

Race, Religion, and Sartre's Being-for-Others

A Major Qualifying Project

submitted to the Faculty of

Worcester Polytechnic Institute

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree in Bachelor of Science

in

Humanities and Arts, Concentration in Philosophy

By

Abdullah Hajjar

## **Abstract**

In this project, I explore the limitation of Jean-Paul Sartre's concept of being-for-others and the accompanying intersubjective attitudes that we take in relation our being-for-others. Because the being-for-others for Blacks and Muslims is their negatively racialized bodies, Sartre's intersubjective attitudes fail in the case of these two groups. This project criticizes Sartre's intersubjective attitudes by examining the different strategies that Blacks and Muslims take in relation to their racialized being-for-others.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank Professor Jennifer McWeeny for advising me on this project. Her help during the previous months is greatly appreciated. Also, I would like to give special thanks to Professor John Sanbonmatsu for his comments on my MQP proposal and for his continued support. I also wish to thank all those who agreed to share their experiences of race and religion with me. In addition, I would like to thank WPI Department of Humanities and Arts and especially all the philosophy professors.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	1
Acknowledgements.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
Introduction .....	4
1. Sartre’s Description of Being-for-Others.....	7
2. Universal Objectification, Alienation, Shame, and Vulnerability.....	13
3. Being-for-Others and Black Experience .....	23
4. Visible and Invisible Bodies between Hate and Love.....	36
5. The Black Experience of Being-for-Others and Self-Hate.....	48
6. Black Collective Attitudes of Self-Love.....	65
7. Being-for-Others and Muslims.....	80
8. Muslim Racial Objectification and Alienation.....	83
9. The Muslim Experience of Being-for-Others and Self-Hate.....	95
10. Muslim Collective Attitudes of Self-Love.....	105
11. Being-for-Others between Blacks and Muslims.....	117
Conclusions.....	121
References.....	123

In *Being and Nothingness*, Jean-Paul Sartre introduces his descriptive study of being. To Sartre, being can only be understood through analyzing one's subjective or phenomenological experience of consciousness. He divides this experience of the human consciousness into three terms: being-for-itself, being-in-itself, and being-for-others. Since Sartre is following Descartes' metaphysical and epistemological conclusions, he begins with the individual's existence in which being-for-itself is the original individuated consciousness. Being-for-itself is how this individuated consciousness experiences his or her being; it is my being-for-me. Being-for-itself is a description of how I exist in the world as a consciousness. While the for-itself is consciousness perceived from the perspective of the subject, the in-itself is consciousness as an object. Finally, being-for-others, which is the focus of my paper, is a description of the part of my being that is for others. In other words, it is the way in which the Other perceives me. Therefore, using this term, Sartre introduces the Other as a constitutive element of being/human consciousness, which is an improvement from earlier ontologies like Descartes'. We are beings who do not merely deal with being-in-itself, but we also deal with other subjects that reveal, solidify, and appropriate parts of our being.

Sartre's view of our being-for-others is limited since it does not accommodate the experiences of all humans. If we take one's race into consideration, we discover the limitation of the Sartrean ontology. If one is Muslim or Black, for example, in a racist environment, he or she does not simply deal with other subjects; he or she deals with the environment at large, which is racist. The Other of the Black or Muslim is not simply the person in front of him or her. He or she deals with institutions, laws, media, and culture that are racist against him or her. Therefore,

Blacks and Muslims deal with a different kind of being-for-others that doesn't hinge on the Other.

Sartre introduces the body as central to the description of being-for-others. Sartre writes, "consciousness exists its body" (1956, 329). Consciousness and the body constitute each other. We can never imagine a consciousness without a body. Sartre follows Husserl in describing consciousness as exhibiting intentionality. Consciousness exhibits intentionality because it is directed toward other subjects and objects; it is always about something and is directed to those subjects/objects. It is always intending what it is not. Therefore, my body is an embodied intentionality in which it is always intending a certain bodily project. Moreover, the body is also an in-itself since it is an object in the world. Finally, it is for-others since it is how others see me. Thus, we can interchange the term being-for-others with body-for-others. The Other does not simply perceive me as an abstract being but as an objectified body.

This last dimension of our bodies is also a cause of negative emotions. Sartre believes that we experience our being(/body)-for-others as a source of alienation, shame, fear, and vulnerability. For the Other's look to be effective against me, I first need to be aware of that look. If someone were spying on me without announcing his or her presence, I would not experience the process of being looked at. Moreover, in addition to this universal experience of being looked at, my interpretation of the Other's look adds another experience of objectification, alienation, and shame. Thus, I need to have an awareness of the norms that dictate which actions are shameful or not and in what context. Moreover, I need to make a judgment on whether or not the Other is following these norms. If I am seen drinking alcohol in an Islamic country, I am

more likely to interpret the Other's look as causing shame to me, which may not be the case if I was in a Western country.

Racism and Islamophobia are global phenomena, so Blacks and Muslims have a permanent negative experience of "the look." First, they are hyper-aware of these discriminatory norms. Second, they assume that everyone is following these norms. For them, every encounter with the Other's look carries a double objectification, alienation, and shame. In other words, aside from this universal experience of objectification, alienation, and shame, Blacks and Muslims experience additional objectification, alienation, and shame. Precisely, they experience their bodies-for-others as *racialized* in a way that carries with it a certain negative value. One can be racialized as white in a positive way. However, Blacks and Muslims experience racialization that is necessarily negative. On one hand, Blacks experience their bodies as Black bodies. Similarly, Muslims experience their bodies as Muslim bodies.

Sartre believes that we are always in pursuit of getting rid of this negative experience of being-for-others. He presents the attitudes of love, masochism, indifference, desire, sadism, and hate as attitudes that we express in an attempt to regain control over our being-for-others. However, these attitudes are used by him to describe the relationship between raceless bodies that are not racialized or have not yet been racialized. Moreover, to Sartre, all of these attitudes end in failure since humans are fundamentally free. We always transcend our situation no matter what attitudes we are taking or our Other. Although these attitudes also fail in the case of Blacks and Muslims in their attempt to regain their being-for-others, the failure is due to their racialized bodies, which inhibit them from controlling their being-for-others. Muslims and Blacks experience their being-for-others as their race or religion. Therefore, they experience a racialized

objectification that renders the individualistic Sartrean attitudes ineffectual against this historicized and concrete experience of being-for-others.

### **1. Sartre's Description of Being-for-Others**

Before describing the specific social dimension of Blacks and Muslims that makes their experience of being-for-others unique, it is necessary to describe Sartre's original formulation of our universal social existence. Being-for-others is social because it describes the social dimension of our unreflective consciousness. Ontology is the study of being, and being-for-others is a study of the part of our being that is for others. Moreover, being-for-others is the social component of our being because it introduces the Other as part of being in general. Being-for-others is the permanent and fundamental modification of our being that appears to our unreflective consciousness in the encounter with the other. In *The Transcendence of the Ego*, Sartre defines unreflective consciousness as when "consciousness is not for itself its own object" (1960, 41). In other words, consciousness is said to be unreflective when it is not taking itself as an object. Moreover, consciousness does not need to take itself as an object because it is empty (40). Therefore, unreflective consciousness, according to Sartre, is "consciousness in the first degree" (40). The unreflective mode of our consciousness is the default.

Thus, the structure of being-for-others within the consciousness is always there, but the encounter with the Other reveals this permanent modification of my being to my unreflective consciousness. Sartre presents only two possible encounters with the Other. The first one is when I look at the Other. The second one is when the Other looks at me. According to Sartre, I can never do both at the same time. When I look at the Other, my being-for-others will remain on the



unreflective level because consciousness is always unreflective consciousness. When I look at the Other, I remain focused on what I am doing, but I am suddenly unreflectively aware of this hidden structure of my consciousness that is for the Other. When I look at the Other and see that the Other has eyes, I am reminded of the abstract possibility that I could be a being-for-others. The eyes of the Other remind me that I could be seen. This is the precise reason why our being-for-others while looking at the Other will remain at the unreflective level. However, when the Other looks at me, it is impossible to still remain on the unreflective level. When the Other looks at me, I am reflectively aware of my being-for-others. I am aware of being observed by the Other. My being or body becomes the focus of reflective consciousness.

### *The For-Itself*

Sartre divides being into being-for-itself, being-in-itself, and being-for-others. Being-in-itself and being-for-others depend on being-for-itself or our human consciousness to exist. Being-for-itself is the first ontological category of our individuated beings because it is the means by which we are able to interact with the in-itself and our being-for-others. It is the ontological structure by which existence becomes possible. In other words, being-for-itself is our consciousness in its most basic sense. Gary Cox writes, “All those phenomena that comprise the human world—change, temporality, possibility, spatiality, distinct objects, lack, freedom and so on, arise through the relationship between being-for-itself and being-in-itself and exist only from the perspective of being-for-itself” (2008, 32).

For-itself/consciousness is not our awareness of the world but is what makes our awareness of the world possible. This is because awareness of the world requires spatiality,

temporality, change, objects, and so on. Sartre thinks that Descartes was wrong when he wrote, “I think therefore I am” because the fundamental thinking happened before I was able to think (Sartre 1956, 21). Sartre visually describes this primordial consciousness as “a sliding beyond itself” or a “burst” (2001, 1). Whenever we pinpoint consciousness, we make the mistake of pinpointing its result.

Sartre argues that the for-itself “is what it is not and is not what it is” (1947, 100). This characterizes the transcendent nature of our consciousness that makes us fundamentally free. This is because the for-itself/consciousness is always sliding off toward the future. This stems from Sartre’s view that consciousness is empty. This emptiness of consciousness allows Sartre to reach the conclusion that consciousness has to be in a continuous relation with the world (Sartre 1937, 40). Sartre provides the example of a waiter. The waiter, in the present moment, is not a waiter because he made the choice to be a waiter in the past (Sartre 1947, 381). As the for-itself is this original burst, the waiter will always lose his identity at the moment that he chose that identity. He will have to continuously reidentify himself as a waiter to counter-attack the forward movement of his consciousness. He will have to face the inevitability of his freedom.

Here we are introduced to what our consciousness moves toward, which is the in-itself—the world of objects—or the for-other—the world of other subjects. Consciousness’ relation with the Other is what is of interest to us here. It is in this relationship with the Other that the experience of our being-for-others figures—a relationship that is akin to a saga with different movement, chapters, and turns. Sartre writes, “Yet by the sole fact that I experience [objectification] and it confers on my flight that in-itself which it flees, I must turn back toward it and assume attitudes with respect to it” (1956, 473). In other words, although consciousness flees

from what it is, it wants to be what it is; it wants to be an in-itself; and it wants to be its own foundation. Sartre writes, “I think, therefore I am. What am I? A being which is not its own foundation, which qua being, could be other than it is to the extent that it does not account for its being” (80). Thus, there is a fundamental want for consciousness to be its own foundation. According to Sartre, this want/lack stems from the fact that we are fundamentally imperfect. Sartre ties this lack in being to Descartes’ metaphysical conclusions. Descartes argued that because he is this questioning entity that questions itself, he must not be God (1998, 22). He thinks that questioning oneself is not worthy of a God. Then he questioned, if I am not God, how do I know about God? Thus, Descartes thinks that to think of God, God must have somehow given him this idea of Himself (22). Thus, as a fundamentally imperfect being, I want to be the foundation of my being; I want to be God (80). I want finally to be the waiter, not the project of escaping or affirming being the waiter. The introduction of the Other objectifies this flight, which makes one aware of oneself as a flight. Thus, the introduction of the Other makes us want to be the foundation of ourselves so that we can stop this flight. This can be achieved through taking one of the Sartrean attitudes such as love, hate, or desire.

### *Universal Attitudes*

The experience of being-for-others is not static. It is always changing. We always take a stand on what we are for our Other so that we can be the foundation of our being. The realization that we are a being-for-others is also a realization that a part of my being-of-being is in the Other’s hand. Only the Other knows my being/body-for-him or her. In a way, the Other becomes the foundation of my being that I wish to regain. I want to want to be the foundation of my own

being. As described by Sartre, I want to be the “in-itself-for-itself” (Sartre 1956, 94). I want to be the source of my own objectification.

Although certain substances or mental illnesses can change how we experience our being-for-others, normally we use certain attitudes to change our experience of being-for-others. By using these attitudes, we attempt to regain this part of our being and to be the foundation of our own consciousness. There are two general attitudes that we take. For example, if my being-for-others as an artist is problematic to me, I may choose to follow certain social norms to feel at ease with this being-for-others. I may practice for years or take lessons to improve as an artist. I may ask for criticism and ways to improve my art. In this way, I feel assured of being-for-others as an artist. By doing all these things, I am assured that my objectivity as an artist is in accordance with the subjectivity of my Other. My being-for-others is not problematic anymore because I am what the Other wants me to be. I know that if I paint this painting in this particular way, my Other will in turn love this painting. However, I may take the other route. I may take the role of the rebellious artist who does not care what his or her Other thinks about his or her art. In this way also, the art minimizes his or her experience of being-for-others since he or she does not care about the Other’s opinion.

Sartre takes these intuitive dispositions and divides them into two general camps. In the first camp, we have the attitudes of love and masochism. In this set of attitudes, we aim to preserve the Other’s freedom. In love, for example, I aim to preserve my beloved’s freedom because she is my precious object/subject. Moreover, according to Sartre, the lover does not want a forced love (147, 478). The aim of the lover is to be the limit of the beloved’s freedom

without forcing him- or herself to be so. The lover aims to be the original freedom of his beloved so that his beloved “bursts” into the world loving him (480).

The second camp includes the attitudes of indifference, desire, sadism, and hate. In this set of attitudes, I aim to make the Other’s freedom an object of my use. Sadism is an example of this second attitude. Sadism is similar to love, in that I am still trying to preserve the Other’s freedom because the Other’s freedom is essential to prove my power (it is better to have power over a free consciousness than an unthinking object) in controlling my being-for-others. However, in sadism, the sadist uses instruments of force, rather than the magic of love, to compel his Other “to identify itself with the tortured flesh” (1947, 523). In this attitude of sadism, there is an incarnation of the Other’s freedom into a specific object, which is flesh. Flesh is a specific kind of body—a passive sexualized body (519).

Sartre claims that the moment an attitude fails in regard to controlling my being-for-others is that moment in which I switch to another attitude. We can take the opposing attitudes of indifference and masochism as an example of how we dynamically experience our being-for-others. Sartre claims that it does not matter what attitude we start with because, eventually, we are going to choose an opposing attitude from the other set of attitudes.

### *The Universal Experience of Being-for-Others*

Aside from the fact that the experience of being-for-others is ever changing, there are, according to Sartre, unavoidable experiences of being-for-others that are instigated by the Other’s look. No matter how old, experienced, confident, or powerful we are, once we are confronted by the Other’s look, we are captured in an occasion that forces us to follow the

Other's look. This is an indicator that our relation with the Other is a deep relation, that is, a relation on the level of being rather than cognition. Sartre writes, "I do not for an instant think of denying [the Other's look]" (350). I am fully captured by the look. This pure being-for-others is the shame that the confident actress feels when she falls in front of millions while she is trying to claim her Oscar, or it is the moment of insecurity when a group of young people laugh behind your back. The power of these moments takes us away from ourselves and back again to the gaze of the Other. I am suddenly awakened to who I am for the Other. Naturally, when we see something moving, this thing captures our attention. Similarly, it is part of our instinct to be captured by these encounters with the Other. Sartre describes these moments of being looked at as experiences of two discoveries and two emotions. The discoveries are of my objectification and alienation, which result in my feelings of shame and vulnerability.

## **2. Universal Objectification, Alienation, Shame, and Vulnerability**

The experience of objectification is intimately linked to our bodies. We do not need to consider consciousness as separate from the body. Sartre writes, "The original bond with the Other first arises in connection with the relationship between my body and the Other's body" (1956, 471). This bodily bond with the Other reveals to me that we have two modes of existing within our bodies. In the first mode, our bodies exist our consciousness. In other words, we live our consciousness as our bodies. As such, our bodies remain beyond our comprehension of them as objects or instruments. Sartre gives the example of handwriting. After years of writing, one finds that one's "hand has vanished" (Sartre 1947, 100). In writing, the hand vanishes because I am not consciously moving my hand. My focus is directed solely on the pen. A similar situation

happens in all actions that require skill. During the beginning stages of driving a car, for example, one will be hyper-aware of his or her hand placement and will be conscious of hand movement to steer the wheel. However, after years of driving, people lose their consciousness of and focus on their hands and focus more on the driving.

However, once I am confronted with the gaze of the other—be it an actual look or the possibility of someone looking at me—I am doubly aware of my body. First, I am suddenly directly aware of my body as an instrument of me—a visible object that I consciously move (Dolezal 2015, 28). Second, I am aware of my body as seen from the other’s perspective—a public object (30). Sartre writes, “If someone looks at me, I am conscious of being an object. But this consciousness can be produced only in and through the existence of the Other” (Sartre 1956, 363). In this manner, I am aware of my body as a public body/object that others could see. Being an object by its very nature implies being a public object and part of the experience of being-for-others.

The need for the Other to objectify me makes sense intuitively because my objectivity is only useful for the Other. It is impossible for the Other to understand me as a being-for-itself/consciousness because this type of existence is for me only. The Other needs to perceive my objectified body to perceive me. Therefore, it is useful for the other to objectify me as this particular object with this particular race, age, height, and weight. However, from the first person perspective, I live these attributes as part of my facticity, as characteristics that preceded the pre-reflective level that I need to overcome (Dolezal 2015, 25).

Facticity is the “resistance or adversity presented by the world that free action constantly strives to overcome” (Cox 2008, 77). It is what for-itself transcends. Therefore, facticity is all the

facts about me, such as my body, race, religion, history, and nationality. Therefore, the Other is necessary for revealing to my objectivity/facticity/outwardness because objectivity is how the other is able to receive me. For me, facticity is simply what I overcome. For example, even in regard to the extreme cases of being imprisoned, I still have no choice but to overcome this facticity because I have to choose a meaning for my imprisonment/facticity.

I remember the first time that I encountered my facticity/objectivity. Unaware of social decorum in Saudi Arabia and its strict code of male behavior, I ran toward my father and hugged him when he came to pick me up on my first day of school. Days later, one of the students was recounting my actions and laughing. At that moment, I realized that there is another being for me, which is my being-for-others, in which my body as an object is judged and used by the Other. I am not just a subject but also a public object. Being-for-others, thus, is the ever-present awareness of ourselves as social objects that become known to us by the introduction of the Other.

### *Alienation*

The second component of the experience of our being-for-others is alienation, which is connected with the experience of being an object. In *The Body and Shame*, which gives an excellent account of Sartre's understanding of alienation, Luna Dolezal claims that every experience that Sartre mentions of the encounter with the Other is alienating (2015, 37). Objectification is the event that happens while I encounter the Other. Without the Other, I am simply a "flight" toward my future possibilities (1947, 387). I am in the process of transcending my facticity. To Sartre, I am this very transcendence (xlvii). However, the other objectifies me as



this very transcendence. With the introduction of the Other, I become known to myself as this flight toward future possibilities. The fact that I need the Other to know my objectivity is alienating. Thus, Sartre equates alienation with objectivity, in contrast to Dolezal, who separates the two.

Dolezal does not view objectification and alienation as experiences that always co-exist. In fact, some objectifying instances do not include alienation, such as going to the doctor or the embrace of two lovers (Dolezal 2015, 37). These instances of objectification are necessary if not desired.

Moreover, she thinks that in some instances, objectification carries with it a higher form of alienation. Dolezal gives the example of presenting a paper at a philosophy conference while some of the male members of the audience made sexual remarks about her. To Sartre, the fact she was objectified is alienating, regardless of whether this objectification was sexual. I am alienated from my body when I receive my body through the Other's gaze as different from the body that I live through. My body is my original "burst" to the world and not an object. However, for Dolezal, this objectification is alienating because it alienated her from her possibilities. She was a sexual object and not a philosopher. To use Sartre's terminology, the male audience transformed her possibilities of being a philosopher into "dead possibilities" (1947, 288).

Sartre acknowledges sexual/racial/religious objectification as a specific kind of objectification and alienation. However, he thinks that it is the result of a more fundamental objectification and alienation. It seems that Sartre recognizes three types of alienation. The first type results from the fundamental experiences of objectification, on which all other kinds of

objectification, such as sexual or racial, are built. The second type of alienation is due to the inherent ambiguity of the Other's gaze. Sartre writes,

The Other looks at me and as such he holds the secret of my being, he knows what I am. Thus the profound meaning of my being is outside of me, imprisoned in an absence. The Other has the advantage over me. (437)

The other is a subjectivity that is beyond me, which means that I can never know what I am for the Other since the Other is “condemned to be free” (Sartre 2007, 27); the Other is a “hole in the universe” beyond my reach (1947, 343). The Other reveals me “across the uneasy indetermination of the being which I am for him” (351). Thus, I am alienated because I can never be certain of what I am for the Other. This is precisely why love fails. Even if I am loved, I am still uncertain that the Other's love will remain forever. I am always anxious about the possibility that this love could someday turn to hate.

The third type of alienation occurs when the Other's look lacks mystery. This alienation stems from our total disregard of the Other's subjectivity and is the most fundamental to but least emphasized by Sartre. Dolezal defines this kind of alienation as “an experience where the subject feels an estrangement from the self or, more precisely, the possibilities of the self. It occurs when I am conscious that my body is not for me, but instead apprehended by the other as an object without regard to my subjectivity” (2015, 36). Dolezal's alienation at the podium in the face of those sexual remarks alienated her from her possibility of being anything but a sexual object. Moreover, the sexual remarks transformed the male audience's gaze from a mysterious look to a known look. She was alienated not by the fact that the Other could disregard her subjectivity but that the Other disregarded her subjectivity. This total disregard of subjectivity can be seen in the example of people who are indifferent to others' subjectivity.

As I mentioned previously, indifference is one of the Sartrean attitudes that we take in relation to the Other. To be indifferent is to have a “blindness with respect to others” (1956, 495). Therefore, the men who made the sexual remarks were indifferent because they turned a blind eye to Dolezal’s subjectivity. Sartre thinks that people who are indifferent see others as “functions” (1956, 459). A waiter is not a subjectivity but an object that has the single function of distributing food. A front desk employee has the sole function of answering questions. These men confronting Dolezal were only aware of their sexual desire. Therefore, they were solely aware of her as a sexual object that had the sole function of satisfying their desire. She was alienated. Her eyes could not see them. Although her eyes were directed toward them, her embodied consciousness was directed toward itself. She was a “looked-at-look” (476).

### *Shame*

The third component that arises in the experience of being-for-others is shame. Shame, in addition to pride and fear, is fundamental in our experience of being-for-other because I need the Other to feel these emotions. Without the Other, I cannot feel shame. Because I live with my shameful acts as a part of my facticity, I attempt to transcend shame at every moment. I live my shame as my original “burst” of the for-itself. The shameful act is something I did that is in the past. But my past is not my past because in the moment of doing the shameful act, I lose myself in the world in which I am engaged. I am in the “pure mode of losing myself in the world, of causing myself to be drunk in by things as in ink by a blotter in order that an instrumental-complex oriented toward an end may be synthetically detached on the ground of the

world” (1947, 348). I lose myself in the act and its particularities. It is not I, Abdullah, who did the act. However, an unqualified consciousness is doing the shameful act.

Now, since the Other is looking at me, I am ashamed. Sartre gives the example of the jealous lover who was caught by someone else looking through the keyhole in an attempt to spy on his lover (1947, 347). This man is suddenly ashamed by the Other’s gaze. Describing this shame, Sartre writes, “But now suddenly I raise my head. Somebody was there and has seen me. Suddenly I realize the vulgarity of my gesture, and I am ashamed” (221). The Other’s look is essential in feeling shame because the Other renders me as shameful. In other words, the Other gives me a self/ego that is essential in feeling shame in the first place. Suddenly, according to Sartre “I am that Ego; for I discover it in shame” (350).

Sartre thinks that the feeling of shame as our being-for-others has a bodily dimension. Shame shows that the experience of being-for-others is not a reflective/cognitive phenomenon but is sensed and felt (1947, 222). Shame is the “immediate shudder which runs through me from head to foot without any discursive preparation” (222). I tremble in shame at the sight of the Other. Shame is the redness of my cheeks, my downcast gaze, and my slack posture (Dolezal 2015, 38).

Aside from this bodily experience of shame, Sartre presents shame as the result of our objectification. This fundamental experience of shame is what Sartre calls “pure shame.” Sartre, in describing this kind of primordial shame, writes,

Pure shame is not a feeling of being this or that guilty object but in general of being an object; that is, of recognizing myself in this degraded, fixed, and dependent being which I am for the Other. Shame is the feeling of the original fall, not because of the fact that I may have committed this or that particular fault but simply that I have “fallen” into the world in the midst of things and that I need mediation of the Other in order to be what I am. (1956, 288)

Therefore, the experience of objectification and alienation is itself shameful. The fact that I need the other to know that I am an object is what is shameful. Sartre writes, “It is not that I perceive myself losing my freedom in order to become a thing; but my very nature is—over there, outside my lived freedom—as a given attribute of this being which I am for the Other” (1947, 350).

Thus, shame is not the fact I am objectified but the fact that I am objectified over there.

Therefore, distance from the Other, who became the foundation of my incarnation as a shameful being, becomes an essential cause of this shame.

The second experience of shame is the experience of transgressing public norms that I accept and that I know the Other accepts. Sartre does not emphasize this experience of shame although it is part of his oeuvre. I am ashamed in front of the Other because the Other rendered me as an object that is unethical. Sartre writes, “Someone was there and has seen me. Suddenly I am aware of the vulgarity of the gesture and I am ashamed” (1947, 348). Dolezal calls this experience of shame “self-evaluative” (2015, 39). Through the awareness of the presence or the possibility that an Other is looking at me, I judge my act to be vulgar according to norms that I accept and apply to myself.

### *Vulnerability*

The next component of being-for-others is vulnerability. I am vulnerable because I can be seen by the Other. Nothing can save me from the Other’s gaze. Sartre writes,

What I apprehend immediately when I hear the branches crackling behind me is not that there is someone there; it is that I am vulnerable, that I have a body which can be hurt, that I occupy space in which I am without defense—in short, that I am seen. (1957, 347)

Once this person hears the sound of the branches, he or she is suddenly aware of him- or herself as a vulnerable human being with a body to which the Other has immediate access.

In a way, I am naked in front of the Other's gaze, which freely appropriates and interprets my being. Dolezal points out that Sartre focuses on the experience of vulnerability, especially in relation to our naked bodies (2015, 40). If the Other holds the secret to my being, then I am practically naked because I have no secrets to hide. When we divulge our inner secrets, we feel naked in front of the Other. In *No Exit*, while consoling Iniz about their predicament in Hell, Garcin says, "Well, I, anyhow, can feel sorry for you, too. Look at me, we're naked, naked right through, and I can see into your heart" (Sartre 1946, 31). In *No Exit*, which depicts three anti-heroes who are stuck in hell, Sartre purposefully enabled the characters to know each other's deep thoughts. In other words, he made all of them naked and vulnerable so that their experience of being-for-others is a true experience of hell. Regardless of whether the characters really knew the others' deep thoughts, the fact that they believe that they know their deep thoughts is enough. Each one of them holds the secret to the Other's being by virtue of believing in having it.

### *Conflict and Guilt*

These unbearable experiences lead, according to Sartre, to conflict. Conflict starts when we are aware of these experiences of objectification, alienation, shame, and vulnerability. In conflict, we attempt to "recapture the very consciousness and freedom [the Other] has stolen from us" (1947, 352). As mentioned earlier, Sartre presents the attitudes of love, masochism, indifference, desire, sadism, and hate as ways to "recapture" our being-for-others. These attitudes ensure the continuity of conflict because each of these attitudes appropriates the Other

differently. Being a failed lover could compel one to be a sadist. Being a sadist could compel one to be a lover again. Sartre mentions that, even being in indifference toward the existence of the Other, we are still using the Other by not using the Other.

This proposition leads us the final component of our experience of being-for-others, which is guilt. A lifelong pattern of love, hate, and desire will eventually lead to guilt. Sartre writes,

It is from this singular situation that the notion of guilt and of sin seems to be derived. It is before the Other that I am guilty. I am guilty first when beneath the Other's look I experience my alienation and my nakedness as a fall from grace which I must assume. This is the meaning of the famous line from Scripture: "They knew that they were naked." Again I am guilty when in turn I look at the Other because by the very fact of my own self-assertion I constitute him as an object and as an instrument, and I cause him to experience that same alienation which he must now assume. Thus original sin is my upsurge in a world where there are others; and whatever may be further relations with others, these relations will be only variations on the original theme of my guilt. (531)

Here Sartre envisions an unfortunate world in which in my original "burst" into the world, I use the Other. I am guilty of even looking at the Other because my look will objectify that Other.

Again, I try to preserve the Other's freedom using love, but I realize that even in love, I am using the Other for my own ends.

At the end of my rope, I am forced to turn to the final attitude, hate. Sartre equates hate with despair. In hate, I imagine a world in which the "the Other does not exist" (1947, 532).

According to Sartre, the hater is content to solely be a for-itself. He or she is just the process of annihilating his or her facticity. However, the precise moment in which I annihilate my Other is the moment in which I am aware that there was an Other. I can only annihilate what was already there. Therefore, the haters cannot deny the being-for-others that they experienced in the past before annihilating their Others. In other words, their being-for-others "by slipping into the past

becomes as an irremediable dimension of [themselves]” (534). Thus, filled with guilt and shame about how we treated the Other, we are forced again to take another attitude in regard to the Other.

### 3. Being-for-Others and Black Experience

In, *Black Skin, White Masks*, Frantz Fanon famously describes his racist encounter with a child on the train. The child screamed, “‘Dirty nigger!’ or simply ‘Look! A Negro!’” (Fanon 2008, 89). As a person who happens to have a dark body, Fanon, in his encounter with the child, does not just discover his objectivity but the fact that he is a black person/object. He discovered that he is a part of a race that is seen negatively. A human lives his or her life as a being-for-itself. We are always this original “burst” towards the world (Sartre 2001, 1). We are beings-for-ourselves. The black person in his encounter with the Other not only discovers that he is this “burst” objectified, temporalized, and spatialized, but more importantly, he discovers himself and his body as *raced*. If the Sartrean experience of objectification is of having an outside, then the particular experience of a person who is Black is the experience of having a racialized outside. Thus, my being-for-others becomes dictated by my race, and in the case of Blacks, it is the Black race.

This objectification/racialization is not a neutral objectification, but in fact, it is an objectification that carries with it a certain determination of the person who is Black. In other words, to be *seen* as a person who is Black carries a certain “weight” over the person who is *actually* Black (Fanon 2008, 112). According to Andrew Cruw, Blackness, prior to the Enlightenment, was seen as “insignificant corollaries of environmental shifts in color” (2011,



127). Blackness was seen a result of a prolonged exposure to the extreme sun of the African continent that burnt the outer layer of the skin (128). However, the second layer was still white. In other words, before the Enlightenment, Blackness was only “skin deep” (127). Nonetheless, after the discoverers during the age of “enlightenment,” Blackness became deeper. Now, you have Black skin, Black sperm, Black brain, Black bile, Black saliva, and Black phlegm (128). As a result, according to Lewis Gordon, black skin in the racist world carries with it “certain affectively charged associations” (1995, 95). As described by Fanon, it “overdetermines” the Black person from the outside (2008, 95). The Black person is chained to his univocally and negatively perceived “appearance” (95). Being Black thus transforms from a simple “projection” that is tentatively juxtaposed over dark bodies to a way to bestow an essence over the person who happens to be Black (95). I argue that the main characteristics that are associated with Blackness, which are the cause of this external determination, are inferiority, criminality, and impurity.

### *The Structure of Black Experience and Being-for-Others*

Before entering into the particular description of the negative characteristics that are associated with the Black race, which are invisibility, inferiority, criminality, and impurity, it is important to signal the process by which dark bodies or Blacks have come to experience their being-for-others as raced. First, let us treat the abstract problem of the Black experience of being-for-others. What does it mean exactly to experience our being-for-others? Put differently, what are the internal requirements for the Black person, for example, to experience his being-for-others as Black?

The first requirement is that there needs to be an abstract link between dark bodies and this created concept of the Black race. That being the case, to envision a connection between the two, it is helpful to envision a moment in history when dark bodies were not associated with Blackness. To Gordon, whiteness and Blackness are simply “projection” (1995, 95). In this state, the juxtaposition between the dark and light bodies and Blackness and whiteness is premature, weak, and tentative. However, after a long history of essentialism, authoritarianism, determinism, slavery, colonialism, violence, and pseudoscience, dark bodies became linked to the Black race. Gordon puts it differently when he writes, “But eventually, Blackness and whiteness take on certain meanings that apply to certain groups of people in such a way that makes it difficult not to think of those people without certain affectively charged association” (95). As a result, whiteness and Blackness became intimately linked with light and dark bodies. The tentative projection transformed into an incurable link.

Still, even with this abstract connection between dark bodies and Blackness, the requirements for the Black person to experience his being-for-others is not yet complete. The second requirement is that there needs to be an internal or subjective recognition that my dark body is Black. In other words, there also needs to be an internal link between one’s dark body and the concept of Blackness. If dark bodies do not associate themselves with the Black race, then the experience of being seen as raced will escape them. For example, a criminal would show signs of lying while taking the polygraph test because he knows that he is the criminal; he knows that he did it and he connects himself to the crime that he know that he did. Thus, for Blacks to experience their being-for-others as racialized bodies, they must associate Blackness with their dark bodies. As the criminal experiences anxiety because he committed the crime, the Black

person experiences the negative affects of being racialized because he / she attaches him / herself to the race.

One of the easier ways to see how dark bodies associate Blackness with their bodies is through the concept of identity. Persons with dark bodies, especially in the United States, grow up identifying themselves as Black. If Blackness is taken as identity, we can safely assume that dark bodies, and thus Blacks generally speaking, associate themselves with Blackness. In fact, identity is one of the strongest forms of association. The identity of someone is always something sacred and dear because identity is something that emerges as the particular person emerges. However, this is of course the simplest presentation of identity. Even if Blacks identify with their Blackness and place it as a part of their identity, they also must perceive their Other as aware of them as raced. In order for the Black person to experience his being-for-others as raced, the person would need to think, "I am Black, and this person sees me as Black. Then, I must be seen Black. Therefore, my being-for-others or my being-for-this-person is that I am Black. I am Black and to this person I am also Black." Thus, within the experience of being-for-others as Blacks, there is the assumption that the Black person makes about how he or she is perceived. Such an assumption is permanent and fixed in every experience that is had by the Black person. For example, to show that this assumption is critical in the experience of being-for-others as raced, one could see how Blacks deal in situations where their skin color can be hidden. Dealing with a child, for example, will not trigger the experience of being-for-others as Black. The Black person will assume that the child does not see that he or she is Black, and thus, he or she will not experience his or her being-for-others as Black.

Moreover, as described earlier, the Black race becomes associated with negative values such as invisibility, criminality, and impurity. In order for the Black person to experience his or her being-for-others as a Black person who is inferior, criminal, and impure, he or she needs to make another two necessary assumptions. The first assumption is that the Black person will have to connect Blackness and these negative characteristics. The second assumption is that he or she must assume that the Other sees Blackness as associated with inferiority, criminality, and shame.

Now, we can finally describe what it means for the Black person to experience his or her being-for-others as Black. First, in the labs of enlightenment scientists and in the treatise of philosophers, a nefarious concept of Blackness was created and was connected abstractly with dark bodies. Moreover, there was an internal acceptance by people who have dark bodies that they are Black. In fact, these dark bodies took this abstract concept, modified it, and made it their identity. Moreover, the Black person makes an additional two assumptions. First, he or she accepts that Blackness is connected to inferiority, criminality, and impurity. Second, he assumes that his or her white Other also made the same connection. In other words, the experience of being-for-others for Blacks is the experience of their bodies being seen by their white Other as invisible, inferior, criminal, and impure.

### *Invisibility*

*Invisibility* is the best word to describe those who experience objectification or racialization, in this case the Black community. It is difficult to read about the Black experience without encountering this experience of invisibility. Invisibility can be seen as an umbrella term that contains under it experiences such as inferiority, criminality, and impurity. In other words, to

experience myself as invisible is to experience myself as undeniably inferior, criminal, and impure.

To be invisible is to be not seen. Nevertheless, the Black person is a person of flesh and bones. He is a material body that can be seen by eyes that can see. Still, the experience of being-for-others for Blacks feels as if one is invisible. It is not that the Black person is wearing the *cloak of invisibility*, but it is the fact their white Other projects their own understanding of the Black man over his flesh and bones. Famously, Ralph Ellison in *The Invisible Man* describes the source of his experience of invisibility as a “peculiar disposition of the eyes of those with whom I come in contact” (1980, 3). Fanon would call this “peculiar disposition” a “color prejudice” (2008, 97). To use Gordon’s terminology, the eyes of the white Other projects “prejudice” against the Black person that renders him or her invisible (1995, 95).

Describing this experience of invisibility, George Yancy in *Black Bodies, White Gazes*, gives the example of his repeated encounter with a white woman in the elevator. Whenever the white woman sees Yancy, who is a middle-aged, African-American philosopher, she instinctively shows signs of fear. She grabs her purse tightly, her heart is beating faster, and her eyes are wandering around (Yancy 2017, 21). Yancy uses this encounter to show his invisibility as a Black person, an invisibility that is due to a “peculiar disposition” in the eyes of this white woman (Ellison 1980, 3). Yancy, describing this woman, writes,

Her perspective, however, is far from ‘direct’ and ‘veridical.’ Her consciousness is far from transparent. Her gaze is not a simple seeing, an act of direct perception, but the racial production of the visible, the workings of racial constraints on what it means to ‘see.’ As a Black, I am a ‘looked at.’ As white, she is bearer of the ‘white look.’ (2017, 27)

Yancy is invisible because he is not seen by her. To use a Sartrean attitude to describe the encounter, she is *indifferent* to his freedom or subjectivity. She sees him as a “function” (Sartre 1974, 495). As the waiter is a function for distributing food, Yancy’s function is to be “evil” (495). She already understands black bodies. Her encounter with Yancy helps her trigger that understanding. Thus, to be precise, she sees Yancy but only enough to trigger the knowledge of Black people in her mind which makes Yancy disappear again from her eyes (26). Yancy is left alienated, used, and invisible.

### *Inferiority*

Invisibility in itself is a contingent experience. Every particular group experience of invisibility is viewed differently. Every racialized group has certain characteristics that is seen as innate to the particular racialized individual. For Blacks, inferiority is the first experience of their invisibility. To be inferior is to be less than your white Other. Gordon describes Blackness as deviation from the standard of humanity which is whiteness (1995, 96). Gordon thinks, in our racist world, to be black is a “mark of inferiority” (96). To be black is to be different— to be nonwhite. This lack of whiteness according to Gordon is the source of inferiority for Blacks. Since whiteness is “presence of (human subsistence),” Blackness in turn must be an “absence (of human substance)” (101). Blackness is “a form of human deficiency” (101). To be black is to be less than white, human. It is to be absent and inferior. Fanon writes, “I was walled in: neither my refined manners nor my literary knowledge nor my understanding of quantum theory could favor me” (2008, 97). Here Fanon describes the inescapability of his predicament as a Black person. To be Black is to be inferior, regardless of your achievements, class, and intelligence. While the

universal person in Sartre's philosophy is "condemned to be free," in complete opposition, the black person is condemned to be seen as inferior (2007, 29).

### *Criminality*

Criminality is an important component of the experience of invisibility and objectification that Blacks endure. Gordon describes the facticity of the Black individual as associated with criminality, which is one of the central experiences of being-for-others as blacks. The Black person experiences *existential criminality*. His or her existence is in itself a crime— a mistake, a deviation, or a degradation. Gordon writes, , "I am black. I have therefore committed a crime. I am black. I know the problem with my black body. It exists. I therefore 'am' a crime" (1995, 101). In "Eye to Eye: Black Women, Hatred, and Anger," which is a moving account of Audre Lorde's struggle as a Black female and lesbian, Lorde describes her existence as Black as criminal. In talking about her experience with her sister, who hates Lorde's existence, she writes, "You have never gotten over the anger that I appeared at all" (2007, 155). Lorde's most significant criminal act is that she exists. Her (bigoted) sister is not angry with Lorde about something that she did to her when they were children; instead, she was angry at her to have the audacity to be— to exist. She is a Black. In the racist world, she is perceived as the degradation of the human species – she should disappear. Aside from this existential criminality, Blacks have experienced being seen as actual law-breaking criminals. Yancy echoes that criminality is one the hallmarks of the Black experience (2017, xxx). Yancy writes, "Here is a case where the Black body is condemned before it even acts; it has always already committed a crime" (16). The

Black body is always perceived as looking through the keyhole, stealing, raping, and trafficking despite his or her innocence.

Part of the reasoning behind seeing Black people as criminals is that they are seen as unfree. When the white woman clutches into her purse as reaction of seeing Yancy, she is a “prisoner to of her own historical inherited imaginary” (Yancy 2017, 36). As a matter of fact, the white woman cannot but see Yancy as unfree. She is chained to this historical imagination in which Black bodies are seen as unfree and determined. She is chained to her own prejudice. Yancy writes, “As a result my being as being-for-itself, my freedom, is fundamentally called into question” (21). She is unwilling to see Yancy as a free agent that is a being-for-himself and has the possibility to transcend his facticity. She continually objectifies him as a Black person who she already knew through and through. She is indifferent to his existence. He does not deserve to be heard—to make his case that he is free. She is in dialogue with herself.

It is helpful to introduce here Gordon’s notion of Blacks as “absence”. To be an “absence” in the Sartrean sense is to be both a being-for-itself and to be a free consciousness. However, according to Gordon, this “absence” in case of Black people transforms into a lack—a lack of freedom (1995, 100). This is because the freedom that is given to Black people is a debased freedom; it is a freedom that is forced to be in bad faith about itself a freedom (98). It is a freedom that lives a lie about its lack of freedom. Thus, according to Gordon, Blacks are seen as absence that leads itself to presence or facticity (98). In other words, it is a freedom that leads itself to be unfree. In this view of Black bodies as absence, black bodies lead themselves by their freedom to crime.



### *Impurity*

This made-up inferiority and criminality are not the only aspects in the anti-black world that are seen as inherent in Black bodies and part of the so-called collective “knowledge” about Blackness. I also think the element of impurity is part of this collective knowledge about Blackness. Since Black people are “absence,” one of the meanings attached to this “absence” is lack of whiteness (Gordon 1995, 98). Thus, Black people are *de facto* impure, less white.

This impurity is threatening. In the Enlightenment, scientists and philosophers would debate the source of Blackness and if it was an infectious disease (Curran 2011, 124). Later on, Fanon echoed a similar point when he wrote,

For some years now, certain laboratories have been researching for a ‘degentrification’ serum. In all seriousness, they have been raising out their test tubes and adjusting their scales and have begun research on the wretched black man could whiten himself and thus rid himself of the burden of his bodily curse. (2008, 91)

In fact, race for Dutch geographer Cornelius de Pauw was seen as a sexually transmitted disease (124). Thus, comedically, the sperm of the Black sperm is now also seen as Black and “tainted” that it “was ultimately responsible for the other measurable and demonstrable liabilities of this particular ‘variety,’ particularly the race’s intellectual deficiency and poor memory” (127). Now, there is a reason to “abstain” from Black people since they carry with them this disease wherever they go. Will touch transmit this disease? Will co-existing with Blacks in the same room, house, country, or world be dangerous? There is the classical story of the white families who started to offer their houses for sale after a Black family started to live nearby. They are not only afraid for their lives because they now live near potential criminals, but they are afraid that the proclaimed impurity of Black people is going to envelop them. They are afraid of the “Black sperm” (124).

They are afraid to be less white by association. They are now afraid that they are undergoing a process of “degradation” as we speak (Curran 2017, 28).

To understand this fear of this polluting impurity, Shiloh Whitney claims that the white person suffers from “Negrophobia” (Whitney 2015, 3). Thus, the anti-black racist experiences phobia or horror of Black bodies. Black people start to understand their bodies as engendering fear. There are two important experiences related to horror outlined by Whitney. First, accompanied by horror, there is the experience of abjection in which there is a spatial ambivalence between the inside and the outside (6). The racist, in his horror, loses the separation between him- or herself and the object of horror. Secondly, associated with the experience of horror of Black individuals is a feeling of dirtiness or impurity that needs removal (8). It is this combination of the loss of clear distinction between subject and object and the perceived dirtiness of Black bodies that animates the racist bodies to recoil from Black bodies in an attempt to rid themselves of this perceived dirtiness. Whitney adds that in the intensity of this recoil, there is an attempt to create a clear separation between what is inside and outside (7). There is an attempt to reinstate boundaries. The white person wants to be cut-off and isolated from the Black person.

We can interpret the reaction of White families leaving after a Black family moved-in to the neighborhood as similar to the recoil that Fanon experienced when encountering his white Other on the train. In describing his racist encounter with white people on the train, Fanon writes,

In the train, it was no longer a question of being aware of my body in the third person but in a triple person. In the train, I was given not one but two, three places. I existed triply; I occupied space. (112, added emphasis)

Whenever he enters the train, Fanon experiences a kind of collective recoil. His white Others recoil by distancing themselves from him and by giving him space to occupy as if he is more than one person. His impurity compiles over his dark body, allowing him to reach his white Other from a distance. Fanon's impurity, due to their fear, is reaching their depths. He is, because he is dirty and polluting, left to stand alone.

Analogously, the families, in their attempt to shield themselves from Black people, created a new Black person out of this separation. They wanted to create a new Black person that has a clear "spatial referents" (Whitney 2015, 4). Their recoil reads, "You are you, and me is me. There is no confusion. Get out of me." Moreover, they wanted to create an Other who was aware of his or her otherness. In other words, out of this recoil, the white families wanted to create a new black family—a family in which its impurity is fixed and contained. Moreover, the burden of containment will be solely a burden on the Black family. Fanon described this creation of a new Black person when he wrote,

But just as I get to the other slope, I stumble, and the Other fixes me with his gaze, his gestures and attitudes, the same way you fix a preparation with a dye. I lose my temper, demanded an explanation...Nothing doing. I explode. Here are the fragments put together by another me. (2008, 89)

Thus, still on the train, Fanon exploded and regathered by his new self. He is now an individual, an isolated individual figuratively and practicality. As Fanon regathers the remnants of his exploded and rejected self, he discovers himself again as the cause of horror to his white Other. He discovers his being-for-others as impure and causing fear and horror. This re-creation of Fanon and discovery is the precise goal of the racist white Other. This discovery of his being-for-others makes Fanon hyperaware of his objectification as a dirty person. Now, not only does the white Other want to recoil from Fanon, but Fanon also wants to escape his painful

being-for-others and his white Other. As Fanon realizes his being-for-others, he writes, “Where should I hide?” (93). As the Black family realizes the discrimination that befell over them or as they realize their being-for-others, it now becomes their responsibility to “hide” (93). The Black children would learn to hide. They will be instructed not to mingle with their white Other—to keep the separation.

This experience of seeing oneself in the eyes of others as dirty and impure is an experience that adds and intensifies the experience of objectification and alienation. It makes one aware of oneself of doing something wrong without doing anything because aspects of me are reaching the Other’s depth. I am polluting their insides by existing. A potential husband for my sister called our house and asked if there is any Black ancestry in my sister’s DNA. The potential husband did not just announce his racism, but he made it so deep that it is beyond reach. Even my sister’s pale skin would not save her from racism. She is polluted and polluting.

As a Black person, I continue to experience myself as invisible, inferior, and criminal. I remember the atrocious racism that a Black student received in my high school. Black people who did not acquire lighter skin tone due to miscegenation with white Arabs are rare in Saudi Arabia. This makes darker bodies easy targets of racism. Similar to Fanon, the student would be given space but restricted at the same time since this space is a mark of exclusion. Whenever the whole school gathered for the evening prayer, one would witness the daily (normalized) operation of racism. According to Alexander Weheliye, racism is “the ordinary means through which dehumanization achieves ideological normality” (2014, 72). Discrimination against this student was not abnormal. In fact, it was encouraged since even the teachers were also part the bullying. The daily play of racism would unfold as follows. Students would refuse to stand next

to him out of fear that his Blackness would envelop them. Whoever is next to this student would try to change his place. This play would continue until the prayer started in which the “unlucky” student would have to endure standing next to the Black student. This student was given space. Yet, he was so restricted and ostracized that after a while, he never showed up to school again.

#### **4. Visible and Invisible Bodies between Hate and Love**

All the Sartrean attitudes of love, masochism, inference, desire, sadism, and hate are directed towards an Other—an Other who we might perceive as a consciousness, body, or object. In the case of Black people, they also have the abstract possibility to take these attitudes towards their white Other. However, according to Gordon, certain Blacks take certain attitudes and aim them towards their own bodies. In fact, according to Fanon, Blacks cannot aim any of the Sartrean attitudes against their white Other since the Black person is always in a “relationship of transcendence” (117). Describing this inequality, Fanon writes, “[the application of the Sartrean attitudes] to the Black consciousness proves fallacious because the white man is not only ‘the Other’ but also the master, whether real or imaginary” (117). The Black person is “incapable of confronting the [white] Other” (92). This is because the Black person is oppressed. Thus, the only thing remaining for the Black individual is to direct these Sartrean attitudes against him- or herself. Now, the only option the Black person has is to direct an attitude of indifference, sadisms, or hate against his own body. Fanon acknowledges this possibility. He thinks that the Black person can just “assimilate” or live in “denial” (94). As a result, in applying these attitudes to oneself, the Black person will be able to enact a kind of denial against his Blackness. However, in order to have any attitude directed towards our bodies, we must stand against our

bodies as if they are an object to us. Our bodies need to transform from the “center of our possibility” or the for-itself, to be a being-for-others, an object that we can love, hate, or desire (Sartre 1947, 481). For us to treat our bodies as a foreign object, one needs to totally disassociate from one’s body.

The discovery of our bodies as an object to us is a common everyday experience. For example, when the flow of a daily activity is hindered by an injury, I am suddenly aware of the injured organ. My injured leg or hand becomes suddenly visible to me. It is at the forefront of attention instead of receding to the background (Dolezal 2005, 25).

There are levels to the visibility or the disassociation from our bodies. When my foot is wounded, I am aware of it as my injured foot. However, the foot is still absent from my “explicit total awareness” (26). The left injured foot is present to my consciousness but still absent. In other words, even though I am aware of my foot (which is due to the pain that it is causing me), I am not consciously aware of every intricate move that my foot takes. There is a “flow” that is hidden to me. There is a body schema that I developed all my life that I follow without explicit thinking. Dolezal writes, “the body schema is a system of motor and postural functions that are in constant operation below the level of self-conscious intentionality. In the most basic sense, the body schema is the subject’s non-cognitive awareness of its position” (2015, 22). Thus, even though I am consciously aware of my injured foot, there is still a flow that hidden to me that allows to move my injured foot. On the other hand, in learning new skills such as driving or skating, I must focus on all the details for some time in order to develop a new body schema. Now, I am aware of every placement of hand or foot. The process will continue until I develop a kind of flow—a learned body schema. However, according to Dolezal, there are instances in

which people are unable to enter into any flow due to rare brain injuries (2015, 26). In these instances, the person can never attain this flow. Dolezal mentions the case of Ian Waterman who is suffering from “large fiber peripheral neuropathy,” which means that he needs to see himself so that he can perform an action (26). Moreover, in addition to the visual requirements, he needs “constant mental concentration” (26). Thus, he is doubly aware of and focused on his body. First, he needs to extremely focus on each move. Second, he must see himself doing these moves in order to be able to orient these moves in space.

This case of Waterman helps us understand the experience of Black people and their bodies which is essential in their experience of being-for-others since their being-for-others is a racialized body. We can describe Waterman’s case as a case of a total dissociation between the mind and the body. Waterman is moving his body as if he is moving a foreign body.

Analogously, Gordon describes a similar process of dissociation that a Black person must experience. According to Gordon, the Black “has taken the transcendent position toward his body. His body is frozen under the force of the look, the force by which his body ends up standing in relation to itself as the Other” (1995, 104/105). Fanon echoed a similar sentiment of feeling alienated from his Black body when he wrote, “the image of one’s body is solely negating. It’s an image in the third person. All around the body reigns an atmosphere of certain uncertainty” (2008, 90). Thus, Black persons undergo a process of disassociation from their bodies. They see their bodies from the outside as bodies that do not belong to them. Their bodies, thus, become too visible so that they are seen as alien objects to the Black person. Now, they can assume these Sartrean attitudes not against their white Other but themselves.

### *Self-Hate*

Hate is the source of the dissociation that Blacks feel in relation to their being-for-others. It is this hate that ultimately enables the Black person to direct the Sartrean attitudes against her own body. Since Blackness is the deviation from whiteness, to be black is not optimal. Gordon writes, “The more present a black is, the more absent is this ‘something.’ And the more absent a black is, the more present is this something” (98). This something that is lacking is whiteness, freedom, subjectivity, or humanity. According to Yancy, the black person is not simply different, but he or she is a total Other, a different kind, dehumanized (2017, 37). As described by Fanon, the Black person is seen as “primitive or a subhuman” (2008, 109). To be Black is not a simple “variety” of the human genome (Curran 2017, 142). Voltaire, one of the French philosophers of the Enlightenment, saw Blacks as totally different in that they are considered a different species than white people (145). This makes Blackness something to eliminate. Blackness becomes an unwanted attribute. I call the process of eliminating Blackness self-hate.

This hate of the Black self is aptly described by Audre Lorde who grew up in the United States in the 1930s and 40s, which was a time and place that hated Blackness. She describes a number of occasions in which hatred was inflicted upon her. The famous encounter is with the white woman on a train. Describing her encounter with a racist white woman, Lorde writes, “I look at the side of my snow pants, secretly. Is there something on them? Something’s going on here I do not understand, but I will never forget it. Her eyes. The flared nostrils. The hate” (Lorde 2007, 148). Similarly, Lorde described a similar experience of hate when she was at school, and a young kid bullied her because of her “braided hair” (148). Also, she recounted the



experience of the bus driver who would smile to everyone except her (148). Placing these various experiences as a source of Lorde's self-hate, she writes,

From that moment [of conception] on, we have been steeped in hatred—for our color, for our sex, for our effrontery in daring to presume we had any right to live. As children, we absorbed that hatred, passed it through ourselves, for the most part, we still live our lives outside of the recognition of what that hatred really is and how it functions. (146)

The repeated instance of discrimination did not go unnoticed. The hatred that she was forced to experience turned into self-hate. She hates her race, skin color, and sex.

The Black person is confronted with the experience of being-for-others as raced which carries with it the values of inferiority, criminality, and impurity. It is the white Other who creates and maintains this experience of being-for-others for Blacks. Now, we now have hate as the consequence. This hate signals and reinforces the visibility and the separation between the Black person and his or her body. A hated body can never be invisible and can never recede to the background (Dolezal 2015, 25). As I hate my body as Black person, I will be hyperaware of this hated matter.

#### *Double-Consciousness as a Consequence of Self-Hate*

As the Black person hates his or her body, he or she is accepting the Other's consciousness. As a consequence, the concept of double-consciousness is important as it helps us understand the mechanics of self-hate and precisely how Black people could be able to hate themselves; more importantly, the Black experience was historically described as a kind a struggle of double consciousness. In America, we can see the concept of double consciousness in the writing of W. E. B. Du Bois. Du Bois writes:

One ever feels his two-ness, an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (2014, 34)

Here, Dubois describes the burden of assuming both an American consciousness and an African consciousness. The original interpretation of the quote is that the freed slaves in the northern United States at the time did not feel comfortable with their American identity because they saw that this newly acquired American identity was unwelcoming to them. They saw the American identity with its ideals of freedom and equality as inapplicable to them as Americans with African descent. On the one hand, they were American and free, and on the other hand, they were of African descent and thus unfree as well as inferior, which was similar to their brothers and sisters in the antebellum South. The two sides of his identity were theoretically at odds with each other, and the powerful struggle between these opposing identities causes the fragmentation within Black bodies.

Gordon modifies Du Bois' double consciousness by changing the terms from the national and regional identities of American and African to the racial ones of Black and white. Now, the African-American is torn between his Black and white consciousness. Moreover, Gordon argues that a Black person is not simply uncertain about his white consciousness but in fact that they have accepted this white consciousness in bad faith (1995, 116). For the body of Northern free blacks to be "torn asunder," the opposite poles—American and African—must be pushing toward the opposite direction with equal force (Du Bois 2014, 34). Regardless, in Gordon's double consciousness of Black and white, the white consciousness wins. As a result, the dark body is intact but hated. The African-American is not torn between his two identities. He is a white who hates his Black body.

The adaptation of this white consciousness is what enables the Black person to be able to see his Black body as the “Other” (Gordon 1995, 105). Moreover, this adaptation of the white consciousness is what enables the Black person to hate his Black body. In the anti-black world in which we live, Blackness and whiteness does not necessarily entail the light and dark bodies that we come to associate with them. According to Gordon, there could’ve been a white race who did not have a light body or a Black race that did not have a dark body (95). In a sense, whiteness and Blackness are placeholder terms for the standard and deviation therein. As a result, since whiteness is the standard, behind every Black person, there is a *de facto* white consciousness that he or she assumes. Moreover, since it is logical to assume that a white consciousness comes from a white body, the Black person who has a de facto white consciousness will have to see his body as a foreign body. He or she will come to stand over his or her body as the Other.

Moreover, since the Black person must assume a white consciousness which separates him from his or her body, he must hate his or her body. He must hate this body that is not really his or hers—a body that is inferior, criminal, and dangerous. Returning to the debate of double consciousness, the Black person in the anti-black world transforms from two consciousnesses to a body and a consciousness—a white consciousness and a hated Black body. Gordon, in describing the Black person, writes, “He ‘is’ only the black-body-as-seen-by-others. There is no black consciousness from the standpoint of an anti-black world” (116). Fanon had a similar take on the Black consciousness when he wrote,

The dialectic that introduces necessity as a support for my freedom expels me from myself. It shatters my impulsive position. Still regarding consciousness, black consciousness is immanent in itself. I am not a potentiality of something I am fully what I am. I do not have to look for the universal. There’s no room for probability inside me. My black consciousness does not claim to be a loss. It is. It merges with itself. (2008, 114)

In other words, the for-itself or consciousness of the Black person is not a Sartrean negating consciousness. It is simply “is” (114). It is fixed and predetermined like his or dark body; the consciousness of the black individual is in fact his or her dark body. Fannon writes, “Yes, we niggers are backward, naïve, and free. For us, the body is not in opposition to what you call the soul. We are in the world” (2008, 106). Thus, because there is no Black consciousness, the Black consciousness transforms into a body. What remains is the white consciousness that is free now to dominate the Black body. As a result of this opposition and the de facto win of the white consciousness, the Black body even to the Black person becomes something to go against, to hate, and to discard. Thus, the Black person loses in the life or war between freedoms. All he can do now is to hate and destroy him- or herself.

*Racism: Between Agency and Freedom*

Gordon describes a number of experiences that shows that Blacks hate their Blackness. He gave examples of Blacks who use the “N word” and those who inflict violence against other Blacks (1995, 105). However, Gordon thinks that these Blacks are in bad faith. They accepted the metaphysical duality of whiteness as the standard of humanity and Blackness as the deviation. Moreover, they accepted that their dark bodies are Black bodies. In a way, the Black person is also anti-black racist. He also hates his body and wants to be distanced from his body.

However, I argue that this concept of self-hate that is present in the experiences of Gordon and Lorde is an experience that shows the agency of the Black individual. It is a common phenomenon to advocate for self-love. Self-love is the goal of many people. However, when the self becomes infused with inferiority, criminality, and impurity, to hate oneself is a way

to affirm one's agency. If the self that is given is a public but a "contaminated" self, why should I not hate this self? (Weiss 2014, 226). Thus, the process of self-hate is negative but constructive. This is because what is always at the end of the process of self-hate is the Black person as continuous negation. Fanon, who describes the existence of the Black person as negation, writes, "the image of one's body is solely negating" (2008, 90). At the end of the process of self-hate, I am given back to myself as negation. I finally become a sort of for-itself. I become aware of myself as the Black person in the process of losing his or her Blackness.

On the other hand, Gordon disagrees. He thinks that at the end of the process of self-hate, the Black person will just be more aware of his or her Blackness. Gordon writes,

The irony of his situation is that the very effort to transcend his Blackness makes him "blacker" than ever. Assuming an anti-black stand makes Blackness low, how low can he step beyond betraying himself by supporting what which militates against his humanity? "Nigger" preserves the racism which he hopes to evade by reinforcing it. (1995, 108)

To Gordon, negation through hate for the Black person who suffers from the Gordonian double consciousness becomes a way to know oneself as a Black person. In the passage quoted above, Gordon gives the example of Blacks who affirm their Blackness by denying it using the "N word" (116). This tactic is kind of a linguistic sadism in which the Black person tortures him- or herself linguistically to separate him- or herself from his or her Blackness (108). This movement towards separation is the moment in which the Black person becomes more aware of his or her Blackness; he or she becomes "blacker" (108).

I disagree with Gordon that at the end of the process of negation that the Black person would be simply aware of his Blackness more than ever. Such characterizations simplify the situation. I affirm Gordon's initial analysis of the situation. In using the "N word," they deny that this word affects them, and they affirm that there is a separation between them and the "N word."

They are not the “N word” (108). They are “not this kind of black” (106). They are not this deviation from the standard. They are white. In other words, they are the standard of humanity. To say that a Black person becomes “blacker” is a slap on the face for the agency of the Black individual. At the end of the process of negating, the Black person would be aware of him- or herself as the in negation of their Blackness. Thus, Gordon is correct in saying that in fleeing Blackness, the connection between dark bodies and Blackness is clear and indisputable.

However, what he is blind to is the fact the Black person in self-hate will only be aware of his or her Blackness as he or she escapes his or her Blackness. He or she will be aware of his or her Blackness as a kind of facticity and as something to escape.

Moreover, for Black people to have the ability to deny their Blackness is not to say that they have a freedom. In other words, Blacks have agency but not a freedom. Agency is our ability to act in a certain situation. I see freedom as additional to agency which is more fundamental but limited. We all have the agency to kill ourselves, but we do not all have the freedom to free speech. Blacks have the agency to take actions against their race but not the freedom of choice to not be racialized in the first place. Sartre problem is that he equates agency with freedom. Sartre writes,

Thus we shall not say that a prisoner is always free to go out of prison, which would be absurd, nor that he is always free to long for release, which would be an irrelevant truism, but that he is always free to try to escape (or get himself liberated); that is, that whatever his condition may be, he can project his escape and learn the value of his project by undertaking some action. (1956, 484)

The the fact that a prisoner of war could kill himself or try to escape is a sign of freedom for Sartre. However, according to Herbert Marcuse, “the free choice between death and enslavement is neither freedom nor choice, because both alternatives destroy the ‘*réalité humaine*’ which is

supposed to be freedom” (1948, 322). Marcuse, here, qualifies choice. For choice to be a sign of freedom, it must a good choice—a choice that preserves our humanity. Thus, Marcuse would think that for Blacks to be able negate their Blackness, it is a sign of agency but not a sign of choice or freedom. The ability to take actions in the case of blacks is not freedom since it is the only option and a very costly option at that. The cost is the whole identity of the Black individual. Moreover, as will be discussed later, all the acts of escaping one’s Black body will fail. Thus, the Black person has agency that is doomed for failure. This failure of even destroying oneself is what is problematic for the situation of Black people—not the fact that they try to transcend their Blackness.

Here, we are introduced the problem of the Black identity and its relation to racism. Is Black identity equal to racism? Is Black identity equal to inferiority, criminality, and impurity? Gail Weiss wants a clear separation between the identities such as the Black or Jewish and anti-black racism or anti-Semitism. Weiss writes:

Crediting the other with the ability to define one’s identity (and in such overwhelmingly negative terms!), not only eviscerates the agency of those who are oppressed by the other’s essentializing descriptions, but also forecloses some of the inherent ambiguity that, I am claiming, always attends each of these identities, giving too much power to the hostile other to define the parameters of one’s embodied existence, thereby denying the spontaneous, unpredictable, and life-affirming dimensions of these experiences even when they are also attended with great suffering. (2014, 225)

Thus, the Black identity for Weiss is not the racism that he or she encounters. To Weiss, the experience of racism is a fundamental experience to the Black identity, but it is not the Black identity in its entirety. Therefore, the Black person is what he makes out these experiences to be. Weiss, as opposed to Gordon, is trying to salvage the Blackness. Blackness is not simply the

deviation from the standard, but it is the identity of the Black people. The Black identity is much more than racism.

Historically, race is a new concept. To associate Black skin, for example, with certain characteristics such as inferiority is a relatively new development. Differences in skin color were simply seen as “insignificant corollaries to [an] environmental shift in color” (Curran 2017, 127). Race as an “authoritative” and “naturalizing” concept was created in the era of slavery as a justification for enslaving Africans. Race based on phenotypic descriptions, according to Alexander Weheliye, is a justification for unjust political and economic relations (2014, 71). Thus, race was created to mask unjust political and economic relations. In other words, race is an easier way to keep and maintain political and economic oppression and injustice. It is easier for the racist to justify his oppression by claiming people who look in certain ways are inferior and thus deserve to be forced to remain in a lower economic and political class. There has never been a time in history when there was race without racism (Weheliye 2014, 73). Thus, I disagree with Weiss that Black identity is separate from the metaphysical Blackness which is the deviation from metaphysical whiteness. Metaphysical whiteness and Blackness are concepts that are used by Gordon to describe how light and dark bodies came to be seen. In the anti-Black world, there is the assumption that there is a standard of humanity which metaphysical whiteness and the deviation from the standard which is the metaphysical Blackness. Thus, Blackness in itself does not exist. Blackness only exists in relation to whiteness. Blackness was created to discriminate against people with dark bodies. Even Fanon supports that the black identity is a political identity (Jules-Rosette 2007, 280).



However, I agree that the identity of the Black experience is richer than the experience of racism. Even if the Black identity is created by the white Other, it does not mean that it remains wholly the creation of the white Other. Of course, the person with the dark body took this imposed identity and made it her own. However, this does not also prevent the possibility for a future liberation in which the Black identity have no use since all humanity will be equal.

This is why it is difficult to privilege self-love over self-hate or vice-versa. Since dark bodies are intimately linked with this concept of Blackness, to hate our Blackness is also to hate our dark bodies. However, to love one's body also means to love one's Blackness which is problematic. Is it possible to hate one's identity without hating one's body and culture? Is it possible to love one's body and culture without loving one's inferiority? These questions are crushed by the fact that the Black person can only apply the Sartrean attitudes against his own body.

### **5. The Black Experience of Being-for-Others and Self-Hate**

We have determined that when the Black person experiences his being-for-others as Black, he experiences certain negative characterizations such as inferiority, criminality, and impurity. This experience leads to self-hate and consequently to an experience of double-consciousness. This makes the Black person have agency but removes his or her freedom. This is because the Black person lacks good choices. With the adaptation of the white consciousness that hates his dark body, his only choice is hate. Thus, the Black person attempts in self-hate to deny his dark body. I chose the body as the locus of hate because it is the fundamental component Blackness. Blackness is simply a description of this dark body. The

inferiority and the culture of the Black person can only be reached through his or her association with the dark body. Thus, when the Black person attempts to hate his body, he is also attempting to hate his inferiority and culture.

The Black person attempts to eliminate his Blackness/body by using the Sartrean attitudes of indifference, sadism, and hate. These attitudes are in the second camp of the Sartrean attitudes in which we aim to reduce the Other into an object so that we can preserve our own freedom/subjectivity. These are objectifying and negative attitudes that the Black person takes in relation to his or her body. However, for the self-hating Black, these attitudes are bittersweet because they are aimed at his or her body which is the locus of his inferiority and culture.

To direct these attitudes against one's dark body is possible because as mentioned previously, there is separation between the Black person and his body. Suddenly, the Black person can use these attitudes as if he is the white Other of his own body. Another component that adds to the separation between the Black person and his or her body is the fact that he or she is "raw desire" (Gordon 1995, 100).

### *Raw Desire and Frustration*

Before starting with the first negative attitude of indifference, I would like to introduce Gordon's concept of raw desire which is essential in the experience of being-for-others as self-hating Blacks. More importantly, it is essential in keeping the separation between Black people and their bodies. Gordon thinks that "Blacks, on the other hand, being Absence, being pure lack, become raw desire" (1995, 100). In other words, "raw desire" means that the desire of the Black person can never be satisfied. Since to be a Black is to signify a lack of

freedom/whiteness, Blacks are not desired. Blackness by default is a deviation from the standard, and thus, they are fundamentally the opposite of desire. Gordon writes, “For the black to seek himself as a black seems to be a warped desire to frustrate desire” (104). Thus, there is an eternal frustration of the desire of Black people—an eternal hell-like predicament.

To understand this concept of “raw desire” which is a complex and multifaceted concept, it is necessary to understand Sartre’s concept of desire. Desire to Sartre is one of the attitudes that we take in relation to our Other. In the most fundamental sense, desire is “a state of the body” (Sartre 1956, 54). The body has multiple states of desire. For Sartre, sex, eating, and drinking are examples of bodily desires.

Sexual desire, which is a type of desire, is the central focus for Sartre. To Sartre, desire is one of the fundamental modes of consciousness. He argues that “consciousness chooses itself as desire” (Sartre 1956, 51). This conception of desire as a primordial mode of consciousness is illustrated when Sartre differentiates between sexual desire and intercourse. Sexual desire is more fundamental than any particular actions such as intercourse, kissing, or hugging. To Sartre, the “doing’ is after the event” of desire (51). Desire is before the “doing;” desire is consciousness. Desire is the original want itself of a transcendent object—an object outside of consciousness.

However, according to Sartre, different kinds of consciousnesses have different relations to their facticity. To Sartre, one of the meanings of facticity is the body and its difference different status?. Synonymous with our bodily states, facticity has two dimensions: for-others and for-itself. The for-others is how others perceive our bodily states. For example, when we are aroused, people will perceive this arousal as, for example, “the turgescence of the nipples of the

breast” or the “rise in temperature” (Sartre 1956, 504). On the other hand, facticity as the for-itself is the way in which I experience my own facticity from the first-person perspective. For when I am hungry, this hunger is experienced by me as “a facticity discovered in a perpetual flight” (503). In a sense, I discover my hunger in my state of transcending this hunger. To be hungry is always a signal to satisfy that hunger.

However, not every experience of our bodily states/desires are experienced the same. Sartre writes, “Every consciousness, as we have seen, supports a certain relation with its own facticity. But this relation can vary from one mode of consciousness to another” (503). In sexual desire, which is the desire of a transcendent body, my relation to my facticity is not a relation of “flight” (Sartre 1956, 503). Thus, in desire, I do not escape my desiring facticity. In sexual desire, I become my body. Sartre described this desiring consciousness as “clogged” or “disturbed” (503). Sartre writes, “it seems that one is invaded by facticity, that one ceases to flee it and that one slides toward a passive consent to the desire” (504). Sexual desire “takes hold of you, that is overwhelms you, that it paralyzes you” (504).

This concept of “clogged” consciousness gives an entire new clarification to the concept of raw desire (Sartre 1956, 503). Since to be a “raw desire” is to be a desire that is by definition unsatisfiable, the Black person’s consciousness is “clogged” or “troubled” by his or her facticity (Gordon 1995, 100). The Black person as “raw desire” does not fly away from his desire but wants to be one with it. He wants to be a body.

However, the Black person can never attain the status of a “clogged” consciousness (Sartre 1956, 503). The Black person is only in pursuit of such a consciousness. However, the Black person can never “exist” his body/facticity. As we have seen in the previous section, the

only relation that the Black person has with his body is an alienated relation. The Black person sees his body as if he or she is the white Other to that dark body.

In order for the Black person to achieve the full potential of his clogged consciousness, he or she must be desired back. He or she must be touched and caressed. Sartre writes, “In desire and in caress which expresses desire, I incarnate myself in order to realize the incarnation of the Other” (Sartre 1956, 508). Thus, the Black person wants to achieve the impossible and be “caressed” so that his or her consciousness can be clogged (503). He or she wants to give up on the world and submit to desire and to exist carnally.

A touch from a Black woman should incarnate herself and incarnate the Black man as a dark body that is his or hers. Her touch should be more than enough for both of them to end their alienation from their bodies. Her touch should remind her and him that they are Black people with Black bodies. However, according to Gordon, since the self-hating Black is in bad faith, he or she accepts the superiority of whiteness over Blackness (1995, 96). Fanon echoed this point when he wrote, “the white gaze, the only valid one, is already dissecting me. I am fixed” (2008, 95). Thus, the white gaze or touch is the only wanted touch. The Black person wants to be desired only by a white man and then by a white woman (100). Their caress is the only effective one.

A hypothesis for the ineffectiveness of the “caress” of the Black woman is the historical view of her as hyper-sexual and promiscuous—as a pure object of pleasure. In the travelogues of European travelers to West and Central Africa, the Black woman was an object with the sole function to work and to allure the Black man into sexuality and laziness (Curran 2017, 10). Then, if the Black man is seen as a hole or lack, she is even more of a hole or lack. She becomes her

own hole and completely disappears (Gordon 1995, 124). Thus, as she tries to touch him, she sinks into him, and as he tries to touch her, he sinks into her. The separation between the Black and his or her body is still maintained. As they try to caress their bodies, they are still alienated from their bodies. They will see their encounter as two historical Black bodies that are touching, bodies that belong in the realm of myth. Thus, because of this internalized hate that is promoted by racism, the pair will view their encounter as if it was a play that they are watching from the outside.

However, even if the Black man, for example, was desired by a white woman, he would still not be reincarnated into a flesh/body that is his body/flesh. Her caress will never stop his alienation and will instead make him realize that this Black body is his Black body. She will never gently caress his body to affect the “reciprocity of incarnation which was precisely the unique goal of desire” (517). According to Gordon, since the anti-black world is also sexist, masculinity and superiority are interlinked (1995, 126). Thus, the white woman is more powerful than the Black man which makes her more masculine. She now has a penis, and he is a “hole.” The Black man is a hole/lack/unfree in which the white female becomes “the white/male that fills his Blackness/femininity” (127). Her soft caresses are violent penetrations. Her penetrative caresses stop him and her to be incarnated as bodies. Sartre writes, “But by the very fact that I now attempt to seize the Other’s body, to pull it toward me, to grab hold, to bite it, my own body ceases to be flesh” (516). Her desire for the Black man is the desire of “taking and of penetration,” even if she is only caressing him (516). Her caress emasculates him and affirms his Blackness. Thus, he remained frustrated in his desire to be a dark body. He remains the Black

man who lives as the spectra of whiteness with an attached but alien Black body. He remains “raw desire” (100).

Of course, these descriptions are metaphors. Between him and her, her caresses are simply human touches. Idealistically, her caresses should be able to incarnate him and her. He wants to forget himself in her intoxicating touch and smell. He wants to press his flesh against her flesh which “is the true goal of desire” (Sartre 1956, 515). He wants to finally exist as his Black body and to fulfill his desire to be his body—to stop this eternal flight of his for-itself. He wants to acquire her and to be with her, now, at this moment. He wants the clock to stop for eternity. However, the third Other, the spectator, takes them out of their private encounter. The third Other alienates their concrete possibilities in the situation. The for-others of their situation triumphs over the for-itself. The for-others of their encounter is of an inferior rapist and superior victim. To Others, he is using her whiteness to fill the “holes” of his Blackness. He needs her more than she needs him. In this racist world, she is the provider of whiteness. She is the man. She is his victim which everyone is so ready to protect.

To be correct, her caresses are healing but damaging. As she caresses him, there is a momentary identification of the Black man with his body. They are both incarnated and chained to the “reciprocity” of their incarnations (Sartre 1956, 515). They become one with their contingency. He would tell himself, “There is no place on Earth that I want to be than to be here. I am this Black man.” Sartre, in describing the goal of the lover, writes, “My goal is to cause him to be incarnated as flesh in his own eyes” (514). Thus, as she caresses him, she looks deeply into his eyes waiting to see him identified with his body, waiting to see the realization on his face that he is caressed by her. He looks at her with a look that reverberates her attention back to her.

However, as her caresses inevitably turn into penetrations, she de-incarnates the Black man out from his body again. The reality of the situation will hit both of them. To Sartre, penetration ends caress because it takes the Other from the states of an incarnated flesh that is “possessed” by a freedom to a mere object in which its freedom escapes the caresser (517). To penetrate the Other is to objectify this Other that this Other becomes a pure object without consciousness. As he is being violated by her penetrations/race/whiteness, he suddenly loses his flesh. His white consciousness appears again, and his body turns again to a “visible body” that he experiences as the Other. Again, he begins to move his body as if it was an external body. He returns to his default mode of self-hate.

But can the Black man look at her from afar to incarnate her and himself? Can he discover his body by looking at her from afar? It is conceivable that the Black man would say to himself, “If she has a body that belongs to her, then I must have a body that belongs to me. This Black body must be my own body.” Sartre equated the caressing eyes with the caressing touch when he wrote, “to caress with the eyes and to desire is the same” (1956, 507). The problem is that the Black person is seen as a person with no eyes to look. Gordon describes instances in which the Black man was accused of rape by just looking at the white women (1995, 102). She is his salvation out of bodily dissociation; however, he is forced to look down or to side but never at her. The white Other knows that she is ready to “betray” her whiteness—to look at him looking at her and reciprocate the caressing gazes with him (Gordon 1995, 126). The white Other sees how they look at each other and how they are ready to be lost in each other’s eyes while being incarnated from a distance but with equal sensuality. Thus, disciplined by fear, torture, and



violence, the Black person cannot even look to caress, and his and her bodily dissociation continues and self-hate.

Therefore, in this state of frustrated caress, in which the Black experiences him- or herself in an eternal state of running after the fulfilment “clogged” / “troubled” consciousness, the self-hating Black person remains the Other of his or her body. In his or her frustration, the Black person discovers the futility of desire. This forces the Black person to take the Sartrean attitudes of indifference, sadism, and hate not against his white Other but against his own Black body.

### *Indifference*

I would like to start with the attitude of indifference since it is the *de facto* attitude for the self-hating Black. Self-hating Blacks are the ones who engage in the Sartrean attitudes not to affirm their Blackness but to deny their Blackness. They are the Blacks who engage in indifference, desire, sadism, and hate to negate themselves as well as erase their Blackness. Gordon claims that a Black person in bad faith negates himself. He writes, “If consciousness is a foundation of nihilating objects, then the possibility of consciousness attempting to nihilate itself is raised. Is there a similar situation when Blackness reflects its Blackness as Absence upon itself”? (1995, 104) Thus, the self-hating Black aims his negating consciousness upon him- or herself so that he or she erases his or her own consciousness; he or she erases his or her own Blackness.

The attitude of indifference marks the first Sartrean attitude in which I aim to objectify the other and assert my freedom. Sartre defines it as a kind of “blindness with respect to others”

(1956, 495). The Other's look suddenly does not cause any negative emotions such as alienation or shame. According to Sartre, in indifference, I am "self-confident; that is, I am in no way conscious of the fact the Other's look can fix my possibilities and my body" (496). Thus, in this attitude, I am finally at peace. This feeling of peace can go on forever. To Sartre, there are some people who will never experience the negative emotions regarding their being-for-others (496). They will go on living unaware of their being-for-others.

The self-hating Black feels a kind of "blindness" not over his or her white Other but his own Blackness/dark body. He is "self-assured" that he is not Black anymore (Sartre 1956, 495). The par excellence example given by Gordon of the self-hating Black who is in blindness against his own Blackness/dark body is of Black person who thinks he is white when he is surrounded by only white people. Gordon writes,

One wonders what truth such black are turned from when they enter rooms where-there-are-no-niggers. They are seduced by the situation. White eyes, behaving in their mundanity, seem to see nothing wrong. The interplay of illusion—the black's presence indulges white denial of racism ('This is how I behave with other whites as well'); the lack of other blacks' presence indulges black denial of there being black presence at all ('No white is saying or acting as though I'm not one of them; therefore, I must be one of them'). Black eyes—awful, truthful eyes—stop, gaze, acknowledge: You are one of us. There it is. In the flesh. The mirror image. (1995, 113)

This self-hating Black is ready to give up his Blackness. The white Other's feigned or real indifference towards this Black person's Blackness makes him- or her affirm his indifference to his own Blackness. He is white and free. To use Fanon's terminology, he or she is in "denial" (Fanon 2008, 94/99). Because they are treated normally, there is no racism and discrimination in the world. He or she is in denial of his or her dark bodies.

However, and similar to every Sartrean attitude, there is a moment in which the attitude fails, and we began to experience our being-for-others. While we are in the traditional Sartrean

attitude of indifference to the Other, we begin, according to Sartre, to feel anxiety and uneasiness (1956, 497). Since indifference is a purposeful “blindness” to what the Other thinks of us, we begin to feel uneasy about what this Other thinks of us. We suddenly reach the conclusion that distancing ourselves from the Other’s look may not be the best choice and that controlling the Other’s freedom/look is a better option in handling our being-for-others (497). Thus, suddenly, my experience of being-for-others returns again to be an experience of objectification, alienation, and shame.

For Blacks who adopt the attitude of self-hate, indifference will fail, but for different reasons. It fails even before it starts. Since the only kind of indifference the Black person is able to direct is against him or herself, indifference against the white Other’s racist perspective is an impossible attitude. This is because for the Black to be indifferent about his own Blackness/freedom, he is mostly in bad faith; he must hold the fundamental premise of the anti-black world of the superiority of white people and inferiority of Black people. Thus, both are given at some stroke. The self-hating Black is indifferent about his own freedom/perspective and fully accepts the perspective of his white Other.

This fundamental failure of indifference is followed by another failure of indifference. As the self-hating Black is indifferent about his own body/Blackness, he will suddenly realize that such indifference is motivated by a more fundamental freedom—the self-negating freedom. Again, the Black person will realize that what is under his attempt to negate himself is his original freedom of self-hate. Whitney claims that the moment in which the Black person realizes that he is the cause of horror in the eyes of his white Other is the moment in which he becomes a Black person (2015, 5). In an analogous way, the Black person will come to know

him- or herself in the flight from Blackness/body. Thus, for the self-hating Black, indifference will fail because there is a moment in which the Black person will realize that he or she is the one who is choosing to be indifferent. The Black person will realize that his attitude of blind indifference towards his or her own body is a purposeful ignorance. He or she realizes that it is by his or her free choice that he or she ignores their bodies.

It seems that indifference to the self-hating Black is a spiral out of control. As the self-hating Black experiences his constructive “debased” freedom of self-negation, he would want to attain that “freedom”/ body so that he could use it for his own wants and needs. However, as the self-hating Black discovers that his “freedom”/ body is a freedom that leads again to Blackness, he will again want to direct indifference toward that body/Blackness. Thus, the black person is imprisoned in a perpetual mode of indifference to his or her own body/Blackness, which, as mentioned before, is the main characteristic of self-hate. The Black body is his or her body, but for this body to remain separate, there needs to a continual renewal of an attitude of indifference towards the Black body.

The attempt of escaping Blackness/the dark body by indifference is a cause of guilt. To treat one’s body with indifference should arise in guilt. In addition to this guilt, since the self-hating Blacks will get glimpses of their fundamental negating freedom and their dark bodies, they will again experience their being-for-others as connected with inferiority, criminality, and impurity. Thus, this announces the failure of indifference of the self-hating Blacks to their bodies and gestures to them to take an opposing attitude.

*Sadism*

Sadism is an example of this second attitude in which I objectify the Other in order to control his or her freedom. Sadism is similar to love in that I am still attempting to preserve the Other's freedom because the Other's freedom is essential in controlling my being-for-others. Since the Other is always a "beyond," my anxiety will always exist in the presence of the Other (Sartre 1956, 529). In sadism, which is different than desire, the sadist uses instruments of force rather than the magic of love or "caress" to compel his or her Other "to identify itself with the tortured flesh" (523). Thus, by incarnating the Other into flesh that is "possessed" by a freedom, I am suddenly in control of my Other's freedom since this freedom is now an embodied freedom (516). As the sadist grabs her with gloved hands and tortures her into submission, he is now alleviated from the ambiguity of his being-for-others. Now, all he needs is to control this freedom or body. Now, he needs to know all the tricks that all the sadists know. His being-for-others is now within his or her power.

What differentiates sadism from desire is that the sadist is using instruments of torture to ensure the separation between him- or herself and the masochist object. The sadist will use tools such as whips or bats to incarnate his Other as a flesh that "ensnare[s] her freedom" (Sartre 1956, 508). In doing so, the sadist will achieve the same goal of desire of incarnating the Other while at the same time keeping his own flesh beyond his comprehension. For example, we see that the sadist will wearing gloves, masks, or body suits in order for his flesh not to touch hers. Flesh is a specific kind of body—a passive sexualized body that lacks movement (519). Accordingly, this separation between the sadist and the masochist is the precise meaning of sadism. The sadist, by separating his body from her body, ensures that the reciprocity of incarnations will be not

materialized since he blocks all the possibilities to be touched. He is not a flesh; he is purely a for-itself or transcendent.

Sartre thinks that the end of desire is the beginning of sadism and vice-versa (Sartre 1956, 517). Thus, when the inevitable fail of the reciprocity of desire comes into reality, sadism becomes the next option. Thus, the self-hating Black uses sadism now to break free from his hyper visible Black body from which he is attempting to escape. Returning to the encounter with the white woman, the black person will now return her violent penetrative caresses with his own violence or explosive desire. He begins to humiliate her—to turn her body into an “obscene” body (524). With the help of tools that he uses, he transforms her into a body without “grace” (522). The sadist revels in pleasure and amusement when she does the humiliating act herself as when she assumes the submissive position without him ordering her (523). Now, the Black person is only a white consciousness. He is not a Black body or anybody for that matter. He continually transcends his or her body using the body of his victim. He makes himself as pure for-itself while making her as pure “being-there” (525). She is nothing more than a toy to him.

However, sadism will fail because there is the inevitable “expulsion” of the Other’s look (1956 Sartre, 526). The sadist will realize that what he was torturing all along is a freedom, and thus, he is transformed from being a “look” to being “a looked-at-look” (476). Sartre writes, “for it in and through the Other’s absolute freedom, there exists a world in which there are sadism and instruments of torture and a hundred pretexts for being humiliated and for forswearing oneself” (526). Thus, as the self-hating Black tortures her, her freedom/whiteness explodes on his face. He realizes that he is Black and that is he is not free. He realizes that she is the one who is free. She is the who is toying with him. She is the one who creates him as a sadism. Her freedom is so

powerful that it objectifies him. His body is for her more than for him. Even as a sadist, he is nothing but an instrument for her. Again, she objectifies him not as Black person with a Black body but as a Black person in the process of negating his Blackness. He is objectified as a transcendence—a negative transcendence. Therefore, the Black person’s attempt to get rid of his or her body through sadism will fail. He or she will be reminded at the precise moment of the failure of sadism of his or her alienation from his or her body. There must be a moment in which it hits the Black person that he has this alienated body that he is trying hide through sadism. As she is performing the “obscene,” he will realize the absurdity of his attempt to separate himself from his Black body. Now, he or she will put the gloves to the side in search for a new way to eradicate the Black body for good.

### *Hate*

The final attitude that we take in relation to the Other is hate. Sartre thinks that in hate, there is a kind of “resignation” (Sartre 1956, 532). In hate, I lose all hope. In hate, my “for-itself abandons its claim to realize any union with the Other; it gives up using the Other as an instrument to recover its own being-in-itself. It wishes simply to rediscover a freedom without factual limits” (532). In other words, I begin to hate the Other when my attitudes of masochism and sadism fails. Hate raises when my attempts to be an object for the Other or to be a subjectivity confronting the Other as an object fails. Thus, I aim “to pursue the death of the Other” (532). In hate, I live alone with no other people. For in hate, I aim at the “destruction” of “all Others” (533). Since in my loneliness there is no Other, my being-for-others escapes me. I

am finally not alienated anymore. I am simply a being-for-itself. I live as “a totality detotalized, a pursuit which assigns to itself its own ends” (532).

For the self-hating Blacks, hate will be their final attempt to escape their Black bodies. In hate, the self-hating Black finally gets rid of his Black body for good. In hate, Sartre thinks that I hate the fact the Other is “transcendence transcended” (Sartre 1956, 532). In other words, I hate the Other even though I already transcended the Other. Even though our connection with the Other as “transcendence-transcended” is very limited since the Other is transcended/overcame by our subjectivity, the Other was a transcendent, and for that, I hate the Other (532). Similarly, although we describe the dissociation between Blacks and their Black bodies, there is still a hint of the connection between their white consciousness and Black bodies. Thus, the Black person attempts to “destroy” his or her own body to finally escape his Black body (533). He or she hopes to finally destroy the Black body and any remaining connections with it.

We can see Blacks attempting to transform their Black bodies using cosmetics and surgery into white bodies as an example of hate against the Black body. Now, the long-awaited unification between the mind and body is near. Now, the assumed white consciousness is going to be united with its assumed white body. Now, the Black person can achieve his or her ultimate goal of hate in which he or she can eradicate his or her Blackness and become the standard—a white human. The use of topical solutions such as make-up and weaves are a step toward the eradication of the Black body. However, it is in the practice of skin bleaching that the full meaning of self-hate comes into play. Yaba Blay presents skin bleaching as a phenomenon that is widespread and chronic in the larger community of Africa. Blay, while characterizing the extent of the use of these skin bleaching products, writes,



Seventy five percent of traders in Lagos, Nigeria; 52% of the population in Dakar, Senegal, 35% in Pretoria, South Africa; and 50% of the female population in Bamako, Mali all use skin bleaching products (2011, 5).

These numbers show the great extent to which this practice is widespread in Africa. In fact, Blay claims that the practice of “skin bleaching is nothing less than a way of life” for so many Africans (5).

However, hate is also primed to fail. The precise moment in which I annihilate my Other is the moment in which I am aware that there was an Other. I can only annihilate what was already there. Therefore, the hater will not be able to deny his being-for-others that he experienced in the past before annihilating his Other. In other words, his or her being-for-others “by slipping into the past becomes as an irremediable dimension of [himself]” (534).

Hate will also fail for the self-hating black. As the Black person tries to bleach his skin, he will realize that these efforts are futile. If he or she could escape his or her skin color, there is still other “black” features like the “flat nose” or “wool-like” hair (Curran 2017, 130). What is the Black person who bleaches his or her skin going to do against his or her inner Blackness? Even if the Black person, by using the miracles of science, became the next Michael Jackson and totally transformed him- or herself into a white person, he is still Black from the inside. He or she still has Black blood, bile, phlegm, skin, and sperm (124/127). He still carries deep within him- or her the disease of Blackness.

In the Enlightenment era, a cure for Blackness and whether there was a possibility for transformation from white to Black or vice-versa was possible was a topic for hot discussion. Some saw the “degradation” from white to Black as the only transformation possible (Curran 2017, 129). As they say, it is easy to damage what is perfect. However, on the other hand, Blacks

were “too damaged to be whites” (128). Channeling his racism, De Pauw writes, “the black African race had already suffered a tremendous amount of damage on the level of its anatomy” (128). Thus, Blacks can never be whites, even if they migrated into a colder climate. This lifts the only possibility for transformation for Blacks into whites through generations of mixing with whites.

However, even after generation after generation of Blacks who mix with whites in an attitude of self-hate and self-loathing, Blackness will still haunt these Blacks who are now whites. The generational effort to escape Blackness is but a sign that they are irredeemably and eternally linked to Blackness. Thus, even the most persistent form of generational self-hate fails, and the self-hating Black must now take another attitude to separate him- or herself from his or her Black body.

## **6. Black Collective Attitudes of Self-Love**

We have described the experience of being-for-others for the self-hating Blacks which direct the Sartrean attitudes of indifference, sadism, and hate against their own bodies. Thus, although the self-hating Blacks assume the Sartrean attitudes of indifference, sadism, and hate, they assume these attitudes masochistically against themselves. They assume these attitudes to deny, not to affirm, their dark bodies. Such an attitude of self-hate that is prevalent in the Black experience is an evidence of the failure of the individual Sartrean attitudes that aim at engagement of the Other.

Finally, I will describe the experience of being-for-others for Blacks who do not assume the attitude of self-hate—Blacks who want to transcend their oppression. For the self-loving

Black, he or she will assume the same attitudes of indifference, sadism, and hate. These attitudes are fundamental and inescapable attitudes. However, they will use these attitudes to affirm, not deny, their Black bodies.

What is peculiar about the attitudes that the self-loving Blacks take is that they are not simply individualistic attitudes but collective ones which signal the second failure of the individualistic Sartrean attitudes. The Black experience of being-for-others is not simply an individualistic experience, but it is a racial experience that encompasses an entire group of human beings. “The fact of Blackness” is not simply an arrangement of pernicious facts that affect a particular Black person, but it universally affects all Black people. This fact motivates and allows for the possibility for Blacks to take collective actions against their white Other. In fact, Herbert Marcuse thinks that it is absurd to think that a historical identity such as race, class, or gender are simply held or supported by the freedoms of individuals. To Marcuse, he is ready to acknowledge that these identities have meaning only for individuals even if they are not established by them. Of course, to a Black person, only a human consciousness makes sense—a for-itself. However, to Marcuse, these identities are created “by the action and reaction of specific social groups under specific historical conditions” (1948, 324). Thus, there is an element of historicity to these identities that is inescapable. In other words, there is a “concreteness” to these identities that transcend the particular for-itself/freedoms. According to Marcuse, this is the precise meaning of “existence precedes essence” (Sartre 2007, 20). To Marcuse, making unracialized and universal individuals into “historical subjects” is the precise meaning of our free enterprise (324). The white “Man” exists, and then, he freely creates himself and his racialized Other (Sartre 1946, 29). Thus, it is precisely because existence precedes essence that race could

be created. If race could not be created, then Sartre is wrong in saying that existence precedes essence. If race is an impossible, then we can say that essence precedes existence. Sartre is saying that a person has an essence to not be racialized which clearly false. According to Gordon, race and the consequences of race are real (1995, 95).

Moreover, the Black person's being-for-others/race/black body is not simply a being that is supported by particular individuals or a group of individuals but of the larger political structure. Thus, what unifies these attitudes, in addition to them being collective attitudes, is that they aim at the larger political system. They are attitudes that are carried through collective actions in the political and economic spheres to create a new history—to create new “historical subjects.” It is in these actions that the precise meaning of “existence precedes essence” comes to play (Sartre 2007, 20). “Man” or the Black person exists to “create” him- or herself—not as an individual but a new collective (21). Sartre believes that in creating myself, I created all humanity (23). Similarly, as the Black collective creates themselves anew, they create a new world—a world for them.

Sartre is not unaware of the situation of the Black person and the need for political action.

In *Black Orpheus*, Sartre writes,

The black man is a victim of [his or her race], inasmuch as he is black, in his role as colonized native or as a deported African. And since he is oppressed in his race and because of it, it is first of his race that it is necessary for him to take conscience. He must compel those who, during the centuries, have vainly attempted, because he was a Negro, to reduce him to the status of the beast to recognize him as a man. (1951, 223)

Sartre acknowledges that the Black person must transcend his or her race through political actions and not through intersubjective attitudes. The Black person is not simply oppressed because he or she faces an individuated sadistic Other who wants to objectify him and take his or

her freedom away. According to Sartre, the Black person's problem is his or her race. He or she must transcend his or her race not the Other. Therefore, the Black person's only real route of salvation is political action directing against one's racelization.

Moreover, what Sartre is presenting as constitutive of political action is not a simple challenge of the system but a total proletarian revolution. In his article "Materialism and Revolution," Sartre defines a revolution as an event that "occurs when a change of institutions is accompanied by a profound modification of property relations" (Sartre 1947, 167). Thus, the Sartrean revolution is a "radical" economic revolution in which the whole system is changed fundamentally (167). Only then, humanity as a whole will reach this Marxist utopia in which the concept of race would be useless.

Thus, we reach now the second failure of Sartre's approach to the problem of being-for-others for the Black person. Doing a survey on the collective actions that are taken by Blacks, one can easily see the failure of this revolutionary Sartrean attitude since all these collective attitudes are not revolutionary. Sartre himself even acknowledges the fact that the collective attitudes that the Black person takes are not revolutionary mostly because he or she is not "an integral part of" of the social system (Sartre 1947, 168). The Black person is a minority, and thus, he or she is not a revolutionary like the working class. More importantly, the Black person is not a revolutionary, according to Sartre, because his or her collective is not aimed to overhaul the political system. Sartre writes,

What the American Negroes and the bourgeois Jews desire is an equality of rights which in no way implies a change of property relations: They simply want a share in the privileges of their oppressors, in other words, they desire a more complete integration. (167)

Thus, according to Sartre, the Black person wants only to better his situation without a complete change of the system. Therefore, analyzing a number of collectives that Blacks take, we will realize that in certain cases the Black person only aims at assimilation and denial but not a fundamental change.

*The Civil Rights Movement and Collective Love*

One of the attitudes that Fanon presents to be available to Blacks is denial and assimilation. Describing assimilation and denial, Fanon writes,

I'll show them! They can't say I didn't want them. Slavery? No longer a subject of discussion, just a bad memory, My so-called inferiority? A hoax that it would be better to laugh about. I was prepared to forget everything, provided the world integrated me. My incisors were ready to go into action, I could feel them, sharp. And then... (2008, 94)

In this attitude, the Black person is in denial of profoundness of his oppression. He or she thinks that a small change is enough. He or she is ready to love and be loved.

Love is a fundamental Sartrean attitude to deal with absurdity of our being. In other words, love is the attitude that we attempt to take to justify our being. In love, Sartre notes, the lover, by his or her attempt to secure the love of the beloved, aims to secure his or her being (476). By transforming myself into an object for my beloved, I convert myself from a for-itself—a consciousness that exists without a reason—to a necessary and loved object using the other's love. Sartre writes, "in order to maintain before me the Other's freedom which is looking at me, I identify myself totally with my being-looked-at (476). Thus, we should note that although I am an object, my aim is to use my objectivity to control the other as a freedom while maintaining the other's freedom.

We can see the Civil Rights Movement that occurred in the 1950s and 1960s in the United States as an example of this attitude of assimilation and integration. The goal of the movement was not to overhaul the system; instead, the goal was for Blacks in the United States to have equal rights.

Moreover, we can see in Reverend Martin Luther King's approach of non-violence and loving the enemy as kind of a collective Sartrean attitude of love. According to Sartre, to love is to be loved, and thus, as the Black person at the time loves his enemy, he or she is waiting for his white Other to love him or her back (Sartre 1956, 489). In other words, the Black person wants to be the "I must be as the limiting-condition of the upsurge, the very condition of the upsurge of a world" (489). He or she wants to be loved, not because they asked for it, but because it is embedded in the freedom of the beloved Other.

However, this Sartrean love is bound to fail. To love is to want to be loved (Sartre 1956, 89). Since I know that, I wish that the other wants me to love him so that I know that they love me. However, this wish is "an ideal out of reach" (491). At the same time, reciprocity of love between the Black and white person is hindered due the indifference of the white person.

Describing the ineffectiveness of the attitude of love, Gordon writes,

Desire from the white body—'love' in the Sartrean sense—does not redeem the black body. Nobody can be redeemed, if by redemption is meant an existential conversion of recognizing oneself as a human being and human reality as a source of value, by way of flight to a serious world. (1995, 105)

Thus, love fails fundamentally for the Black person because love can never justify his or her existence. He or she is a degradation, a mistake.

Moreover, there is another failure in this collective attitude of love. Obtaining more civil rights is important, however, it does not solve the heart of the issue. To this day, institutional

racism is a fact. Sartre mentions the difficulty in trying to attack that from which you gain. It will be difficult for Blacks to have any meaningful stand against the system while wanting to gain from it. Kassim argues that for any group in the United States to enter into its system, it needs to yield to its hegemonic and imperialism project. Since African-Americans are part of the mainstream, they yielded to the US imperialists even if these projects exploited people that share their race, religions, or even themselves.

### *The Negritude Movement and Collective Masochism*

The second Sartrean attitude is Masochism. It is the final attitude in which I try to assimilate the Other's freedom while preserving the Other's freedom. In opposition to love, which I make myself the "object-limit" of the Other's freedom, in masochism, I insist "on making myself be treated as one object among others, as an instrument to be treated as one object among others, and as an instrument to be used. Now, it is my transcendence to be denied, not his" (Sartre 1956, 492). Thus, to be a masochist is to identify with one's objectivity.

We can look at the attitude of the Negritude Movement as an example of collective masochism in which Blacks become one with their objectivity. The Negritude Movement was most active during the 1930s and 1940s. The movement was led by French-speaking intellectuals to assert their Black identity. Instead of trying to escape one's Black identity, the Negritude Movement masochistically took the Black identity. The Negritude Movement focused on the stereotype of Black persons as emotional and sensitive. Fanon acknowledged this stereotype when he wrote, "there is no room for your sensitivity" (2008, 111). The movements focused on sensitive and creative disciplines like "black poetry" and "art" (268). Thus, the goal of the



movement was to promote “politically engaged forms of literature, philosophy, and art” (724). In doing so, Black poetry and art hoped to challenge “European society to address an affirmation of identity and assertion” (Jules-Rosette 2007, 268). Fanon saw this moment as his “salvation” (112).

Masochism as a universal Sartrean attitude is also doomed to fail because we are fundamentally free. Sartre writes,

Thus, in every way the masochist's objectivity escapes him, and it can even happen—in fact usually does happen—that in seeking to apprehend his objectivity he finds the Other's objectivity, which in spite of himself frees his own subjectivity. (1956, 493)

Thus, masochism fails because the more the masochist identifies herself with his objectivity, the more the masochist asserts her subjectivity which defeats the purpose of masochism. Moreover, since the goal of masochism is to assimilate to someone's freedom to control one's being-for-others, this assimilation to an absolute” freedom will fail. This is because the more the masochist asserts her objectivity, the more she will realize that she is not an object for the other but that the other is an object for her pleasure.

We can see how such movement is politically doomed even before it starts. This movement did not aim to challenge any political institutions in “a profound modification of property relations” (Sartre 1947, 167). The only purpose of the movement was to challenge the racism that was internalized by the Black person. According to Weiss's reading of Fanon, the Black person is not only overdetermined from the outside but also from the inside (2017, 235). According to Fanon, the Black person because of her skin color is overdetermined from the outside (2008). The Black person does not determine who he is in the world but it is his skin color that is seen by his white Other to determines who he is as a person. However, this external

overdetermination does not just stop at the outside but also penetrate into the Black person consciousness. In other words, there is an internalization of racism that occurs in the Black person. As an example of this overdetermination from the inside, Fanon writes,

Here was the Negro teacher, the Negro physician; as for me, I was a nervous wreck, shaking at the slightest alert. I knew for instances that the physician made one false move, it was over for him and for all those who came after him. What, in fact, could one expect from a Negro physician? (2008, 97)

Thus, this movement's goal was to overcome this overdetermination from within without any political aspirations. Therefore, the movement would fail politically and as a revolution even before it started.

### *Malcolm X and Collective Indifference*

The next possible collective attitude of the self-loving Black is indifference. In indifference, one is "dealing with a kind of blindness with respect to others" (Sartre 1965, 495). I am blind to the fact the Other is freedom, and my being-for-others escapes me. I become "self-confident; that is, I am in no way conscious of the fact the Other's look can fix my possibilities and my body. I am in a state of the very opposite of what you call shyness or timidity" (496).

The main example of Blacks collectively adapting the attitude of indifference against their white Other is in the political movement led by Malcolm X. When one is indifferent about the other, one starts to see the Other as "functions" (Sartre 1956, 495). I would begin to think that "the ticket-collector is only the function of collecting tickets; the cafe waiter is nothing but the function of taking orders?" (495). Applying this attitude of indifference, Malcolm X saw the function of his white Other as an oppressive and inhumane machine: "Who taught you to hate the

color of your skin?” he questioned. He added, “You should ask yourself who taught you to hate being what God made you.” The answer to these questions is the Other who transgressed over and beyond the point in which I can forgive—a mechanized other. In fact, part of the reason that attracted Malcolm X to the Nation of Islam was the way in which they characterized the white Other as the “white devil.” This term permeates with indifference towards an entire group of people.

Central to Malcolm X’s philosophy was his philosophy of separation. He saw separation as the only possible way for Blacks to live. Still, this attitude of indifference and separation is far from a political revolution. By calling for separation between whites and Blacks, any possibility for Blacks to play in the envisioned Marxist revolutions will be eradicated.

#### *The Black Panther Party and Collective Sadism*

The next collective attitude of the self-loving Black is sadism. The sadist’s goal is to incarnate his Other into body/flesh without incarnating him- or herself. To do so, the sadist will use the tool to torture his Other to identify with his flesh. The incarnation is the precise goal of sadism since it is the way by which the sadist is able to control his or her Other’s freedom and as a consequence his being-for-others. An example of sadism was Blacks who did not follow the revolutionary Black Panther Party (BPP) which was active in the 1960s and 70s in the United States. The BPP as one of the Black Power movements advocated for the betterment of Blacks. However, the BPP rejected Martin Luther King’s nonviolent approach and opted to adapt a violent approach. According to David Hillard, who was the chief of staff of the BPP, the goal of the BPP is “the very direct overthrow of the government by way of force and violence, by

picking up guns and moving against it because we recognize it as being oppressive and . . . we know that the only solution to it is armed struggle” (2006, 5).

The BPP is a great example of self-loving Blacks who used the attitude of sadism. In fact, the BPP adopted two kinds of Sadism: linguistics and physical force. The BPP in the 1960s and 1970s used a kind of linguistic sadism against their Other and particularly against the police. The word that carried this linguistic sadism was *pigs*. The BPP had their newspaper, the *Black Panther Party News Paper*, which ran from 1968 to 1971. In *Up Against the Wall*, Curtis Austin goes in depth to show that the association between the word *pigs* and the police was a central theme to the BPP’s newspaper (2). This is important since all BPP members were required to read that publication. In one of their issues, the newspaper displayed a cartoon of a police officer as humanoid pig in a police costume and thus connected the police officer with the pig in the minds of the readers.

This association with white police officers as pigs is a form linguistic sadism because it aimed to reincarnate the police officer into a body. As the sadist uses tools of torture to reincarnate the body of his masochist/slave, Blacks who were associated with the BPP used *pigs* to incarnate the police officers into a body—an obscene, filthy, and gluttonous body. Words are not physical tools of torture, but here, they function as such. According to Gordon, language is one of the forms in which a person could be sadistic (1995, 105). Pain is the way in which the sadist forces his slave to be associated with her body. Similarly, the BPP members used *pigs* to linguistically whip the police officer, which caused him pain so that he came to associate himself with his now *pigish* body. Using Dolezal’s concept of visible and invisible bodies, the pain that

is intended in the use of the word *pig* caused the officer's body to be visible to him. Now, for the racist police officer, his piggishness and his lust for Black blood is apparent to him.

The word *pigs* is also sadist because it is actually associated with real violence. Certain words have power to particular individuals due to their individualistic experiences with this word. Thus, the word "pigs" for the police gained a deeper connection with pain due to the fact it was always associated with killing, shooting, and beating a police officer. For example, "kill the pigs" was the campaign BPP's newspaper advocated. Moreover, actual violence against the police when the BPP party was active rose dramatically. Therefore, the word *pigs* to the police became sadistic because it is a word that signals violence and subsequently pain.

In addition to the fact that the word "pigs," forces the police officer to be painfully aware of their bodies, "pigs" also signifies a kind of dehumanization. This dehumanization is an integral part of sadism. We see in the example of Sadism that the sadist will force his slave to wear collars, mouth gags, or chains. All of these items share the fact they are associated with animals and thereby cause the dehumanization.

Since the BPP members were only dealing with the white police officers using only tools of torture such as "pigs" and guns, the BPP members were able to escape their bodies. Since "caress" is absent from the interaction, the BPP member will see himself as "an instrument of giving pain" (518). As long as the BPP member keeps the police officer at bay, he will be certain about his being-for-others. Now, the BPP is free from the experience of objectification, alienation, and shame since he is the one who is doing the objectification, the alienation, and the shaming. The BPP member chooses himself to be seen as an "instrument of pain," and the police

officers, by experiencing fear, confirm the BPP members' being-for-others. Finally, they are self-assured.

Still BPP's attitude of sadism is doomed to fail. Even if words like "pigs" or machines separated them from their white Other, they were the opposite end of a sadist police force who were forced to identify with their bodies. The whole police can be seen as tools of torture that Blacks in general, and specifically BPP members, were forced to experience. This experience in which Blacks "were brutalized or attacked" is much greater than their BPP sadism against the police force (Austin 2006, 6). The police force had the power of the state behind it, while the BPP was forced to steal from police officers or raid gun manufacturers (8). Thus, as the BPP tried to escape the fact that they have a body, they were confronted again by their Black bodies due to the police brutality that was directed upon them.

There also is a second failure of the collective sadist approach. If the goal of the party was only self-defense, then the party really did not aspire radical change in the political system. Again, we see how the concept of equality is the sole purpose of such a movement (Sartre 1947, 168). Returning violence by another kind of violence is merely assertion of one's equality.

### *Back-to-Africa and Collective Hate*

Now we enter into the final Sartrean attitude that self-loving Blacks could take which is hate. Hate is when Black people are fed up. Hate is when love, desire, sadism, and indifference do not work. Hate is when a white imposter hears some white people talking behind his back about how Black he is, reminding him or her the futility of his or her efforts. Hate is a

“resignation” (Sartre 1956, 532). In hate, I live alone. This is because the hater only “consents to being only “for-itself” (523).

It is difficult to find a Black movement in which they simply aspired to destroy their white Other. I think that the closest one is the Back-to-Africa Movement which peaked specifically in Arkansas in the late 1800s (Barnes 2004, 14). In *Journey of Hope: The Back-to-Africa Movement in Arkansas in the Late 1800s*, Kenneth Barnes describes the Back-to-Africa movement as a kind of “exodus” (24). Describing this exodus, Barnes writes, “thousands of Black Americans, especially in Arkansas, were equally anxious to get out of this country. The hope for many African-Americans centered on the Republic of Liberia in West Africa” (14). Barnes argues that there was a “rapid” intensification of racism that forced African-Americans to migrate to Liberia. This is a very attractive prospect since Liberia is run independently by Black people and whoever migrated there would get free land (14).

However, according to Sartre, hate will always fail. Sartre thinks that if one is successful in destroying the Other, I will be able to get rid of my being-for-others (Sartre 1956, 534). This is because destroying the Other “implies the Other has existed. Immediately, my being-for-others, by slipping into the past, becomes an irremediable dimension of myself” (534). Thus, as Blacks from Arkansas escaped their predicament in the south, they transformed the racism that was inflicted upon them as the past of their inescapable past. The Black person’s problems cannot simply go away when he or she returns to Africa. This racist environment or colonization distorts and changes the colonized by altering his or her relationship with him- or herself (Fanon 2008, 78). Regarding the normal relationship with the self, Fanon noted, “A Malagasy is a Malagasy; or rather he is not a Malagasy, but he lives his ‘Malagasyhood’” (Fanon 2008, 78). Now the

Malagasy only “exists in relation to the European” (77). This shows the failure of attempt of the Black person to escape from his white Other. The Black person needs the white Other to exist. Fanon thinks the two relations that the Black individual has with his white Other is either dependency or disappearance. Thus, the Black person after migrating to Africa will disappear he does not have his white Other to depend on. If the Black person in self-hate is the deviation from the standard, then he needs his Standard to be present to remain the deviation.

The problem with the attitude of hate is not only that it is just an easy escape and does not deal with any racist political structures, it is also problematic because it is not a revolutionary attitude. An African-American distancing himself more and more from the mainstream of society makes him a lesser candidate to be a revolutionary. Thus, similar to all the collective attitudes that were adopted collectively by Blacks, the attitudes were adapted to promote equality and not a revolution.

## **7. Being-for-Others and Muslims**

While Muslims experience all the components of Sartre’s being-for-others, there are other parts of their experience that go beyond Sartre’s conception. Like Blacks, Muslims experience their own kind of being-for-others. They experience their being-for-others as Muslims. Thus, their being-for-others is a shared being. As a Muslim, I experience my being-for-others as a part of a larger collective—the Muslim nation or *ummah*. This collective affects how others see me. If Muslims are presumed to be terrorists, irrational, and backward, I will also be seen through the lens of those negative stereotypes because I am a Muslim. .



*The Racialization of Muslims in the United States*

Therefore, the experience of being-for-others for Blacks and Muslims is similar because both are racialized. To be a Muslim or to be a Black person is to be a part of a racialized identity. The Black identity as a racial identity is an accepted concept. However, in the case of Muslims, applying the concept of race is controversial because race is often connected to skin color and not to religious affiliation. Many scholars of race such as Robin Cohen see it as impossible to talk about race without talking about “racial classification based on phenotypical differences” (Selod and Embrick 2013, 647). In a similar vein, according to Garner and Selod, in academia, there is “reluctance to use the concept of racialization” regarding the Muslim experience (2014, 10). Even in common culture, it is difficult to think of Muslims as racialized, especially given the fact that Muslims come from diverse racial backgrounds (12). For example, in Saudi Arabia, the birthplace of Islam, talk about Muslims as a part of a race would be confusing, because the whole population is Muslim. Thus, other categorizations like tribal affiliation are used to racialize or to divide people into “distinct races” with “specific natural characteristics” (11). However, in the United States talking about Islamic religious affiliation as a racial identity makes sense. Selod and Embrick think that the process of racialization is an effective tool in describing the Muslim experience in the United States. He writes,

Scholars can use racialization to understand how African immigrants who migrate to the United States acquire a new racial classification of Black or African-American due to their shared pigmentation, but they can also employ it to explain how signifiers such as language, religion, clothing, etc. acquire racial meanings. (645)

Thus, in the United States, not only dark bodies underwent a process of racialization but also Muslims. As pointed out by Selod and Embrick, this does not mean that all Muslims in the United States experience the same process of racialization. Phenotype, class, gender, and

nationality to name a few all “intersect” in the particular racialization of a Muslim individual (651). Thus, a Muslim person who is also rich and Arabic will have a different experience than a Black Muslim, for example.

However, still, even though Muslims come from different backgrounds, part of the process of racialization is to ignore differences and the focus on the similarities. Garner and Selod write,

Using racialization as a key analytical concept allows us to make sense of the fact that regardless of physical appearance, country of origin and economic situation, Muslims are homogenized and degraded by Islamophobic discourse and practices in their everyday lives. (2014, 17)

Tahseen Shams also agrees that, in the process of racialization, there is a homogenization of different people. She thinks that, in the United States, the word *Muslim* now refers to “a racial category that homogenizes South Asians, Arabs, Middle Easterners, North Africans, and blacks, all of whom fall on a wide spectrum of physical appearance” (2018, 74). Part of this homogenization stems from the fact the group who creates race is the single group of the white Other. Thus, it is possible for the white Other to reduce a number of groups to one group. As described by Gordon, in creating a race, the powerful group would emphasize the similarities within a group of human beings and ignore the differences (1995, 96). By this method, it becomes possible to have the Muslim race.

Moreover, what does it mean exactly for Islam to have a racial meaning? It means that Islam becomes something innate and essential. I can change my religion. But if religion is my race, I cannot change my religion. It is important to point that the religion of the Muslim person and what is associated with that religion become innate to the Muslim person. According to Selod and Embrick, with race there is a tendency of “essentializing” (2013, 651). In fact, race is

the end of a process that *is* essentializing. Thus, to have a racial identity is to have a fixed identity and to have a fixed identity is to have a racial identity.

In addition to this essentializing power of race, race is also a group-wide identity.

Describing what it means to have a racial identity, Garner and Selod write,

The process of racialization entails ascribing sets of characteristics viewed as inherent to members of a group because of their physical or cultural traits. These are not limited to skin tone or pigmentation but include a myriad of attributes including cultural traits such as language, clothing, and religious practices. (2014, 12)

Thus, to be raced is the highest form of group formation in which that group shares several fixed characteristics. To be raced is to be seen as a part of a group that shares “physical or cultural traits” that are seen as essential and unique to that group (Garner and Selod 2014, 12). Therefore, the Black person becomes fixed as Black because he or she has a dark body with particular biological features that belong to the Black race. The Black person, now, is part of a larger collective. Similarly, Muslims are raced because of the particular features of their religion. Thus, the hijab, the Arabic language, and robes become racial signifiers; Moreover, Muslims are raced because they belong to the larger collective of the Muslim race.

Moreover, to be raced also includes other signifiers than “physical or cultural traits” (Garner and Selod 2014, 12). For the Black person, inferiority, criminality, and impurity are part of his or her race while for the Muslim person terrorism, irrationality, and backwardness are now part of his race. Thus, part of one’s race, in addition to phenotypic and cultural descriptions, is certain “myths” (Memmi 1965, 133). Garner and Selod describing which characteristic or myths are associated with the Muslim identity writes, “(violence, misogyny, political allegiance/disloyalty, incompatibility with Western values, etc.) are treated as if they are innate”

(14). Thus, to be Muslim is a racial identity in which certain characteristics or myths like terrorism, misogyny, and backwardness are seen as an “innate”/essential characterization of every Muslim person.

## **8. Muslim Racial Objectification and Alienation**

In addition to the universal experience of objectification for Muslims, there is an added experience of objectification. Thus, Muslims experience objectification twice. They experience objectification once as an object for the Other’s perceptions. Second, the other experience of objectification is an experience of oneself as a *Muslim* object. Fanon writes, “Malagasy is a Malagasy; or rather he is not a Malagasy, but he lives his Malagasyhood (2008, 78). The Malagasy are never given to him- or herself as an object. He is his “Malagasyhood” (78). Similarly, Muslims in Indonesia, Turkey, or Albania live through their Muslimhood. In a Muslim country, I am never given back to myself as Muslim. In other words, I do not see myself being seen as Muslim. In a Muslim country, being a Muslim is a *de facto* state. In Saudi Arabia, for example, I never experience my being-for-others as Muslim. Because being a Muslim is a universal quality of everyone in Saudi Arabia, this quality of myself recedes into the background (Dolezal 2015, 25). In Saudi Arabia, I experience my being-for-others in other terms such as tribal affiliation, race, gender, or age. I do not even need to say that I am Muslim, because it is me. It is part of my “I”.

However, the experience of Muslims, once they are confronted with a Westerner’s consciousness, is an experience of themselves as Muslims. I am suddenly a Muslim because I see myself in the eyes of my other. I know my “meta-perceptions” or the way that I am perceived is

exclusively through this identity of being a Muslim (Blackwood 2015, 257). I know that my Muslimhood is all what my white Other cares about and sees. Now, I am an object who is Muslim and I experience myself seen as that Muslim object.

Like the objectification of the Black person, the objectification of the Muslim carries certain negative values. Thus, the added objectification of being seen as a Muslim object is necessary alienating. Sadek attributes this alienation to the collapse or “flattening” of the Muslim identity (2017, 204). Sadek describes the stereotype that Muslim men are seen as “conservatively religious, authoritarian, sexually aggressive, and prone to violence” (204). Thus, Muslim men find themselves different in the eyes of their Other than what they experience themselves to be. Of course, there are Muslim men who animate these stereotypes. However, even if a Muslim man is born in a foreign country or explicitly distances himself from Islamic values, he will experience his being-for-others as a Muslim who is seen as religious, sexually aggressive, and prone to violence.

### *Hypervisibility and the Creation of the Enemy*

As opposed to the Black person who has the dominant experience of invisibility, the Muslim person experiences hypervisibility. According to Selod and Embrick, Arabs, which are a minority in the United States, are “no longer an invisible minority but are rather a visible one” (2013, 645). It is not just Arabs, but Muslims in general who are now seen as hypervisible in the United States. Describing this hypervisibility of the Muslim person, Tahseen Shams writes, “The post-9/11 terror-panic climate has irrevocably transformed Muslims from a relatively invisible minority in America to hypervisible suspects of terrorism” (2018, 73). Being from a Muslim

country but having lived almost quarter of my life in the United States, I experience this hypervisibility continuously. When I say that I am from Saudi Arabia, all that I hear is silence. There is no curiosity about this foreign place; there is no exoticism. People's silence is an indication that they already know the place. There is nothing to learn from asking about it.

A sign of this hypervisibility is the continuous surveillance and monitoring of Muslims. After 9/11, Muslims from several Muslim majority countries were required to give fingerprints and photos when entering the United States (Shams 2018, 73). Another example is of the New York Police Department that after 9/11 "maintained a secret surveillance program on Muslim communities in New York that monitored and analyzed their everyday lives, going as far as to recruit insiders of the community as informants" (74). Shams claims that even though most of the 9/11 programs have ended, the continual surveillance and monitoring of Muslims has not yet ended.

As consequence of this hyper-visibility that is enforced by this continual surveillance, the Muslim person comes to experience his being-for-others as a Muslim person who is under suspicion. Whenever there is any kind of surveillance, the surveillance creates an Other. The existence of surveillance in a store, for example, creates the possibility of a thief or shoplifter. Similarly, as the Muslim person is under this continual surveillance, he or she will become aware of his being-for-others is as the "enemy" (Luna 2007, 154). If people are "walking on eggshells" around a person being afraid to anger that person, this person will realize that his being-for-others is of an angry person. Thus, as Muslims discover that their white Other is placing them under continual suspicion, they will realize that their being-for-others is that of the enemy. Shams writes,

As such, increased surveillance of “Muslims” not only puts Muslim Americans in danger but also members of a whole swath of categories. More broadly, surveillance security practices contribute to creating a vague yet diffuse “atmosphere,” which organizes social and political relations around enemies, risks, fear, and anxiety, and can erode democratic values. (2018, 74)

Thus, this hypervisibility not only that intimately links the Muslim person with his Muslimhood, but also signals him or her out. He or she sticks out like a sore thumb. He or she now experiences his being-for-others not only as an outsider but as the “enemy within” (Rana 2007, 145). The creation of the Muslim as the enemy is a sign that the Muslim is in conflict with his white Other.

### *Identity, Alienation, and Self-Hate*

If invisibility is an all-encompassing word that describes the Black experience, then alienation is the word that describes the Muslim experience in its entirety. The Muslim person in the West feels alienated from his or her identity. The alienation or the estrangement stems from the fact their identity is hypervisible and bad. As the term *Muselmann* was used as a derogatory term to describe the Holocaust camps prisoners who were in the worst health and sanitary conditions, the word *Muslim* now is used to describe a “disposable population” (Weheliye 2014, 71). Thus, alienation for Muslims is simply that they were given their identity objectified. It is the fact their identity was given back to them as the death of this identity. I am alienated from myself because being a Muslim stops being a viable option for me. I am forced to hate this Muslim identity. I must hide from it. One of the counter-terrorism initiatives by Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) once asked Muslims to inform on other Muslims who they think that had been radicalized. Shams writes, “If any of them identifies ‘visible’ signs of individuals from their community joining extremist groups or becoming terrorists, he/she is to take action by

pinpointing that suspect to law enforcement authorities” (2018, 77). Thus, the Muslim is alienated from his Muslim identity because he or she is denied any visibility of his or her identity since all the Muslim signifiers are now connected with terrorism. The Muslim person is thus alienated from his identity because to show any signs of his identity is align oneself with the outside enemy. Thus, the Muslim-American has to choose between his American or Muslim identity.

Going to the United States from Saudi Arabia after high school meant that I was already formed as a Muslim man. However, coming to the United States was not helpful in keeping this identity. Even my conservative family will ask me not to go to mosques or pray anywhere publicly for fear that I will suffer physical violence. My friend who lives with an American roommate will not even wash in preparation for prayer for fear that his roommate is going to judge him. Shams gives the example of a Muslim family, originally from Bangladesh, who after 9/11 tried to cut all their ties with Islam (2018, 81). They stopped answering their Muslim friends who looked Muslim. Also, they stopped going to the mosque or celebrating Islamic holidays. The Muslim is alienated from his or her identity in that he or she is forced to give it up. Thus, I present terrorism, irrationality, and backwardness as the factors that constructs this Muslim identity/being-for-others.

### *Terrorism*

The essential element of being-for-others to Muslims is seeing oneself as a potential terrorist. Before 9/11, it was possible to discuss terrorism without discussing Muslims (Kundnani 2015, 116). In fact, before 9/11, you could think of other forms of terrorism like Irish terrorism.



Still, even before 9/11, Muslims were associated with terrorism (Garner and Selod 2014, 650). However, after 9/11, terrorism became intimately linked to the Muslim identity, and thus terrorism became part of how Muslims see themselves as seen by others. The fact that Muslims are terrorists or have the possibility to be terrorists is now part of the collective global knowledge about Muslims. The bias of the United States media makes this connection with terrorism even stronger. Shams points out that whenever there is an act of terrorism done by a Muslim person, the media is quick to announce that the terrorist acted because of his religion. These news organizations are quick to make “moves from identifying the perpetrator as Muslim to making a connection to an international terrorist cell, the attacker’s motivation being a holy war against the United States” (Shams 2018, 76). Moreover, there is fundamental bias in the media in which members of the media will focus more on the acts of terror or violence done by Muslims.

There is no place for Muslims like airports to experience this part of their being-for-others as a terrorist. This is because in airports Muslims have no doubt about their “meta-perceptions” (Blackwood 2015, 25). They are positively sure that they are seen as suspects in airports. There is no “secret” about the status of their being-for-others (Sartre 1956, 473). The secret is out. I know that the Other sees me as a terrorist.

Airports are the most humiliating place for a Muslim to be. Abdnor, a Muslim-American who is originally from Somalia, speaks about his experience in the airport coming out of and to the United States. He said, “I am an American, but they always ‘randomly’ search me while coming in.<sup>1</sup>” His Muslim identity is hypervisible. It colors how he sees himself seen.

---

<sup>1</sup> Personal communication

It is at the airport in which the Muslim man and woman come to see themselves as dangerous. The whole airport security apparatus is a reminder of who they are. I do not look at the machines, devices, and people, but they look at me. I am a pure being-in-itself—an object. I realize that everybody is walking with me in the airport, but I realize that it was designed for me. I am who they are trying to catch. Others are afraid to appear as if they are hunting for Muslim terrorists. In fact, non-Muslims are stopped just so that the authorities will not look bad only stopping Muslims (Blackwood 2015, 259). On the other hand, I am afraid, not to appear as myself, not to reveal my inner terrorist. The female traveler in front of me deserves a smile and pleasant small talk at the end of her trip, but I deserve to be propped?. I deserve to be naked. I deserve to see my stuff thrown in front of me, to be hollowed, and to be gutted and dispersed like the clothes in front of me.

Terrorism-as-objectification that the Muslim person feels is similar to the weight that Fanon feels. In the same way that Fanon feels that he is carrying the weight of centuries of racism and his ancestors, so the Muslim person carries with him or her the tremendous weight of all the acts of terrorism that happen every day. As I experience myself in the eyes of others as objectified and colored as terrorist-to-be, I experience this being-for-others as a tremendous weight that I am carrying on my shoulders. I remember walking through the campus with a tripod that could resemble the general shape of a rifle. I was mortified the whole way. I know that it looked like a tripod. However, I grappled with the question of “what if?” What if someone thought of this tripod as a rifle? What if they knew that I felt ashamed, but they hid their suspicion so that I would not know that they know? As long as it is possible for me to be suspect, the experience of being-for-others will remain an incredible weight. Like the Jewish person, I am

overdetermined from within (Weiss 2017, 233). Describing overdetermination from within, Gail Weiss writes, “Overdetermination from within, as Sartre depicts it, is indeed like a ‘haunting,’ insofar as it forces the Jew to reckon continuously with the ‘humiliating image which the hostile mob has of him’” (233). Similarly, I am haunted and weighed down by the continual anxiety of what my white Other thinks of me. I am overdetermined from within because not only the Other is trying to fix me as terrorist from the outside, but I am also struggling with my internalized identity as a terrorist.

### *Exclusion and Islamophobia*

The natural extension of the characterization of Muslims as terrorists is the subsequent criminalization of Muslims within the United States. Muslims are seen as the enemy within. Even Muslim Americans are seen as foreigners who can never be fully integrated into the mainstream society of the United States. The motivation for exclusion is Islamophobia. There is a debate on the effectiveness of the term itself as a signifier of anti-Muslim racism. However, this term is effective in showing there is phobia against the Muslim person. The Muslim person engenders fear in the eyes of his white Other. In fear, there is a spatial ambivalence between the inside and the outside (Whitney 2015, 6). The anti-Muslim racist, in his horror, loses the separation between him- or herself and the object of horror. Any person who has a phobia will experience this ambivalence. I have a phobia of dogs, and whenever there is a dog behind me, I feel the dog touching me. I feel that the dog is reaching me even if it is far away. I lose the distance between me and the dog. The dog becomes here, inside of me; I am afraid. Muslims as

phobic objects suddenly become everywhere to their anti-Muslim racist Other. “Leave America. Go back to your country,” could be translated into “I am afraid. Leave my inner depths.”

Whitney claims that in recoil the anti-black racist attempts to create a separation between him- or herself and the phobic object (Whitney 2015, 7). In recoil, I try to purge this Other. There are a lot of tools that are used to enact this collective recoil against Muslims. One of the tools of exclusion is legal. After 9/11, the Patriot Act was issued so that Muslims would be singled by law enforcement officers. Describing the consequences of this act on Muslims, Selod thinks that it “attacked the civil liberties of Muslim immigrants and citizens in the United States by making secret searches and wiretaps without probable cause legal and allowing the deportation of noncitizens for associations with unfavorable political organizations” (2014, 650). This law, thus, furthered the chasm between mainstream America and the Muslim population. Recently, we can see the Muslim ban that was enacted by Donald Trump as an example of this continued exclusion of Muslims. In enacting the Muslim ban, it was the final nail in the coffin for any hope that Muslims would be integrated into the mainstream of the United States. The Muslim ban shows that Muslims come from the outside, not the inside. He or she is “walled” out of the United States. Trump created and re-created a new Muslim person. He created a Muslim person who is aware of his or her being-for-others an excluded person.

Exclusion is not only enacted through laws but also “takes a number of forms ranging from abuse and epithets that tie them to terrorism, through identification of their dress that marks them as innately unable to be integrated, to explicit denials of their normalcy, even where this normalcy is evident (Garner and Selod 2014, 15). Therefore, the exclusion of Muslims is also carried on through the continual acts of discrimination that are motivated by anti-Muslim

sentiments. According to the Pew Research Center, acts of violence against Muslims skyrocketed after 9/11. In 2000, before the terrorist attack, there were only twelve cases of assault reported against Muslims. However, after the attack, the number dramatically rose to 93. In fact, in the past year, assaults against Muslims reached the same levels as directly after 9/11. Moreover, these numbers are not definite because part of the discrimination against Muslims is making it harder to report these incidents. As pointed out by Garner and Selod, part of the discrimination against Muslims is “the creation of a climate that makes reporting incidents around violence and discrimination riskier” (15). In addition to physical violence, Muslims in the United States face continuous harassment. As Muslim women are easy targets of harassment since they are hypervisible as Muslims, there are countless videos of them being harassed by other white women telling them to leave the country. In addition, there are also cases of vandalism of properties owned by Muslims.

This shows the peculiarities of the Muslim experience of exclusion. The Muslim person experiences his being-for-others as engendering fear, a fear that ironically further excludes the Muslim person from the social space. Thus, we reach the contradictory power of phobia. The Muslim person is given the power of fear, but this power is a power that aids in his or her own exclusion and isolation.

### *Irrationality and Radicalization*

Part of the objectification that the Muslim person feels as part of his or her experience of being-for-others is being seen as irrational. Unlike Christianity, which went through the Enlightenment, Islam did not have any major revolutions. Thus, since Muslims are seen as very

religiously conservative; they are perceived to favor theology over reason. The word of God is absolute, and every other human creation is inferior to the word of God.

Specific instances of terror helped to solidify this view of Muslims as irrational. One of them is the Charlie Hebdo shooting that happened in 2017 in France. The satirical newspaper is famous for its intentionally offensive cartoons. However, some of the publication's cartoons depicted the Islamic prophet Mohammed, who is extremely venerated and respected by Muslims. The publication of the offensive cartoons provoked an unjustified attack on the newspaper that resulted in the death of twelve staff members. Such an attack helped to create the image of Islam and Muslims as irrational. This is because such attacks show that Muslims are unable to differentiate between physical violence and cartoons.

### *Backwardness and Misogyny*

It is difficult not to think of Muslims without associating them with backwardness. The Muslim person is seen as stuck in a time capsule. He or she is seen as if they still live in the past. The status of women in Muslim countries plays an important role in this characterization. It is common when asking people if they wanted to visit the Middle East to reply with, "No, I would never go there. Did you see how they treat women over there?". Thus, Muslim women become a symbol of the backwardness of the Muslim man. Describing how the Muslim women are portrayed in relation to the Muslim man, Garner and Selod write, "[the] Muslim identity racializes women as subordinate, oppressed, and powerless women in relation to violent and aggressive Muslim men" (2014, 650). Her clothes, mannerism, domesticity, and submissiveness all reflect negatively on him.

According to Selod and Embrick, the Muslim person is seen as backward because “Muslim body is incapable of upholding democratic or Western ideals and values” (Selod, 651). This view not only exacerbates the exclusion of Muslims but it also further allows Western countries to invade more Muslims countries. One of the reasons that the United States invaded Iraq was to topple their dictatorship and install a democratic government (657). Such actions further paint Muslims inside and outside the United States as backward. Moreover, the inability of the Muslim person to hold Western ideals further justifies the exclusion of Muslim Americans from being seen as Americans. Because Muslims are seen as part of this collective that holds views that are fundamentally anti-American, they are denied equal status in the United States.

### *The Failure of the Sartrean Attitudes*

Of course, since this experience of objectification is alienating, Muslims will have to choose particular attitudes to deal with their being-for-others. Like Blacks, Muslims can take two general attitudes in relation to their being-for-others, which are self-hate or self-love.

All these three attitudes signal the fundamental failure of all the Sartrean attitudes. All the Sartrean attitudes are individualistic attitudes. They are attitudes that are taken up by an individuated consciousness/freedom against an individuated Other. However, the being-for-others of Muslims is their Muslim identity. This Muslim identity does not belong to any particular Other (Marcuse 1948, 324). If a Muslim person will eradicate all his or her others, still this identity will exist. Thus, all the Sartrean attitudes fail even before they start because it is not that or this particular Other that carries the “secret” to my being (Sartre 1956, 437). My being-for-others as Muslim is abstracted and dispersed. The being-for-others of Muslims not

only exists in people's imagination, it also exists in the media, newspaper, books, laws, and body schemas. I could try to love this person, to hate that person, or to ignore this person, but my attitudes will fail because my reputation as terrorizing, irrational, and backward precedes and escapes them all.

### **9. The Muslim Experience of Being-for-Others and Self-Hate**

The first consequence and evidence of the failure of the individualistic Sartrean attitudes is self-hate. In this attitude the Muslim person is in a perpetual mode to negate his or her Muslim identity. He or she comes to be by not being what they are. They exist as a nothing—as a not. It becomes useless to direct any of the Sartrean attitudes towards my Other since he does not hold the “secret” to my being (Sartre 1956, 437). The “secret” of my Muslimhood is outside beyond my Other. It is like being the most wanted man in the world and your pictures are being distributed everywhere. There is no place to hide. There is no effective attitude to take. The criminal will ask the same question that Fanon asked, “where should I hide?” (2008, 93). The criminal knows that he could deceive one or two individuals, but he cannot deceive everyone. He now only has himself to work on. Thus, the self-hating Muslim will direct Sartre's attitudes towards him- or herself and not against his or her white Other. The change of direction reveals the failure of the Sartrean attitudes. The change in direction reveals the magnitude of the problem—the Muslim problem.

Hypervisibility, as discussed before, is how Muslim people experience their Muslimhood. Under Islamophobia, the Muslim identity stops being “the center of meaning” and becomes hypervisible (Sartre 1956, 488). Being a Muslim transcends from being this hidden aspect of me



that guides all my actions and transform to be how my Other sees me. I become a foreigner to my own identity. Thus, the self-hating Muslim person will try to maintain the separation between him or herself and his or her Muslim identity. However, there are levels of separations.

Depending on the particular individual, they will direct the attitudes of indifference, sadism, or hate against their Muslim identity/body.

### *Self-Hate*

Before we discuss the particular attitudes to illustrate the fundamental failure of Sartre's individualistic attitudes, it is important to specify who are the Muslims in self-hate. Since the experience of self-hate, as it is the case in Blacks, requires a double consciousness, Muslims needs to acquire this secondary white consciousness for them to be able to manifest self-hate. The Muslim person would think of him- or herself, "I am white. I need to destroy this foreign object. I need to separate myself from my Muslimhood". However, double consciousness is the result of a full indoctrination. As mentioned before, it requires uncontested domination to infuse the Black or the Muslim person with this white consciousness. Thus, the white consciousness is only possible in countries where most of the inhabitants are whites and the Muslim population is the minority. It is impossible for Muslims who live in countries where Islam is the religion of the majority to experience Gordon's double-consciousness. There are cultural, linguistic, and geographical gaps that separate these Muslims from the white consciousness. In fact, in Islamic and Arabic countries, there is a belief of the superiority of Arabic race over all the other races. However, according to Ahmad Aijaz, the power of the U.S. media is unparalleled in the history (2004, 46). This I think makes it possible to infect people worldwide with a kind of Du Boisian

double consciousness (2004, 46). However, I still believe that for Muslims to have a double consciousness, they need to be the minority in a country with a white majority. Moreover, this double-consciousness is more likely to occur for young immigrants that have grown up in non-Muslim European countries than for older immigrants who have already built up a strong Muslim consciousness. This is because young immigrants have less separation with their white Other. This is because they share enough culture, language, and experience with their white Other so that it becomes easier to infect them with a kind of double consciousness.

Since the United States is built on a racial hierarchy, the Muslim race becomes an inferior race. It becomes a deviation from whiteness—the nonstandard. It becomes easy to see how a young Muslim comes to develop a kind of double consciousness in which he or she has both a white consciousness and a Muslim body (Mac an Ghail and Haywood 2015, 104). Since the Muslim identity is now a racial identity, young Muslims will have to develop an attitude of self-hate to get rid of this unwanted identity. This attitude of self-hate and all the inter-subjective attitudes that accompany it show the failure of the Sartrean attitudes. This is because the Sartrean attitude is directed toward the Other, not the self. Moreover, Sartre claims that our being-for-others is a universal being to all humans. Thus, the individualistic attitudes should be at least temporarily effective against the being-for-others of all humans. However, since race is the being-for-others of the Muslim person and since race transcends our intersubjective encounters, all the Sartrean attitudes fail in relation to our being-for-others.

*The Default Attitude of Masochism*

The first attitude that the self-hating Muslims take in order to maintain the separation between themselves and their Muslim identity is of masochism against their white Other. This is the first and only attitude that they take in their white Other. In this stance, the Muslim person wants to be “absorbed” into his Other (Sartre 1956, 491). In this stage, my being-for-others is very problematic to me. I am seen as a terrorist, irrational, and backward. I feel the alienation that these characterizations cause against my Muslim identity. My being-for-others becomes something that I wish to deal with. I am hypervisible, and I wish to reduce my visibility. In this attitude, I deal with the anxiety by accepting the subjectivity of my other and turn myself into an object. I accept the characterization of the Other of my Muslim identity. I transform myself into a masochistic hater. I am now the self-hating Muslim. I become to believe wholeheartedly that I deserve to be hated. I need to disappear.

In this masochistic attitude of bad faith, the Muslim man or woman would remove all his or her possibilities for transcendence (consciousness) and accept his body as an object. The Muslim person is forced now to give up to the Other’s desire and to remove all the traces of his or her Muslimhood. Arun Kundnani speaks about the overcompensation many of the Middle Eastern families enact by showing excessive patriotism by hanging the American flag in their homes or in their cars where others can see it (2015, 52). Muslims will have to actively erase all the remnants of his or her hypervisible Muslim identity. The Arabic name transforms from a foreign but integrated name to a name that needs to be covered with a nickname. My Muslim friend, for example, will not use his real name in public spaces. He transformed his name from Mubarak to Mub. He wants to hide. He masochistically affirms his objectification. He affirms his characterization as terrorist and dangerous by trying to deny these characterizations.

I took a cab ride with a Muslim driver to a general store. He went into the store with me. I noticed that he was phenotypically white (Arab/Semitic White), but he was wearing the Muslim cap which is a universal sign of Muslimhood. I wondered for a while why he is wearing a piece of clothing that clearly racializes him? It turns out, he is also in bad faith. He does not see himself as a subject but as an object of the white gaze (even if in the surface his action looks like an act of defiance). Highlighting or hiding the Muslim identity are two sides of the same coin. After 9/11, all different ethnicities of Muslim origins became solidified into the umbrella identity “Muslim American”. Therefore, any actions of hiding or highlighting the symbols of Muslimhood are in relation to this accepted and imposed identity. Thus, the cab driver wears the Muslim cap because he thinks that he should wear that cap. He thinks that if he did not wear that cap, it signifies that he is hiding his identity, which he will not do because he thinks that it is impossible to hide his identity since it is his racial identity. As outlined by Gordon, he is taking another approach regarding his shame. He is putting it in the open. He goes to his Muslim identity to be separated from his Muslim identity. He puts it in the open in the hope that it will disappear. The Muslim man wearing the cap is saying, “I am Muslim”. He is trying to say that being a Muslim is something added to him and not part of his “I”.

These efforts are ineffective because they make the Muslim individual even more Muslim than before. By running away from Islam, he or she affirms the white consciousness of the Western world and becomes even more Muslim than ever. The more I run away from my Muslim identity the more that I affirm this identity. I can only disassociate myself from the things that I think are associated with me.

Thus, this attitude will fail because I will realize that even if I try to disassociate myself from my Muslim identity, this will never change my being-for-other. My being-for-others transcends all individualistic attitudes. This is because my being-for-others is an identity that is in the social level and transcends any particular individuals. This again signals the failure of individualistic Sartrean attitudes. Now, I hate myself even more. Now, I realize that the Other cannot help me in the dilemma that is my Muslim body. Now, I need to take a drastic effort against this body—my Muslim body.

*From Masochism and Hypervisibility to Indifference and Invisibility*

The first individualistic attitude that the self-hating Muslims take in relation to themselves is indifference. Even though Muslims experience their being-for-others as Muslim bodies in which negative characteristics such as terrorism, irrationality, and backwardness are associated with these bodies, it is possible to feel indifferent about this being-for-others. Describing indifference Sartre writes, “In a sense I am reassured, I am self-confident; that is, I am in no way conscious of the fact the Other’s look can fix my possibilities and my body. I am in a state the very opposite of what you call shyness or timidity” (Sartre 1956, 496). Suddenly, the fact that I am seen as Muslim becomes something that does not bother me. I am relieved.

According to Sartre, indifference is the first attitude in which I look at the Other’s look which transforms the Other from transcendence to “transcendence-transcended” (Sartre 1956, 532). In fact, to Sartre, to look at the Other’s look so that to objectify the Other is to lose one’s experience of being-for-others. Such a move is an intuitive move. A strong woman would stare angrily at the eyes of her Other when seen by eyes that she does not want to be seen with. She

looks at him to take away her being-for-others from him by turning him into a being-for-others-for-her. She stares at him so that he forgets what she is for him and become aware what he is for her: unwanted and creepy eyes. However, as the Muslim person looks at his white Other, he or she is confronted with eyes much stronger than his. Metaphorically, the Muslim person looks up and suddenly looks down. In my countless weekly visits to the hospital to treat my skin, I remember sitting in this small segregated waiting room. I was young, shy, and ashamed. Three times a week, I would sit there looking at the ground. I would feel my Other's look on me. I was simply a "looked-at-look" (476). I was an object for whomever was setting in front of me. Once I assumed that position, it was difficult to escape. I would look up for a moment to see if the person in front of me was looking at me or not, then, I would quickly avert my eyes to the ground again. The nurse call would be my salvation from my Other. I can again look; I can be a subject again. I am free from his objectifying eyes. Therefore, since the Muslim person cannot look at his white Other, he would have to look at him- or herself. He or she would have to look down or the side. As my Other in the hospital waiting room was older, powerful, confident, the white Other is more powerful and confident. The white Other is the healthy one, while I am flawed. He is the more peaceful, advanced, and intellectual one, while I am the more violent, barbaric, and backward one.

Thus, indifference in the case of the self-hating Muslims takes on a new meaning. It is an indifference towards the meaning of one's Muslim identity. I begin to see myself and other Muslims as "functions" (Sartre 1956, 495). I begin to see myself as a Muslim person whose sole function is to do evil. I am indifferent towards the meaning of my Muslimhood. I do not to assert

that there are good or bad Muslims. Muslims are all bad. I accept that I am a terrorist, irrational, and backward.

However, according to Sartre, to be indifferent is not to feel the Other's look. The Muslim person who is indifferent will also lose the anxiety that comes with his being-for-others. It is not because he or she transformed the Other into "function" (Sartre 1956, 495). He cannot look at his or her Other to turn his or Other into an object. He loses his experience of being-for-other because the hypervisibility of his identity becomes hidden to him. After years of trying to escape one's identity, this identity becomes hidden. Dolezal gives the example of the stick that the blind man uses to figure his way around. After a while the stick becomes hidden. It becomes "invisible" (2015, 25). Similarly, the Muslim person after years of evading his Muslim identity, this identity loses its hypervisibility. I am now indifferent about my own Muslimhood.

Let us take the example of some Muslims at the airport who hide their identity in an attitude of indifference towards their Muslim identity. According to Blackwood, Muslims have the learned habit of "avoiding particular airports and traveling less frequently; changing micro-behaviors such as eye contact and gait; and removing markers of Muslim identity" (2015, 256). These behaviors are not indications that their being-for-others is still shameful to them. If I consciously choose to hide my hypervisible Muslim identity, there will become a day in which this hypervisible body/identity becomes invisible to me. As I unreflectively and out of habit choose routes that are less populated with eyes, the Muslim men and women when entering an airport will habitually change how they look without thinking about it. I unreflectively leave my Arabic clothes at home, not because they are a source of shame, but it is because of part of my habit. The Muslim woman removes her headscarf not because it is a mark of subordination and

misogyny, but it because it is what she always does when she goes to the airport. I am truly indifferent towards my Muslimhood, and my masochistic efforts to hide my problematic identity are now invisible to me.

However, according to Sartre, to be indifferent towards the Other will fail because I will realize that to “get possession of the Other’s freedom” is a better route than being indifferent towards the Other (Sartre 1956, 497). There is a moment for every person who is indifferent towards the Other in which he or she feels “in danger” of an alienating look behind his or her “back” (497). The self-hating Muslim will realize that to be indifferent towards one’s own Muslim identity also leads to failure. He or she will again be aware of his or her hypervisibility; he or she will realize that to be aware of one's Muslim identity as an object for the Other is much more advantageous than otherwise. If the goal is to hide this Muslim identity, then it becomes much easier to make one’s Muslim identity much more visible so that it is much easier to cover. This again signals the failure of the individualistic Sartran attitudes. Being indifferent towards my Muslim identity or actively trying to conceal my Muslim identity are both attitudes towards my own self, not my Other. I conceal or ignore my own self not my Other. Conflict is now within me. Hell exists here inside of me and not in relation with my Other (Sartre 1946, 31); I am hell itself.

### *Hate*

The failure of masochism and indifference signals to the self-hating Muslim to take the attitude of Hate. I strategically placed hate as the last attitude because it is also the last attitude for Sartre. Sartre characterizes hate as a sort of resignation” (Sartre 1956, 532). I finally give up



on “using the Other as an instrument to recover [my] own being-in-itself” (532). In hate, I am the only one who exists. I am simply “a freedom without factual limits” (532). I am simply a for-itself. I am this original “burst” towards the world. The Other is nowhere found. The Other is destroyed, and I am alone.

However, for the self-hating Muslims, they will direct this attitude of hate not against their white Other but against themselves. Thus, this attitude of hate for the self-hating Muslim signals their the final “resignation” (532). In this attitude, the self-hating Muslims want to eradicate their Muslimhood permanently. Now, he or she stops wearing the hijab, praying, and fasting. They suddenly announce their atheism. To enter Islam, you either need to born into it or to say the *Shahada*, to be a witness that there is no God but God. Now, the self-hating Muslim denounces God—Allah. He drinks alcohol to show that he is not a Muslim. He sleeps around to prove he is not affected by religion. He eats pork for breakfast, lunch, and dinner to show his indifference towards Islam. The call of prayers is deafening, but he chooses to continue what he is doing. He is an atheist, and he has killed his Muslim identity. He is now an Arab, a worker, or simply a human being. He or she now demands to be seen as who he or she is—a non-Muslim.

According to Sartre, hate will fail because even if was successful in eradicating my Other, I could never erase that I was a being-for-others in the past (Sartre 1957, 534). Sartre writes, “[hate] implies the explicit recognition that the Other has existed. Immediately my being-for-others by slipping into the past becomes an irredeemable dimension of my being” (534). In other words, my being-for-other is now my past, and I can never escape my past. Similarly, the attitude of hate will fail for the self-hating Muslims because the fact that they hated themselves indicates that their Muslimhood is part of their past. In this way, hate can never

succeed. I hate my Muslimhood so much that I want to erase it. Thus, hate is a sign of an undeniable connection. However, I also hate the fact that I was Muslim. Now, I am eternally connected with Islam. Hate is a failure.

Hate for the self-hating Muslims will also fail for another reason. Since to be a Muslim is a racial identity, it becomes impossible to overcome that identity. Islam, under the United States racial system transforms from being an ideology to be a racial marker. Even if I announce at every encounter that I am not a Muslim or that I am just culturally Muslim, I would still be seen as Muslim. I am raced as Muslim and I can never escape my Muslimhood.

### **10. Muslim Collective Attitudes of Self-Love**

The failure of the individuated Sartrean attitudes leads Muslims to taking on different approach to their being-for-others as Muslim bodies. This failure leads to the attitude of self-love which is the second consequence/evidence of the failure of the individuated Sartrean attitudes. In this attitude of self-love, the self-loving Muslims want to affirm, not to deny, their Muslimhood. These Muslims understand an individuated Other does not hold the “secret” to their being (Sartre 1956, 473). The secret is out and beyond their Other. The secret is their religion which is also their identity/race which had been reified to the extreme. Moreover, they are well aware that taking the individuated Sartrean attitudes towards their Other will not work because they are part of a larger collective. Thus, these Muslims take on the Sartrean attitudes of masochism, indifference, sadism, and hate, not as individuals, but as collectives against their white Other.

Thus, these collective attitudes signal the triple failure of the Sartrean attitudes. First, the fact that Muslims have to take collective attitude signals the failure of all the Sartrean

individualistic attitudes. Second, these collective attitudes also signal the failure of the Sartrean revolutionary attitude. To Sartre, race can only be transcended only if we reach the pinnacle of Marxism (Sartre 1947, 167). Thus, the revolutionary attitude is not directed against other people, but it is directed against fundamental institutions to cause “a profound modification of property relations” (Sartre 1947, 167). Thus, racial equality is a secondary consequence of class equality. In fact, Sartre privileges class oppression over racial oppression. Sartre writes, “Consequently this oppression is not, like that of the Jews or the Negroes, a secondary, so-to-speak lateral characteristic of the social system in question, but is, on the contrary, an integral part of it” (168). Thus racism, anti-Semitism, and Islamophobia are consequences of the more fundamental oppression of the working class. By freeing the working class, the Muslim person as consequences will be free. Moreover, there is also a third failure in these collective attitudes. Since the oppression of the Muslim person is a marginal oppression, the Muslim person is not seen as the person who will be the revolutionary. Equating the revolutionary person with the working class Sartre writes, “That is to say, the revolutionary is among those who work for the dominant class” (168).

Therefore, all the collective attitudes that Muslims take in relation to their Other is “for an improvement in certain details of their life, not for a radical change” (Sartre 1947. 168). Muslims by demanding equality affirm the system as their goal is to benefit from the system. Therefore, in addition to Sartre’s blindness to the Black and Muslim experiences of being-for-others, he doesn't see them collectively as even part of the revolution. As a group, they must set to the side waiting for their salvation.

*Collective Masochism*

Sartre introduces the individualistic attitudes of masochism as a way to deal with our being-for-others. According to Sartre, in masochism, I “insist on making myself be treated as one object among others, as an instrument to be treated as one object among others, as an instrument to be used. Now it is my transcendence to be denied not his” (Sartre 19576, 492). In masochism, I become identified with my objectivity. In masochism, I “project being nothing more than an object; that is, radically as in-itself” (492). The Other moves me around like a toy. The masochist enjoys being an object for others, even though he or she knows deep down that he or she is a subjectivity. Deep down, the masochist knows that he or she is treating the “Other as an object and transcends him toward his objectivity” (493). Thus, the Other is toying with me, and I am toying with them toying with me. In fact, masochism is the enjoyment of the very failure to be an object for the Other (Sartre 1956, 526). Moreover, this objectification will be the end of my alienation. This is because in masochism “my being will become again the foundation of itself” (492). This is because masochism is to be “absorbed” into the Other’s freedom. Now since I am one with this freedom, this freedom is mine. I become again the foundation of my being through the Other (492). Now, I am self-assured.

Collectively, in the case of Muslims, they are masochists against their white Other. After every terror attack, Muslim organizations will announce their disagreement with what happened. There are countless denunciations of terrorism by Islamic organizations, Islamic scholars, intellectuals, countries, and individual Muslims. We can see their attempts as masochistic attitudes toward their Other. In these attempts, the self-loving Muslims will identify with their collective identity/race. They see themselves as part of this larger collective that is seen

negatively. Their attitude is masochistic because they feel the urge to change how their Other thinks about them as an object, but not to focus on their subjectivity. They masochistically accept their negative objectification and association with terrorism, and they are actively trying to separate themselves from that objectification.

However, their attempts are destined to fail since they are confronted with an Other who is indifferent to their Muslimhood. Muslim people will never be seen as subjects who transcend their extremist ideology. No matter how they try, their efforts remain invisible. The Other will always see the Muslim person as a terrorist, irrational, and backward. There is a “blindness” towards Muslims and their efforts to challenge their negative objectification (Sartre 1956, 459). Gordon gives an example of how the media purposely chooses to focus on information that portrays Westerners in a positive light while focuses on Blacks in a negative light. Aberrantly, in Somalia, there were “thugs” who were wreaking havoc (Gordon 1995, 114). One of the news organizations covering the story called Pacifica News chose to publish a story that focuses only on the “White American and European physicians, relief workers, educators, and soldiers” (114). While there were “Somalian physicians, relief workers, and community defense teams,” the news organization elected to render them “invisible” (114). Similarly, in the Muslim situation, all the efforts they take to change their objectivity fail. After every terrorist attack, the same question will be asked again: “Why Muslims do not denounce terrorism?”. Such a question shows the indifference of this or that reporter has towards Muslims. Herra Hashmi, a student at the University of Colorado Boulder, compiled a 712-page spreadsheet listing sources of Muslims condemning terrorism. Thus the condemnation is there, but the reporter’s eyes do not see a freedom but an object who has the sole “function” to do terrorism (Sartre 1956, 495). Moreover,

the question itself shows an attempt to force all Muslims to be masochistically identified with terrorism. His question is saying that all Muslim should be hyper-aware of their objectivity at all times, and they should try to defend themselves against this objectification. The desire for a collective apology is an explicit accusation against all Muslims. It is an act of racialization and group formation.

What these organizations are attempting is a step above the Sartrean intersubjective attitudes. They are not trying to change their being-for-others by convincing a particular individual to change his or her opinion. These organizations show a collective effort of Muslims to change their shared being-for-others by attempting to reach their white Other also as a collective. However, this attitude still will fail because the Muslim identity is not simply an identity that is held by the white Other as individuals or as collectives. Of course, the Muslim identity can only exist for human beings. However, according to MarcusE, for the Muslim identity to be created, there needs to be “action and reaction of specific social groups under specific historical conditions” (1948, 324). For Muslims to be associated with terrorism is the end process of “specific historical conditions” of hegemony, imperialism, colonialism, and capitalism (324). A simple denunciation of terrorism will never work. Again, it is a step towards changing our being-for-others, but it is an effort that starts with masochism. It is an effort that tries to remain within the system that is created against the Muslim person. It is not a revolutionary effort.

*Collective Indifference*

Another attitude that the self-loving Muslims could take collectively against their white Other is indifference. We can see the creation of Muslim ghettos across Europe as a kind of attitude of indifference to what the white Other thinks of them. In these ghettos, Muslim men and women get raised as if they were in a Muslim country. They will retain the majority of their religion, language, culture, or food. They will develop a kind of exclusive Muslim consciousness. They will live with kind of “blindness” towards their white Other (Sartre 1947, 495). Since in these ghettos, the penetration of the mainstream culture is curtailed and blocked with an imported Muslim culture, it will be impossible for them take on a white consciousness. They will see themselves as exclusively Muslim, and their white Other is separate from them. In a sociology article titled “British-born Pakistani and Bangladeshi Young Men: Exploring Unstable Concepts of Muslim, Islamophobia, and Racialization,” Martin Mac an Ghail and Chris Haywood focus on the experience of young Bangladeshi and Pakistani Muslim males growing up in Birmingham, Britain. One of the trends highlighted in the article is the growing trend of young Muslim males who self-identify as Muslim (Mac an Ghail and Haywood 2014, 103).

Moreover, there is a sense of separation between how these young Muslim men see themselves and how their white Other sees them. In one of the interviews, Imran speaking about this sense of separation says, “Groups can label themselves like we label ourselves Muslim. But it’s not the same as when white people use the label” (104). Thus, we can see a separation between how Muslims in Birmingham see themselves and how they see themselves being seen, which is essential to any attitude of indifference. In a way, this separation is important because it is an act of distancing oneself from negative stereotyping. Now, since there is a gap, Muslims in

Birmingham could have this “blindness” with regard to how their white Other see them (496). Now they are “assured” and “self-confident” about their Muslimhood.

However, indifference is always destined to fail because there is always the realization that “I am in danger of [a wandering and inapprehensible look] alienating me behind my back (Sartre 1956, 497). Sartre thinks that even if we are indifferent to the Other’s freedom or perspective, we “despite all [have] an implicit comprehension of this freedom” (497). Thus, I am suddenly motivated to end my indifference and to take action and “attempt to get possession of the Other’s freedom” (497). Similarly, the attitude of indifference that these young Pakistani and Bangladeshi Muslim males adopt is also destined to fail. Because, unlike their parents, they are British nationals; they know no other country other than Britain. Thus, their attitude of indifference to their white Other is difficult to maintain. The language and cultural barriers are not as strong as they once were in the case with their parents. Abdul, one of the interviewees, describing the difficulties of being a Muslim and British says, “It’s different for us because we’re born here, so we’re British and have a Pakistan heritage. And, anyway, probably everything changed round here and everywhere after 9/11” (Mac and Ghail 2015, 100).

Therefore, collective indifference in which self-loving Muslims creates semi-exclusive communities is a way in which they could combat their white Other. In these communities, Muslims find a way to create a Muslim identity and to be self-identified as Muslims without the negative stereotypes that are seen to be present with the Muslim identity. However, even in this semi-isolated communities, the penetration of the negative mainstream view of Muslims is undeniable. Even in isolationist countries like Saudi Arabia or Iran, one sees a growing trend of awareness of how Muslims are depicted and seen by their white Other. Now to be indifferent as a



Muslim person anywhere in the world is impossible or very difficult to maintain. This is because cultural and linguistic gaps are now smaller than ever because of globalization.

### *Sadism*

One of the ways that Muslims collectively affirm their Muslim identity/body is through self-inflicted terrorism. I characterize this self-inflicted terrorism or violence as a sadistic attitude. Gordon describes Black-on-Black violence as a form of sadism (1995, 110). To Sartre, sadism is when I try to incarnate the Other as a flesh which is similar to desire. However, in sadism, instead of using “caress,” the sadist uses violence to incarnate his Other (Sartre 1956, 522). In sadism, through violence, I attempt to incarnate the Other into flesh so that I can control the Other’s freedom and as consequences my being-for-others. Moreover, in sadism, since I am not touching the Other, the Other does not incarnate me as a body. This means that as a sadist I deny that I have a body and a being-for-others. Describing the sadist attempt to disassociate from his or her body, Sartre writes, “The sadist apprehended his body as a synthetic totality and center of action; he has resumed the perpetual flight from his own facticity. He experiences self in the face of the Other as pure transcendence” (518). In sadism, I am simply a freedom—a consciousness.

Similarly, in an attitude of sadism, Muslims in acts of terrorism will inflict violence against other Muslims as a way to affirm their Muslim identity. By incarnating other Muslims through violence, they affirm their Muslim identity. They affirm that they are a consciousness or a perspective. The Muslim terrorist by inflicting violence against other Muslims is saying, “Look at me. I am here”.

To understand this phenomenon of collective self-inflicted violence, it is better to look at the history of the Muslim identity. A quick survey into some Islamic political organizations such as Hizb Al Tahrir (HT) in Jordan, Muslim Brotherhood (MB) in Egypt, or Jamaat-i-Islam (JI) in South Asia will result in the realization that these groups were first established after decolonization to deal with the damage that was dealt to the identity of the colonized. During colonization, the Muslim identity was demonized and prohibited. Thus, after colonization, Muslims saw their Muslim identity as their way to affirm their freedom. Even though Muslim countries gain independence, the colonizer still did not leave completely. Thus, these groups self-identify as the protectors of the Muslim identity that is seen as last hope of true independence after decolonization.

However, after the decolonization, issues of modernity and westernization became a very hot topic. A lot of the Muslim populous was seen by these organization as un-Islamic or heretic for taking on a more Westerner lifestyle. Thus, violence against Other Muslims was a way to remind them of their mistakes that they are not Muslim enough. In fact, according to the 2011 report of US government's National Counter-Terrorism Center (NCTC), 82% of the victims of terrorism are Muslims<sup>2</sup>. This self-inflicted violence can be seen as an attempt to salvage the colonized identity after decolonization. It is a slap on the face of the other delinquent Muslims who gave up their Muslim identity for Westerner ideals. It is an attempt for the self-loving terrorist to cause his Muslim Other to be reminded of his or her mistake. Sartre claims that “in pain facticity invades the consciousness” (Sartre 1956, 518). In pain, the Muslim terrorist forces his or her Muslim Other to see his or her “obscene” and sinful body (524). Thus, we can see

---

<sup>2</sup> The National Counter-Terrorism Center, *Report on Terrorism* (Washington, 2011), 14, <https://fas.org/irp/threat/nctc2011.pdf>

Muslim-on-Muslim violence as an ironic self-love in which Muslims try to keep and save their Muslim identity by forcing their Muslim Other to reflect on his or her body/identity.

However, according to Sartre, the attitude of sadism will always fail. It is because even if I treat the other as mere object, there is the moment in the which the Other subjectivity is going to explode in my face (Sartre 1956, 526). Moreover, the more I treat the Other as an object that more I realized that the Other is subject. I realize that I am in fact an object for this Other, that I the Other wants by his or her freedom to be dominated.

Similarly, self-inflicted violence as collective attitude will fail. The Muslim groups who indulge in self-inflicted terrorism will realize that attacking Other Muslims is not the right way to combat westernization. Sartre associates the experience of the sadist with guilt (Sartre 1956, 531). The sadist is guilty of using the Other as an object to exercise his or her freedom on him or her. Burdened with guilt, the Muslim terrorist will realize his mistake. First, he will realize that using his Muslim Other to keep his own identity is mistake. Second, he will feel guilty against this Muslim identity that he dearly holds. He will realize that what he is doing tarnishes the Muslim identity that he dearly cherishes. What he is doing is alienating himself more from his identity. He will realize that he will be an additional cause in which the Muslim identity will lose more of its ground. Now, the Western Other has the evidence to verify the all negative stereotypes that are associated with Islam.

Moreover, we can see how this attitude of self-inflicted violence will be a failure in another way. This attitude of sadism is not a revolutionary attitude. By killing his Muslim Other, the Muslim terrorist is not fundamentally changing the system. He is not trying to reach a Marxist utopia. He is a radical. He wants to keep the separation between human beings. He does

not want the equality that is the end result of Marxism. Thus again, sadism signals the failure of the individualistic and revolutionary Sartrean attitudes.

### *Hate*

In hate, we aim at the death of the other. I hate the existence of the Other, and not a particular aspect of the Other (Sartre 1957, 534). Hate is our attempt to get rid of the existence of the Other and to be alone is existence. Sartre writes, “the one who hates projects no longer being an object; hates presents itself as an absolute positioning of the freedom of the for-itself before the Other” (532). Hate is a “resignation” (532). I give up in all my previous attitudes, and all that I can do now to is destroy the Other so that I am finally free from my being-for-others.

In hate, self-loving Muslims will want the total the death of his white Other. After the failure of masochism, indifference, and sadism, the self-loving Muslim loses all hopes in affirming his Muslim identity. He can never be the “in-itself-for-itself” (Sartre 1956, 94). Now, the only way to affirm the Muslim identity is the total destruction of the white Other. Violence or terrorism against the white Other is an expression of this attitude of hate.

However, for these self-loving Muslims to destroy their white Other, there needs to be a total separation between themselves and their white Other. Most Muslims who carry this kind of violence were raised in a different culture than their white Other. They were raised with a different language, religion, and customs. Such a gap enables them to place the white person as a total Other in relation to them. They now see the white person as totality distinct from them.

Thus, for radicalized self-loving Muslims to be able to do violence against their white Other, they need beforehand to see their white Other as a purely mechanized object. Their white

Other by his or her actions emphasize the separation between the two. The soldiers in Afghanistan and Iraq look like mechanized robots that have landed in a different realm. All that Muslims see is unmanned drones, unmanned helicopters, and unmanned killing machines. This is how many Muslims know and experience their Other. Thus, in bad faith, the Muslim in Iraq, Syria, or Afghanistan wants to eradicate every Western human being in direct opposition to the destruction that he is experiencing with his or her people. As a natural reaction, the white Other stops existing for him or her as a freedom, and now what he or she only sees is objects—machines. Now, the Muslim person has no being-for-others since his Other is now eradicated.

However, this attitude of hate is also destined to fail. Even if I succeed in eradicating my Other, I am now aware of my vulnerability to be an object for others. I am painfully aware that I was a being-for-others in the past. My being-for-others thus becomes an unreadable aspect of my past (Sartre 1956, 533). Similarly, for the self-loving radical Muslims, even if they succeeded in eradicating their white Other, their being-for-other will still be an irredeemable aspect of their past. The radical would think to himself, “I was an inferior Muslims to these eyes”. Thus, he is intimately linked to his being-for-others, and this being can never escape him or her. Moreover, even if the Muslim person destroyed his Other, his being-for-others does not exist within the white Other. It exists in the laws, policies, media, books, news stories, and paintings. His being-for-others is reified beyond control. His being-for-others is now an objective fact. Again, the being-for-others of Muslims is a product of specific historical conditions. Moreover, and more importantly, their being-for-others is their identity. Thus, they themselves are always aware of their being-for-others and affirm that being-for-others themselves.

This attitude of destruction is also a resounding failure to the inter-subjective and revolutionary Sartrean attitudes. First, terrorism is a collective effort and thus it fails to count as an individualistic Sartrean attitude. Second, this attitude is far from revolutionary. Random acts of violence against Westerners is not a revolutionary attitude. Mindless destruction of others is not a road to a Marxist utopia, but to a dystopia. Terrorism is an attitude that greatly increases Muslim racialization and reaffirms the difference between Muslims and their Other.

### **11. Being-for-Others between Blacks and Muslims**

I chose to juxtapose Black and Muslim experience because both are part of different oppressed minorities in the United States. Moreover, I chose to focus on the Black experience because of its dominance in the literature of race. Thus, I chose to focus on the Black experience as an attempt to bridge the gap in the literature for the Muslim experience. However, that does not mean that the experiences of the Black person are the same as those of the Muslim person. Colloquially, people would say that Muslims are now the new Black population in the United States. A theory of racial formation by Omi and Winant supports such sentiment. The pair defines racialization as the “extension of racial meaning to a previously racially unclassified relationship, social practice, or group” (1986, 64). In this view, Muslims will be a given an already given racial identity such as Black and not a new one. However, to think of the Muslim person as a Black person would do a disservice to the phenomenological experience of both. Selod and Embrick agree that there is a difference in the experiences of both groups. He writes, “Because race theories in the United States were used to understand Black/White experience, attempting to apply these frameworks to groups that were socially, politically, and economically

contextually distinct is irresponsible” (648). Therefore, although both the Black and Muslim person are realized, they both have different experiences.

*Religion, Biology, and Equal Dehumanization*

Because Blacks and Muslims are radicalized, they are both equally dehumanized; they are both less than their white Other. However, the initial source inferiority differs between the Black the Muslim person. For the Black person, his or her biology was seen as the initial and final source of inferiority. Phenotypic descriptions such as “skin tone, phenotype, hair texture” were seen an evidence of the inferiority of Blacks (Selod and Embrick 2013, 645). For the Muslim person, however, his or her religion was the source of inferiority. Inferiority here means inferiority of the body. Thus, the Black body becomes its own source of inferiority while the religion becomes the source of the inferiority of the Muslim body. Characterizing this inferiority of the body of the Muslim person, Selod and Embrick write,

Religious identity had a biological component to it and was not simply based on cultural differences. It was believed that Muslims were inherently and innately inferior to Christians due to perceived biological differences. Consequently, Christians were placed at the top of the hierarchy in society, while Jews and Muslims were given second-class status. (646)

Therefore, the Muslim person is not simply inferior because he belongs to a different religion, but it because of the inferiority of his or her body. Similarly, Garner and Selod write, “in other words, people (physical bodies) are the ultimate site of racism, even if the path toward those bodies lies through cultural terrain” (2014, 12). Thus, the two bodies are seen as inferior. The Black body itself signals its inferiority while religion is a sign of a bodily inferiority of the Muslim person.

Moreover, the word *inferiority* is ambiguous. If something is less than something else, then it is a perfectly normal question to ask what is it that the else refers to? This else is the white Other. Thus, to be clear, inferiority here means to be less than your white Other. Inferiority is always linked to whiteness. As described by Garner and Selod, race is “is something the powerful do to the less powerful” (2014, 14). Garner and Selod write,

On the basis of these definitions, groups thus racialized (made into either *de jure* or *de facto* ‘races’) are assigned to a hierarchy with white Europeans (later ‘Caucasians’) at its summit, and other groups in their wake. (12)

Thus, although Muslims and Blacks are not the same race, they are both dehumanized and seen as the inferior Other of the white race.

#### *Different Processes of Racialization*

Blacks and Muslims experience their being-for-others as racialized bodies. Thus, we need to know the precise differences in their processes of racialization to understand the difference in their experience of being-for-others. Every process of racialization is different, and thus every race is different. This is due to the particular time, political, social, and economic factors that accompanies the creation of both races. Each race is different and experiences its being-for-others differently.

Muslim migration to the United States is recent. In fact, it is just in the 1960s that Muslims started to migrate to the United States (Selod and Embrick 2013, 644). What coincided with their arrival is the United States imperialist project of world domination (Ajaz 2004, 43). A crucial part of this project is the Middle East which is rich in natural resources. Thus, we can see the creation of the Muslim race as a justification for the United States imperialist project. Race is



a proven tool for creating and justifying oppression. As pointed out by Weheliye, race is that “by which sociopolitical hierarchies are camouflaged by the natural features of the human body” (69). Race was created to justify discrimination against others. Describing the creation of the Muslim race within the United States as a justification for its imperialist project Selod and Embrick write,

In a post-9/11 society, imperialism is once again being sold to the American public under the guise of the “war on terror.” Wide acceptance of socially constructed notions of Muslims and Arabs as terrorists who are inherently opposed to democracy, freedom, and Western values attracts public support and allows for justification of illegal or irrational wars such as the US invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan. (647)

Thus, the creation of the “enemy within” justifies the war on terror which becomes a justification for the continuous military presence of the United States in the Middle East. Now the Muslim person is the enemy—the outsider. The Muslim becomes the exception. The Muslim person in the United States is racialized as his or her Muslim brother or sister. They are both seen as objects who can never hold Western ideals and therefore can never be part of the United States mainstream society. He is an extension of the enemies outside the United States.

The recent Muslim travel ban signifies this separation between Americans and Muslims Americans. This travel ban signals how Muslim Americans are seen. They are seen as totally different. They are seen as a special case. A legal wall was built between the two social components—a wall of distrust. A Muslim person is always under suspicion. As a Muslim person in a Western space, you are always on your toes not to appear suspect. The recent experience of the teenager, Ahmad, who was suspected of bringing a bomb (which turned out to be a clock) to class, echoes this mistrust that now part of the Muslim experience in the United

States<sup>3</sup>. This story reveals the facticity of the Muslim body. My body for others is a body that is ready to destroy itself, a body that will always remain foreigner and outsider.

This is different from the experience of distrust and expulsion that Blacks experience. Although Blacks also see themselves seen as suspect and dangerous, their danger is seen as a pity danger. The Black man has in him the ability to mug you or beat you up. However, the Muslim man is a national threat or even a worldwide threat. When they say national security, they mean security against Muslims. Thus, the danger of Muslims makes them total outsiders. However, in the case of Blacks, since their crimes are not a national security threat, they are also marginalized and excluded. However, they are still seen part of the American society.

In conclusion, Sartre's concept of being-for-other and the intersubjective attitudes that we take in relation to our being-for-others are inherently limited. My being-for-others is not simply my objectified body. If I am Black or Muslim, my being-for-others is also my racialized body. Thus, I experience a different kind of objectification. As a Black person, I am objectified as a Black body that is inferior, criminal, and impure. Moreover, as a Muslim person, I experience my being-for-others as a Muslim body that is threatening, irrational, and backward. Thus, because Blacks and Muslims are raced, the Sartrean attitudes fail in relation to their being-for-others. To be a sadist and objectify my other or to be a masochist and identify with my objectification does not change the fact that I am raced. Therefore, the attitudes of self-hate or collective self-love that have been introduced in the paper show the failure of the intersubjective

---

<sup>3</sup> Manny Fernandez and Christine Hauser, "Handcuffed for Making Clock, Ahmed Mohamed, 14, Wins Time With Obama," *New York Times*, September 16, 2015.

Sartrean attitudes. This is because race transcends our intersubjective encounters. Moreover, also the revolutionary attitude will fail. Black and Muslims are not even seen as a part of the revolutionary class (Sartre 1947, 168).

## References

- Ahmad, Aijaz. 2004. "Imperialism of Our Time." In *The New Imperial Challenge*, ed. Leo Panitch and Colin Leys, 43-62. London: Merlin.
- Austin, Curtis. 2006. *Up Against the Wall: Violence in the Making and Unmaking of the Black Panther Party*. Fayetteville, NC: University of Arkansas Press.
- Blay, Yaba Amgborale. 2011. "Skin Bleaching and Global White Supremacy: By Way of Introduction." *Journal of Pan African Studies* 4 (4): 4-46.
- Barnes, Kenneth. 2004. *Journey of Hope: The Back-to-Africa Movement in Arkansas in the Late 1800s*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Mann, Bonnie. 2011. "Creepers, Flirts, Heros, and Allies." *APA Newsletter* 2 (11): 24-30.
- Curran, Andrew. 2011. *The Anatomy of Blackness: Science and Slavery in an Age of Enlightenment*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cox, Gary. 2008. *The Sartre Dictionary*. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Descartes, René. 1998. *Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy*. Trans. Donald Cress. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Dolezal, Luna. 2015. *The Body and Shame: Phenomenology, Feminism, and the Socially Shaped Body*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2014. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Middletown, DE: Millennium Publications.
- Ellison, Ralph. 1980. *The Invisible Man*. New York, NY: Vintage International.

- Fanon, Frantz. 1952/2008. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Trans. Richard Philcox. 64-88, New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Sadek, Noha. 2017. "Islamophobia, Shame, and the Collapse of Muslim Identities." *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* 14 (3): 200-221.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 2001. "A Fundamental Idea of Husserl's Phenomenology: Intentionality." *Prague* 49 (4): 618-622.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1943/1956. *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. Trans. Hazel Barnes. New York, NY: Washington Square Press.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1951. "Black Orpheus." Trans. and S. W. Allen. *Présence Africaine* 10 (11): 219-247.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1946/2007. *Existentialism is a Humanism*. Trans. Carol Macomber. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. "Materialism and Revolution." *Politics*, April; 1947.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1937/1960. *The Transcendence of the Ego: An Existentialist Theory of Consciousness*. Trans. Forrest Williams. Trans. Robert Kirkpatrick. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
- Selod, Saher, and David Embrick. 2013. "Racialization and Muslims: Situating the Muslim Experience in Race Scholarship." *Sociology Compass* 7 (8): 644-55.
- Shams, Tahseen. 2018. "Visibility as Resistance by Muslim Americans in a Surveillance and Security Atmosphere." *Sociological Forum* 33 (1): 73-94.

- Weiss, Gail. 2014. "Pride and Prejudice: Ambiguous Racial, Religious, and Ethnic Identities of Jewish Bodies." In *Living Alterities, Phenomenology, Embodiment, and Race*, ed. Emily Lee, 222-240. New York, NY: Suny Press.
- Garner, Steve, and Saher Selod. 2014. "The Racialization of Muslims: Empirical Studies of Islamophobia." *Critical Sociology* 41 (1): 9-19.
- Gordon, Lewis. 1995. *Bad Faith and AntiBlack Racism*. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.
- Jules-Rosette, Bennetta. 2007. "Jean-Paul Sartre and the Philosophy of Négritude: Race, Self, and Society." *Theory and Society* 36 (3): 265-285.
- Kassam, Zayn. 2003. "Can a Muslim be a Terrorist?" In *Terrorism and International Justice*, ed. James Sterba, 114-134. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kundnani, Arun. 2015. *The Muslims are Coming!*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso.
- Leda, Blackwood. 2015. "Policing Airport Spaces: The Muslim Experience of Scrutiny." *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice* 9 (3): 255-262.
- Lorde, Audre. 2007. "Eye to Eye: Black Woman, Hatred, and Anger." In *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*, 145-175. New York, NY: Cross Press.
- Mac an Ghail, Mairtin, and Chris Haywood. 2015. "British-Born Pakistani and Bangladeshi Young Men: Exploring Unstable Concepts of Muslim, Islamophobia and Racialization." *Critical Sociology* 41 (1): 97-114.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1948. "Existentialism: Remarks on Jean-Paul Sartre's L'Être Et Le Néant." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 8 (3): 309-336.
- Memmi, Albert. 1965. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. New York, NY: Beacon Press
- Rana, Junaid. 2007. "The Story of Islamophobia." *Souls* 9 (2): 148-61.

Weheliye, Alexander. 2014. "Racism: Biopolitics." In *Habeas Viscus*, 53-73. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Whitney, Shiloh. 2015. "The Affective Forces of Racialization: Affects and Body Schemas in Fanon and Lorde." *Knowledge Cultures* 3 (1): 45-64.

Yancy, George. 2017. *Black Bodies, White Gazes: The Continuing Significance of Race in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.