: "I can't talk any more, David, I just can't", she says, speaking softly, rapidly, as though afraid the words will dry up. 'I know I am not being clear. I wish I could explain but I cannot. While he holds on to "abstractions

and readings try and make sense of the event, she resists his determination to find a rationale. (123)

Lucy challenges Lurie's attempts at exposing himself (or her) as communicator of knowledge about others. Her unwillingness to rationalize her decision enumerates the fact that she knows she is caught between to 'be or not to be that is the question' situation. When it comes to representing herself as a rape victim, she takes on either a silent position or simply goes into seclusion. If she presses charges, the gendered dimension of the rape will immediately investigate.

Lucy cannot presuppose any obviousness of oppression. Without taking the support of her father and her well-wishers, Lucy prepares herself to endure the effect of rape, which is reflected in the following extract:

She shrugs. 'A month. Three months. Longer. Science has not yet put a limit on how long one has to wait. Forever, maybe.' The cat makes a quick pounce at the belt, but the game is over now. He sits down beside his daughter; the cat jumps off the sofa, stalks away. He takes her hand. Now that he is close to her, a faint smell of staleness, unwashedness, reaches him. 'At least it won't be forever, my dearest,' he says. 'At least you will be spared that. (125)

Lucy's politics of representation foregrounds the impossibility of knowing others. At the same time it also hints at the impossibility of attempting to know the self. She herself is unable to know about herself in the condition in which her body is overwritten with narratives of power. Lucy's response to the rape brings into relief the earlier response to the act of sexual aggression in the novel.

Both instances of sexual violence are focalized through Lurie's perspective rather than through the victims. Lurie's own sexual hunger and immoral act are not consequently represented as having occasioned excessive punishment. The gang rape

of his daughter is seen as not having induced enough. The following extract throws light on how Lucy managed to deal with the aftershock of the sexual abuse and assault that is mounted on her:

Lucy knows some of the women. She commences introductions. Then Petrus appears at their side. He does not play the eager host, does not offer them a drink, but does say, 'No more dogs. I am not any more the dog-man,' which Lucy chooses to accept as a joke; so all, it appears, is well. 'We have brought you something,' says Lucy; 'but perhaps we should give it to your wife. It is for the house. (129)

Lurie's rhetoric in relation to the appropriateness of a legal response is questionable. But it can trigger many implications and assumptions. Melanie should have stood up for herself. Her failure to do so is the question that echoes response to gendered crimes including rape and domestic violence.

It is also the question that grounds Lurie's self-righteousness. It is the form of ideological equivocation. It follows rape claims. She states that her experience of sexual violence is a purely private matter. She knows that evidence of autonomy and agency in a victim of sexual violence is always already compromising. Its absence is held against the victim as potential consent while its presence is seen as taking away from. Victims of sexual violence are therefore caught between polar opposite things. Lucy chooses to completely avoid this pseudo-choice in favor of a model of futurity. Her stand challenges such individualizing response to its core.

Lurie is harsh on his daughter's alleged rapist. But Lucy thinks quite the contrary. She tells her father not to be harsh on Petrus though there is sufficient ground to doubt him. The following extract is illustrative of how the viewpoints of both the daughter and father veer off markedly giving rise to the possibility of tussle

between them:

Don't shout at me, David. This is my life. I am the one who has to live here. What happened to me is my business, mine alone, not yours, and if there is one right I have it is the right not to be put on trial like this, not to have to justify myself- not to you, not to anyone else. As for Petrus, he is not some hired laborer whom I can sack because in my opinion he is mixed up with the wrong people. That's all gone, gone with the wind. (133)

Lucy's refusal to seek legal action is not an extension of her refusal to resist. Her laconic stand poses as neutral arbiter between incriminated and isolated individuals. Lucy is then refusing to be raped insofar as she recognizes that her rapist is history. It is the history of apartheid she identifies as the cause of the horrific violence. She is subjected to this sort of choice. Its effects are lingering and undeniable.

In rejecting legal action, she also challenges any notion of individual responsibility to which her rapists and she could be held. In so doing, she offers a harsh criticism of the logic. This logic relies on the notion that informs discussions of rape. It emphasizes the degree of responsibility of the victim. Lucy is unable to take right decision because of her compromising agency. She is unable to cope with the ambivalence of the notion of consent and the stereotypical framing of black youth. The following extract hints at how Lurie is prone to killing sense of ambivalence and how his own inability to isolate truth from falsehood puts him in dilemma:

The man is speaking, orating in rounded periods that rise and fall. He has no idea the man is saying, but every now and then there is a pause and a murmur of agreement from his audience, among whom, young and old, a mood of quiet satisfaction seems to reign. He looks around. The boy is standing nearby, just inside the door. The boy's eyes flit nervously across him. Other eyes turn

toward him too: toward the stranger, the odd one out. (135)

Lucy intuitively knows that trials are not about principles. They are about how well you put yourself across. It is individual performance not justice that drives the legal machinery. Lucy rape is not just about race any more that her father's fantasized sexual relationship with a student. It is just about gender is an awareness that is simultaneously offered.

The isolation of one rape along with the normalization of the other has everything to do with Lurie's racialized and racist perspective. It works to highlight the ethical limitations of Lurie's character. It aims at encouraging the reader's active participation in the narrative. The ethical dilemma on the part of Lurie is noticeably present in the following extract:

On one of his afternoons at the clinic, he unburdens himself to Bev Shaw.

'Lucy and I are not getting on,' he says. 'Nothing remarkable in that, I suppose. Parents and children aren't made to live together. Under normal circumstances I would have moved out by now, gone back to Cape Town. But I can't leave Lucy alone on the farm. She isn't safe. I am trying to persuade her to hand over the operation to Petrus and take a break. But she won't listen to me.'(139)

Lurie lapses into a vicious cycle of guilt. His notion of the rights of desire does not bring him in rapprochement with his daughter who is unhappy due to his persistent effort to legalize the case of sexual assault. Omission facilitates rather than hampers our identification with the protagonist's stance. The self-satisfaction the character feels at having solved the problem of sex is obviously not probed within the realm of common sense.

Lurie's character is intelligent. He is adept at scrutinizing his own and others' motivations and emotions. Petrus thinks and act independently of the existing

stereotypes. He aims at limiting spectrum of norms. He is actually lost in a maze of guilt, inner chaos and ambivalence. His whole being is "gripped by what happens in the theatre. He is convinced the dogs know their time has come. Despite the silence and the painlessness of the procedure, despite the good thoughts that Bev Shaw thinks and that he tries to think, despite the airtight bags" (145) in which they tie the new-made corpses, the dogs in the yard smell what is going on inside.

Lurie is so forthcoming about his own imperfections that he appears trustworthy. Even his deluded Romantic notions contribute to making the reader identify with him. What is happening to Lurie is made palatable because he is narrating it through a white middle-class sensibility. Many of Lurie's biased assumptions are naturalized. It would be better to see through Lucy's refusal to represent the violence perpetrated against her. He does not know the names of the crew and they do not know. Lurie does not feel that he has become a part of the society he inhabits. The incipient sense of not being a part of the society corrodes his interiority which is pretty clear in the following citation:

To them he is simply the man who began arriving on Mondays with the bags from Animal Welfare and has since then been turning up earlier and earlier. He comes, he does his work, he goes; he does not form part of the society of which the incinerator, despite the wire fence and the padlocked gate and the notice in three languages, is the hub. For the fence has long ago been cut through; the gate and the notice are simply ignored. (145)

Lurie is subjected to disciplinary hearing. He goes to the extent of parodying the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's proceedings. Lurie's claims about the rights of desire in fact exhibit a certain wisdom that works to illumine critical limitations of human rights and the available diagnoses that they offer.

Lurie's instinctual rights constitute an indisputable. To the extent that human rights fail to countenance sexual and other irrational manifestations of desire, the rights paradigm is structurally inadequate. In other words, insofar as the law does not account for passion and unreason, it ultimately offers a limited form of social justice. His advocacy of the noble cause of animal rights is just of deflection of his inner agony and dilemma which is ethically igniting:

Curious that a man as selfish as he should be offering himself to the service of dead dogs. There must be other, more productive ways of giving oneself to the world, or to an idea of the world. One could for instance work longer hours at the clinic. One could try to persuade the children at the dump not to fill their bodies with poisons. Even sitting down more purposefully with the Byron libretto might, at a pinch, be construed as a service to mankind. (146)

It can be suggested that Lurie valorizes desire and its rights. It reinforces the spurious equivalence he establishes between the "rights" of desire and sexual violence. The university's response to Lurie's affair feels excessive because the novel is confronting the cultural systems. Gendered and racial relations contest the law. The law's affectivity or validity is conditioned by these cultural expectations. Had the professor having the affair been a black middle-aged man forcing himself on one of his young white students, the emotional response to that scene of violence would be fundamentally different.

In light of his own abuse of a student, Lurie's violent hatred towards his daughter's rapists functions as a double standard. After all, Lucy is as accepting of her fate as his student Melanie was of the sexual act to which she was subjected. That he identifies his daughter's violation as rape while being unable to recognize his own act as such exposes his sexism as well as his racism. Lurie is torn between the seduction

of instinct and the prick of conscience which is disclosed in the following bit of monologue:

'Lucy, it really is time for you to face up to your choices. Either you stay on in a house full of ugly memories and go on brooding on what happened to you, or you put the whole episode behind you and start a new chapter elsewhere. Those, as I see it, are the alternatives. I know you would like to stay, but shouldn't you at least consider the other route? Can't the two of us talk about it rationally? (155)

The contrast in his response to each instance of sexual violence shows that it is his investment in racist ideology that allows him to do what his investment in sexist norms prevented him from doing rape. He can only see rape as what black men do to white women. It is an attitude that ultimately exposes him as a white anachronism of the colonial era. The information about David's mentions that "childhood was spent in a family of women... with his height, his good bones, his olive skin, his flowing hair; he could always count on a degree of magnetism" (7). This retrospection is related to the focalization. It allows access to David's mind. Consciousness has its own time. It does not necessarily follow continuity, but is able to move in time.

David Lurie has long been used to satisfying his existential needs in sadistic ways. He is a sadistic character. He extends his power over those around him. He brings them under his control. That is why he is so disturbed when Soraya refuses to act as his powerless, obedient prostitute any longer. Before leaving the university, his sadism was manifested mainly in his sexual relations. It was only after he was in the country with his daughter that his desired to have others under his control found other outlets. As a result, he experienced crisis of authority. With Soraya gone, Lurie had to replace her with a new object for his sadistic strivings.

His desires to have sadistic control over others are given a voice. When in his relation with Melanie he feels satisfied since to the extent that they are together. If they were together, he was the one who leads. By appealing to liberal views and calling himself the servant of Eros, he denies that he takes advantage of his position as a teacher to bring Melanie under his control. He believes that his experiences with others.

Lurie is affected by the sense of being condemned to ineffectiveness. Lurie has been troubled by this sense of approaching ineffectiveness. He is still teaching at university. Old age and sexual impotence are two manifestations of ineffectiveness. That is why when Lurie is still at university. He is worried that “he [Lurie] ought to give up, retire from the game. At what age, he wonders, did Origen castrate himself? ... Ageing is not a graceful business” (9). Moreover, after his night with Melanie, he is uncertain about her motives for asking to stay at his house. He is equally uncertain about what he himself wanted. Lurie examines his situation only to conclude that the affair was “a last leap of the flame of sense before it goes out” (27).

Lurie refuses to accept that his relationship with Melanie. It is indicative of any wider relation to the long history of exploitation. It is hard not to agree with the assessment of one of his colleagues. He is a hangover from the past. Lurie becomes ever more single-minded and incapable of change. He is unable to give up his interest in Melanie. When his daughter Lucy refuses to report her rape, he responds with such a monotone of horror and disgust. She is ultimately forced to show him the door. Lurie's monolithic view and his helplessness arise from his realization. Disgraceful choices are blatantly emphasizes in the following extract:

Though distracted by Isaacs's back-and-forth, he tries to pick his words carefully. 'Normally I would say', he says, and 'that after a certain age one is

too old to learn lessons. One can only be punished and punished. But perhaps that is not true, not always. I wait to see. As for God, I am not a believer, so I will have to translate what you call God and God's wishes into my own terms. In my own terms, I am being punished for what happened between me and your daughter. I am sunk into a state of disgrace from which it will not be easy to lift myself. (172)

In her decision as to whether or not to report the crime, Lucy is required to make demands she perceives to be made by the situation she occupies as a white woman. It involves a choice between the politics of equal dignity and the politics of difference. Of course, she chooses the latter: rejecting David's insistence upon her abstract equality. She decides on a course of action that seeks to do justice. She is concretely situated in this time. It leads to her marriage with Petrus.

Lucy herself becomes an ever more unassailably serious character. She embodies the witty playfulness. She teases her father disappears. She becomes ever less patient with him: 'Wake up, David. David is himself briefly transformed into a belittling, dog-like state: "Abandoning them, he rushes back to the kitchen door. The bottom leaf is not bolted: a few heavy kicks and it swing open" (72). The question of truth troubles Lurie upsetting the whole procedures of accomplishing the rights of desire. In a conversation with George, Lurie insists "Not quite. I was not telling the truth. I was not just passing through. I came to George for one reason alone: to speak to you. I had been thinking about it for some time.' 'Yes, you came to speak to me, you say" (173). David is certainly the fall guy as he scrambles through the door on all fours, only to be pummeled over the head and then summarily thrown into the lavatory.

Lucy is being subjected to the most terrifying assault. Its consequence will be

to galvanize her sense of serious demands being made by the politics of difference. David has become decidedly non-serious. The dilemma in which he is put by adverse situation teaches him bitter lesson but he is still feeling hard to come to terms with the demand of life governed and guided by reality:

Lurie wanders through the house taking a census of his losses. His bedroom has been ransacked, the cupboards yawn bare. His sound equipment is gone, his tapes and records, his computer equipment. In his study the desk and filing cabinet have been broken open; papers are scattered everywhere. The kitchen has been thoroughly stripped: cutlery, crockery, smaller appliances. His liquor store is gone. Even the cupboard that had held canned food is empty. (176)

Lurie's valorization of desire is anything but self-serving. It supports the fake equivalence he establishes between the rights of desire and sexual violence. It stands for an equivalence that is then given legitimacy. These readings hide from itself the truth that what is disavowed by the law is neither passion nor unreason. On the contrary, it is rather the violating effects.

The university's response to Lurie's affair feels excessive. Such systems define gendered and racial relations in a way that contests the law. The law's affectivity or validity is conditioned by these cultural expectations. Had the professor having the affair been a black middle-aged man, the emotional (and legal) response to that scene of violence would be fundamentally different. To the best of his knowledge, Lurie tries to harmonize the pressure of ethics to the temptation of emotions. The outcome of such a harmonizing attempt is reflected here:

There is something misconceived about it, something that does not come from the heart. A woman complaining to the stars that the spying of the servants forces her and her lover to relieve their desires in a broom-closet — who

cares? He can find words for Byron, but the Teresa that history has bequeathed him — young, greedy, willful, and petulant — does not match up to the music he has dreamed of, music whose harmonies, lushly autumnal yet edged with irony, he hears shadowed in his inner ear. (181)

The check on Lurie's biased perspective is thus provided. The response to the second act of sexual violence is depicted. Lurie's violent hatred towards his daughter's rapists functions as a double standard. After all, Lucy is as accepting of her fate as his student Melanie was. That he identifies his daughter's violation as rape while being unable to recognize his own act.

David has reached a point where he has little concern for the morality of his actions. It would be easy to put judgment on David and his action. This is not what Coetzee wants us to do. Following up on his characterization of Lucifer, David says to his class:

Not that we are not asked to condemn this being with the mad heart, this being with which there is something constitutionally wrong. On the contrary, we are invited to understand and sympathize. But there is a limit to sympathy. He is exactly what he calls himself: a thing, that is, a monster. Finally, Byron will suggest, it will not be possible to love him, not in the deeper, more human sense of the word. He will be condemned to solitude. (34)

It is easy to see how this relates to the narrative of *Disgrace*. Just like Lucifer, Lurie is a nearly impossible to like and ends his story in solitude. The contrast in his response to each instance of sexual violence shows that it is his investment in racist ideology. It allows him to do what his investment in sexist norms. It prevents him from doing earlier.

Lurie can only see rape as what black men do to white women. It is an attitude

that ultimately exposes him as a white anachronism of the colonial era. It is the discrepancy between the responses to these two instances of gendered violence. It tries to patch up a gap that is only naturalized. Insufficient attention is paid to the workings of narration. When talking about the incident with his daughter Lucy, David highlights the fact that his admittance of guilt was a “secular plea” (58). He goes further and says, “Repentance is neither here nor there. Repentance belongs to another world, to another universe of discourse” (58). The statement shows the reader that Lurie indeed is aware that by aligning himself with the secular law he denies Melanie justice and the chance for forgiveness. Over time, Lurie begins to treat his private life as a kind of descent into the underworld, which is clearly reflected in the following extract:

The deeper he follows the Contessa into her underworld, singing her words for her or humming her vocal line, the more inseparable from her, to his surprise, becomes the silly plink-plonk of the toy banjo. The lush arias he had dreamed of giving her he quietly abandons; from there it is but a short step to putting the instrument into her hands. Instead of stalking the stage, Teresa now sits staring out over the marshes toward the gates of hell, cradling the mandolin on which she accompanies herself in her lyric flights. (184)

David’s insistence on the secular nature of his plea illustrates the focus of language. Along with the questions of language, there is also an element of shame. David, being the perpetrator, is publically shamed and disgraced. David never admits to, or shows any, feelings of shame. But his eagerness for the hearing to end combined with his escape to the countryside. It indicates that he on some level feels humiliated. It points towards this humiliation which contrasts so starkly with the cold narration.

The issue of shame can be used to questions David’s intentions. If shame is his

main reason for wanting to end the hearing early, then perhaps his principles are not as important to him as he makes them out to be. There is no reason to doubt that David is convinced that his “case rests on the rights of desire” (89). He believes himself to be a victim of a puritan society. Still, there is reason to doubt that David is not just using this as another excuse to lie to himself. He is shrewd enough to use this as another way of escaping his shame. This also explains the hypocrisy of demanding justice for the rape of his daughter. Melanie’s rape is paralleled later in the novel as Lucy. David’s daughter is raped by a group of black men.

Lurie's perceptive and rational calculation is distorted by his perverted gut instinct. It stops him from normalizing his sexual appetite. The part of evidence in conjunction with his depravity is mentioned below:

The mention of Melanie Isaacs unsettles him. He has never been given to lingering involvements. When an affair is over, he puts it behind him. But there is something unfinished in the business with Melanie. Deep inside him the smell of her is stored, the smell of a mate. (190)

Lurie and Melanie topic of discussion matter is beyond the normative ethics. They both have sexual intercourse and they fall in love for Lurie’s right to desire. The smell of Melanie is stored in Lurie’s affair toward Melanie though it is over but the discourse and debate is still remained.

During the attack David is knocked down and set on fire. There is no description of what happens to Lucy. She further refuses to talk about it with David. She considers the rape to be “a purely private matter” (112). The fact that the accounts of both victims are left out of the narrative brings the parallels closer together. Many have noted David’s inability to see the parallel between the rape of his daughter and the crime he himself committed. The following extract uncovers the inner psychic

dwindling of Lurie:

In a sudden and soundless eruption, as if he has fallen into a waking dream, a stream of images pours down, images of women he has known on two continents, some from so far away in time that he barely recognizes them. Like leaves blown on the wind, pell-mell, they pass before him. A fair field full of folk: hundreds of lives all tangled with his. He holds his breath, willing the vision to continue. (192)

This ethical task is in other words completely left to the reader. Something portrays the immense commitment the novel demands. She refuses to press charges against the perpetrators.

To conclude, *Disgrace* establishes a parallel between these two instances of sexual violence. The critical attention paid to black on white sexual violence in the charged context masks its link to the similar forms of more or less naturalized violence. This sort of transitional societal renders the need to attend ethics problematical.

The Gun is in court. It has become Exhibit 1.

The fingerprints of the accused's left hand, the Prosecutors says, were discovered upon it by forensic tests...

-You know this handgun?-

-Yes.-

-No.-

-Who does?-

-I don't know in whose name it was licensed. It was the gun kept in the house so that if someone was

attacked. Intruders broke in; so whoever it was could defend himself.-

(Source: Hughes, Nancy Scheper)

The House Gun, Gordimer explores questions of individual and social responsibility in the context of widespread violence. The opening line of the novel is “something terrible happened” (3) contends that there is cases even aftermath of the apartheid. The terrible event occurs in South Africa and “someone’s been shot. He’s arrested (4). Duncan’s is an individual character not a political felony. So as, novel “opens with new of crime of Johannesburg” (Golden J. Audrey 4). The central incident is a murder. It seems to have no obvious political causality. Nonetheless, Gordimer uses this enigmatic crime. Its repercussions are pervasive. It examines indirectly the complex relationship between the individual and the wider social context in South Africa. It is predominantly concerned with the relationship between the personal and the political.

Duncan’s parents occupy the forefront of the novel. He is lost in recollection and introspection. They are bent on discovering some clue from the past that could explain their son’s crime. Their agonies of self-doubt are intense. Their inability to understand the main reason remains a challenge to their hitherto safe beliefs. Final awakening on the part of Duncan results from his action. It forms much of the material of the novel. However, it is the black lawyer, Hamilton Motsamai, who discovers the circumstances and events. He does his best to track down the real events. It lies in unidentifiable form.

The process of identification leads to the shooting. Duncan’s brief homosexual affair with Jespersen draws the attention of those who had naïve view about him. His desperate love for Natalie is breathtaking. She is a girl he saved from suicide. The

way he had saved her is impressive and astonishing. His finding Natalie and Jespersen having sex is the momentous event. These circumstances contribute nothing to the act of demystifying what lie behind the veil of confusion. Duncan's mental instability, the politics of race, and the easy availability of weapons are all likely to problematize the former ethics. The intersection of the personal and the political has always been a part of Duncan's choice. Duncan develops a thin proximity with the notion of the instantaneous. Duncan's passion and his parents' natural pride is suddenly links him to other cruel events in the world, his own life no longer outside but within the limitations of disaster. Gordmier says that "violence as an ancient, transcultural and even rather mysterious experience" (Isidore 53). It is a repetition few people seem able to break. Duncan's parents spend much of their time trying to discover some clue from the past. They are badly weakened by their agonies of self-doubt. They are suspicious of any attempt to challenge their hitherto safe beliefs. They are awake to the changes in perception that result from Duncan's action.

One unremarkable evening, a messenger comes to turn Harald and Claudia calm life. The messenger is from Duncan's household. There he lives communally with a handful of young white and black men. Among the things they share is a gun. It is a man who is lying on living room "had a bullet wound in the head" (15). It is "always somewhere about no use of having it for protection if when the time came no-one would remember where it was safely stashed way (148). Duncan has been arrested for using that gun to murder one of his housemates. There is never any doubt that Duncan pulled the trigger. There is not even a mystery about Duncan's motive. But there is a mystery for the Lindgards who cannot understand how it is that their intelligent and caring son can be brought to kill another human being.

Harald argues:

He sees from her, silence, he has said nothing; brought back nothing that would explain. Duncan's came out that man's house and dropped something in the garden on his way of back cottage. A gun was found... None of this tells anything more, gives any more explanation than there was in the confrontation across in court. (16)

The interpersonal relationship is brought into focus. It is put in the centrality of concern in the light of Duncan's act of murdering his friend and one-time lover, Carl Jespersen. The act of murder ironically compels everyone to re-examine the ties. It helps to live in order to arrive at a better understanding of life itself.

Harald and Claudia live in comfort and safety. One evening they discover something terrible has happened. Claudia and Harald's 27 (Twenty Seven) years old son, Duncan has killed a man. They are white upper-middle-class members of South African have always lived at remoteness from the conflict of their homeland. There is never a question of his guilt. He has confessed to the crime. The "irrational revulsion against contact with the young man" (17) contends that Duncan is accused of crime. . It is hard for them to believe that the violence had always affected other people. The question is "Duncan being accused of such horror? (21) foregrounding that guilt and crime is not acceptable in humanity. Duncan's crime is surely one of passion. Duncan's parents face the legacy of South Africa's bloody history. Harald and Claudia also must face their own prejudices.

The revelation of the Duncan's murder case to the Karl Jespersen (his mate) is subject to be discussed in post apartheid era. TRC and seeking novelty of truth, Lindgard's searches for reconciliation and they become reconciled to the brutal truth of murder. Focusing to the humanity, Herald says, "they were in the shape of human beings" (67) reveals that disparity and race are not determining the truth. The

Lindgards could be considered liberal minded. They are not supporters of segregation but never actively stood against it. They have to make tremendous efforts to adjust to the post-apartheid scenario of black liberty. Harald is instrumental in sanctioning loans for low cost housing projects for the blacks. But his functional relation with Duncan remains in obscurity.

Duncan's parents have never expected the violence. They are watching on television regarding Bosnia or Somalia. The very word murder is obscene. It would lead to a completely different identity and relationship. Harald has given Duncan the strength of religious and moral faith. Duncan is in every way trained to believe that the human body must not be damaged. Despite this, Duncan has murdered his friend. Harald unfolds:

It is absurd for the murder to outlive the murdered. They two alone together — as two beings are together in only one other human relationship, the one acting, the other suffering him—share a secret that binds them forever together. They belong to each other. (71-72)

His statement addresses that entities of human beings are different and realizing that nothing in the world could substitute the strength which human relationships can separate forever. As human beings “conventional wisdom is the most demonstrable” (124). He asserts that stereotype of thought has a power of showing the absurdity. Deeply rooted or conventional wisdom is reflecting or portraying the action of past that highlights the pain of sufferer vividly.

In contrast to this, Duncan's love for Natalie endures all odds. His relationship with Natalie begins after his gay relations with Carl breaks. He feels terribly lonely and betrayed. He saves Natalie from killing herself by drowning. He gives her all possible attention and care. But Natalie feels suffocated by the attention Duncan is

paying her. She tells the court how possessive and suspicious Duncan is. Natalie describes him as a spoilt brat. She does not call their relationship a happy one. She presents herself as a lover of Jespersen. She replies the answer about her pregnancy is, “Duncan made love to me in the early morning, the same day, it was bad nights ended” (194). She is testifying in Court to his capacity for violence. This is true of his relation with Carl who not only betrays Duncan but also takes away Natalie from him. So when it becomes completely unbearable for him, the murder occurs.

Duncan explains to himself in a monologue. In his monologue he says why he is prompted to kill Carl. It is a kind of suicide because he is no longer endure what Carl does or says. Carl is so close to him that he is almost his self. Duncan says “when you kill the other you are trying to kill the self that plagues your existence” (292). Duncan and Carl shares an inseparable bond. Thus Duncan and Carl are the same self. The existence of one could not be complete without the other. Duncan's case creates history in yet another sense. He selects a black lawyer to plead his case. Initially, Harald and Claudia are not very agreeable about the choice of Hamilton Motsamai. Herald says, “my wife I do not know [t]his person, we have no person feelings for or against him” (36). They are not confident about him. So as claiming on black lawyer is “you have had doubts ...defence being conducted by a black man. It promotes the “racial prejudice” in the old regimes. It gives the negative message that black lawyers “has had less experience than white lawyers” (38). The intelligence of lawyers posits with “he knows what he wants, what will serve. It could be that he'll want to present two moral influences; religious faith from the father, secular humanism from the mother” (98). These sets of moral percepts rely on all the kinds of violence rape, crime and murder. The Lindgards now realize that freedom also meant not knowing anything about each other that they needed to know. A murder is the worst kind of

violation of human relationship. The act of killing is the violation of the other's right to live. It is a deliberate misuse of one's own freedom of action.

The violence is sponsored by the apartheid state infected personal relationships in its aftermath. Moral questions of retribution and punishment affect not just the body politic but individuals therein. Coming to terms with forgiveness, guilt and responsibility is part of the process of recovering from the disease of apartheid. It amounts to forging a new state in which black and white can form more equal relationships. Harald says, as Duncan's trial progresses, that "Justice is a performance" (240). The need for public confession of a crime is unavoidable. The need to be seen for cleansing the wounds of the past is imperative. In the civilized country, the state does not promote murder but "what sentence the judge passes down... out of his knowledge, his cleverness" (241) gives insightful remarks in the cases. The lawyer Motsamai adds that "he thinks he has succeeded in a manner that has a good chance of seven (242). Duncan who is blamed as a criminal will be reconciled through TRC for not repeating disharmony in two races. Claiming that, it is guilt of Duncan and even question raise in human rights, under the lawyer sense of ethicality, the repetition of the same crime twice promotes crimes.

To be performing forgiveness and repentance is an aspect of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. These acts seldom meet with universal approval. Memory may be excavated. It can be shaped, initiated and corrected. It needed to serve as backbone to the new history of the new nation. On the other hand, the process of excavation and recovery is referred to by its Chairman, Archbishop Tutu which is reflected in the following terms:

They must be opened. They must be cleansed. And balm must be poured on them so they can heal...There can be no healing without truth. How, though,

does an entire society come to terms with a history of violence and a present-day reality in which violent crime is so prevalent. And how are the many competing "truths" which emerge in the stories told to the Commission to be reconciled? (57)

Tutu distinguishes between a performative plea of guilty and inner repentance. This gap affects the relationship between Claudia and Harald. Harald stands back for Claudia with the politeness of a stranger. Uncertainty and the need to rethink uncover hidden streams of violence. It brings into light the desire beneath the veneer of the ordinariness of suburbia.

Harald and Claudia become consumed by this question. During the pre-trial period, Harald and Claudia seek the truth in their memories. Their son Duncan is on prison and the decision of the court "whose decisions would not be made one on any circumstances in mitigation of the act of an individual, but on the collective morality of a nation" (128). They examine the choices they make for their son. They are inclined to hope against hope. They send him to a boarding school where a school mate subsequently killed himself. But as Harald and Claudia turn over the past, other choices they have made also surface. Those choices pose much larger questions of guilt. As an insurance executive, Harald has accepted without questioning that housing for blacks was no business of his. Their housing is the responsibility of the government. Harald's sympathies for the victims of the injustices led him to do no more than vote against a government. He could have done more. Mental calmness of Duncan and its resultant outcome are both the cause and effect of his life. The following extract serves as a convincing proof of his moral dishonesty of Lindgards are, "It is difficult enough... to talk, enough to know what we're saying. I have the feeling you're in some ways suspicious of me —as a compensations for pain and

disaster” (51). Being upper middle white class Duncan and his family has skipped from, “judgment unable to escape; or was it such confirmation of ego of power” (52). In their inaction and refusal to take responsibility, they have been complicit in creating a society where people “breathed violence along with cigarette smoke (267). In the midst of their pain and confusion, the Lindgards find a temporary refuge in the Motsamai family. Hamilton Motsamai becomes their son's Senior Counsel. He is recommended to the Lindgards. The Lindgards finds comfort and support among people who owe them the least.

Motsamai becomes the friend and lawyer. He supports Duncan and his parents through an unfamiliar process. In his discussions with the jailed Duncan, he plays father when father cannot. As said about in Duncan, “he is not innocent but he cannot be guilty” (30). The character of Duncan is mysterious. For Harald and Claudia, he is the man who exposes the understanding of people in trouble. In a visit to his home, Harald and Claudia meet Motsamai's family. His family members display a vitality and awareness of the world around them. It is in contradistinction to the Lindgard's much more homogeneous and bland lives. The banality of the life of Duncan's parents frustrates the instability of Duncan's life. The following extract serves as an evidence of out of prejudices towards blacks:

They had heard it at once, in the shock of the name; the choice of a black man. She's not one of those doctors who touch black skin indiscriminately along with white, in their work, but retain liberal prejudices against the intellectual capacities of blacks...old prejudices in the surface. Looking the appointment of someone called Motsamai that way; he can find answer within the context.

(33)

Motsamai sums them up in commenting on the job of warder. Society seeks the truth

of Duncan's crime in the courtroom. The lawyer Motsamai is chosen as senior Lawyer not by his colour. He judges his verdict of Duncan with his intelligence.

Although Duncan is guilty, the circumstances of the killing raise doubt of his intent. He will come out of prison a middle-aged man. His deed towards Jespersen breaks the humanity. The lawyer Motsamai charges his ethical notes towards the white Duncan for his rights to live. Motsamai argues that it is unendurable provocation. Motsamai “responded with zest to the new attitude... to do something, anything unethical (as they saw it) in defence of their son” (145). Hamilton is confronting very gently for releasing their son from the prison. Duncan’s future depends on whether or not the judges believe that he does not intend to kill his friend. Motsamai is not meant to punish but to rehabilitate. The crux of murder case done by Duncan has made him “a vacuum is the antithesis of life” (149). Duncan has been sentenced. But the issues of truth and guilt are not put to rest. Duncan has committed a horrible crime, and he will pay. But his sentence has been tempered by understanding and mercy from the court and he will not pay with his life.

In a court Motsamai clearly says “jurisdiction to be handed down when his own case is heard... [Motsamai] My concern for my client does not include any fears about the outcome” (162). Duncan shall have this will to his death surrounding him as long as he lives. In that grim view Gordimer invites a comparison. One unplanned death, carried out in a moment of tumultuous emotion, can evoke such a determination not to forgive. The state may be able to suspend punishment but only the individual can forgive. Each South African must make their own peace with their country's history.

At the announcement of the murderous act of their son Duncan, Harald and Claudia are both shocked. They cannot believe what they have just been told. The

voice relates the reactions of the couple:

A kind of... Not Duncan, no, no! Someone's been shot. He's arrested.

Duncan. They both stand up. For God's sake – what are you talking about – what is this – entire how arrested, arrested for what – The messenger is attacked, he becomes almost sullen, unable to bear what he has to tell. The obscene word comes ashamedly from him. He strides over and switches off the television. So long as nobody moved, nobody uttered, the word and the act within the word could not enter here. (4-5)

Puzzling in the text is the questions of individual and social responsibility. The central incident is a murder. It seems to have no obvious political fallout. The following extract is a candid illumination of the confounding reality that shocks the common people at large:

Now with the touch of a switch and the gush of a breath a new calendar is opened. The old Gregorian cannot register this day. It does not exist in that means of measure. She has marked the date on patients' prescriptions a dozen times since morning but she turns to find a question that will bring some kind of answer to that word pronounced by messenger. She cries out. (5)

The dialogues are a blurred expression of the reactions of both parents to the fatal news of their son's arrest. They suggest the shock they feel but also the difficulty to realize that their son is a murderer. The shock they feel is structurally materialized by the phrase. This is to impart that the parents are one being, one voice.

The agony and fallouts of the heavy historical experience of institutionalized injustice have brought communities. The uncontrolled violence is here described by the anonymous voice:

...in a region of the country where the political ambition of a leader had led to

a killing that had become vendettas, fomented by him, a daily tally of deaths was routine as a weather report; elsewhere, taxi drivers shot one another in rivalry over who would choose to ride with them, quarrels in discothèques were settled by the final curse-word of guns. (49-50)

It is worthwhile to expose the plenty of causes and forms of violence not only to alert communities at loggerheads but to make them aware that there is another way. It is with much surprise that parents discover.

Harald and Claudia are distressed to know that their son Duncan is bisexual. The consequence of this is a new perspective in racial and sexual orientation. Homosexuality and bisexuality are rather gaining ground in South Africa. Such a deviation from norms can be read through the lens of ethical dilemma. In other words, the confusion of times and the skepticism born from the sudden ending of apartheid, led to a confusion of lives, of values and codes of conduct. As the South Africans' hopes turn into doubts and disillusion, the narrative design also gives the image of a total chaos. This passage is illustrative of the psychological impact that the sexual orientation of Duncan has on his parents:

He seems to have been besotted with her. Sexually there must have been something very strong between them ... even devastating, the way I suppose it can be if... That business with a man, before her is prudential. Wasn't it a matter of being fascinated by the set in that house? Fashion's that's been around for his generation, the idea that homosexuality is the real liberation, to suggest this as superiority beyond the ordinary humdrum. (119-120)

In this exchange between the parents of Duncan, it is noticeable to get an expressive allusion of the pain. They feel to grasp the motives behind the sexual identity of the son. The dialogue itself is disconcerted. The jagged sentences in the passage rebel

against the dictates of the grammar. Duncan and his friends defy the system. This fragmented aspect of the narrative is suggestive of the youth's blunt violation of norms and truths.

The agitation of the father is proverbial. He too is in ethical dilemma. He finds it hard to understand the bisexuality of the son. The son freed from all social and cultural trappings. He escapes all regulations to experience Duncan's subversive love relationships. The following extract demonstrates the spirit of eccentricity on the part of Duncan who consciously or unconsciously makes anomalous choice:

Why did he choose to live with those men? It turns out he didn't take the cottage because of the girl. Moved in with them on the property because their freedom claims to go beyond all the old trappings between men and women, marriages and divorces and crying babies. He didn't suffer any example of divorces and crying babies with us. (120)

Duncan and his homosexual friends are symbols of a progressive conception of freedom. The friends from multicultural origin live unbound by any cultural norms. They can be well taken as a microscopic image of the social atmosphere of a country. They suddenly free from the shackles of oppression. They so abruptly engage on the road to ethical dilemma. Duncan's bisexuality can be associated with a total loss of control.

This transformation of the true identity of Duncan to his parents is the reality. It drives them to revisit the past of the son. They are keen to diagnose his childhood. They are eager to know Duncan's sexual experience. With the hope of understanding his violation of moral and social boundaries, they take various measures. While the mother leans on Freud's psychology to dig out the hidden motives of the subject, the father tries to find answers in religion. The parents are both bewildered by the

discovery of the bisexuality of Duncan. They go to the point of blaming themselves. The narrative voice here describes their difficulty to understand and accept the criminal actions of Duncan:

Harald and Claudia have, each, within them, now a malignant resentment against their son that would seem impossible to exist in them as an ability to kill could exist in him. The resentment is shameful. What is shameful cannot be shared? What is shameful separates. But the way to deal with the resentment will come, must come, individually to both. The resentment is shameful: because what is it that they do to him? Is that where the answer – Why? Why? – is to be found? Harald is prompted by Jesuits, Claudia by Freud. (63)

Duncan's parents are agitated. They are affected badly by the events. They are unable to face such a tragic experience. They lack energy to face to uncertainty. They took for granted. It's no wonder that characters like the Lindgards turn each to themselves. They try to find answers to unanswerable questions. Those questions are bubbling in the mind.

The pathetic situation of the Lindgards is connoted by this passage from the text with a juxtaposition of the confusing voices and the narrated monologue of the character:

Hamilton Motsamai had left them. . . . He was all there was between them and Death Penalty. Not only had he come from the Other Side; everything had come to them from the Other Side, the nakedness to the final disaster; powerlessness, helplessness, before the law. The queer sense Harald had had while he waited for Claudia in the secular cathedral of the court's foyer. (127)

Society seeks the truth of Duncan's crime in the courtroom. Although Duncan is

guilty, the circumstances of the killing raise doubt of his intent. He will come out of prison a middle-aged man or a relatively young one. Motsamai argues that it is unendurable provocation. The proximity of the gun lying on a nearby table drove Duncan to kill. Duncan's future depends on whether or not the judges believe that he did not intend to kill his friend.

To sum up, the issue of ethical dilemma reigns sovereign in these two texts. Most of people have suffered the most. Incarceration is not meant to punish but to rehabilitate. It should not be used to identify a scapegoat for society's ills. Duncan has been sentenced. But the issues of truth and guilt are not put to rest. Duncan has committed a horrible crime. And he will pay. But his sentence has been tempered by understanding and mercy from the court. He will not pay with his life. Harald hears in the public debate over abolishing the death penalty. Eventually Duncan will leave prison.

Chapter III

Ethical Impotence in Transitional Society

The conclusive finding of this study is that transitional society and double ethical standard endorsed by racially divided society give rise to ethical dilemma and subsequently cripples the promotion of human rights. The intensive study of Coetzee's *Disgrace* and Gordimer's *The House Gun* yields this finding. Lurie is depicted as being totally self-absorbed in his dealings with others. He routinely reduces women to the status of objects with which to gratify his desires. This is, of course, most evident in his final sexual engagement with Melanie Isaacs. He possesses her against her will. His lack of concern for others is further apparent in his subsequent defense of his violation of his student in terms of the rights of desire. He conceives of himself as an individual who is free to realize his every desire even if this means violating the rights of other individuals.

Lurie is depicted as a solipsistic individual divorced totally from other beings. Consequently, he is incapable of sympathizing with them. The gang rape of Lurie's daughter serves as a structural parallel in the novel to Lurie's rape of Melanie Isaacs. It is the mechanism through which Coetzee challenges his protagonist's assumption of autonomy. Lurie is confined in the toilet of his daughter's homestead while she is being raped. Therefore, he does not witness her violation. Afterwards, Lucy rejects Lurie's gestures of sympathy because she feels that he cannot begin to know what has happened to her. His daughter refuses to discuss her violation with him and asks him to keep to his story.

Lurie would not be able to tell Lucy's story because he cannot imagine himself into her position. He must try to imagine what had happened there. He must put himself in Lucy's place and be the woman in order to understand. He does

eventually manage to view the events. Lucy in the *Disgrace* has muted her voice even she could not open out her torture publicly. Though, she is herself as the source of justification. What the point here is the character Lucy is a victim of rape from black people. She neither gets justice nor is her voices become an issue. Melanie is begging the justice when she is sexually violated from Luri. But her words are not working. She is panic in terms of human rights perspectives.

Lurie is thinking his way into Melanie's life. In identifying with his daughter, he is discovering what it would be like to have been raped by him. In addition, he is discovering the effect of his rape of Melanie on her family. He now finds himself in their position. Hence, after Lucy's rape, Lurie begins to find it possible to sympathize with Melanie's father. David Lurie comes to sympathize with the parents of a girl whom he used in much the same way as the gang rapists used his own daughter. Lurie has gained the ability imaginatively to identify with creatures other than human beings.

In Gordimer's *The House Gun*, the family is the Lindgards. Harald and Claudia Lindgard are liberal whites. He is a senior insurance executive involved in the housing sector. She is a doctor who has worked one day a week at a clinic. One unremarkable evening, a messenger comes to shock and silence Harald and Claudia. The messenger is from Duncan's household. He lives communally with a handful of young white and black men. Carl Jespersen who is shot by his friend-Duncan is beyond the humanity. Among the things they share is a gun that is always somewhere about. Duncan has been arrested for using that gun to murder one of his housemates. During the pre-trial period, Harald and Claudia seek the truth in their memories.

Harald and Claudia examine the choices they made for their son, hoping to identify what combination of influences and events made him a killer. They sent him

to a boarding school where a school mate subsequently killed himself. Harald had accepted without questioning that housing for blacks was no business of his. The case of his is unforgivable though Duncan is arrested from police but rescue of him is another site. It knocks the human rights. Their housing was the responsibility of the government. He knew existed led him to do no more than vote against a government that could have done more.

To sum up, protagonist Lurie finally comes with one point that is accepting the guilt he does in Melanie when his daughter forgiving to condemn anyone though she is badly suffered from black. It shows that Lucy has an emblem of goodness of transitional society in a sense for her goodness; black's revenge towards the white is balancing to some extent. Her forgiveness is inflicted by human right but ethically it is ok. It is because she is more responsible than all. Similarly, Charges notes black lawyer-Hamilton Motsami is healing the perpetrator's torture for his eternal psyche in-line with law. He is the savior and he is fighting against the rights not by colour but by his virtue. This way of thinking seems to be totalizing and self to the other. Duncan parent's Harald and Claudia who serves in the South Africa though they are in difficulty.

With the hand of black, they beg for their son's justice even though they are from white middle class. They are lost in the maze of legal system except Motsami has the map. They are out from the pre-occupied consciousness and bring back them to adjust into transitional society. The wind of political liberation that flew in the country seems to sweep away or to derange the socio-cultural standards determining human relationships. The consequence of this is a new perspective in racial and sexual orientation. Homosexuality and bisexuality are rather gaining ground in the South African scenario. Such a change puts people in ethical dilemma.

Works Cited

- Alexandar, Jeffrey et al, editors. *Cultural Theory and Applications*. University of California Press, 2021.
- Bailey, Jon S. and Burch, Mary R. *Ethics for Behavior Analysts*. Routledge, 2005.
- Brittan, Alice. "Death and J. M. Coetzee's Disgrace". *Contemporary Literature*, vol. 51, no.3, 2010, pp. 477-502.
- Caruth, C. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, and the Possibility of History*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1996.
- Chakrabarti, Gagari and Chatterjea, Tapas. *Ethics and Deviations in Decision-making: An Applied Study*. Macmillan, 2020.
- Cheah, Pheng. *In Human Conditions: On Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights*. Harvard UP, 2007.
- Clapham, Andrew. *Human Rights: A very short Introduction*. Oxford UP, 2016.
- Clingman, Stephen. "Surviving Murder: Oscillation and Triangulation in Nadine Gordimer's *The House Gun*". *Modern Fiction Studies*. Vol.46, no.1, 2000, pp. 139-158.
- Copp, David. *The Oxford hand book of Ethical Theory*. Oxford UP, 2008.
- Coundouriotis, Eleni, and Lauren M. E. Goodlad. "Comparative Human Rights: Literature, Art, Politics". *Journal of Human Rights*, vol.9, no. 2, 2010, pp. 121-126.
- Dauphinee, Elizabeth. "The Politics of Body in Pain: Reading the Ethics of Imagery". *Security Dialogue*, vol. 38, no. 2, 2007, pp. 140-154.
- Dawes, James. "Human Rights in Literary Studies." *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 31, no. 2, 2009, pp. 394-409.

- Dekoven, Marianne. "Going to the Dogs in Disgrace". *ELH*. Vol. 76, no. 4, 2009, pp. 847-875.
- Eze, Chielozona. *Ethics and Human Rights in Anglophone African Women's Literature*. Macmillan, 2016.
- Feyter, Koen De. *Human Rights: Social Justice in the Age of the Market (Global Issues Series)*. Zed Books, 2005.
- Gilmore, Leigh. *The Limits of Autobiography: Trauma and Testimony*. Cornell UP, 2001
- Gordimer, Nadine. *The House Gun*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 1999.
- Hughes, Nancy Scheper. "White Writing and White Fears and Black Justice," *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 30, no. 6, 2014, pp. 8-14.
- Hunt, Lynn. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. Norton and Company, 2007.
- Kerry, Bystrom. "Novels and Human Rights". *Journal of Human Rights*. Vol. 7, no. 4, 2008, pp. 388-396.
- Lévinas, Emmanuel. *Ethics and Infinity*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1985.
- Mapp, Susan C. *Human Rights and Social Justice in a Global Perspective*. Oxford UP, 2007.
- Margalit, Avishai. *The Ethics of Memory*. Harvard UP, 2004.
- Medalie, David. "The Context of Awful Event: Nadine Gordimer's *The House Gun*." *Southern African Studies*, Vol. 25, no. 4, 1999, pp. 633-44.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Belknap Press, 1971.
- Santas, Gerasimos. "Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's of The Good: Ethics without Metaphysics?" *Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 18, no. 2, 2010, pp. 137-160.
- Sara Joseph Sara and Kyriakakis Joanna. *Research Handbook on International Human Rights Law*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2010.

Scarry, Eliane. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. Oxford UP, 1985.

Susan C. Mapp. *Human Rights and Social Justice in a Global Perspective: An Introduction to International Social Work*. Oxford UP, 2008.

Wronka, Joseph. *Human rights and social justice: social action and service for the helping and health Professions*. SAGE, 2017.

Yang, June Unjoo. "The Trial and Tribulation". *The Women's Review of Books*, vol. 15, no. 7, 1998, pp. 22.