

Paradox of Barbarism and Fear in J. M. Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*

Patricia Ofili

Department of English, University of Waterloo

Abstract

The racial prejudice, violence, and oppression in J. M. Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians* are perpetrated by the forces of colonialism and capitalism. The divide between the civilizers and the natives in the novel raises questions of what standards are employed for measuring civilization and what impels one group to ascribe the label of barbarism to another. In that case, who really is the barbarian? Coetzee interrogates the colonizer's construction of the barbarians through binary oppositions (good/evil, white/black, etc.), which are discursive tools for entrenching inequality and injustice. However, this binary discourse can be seen as falling into the fallacy of what Lawrence McPhail terms *complicit rhetoric*, which can only be overcome by "rhetoric as coherence," a tool for providing an alternative to the discourse of negative difference. Coetzee successfully subverts the superiority complex of the colonizers, through the narrator whose division from the Empire necessitates his identification with the colonial subject. The failure of the colonial empire indicates that ideologies, which are not based on the humane sensibilities with deep moral values, are bound to collapse.

Keywords: Othering; identification; complicit rhetoric; coherence; psychodynamics.

Résumé

Dans *Waiting for the Barbarians* [*En attendant les barbares*] de J. M. Coetzee, le préjugé racial, la violence et l'oppression est le fait des forces du colonialisme et du capitalisme. La ligne de démarcation entre les civilisateurs et les populations locales soulève des questions : quelle est l'étalon pour mesurer la civilisation et qu'est-ce qui pousse un groupe à assigner l'étiquette « barbare » à un autre ? Dans ce cas, qui est vraiment le barbare ? Coetzee interroge la construction des barbares par le colonisateur, au moyen d'oppositions binaires (bon/mauvais ; blanc/noir, etc.) qui sont des instrument discursifs pour enraciner l'injustice et l'inégalité. Cependant, ce discours binaire peut être vu comme succombant au piège de ce que Lawrence Michail appelle « rhétorique de complicité », qui ne peut être surmonté que par ce que par une « rhétorique de cohérence », outil qui peut fournir une alternative au discours de différence négative. Coetzee réussit à subvertir le complexe de supériorité du colonisateur, à travers le narrateur, dont l'aliénation à l'égard de l'Empire nécessite une identification au sujet colonial. L'échec de l'empire colonial indique que les idéologies sans valeurs morales profondes fondées sur l'humanité, sont vouées à l'effondrement.

Mots-clefs : Autre/ altérité; identification; rhétorique de complicité ; cohérence ; psychodynamique.

Introduction

Colonialism has two very powerful motivations: capitalism and imperialism. The imperialist desire to conquer and dominate others engenders the construction of the “colonial realm as a confrontation based on differences in race, language, social customs, cultural values, and modes of production” (JanMohamed 18). In essence, dominance by the colonial powers emanates from the superiority complex of a Eurocentric worldview. This paper revolves around Coetzee’s interrogation of the racial violence enacted by the colonial Empire. It offers a reading as a progression from rhetoric of complicity through a cognitive shift toward a reconstruction of a rhetoric that opens up possibilities for interracial co-existence. To argue this interpretation, this paper examines the manner in which the rhetoric of ‘othering’ the barbarians by the colonizers in *Waiting for the Barbarians* is fostered by the constructions of racial differences in negative terms in a bid to produce racial homogeneity using binary oppositions. Mark Lawrence McPhail’s concept of complicity proves very productive for interrogating racial homogeneity as a hegemonic reproduction of essentialism, which gives no room for creative possibilities, and fails to open up spaces for equality. McPhail, however, argues that interlocutors would often reproduce the discourses that formed their realities. Therefore, racism is rhetorically and socially constructed through the linguistic frames that are pervasive within a particular language and culture.

McPhail’s ideas form the basis for a critical examination of the perpetuation of racism through the articulation and reification of essentialism. McPhail draws upon Vincent Crapanzano ideas in *Waiting: The Whites of South Africa* to discuss how the psychodynamics of racism produces a cycle whereby the oppressors and oppressed become so trapped within essentialism that both groups live in mutual fear of each other. This paper aims to show that to subvert colonial racism, violence, and domination, the rhetoric deployed in *Waiting* implicates the very notion of essentialism it calls into question. In addition, the colonial identification with the natives would prove ineffective if the complicit rhetoric of othering employed, whereby human flaws are assigned to visible differences in race and cultures, did not progress to the rhetoric of coherence.

1. Post-Colonial Discourses and Colonial Racism

Coetzee’s *Waiting for the Barbarians* addresses in fiction what Nelson Mandela confronted in his fight against the Apartheid regime in South Africa. Coetzee uses his allegorical novel to interrogate the Apartheid system, which Mandela spent most of his adult life battling to dismantle. Mandela echoes the sentiments of war and invasion captured in *Waiting* in his autobiography entitled *Long Walk to Freedom*. Mandela describes the manner in which the Xhosa tribes are deprived of their land through the nineteenth century British Frontier wars, as a venture that is shaped by capitalist greed. According to Mandela, “[t]he White man was hungry and greedy for land, and the Black man shared the land with him as they shared the air and water; land was not for man to possess. But the white man took the land as you might seize another man’s horse” (24). Coetzee shares Mandela’s views in *Waiting* by depicting the way in which the violence perpetrated by the colonial powers against the Frontier tribes, who are referred to as barbarians, stems from greed and deep-seated moral barbarism. The reason why colonizers can justifiably take over the land of others and then visit untold violence upon them is a consequence of the rhetorical othering of the colonized through racism.

When Jacques Derrida claims that racism is both a constative and a performative act that engenders cataclysmic violence, he is referring to some of the methods through which racism is constructed and entrenched. Furthermore, the rhetorical degradation of racialized others, often captured in negative binaries, creates a cause and effect system, which produces fear and this fear generates a cycle of violence, more fear, and more violence. The “‘difference’ of the post-colonial subject by which s/he can be ‘othered’ is felt most directly and immediately in the way in which the superficial differences of the body and voice... are read as indelible signs of the ‘natural’ inferiority of their possessors” (Ashcroft *et al* 321). The essentialism that is evident in such rhetorical constructions is what Postcolonial discourses and theories aim to subvert.

Several critics have examined *Waiting for the Barbarians* from different perspectives. Jane Poyner’s “Madness and Civilization in *Waiting for the Barbarians*” studies the manner in which *Waiting* exemplifies Michel Foucault’s historicizing in *Madness and Civilization*. Such madness is captured by the Empire’s fantasy and paranoia, which causes the Empire’s agents, who are supposedly ‘civilized,’ to brutalize the barbarians. The totalitarian manner in which the barbarians are constructed as the enemy and dehumanized by the Empire’s “barbarous” regime represents the ‘madness in civilization’ (Poyner 54). Lance Olsen sees the novel as a symbol of “absence in presence” whereby the reader has to fill up the gap that is created through the absence that the endless waiting creates. The idea of the absence in presence represents a moral vacuum, which creates the endless waiting, and this waiting may be interpreted as a psychological state that generates violence as a compensatory system. Susan Galaghar argues that the “moral vacuum” in the colonizers enables the torture of the barbarians in the novel. This moral vacuum is projected onto the barbarians, and the violence the colonizers see everywhere is actually a figment of their own imagination. However, the violence is real enough to produce a counter violence that is visited upon the barbarians.

Patrick Hayes examines the concept of moral conscience by interrogating the motives of the Magistrate, the only agent of the Empire who exhibits some measure of moral conscience. Hayes does not believe the Magistrate possesses any moral conscience by virtue of his tendency to take advantage of his position to form sexual relationships with young girls. Hayes indicates that the motives of the magistrate are questionable. The motives for taking the barbarian girl into his home and to bed go beyond a moral conscience. The “barbarian girl’ is used to satisfy his sexual lust for young girls, a trend he had established and for which he is notorious within the land. Hayes argues that the magistrate is “using his power to prey on the innocent” (66), and he suggests that Coetzee pitches the barbarian girl against the magistrate’s “liberal conscience” (61) in a moral dialectic. And this conflict is demonstrated by the Magistrate, who is both drawn to and repelled by the inscrutability, the ugliness, and the brutalized deformity of the barbarian girl.

The positions of these critics hold great value in their arguments, but the intervention of this paper stems from the idea that until the rhetoric of racism is deconstructed and reconstructed, violence will always act as a persuasive tool for keeping the oppressed races dominated. Even though coercion is inimical to persuasion, violence can be persuasive on a different level, especially when the receiver of the violence has been scapegoated through the rhetoric of othering and negative difference. The fact that Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* advocates torture as a means of obtaining evidence from slaves indicates that violence has always been perceived as a persuasive tool of enforcing acquiescence. However, though violence is persuasive, it operates at a different level from rhetorical persuasion. Violence as

a persuasive tool operates outside the *techne* because rhetorical persuasion requires freedom to be considered effective, and slaves do not have access to such freedom. The fact that it is only slaves who are subjected to this method of obtaining evidence proves that the constative part of rhetoric paves the way for the performative in the realm of persuasion. In essence, someone has to first be labelled a slave in order to be subjected to certain types of violence. Thus, physical violence is often preceded by labelling (which can be rhetorical) and such labelling forms the basis for the physical violence.

The violence fictionalized by Coetzee is captured by Frantz Fanon in *Wretched of the Earth* and Jean-Paul Sartre in *Colonialism and Neocolonialism* as veritable tools employed by colonialist powers to sustain their exploitative/imperialist motives for subjugating the colonized. And the “[v]iolence does not only have for its aim the keeping of these enslaved [people] at arm’s length; it seeks to dehumanize them” (Fanon, *Wretched* 13). In *Waiting*, the barbarians are described by the magistrate as “frank and filthy”, “a race of beggars”, “ugly people”, and “wild animals”, thereby indicating that physical identity and cultural practices form the basis of their otherness. Fanon and Sartre’s description of colonial violence is most evident during one of the raids by Joll and Mandel when a sick boy and an old man are captured. The boy and man are both tortured and dehumanized. The torturers kill the old man and make the sick boy lie with the corpse. On another raid, a large number of barbarians, who are actually native fishermen and hunters, are captured and also tortured. Coetzee’s *Waiting* corroborates Fanon’s ideas that “colonialism is not a thinking machine, nor a body endowed with reasoning faculties. It is violence in its natural state, and it will only yield when confronted with greater violence” (*Wretched* 48). In essence, the unbridled violence portrayed in *Waiting* is not only barbaric, it is equally animalistic. Paradoxically, the violence that the agents of the colonial Empire enact in *Waiting* originates in their imagination, which has been nurtured in a rhetoric that creates otherness in negative terms.

Several genocides have been perpetrated based on physical, cultural, and racial differences.

On the eve of the twenty-first century, hatreds explode in such places as Sarajevo, Argentina, Chechnya, Rwanda, Los Angeles, and Oklahoma City. The hatred embodies a complex set of fears about difference and otherness. It reveals what some people fear in themselves, their own ‘difference’. Hatred forms around the unknown, the difference of ‘others’. And we have learned the difference that we fear through racialized and sexualized markings. Because people grow othered by their racialized, sexualized, and engendered bodies, bodies are important to the writing of hatred on history (Hooks 9, quoting Zillah Eisenstein’s *Hatreds: Racialized and Sexualized in the Twenty-First Century*).

The body elicits fear and hatred when it is different. Usually, the different other is hardly understood, and thus, it is feared, hated, and brutalized. Once a body has been identified as different, language kicks into place to attempt a description. The verbalized construction of the difference in negative terms sets the stage for waging verbal and physical war against the “other” whose identification as the enemy is embodied by various nuances. Negative difference as deployed in racism emanates from human language acquisition and usage. Hence, Kenneth Burke argues that “*language by its nature necessarily culminates in the Negative, hence negation is the very essence of language*” (*Language as Symbolic Action*, 457 - italics is in the original). McPhail argues that human predilection to construct

racial difference negatively is consequent upon the fact that “[t]he language with which racial interaction is constructed sustains a discriminatory discourse, premised upon assumptions of negative difference, that continues to separate individuals from each other in both attitude and action” (*The Rhetoric of Racism Revisited: Reparations of Separation?* 58). McPhail connects human thought processes with language usage because language is the most elemental creator of reality. This idea validates James Berlin’s argument that cognitive rhetoric is deeply connected to human ideological formations. According to Berlin, human ideologies are the cognitive products of the rhetorical traditions to which they subscribe.

Therefore, it is “essentialist thoughts which give rise to racism” (McPhail, *The Rhetoric* 58). In essence, traditional rhetoric with its legacy of “argumentative and persuasive language perpetuates complicity in the linguistic negatives” (McPhail, *The Rhetoric* 97). McPhail states that human beings are trapped within their appreciation of reality by virtue of language and thus, the anti-dote to complicity rhetoric is “rhetoric as coherence”, which provides an alternative to the discourse of negative difference. The colonialists in *Waiting* who describe the barbarians in negative terms are deploying language the only way they know how to because “this discourse of negative difference is intimately connected to the foundational principles of reason and logic in Western metaphysics” (McPhail, *The Rhetoric* 97). The mere fact that there is no middle ground in this rhetoric of polarity, a paradigm shift represented by coherence comes to the rescue. McPhail describes coherence as “paradigm expansion”, which acts as a way out of complicity discourse. Human ways of constructing realities and truths require rigorous interrogation, and the articulation of essentialism needs to be taken apart in order to construct a different appreciation of reality and truth.

Frantz Fanon and Edward Said “explore the ways that representations and modes of perception are used as fundamental weapons of colonial powers to keep colonized people subservient to colonized rule” (McLeod 17). From his personal experiences, Fanon captures the fear that the othering of the black race generates in “The Fact of Blackness” as he describes the reaction of a little white boy to him thus: “Mama, see the Negro! I’m frightened!...Now they were beginning to be afraid of me” (324). The fear of the negro is derived from the negative metaphors employed in their description as animals and as bad, mean, ugly, dirty, lazy, lascivious and more. The discourse of othering does not only produce fear but also creates room for verbal and physical violations. Thus, “[f]ollowing Burke’s thinking, the creation of an ‘Other’ is not merely a demarcation or a means of defining - “us”- but also creates a sense of fear of that Other whose difference from us defines them... this division between - ‘us’- and - ‘them’- and the fear it generates, in turn, leads to anger and resentment” (Phillips 87). Such divisions often result in a cauldron of racial, religious, cultural, and ideological intolerance waiting to boil over.

The peculiar situation in South Africa when Coetzee wrote *Waiting* may have prompted the allegorical perspective that allows him to make the Empire, its agents and the barbarians, part of a “moral community” that is universalist and unconfined. Coetzee blends political engagement and artistic creativity to produce a novel that subverts Apartheid, similar to the way George Orwell uses his allegorical novella, *Animal Farm*, to interrogate Stalinism. *Waiting for the Barbarians* captures the othering of the barbarians by the Agents of the Empire, such as the Magistrate, Police Colonel Joll, and his sidekick Mandel. The dehumanization of the barbarians is fostered by the ideological tendency to reduce the “othered” to the level of an animal. The animal metaphor creates a cognitive activity that produces fear, similar to the human fear of wild and dangerous animals. In this way,, their

confinement within physical and psychological boundaries is justified by the agents of the Empire.

2. Dialectical Identification, Merger, and Division

Kenneth Burke's notions of identification, merger, and division would prove quite productive for creating a connection between Jacques Derrida's ideas of binary opposition as an instrument for fostering racial fear and the conflict/division thus generated. Burke articulates merger and division as "unity and plurality", as well as "a progressive development from homogeneity to heterogeneity" (404), whereby the birth metaphor is used to describe the offspring, who is "substantially one with the parent" (405). This offspring, who is in a merger with the parent, undergoes a division at the point of birth. These ideas are used to describe the division that the Magistrate embodies in *Waiting*, when he identifies with the barbarians against the Empire. The Magistrate is the only one left to encourage the people to recapture their existence before the declaration of the state of emergency. The Magistrate, who abhors the torture and killing of the barbarians by Joll and Mandel, takes on a Christ-like figure in this novel. He sacrifices his pleasures, his position, and his comfort in order to identify with the barbarians he used to see as animals. However, the Magistrate's portrayal as on a par with the natives can be convincing only when he undergoes a cognitive division within himself, because his appreciation of reality is essentially different from that of the natives.

Dialectical merger and division are complementary to identification, which, Burke claims, plays a key role in persuasion. Burke suggests that identification expands our scope of rhetoric beyond the agonistic level, and that "identification is affirmed with earnestness precisely because there is division. Identification is compensatory to division" (22). These Burkean principles will be used to show that, though merged with the Empire and its other agents like Joll and Mandel, the Magistrate is compelled to initiate a division because he does not harbour a similar fear of the barbarians who imprison these other colonial agents. The division from the Empire occurs at the point where the Magistrate recognizes the injustice inherent in othering the natives based on their visible difference. This cognitive transformation is what McPhail describes as "rhetoric as coherence" because the recognition of the humanity of the natives goes from the merely verbal to a deeper psychological level.

The violence employed by Joll is the antithesis of rhetorical persuasion because it evokes fear. Fear thus becomes the catalyst for action or inaction, meant to dissuade the community of barbarians from planning counter violence against the Empire. The contagious violence, which is also repellent, persuades the Magistrate into a division from the Empire. The persuasive role of violence in this novel exemplifies the concept of constative and performative violence described by Derrida. Colonel Joll and his assistant Mandel are used by the Empire as agents of this constative/performative violence to raid the barbarians, who are captured and tortured during interrogations. Consequently, the Magistrate embodies the merger/division described by Burke in a metamorphosis. Despite the Magistrate's division from the Empire and his identification with the dominated in this novel, he implicates himself in the complicit rhetoric of essentialism by assigning moral depravity as an essence of the colonial Whites. The implicature of the Magistrate's rhetoric is accentuated by the violence identified among the natives to indicate that violence is not peculiar to the colonial Whites, but it is rather a human flaw that is practised at various levels of human interaction.

Though the Magistrate had previously described the barbarian girl in animal metaphors, he makes a paradigm shift. However, his initial rhetoric gives us a glimpse into his discourse of formation, which is solidly based on symbolism. Burke describes human beings as “symbol-using animal[s]” (*Language as Symbolic Action* 5). The animal metaphors used to describe the barbarians by the colonialists is an indication that human beings, in addition to being the “Inventor[s] of the negative” (*Language* 9), conceptualize their realities in metaphors. Thus, Burke’s question—“[b]ut can we bring ourselves to realize just what that formula implies, just how overwhelmingly much of what we mean by ‘reality’ has been built up for us through nothing but symbolic systems?” (*Language* 5)—reinforces McPhail’s idea that complicit rhetoric is embedded within human discourse of formation.

In addition to language, postcolonial theorist Edward Said argues that culture is also powerful in constructing reality. According to him, Western cultural identities were formed through arts of description, communication, and representation, which exist in aesthetic forms. Thus, Western narrative fiction, which include stories of what explorers and novelists say about distant lands, were used to form stereotypes about other people. The Western cultural othering, supported by statements like “they were not like us”, “they were primitive and barbaric”, and “they had to be flogged because they mainly understood force or violence” created the platform for subjecting colonial subject to dehumanizing acts.

The Magistrate’s division from the Empire, as well as a willingness to give up all the paraphernalia of comfort/civilization can be described as transcendental. Transcendentalism as described by Burke is the desire to perform an act for God or for the greater good of the people, rather than for mere personal gain. The nature of the Magistrate’s identification with the victims of colonial violence and the articulation of a merger-division psychodynamics within himself represent McPhail’s concept of coherence rhetoric as well. That is because, as the voice of the Empire, the Magistrate’s initial description of the barbarians evinces contempt for them, yet he subverts this characterization by asking, “How do you eradicate contempt, especially when that contempt is founded on nothing more substantial than differences in table manners, variations in the structure of the eyelids?” (*Waiting* 58). The Magistrate vacillates in the merger-division dialectic and so we get the impression that he has finally recognized racism as a fallacy. But the Magistrate’s coherence rhetoric can be validated only once he recognizes racism as a human flaw to construct difference in negative terms.

Therefore, the label *barbarian* provokes a conflict between those who identify themselves as civilized and those perceived as savages. The divide between the colonial powers and the natives in the novel raises the questions of what yardsticks are employed for measuring civilization, and what impels one group to inscribe the label of barbarism on another. In that case, who really is the barbarian? Herein lies the paradox: that the fear of the barbarian is generated by the colonialist and this fear is projected onto the barbarian. This fear unleashes the barbarian within the colonialist, such that the violence meted out to the barbarians stems from this self-induced fear. Consequently, a psychic cycle is produced, whereby the fear of the barbarians generates violence and this violence induces further fear, which in turn produces more barbaric actions. McPhail’s concept of coherence indicates that the psychic cycle enacted in the novel will continue to be a part of human co-existence unless the discourse that forms human realities is reconstructed and renegotiated in order to create spaces for new discourses.

The writing of “enemy” on the physical bodies of the barbarian prisoners precedes their beating, thus a praxis of their rhetorical branding is exemplified. The Magistrate recounts that “[t]he Colonel steps forward. Stooping over each prisoner in turn he rubs a handful of dust into his naked back and writes a word with a stick of charcoal. I read the words upside down: ENEMY...ENEMY...ENEMY...ENEMY...Then the beating begins” (*Waiting*, 120). The reiterated branding of the barbarians symbolizes a rhetorical act meant to persuade both Joll and the watching crowd that his barbaric treatment of the barbarians is logical and justified. Therefore, the maltreatment of the barbarians is a syllogistic progression of their rhetorical construction. The activities of the Empire create tension, which is the offshoot of the psychic cycle caused by fear and desperation. This tension ultimately produces an implosion portrayed in the violence among the inhabitants of the frontier and their hostility towards the soldiers.

The point thus established here is that people are treated according to their racial identities, which are rhetorically and socially constructed. Colonel Joll describes (and justifies) his use of torture as a mechanism for obtaining the truth thus: “I am probing for the truth...I have to exert pressure to find it. First, I get lies...then pressure, then more lies, then more pressure, then the break, then more pressure, then the truth” (*Waiting* 6). The Magistrate attempts to persuade Colonel Joll not to inflict pain on the prisoners captured in the raids. Joll’s resistance to the Magistrate’s logical reasoning exemplifies how intransigent hegemony’s obstacles to rhetorical persuasion can be. The Magistrate employs forensic logic in an attempt to convince the Colonel that the old man and sick boy captured in their raid may be innocent by saying: “The old man says they were coming to see the doctor. Perhaps that is the truth. No one would have brought an old man and a sick boy along on a raiding party” (*Waiting* 4). Despite seeing the sick boy’s sore, Joll resists the Magistrate’s rhetoric and that marks their path of division. Joll’s resistance to the Magistrate’s rhetoric indicates the ideology he (Joll) identifies with. The ideology, which constructs the inferiority of the other in essentialist terms, necessitates the resistance to persuasiveness that Joll exemplifies.

Paradoxically, the Magistrate recognizes his merger with Joll, because according to him, “I drink with him, I eat with him, I show him the sights, I afford him every assistance as his letter of commission requests” (6). Regardless of this physical position of merger, he is psychologically divided from Joll. Hence, his declaration that in the “farthest outpost of the Empire of light there existed one man who in his heart was not a barbarian” (*Waiting* 120) is convincing, despite his human flaws. The Magistrate’s flaws, such as his sexual exploitation of the barbarian girl and his notoriety as a lover of young girls in the frontier town fade into insignificance compared to the crimes of Joll and Mandel.

Ironically, Colonel Joll “with his tapering fingernails, his mauve handkerchiefs, his slender feet in soft shoes” (*Waiting* 6) and wrinkle-free face is the barbarian at heart. Joll’s finesse, which represents colonial civilization, contradicts his psychological decadence, which enables him to torture, maim, and kill the barbarians. Joll’s civilized poise is portrayed as superficial, with his dark glasses, which serve to protect his face from the sun. Joll and his glasses also symbolize the Empire’s screen of protection from the barbarians. This screen means that the Empire fails to see the barbarians as human beings, and this failure represents the colonial ideology, which is half blind in its myopia. The colonial Empire symbolized by Joll desires a wrinkle-free body, but exploits, ravages, and brutalizes the barbarian land and body to achieve this protection.

Conclusion

The moral vacuum identified by some critics of *Waiting*, which acts as a catalyst for the racial violence against the oppressed, goes beyond ethical issues. Rather, the violence meted out against the barbarians emanates from a complicit rhetoric, which produces the othering of those who are racially different. The subversion of racism requires a deep psychological evaluation of the systems of ontological conceptions that have produced and reproduced racism. Racism is a rhetorical construction that has been crafted from the linguistic and rhetorical traditions responsible for forming human realities. To move beyond the complicit rhetoric of racism, McPhail argues for a “rhetoric of coherence” where new realities are formed in a paradigm shift. To escape the rhetoric of complicity, there is the need for a psychodynamic division similar to that exemplified by the Magistrate in *Waiting for the Barbarians*, when he articulates the othering of the racially different in negative terms as unjust and dehumanizing.

Works Cited

- Ashcroft, Bill, Griffiths, Gareth, and Tiffin, Helen (eds.) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Berlin, James. “Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class.” *College English*, Vol. 50, No. 5. (Sept. 1988), pp. 477-494. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed January 19, 2015.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action*. U of California P, 1966. Print
- Coetzee, J. M. *Waiting for the Barbarians*. Penguin Books, 1980. Print.
- Crapanzano, Vincent. *Waiting: The Whites of South Africa*. Random House, 1985. Print.
- Derrida, Jacques. “The Laws of Reflection: Nelson Mandela, in Admiration” in Derrida, Jacques and Tlili, Mustapha (eds.). *For Mandela*. Henry Holt and Co. 1987, pp. 11-42. Print.
- Fanon, Frantz. “The Fact of Blackness” in Ashcroft, Bill, Griffiths, Gareth, and Tiffin, Helen (eds) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Routledge, 1995, pp. 323-326.
- _____. *The Wretched of the Earth*. (Translated by Constance Farrington). Grove Press. 1966. Print.
- Gallagher, Susan. “Torture and the Novel: J. M. Coetzee’s *Waiting for the Barbarians*.” *Contemporary Literature*. Vol. 29, No. 2 (Summer 1988), pp. 277-285. Available at <http://www.jstor.org>. Accessed May 5, 2016.
- hooks, bell. *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. Routledge. 2003. Print.
- JanMohamed, R. Abdul. “The Economy of Manichean Allegory” in Ashcroft, Bill, Griffiths, Gareth, and Tiffin, Helen (eds.) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Routledge, 1995, pp. 18-23.
- Mandela, Nelson. *Long Walk to Freedom*. Little, Brown & Co, 1995. Print.
- McLeod, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester UP. 2000. Print.
- McPhail, Lawrence Mark. “(Re)constructing the Color Line: Complicity and Black Conservatism.” *Communication Theory. Journal of the International Communication Association*. Vol 7, No. 2 (May 1997). <http://www.jstor.org>. Accessed October 26, 2016.

- _____. *The Rhetoric of Racism Revisited: Reparations or Separations?* Rowman and Littlefield Pub. 2002. Print.
- Olsen, Lance. "The Presence of Absence: Coetzee's Waiting for the Barbarians" Available at <http://www.ariel.journalhosting.ucalgary.ca>. 1985. Accessed April 12, 2015.
- Phillips, R. Kendall. "Race and Ethnicity: Spike Lee's Do the Right Thing." In *Controversial Cinema: The Films That Outraged America*. Praeger Pub, 2008. Print.
- Poyner, Jane. "Madness and Civilization in Waiting for the Barbarians" in *J. M. Coetzee and the Paradox of Postcolonial Authorship*. Ashgate Pub, 2000, pp. 53-68. Print.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Colonialism and Neocolonialism*. Routledge, 1964. Print.
- Said, Edward. W. *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books. 1994. Print.