

## Mimicry as Mockery in J.M. Coetzee *Disgrace*

Hosni Dhanu Pranata

English Literature, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Surabaya State University

[hosnidhp@gmail.com](mailto:hosnidhp@gmail.com)

### Abstrak

Mimikri merupakan suatu bentuk perlawanan terhadap penjajah karena mimikri tidak hanya meniru, tetapi juga mengolok menjadikan penjajah terlihat berbeda. Coetzee *Disgrace* mencoba menguraikan masalah yang diakibatkan oleh keadaan pasca-apartheid; memberikan kemungkinan bagi orang kulit hitam dan orang kulit putih untuk berinteraksi satu sama lain dan dalam pertemuan ini membuat orang-orang kulit hitam melakukan mimikri atau meniru apa yang dilakukan orang-orang kulit putih, dalam berperilaku, dan bertindak. Akan tetapi, hal ini pasti ada yang berbeda, namun perbedaan tersebut justru menjadi cara bagaimana orang kulit hitam mengolok kulit putih. Olokan ini adalah cara untuk memberi perlawanan dan Petrus sebagai peran antagonis bagi Lurie memainkan perannya dengan baik. Dengan demikian persoalan problematis ini dimana mimikri sebagai ejekan untuk member perlawanan mengarahkan masalah yang akan dirumuskan sebagai berikut; (1) bagaimana mimikri digambarkan dalam J. M. Coetzee *Disgrace*? Dan (2) bagaimana mimikri berubah menjadi olokan sebagai perlawanan dalam J. M. Coetzee *Disgrace*? Untuk menjadikan penelitian ini menjadi lebih matang dan terarah, metode yang digunakan adalah pendekatan objektif dan interpretasi. Dibangun pada analisis, Petrus bermimikri untuk hidup namun hal ini tumbuh berbeda pada pandangan perspektif Lurie seakan martabatnya dipermalukan dan diejek, apalagi, Lucy tampaknya selalu berlindung pada Petrus setelah ia diperkosa oleh tiga pria kulit hitam. Kenyataan tak terduga ini secara meyakinkan memperlihatkan bahwa terdapat ruang untuk bernegosiasi selama pertemuan antara kulit putih dan orang kulit hitam terjadi, dan ruang itulah yang disebut Bhabha sebagai ruang ketiga.

**Kata Kunci:** mimicry, *ruang ketiga*, perlawanan.

### Abstract

Mimicry is a kind of resistance against colonizer because mimicry does not simply imitate, but also mock the colonizer of being difference. Coetzee's *Disgrace* elaborates the problems resulted of post-apartheid; it gives the possibility for the black and the white people to interact to each other and this encounter makes the black people doing mimicry or imitating what the white people do, behave, and act. However, it must be always different but this difference precisely becomes the way the black people mock the white. This mocking is the way to resist and Petrus as Lurie's antagonist plays it well. Thus this problematical circumstance of mimicry as mockery to resist leads the problem to be formulated as; (1) how is mimicry depicted in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*? And (2) how does mimicry turn to be mockery as the resistance in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*? To bond and to stalemate the steady amount of the analysis, the used method is objective approach and interpretation. Constructed on the analysis, Petrus does mimicry to live but it grows differently on Lurie's perspective as if his dignity is humiliated and mocked, moreover, Lucy seems to be always defending on Petrus after she is raped by three black men. This unpredictable ailment conclusively exposes that there is a space to negotiate during the encounter between the white and the black people and the space is actually what Bhabha calls as the *third space*.

**Keywords:** Mimicry, the *third space*, negotiation and resistance.

### INTRODUCTION

Talking about South African in the post-Apartheid era can be very interesting, it is not only about the equality process between Black and White, but also about the encounter between the two. Analogically, if a servant is living in a house with his master, there will encounter between the two. In so far the master rules the servant, he

indirectly needs the servant's presence because without his servant's, the master cannot rule it. In simpler word, the way the master rules the servant precisely shows his inability without the servant. With this condition, the servant, indirectly, has a power to control the master. The master cannot exile and even kill the servant because without the servant, the master cannot do anything in his

house. This encounter shows that there is a moment when the one who is seen, oppositely sees the one who sees him. This encounter constructs a condition and irreducible distance between the servant and the master which ruins the ruling power.

Ways in which the servant was try to give a resistance with imitating something known as mimicry. In the context of postcolonial mimicry becomes a way for inferior to imitate and be like superior. According to Bhabha views the man who does mimicry (the imitator) will not be one hundred percent the same as the original one. Mimicry is the process of reshaping, but not totally perfect "almost the same, but not quite." (Bhaba 1994 : 86). To imitate means to have known what is imitated, and the imitated should be encountered by the imitator. In this encountering, the imitator tries to copy what the imitated has, and the two must encounter in one space, both mentally and physically. This is how the *Third Space* should be understood.

*Third Space*, Bhabha says, "overcomes the given grounds of opposition and opens up a space of translation: a place of hybridity" where the cross-interrogation does not become a substance of unpretentious opposition between the colonizer and colonized that leaves prevailing modes of directive intact. In simple assumption, third space occurs in an encounter between the colonizer and the colonized in undetermined space beyond the colonizer and the colonized. However, in this space, hybridity is constituted and mimicry is processed in its negotiation. For Bhabha, "hybridity is a problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal" (1994: 114) and "mimicry is at once resemblance and menace." (1994: 86).

In this understanding, hybridity and mimicry cannot be separated at all because hybridity shows the condition of encountering between the colonialist and the colonized while the encountering means no boundary between them, on the other hand, mimicry means the effect resulted from this encounter which makes the colonized imitates the colonizer while the imitation is never same. The dissimilar imitation becomes the mockery and the mockery becomes the reversing against the total power of colonialist. Being imitated can be seen as the menace and it is the implications of Bhabha's theory to resist against the colonizer in the postcolonial space.

Finally, to simplify this background, Coetzee's *Disgrace* complicates interweaving cases, but from the facts that can be collected, those all do not run to what this study will analyze; it is to dig out the mimicry as mockery in its resistant practices in the third space. The space itself is not only the physical territory, but it is also the mentally construction which is blended to each other. This space is also presented as the result of the fact that the setting of

this novel is in the post-apartheid where the White and the Black are assembled in one place. Thus, it will be very significant to carry on this problem about the resistant process in this novel through mimicry in the context of post-colonialism.

### 1. Statement of the Problems

Black seems to be White and White seems to be Black, thus mimicry is something floats around them and their complications. For that reason, it is thought-provoking to notice and in accordance of background study above, it can be simplified to discuss two significant problematic matters toward this novel as it is formulated below;

1. How is mimicry depicted in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*?
2. How does mimicry turn to be mockery as the resistance in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*?

### 2. Scope and Limitation

This research study will frequently emphasize on the relation between the White and Black characters in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*. The study is also limited mainly to focus on the discussion about post-apartheid in J.M. Coetzee's *Disgrace* and how it depicted the colonizer otherness process by the mimicry of colonized in the novel through male character of David Lurie and Petrus. To limit the discussion, the researcher will drag the analysis focused on the problems that have been proposed before; it is about the post-apartheid as the third space that encounters the colonizer and the colonized and therefore, Bhabha's theory and concepts are also applied to sustain this limitation of the study. This study uses the key concepts such as post-colonialism, mimicry and third space (Bhabha's perspective). This also can be sustained by some referential understanding of what happens historically in the Apartheid and Post-apartheid era. Thus, these all will be the groundwork of how this analysis is operated and worked.

### 3. Objective of the Study

Established on the problems which have been presented previously, then the objectives can be inscribed in several to ideas as follows:

1. Describing how mimicry is depicted in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace* and it is firstly to expose how the life of the Whites and the Blacks in South Africa's post-apartheid. It also automatically portrays the encounter of the two as portrayed in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*.
2. Describing how mimicry turns to be mockery as the resistance in J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*.

### 4. Previous Study

There are two taken studies are actually important to sustain and to support this study to be better and reliable research. The first taken previous study conveys the critic

toward power domination over the Black in South African while the second taken previous study seems closely to solve the *Disgrace* ethically while seeing something lovely in Lurie. However, if it is taken a redline of these two, these will accumulate in a calculation that the problem is actually about how the colonizer and the colonized cannot be separated if the two do not want to be united. Therefore, it is very crucial to rethink that this study, using mimicry and the third space as the projection theory, will be inspired of these oppositional researches.

## RESEARCH METHOD

To analyze a literary work, there must be a necessity of a method, while within the method there is the technique and the approach.

In post-structural method, the approach should be integrated to objective approach as it intends to see something textually and to chain it in inter-textual webs of the cases, facts and problems. On the other hand, the technique to analyze these data is interpretation. To see it in detail, the data is actually taken accordingly to the proposed problems. Therefore, the descriptive data to operate the analysis of this study and to connect it with the used theoretical approach can be elaborated as follows:

### 1. Data

This study takes the data from those quotations taken from J.M. Coetzee's novel entitled *Disgrace* including the data in the form of direct and indirect speech of the characters, dialogue, epilogue and quotations that imply and explicate the proposed problems.

### 2. Source of the Data

The data is sourced from J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*, published by Vintage, Random House, 20 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London, Great Britain in 1999.

### 3. Data Collection

The data is collected approximately and it is referred to the problems that have been projected before; they are mimicry and its resistant form.

### 4. Theoretical Approach

Finally, by keen-sighting on this method, this research will be reliable to be kept an eye on. This research method is also cooperative and valuable to be stepped on before going to further parts. These below are the step to analyze those data;

Reading novel; this is the first step to process the facts to be raw data. Then inventorying data; this is the second step to collect the data and the data which is collected is to determine the binary opposition in the context of colonizer and the colonized, or the Whites and the Blacks. The last step is analyzing data; the binary opposition taken from the data is turning upside down by using the concept of mimicry and some Bhabha's perspectives. This also becomes the important step to be seen because this step will produce the final assumption as the result of the analysis.

## ANALYSIS

It is very important to start with the general perspective on *Disgrace* in which it unlocks the story with a portrayal of David Lurie, a divorced Cape Town professor, who hunts for new ointment to the problem of sex in his middle-age. He involves in a scandalous affair with a student, Melanie Isaacs, and this relation becomes the last flirtation that ends Lurie's career as a lecturer. This scandal signifies the loss of his job and finally he escapes to his daughter's farm in the rural Eastern Cape. Afterwards, David's arrival is followed by an incident; the farm is viciously attacked by three black men who also rob the property, attack David and gang-rape his daughter, Lucy. Since this event, the novel spreads its silent and unspeakable complicated cases. Lucy does not want to report it to the police and she finds out that she is pregnant but she even chooses to keep the baby.

Imaginatively, this unspeakable Lucy and the enthusiasm to pour his vengeance to those bastards have painted an elusive bleak sketch of human relationships and the brutalities of which human beings are capable to do it. However, what further complicates offered by the novel is the way race(ism) involves in the story, particularly in its immersion in the cultural and historical space. The Luries (David Lurie and Lucy) are white, the attackers are black and it can be concluded that Melanie Isaacs is colored woman. The term *colored* itself is referring to South Africans of mixed race ancestry. In more general understanding, it is also known that *colored* can refer to compare between White and the comparison, both Black and Indian as racial classifications throughout apartheid reign. The term of *colored* has also been associated to the part of cultural identity for most people of mixed sub-Saharan African, British and Dutch. There are also attributions that indicate to recognize the *colored* as black instead of the other races. It is caused by a reason that the term black has been including all non-white people. Thus, the problem of racism can be detected along this novel's characterization while it raises the classification between the colonized and the colonized after the colonization era; about resistance and power of domination. As Lurie has done to Melanie (the colored woman),

She does not resist. All she does is averting herself: avert her lips, avert her eyes. She lets him lay her out on the bed and undress her: she even helps him, raising her arms and then her hips. Little shivers of cold run through her; as soon as she is bare, she slips under the quilted counterpane like a mole burrowing, and turns.

Not rape, not quite that, but undesired nevertheless, undesired to the core. As though she had decided to go slack, die within herself for the duration, like a rabbit when the jaws of

the fox close on its neck. So that everything done to her might be done, as it were, far away her back on him. (Coetzee, 1999: 25).

It is not a rape but it is just undesired relation. Analogically to colonization, the colored people who are associated to the colonized, are actually having been on the side of doing nothing but receiving. So, the rule of apartheid has indicated this system and reproduced the colonization in its core. If apartheid separates the black and the white, the post-apartheid joins them in an encounter but it even shows that the white still has the domination over the black and David Lurie represents it very well at how he *rapes* Melanie. Moreover, the setting of the novel itself, in which these characters try to deploy their *maneuver*, is post-apartheid South Africa, circa 1997, in cosmopolitan Cape Town and the Eastern Cape countryside. Therefore, it will be crucial to dive to the problem of this racial case historically; apartheid and post-apartheid.

### The Portrayal of Mimicry

The first important part that should not be forgotten is the existence of Petrus, both his condition and characteristics because Petrus is the *main actor* of this mimicry, especially for the fact he lives around Lucy (a white woman). Petrus seems to be like a representative of the countryside because David directly can explain his physical features as it is noticed, "A lined, weathered face; shrewd eyes. Forty? Forty-five?" (Coetzee, 1999: 64). With a face that is wrinkled by the outdoors, it is tough to express precisely how old Petrus is, he introduces himself to David in expressions of his profession, which consists of noticeably countryside obligations: "I look after the dogs and I work in the garden. Yes ... I am the gardener and the dog-man." *He reflects for a moment*, "The dog-man," *he repeats, savoring the phrase*. (Coetzee, 1999: 64).

The interesting part is the phrase of dog-man and yet, it can be affirmed as the satirical sarcasm that Petrus does not look to truly love being acknowledged as the "dog-man," he looks to play it in repeat as a repetition that reminds him of who he really is, where he is really now and where he should be going. This can be the way of how he later speaks that he is no more the *dog-man* just as he instigates to rejoice the land handover that will make him a richer and more authoritative *black* man in his own land. To take it simpler, the social status is a matter that comes up regularly in orientation to Petrus and through him, something cannot only be understood as the way that social dynamic forces change between characters in the novel, but also during their communal group and the cases happen in the country even before his stores start to increase in the novel, Petrus is already attractive and firm,

but with Lucy's support as she notes, Petrus goes far from being poor *peasant*, "He got a Land Affairs grant earlier this year, enough to buy a hectare and a bit from me. I didn't tell you? The boundary line goes through the dam. We share the dam. Everything from there to the fence is his ... By Eastern Cape standards *he is a man of substance*." (Coetzee, 1999: 77, *italic* is added). At this stimulation, the mimicry can be sneaked like a leakage that cannot be calked. The italic sentence indicates the way Petrus is going to be, he is actually grows to be like a white in the colonized land. Petrus turns to imitate how to be the landlord rather than being a black man who works for the white as he shows that he has his own land taken over from Lucy.

PETRUS HAS BORROWED a tractor, from where he has no idea, to which he has coupled the old rotary plough that has lain rusting behind the stable since before Lucy's time. In a matter of hours he has ploughed the whole of his land. All very swift and businesslike; all very unlike Africa. In olden times, that is to say ten years ago, it would have taken him days with a hand-plough and oxen. (Coetzee, 1999: 151).

Petrus is not only having the land, but he develops it by having (from borrowing) a tractor to self-manage the land as he wants and wish without any demand and whip from the owner because he is the owner. Petrus is the boss of his land and near around it, Lucy lives. Lucy is sort of a silent woman, living lonely in the country side where the black people live freely. In contrast with David's lustrous, formal, stylish ways of performing (it can be traced and looked from how he loves pouring red wine, watching art films, teaching at a university in a major metropolitan area), Lucy is a plain woman who survives in the countryside, farms the land for a simple living, and does not care to fashion or body image as woman in the metropolis city as her father lives in the Cape Town (Capital of South Africa). Something that can be assumed is that Lucy's homegrown is near Petrus's life and she has not moved away, more than that, she really does not want to move as she explains that "[...] now here she is, flowered dress, bare feet and all, in a house full of the smell of baking, no longer a child playing at farming but a solid countrywoman, a *boervrou*." (Coetzee, 1999: 60). Lucy's characteristic is really poor, looking dirty, flowered dress like a peasant and her house is not under good condition. Thus, there appears a simplification of the explanation about *boervrou* which means farmers wife in Afrikaans and it strengthens the assumption that the

mimicry gives the space for the colonizer and the colonized people to have a hybrid cultural situation. Petrus is not the only one who imitates how to be like white, but Lucy is also the one who shows that white can be melt down to be like black who is poor and dirty.

Defeated. It is not hard to imagine Lucy in ten years' time: a heavy woman with lines of sadness on her face, wearing clothes long out of fashion, talking to her pets, eating alone. Not much of a life. But better than passing her days in fear of the next attack, when the dogs will not be enough to protect her and no one will answer the telephone. (Coetzee, 1999: 151-152).

The portray of Lucy can be directly guiding the assumption straight to the portray of black in the colonization era under the white. Lucy is really tickling the foundation that white in the South Africa is identical with good life, wealth, prosperity, affluence, capital, fortune, mammon and riches, while the way the women live is through fashionable and stylish dresses. Indeed, it strikes general idea that white is always higher than black and here comes the boom of how the mimicry shows its automatic mechanism. The encounter between the black and the white does not simply to show that white dominates the black, but rather it makes the whites mock themselves by being imitated while the imitation will never be the same.

There must be a lot of question of why Lucy should choose to live in the farm even when there is no white people nearby her, the answer cannot be explained in simple elaboration because Lucy never gives these answers up front, but she keeps the curiosity whipping every step of the way the conflict grows and it is actually the silent space that keeps remaining. However, the little hint for the shocking clue can be analogized with catching a tiger. The problem of Lucy who keeps silent is actually similar the silence of a tiger, to catch this fighter animal, it does not need to fight with it directly, but rather distracts it with a trap or let it show its flaw. The flaw leads to question, why should a tiger caught up while it does not attack human? This is the trick, the silent Lucy actually leads the balance of the relation between her and Petrus, Petrus is a black guy lives near to him Lucy cannot work her "master position" to enslave Petrus because he indirectly needs Petrus. Therefore, to let Petrus lives there is actually the situation that cannot be explained. Like catching the tiger, catching Lucy's silence is just about how something does not work as usual, people who think Lucy is wrong by living with black (like Lurie) are the people who think that Tiger should be defeated before it

attacks while the Tiger does not really attack if it is not attacked or disturbed first.

Here the connection, by alienating or by being discriminated, the black finally wants to be like white because being like white means that they (the black people) will never be attacked. The tiger should tame because if the tiger tames, the people loves it and when the people love the tamed tiger, the tiger will live safely. The tiger cannot be killed at all because it will cut the circulation of food circle, so in simpler world, the tiger is needed and people are afraid of it. The white people need the black while they are afraid of losing them (the black people). It is also added by this quotation that shows Lucy's declaration,

"Wake up, David. This is the country. This is Africa."

There is a snappishness to Lucy nowadays that he sees no justification for. His usual response is to withdraw into silence. There are spells when the two of them are like strangers in the same house. (Coetzee, 1999: 124).

Lucy tells to David that the place she lives is South Africa and it means that Lucy admits that she lives on the land of black man. Finally it completes the ruptures of the puzzle that Lucy imitates of how to be like black man until she recognizes and admit consciously that she lives on the black's land.

The problem that black people are lower than white people can be known when Petrus says deliberately that he is dog man, and as white people recognize, they will be very proud to know that the black is looking after the dog rather than living opportunely, this is how the image of Westerner sees Black; "he is left with Petrus. 'You look after the dogs,' he says, to break the silence. 'I look after the dogs and I work in the garden. Yes.' Petrus gives a broad smile. 'I am the gardener and the dog-man.' He reflects for a moment. 'The dog-man,' he repeats, savoring the phrase. (Coetzee, 1999: 64). But this construction is quickly replied additionally by Petrus with his proof that he has been wealth and richer. He is the boss and the master, although he is black, he can control white people; "'Does he live on the property?' 'He and his wife have the old stable. I've put in electricity. It's quite comfortable. He has another wife in Adelaide, and children, some of them.'" (Coetzee, 1999: 64). Thus, it is clear to admit that Petrus' mimicry is shown up and it is performed completely against the white people, Lucy and Lurie.

During the conflicts that trail Lucy's rape, Petrus looks unenthusiastic to get involved in the conflict of it, he does not even look to need to offer either a suggestion or an estimation as to what has occurred and it is, of course, boiling Lurie's temper totally up. Petrus seems to have

blind eye and does not care of the fact that Lucy has been raped. Petrus even acts as if it was just a common robbery and the important is Lucy and Lurie is fine. Fine here is having no pain and is still alive while Lurie disagrees because when people are not dead does not mean that they are fine. Moreover, Petrus' comportment at the party is similar as usual as if there is nothing happens. When Lurie is told by Lucy that there is a boy who raped her, Petrus decides not to obey David's complaint that the boy is hunted by the police. In fact, Petrus fundamentally disregards any appeals, requests, petitions, entreaties, supplications, or implorations that David claims for him to set the problem and case right. Obviously, at this part, it is not known that the boy is Petrus's wife's brother and regardless this fact, it can be assumed that the entire conflicts of the novel will be definitely different if Petrus can act and decide differently in response to the rape by calling the police. Lucy herself does not seem to take it seriously because she does not want to interrupt Petrus' party. It means that Petrus has a power to handle Lucy's emotion and this how Petrus becomes the mimic man as if he is a white people. It is not the only one example, because Lucy always helps and even blames Lurie if Lurie does not want to assist Petrus,

'Give Petrus a hand. I like that. I like the historical piquancy. Will he pay me a wage for my labor, do you think?'

'Ask him. I'm sure he will. He got a Land Affairs grant earlier this year, enough to buy a hectare and a bit from me. I didn't tell you? The boundary line goes through the dam. We share the dam. Everything from there to the fence is his. He has a cow that will calve in the spring. He has two wives, or a wife and a girlfriend. If he has played his cards right he could get a second grant to put up a house; then he can move out of the stable. By Eastern Cape standards he is a man of substance. Ask him to pay you. He can afford it. I'm not sure I can afford him anymore.'

(Coetzee, 1999: 77).

On the other hand, Petrus' actions or lacks shove the subtleties of power definitely in accordance of the burglars and against Lucy and David. However, Petrus' actions are not just exaggerated by the prospective consequences where power is founded fundamentally. It can be understood that Petrus also has a lot of sacrifices about his own family's well-being. When Petrus defends on Pollux, the suspected rapist, Petrus does not only defend for a member of his own race or the black people, but he also defends for a member of his own family. Here, it is known that Petrus is more civilized than what white people claim about the black people who are not civilized.

This is also one aspect Petrus shows about his mimicry. While Lucy, she is trapped in this condition so that she cannot decide something clear because Petrus is better than her father, calmer and positive.

"... That is not how vengeance works, Lucy. Vengeance is like a fire. The more it devours, the hungrier it gets."

'Stop it, David! I don't want to hear this talk of plagues and fires. I am not just trying to save my skin. If that is what you think, you miss the point entirely.' (Coetzee, 1999: 112).

Lucy cannot abandon the situation (raped by Blacks) and David cannot demand and sue Lucy to tell the truth. This shows that there are relations that cannot be erased, all of them need to each other and this is how mimicry works. But the question is about the location that leaves his relationship with Lucy. This question chases an answer that never really finds out how Petrus feels about her on a personal level, especially to Lucy, but his reactions and responses, both in the context of working *against* her (when he is anything but obliging after the home invasion and the rape) and working *for* her (when he offers her safeguard and when he asserts that he will marry her). But when it is seen in detail perspective, Petrus is actually one of the most frustrating characters to deal with it, but he is also one of the most interesting characters because from him, the point of an unbelievable amount about loyalty, betrayal, and trying to make it in the world can be understood. Especially about his ignorance as if he does not care to the other and it is what the white people did during the colonization. Petrus is a rich white people and no longer a poor black peasant.

'Petrus is back,' he tells Lucy. 'With a load of building materials.'

'Good.'

'Why didn't he tell you he was going away? Doesn't it strike you as fishy that he should disappear at precisely this time?'

'I can't order Petrus about. He is his own master.'

A non sequitur, but he lets it pass. He has decided to let everything pass, with Lucy, for the time being. (Coetzee, 1999: 114).

Lucy knows that Petrus is coming back with some properties and he seems to enlarge his area, his land. Lucy does not have any right to order Petrus because she knows that Petrus is the master of himself. Moreover, Lucy knows that Petrus is not stupid, he is good enough to plan, he has great vision of life behind his ignorance about the rape and the burglars.

By these all quotation and explanations, it can be known that mimicry is performed by Petrus and it also affects to Lucy. Petrus imitates and becomes to be like a white people, he is rich and he has his own land while Lucy and Lurie are suffering of what he has done, Here also known the turning down of the construction that white is higher than black, and mimicry seems to loosen its construction in its fluid composition that black people can do what the white people do in dissimilar way. This how mimicry works and function for the colonized people.

### Mimicry as Resistance

If the previous part of analysis describes the elaboration about how the mimicry cases are recognized, at this part it will be shown that inside of mimicry actions, there are resistance to deconstruct the construction between the colonizer and the colonized people in the encounter space or the *third space*.

The first interesting thing should be observed here is about Lurie. Lurie is a professor and as a professor, he must meet so many students, both colored and white students. Here, the scandal happens, Lurie seems to be attracted to a colored girl named Melanie and from this affair, Lurie is banned and he goes to the countryside for a living with his lonely daughter, Lucy. However, the conflicts happen in Lucy's house finally has scratch the *itches* (the sins) of what he has done to Melanie, thus he decides to ask for apology to Melanie's family.

'We put our children in the hands of you people because we think we can trust you. If we can't trust the university, who can we trust? We never thought we were sending our daughter into a nest of vipers. No, Professor Lurie, you may be high and mighty and have all kinds of degrees, but if I was you I'd be very ashamed of myself, so help me God. If I've got hold of the wrong end of the stick, now is your chance to say, but I don't think so, I can see it from your face.' (Coetzee, 1999: 38).

This apology seems to be an underestimation for Lurie himself, Mr. Isaac looks to undervalue Lurie if he were him to apology because he is a white professor that means he is a high class person. Hate overtakes many forms in *Disgrace* at this novel and this is one of the *soundless* illustrations to get that Mr. Isaacs might rebuke David in to a certain extent of discrimination case, but Mr. Isaacs does it probably with shooting blades at David with his eyes. This case leads back to the way this house (Isaacs' house) becomes the encounter space between white and black and the white is the master who apologizes for the black who is the servant.

The house becomes the representative illustration of how the black and the white are encountered and the two are gazing to each other. The gazes absorb them to an

automatic relation that cannot be cut down, the black seems to be the white and the white seems to be the white. What Lurie has done, by asking for apology for black family like Isaacs' family, has exposed the ruin of black and white construction like a man who feels govern woman in sexual relation while he does not realize that he is under woman's control; the woman enjoys herself while the man enjoy for the woman's self.

The problem of mimicry as a mockery to resist against the colonizer people in this novel cannot be far away from Lurie because Lurie should be seen as the representation of white people. Going further of this resistance case through mimicry, especially which is focused on Petrus, Lucy and Lurie, most of them happen in the countryside as the rape and the unspeakable Lucy is recorded. The reason of how Lurie is suggested to be the representation of white people is not only sourced from his skin color, but it is also to the response and reaction of him against the black people like Melanie, and it goes worse to Petrus.

A flurry of anger runs through him, strong enough to take him by surprise. He picks up his spade and strikes whole strips of mud and weed from the dam-bottom, flinging them over his shoulder, over the wall. You are whipping yourself into a rage, he admonishes himself: Stop it! Yet at this moment he would like to take Petrus by the throat. If it had been your wife instead of my daughter, he would like to say to Petrus, you would not be tapping your pipe and weighing your words so judiciously. Violation: that is the word he would like to force out of Petrus. Yes, it was a violation, he would like to hear Petrus say; yes, it was an outrage. (Coetzee, 1999: 119).

David discerns that he should not hate Petrus, but he just cannot afford it and handle it. It grows as if it is natural ascending hatred against black people. Especially when it is known that his daughter is raped by three black men, and Petrus seems not to care about it. If Petrus is white, this can be tolerated by asking Petrus to keep his daughter, even to marry her. But Petrus is a black man who turns to be like white, so that Lurie's hatred cannot be expressed but it is just buried. This becomes the answer of how the resistance should not be always physically, because the great resistance can be also effectively through mental as what Petrus does, he is rich and he has the land while Lucy obeys him. There is no agreement and there is no debate, but those all live in a space that encounters them. This space results the un-identified space because no group or individual that can control it totally, those can be fluid and changing.

One moment which really makes itches for Lurie is when he realized that he is woken up by the noisy voice of the television watched by Petrus. Petrus can come and go

out of the house as he wishes as if the house is his wants, while Lucy lives there.

HE IS SITTING in the front room, watching soccer on television. The score is nil-all; neither team seems interested in winning.

The commentary alternates between Sotho and Xhosa, languages of which he understands not a word. He turns the sound down to a murmur. Saturday afternoon in South Africa: a time consecrated to men and their pleasures. He nods off. (Coetzee, 1999: 75).

Sotho and Xhosa are two of the most commonly-spoken languages in the entire country of South Africa, but as someone from the westernized city of Cape Town, David does not communicate with those languages because he only communicates in English while it is very crucial to understand that language has the power to either push away those who do not understand or take in those who do understand. In this contextual case, it has to see that the power of language here is to create outsiders and Lurie is the outsider in his house (Lucy's house). Petrus cannot be said as the stranger or the outsider one because, as it has been told before, that Petrus can do everything he wants in Lucy's house. Petrus does it, acts it, and performs his role as the master so that he is actually the one who controls the other, and he has the power over Lurie as the white people.

Moreover, the television Petrus watches uses South African language rather than English, if Lurie has the power, it will be understood that Lurie can shout on Petrus to turn off the television, but Lurie does not do it. It means that Lurie is actually having no power to do something with what Petrus does, or simple word, he has to feed the servant, he has to take care of the servant, he has to follow what the servant want, and it is actually the fact of being master. The master is actually the servant from himself because he himself needs the servant.

Suffering in this novel, especially in this case happened to Lucy, is not only about physical pain, but also mental pain. Probably, it will be more importantly to see that undergoing feelings of shame and disgrace establishes an even more influential kind of suffering. Lucy looks to recover her physical wounds, but the emotional scars as the leftovers of the rape will have a considerably longer-lasting impact of him. It will never happen if the white people do not live in the black area and it will never happen if Lucy lives with his father in the city, but Lucy lives in the encounter space where the black and the white freely exchange. Therefore, the black people can do everything they want and as the result, Lucy is raped but Lucy cannot report it. Lucy is imposed a burden not to tell it because he is actually trapped in the condition of how things should be going off and how she should

forget the pain. Reporting to the police will just remain the vengeance and hatred and it will never erase the pain.

This situation is actually the situation of how the colonizer cannot do something, rape is actually the analogy of how the colonized people rob their own treasure, the pleasure should not only seen on the surface because it is essentially shows the implicit part of how the colonizer people rob the right of black people, as if the black people are raped. The colonized people cannot report it because at the time, the world is under control of the colonizers, this is why, Lucy is trapped in this condition. The third space becomes the space that situates the colonized people and the colonizer people can do everything they want without defeating to each other, because there is always negotiation in every encounter, both mentally and physically. The mimicry, as what Petrus does, becomes the great example of how the colonized people resist against the domination for white people as the colonizers.

For Lurie, this case cannot be stopped without any responsibility to pay it. He wants justice as if it is something he deserves to receive. He explains to Petrus that those black men have robbed the stuffs and car, they have hit Lurie and they have raped his daughter. Therefore, Lurie asks Petrus to understand it while Petrus seems not to care about it.

'It was not simply theft, Petrus,' he persists. 'They did not come just to steal. They did not come just to do this to me.' He touches the bandages, touches the eye-shield. 'They came to do something else as well. You know what I mean, or if you don't know you can surely guess. After they did what they did, you cannot expect Lucy calmly to go on with her life as before. I am Lucy's father. I want those men to be caught and brought before the law and punished. Am I wrong? Am I wrong to want justice?'

He does not care how he gets the words out of Petrus now, he just wants to hear them. (Coetzee, 1999: 119).

When David speaks he wants justice, he means he wants Petrus to acknowledge that Lucy is factually raped and to support to move the case forward by giving David and the police any information he must have on the burglars, but as it has been said, Petrus does not care of it. It means that Lurie cannot do everything he wants, he needs Petrus, he needs the black man to catch the black man while the white man cannot do something, at least it is under the law. This recalls back to the way the post-apartheid era draws this case, the black people have their right and the white people cannot separate themselves from the black people. This blending, the broken wall that separates the black people and the white people, has made a accumulation problem. The accumulation is the encounter that affects the problem as what happens to

Lucy, Lucy cannot do anything and she does not want to reproduce any vengeance for what happens to her, while Lurie sees this as the vengeance against black people. He still feels that he is a white people and he is the ex-professor, a high class man. But it goes in disgrace, and the disgrace is actually the only reason why Lurie is firing up to end this rape case. Again, the encounter results the freedom, the house has made the servant and the master live in one roof. Living in one roof exposes that they have and must live together, with or without violence and compassion. Petrus is the mimic man that succeeds to operate this third space, the land, and the Lucy's house. And for David Lurie, it even goes worse;

Finally, this all cases and facts should be lined in one straight conclusion that the problem of what Petrus does is actually the mimicry. The way to be rich and the way to act gently in facing Lurie's anger is actually the report of how black and white people can negotiate something on the un-authorized space called the third space. Lucy's house, the land, Isaacs' house are actually the representation of a territory where both black and white cannot control over. If these places are physically restricting, the mental of the two also includes in this space. It can be known that Lurie cannot kill the black people who have raped his daughter, Lurie is asking the apology for the black man (Mr. Isaacs), Lurie helps Petrus, are just the examples of how the white people can smile while bowing down beneath the black people's knees. Lucy is silent, Lucy can do something for the rape, and she even agrees to be married by Petrus. This shows the exclusive example that black people can be the white people to dictate how everything goes wrong or good. The black people are still black people, and they are trying to be like the white people, but still, they will never. This impossibility and this difference even becomes the intruders around their encounter to the white; the encounter becomes the space that provides a chance to negotiate the resistance.

## CONCLUSION

As the result of this study, it can be known that Coetzee's *Disgrace* elaborates the complicated cases and the most prominent issue taken in this study is the way the black and the white people are poured into hatred but the two are helping to each other. Therefore, this is how the mimicry plays its role to enlighten this encounter space with Lurie, Lucy and Petrus as the characters involved in this encounter space, the *third space*.

Mimicry refers to a situation where the colonized people are trying to imitate the colonizer and the imitation is never the same. The dissimilar imitation becomes the mocking for the colonizer and this mocking is actually the way the colonized people resist. The colonizer people

cannot realize and even when they realize it, they still cannot do anything because they also blend with the colonized in their encounter. The encounter means that what the colonizer see oppositely sees the colonizer; the gazed turns back and gazes the ones who gaze at them. The encounter of this gaze makes the two, the colonizer and the colonized people are absorbed, so that they cannot erase each other, as the relation between master and servant. The master cannot kill the slave because the master consciously or unconsciously needs the servant and the servant indirectly controlled the master.

Lucy and Lurie are the masters while Petrus is the slave or the servant. Lucy is raped by three black men but Lucy cannot report it to the police. Lurie is angry with Petrus but he cannot do anything with Petrus, moreover, Petrus is going rich, he has the right to come and go out of Lucy's house. Petrus is becoming like the white people over the white people and the land they live, the house Lucy lives, become the situation that shows that the encounter between them constructs a new situation of how everything cannot be erased, everything is negotiated, the anger, the domination, and the authority is so fluid. Lucy has the house but she needs Petrus, Petrus acts like the boss and Lurie cannot attack Petrus.

Finally wanted to say here is mimicry success to represent his role in the *third space* and change an imbalanced situation where a state of superior and inferior are at the same point. Interaction between blacks and whites can't be avoided, that condition giving *third space* in which negotiations are happens in it. Then as a black man who living in the post-apartheid era Petrus was facilitated to give a resistance to the white man. Petrus who live like a white people, controlled Lurie's anger and dictate Lucy's silence and he was successes to mocking them (white people).

## REFERENCES

- Armstrong, Sue. 1994. *Rape in South Africa: an invisible part of Apartheid Legacy*. Focus on Gender, 34(2), 35-39.
- Aschroft, Bill & Paul Ahluwalia. 2001. *Edward Said*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, Bill et.al. 1998 (2001). *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Barry, Peter. 2009. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary Theory and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester UP.
- Beck, Roger B. 2000. *The History of South Africa*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1983. *The Other Question ...*, Screen (November-December 1983), 24(6), 18-36.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *The Third Space: Interview with Homi K. Bhabha* in *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference* (ed. Jonathan Rutherford). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992a. *Postcolonial Criticism*, in *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies* (eds. Stephen Greenblatt & Giles Gunn). New York: MLA.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992b. *The World and the Home*, *Social Text* (1992), 10(31–2), 141–153.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995a. *Black Male: The Whitney Museum of American Art*, *Artforum* (February), 33(6), 86–87, 110.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995b. *Translator Translated: W. J. T. Mitchell Talks with Homi Bhabha*, *Artforum* (March) 33(7), 80–83, 110, 114, 118–119.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Joking Aside: The Idea of a Self-Critical Community in Modernity, Culture and the Jew* (eds. Bryan Cheyette & Laura Marcus). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000a. *Cosmopolitanisms* (with Carol A. Breckenridge, Sheldon Pollock and Dipesh Chakrabarty), *Public Culture* 12(3) (Fall), 577–89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000b. *On Minorities: Cultural Rights*, *Radical Philosophy*, 100 (March/April), 3–6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000c. *Surviving Theory: A Conversation with Homi K. Bhabha* in *The Pre-Occupation of Postcolonial Studies* (eds. Fawzia Afzal, et.al.). Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. *Democracy De-realized*, *Diogenes* 50(1), 27–35.
- Bonnici, Thomas. 2001. *Coetzee's Disgrace (1999) and Postcolonial Power*, *Acta Scientiarum*, Maringá, 23(1):87–92, Maringá: Universidade Estadual de Maringá.
- Castle, Gregory. 2007. *The Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cornwell, G. 1996. *Gorge Webb Hardy's the Black Peril in Early Twentieth Century South Africa*. *Journal of South African Studies*, 22(3), 441–454.
- Diehl, Lindsay Ann. 2012. *In the Name of Love: David Lurie's Romanticized Violence in J. M. Coetzee's Disgrace*. Okanagan: the University of British Columbia.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1957(2008). *Black Skin White Masks* (trans. Charles Lam Markmann). London: Pluto Press.
- Fieldhouse, D. K. 1989. *The Colonial Empires*. London: Macmillan.
- Gorra, Michael. 1999. *After the Fall (In J. M. Coetzee's Novel, One Man's Humiliation Mirrors the Plight of South Africa)*, *The New York Times*, retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/books/99/11/28/reviews/99112828gorrat.html>, on 3 August 2015 at 10 am.
- Graham, L. Valerie. 2003. *Reading the Unspeakable: Rape in J.M. Coetzee's Disgrace*. *Journal of South African Studies*, 29(2), 433–444.
- Henderson, Joan C. 2004. *Tourism and British Colonial Heritage in Malaysia and Singapore in Tourism and Postcolonialism Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations* (ed. C. Michael Hall & Hazel Tucker). London & New York: Routledge.
- Hooks, Bell. 1990. *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End.
- Huddart, David. 2006. *Homi K. Bhabha*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Loomba, Ania. 2005. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). London & New York: Routledge.
- Lorenz, Edward N. 1993. *The Essence of Chaos*. London: UCL Press.
- Lowry, Elizabeth. 1999. *Like a Dog*, *London Review of Books*, Vol. 21 No. 20, 14 October 1999, pages 12–14, retrieved from <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v21/n20/elizabeth-lowry/like-a-dog>, on 2 August 2015 at 10 pm.
- Makhaya, Gertrude B. 2004. *The Trouble with J. M. Coetzee*, *The Oxonian Review*, retrieved from: <http://www.oxonianreview.org/wp/the-trouble-with-jm-coetzee/>, on 2 August 2015 at 9 pm.
- McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Minh-ha, Trinh T. 1990. *Cotton and Iron in Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures* (ed. Russell Ferguson et al). Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT; New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art.
- Noyes, J. K. 1992. *Colonial Space: Spatiality in the Discourse of German South West Africa 1884–1915*. Chur: Harwood.
- Said, Edward. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Tyson, Louis. 2006. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Upchurch, Michael. 1999. *Facing Disgrace—J. M. Coetzee Creates a Flawed, Intriguing Character in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, *Seattle Times Book Critic*, retrieved from <http://community.seattletimes.nwsources.com/archive/?date=19991107&slug=2993875>, on 2 August 2015 at 11 pm.

Walder, Dennis. 1998. *Post-colonial Literatures in English: History of Language Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Wood, James. 2001. *Parables and Prizes*, Powell's Books Review, retrieved from [http://www.powells.com/review/2001\\_05\\_10](http://www.powells.com/review/2001_05_10), on 3 August 2015 at 9 am.

Shore, Megan. 2009. *Religion and Conflict Resolution: Christianity and South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing.

