

**THE UNCANNY MIRROR: MIMICRY, AFFECT, AND
THE COLONIZATION OF DESIRE IN MORRISON'S *THE
BLUEST EYE***

المرآة الغريبة: المحاكاة، والانفعال، واستعمار الرغبة في رواية موريسون العيون
الأشد زرقاً

Wafa Mekhaznia ^{*(1)}

¹University of Kasdi Merbah - Ouargla (Algeria), Faculty of Letters and
Languages, wafaloyalty2013@gmail.com

Nadhir Kaouli ⁽²⁾

²University of Batna2 (Algeria), Faculty of Letters and Languages,
n.kaouli@uni-batna2.dz

Mohammed Seghir Halimi ⁽³⁾

³University of Kasdi Merbah-Ouargla (Algeria), Faculty of Letters and
Languages, Halimi.seghir@univ-ouargla.dz

Title of the research laboratory: //

Submission date: 07/12/2025 Acceptation date: 28 /02/2026 Published date: 15/03/2026

Abstract:

The research investigates Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye* (1970) by uniting feminist theory with psychoanalytic and postcolonial and reader-response approaches and uncanny theory. The research investigates how Western beauty standards create mental fragmentation in black women through their racial and gendered experiences. The research uses bell hooks and Frantz Fanon and Gayatri Spivak and Julia Kristeva and Homi Bhabha and Sara Ahmed and Patricia Hill Collins and Freud to demonstrate how Morrison presents the psychological effects of internalized oppression. The character of Pecola Breedlove demonstrates how black women face racialized femininity through their desire for blue eyes which leads to their disappearance under white observation. Through Claudia's incomplete storytelling Morrison forces readers to experience moral responsibility toward their involvement with emotions and their role as observers. The research applies affect theory and postcolonial hybridity and uncanny

analysis to establish *The Bluest Eye* as a space where beauty and recognition undergo decolonization and transformation.

key words: Toni Morrison, *The Bluest Eye*, gender, affect, uncanny, gaze, internalized oppression

ملخص باللغة العربية:

يتناول هذا البحث رواية توني موريسون "العين الأشد زرقة" (1970) "من خلال توحيد النظرية النسوية مع مقاربات التحليل النفسي وما بعد الكولونيالية واستجابة القارئ ونظرية الغرابة. (The Uncanny) يستقصي البحث كيف تخلق معايير الجمال الغربية حالة من التفكك العقلي لدى النساء السود من خلال تجاربهن العرقية والجنسية. يستخدم البحث أعمال بيل هوكس وفرانز فانون وغاياتري سبيفاك وجوليا كريستيفا وهومي بابا وسارة أحمد وباتريشيا هيل كوليز وفرويد لإظهار كيف تقدم موريسون الآثار النفسية للقمع المستبطن. تُظهر شخصية بيكولا بريدلوف كيف تواجه النساء السود الأنوثة المُعرّنة من خلال رغبتهم في الحصول على عيون زرقاء، مما يؤدي إلى اختفائهن تحت الملاحظة البيضاء. من خلال السرد غير المكتمل الذي تقدمه كلوديا، تُجبر موريسون القراء على اختبار المسؤولية الأخلاقية تجاه تورطهم في المشاعر ودورهم كمراقبين. يطبق البحث نظرية الانفعال (Affect Theory) والهجنة ما بعد الكولونيالية وتحليل الغرابة لتأسيس رواية "العين الأشد زرقة" كفضاء يخضع فيه الجمال والاعتراف لعملية تحرير من الاستعمار والتحول.

الكلمات المفتاحية: توني موريسون، "العين الأشد زرقة"، الجندر / النوع، الانفعال، الغرابة، النظرية، القمع المستبطن.

Introduction:

Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye* (1970) is a searing meditation on race, gender, sexuality, and beauty in mid-twentieth-century America. Set in Lorain, Ohio, in the early 1940s, the novel traces the psychic and social destruction of Pecola Breedlove, an eleven-year-old Black girl who becomes convinced that blue eyes—the clearest emblem of white, middle-class beauty—would save her from ridicule, violence, and invisibility. Pecola's story is not presented as an isolated "case" but as a diagnostic lens through which Morrison examines how Western norms of beauty and family, when internalized by a Black community already marked by economic precarity and racial exclusion, become mechanisms of gendered subjugation. To be

seen as beautiful, or even properly human, requires assimilation to an image that annihilates Black selfhood.

The Bluest Eye originated as a short story inspired by a childhood conversation Morrison had with a friend. While Morrison believed in God, her friend expressed doubt, stemming from unanswered prayers for blue eyes. Morrison recounts in the novel's afterword, "We had just started elementary school. She said she wanted blue eyes."

I looked around to picture her with them and was violently repelled by what I imagined she would look like if she had her wish. The sorrow in her voice seemed to call for sympathy, and I faked it for her, but astonished by the desecration she proposed, I got mad at her instead. (Morrison, 1994, p. 187)

This little reminiscence embodies what is central in the novel. The yearning for blue eyes is a manifestation of what Frantz Fanon (2008) refers to as internalization of the colonizer's gaze: the Black subject sees herself through white eyes and judges her own features as inherently deficient. At the same time, the scene is uncannily disturbing in Freud's sense (2003): what is most familiar—the child's own face—becomes estranged when reimagined according to an alien aesthetic. Morrison's anger at the "desecration" indicates that the wish is not merely aesthetic but ontological, implying the erasure of Blackness as the precondition for beauty and love.

Although much of the criticism of *The Bluest Eye* has long interpreted it as a condemnation of white beauty standards, the novel is also illustrative the ways that race, gender, class and sexuality operate in relation to each other as what Collins (1990) calls a "matrix of domination." Morrison's characters live under overlapping systems of regulation that form bodies, desires and identities. Pauline Breedlove compares herself and her daughter to movie images of white womanhood. Cholly Breedlove's sexual humiliation under white surveillance informs his fragile sense of masculinity and his catastrophic violation of Pecola. Geraldine maintains middle-class respectability by distinguishing "colored people" from "niggers," displacing self-contempt onto children like Pecola. Even Claudia, who resists white dolls and Shirley Temple, participates in the communal scapegoating that leaves Pecola abandoned.

The narrative form makes clear how these dynamics work. The novel starts with the Dick-and-Jane primer, a white children's story of a "happy family," printed three times: once correctly, once without punctuation, and once without spacing. Its gradual breakdown visually stages the disintegration of the national myth it embodies. As it disintegrates into an

unreadable block, the white suburban ideal appears both ubiquitous and unattainable, especially to children like Pecola. The concept of colonial mimicry, deplored by Homi Bhabha (1994) comes to mind –“almost the same, but not quite”: Black children are asked to perform a textual script about American normality which they will never be able to fully live.

From its striking opening line; “Nuns go by as quiet as lust” (Morrison, 1994, p. 3), the novel also signals its preoccupation with sexuality and its regulation. The pairing of “nuns” and “lust” juxtaposes sacred and profane, suggesting the pervasiveness of sexuality in spaces ostensibly governed by purity and discipline. Morrison confronts incest, rape, and sexual exploitation, emphasizing how such violences fall on Black women and girls whose bodies remain unprotected and whose suffering is routinely silenced. As Hartman (1997) and Spillers (1987) argue, slavery’s reduction of Black women to flesh rather than “proper” women continues to structure their vulnerability in the present.

This article argues that *The Bluest Eye* portrays gender role subjugation through a Western internalized lens in three interrelated ways. First, through Pecola’s longing for blue eyes and her desire to disappear, the novel dramatizes the psychic colonization of Black female subjectivity. Second, through dolls, movies, candy, and domestic labor, it shows how white aesthetics and middle-class norms become affectively compelling, organizing what Ahmed (2004, 2010) calls “affective economies” of shame, envy, and desire. Third, through the white and male gaze as embodied in figures such as Mr. Yacobowski, Junior, the community’s onlookers, and ultimately Cholly and Soaphead Church, the text brings to light how vision functions as a disciplinary tool determining which bodies can be loved, protected, or mourned.

Methodologically, this study is qualitative, interdisciplinary, and hermeneutic. It uses close reading of Morrison’s language, imagery, and narrative structure to examine how internalized Western norms shape the characters’ emotional and social worlds. *The Bluest Eye* is approached as both a literary text and a cultural critique, a narrative that “thinks with” and “thinks against” dominant theories of subjectivity, power, and representation. The analysis unfolds in four main sections. “Internalized Oppression and the Black Female Subject” traces how Pecola and her community accept racial and gender hierarchies as natural. “White Aesthetics, Beauty Standards, and Selfhood” examines the Dick-and-Jane primer, dolls, film, and consumer culture in constructing a white feminine ideal. “The White/Male Gaze and Racial-Sexual Subjugation” explores how seeing and being seen organize racialized, gendered power within and

beyond the Black family. "Sexuality, Silence, and Madness in Black Women's Experience" reads sexuality as a terrain of both agency and punishment, culminating in Pecola's madness. The conclusion reflects on Morrison's ethical challenge to readers: to recognize that what we take as "normal" American family life — beauty, innocence and domesticity — is predicated on the systematic absence of Black female existence.

I- Internalized Oppression and the Black Female Subject

The most insidious violence depicted in *The Bluest Eye* is not overt racism alone but its internalization: the moment when the contempt of the dominant culture becomes the lens through which Black subjects view themselves. Pecola Breedlove's tragedy is emblematic of what Fanon (2008) calls the "epidermalization of inferiority," where racial hierarchies are inscribed onto the skin and psyche. She envisions her face and body through white eyes and finds them lacking; her sense of self-worth is wholly mediated by an aesthetic that renders her inherently unworthy. As Collins (1990) and hooks (1992) both point out, Black women and girls are positioned in a field of "controlling images"—the mammy, the mule, the Jezebel—that make it difficult for them to claim beauty, innocence or desirability without reproducing those stereotypes that devalue them. At the bottom of this visual hierarchy is Pecola; she is poor, dark-skinned, a child and girl.

Pecola's fantasy of transformation centers on her eyes, the organ that both sees and is seen. Morrison explains that at some point, Pecola realizes that if her eyes; "those eyes that held the pictures, and knew the sights", were different, "that is to say, beautiful," she herself would be different:

It had occurred to Pecola sometime ago that if her eyes, those eyes that held the pictures, and knew the sights—if those eyes of hers were different, that is to say, beautiful, she herself would be different. [...] If she looked different, beautiful, maybe Cholly would be different, and Mrs. Breedlove too. Maybe they'd say, 'Look at pretty-eyed Pecola. We mustn't do bad things in front of those pretty eyes. (Morrison, 1994, p. 45)

Here beauty becomes a moral shield: Pecola imagines that blue eyes could discipline her parents' violence and produce a home where she is safe. Beauty is not simply about appearance; it is a promise of transformed social relations. Judith Butler's (2004) notion of "livable lives" illuminates this passage. Pecola believes that blue eyes would make her life livable by granting her access to recognition, respect, and love—privileges tied closely

to white femininity and middle-class domesticity. To be “pretty-eyed Pecola” would mean, she hopes, that the everyday brutality of her home would become unthinkable.

Yet Pecola's desire is also bound to an uncanny wish for self-erasure. In one of the novel's most striking episodes, she prays to God: “please make me disappear” (Morrison, 1994, p. 44). She experiments with disappearing: “She squeezed her eyes shut. Little parts of her body faded away. [...] only her tight eyes were left, they were always left” (Morrison, 1994, p. 44). No matter how intensely she wishes, her eyes refuse to vanish: “Try as she might, she could never get her eyes to disappear, so what was the point? They were everything. Everything was there, in them” (Morrison, 1994, p. 44).

This is a quintessentially uncanny moment in Freud's sense: the very organ that mediates her relation to the world becomes the site of horror. What should be most intimately “hers” feels alien and unbearable. Pecola's eyes both store the images of her suffering and embody the gaze through which she imagines she is judged. Lacan's (1977) theory of the gaze is helpful here: she experiences herself as seen from a hostile elsewhere, as though her own perception were overcoded by the white/male eye. Even when she closes her eyes, that gaze persists inside her head. Kristeva's (1982) concept of abjection is also relevant: Pecola wants to expel or erase what she finds intolerable in herself—her own visibility as a Black girl—but discovers that the abject cannot simply be thrown away. It remains the “everything” in her eyes.

Internalized oppression is not confined to Pecola; it structures the Breedlove family as a whole. Morrison insists that the Breedloves do not live in a storefront “because they are poor, or because their father is drunk, or their mother works,” but because of an accepted ugliness:

It was as though some mysterious all-knowing master had given each one a cloak of ugliness to wear, and they had accepted it without question. The master said ‘you're ugly people.’ They had looked about themselves and saw nothing to contradict the statement; [...]. ‘Yes,’ they said. ‘You are right.’ And they took the ugliness in their hands [...] dealing with it each according to his way. (Morrison, 1994, pp. 38–39)

The “master” here is both historical—echoing the slave master and overseer—and symbolic, representing the internalized voice of white supremacy. The “cloak of ugliness” is a psychic garment: once put on, it shapes how they feel, move, love, and fight. Hooked into what Collins

(1990) calls “controlling images” of Black inferiority, the Breedloves restructure their emotional lives around this verdict. Pauline retreats into service and cinema, aligning herself with white employers and white film narratives rather than with her own family. Cholly drinks and lashes out violently, acting out his rage on those closest to him. Sammy runs away, trying repeatedly to leave the scene of his own humiliation. Pecola turns inward and blames herself, absorbing the family's and community's contempt into a core conviction that she is, in fact, ugly and unlovable. Spillers's (1987) account of the “ungendering” of enslaved Black women—the reduction of women to flesh without protected womanly status—resonates here: Pauline and Pecola inherit a world in which Black womanhood is already marked as less than fully human.

The broader community participates in this economy of degradation. Claudia reflects that Pecola “was so sad to see. Grown people looked away; children, those who were not frightened by her laughed outright” (Morrison, 1994, p. 184). The adults' “looking away” and the children's open laughter mark Pecola as a legitimate object of scorn rather than of concern. Ahmed's (2004) notion of affective economies helps make sense of this. Emotions such as disgust and pity “stick” to Pecola; she is the surface onto which communal anxieties and self-hatred are projected. Claudia confesses: “We were so beautiful when we stood astride her ugliness. Her poverty kept us generous” (Morrison, 1994, p. 206). Pecola's degradation allows others to feel relatively innocent and whole. By comparison, they seem clean, upright, sane. In Girard's terms, she becomes a kind of scapegoat whose suffering consolidates the group's fragile sense of goodness.

Domestic violence further entrenches this internalization, especially along gendered lines. Cholly returns home drunk, provoking fights with Pauline that terrify the children. Their responses diverge: “There was a difference in the reaction of children to these battles. Sammy cursed for a while, or left the house, or threw himself into the fray. He was known by the time he was fourteen, to have run away from home no less than twenty-seven times” (Morrison, 1994, p. 43). Pecola, “restricted by youth and sex,” cannot flee:

Pecola on the other hand, restricted by youth and sex, experimented with methods of endurance. Though the methods varied, the pain was consistent as it was deep. She struggled between an overwhelming desire that one would kill the other and a profound wish that she herself could die. (Morrison, 1994, p. 43)

This double wish; death of the parents or death of the self, reveals the depth of Pecola's entrapment. Sammy, as a boy, can dream of flying away or struggling against oppression; Pecola, as a girl, has to invent ways to survive with her spirit healed. It is important to recall Hartman's (1997) work on the "afterlife of slavery" in these moments: the Black home is not always a sanctuary; it is a space where the violence of race has been reproduced, especially in gendered terms. The logic of the plantation that once justified violence against enslaved women has now reentered a working-class Black home, where a father's rage, shaped by his own humiliation, falls on a powerless daughter.

In this sense, Pecola's yearning for blue eyes is not merely a personal fantasy but rather a symptom of a structural reality. Her subjectivity is colonized by racial hierarchies; her gendered vulnerability leaves her with little protection; her economic deprivation separates her from competing models of beauty and worth. In Collins's (1990) "matrix of domination," Pecola is at the bottom: she is poor, Black, female, and a child. So every axis of her identity amplifies the others in producing a sense of utter worthlessness. She is precisely the kind of subject whom Spivak (1988) referred to as subaltern: she cannot "speak" in a way that transforms her social position, and when she does speak—especially after her breakdown—she is dismissed as mad. Her body and voice circulate as objects of gossip, pity, and contempt, but her own understanding of herself never takes hold in the public's mind.

Meanwhile, Morrison throws into question any mere dichotomy of internal and external oppression by demonstrating how deeply the two intertwine. The insults Pecola hears, the looks that pass over her, the physical violence she witnesses and endures; all these outward acts become inward beliefs. Christian's (1987) claim that Black women writers "theorize in narrative" is realized here; through Pecola's fantasies of disappearance and transformation, through the Breedloves' "cloak of ugliness," through Claudia's belated recognition of her own complicity, Morrison dramatizes how ideology becomes flesh and feeling. Internalized oppression, in *The Bluest Eye*, is not an abstract psychological condition but rather the daily experience of living in a world that insists, at every level, that a Black girl like Pecola Breedlove does not and cannot matter.

II- White Aesthetics, Beauty Standards, and Selfhood

The Bluest Eye illustrates Morrison's critique of white aesthetic norms, which have the deleterious effect on Black selves, but especially on women and girls. At the level of form, the novel begins with a Dick-and-Jane primer—the quintessential text on white middle-class home life: an

orderly house, a gentle mother, a busy father, smiling children and playful dog. Printed three times — with full punctuation, then without punctuation, and finally stripped of spacing — this primer slowly disintegrates into visual noise. This typographical experiment dramatizes how ideology operates: what Terry Eagleton (2011) might have called a “structure of feeling” that seems natural and innocent, but actually encodes social power. The happy family story of the primer is soaked up by the cultural milieu as what normal looks like, yet it remains structurally closed to Black children such as Pecola and Claudia whose lives can never fit its frame.

From a postcolonial standpoint, this opening resonates with Bhabha's (1994) work on colonial mimicry and the uncanny. Text from Dick-and-Jane books is meant to be repeated by children learning to read, and to inhabit the normative space of “American childhood.” It serves, however, as a script for Black kids that denies their lived experience. They're asked to identify with characters whose whiteness and lack of difficulty are impossible for them. The primer is reduced to an uncanny object, familiar as a school tool but foreign once we recognize that it silently excludes the same children who are expected to absorb its lessons. Loomba's (1998) observations on colonial discourse—and its insistence on comparing the colonized to an idealized European self —critically come into play in this area too, in what might be considered an innocuous domain of children's literacy.

White aesthetic norms do not remain abstract. They are embodied in objects, images, and everyday commodities. Claudia recalls that: “It began with Christmas and the gifts of dolls. The big, the special, the loving gift was always a big, blue-eyed baby doll [...] I was bemused by the thing itself and the way it looked” (Morrison, 1994, p. 21). She is “physically revolted by and secretly frightened of those round moronic eyes, the pancake face, and orangeworms hair” (Morrison, 1994, p. 21), and describes the doll as “a most uncomfortable, patently, aggressive sleeping companion” (Morrison, 1994, p. 21). These images are not neutral but charged. Ahmed's (2004) notion that emotions “stick” to objects helps explain why dolls are so powerfully affective: they come pre-loaded with love, admiration, and desire, and those feelings are directed toward a white, blue-eyed, pink-skinned form. Unlike Pecola and Frieda, who adore these dolls as they have been taught to, Claudia refuses to accept their beauty. Her response is both intense and incisive: “I had only one desire: to dismember it. To see of what it was made, to discover the dearness, to find the beauty, the desirability that had escaped me, but apparently only to me” (Morrison, 1994, p. 22).

Her impulse to break the doll apart is not mere destructiveness; it is a critical investigation into the ideological construction of beauty. In Eagleton's sense, she is interrogating the "naturalness" of the aesthetic standard imposed on her. Christian (1987) argues that Black women writers often produce theory through narrative rather than abstract treatises; Claudia's narrative of doll-dismemberment is precisely such a theorizing of aesthetics from below. Yet Claudia is troubled by the perception that her reaction deviates from the norms of her interpretive community: "adults, older girls, magazines, newspapers, window signs—all the world had agreed that a blue-eyed, yellow-haired, pink-skinned doll was what every child treasured. 'Here,' they said, 'this is beautiful, and if you are on this day 'worthy' you may have it'" (Morrison, 1994, p. 22).

The doll is a material reward and a moral barometer; to reject it is to refuse the gift and risk being marked as "unworthy." Ahmed's (2010) analysis of "happiness scripts" clarifies this: happiness is promised to those who align with certain objects (the doll, the white child) and withheld from those who do not. Claudia confesses that "the truly horrifying thing" is when the impulse to destroy shifts from dolls to real white girls: "I destroyed white dolls. But the dismembering of dolls was not the true horror. The truly horrifying thing was the transference of the same impulse to little white girls" (Morrison, 1994, p. 23). She wonders: "what made people look at them and say, 'awwwww,' but not for me? The eye slide of black women as they approached them on the street, and the possessive gentleness of their touch as they handled them" (Morrison, 1994, p. 23).

This is a precise description of what Ahmed (2004) calls an affective economy: love, tenderness, and protectiveness circulate around white female children, while Black girls are positioned outside that circle. Wallace-Sanders (2002) notes that images of the Black female body in American culture have historically been marked by hypersexualization and labor, not innocence and vulnerability. Claudia's memory shows how that historical archive shapes contemporary gestures—whose head is stroked, whose is ignored. White femininity is further idealized through film and popular culture. Shirley Temple becomes the child-star embodiment of the white aesthetic. Claudia remarks: "Frieda and she had a loving conversation about how cu-ute Shirley Temple was. I couldn't join them because I hated Shirley" (Morrison, 1994, p. 20).

While Claudia experiences resentment and fatigue toward this icon, Pecola is entranced. She drinks milk from a Shirley Temple cup and purchases Mary Jane candies, whose wrappers feature a smiling white girl. The narrative specifies: "She eats the candy, and its sweetness is good. To

eat the candy is somehow to eat the eyes, eat Mary Jane, love Mary Jane. Be Mary Jane" (Morrison, 1994, p. 49). And: "three pennies bought her nine lovely orgasms with Mary Jane. Lovely Mary Jane, for whom the candy is named" (Morrison, 1994, p. 49). Rigney (1991) reads the Mary Janes as "emblems of shame" and "envy" in their association with white privilege (p. 86). From another angle, they can be seen as objects of commodity fetishism in the Marxian sense, but now mediated through race and gender. The candy is more than sugar; it is a portable piece of whiteness that Pecola can momentarily possess and ingest. Bhabha's (1994) concept of mimicry is helpful; Pecola tries to "be Mary Jane" by consuming the image, but the result is only an intensified awareness of her difference—"almost the same, but not quite."

The figure of Maureen Peal expands on this exploration of aesthetics and identity within colorism and intra-racial hierarchy. Maureen is "a high-yellow dream child with long brown hair braided into two lynch ropes that hung down her back" (Morrison, 1994, p. 58). Teachers, adults, and Black boys alike admire her. Claudia does not truly hate Maureen; she hates "the thing" that makes her desirable—her proximity to the white ideal. Collins (1990) explains that lighter skin and "good hair" frequently come to stand in for respectability and value within African American communities, pointing to the extensive history of upholding those who most resemble whiteness. Maureen's treatment is an example of how white aesthetics break up Black solidarity by ordering Black bodies on a color line.

Through Pauline Breedlove, Morrison also highlights the function of narrative imagination in aesthetic internalization. As a young woman, Pauline finds in the movies "a world which was in sharp contrast to the shabbiness of her own." She learns "to look at a face and assign it some category on the scale of absolute beauty, and the scale was one she absorbed in the movies" (Morrison, 1994, p. 122). Smith (2012) argues that Morrison's work consistently criticizes the "moral imagination" of mainstream America—its tendency to equate goodness with white, middle-class domesticity. It is this film aesthetic that has colonized Pauline's imagination. And when she starts working as a servant for the Fishers, she's finally living in a world that resembles life in the movies. Their house is clean, ordered, and lit like a film scene; the Fisher child resembles the heroines she has long admired.

Rigney (1991) suggests that Pauline "has lost her sexual self in her rage for order and her fascination with the cleanliness (sterility) of the white woman's kitchen" (p. 99). In other words, Pauline finds her sense of self not in her own home, body, or daughter, but in the role of the devoted Black

servant who maintains white beauty. Hartman's (1997) theory of the "afterlife of slavery" is present in these situations: the emotional and physical energies of Black women continue to be invested in the care and maintenance of white families, often at the expense of their own.

The scene in which Pecola accidentally spills the blueberry cobbler at the Fishers' house crystallizes this dynamic. When the pie splatters on the Fisher girl's dress, Pauline erupts: "crazy fool.... look what you.... work... get on out...now that.... crazy.... my floor... my floor" (Morrison, 1994, p. 99). Turning to the crying Fisher child, her voice softens: "Mrs. Breedlove turned to her. 'Hush, baby, hush. Come here. Oh, Lord, look at your dress. Don't cry no more. Polly will change it'" (Morrison, 1994, p. 99). Claudia and Frieda recoil "in dread," noting that "her words were hotter and darker than smoking berries" (Morrison, 1994, p. 99). The contrast in Pauline's affective response—rage directed at Pecola, tenderness toward the Fisher girl—reveals the full internalization of white aesthetics and values. Wallace-Sanders (2002) emphasizes that the Black female body has historically been positioned as caretaker of white families; Morrison's scene demonstrates the psychological cost of that positionality: a mother who literally cannot see her own child as worthy of the care and love she lavishes on a white girl.

Finally, Morrison connects aesthetic ideology to the environment through the marigold motif. Claudia recalls that she and Frieda planted marigold seeds with the hope that God would let Pecola's baby live if the flowers bloomed: "We thought, if our seeds were not the only ones that did not sprout, but there must be something wrong. We had dropped our seeds in our own little plot of dirt just like Pecola's father had dropped his seeds in his own plot of dark, fertile dirt" (Morrison, 1994, p. 10). But: "the seeds shriveled and died; her baby too" (Morrison, 1994, p. 10).

The failure of the marigolds is not merely a private sadness for the girls; it is a sign that "the soil is bad" (Morrison, 1994). The environment—social, cultural, literal—is inhospitable to Black girlhood and Black life. Eagleton's (2011) sense that ideology saturates the "very air we breathe" is literalized here: the ground in which seeds ought to grow has been poisoned by racism, sexism, and internalized self-hatred. There is no neutral space in which Pecola could flourish.

In sum, *The Bluest Eye* shows how white aesthetics are disseminated through primers, dolls, films, advertising, domestic labor, and the very structures of feeling that define love, beauty, and family. These standards are not simply imposed from without; they are taken up, repeated, and sometimes resisted by Black characters themselves. Claudia's doll-dismemberment and lasting sorrow for Pecola represent one mode of

critique; Pauline's devotion to the Fisher household and contempt for her own daughter represent another, more tragic internalization. Between these poles, Pecola's self dissolves under the pressure of an ideal she can never embody, leading her to seek salvation in the most uncanny of places: her own imagined blue eyes.

III- The White/Male Gaze and Racial-Sexual Subjugation

If white aesthetics in *The Bluest Eye* operate through objects, stories, and commodities, the white/male gaze works more directly on bodies, organizing who is seen, how, and with what consequences. Morrison fuses psychoanalytic and postcolonial accounts of the gaze with Black feminist insights to show that visual regimes originating in racial hierarchies are refracted through gender and sexuality. Black women and girls bear the compounded weight of racialized and sexualized looking; they become both hypervisible as objects of scrutiny and invisible as subjects of care and recognition.

The encounter with Mr. Yacobowski crystallizes the operation of the white gaze as a refusal of recognition. Sent to buy candy, Pecola stands before the counter:

The gray head of Mr. Yacobowski looms up over the counter. He urges his eyes out of his thoughts to encounter her. [...]. Somewhere between retina and object, between vision and view, his eyes draw back, hesitate, and hover. At some fixed point in time and space, he senses that he need not waste the effort of a glance. He does not see her because for him there is nothing to see. (Morrison, 1994, p. 47)

In Pecola's understanding, this refusal is directed at her race: "The distaste must be for her, her blackness. All things in her are flux and anticipation. But her blackness is static and dread" (Morrison, 1994, p. 47). The narrator concludes: "and it is the blackness that accounts for, that creates, the vacuum edged with distaste in white eyes" (Morrison, 1994, p. 47).

Here Fanon's analysis of the Black subject under the white gaze is inverted. Instead of being pinned in place by the white child's exclamation "Look, a Negro!", Pecola is rendered absent: the gaze passes through her as though she is a void. She experiences herself as a vacuum, a non-subject in the field of vision. This is precisely what Butler (2004) later theorizes in terms of grievability: some lives do not count as lives within dominant frames, and therefore their injury or loss does not register as a loss. Mr. Yacobowski's refusal to "waste the effort of a glance" is an early sign that Pecola's existence is structurally ungrievable; she is not only unloved, she is un-seen.

The gaze is not only white; it is gendered and sexual. Cholly's adolescence is marked by a traumatic episode that entangles sex, race, and surveillance. As a young boy, he and Darlene are discovered having sex by two white men who force them to continue while they watch and shine flashlights on their bodies. Cholly feels rage, humiliation, and helplessness, but he directs his anger at Darlene rather than at the men. Foucault's account of the panopticon and disciplinary power is instructive here: Cholly's sexuality is literally illuminated and policed from above by white male observers. They never touch him, but their gaze invades his most intimate moment. Unable to respond to the true source of violation, he internalizes the humiliation and misdirects his fury downward, toward someone more vulnerable. This pattern—of power flowing from the top down, with violence redirected horizontally or inward—is a key mechanism through which racial and sexual domination perpetuate themselves.

The white/male gaze also structures Pauline Breedlove's experiences and reshapes her sense of femininity. As a young woman, Pauline finds respite from the chaos of her life in the movies. She enters the theater "on tiptoe, not to disturb the lushness. Her hat, like her coat, was too big. She sat in the dark, feeling that the world inside the movie house was more orderly, more coherent, than the one she inhabited" (paraphrased from Morrison). She learns to "look at a face and assign it some category on the scale of absolute beauty, and the scale was one she absorbed in the movies" (Morrison, 1994, p. 122). That scale is strictly racialized and gendered: white women are delicate, central, adored; Black women are peripheral or absent.

Smith (2012) and Tally (2007) both note that Morrison's fiction interrogates the "moral imagination" of American culture, revealing the ways in which goodness and desirability are cast in white, middle-class feminine terms. Pauline's imagination has been colonized by this cinematic aesthetic. When she becomes a domestic worker for the Fisher family, she feels she has finally walked into the very world she has been trained to admire. Their home is clean, bright, beautifully arranged—"like walking into the movies"—and the little Fisher girl resembles the actresses she has watched on screen. Rigney (1991) observes that Pauline "has lost her sexual self in her rage for order and her fascination with the cleanliness (sterility) of the white woman's kitchen" (p. 99); she displaces her frustrated erotic and maternal energies onto the maintenance of white domestic space.

This displacement is dramatized in the blueberry cobbler scene. When Pecola, working with her mother at the Fisher home, accidentally spills the cobbler, the hot berries stain the Fisher girl's dress. Pauline reacts

with explosive anger toward Pecola: "crazy fool.... look what you.... work... get on out...now that.... crazy.... my floor... my floor" (Morrison, 1994, p. 99). But when the Fisher child begins to cry, Pauline's voice softens into maternal cooing: "Mrs. Breedlove turned to her. 'Hush, baby, hush. Come here. Oh, Lord, look at your dress. Don't cry no more. Polly will change it'" (Morrison, 1994, p. 99). Claudia and Frieda, witnessing this, are struck by the intensity of Pauline's rage and tenderness: "her words were hotter and darker than smoking berries, and we backed away in dread" (p. 99).

In Hartman's terms, this scene reveals the afterlife of slavery in affective form. The Black mother's nurturing attention is reserved for the white child; her own Black daughter receives only scorn. Wallace-Sanders (2002) reminds us that the Black female body has historically been positioned as an instrument of white domesticity; Morrison shows how this position distorts maternal love. Ahmed's (2004) idea of affective orientation helps clarify what is happening: Pauline's love, care, and pride have been oriented toward whiteness; her anger and disgust have been oriented toward Blackness—particularly Black girlhood.

Morrison extends her analysis of the gaze to intra-racial and intra-gender relations. Junior, Geraldine's son, internalizes his mother's contempt for "niggers" and enacts it on Pecola. Geraldine, a middle-class Black woman obsessed with order and respectability, draws sharp distinctions between "colored people" like herself and "niggers" whom she associates with dirt, disorder, and excessive sexuality. Her son Junior has been trained to despise children like Pecola. When he invites Pecola into his house ostensibly to see his cat, he stages a cruel performance of power. As she admires the furnishings: "She was deep in admiration of the flowers when Junior said, 'Here.' Pecola turned. 'Here is your kitten!' he screeched, and he threw a big black cat right in her face" (Morrison, 1994, p. 83). "She sucked in her breath in fear and surprise and felt fur in her mouth. The cat clawed her face and chest in an effort to right itself, then leaped nimbly to the floor" (Morrison, 1994, p. 84). When Pecola tries to escape: "'You can't get out. You're my prisoner,' he said. His eyes were merry but hard. [...] He pushed her down, ran out the door that separated the rooms, and held it shut with his hands" (Morrison, p 84).

As she bangs on the door, "his gasping, high-pitched laughter" grows louder (Morrison, 1994, p. 84). Junior's pleasure lies in seeing her terror and controlling her movement. He has learned that his own fragile sense of subjectivity can be shored up by reducing a Black girl to an object of spectacle and pain. Spillers's (1987) analysis of the Black female body as

“flesh” rather than protected personhood helps explain why Pecola can so easily be turned into a plaything.

The most devastating enactment of the male gaze is Cholly's rape of Pecola. Coming home drunk, he finds her scraping dishes at the sink. The narrative traces his confused internal state: he feels discomfort at seeing her in such a vulnerable position, then pity, then guilt at his own failures as a father. He remembers Pauline in her youth and is stirred by old desire. When Pecola scratches the back of her calf with her toe—a gesture that echoes Pauline's earlier sensuality—Cholly misreads the scene through a haze of past and present. The text describes his reaction: “The rigidity of her shocked body, the silence of her stunned throat, was better than Pauline's easy laughter had been. The confused mixture of his memories of Pauline and the doing of a wild and forbidden thing excited him” (Morrison, 1994, p. 148). The narrator comments, in one of the novel's most chilling lines: “So it was. A little black girl yearns for the blue eyes of a little white girl, and the horror at the heart of her yearning is exceeded only by the evil of fulfillment” (Morrison, 1994, p. 148).

Cholly's gaze, shaped by his own history of racial-sexual humiliation, now turns violently inward on his daughter. Foucault (1978) reminds us that sexuality is not a private instinct but a field of power; here, the power of the white gaze is reproduced within the Black family. Butler's insistence that some lives are rendered “unlivable” is also relevant: Pecola's life, already precarious, becomes unlivable after the rape. Her body becomes a site where multiple histories of violence intersect, and her subjectivity cannot withstand the pressure.

Pecola's response to the rape is silence. She “sucks the air” into her lungs; she does not scream or tell her mother. When Pauline eventually learns of the pregnancy, she blames Pecola and expresses more concern about the scandal than about the violation. Hammonds notes that “historically, black women have reacted to this repressive force of the hegemonic discourses on race and sex with silence, secrecy, and a partially self-chosen invisibility” (as cited in Wallace-Sanders, 2002, p. 307). Rigney (1991) observes that Pecola's silence:

broken only in her insane discourse with an imaginary friend who reassures her that her eyes are blue and therefore beautiful, surely is intended to represent the muted condition of all women as well as the powerlessness of children in the face of cruelty and neglect, and to indict a dominant culture that values speech over silence and presence over absence.”
(p. 21)

Spivak's (1988) question—"Can the subaltern speak?" resonates with particular force in this context. Pecola can speak, but not in a register recognized as meaningful by her community. When she later talks to her imaginary interlocutor, insisting that her eyes are now "the bluest of all," her speech is immediately categorized as madness. Her attempt to articulate a self that is lovable and beautiful can only take place in a psychotic split with reality.

The community's reaction to Pecola and her unborn child further reveals the workings of the gaze and grievability. When the pregnancy becomes known, the townspeople react with gossip and condemnation. Some say "she carry some of the blame." Others declare that "it'd be better if it died." Claudia recalls that "we had dropped our seeds in our own little plot of dirt just like Pecola's father had dropped his seeds in his own plot of dark, fertile dirt," but "the seeds shriveled and died; her baby too" (Morrison, 1994, p. 10). No collective mourning attends the baby's death, nor Pecola's collapse. In Butler's terms, Pecola's life and her child's life are ungrievable within the dominant frame; they do not qualify as losses that call forth public sorrow.

From the perspective of reader-response, Morrison uses Claudia's narration to implicate the reader in this dynamic of looking and not looking. Claudia, speaking from adulthood, admits both love and complicity. She acknowledges that "we were so beautiful when we stood astride her ugliness. Her poverty kept us generous" (Morrison, 1994, p. 206). In Iser's (1978) terms, this confession occupies a "gap" that the reader must fill with their own self-recognition: do we, as readers, also use Pecola's suffering as a pedestal for our moral comfort? Fish's (1980) concept of interpretive communities suggests that readers bring their own norms and habits of seeing to the text; Morrison works to unsettle those habits by forcing us into an uncomfortable identification with Claudia, who realizes too late how profoundly she and her community have failed Pecola.

Through these scenes and narrative strategies, Morrison demonstrates that the white/male gaze is not simply a matter of who looks at whom. It is a structure of power that determines who is recognized as a subject, whose pain counts, whose bodies can be violated without consequence, and whose lives are seen as worth grieving. Set against this backdrop, Pecola's final retreat into madness—talking to an imaginary friend who confirms that she now has blue eyes—is not merely a psychological breakdown. It is the logical, if horrifying, culmination of a visual and affective regime in which the only way for a Black girl like Pecola to feel beautiful and loved is to leave reality altogether.

IV- Sexuality, Silence, and Madness in Black Women's Experience

If the white/male gaze in *The Bluest Eye* structures who is seen, how, and with what value, it also structures whose sexuality is thinkable, whose pleasure is legitimate, and whose suffering is speakable. Morrison situates sexuality at the intersection of race, class, and gender, exposing how Black women's and girls' desires are both a potential source of agency and a primary terrain of punishment and control. Sexuality in the novel is never a neutral realm of private feeling; it is saturated with the afterlife of slavery, the demands of respectability, and the internalization of white, patriarchal scripts of purity and deviance.

Patricia Hill Collins (2004) stresses that "sexuality was one of the few realms in which masses of African American women could exercise autonomy, and thus tangibly distinguish themselves as free women both from the sexual exploitation of slavery as well as the demands of having thirteen babies in insular southern rural families" (p. 72). Yet Collins also emphasizes that African American women's sexuality is heavily regulated by intersecting racial and gender stereotypes—the Jezebel, the welfare queen, the matriarch—which deny them the right to be both sexual and respectable. Morrison dramatizes this ambivalence through Pauline, the prostitutes, Geraldine, and, most vulnerably, Pecola, showing how Black female sexuality is either policed into silence or forced into stigmatized excess.

Pecola's first menstruation is a key scene in which sexuality is briefly seen as sacred rather than shameful. When Pecola begins to bleed in the MacTeer backyard, Mrs. MacTeer initially responds with fury because the girls have drunk all the milk; but when she realizes Pecola is "ministratin'," her anger turns to care. She washes Pecola and puts her to bed. Claudia recalls: "That night, in bed, the three of us lay still, we were full of awe and respect for Pecola, lying next to a real person who was really ministratin' was something sacred. She was different from us now—grown-up-like" (Morrison, 1994, p. 32).

Here, menstruation symbolizes Pecola's initiation into womanhood in a realm of whispered reverence. The girls stare with adoration, even worship; for once Pecola's body is not an object of ridicule but a sign of mystery and power. Ahmed's (2010) notion of orientation helps to further explain the scene; the girls' affects (awe, respect, curiosity) are temporarily oriented toward Pecola's body as a site of significance, not contamination. At the same time, this sacredness is precarious. It does not translate into long-term protection or a sustained reorientation of how she is seen. The

ritual recognition of her fertility coexists with a social order that will utterly fail to safeguard her sexual integrity.

Pecola herself has almost no knowledge of sex. After her first period, she asks Frieda, in a voice “hollow with wonder”: “Is it true that I can have a baby now? [...] ‘But... how?’” (Morrison, 1994, p. 32). Later she asks, with heartbreaking simplicity: “How do you do that? I mean how do you get somebody to love you?” (Morrison, 1994, p. 33). These questions reveal that her longing is not primarily for sexual experience but for affection, stability, and being wanted. In her imagination, “having a baby” and “getting somebody to love you” blur into each other; love is something that happens to other people, in other stories (movies, primers), and she seeks the secret procedure that would make it happen to her. From a psychoanalytic angle, this confusion shows how *eros* for Pecola is already colonized by external narratives: she has no language for desire that is not filtered through white, heteronormative romance and the family forms she sees idealized around her.

In stark contrast to Pecola's ignorance, Morrison presents the three prostitutes—China, Poland, and the Maginot Line as women who speak openly and even comically about sex and men. They occupy a marginal social position, despised by “respectable” Black and white communities alike, but they also possess a certain autonomy. They make their own money, choose their own clients, and enjoy sexual talk without pretense. For them, sexuality is both a survival strategy and a space where they can articulate opinions and judgments that would be impossible in more regulated settings. Hooks (1981, 1992) and Collins (2004) caution against reading such women solely through respectability politics; when viewed through a Black feminist lens, the prostitutes' sexuality is not pure degradation but a contradictory site of agency within heavily constrained conditions.

Importantly, the prostitutes show Pecola more kindness and solidarity than most “proper” adults do. They call her “baby” and treat her with warmth. In this sense, Morrison complicates any simple moral hierarchy in which sexual “virtue” is equated with ethical goodness. Those who most closely conform to middle-class scripts of respectability—Geraldine, the Fishers, the churchgoing women—are often the quickest to condemn, while those cast out as “fallen” are capable of genuine care. The novel thus undercuts the binary that equates sexual propriety with moral value, a binary that has historically justified harsh control over Black women's bodies.

By contrast, Pauline's sexuality has been repressed, redirected, and ultimately disfigured by racism, poverty, and cinematic fantasies. Early in her relationship with Cholly, Pauline experiences mutual desire and companionship. But as economic pressures mount and as she internalizes Hollywood's white feminine ideal, she withdraws from both her sexual and maternal roles. Movies teach her to value romance and beauty she can never possess; her own body, scarred and dark, becomes an object of shame. Rigney observes that Pauline "has lost her sexual self in her rage for order and her fascination with the cleanliness (sterility) of the white woman's kitchen, in which she could 'arrange things, clean things, line things up in neat rows'" (Rigney, 1991, p. 99). Sexual energy is sublimated into the meticulous upkeep of the Fisher household, a space that allows her to feel competent and valued in a way she never feels at home.

From the standpoint of Hartman (1997) and Spillers (1987), Pauline's story exemplifies "the afterlife of slavery" in the realm of sexuality and labor. As a Black woman, she has been trained to care for others' desires and appearances, especially white families', at the expense of her own. Her withdrawal from Cholly and contempt for her own daughter are not excusable, but they are explainable within a system that has systematically devalued Black female desire and motherhood. Her distorted relationship to sex and love is part of the same "matrix of domination" that makes Pecola vulnerable to sexual assault.

It is Cholly's rape of Pecola that crashes many of these threads – race, gender, sexuality, destitution, and trauma—into one single horrific act. From a psychoanalytic standpoint, the scene is overdetermined by Cholly's own sexual humiliation under white gaze; from a postcolonial perspective, it is a reenactment of colonial dominion within the Black family; from a Black feminist position, it is the ultimate manifestation of Black female vulnerability in a world that refuses to see their bodies as sacred. Morrison carefully narrates Cholly's internal confusion—his pity, guilt, memory of Pauline's youth, and the sudden, transgressive excitement at "the doing of a wild and forbidden thing"—without exonerating him: "The rigidity of her shocked body, the silence of her stunned throat, was better than Pauline's easy laughter had been. The confused mixture of his memories of Pauline and the doing of a wild and forbidden thing excited him" (Morrison, 1994, p. 148).

The narrator then delivers the devastating summation: "So it was. A little black girl yearns for the blue eyes of a little white girl, and the horror at the heart of her yearning is exceeded only by the evil of fulfillment" (Morrison, 1994, p. 148). Pecola's desire for blue eyes is "fulfilled" in the

most grotesque way: her body becomes the site where her father “drops his seeds,” paralleling the marigold seeds that Claudia and Frieda plant and that refuse to grow. The “evil of fulfillment” is that the very structures that taught her to hate herself now consummate their logic through her violation and pregnancy. Foucault's (1978) insight that sexuality is a point where power and knowledge intersect is vivid here: the community “knows” what has happened to Pecola and her baby, but it responds with condemnation and fatalistic resignation rather than protection or justice.

Pecola's immediate response to the rape is silence. She “sucks the air”—a bodily reaction that signals shock and repression—but she neither screams nor tells anyone. When Pauline eventually learns of the pregnancy, she blames Pecola, beats her, and worries more about public scandal than about what her daughter has endured. Evelyn Hammonds remarks that “historically, black women have reacted to this repressive force of the hegemonic discourses on race and sex with silence, secrecy, and a partially self-chosen invisibility” (as cited in Wallace-Sanders, 2002, p. 307). Pecola's silence thus participates in a longer tradition of enforced muteness around Black women's sexual violation, a tradition rooted in slavery and perpetuated by respectability politics. Rigney (1991) argues that Pecola's mute suffering:

Broken only in her insane discourse with an imaginary friend who reassures her that her eyes are blue and therefore beautiful, surely is intended to represent the muted condition of all women as well as the powerlessness of children in the face of cruelty and neglect, and to indict a dominant culture that values speech over silence and presence over absence. (p. 21)

What begins as silence in the face of unspeakable trauma eventually transforms into a split consciousness. In the final section of the novel, Pecola converses with an imaginary friend who assures her that her eyes are now the bluest of all, even bluer than those of Hollywood stars. This friend challenges her to test whether others notice, and when they do not, it is always because they are jealous or cruel. Pecola has, in effect, constructed an internal gaze that confirms what the external world will never grant. In psychoanalytic terms, this is a psychosis; in Butler's (2004) terms, it is the result of living a fundamentally unlivable life. Madness becomes the only space where she can feel beautiful, loved, and chosen.

From a postcolonial and decolonial perspective, this madness can also be read as the extreme, self-destructive endpoint of colonial mimicry. Fanon (2008) describes the Black subject's attempt to don a “white mask”

as a strategy of survival that ultimately fractures the self. Pecola's blue eyes are such a mask, but one that exists only in her mind; the world around her continues to perceive her as ugly, dirty, and mad. Spivak's (1988) question—"Can the subaltern speak?"—resonates bitterly: Pecola speaks, but only to a phantom interlocutor; when she tries to communicate her new reality to others, she is dismissed as insane. Her discourse cannot penetrate the social field.

Ahmed's (2010) work on "affect" further clarifies the community's reaction to Pecola's breakdown. Claudia reflects that Pecola's madness "protected her from us simply because it bored us in the end" (Morrison, 1994, p. 186). Boredom is not a neutral lack of feeling; it is an active refusal to invest emotional energy in another's suffering. The community's boredom, laughter, and avoidance serve as affective disavowals that allow them to maintain their own fragile sense of normality. Butler's (2004) notion of grievability returns here; since Pecola's life was never fully recognized as a life, her destruction does not call forth collective mourning. Her baby's death is anticipated, and when it happens, it confirms rather than disrupts the community's assumptions about what happens to "girls like that."

In this sense, Morrison demonstrates that sexuality, silence, and madness in Black women's experience cannot be separated. Pecola's emerging sexuality is never allowed to unfold under conditions of care and mutual connection; it is instead overdetermined by shame, ignorance, and violation. Silence is both enforced and chosen; it protects her from the immediate threat of disbelief and punishment but also isolates her from any possibility of help. Madness is both an illness and a strategy: a final, uncanny refuge where she can inhabit the fantasy of blue eyes and love, even as that refuge confirms her total exclusion from the shared reality of her community.

By the end of *The Bluest Eye*, sexuality has been revealed not as a private domain of individual choice but as one of the key sites where the matrix of domination operates. Morrison's portrayal of Pecola's sexual initiation, exploitation, and breakdown forces readers to confront how deeply Western, patriarchal, and racist norms structure which desires are recognized, which bodies are protected, and which lives are allowed to remain coherent. The novel thereby turns Black female sexuality; so often silenced or sensationalized, into a lens for understanding the fundamental violence of a social order that demands, and then abandons, girls like Pecola Breedlove.

Conclusion

The Bluest Eye is a devastating exploration of the psychic, social, and affective costs of internalizing Western standards of beauty, morality, and normality within a Black community. Through the story of Pecola Breedlove, Morrison reveals how race, gender, class, and sexuality co-produce a world in which Black girls are scarcely seen as fully human, let alone as beautiful or worthy of love.

By combining close reading with feminist, Black feminist, psychoanalytic, postcolonial, affective, and reader-response frameworks, this article has argued that the novel portrays gender role subjugation through a Western internalized lens in several interlocking ways. First, Pecola's longing for blue eyes and her attempts to disappear dramatize the colonization of Black female subjectivity by white visual norms. Second, objects like dolls, films, the Dick-and-Jane primer, and Mary Jane candies operate as material technologies of aesthetic discipline, teaching children to love what negates them. Third, the white/male gaze—articulated through Mr. Yacobowski, Junior, the Fisher household, Cholly, and Soaphead Church—reveals how seeing and being seen are never neutral but always embedded in relations of power.

At the same time, Morrison offers glimpses of resistance and alternative ways of seeing. Claudia's refusal to love white dolls and her lifelong mourning for Pecola, the tenderness of the prostitutes toward Pecola, and the girls' initial reverence for menstruation suggest that internalization is neither total nor inevitable. Yet these countercurrents are fragile, easily overwhelmed by the weight of institutional and cultural forces. The marigolds that fail to bloom testify that individual acts of care may not be enough to transform a poisoned soil.

Ultimately, *The Bluest Eye* functions as an uncanny mirror for American culture. It shows that what appears most “home-like”—the ideal family, the innocent child, the beautiful woman—is underwritten by histories of racial and gender violence that remain unresolved. By compelling readers to identify with Claudia's belated recognition of complicity, Morrison turns interpretation itself into an ethical act. We are not allowed to remain innocent spectators; we are asked to see how our own ways of looking, feeling, and narrating may reproduce the conditions that destroy girls like Pecola.

To respond to Morrison's challenge is to engage in a process of decolonizing recognition; to refuse aesthetic standards and moral scripts that are predicated on Black women's exclusion, and to imagine forms of beauty, love, and belonging that do not require the erasure of Black female life. In this sense, *The Bluest Eye* is not only a story of loss but also a call to

reconfigure the terms under which anyone is allowed to be seen, loved, and remembered.

Bibliography List:

- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Routledge.
- Ahmed, S. (2010). *The promise of happiness*. Duke University Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Bloom, H. (Ed.). (2007). *Toni Morrison's The Bluest Eye*. Infobase Publishing.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. Verso.
- Christian, B. (1987). The race for theory. *Feminist Studies*, 14(1), 67–79.
- Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. (2004). *Black sexual politics: African Americans, gender, and the new racism*. Routledge.
- Eagleton, T. (2011). *Literary theory: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fanon, F. (2008). *Black skin, white masks* (R. Philcox, Trans.). Grove Press. (Original work published 1952)
- Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities*. Harvard University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1965). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason* (R. Howard, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: Vol. 1. An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Freud, S. (2003). *The uncanny* (D. McLintock, Trans.). Penguin Books. (Original work published 1919)
- Girard, R. (1977). *Violence and the sacred* (P. Gregory, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1972)
- Hartman, S. (1997). *Scenes of subjection: Terror, slavery, and self-making in nineteenth-century America*. Oxford University Press.
- hooks, b. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1992). *Black looks: Race and representation*. South End Press.
- Iser, W. (1978). *The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1982). *Powers of horror: An essay on abjection* (L. S. Roudiez, Trans.). Columbia University Press.
- Lacan, J. (1977). *Écrits: A selection* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). W. W. Norton.
- Loomba, A. (1998). *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. Routledge.
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Crossing Press.
- Morrison, T. (1994). *The Bluest Eye*. Plume.
- Rigney, B. (1991). *The voices of Toni Morrison*. Ohio State University Press.

- Selden, R., Widdowson, P., & Brooker, P. (2005). *A reader's guide to contemporary literary theory* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Smith, V. (2012). The flesh and the word: Toni Morrison's *Beloved*. In A. Bendixen (Ed.), *A companion to the American novel* (pp. 570–581). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Spillers, H. J. (1987). Mama's baby, papa's maybe: An American grammar book. *Diacritics*, 17(2), 65–81.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- Tally, R. T., Jr. (2013). *Spatiality*. Routledge.
- Taylor-Guthrie, D. (Ed.). (1994). *Conversations with Toni Morrison*. University Press of Mississippi.
- Wallace-Sanders, K. (2002). *Skin deep, spirit strong: The Black female body in American culture*. University of Michigan Press