

University of Scranton ILL



ILLiad TN: 140784

Borrower: PAU

Lending String:

*SRU,MMT,SYB,YOM,DNU,ONU,UXC,WIT,WVS,
AKC,CIA,CWS,COC,FCK,FHS

Patron:

Journal Title: The cultural politics of emotion /

Volume: Issue:

Month/Year: 2015 (second edition)**Pages:**
ch.2:n/a

Article Author: Ahmed, Sara, 1969- author.
Ahmed, Sara

Article Title: Chap.2: The Organisation of Hate'

Imprint: New York : Routledge, 2015.

ILL Number: 207796347



Call #:

Location:

ODYSSEY ENABLED

Charge

Maxcost: 75.00IFM

Shipping Address:

Van Pelt ILL

Univ. of Pennsylvania Libraries

3420 Walnut Street

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6277

United States

Fax:

Ariel: 130.91.116.111

Email:

BF531 .A585 2015

The Organisation of Hate

The depths of Love are rooted and very deep in a real White Nationalist's soul and spirit, no form of 'hate' could even begin to compare. At least not a hate motivated by ungrounded reasoning. It is not hate that makes the average White man look upon a mixed racial couple with a scowl on his face and loathing in his hear [sic]. It is not hate that makes the White housewife throw down the daily jewspaper in repulsion and anger after reading of yet another child-molester or rapist sentenced by corrupt courts to a couple short years in prison or on parole. It is not hate that makes the White workingman curse about the latest boatload of aliens dumped on our shores to be given job preference over the White citizens who built this land. It is not hate that brings rage into the heart of a White Christian farmer when he reads of billions loaned or given away as 'aid' to foreigners when he can't get the smallest break from an unmerciful government to save his failing farm. No, it is not hate. It is Love. (The Aryan Nations' Website)¹

How do emotions such as hate work to secure collectives through the way in which they read the bodies of others? How does hate work to align some subjects with some others and against other others? In this chapter, I consider the role of hate in shaping bodies and worlds through the way hate generates its object as a defence against injury. We can see such defensive uses of hate within fascist discourse. It is a common theme within so-called hate groups to declare themselves as organisations of love on their web sites. This apparent reversal (we do and say this because we love, not because we hate) does an enormous amount of work as a form of justification and persuasion. In the instance above, it is the imagined subject of both party and nation (the White nationalist, the average White man, the White housewife, the White workingman, the White Citizen and the White Christian farmer) who is

hated, and who is threatened and victimised by the law and polity. Hate is not simply present as the emotion that explains the story (it is not a question of hate being *at its root*), but as that which is affected by the story, and as that which enables the story to be affective.

Such narratives work by generating a subject that is endangered by imagined others whose proximity threatens not only to take something away from the subject (jobs, security, wealth), but to take the place of the subject. The presence of this other is imagined as a threat to the object of love. This narrative involves a rewriting of history, in which the labour of others (migrants, slaves) is concealed in a fantasy that it is the white subject who 'built this land'.² The white subjects claim the place of hosts ('our shores'), at the same time as they claim the position of the victim, as the ones who are damaged by an 'unmerciful government'. The narrative hence suggests that it is love for the nation that makes the white Aryans feel hate towards others who, in 'taking away' the nation, are taking away their history, as well as their future.

We might note that this emotional reading of others as hateful aligns the imagined subject with rights and the imagined nation with ground. This alignment is affected by the representation of the rights of the subject and the grounds of the nation as under threat, as 'failing'. *It is the emotional reading of hate that works to stick or to bind the imagined subjects and the white nation together.* The average white man feels 'fear and loathing'; the White housewife, 'repulsion and anger'; the White workingman 'curses'; the White Christian farmer, feels 'rage'. The passion of these negative attachments to others is redefined simultaneously as a positive attachment to the imagined subjects brought together through the capitalisation of the signifier, 'White'. It is the love of White, or those that are recognisable as White, which supposedly explains this shared 'communal' visceral response of hate. *Because we love, we hate, and this hate is what brings us together.*

This narrative, I would suggest, is far from extraordinary. Indeed, it reveals the production of the ordinary. The ordinary is here fantastic. The ordinary white subject is a fantasy that comes into being through the mobilisation of hate as a 'passionate attachment closely tied to love. The emotion of hate works to animate the ordinary subject, to bring that fantasy to life, precisely by constituting the ordinary as in crisis, and the ordinary person as the *real victim*. The ordinary becomes that which is *already* under threat by the imagined others whose proximity becomes a crime against person as well as place. As I discussed in the previous chapter, the ordinary or normative subject is reproduced as the injured party; the one that is 'hurt' or even damaged by the 'invasion' of others. The bodies of others are hence transformed into 'the hated' through a discourse of pain. They are assumed to 'cause' injury to the ordinary white subject such that their proximity is read as the origin of bad

feeling. Indeed, it is implied that the white subject's good feelings (love) have been 'taken' away by the abuse of such feelings by others.

So who is hated in such a narrative of injury? Clearly, hate is *distributed* across various figures (in this case, the mixed racial couple, the child-molester, the rapist, aliens and foreigners). These figures come to embody the threat of loss: lost jobs, lost money, lost land. They signify the danger of impurity, or the mixing or taking of blood. They threaten to violate the pure bodies; such bodies can only be imagined as pure by the perpetual restaging of this fantasy of violation. Note the work that is being done through this metonymic slide: mixed race couplings and immigration become readable as (like) forms of rape or molestation; an invasion of the body of the nation, evoked here as the vulnerable and damaged bodies of the white woman and child. The slide between figures constructs a relation of resemblance between the figures. What makes them 'alike' may be their 'unlikeness' from 'us'. Within the narrative, hate cannot be found in one figure, but works to create the outline of different figures or objects of hate, a creation that crucially aligns the figures together, and constitutes them as a 'common threat'. Importantly, then, hate does not *reside* in a given subject or object. Hate is economic; it circulates between signifiers in relationships of difference and displacement. To understand such affective economies of hate, I will consider the way in which 'signs' of hate work, and their relation to bodies. My examples will refer specifically to racism as a politics of hatred, and will include an analysis of hate crime as a legal response to racism.

AFFECTIVE ECONOMIES

If hate involves a series of displacements that do not reside positively in a sign or figure, then hate does not originate within an individual psyche; it does not reside positively in consciousness. As such, hate operates at an unconscious level, or resists consciousness understood as plenitude, or what we might call 'positive residence'. My reliance on 'the unconscious' here signals my debt to psychoanalytical understandings of the subject. It is hence important that I clarify how my argument will exercise a concept of the unconscious. In his paper on the unconscious, Freud introduces the notion of unconscious emotions, whereby an affective impulse is perceived but misconstrued, and which becomes attached to another idea (Freud 1964a: 177). What is repressed from consciousness is not the feeling as such, but the idea to which the feeling may have been first (but provisionally) connected. Psychoanalysis allows us to show how emotions such as hate involve a process of movement or association, *whereby feelings take us across different levels of signification, not all of which can be admitted in the present*. This is what I call the

'rippling' effect of emotions; they move sideways (through 'sticky' associations between signs, figures and objects) as well as forwards and backwards (repression always leaves its trace in the present – hence 'what sticks' is bound up with the absent presence of historicity). In the Aryan Nations' quote, we can see how hate slides sideways between figures, as well as backwards, by reopening past associations, which allows some bodies to be read as being the cause of 'our hate'.

Indeed, insofar as psychoanalysis is a theory of the subject as lacking in the present, it offers a theory of emotion as economy, *as involving relationships of difference and displacement without positive value*. That is, emotions work as a form of capital: affect does not reside positively in the sign or commodity, but is produced as an effect of its circulation. I am using 'the economic' to suggest that objects of emotions circulate or are distributed across a social as well as psychic field, borrowing from the Marxian critique of the logic of capital. In *Capital*, Marx discusses how the movement of commodities and money, in the formula (M–C–M: money to commodity to money), creates surplus value. That is, through circulation and exchange 'M' acquires more value (Marx 1976: 248). Or, as he puts it: 'The value originally advanced, therefore, not only remains intact while in circulation, but increases its magnitude, adds to itself a surplus-value or is valorised. *And this movement converts it into capital*' (Marx 1976: 252, emphasis mine). I am identifying a similar logic: the movement between signs or objects converts into affect. Marx does link value with affect through the figures of the capitalist and the miser. He says: 'This boundless drive for enrichment, this passionate chase after value, is common to the capitalist and the miser' (Marx 1976: 254): Here passion drives the accumulation of capital: the capitalist is not interested in the use-value of commodities, but the 'appropriation of ever more wealth' (Marx 1976: 254). What I am offering is a theory of passion not as the drive to accumulate (whether it be value, power or meaning), but as that which is accumulated over time. Affect does not reside in an object or sign, but is an effect of the circulation between objects and signs (= the accumulation of affective value). Signs increase in affective value as an effect of the movement between signs: the more signs circulate, the more affective they become.

Of course, this argument does not respect the important Marxian distinction between use value and exchange value and hence relies on a limited analogy. In some ways, my approach has more in common with a psychoanalytic emphasis on difference and displacement as the form or language of the unconscious, described on page 44. Where my approach involves a departure from psychoanalysis is in my refusal to identify this economy as a psychic one (although neither is it *not* a psychic one), that is, to return these relationships of difference and displacement to the signifier of 'the subject'. This

'return' is not only clear in Freud's work, but also in Lacan's positing of 'the subject' as the proper scene of absence and loss (see Ahmed 1998: 97–8). In contrast, my model of hate as an affective economy suggests that emotions do not positively inhabit *anybody* or *anything*, meaning that 'the subject' is simply one nodal point in the economy, rather than its origin and destination. This is extremely important: it suggests that the sideways and backwards movement of emotions such as hate is not contained within the contours of a subject. The unconscious is hence not the unconscious of a subject, but the failure of presence – or the failure to be present – that constitutes the relationality of subject, objects, signs and others. Given this, affective economies are social and material, as well as psychic. Indeed, as I have shown, if the movement of affect is crucial to the very differentiation between 'in here' and 'out there', then the psychic and the social cannot be installed as proper objects. Instead, I examine how materialisation involves a process of intensification (see Chapter 1).

More specifically, it is the circulation of hate between figures that works to materialise the very 'surface' of collective bodies. We can take as an example the speeches on asylum seekers by one of the previous leaders of the Conservative Party in the UK, William Hague. Between April and June 2000, other speeches were in circulation that became 'stuck' or 'attached' to the asylum seekers speech partly through temporal proximity, but also through the repetition with a difference, of some *sticky words* and language. In the case of the asylum speeches, Hague's narrative is somewhat predictable. Words like 'flood' and 'swamped' are used, which create associations between asylum and the loss of control and hence work by mobilising fear, or the anxiety of being overwhelmed by the actual or potential proximity of others (see also Chapter 3). These words were repeated in 2003 by the current British Home Secretary David Blunkett, who used 'swamped' to describe the effect on others that children of asylum seekers would have if they were taught in local schools. When criticised, he replaced the word 'swamped' with 'overwhelmed'. The assumption here is that 'overwhelmed' resolves the implication of 'swamped', but as we can see, the word still evokes the sensation of being overtaken or taken over by others. The word constructs the nation as if it were a subject, as one who 'could not cope' with the presence of others. Such words generate effects: they create impressions of others as those who have invaded the space of the nation, threatening its existence.

In the earlier speech, Hague differentiates between those others who are welcome and those who are not by differentiating between genuine and bogus asylum seekers. Partly, this enables the national subject to imagine its generosity in welcoming some others. The nation is hospitable as it allows those genuine ones to stay. And yet at the same time, it constructs some others as already hateful (as bogus) in order to define the limits or the *conditions* of this

hospitality (see also Chapter 6). The construction of the bogus asylum seeker as a figure of hate also involves a narrative of uncertainty and crisis, but an uncertainty and crisis that *makes that figure do more work*. How can we tell the difference between a bogus and a genuine asylum seeker? It is always possible that we may not be able to tell, and that the bogus may pass their way into our community. Such a possibility commands us (our right, our will) to keep looking, and justifies our intrusion into the bodies of others.

Indeed, the possibility that we may not be able to tell the difference swiftly converts into the possibility that *any* of those incoming bodies may be bogus. In advance of their arrival, they are read as the cause of an injury to the national body. The figure of the bogus asylum seeker evokes the figure of the 'bogey man', as a figure that stalks the nation and haunts its capacity to secure its borders. The 'bogey man' could be anywhere and anyone; a ghost-like figure in the present, who gives us nightmares about the future, as an anticipation of a future injury. We see 'him' again and again. Such figures of hate circulate, and indeed accumulate their affective value, precisely insofar as they do not have a fixed referent. So the figure of the bogus asylum seeker is detached from particular bodies: any incoming bodies *could be* bogus, such that their 'endless' arrival is anticipated as the scene of 'our injury'.³ The impossibility of reducing hate to a particular body allows hate to circulate in an economic sense, working to differentiate some others from other others, a differentiation that is never 'over', as it awaits others who have not yet arrived. Such a discourse of 'waiting for the bogus' is what justifies the repetition of violence against the bodies of others in the name of protecting the nation.

Hague's speech also generated certain effects through its temporal proximity to another speech about Tony Martin, a man sentenced to life imprisonment for murdering a 16-year-old boy who had attempted, along with one other person, to burgle his house. One sentence of Hague's circulates powerfully. He stated following the sentencing of Martin (but without reference to the Martin case) that the law is 'more interested in the rights of criminals than the rights of people who are burgled'. *Such a sentence evokes a history that is not declared* (this is how attachment can operate as a form of speech, as resistance to literalisation). The undeclared history sticks, and it positions Martin as the victim rather than the criminal, as a person who was burgled, rather than a person who killed. The victim of the murder is now the criminal; the crime that did not happen because of the murder (the burglary) takes the place of the murder as the true crime, and as the real injustice.

The implicit argument that killing in defence of your home makes you a victim acquired more force when Tony Martin was released in August 2003. Tabloids described Tony Martin as an 'ordinary farmer' whose home was ruined during his prison sentence (McGurran and Johnston 2003: 4). The

headline on the front page of the *Daily Mirror* sums it up: 'He killed to protect his house . . . but now the memories are too much' (*Daily Mirror*, 9 August 2003). The tragedy of the story is not the death of 'a teenage burglar' but Tony Martin's loss of his home: 'This isn't a home any more. It's a shell' (McGurran and Johnston 2003: 4). The 'shell', an empty and barren place, becomes a sign of the injustice of Martin's prison sentence. The moral of the story becomes: those who defend their property must be defended by the law. In other words, the reversal of the victim/criminal relationship is an implicit and unarticulated defence of the right to kill those who unlawfully enter one's property.

The coincidence of William Hague's words: 'The law is more interested in the rights of criminals than the rights of people who are burgled' in connection with asylum seekers was also affective. The detachment of that sentence allows the two cases to get stuck together, burglary and asylum, which now both become matters of the right to defence. More specifically, the figure of the asylum seeker is aligned with the figure of the burglar. The alignment does important work: it suggests that the asylum seeker is 'stealing' something from the nation. The characteristics of one figure get displaced or transferred onto the other. Or we could say that it is through the association between the figures that they acquire 'a life of their own', as if they contain an affective quality. The burglar becomes a foreigner, and the asylum seeker becomes a criminal. At the same time, the body of the murderer (who is renamed as the victim) becomes the body of the nation; the one whose property and well-being is under threat by the proximity of the other. The sticking together of these speeches produces the following claim: the nation, like Tony Martin, has the right to expel asylum seekers (whatever the means), who as burglars are trying to steal something from the nation, otherwise the nation itself will become 'the shell'. The moral of the story becomes: if we let them in, they will turn the nation 'into a shell', and take the land on which 'we have worked'.

Such a defensive narrative is not explicitly articulated, but rather works through the movement between figures. The circulation does its work: it produces a differentiation between 'us' and 'them', whereby 'they' are constituted as the cause of 'our' feeling of hate. Indeed, we can see how attachment involves a sliding between pain and hate: there is a perceived injury in which the proximity of others (burglars/bogus asylum seekers) is felt as the violence of negation against both the body of the individual (the farmer) and the body of the nation. Bodies surface by 'feeling' the presence of others as the cause of injury or as a form of intrusion. The signs of hate surface by evoking a sense of threat and risk, but one that cannot be simply located or found. This difficulty of location is what makes hate work the way that it does; it is not the impossibility of hate as such, but the mode of its opera-

tion, whereby it surfaces in a world made up of other bodies. It is the failure of hate to be located in a given object or figure, which allows it to generate the effects that it does.

HATED BODIES

In this section, I examine how hate works on and through bodies. How does hate involve the spatial reorganisation of bodies through the very gestures of moving away from others that are felt to be the 'cause' of our hate? We need to reflect firstly on the experience of hate. Hate is an intense emotion; it involves a feeling of 'againstness' that is always, in the phenomenological sense, intentional. Hate is always hatred of something or somebody, although that something or somebody does not necessarily pre-exist the emotion. It is possible, of course, to hate an individual person because of what they have done or what they are like. This would be a hate brought about by the particularity of engagement, and one that makes it possible to say, 'I hate you' to a face that is familiar, and to turn away, trembling. It is this kind of hate that is described by Baird and Rosenbaum when they talk of 'seeth[ing] with passion against another human being' (Baird and Rosenbaum 1992: 9). And yet, classically, Aristotle differentiated anger from hatred in that 'anger is customarily felt towards individuals only, whereas hatred may be felt toward whole classes of people' (cited in Allport 1992: 31). Hate may respond to the particular, but it tends to do so by aligning the particular with the general; 'I hate you because you are this or that', where the 'this' or 'that' evokes a group that the individual comes to *stand for* or *stand in for*. Hatred may also work as a form of investment; it endows a particular other with meaning or power by locating them as a member of a group, which is then imagined as a form of positive residence (that is, as residing positively in the body of the individual).

As an investment, hate involves the negotiation of an intimate relationship between a subject and an imagined other, as another that cannot be relegated to the outside. Indeed, a psychoanalytical model used to explain hatred is projection. Here, the self projects all that is undesirable onto another, while concealing any traces of that projection, so that the other comes to appear as a being with a life of its own (see Laplanche and Pontalis 1988: 352). We also have the Kleinian model of projective identification, which is described by Ian Craib as 'a more profound form of projection . . . I behave in such a way as to lead the other person to experience that quality in themselves' (cited in Bird and Clarke 1999: 332). However, this model of projection or projective identification is limited to the extent that it repeats the commonly held assumption that hate moves from inside to outside (pushing what is unde-

sirable out), even if it undermines the objectivity of this distinction. In other words, it takes for granted the existence of negative feelings within the subject, which then become 'the origin' of hatred for others. Whilst there is of course a certain truth within this insistence (bad feelings are crucial to modes of subject formation), negative feelings 'within' might also be effects. The very distinction between inside and outside might be affected by hate. Rather than assuming that hate involves pushing what is undesirable within the self onto others, we could ask: *Why is it that hate feels like it comes from inside and is directed towards others who have an independent existence?*

To consider hatred as a form of intimacy is to show how hatred is ambivalent; it is an investment in an object (of hate) whereby the object becomes part of the life of the subject even though (or perhaps because) its threat is perceived as coming from outside. Hate then cannot be opposed to love. In other words, the subject becomes attached to the other through hatred, as an attachment that returns the subject to itself. Certainly, within psychological theories of prejudice, hate is seen as tied up with love. Or, to put it more precisely, love is understood as the pre-condition of hate. Gordon W. Allport in his classic account *The Nature of Prejudice* suggests that the 'symbiosis and a loving relation always precede hate. There can, in fact, be no hatred until there has been long-continued frustration and disappointment' (Allport 1979: 215). Allport draws on Ian Suttie's *The Origins of Love and Hate*, which argues that hatred 'owes all its meaning to a demand for love' (Suttie 1963: 37), and is bound up with the anxiety of the discovery of the not-self (Suttie 1963: 40). Freud, of course, considers the intimacy of love and hate as affections for objects throughout the corpus of his work. In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, the love for the mother is 'expressed' through a hostile game with a mother-substitute: in the child's game '*fort da*', the child sends an object away, and then pulls it back. The game is partly read as an attempt to convert the passivity of love, in the face of the loved other's departure, with hostile aggression, as if to say 'All right, then, go away!' (Freud 1964c: 16). If the demand for love is the demand for presence, and frustration is the consequence of the necessary failure of that demand, then hate and love are intimately tied together, in the intensity of the negotiation between presence and absence.

It would be problematic to derive all forms of hate from the psychodynamics of the child's relation to its first love, the mother (see Chapter 6). Such a derivation would be a clear instance of the psychologisation of emotions, in which different emotions are always referred back to a primal scene. And yet from the Freudian model, we can begin to grasp the complexity of attachments to objects, and the ways in which such attachments are *sustained* through the conversion of positive to negative feeling. As David Holbrook suggests in *The Masks of Hate*: 'Indifference would manifest our lack of need

for the object. Where there is hate there is obviously an *excessive need* for the object' (Holbrook 1972: 36). In other words, hate is opposed to indifference: in hate, the object makes a difference, but cannot satisfy the subject, whose need goes beyond it. However, it is not that the object itself is needed, or that the object is simply determinant. The subject may need the destructive relation to that object: one may be attached to the attachment of hate. Christopher Bollas (1995) differentiates between hate that is destructive, and 'loving hate', which seeks to conserve the object. There is a relation between destructive attachments and conservation: *for the destructive relation to the object to be maintained the object itself must be conserved in some form*. So hate transforms this or that other into an object whose expulsion or incorporation is needed, an expulsion or incorporation that requires the conservation of the object itself in order to be sustained. Such an argument does not presume that one must have first loved an object to hate it (the conversion of hate to love is possible but not necessary), but it does suggest that hate sustains the object through its mode of attachment, in a way that has a similar dynamic to love, but with a different orientation. As Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen puts it, 'Hate wants to get its hands on the other; it wants to touch even when it wants to destroy' (Borch-Jacobsen 1993: 10).

Hate is involved in the very negotiation of boundaries between selves and others, and between communities, where 'others' are brought into the sphere of my or our existence as a threat. This other, who may stand for or stand by other others, *presses* against me, threatening my existence. The proximity of the other's touch is felt as a negation. Hate involves a turning away from others that is lived as a turning towards the self. We can now see why stories of hate are *already* translated into stories of love. Of course, it is not that hate is involved in any demarcation between me and not-me, but that some demarcations come into existence through hate, which is felt as coming from within and moving outwards towards others. If hate is felt as belonging to me but caused by an other, then the others (however imaginary) are required for the very continuation of the life of the 'I' or the 'we'. To this extent, boundary formations are bound up with anxiety not as a sensation that comes organically from within a subject or group, but as the effect of this ongoing constitution of the 'apartness' of a subject or group (see Chapter 3).

However, it would be insufficient to posit the story of the 'I' and 'we' as parallel or homologous. Rather, what is at stake in the intensity of hate as a negative attachment to others is how hate creates the 'I' and the 'we' as utterable simultaneously in a moment of alignment. At one level, we can see that an 'I' that declares itself as hating an other (and who might or might not act in accordance with the declaration) comes into existence by also declaring its love for that which is threatened by this imagined other (the nation, the community and so on). But at another level, we need to investigate the 'we' as

the effect of the attachment itself; such a subject becomes not only attached to a 'we', but the 'we' is what is affected by the attachment the subject has to itself and to its loved others. Hence in hating another, this subject is also loving itself; hate structures the emotional life of narcissism as a fantastic investment in the continuation of the image of the self in the faces that together make up the 'we'. The attachment to others becomes divided as negative and positive (hate and love) precisely through imaging the faces of the community made up of other 'me's'; of others that are loved *as if they were me*.

When Freud suggests in *Group Psychology* (1922) and *The Ego and the Id* (1964b) that we identify with those we love he went some way toward addressing this relationship between ego formation and community. The ego is established by imitating the lost object of love; it is based on a principle of a likeness or resemblance or of *becoming alike* (see Chapter 6 for an extension of this argument). However, I would argue that love does not pre-exist identification (just as hate does not pre-exist dis-identification); so it is not a question of identifying with those we love and dis-identifying with those we hate. Rather, it is through forms of identification that align this subject with this other, that the *character* of the loved is produced as 'likeness' in the first place. Thinking of identification as a form of alignment (to bring into line with ourselves – the subject as 'bringing into line') also shows us how identifications involve dis-identification or an active 'giving up' of other possible identifications (see Butler 1997b). That is, by aligning myself with some others, I am aligning myself against other others. Such a 'giving up' may also produce the character of the hated as 'unlikeness'. What is at stake in the emotional intensities of love and hate, then, is the production of the effect of likeness and unlikeness as characteristics that are assumed to belong to the bodies of individuals. This separation of others into bodies that *can be* loved and hated is part of the work of emotion; it does not pre-exist emotion as its ground – 'I love or hate them *because* they are like me, or not like me.' The effects of the circulation of objects of hate are hence retrospectively evoked as the origin of hate ('I hate them *because* they are unlike us'). So hate works by providing 'evidence' of the very antagonism it effects; we cite the work that it is doing in producing the characteristics of likeness and unlikeness when we show the reasons for its existence. In seeing the other as 'being' hateful, the subject is filled up with hate, which becomes a sign of the 'truth' of the reading.

I have suggested that emotions, which respond to the proximity of others, do not respond the way that they do because of the inherent characteristics of others: we do not respond with love or hate because others are loveable or hateful. It is through affective encounters that objects and others are perceived as having attributes, which 'gives' the subject an identity that is apart

from others (for example, as the real victim or as the threatened nation). How does this attribution work on and through bodies? Let's take the following quote from Black feminist Audre Lorde, about her encounter with a white woman on a train:

The AA subway train to Harlem. I clutch my mother's sleeve, her arms full of shopping bags, christmas-heavy. The wet smell of winter clothes, the train's lurching. My mother spots an almost seat, pushes my little snow-suited body down. On one side of me a man reading a paper. On the other, a woman in a fur hat staring at me. Her mouth twitches as she stares and then her gaze drops down, pulling mine with it. Her leather-gloved hand plucks at the line where my new blue snowpants and her sleek fur coat meet. She jerks her coat closer to her. I look. I do not see whatever terrible thing she is seeing on the seat between us – probably a roach. But she has communicated her horror to me. It must be something very bad from the way she's looking, so I pull my snowsuit closer to me away from it, too. When I look up the woman is still staring at me, her nose holes and eyes huge. And suddenly I realise there is nothing crawling up the seat between us; it is me she doesn't want her coat to touch. The fur brushes past my face as she stands with a shudder and holds on to a strap in the speeding train. Born and bred a New York City child, I quickly slide over to make room for my mother to sit down. No word has been spoken. I'm afraid to say anything to my mother because I don't know what I've done. I look at the sides of my snowpants 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 1984: 147–8)

In this encounter Audre Lorde ends with 'The hate', as an emotion that seems detached from bodies, surrounding the scene with its violence. And yet, the word 'hate' works by working on the surfaces of bodies. This bodily encounter, while ending with 'The hate', also ends with the reconstitution of bodily space. The bodies that come together, that almost touch and commingle, slide away from each other, becoming relived in their apartness. The particular bodies that move apart allow the redefinition of social as well as bodily integrity. The emotion of 'hate' aligns the particular white body with the bodily form of the community – the emotion functions to substantiate the threat of invasion and contamination in the body of a particular other, who comes to stand for and stand in for, a group of others. In other words, the hate encounter aligns, not only the 'I' with the 'we' (the white body, the white nation), but the 'you' with the 'them' (the black body, black people).

Does Audre's narrative of the encounter involve her self-designation as the hated; does she hate herself? Certainly, her perception of the cause of

the woman's bodily gestures is a misperception that creates an object. The object – the roach – comes to stand for, or stand in for, the cause of 'the hate'. The roach crawls up between them; the roach, as the carrier of dirt, divides the two bodies, forcing them to move apart. Audre pulls her snowsuit, 'away from it too'. But the 'it' that divides them is not the roach. Audre comes to realise that, 'it is me she doesn't want her coat to touch'. What the woman's clothes must not touch is not a roach that crawls between them, but Audre herself. Audre becomes the 'it' that stands between the possibility of their clothes touching. She becomes the roach – the impossible and phobic object – that threatens to crawl from one to the other: 'I don't know what I've done. I look at the sides of my snowpants secretly. Is there something on them?' Hate slides between different signs and objects whose existence is bound up with the negation of its travel. Audre becomes the roach that is then imagined as the cause of the hate. The association between the roach and her body works powerfully. Her body becomes an object of hate through 'taking on' the qualities already attached to the roach: dirty, contaminating, evil. The transformation of *this* or *that* other into an object of hate is over-determined. It is not simply that any body is hated: particular histories of association are reopened in each encounter, such that some bodies are already encountered as more hateful than other bodies. Histories are bound up with emotions precisely insofar as it is a question of *what sticks*, of what connections are lived as the most intense or intimate, as being closer to the skin.

Importantly, then, the alignment of some bodies with some others and against others take place in the *physicality of movement*; bodies are disorganised and re-organised as they face others who are already recognised as 'the hated'. So the white woman loses her seat to keep the black child at a distance, in the 'speeding' movements of the train. The organisation of social and bodily space creates a border that is transformed into an object, as an effect of this intensification of feeling. The white woman's refusal to touch the black child does not simply *stand for* the expulsion of blackness from white social space, but *actually re-forms that social space through re-forming the apartness of the white body*. The re-forming of bodily and social space involves a process of *making the skin crawl*; the threat posed by the bodies of others to bodily and social integrity is registered on the skin. Or, to be more precise, the skin comes to be felt as a border through the violence of the impression of one surface upon another. In this way, hate creates the surfaces of bodies through the way in which bodies are aligned with and against other bodies. How we feel about others is what aligns us with a collective, which paradoxically 'takes shape' only as an effect of such alignments. It is through how others impress upon us that the skin of the collective begins to take shape.

HATE CRIME

Hate involves the surfacing of bodies through how we encounter others in intimate and public spaces. The politics of racial hatred involves attributing racial others with meaning, a process we can describe as 'the making of unlikeness'. Hatred is a negative attachment to an other that one wishes to expel, an attachment that is sustained through the expulsion of the other from bodily and social proximity. In this section, I want to bring the arguments of the previous two sections together. That is, I will explore how affective economies of hate, where hate circulates in signs that are detached from particular bodies, affect the way bodies take shape. In particular, I will consider how the movement between signs of hate affects the bodies of those who become the objects of hatred.

In order to explore the connection between the language of hate and the surfacing of bodies, I will examine the politics of hate crime. Hate crimes typically are defined when the crime is committed *because of* an individual's group identity (defined in terms of race, religion, sexuality):

If a person . . . intentionally selects the person against whom the crime . . . is committed or selects the property which is damaged or otherwise affected by the crime . . . *because of* the race, religion, color, disability, sexual orientation, national origin or ancestry of that person or the owner or occupant of the property, the penalties for the underlying crime are increased [Wisconsin v. Mitchell]. (Jacobs and Potter 1998: 3, emphasis added)

What is at stake in hate crime is the *perception* of a group in the body of an individual. However, the way in which it is perception that is at stake is concealed by the word 'because' in hate crime legislation, which implies that group identity is already in place, and that it works only as a cause, rather than also being an effect of the crime.⁴ The fact that hate crime involves a perception of a group in the body of the individual does not make the violence any less real or 'directed'; this perception has material effects insofar as it is enacted through violence. That is, hate crime works as a form of violence against groups *through* violence against the bodies of individuals. Violence against others may be one way in which the other's identity is fixed or sealed; the other is *forced* to embody a particular identity by and for the perpetrator of the crime, and that force involves harm or injury.

The legal response to hate crime is one way of dealing with the injustice of violence against minority groups.⁵ I suggest that 'hate crime' may be useful as a technology of redress because it can make explicit the role of hate as an intense and negative attachment to others in the politics of racism, as well as

other forms of structural violence. As Zillah Eisenstein argues, attending to hate allows us to show how racism involves psychic and bodily investments (Eisenstein 1994: 5–22). For some, this is the risk of hate crime legislation: it can attribute power to psychology, or transform power into psychology. David Theo Goldberg, for example, argues that the use of hate turns racist expression into a psychological disposition (Goldberg 1995: 269). AnnJanette Rosga argues that the use of hate crime as a category has ‘a susceptibility to individualised models of oppression through its mobilisation of personal, psychological notions of prejudice and hatred’ (Rosga 1999: 149). These critiques are useful, and they remind us of the importance of understanding emotions not as psychological dispositions, but as investments in social norms. Attending to the politics of hate allows us to address the question of how subjects and others become *invested* in norms such that their demise would be felt as a kind of living death. While we need to take care to avoid psychologising power and inequality, we also need to avoid reifying structures and institutions. To consider the investments we have in structures is precisely to attend to how they become meaningful – or indeed, are felt as natural – through the emotional work of labour, work that takes time, and that takes place in time. So ‘hate crime’ as a category can show us that violence against others involves forms of power that are visceral and bodily, as well as social and structural.

But if hate is part of the production of the ordinary, rather than simply about ‘extremists’ (perhaps we should say that ‘extremes’ are part of the production of the ordinary), then we need to ask if it makes any sense to talk about hate as a crime. While it might be important to challenge the narrative which sees hate as something extremists do (which saves the ‘ordinary nation’, or ‘ordinary subjects’, from any responsibility for its violence), it is equally important to see that there are different ways in which hate operates. In other words, particular acts (including physical violence directed towards others, as well as name calling and abusive language) do not necessarily *follow* from the uneven effects of hate. Of course, not all subjects hate in the same way. We can demarcate certain actions as wrong and unjustifiable. Such actions can be seen as the responsibility of individuals or groups who commit them. Undermining the distinction between hate and hate crime in the non-opposition between the ordinary and criminal does not mean an emptying out of responsibility for the effects of hate crime.

The terms of my argument about the usefulness of hate crime as a category also suggest its limits: hate crime does not refer to a discrete set of enactments that stand apart from the uneven effects that hate already has in organising the surfaces of the world (though neither does it simply follow from them, as I have suggested). The limits of hate crime then may partly be the limits of the law that seeks to designate the criminal as an ontological

category. Insofar as hate enacts the negation that is perceived to characterise the existence of a social group, then we can link hate to injustice, an injustice that is, of course, irreducible to the law, at the same time as it has a relation to it (see Derrida 1992). If hate is always directed to others as a way of *sealing* their fate, then hate may be *about* the effect it has on others. Given this, the introduction of hate crime as a category should be used as a way of making visible the effects of hate, by *listening to the affective life of injustice*, rather than establishing the truth of law.

We can return to Audre Lorde’s example. We can ask: How is the black body re-formed in the encounter? What happens to those bodies that are encountered as objects of hate, as having the characteristic of ‘unlikeness’? In my earlier reading, I emphasised the effect of the encounter on the white body that becomes lived as apart. What I failed to ask was the role of hate, as a social encounter between others, on the bodies of those who are designated as hated. It is this failure that I take as symptomatic of a tendency to think of hate and hate crime from the point of view of those who hate rather than those who are hated. The destruction of the bodies of the hated is, of course, what is often sought in hate crime itself. To allow such bodies to disappear in our own analysis would be to repeat the crime rather than to redress its injustice.

In the case of Audre’s story, Audre’s gestures mimic the white woman’s. Her gaze is ‘pulled down’, following the gaze of the white woman. This pulling down of the gaze and the transformation of the black body into an object of its own gaze seems crucial. The hated body becomes hated, not just for the one who hates, but for the one who is hated. This ‘taking on’ of the white gaze is central to Frantz Fanon’s argument in *Black Skin, White Masks*, where he describes how the black body is ‘sealed into that crushing objecthood’ (Fanon 1986: 109). When Audre’s gaze is pulled down with the white woman’s, she feels ‘afraid’. She comes to recognise herself as the object of the woman’s hate: she is ‘hailed’, in Althusser’s (1971) sense, as the hated. The ‘doing’ of hate is not simply ‘done’ in the moment of its articulation. A chain of effects (which are at once affects) are in circulation. The circulation of objects of hate is not free. In this instance, bodies that are attributed as being hateful – as the origin of feelings of hate – are (temporarily) sealed in their skins. Such bodies assume the *character of the negative*. That transformation of this body into the body of the hated, in other words, leads to the enclosure or sealing of the other’s body within a figure of hate. The white woman who moves away from Audre moves on, of course. *Some bodies move precisely by sealing others as objects of hate.*

Our task may then be to reflect on how it feels to be an object. Mari J. Matsuda’s work emphasises the effects of hate on the bodies of the victims. She writes:

The negative effects of hate messages are real and immediate for the victims. Victims of vicious hate propaganda experience physiological symptoms and emotional distress ranging from fear in the gut to rapid pulse rate and difficulty in breathing, nightmares, post-traumatic stress disorder, hypertension, psychosis and suicide. (Matsuda 1993: 24)

The enactment of hate through verbal or physical violence, Matsuda suggests 'hits right at the emotional place where we feel the most pain' (Matsuda 1993: 25). Such lived experiences of pain can be understood as part of the work of hate, or as part of what hate *is doing*. Hate has effects on the bodies of those who are made into its objects; such bodies are affected by the hate that it is directed towards them by others. Hate is not simply a means by which the identity of the subject and community is established (through alignment); hate also works to unmake the world of the other through pain (see Scarry 1985; see Chapter 1). Or hate crimes seek to *crush* the other in what Patricia Williams has called 'spirit murder' (cited in Matsuda 1993: 24).

If the effect of hate crime is affect, and an affect which is visceral and bodily, as Matsuda's work has emphasised, then *the body of the victim is read as testimony*, as a means by which the truth of hate crime is established in law. This poses a particular problem for the incitement to hatred laws as they relate to hate speech. The effects must be seen as fully determined by the crime, a determination that, in a strict sense, is very difficult to establish, without evidence that can be described as bruised skin or other traces of bodily violence. So critics such as Ray Jureidini have mentioned the 'subjectivity' of hate speech laws as a problem: 'Some people are offended by ethnic jokes and name-calling as a problem, some are not' (Jureidini 2000: 13). If the affect and effects of hate speech are not fully determined, then to what extent can 'harm' become evidence for the injustice of hate speech? To what extent can listening to the victim's story become a means of delivering justice?

We can consider here the important critiques made by Wendy Brown (1995) and Lauren Berlant (2000) of 'wound culture', which fetishises the wound as proof of identity (see Chapter 1). Wound culture takes the injury of the individual as the grounds not only for an appeal (for compensation or redress), but as an identity claim, such that 'reaction' against the injury forms the very basis of politics, understood as the conflation of truth and injustice (Brown 1995: 73). What follows from such critiques should not be a refusal to listen to histories of pain as part of the histories of injustice, whereby pain is understood as *the bodily life of such histories*. The fetishising of the wound can only take place by concealing these histories; the greater injustice would be to repeat that fetishisation by forgetting the processes of

being wounded by others. I am suggesting the *importance of listening to the affects and effects of hate and hate crime* as a way of calling into question, rather than assuming, the relationship between violence and identity. To say these affects and effects are not fully determined, and that they do not congeal into an identity, is not to suggest that the affects and effects don't matter, and that they are not a form of injustice, even if they cannot function in a narrow sense as evidence or an identity claim. Indeed, to treat such testimonies of injury as evidence would perform its own injustice: the language and bodies of hate don't operate on the terrain of truth, they operate to make and unmake worlds, made up of other bodies. Listening to the affects of hate crime must involve recognising that the affects are not always determined: we cannot assume we know in advance what it feels like to be the object of hate. For some, hate enactments may involve pain; for others, rage. So if the pain of others is the 'intention' of hate crime, then hate crime is not always guaranteed to succeed. We have to have open ears to hear the affects of hate.

But what does the failure of hate as an action against others to determine fully its effects mean for politics? In *Excitable Speech* (1997a) Judith Butler considers the impossibility of deciding in advance the meaning of hate speech for hate crime. She suggests that any signifier can be mobilised in different ways and in new contexts, so that even signs we assume stand for hate (and can only stand for hate), can operate otherwise, such as the burning cross (Butler 1997a: 19). Butler hence criticises the work of Matsuda, amongst others, which she suggests assume that hate resides in particular signs and that the effects of such signs are already determined in advance of their circulation. I am in agreement with Butler. As I have argued in this chapter, hate is economic, and it does not reside positively in a sign or body. But Butler overlooks the relationship between affect and effect that is crucial to Matsuda's own work. Following Matsuda, we need to relate the question of the effect of hate speech with *affect*, which includes the question of how others have been affected by hate speech. Following Butler, we might recognise that the affects are not determined in advance. But if they are not determined in advance, then how do they come to be determined? We need to ask: How do certain signs of hate produce affective responses? Or why are some signs of hate repeated? Is it because such signs are over-determined; is it because they keep open a history which is already open insofar as it is affective?

The fact that some signs are repeated is precisely *not* because the signs themselves contain hate, but because they are effects of histories that have stayed open. Words like 'Nigger' or 'Paki' for example tend to stick; they hail the other precisely by bringing another into a history whereby such names assign the other with meaning in an economy of difference (see Chapter 4, for an extension of this argument about sticky signs). Such words and signs

tend to stick, which does not mean they cannot operate otherwise. Rather, they cannot simply be liberated from the history of this use as violence or insult, even if they cannot be reduced to that history. Another way of putting this is to say that some words stick because they become attached *through* particular affects. So, for example, someone will hurl racial insults (the white woman who retreats from Audre may mutter under her breath to a compliant witness, 'nigger' and 'roach': an insult that is directed against an other, but mediated by a third party), precisely because they are affective, although it is not always guaranteed that the other will be 'impressed upon' or hurt in a way that follows from the history of insults. It is the affective nature of hate speech that allows us to understand that whether such speech works or fails to work is not really the important question. Rather, the important question is: *What effects do such encounters have on the bodies of others who become transformed into objects of hate?*

This question can only be asked if we consider how hate works as an affective economy; hate does not reside positively in signs, but circulates or moves between signs and bodies. The circulation of signs of hate involves movement and fixity; some bodies move precisely by sealing others as objects of hate. Tracking the history of hate involves reading the surfaces of bodies, as well as listening to those who have been shaped by this history.

NOTES

1. <http://www.nidlink.com/~aryanvic/index-E.html> Accessed 4 January 2002.
2. Thanks to David Eng for this point.
3. For the British National Party, this argument that 'any' body could be bogus gets translated into 'all' are bogus: 'We will abolish the "positive discrimination" schemes that have made white Britons second-class citizens. We will also clamp down on the flood of "asylum seekers", all of whom are either bogus or can find refuge much nearer their home countries.' See the British National Party website, <http://www.bnp.org.uk/policies.html#immigration> Accessed 30 July 2003.
4. There are some difficulties around cause and effect here. I would argue with Rosga (1999) that hate crime legislation does tend to reify social groups, by assuming that groups are sealed entities that hate is then directed towards. At the same time, I would question the work of critics such as Jacobs and Potter (1998), who in arguing against the efficacy of the category 'hate crime' suggest that the legislation itself is creating the divisions that the crime is supposed to be a result of. They hence imply that such divisions would not exist if they were not introduced and then exacerbated through hate crime legislation. I cannot go along with this. Rather, I would argue that hate crimes (which I define as forms of violence directed towards others that are perceived to be members of a social group, whereby the violence is 'directed' towards the group) work to effect divisions partly by enforcing others into an identity through violence. This does not mean that others are not aligned with an identity (= identification) before the violence. In other words, the enactment of hate through violence does not 'invent' social

groups out of nothing. Rather, such enactments function as a form of enforcement; hate crimes may work by sealing a particular other into an identity that is *already* affective. The distinction between cause and effect is hence not useful: hate both affects, and is affected by, the sealing of others into group identities. This is why some bodies and not others become the object of hate crimes: hate ties the particular with the group only by reopening a past history of violence and exclusion that allows us to recognise the bodies of some others as *out of place* (see Ahmed 2000: 38–54). Of course, the relevant laws within the UK – the 'incitement to racial hatred' in Part III (ss. 17–29) of the Public Order Act 1986 – are about hate speech rather than hate crime defined in the terms above. Here, racial hatred is not described as the origin of crime, but as the effect (there is criminal liability if a person uses or publishes words or commits acts that are threatening, abusive or insulting, and which are likely to 'stir up' racial hatred). Hence hate speech laws tend to criminalise hate as effect, and hate crime laws to criminalise hate as origin; both of them fail to recognise the role played by hate *in an economy of affects and effects*.

5. In a very interesting article, Muneer Ahmad examines the use of the language of 'hate crime' after September 11, analysing the discourses around the murder of five men. He suggests that 'the hate crime killings before September 11 were viewed as crimes of moral depravity, while the hate killings since September 11 have been understood as crimes of passion' (Ahmad 2002: 108). This shift occurs, he suggests, because the 'hate' that was directed against 'others' was shared by the vast majority of Americans; in other words, the crimes become 'crimes of passion' insofar as a collective anger against the attacks gets displaced into an anger towards racial others. Thanks to David Eng for directing me to Ahmad's article. See Chapter 3 for reflections on racial profiling since September 11.