The Majority's Descent to Minority: Redefining American Democracy and Freedom in Ellison's *Invisible Man*

Andraya Sudler

Advised by Dr. Elizabeth Foley O'Connor

English Senior Capstone Experience

3 April 2026

I pledge my word of honor that I have abided by the Washington College Honor Code while completing this assignment.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....…….…… 2

Chapter I: Political Critiques of Democracy & White Supremacy..……...…… 6

Chapter II: Capitalism, Space, and Expulsion…...…….…..…… 11

Chapter III: Psychological Dimensions of Memory, Historical Erasure, & Identity…..…..…..… 19

Chapter IV: The Black Being, Law, Freedom, and Ontological Exclusion...……..…...… 24

Works Cited.….…….....…….33

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to the Washington College English Department for providing an environment dedicated to students' growth. Dr. O'Connor, thank you for bearing with my schedule, making time for me while on sabbatical, and simply encouraging me. I could not have asked for a better thesis advisor throughout this process, and I am so thankful for all of your guidance. Dr. Charles, I first encountered the beauty of the literary department in your FYS. You not only set me up to critically engage with texts, but you also helped me pick the best classes for my interests each semester. To Dr. Rydel, Dr. Hall, Dr. Meehan, Dr. Pitts, Prof. Kesey, and Prof. Taliancich, I thank you all for helping me develop my voice.

Thank you to my mother, Tamika Hall, for your endless support over these four years; to my aunt, Joyell Johnson, thank you for both challenging and encouraging me to explore myself and the world; to my peers, I thank each of you for your contributions to my development, and wish you the best; and to the rest of my family, I thank you all for being in my corner.

Invisible Man stages a sophisticated critique of American political and social structures by showing how myth, narrative, and institutional authority intersect to maintain racial hierarchy. By examining the interplay of religion, economic power, law, and psychological pressure, the novel exposes the mechanism through which democracy is sustained even as it marginalizes Black subjects. However, from its publication in 1952, Ralph Ellison's work was subject to critical tensions that mirror the very structures the novel interrogates. Some critics of the novel attempt to contain it within a narrow sociological frame that insist on reading Black literature primarily in terms of protest. In contrast, others dismissed its political authority altogether. Ellison resisted these constraints in an essay, stating that his "'fiction [must] be judged as art…not because [he] did or did not fight some ideological battle,'" and he challenged the assumption that democratic ideals inherently produce justice and that Black writers serve as transparent representations of racial struggle (qtd. in Parrish 646). At the same time, critics such as Irving Howe, giving his opinion from a non-Black perspective, unintentionally reduced Black experience to abstraction, seeing not a complex subject but "an abstract embodiment of living hell," thereby reinforcing the same erasures the novel critiques (Parrish 644). More broadly, Ellison redefines a critical landscape in which "what whites think of the Negro's reality is more important than what Negroes themselves know it to be," revealing that authority over interpretation remains racially structured (Parrish 645). These tensions underscore how *Invisible Man* operates not only as a literary text but as a contested site of meaning, where struggles over racial ideology, institutional power, and the psychic dimensions of survival under white supremacy are enacted. This project proceeds by examining how these mechanisms operate across multiple domains: first, through religious myth and institutional performance; second, through economic exploitation and spatial control; third, through psychological regulation and

the pathologization of Black consciousness; and finally, through the limits of law and the ontological exclusion of Black being.

By tracing the narrator's journey through Black institutions, northern and southern spaces, and racially coded social structures, Ellison shows that the ideals of democracy are sustained by mythmaking rather than substantive justice. Figures such as Reverend Homer A. Barbee and Dr. Bledsoe exemplify how religion, history, and institutional authority intertwine to maintain hierarchical power under the guise of communal uplift. In this framework, the performance of moral rectitude, the sanctification of myth, and the orchestration of perception become tools for managing Black life, allowing institutions to signal progress while sustaining structural inequality. Reverend Barbee's sermon concerning the symbolic Founder illustrates this fusion of religious rhetoric and institutional power. By framing the Founder's legacy as a prophetic seed producing inevitable fruit, Barbee transforms historical contingency into sacred inevitability. The narrative constructs the Founder not as a flawed human figure but as a pseudo-divine symbol whose work validates obedience and suppresses dissent. Barbee's literal blindness amplifies this irony, exposing how institutions craft ideological reverence based on faith rather than reality. Similarly, Dr. Bledsoe reveals the strategic dimension of this mythmaking, acknowledging the manipulation necessary to maintain both white patronage and internal hierarchy. His admission that he must "act like a n****r" underscores the performative labor demanded of Black subjects within institutional frameworks (Ellison 143). Both figures demonstrate that power is reinforced not only through economic or governmental authority but through the cultivation of belief, the regulation of perception, and the discipling of aspiration. Myth, religious language, and narrative performance stabilize the contradictions of democracy, masking structural dependency and racialized exploitation.

Ellison's critique extends beyond institutional mythmaking to the psychological pressures imposed upon Black subjects. The Trueblood episode in Chapter Two dramatizes the entanglement of racialized space, economic exploitation, and narrative performance. Whether read as a literal or as a strategic tall tale, the story reveals how Black sexuality is commodified and surveilled within a white-dominated social sphere. As Gillian Johns argues, Trueblood's narrative functions as a rhetorical contest with white audiences, illustrating the manipulative stakes of storytelling and interpretive labor demanded of Black subjects. For the narrator, Trueblood's confession produces both psychological trauma and a crisis of collective representation: one individual's actions become evidence of racial pathology, underscoring the impossibility of separating private life from racialized expectation. Ellison thus illustrates the persistent burden of representation, revealing the psychic toll of inhabiting a world in which survival requires constant negotiation between visibility, invisibility, and narrative control.

The third chapter of this project turns to the psychological dimensions of Ellison's critique, arguing that American democracy is sustained not only by institutional and economic structures but also by the regulation of consciousness itself. In *Invisible Man,* the mind becomes a place of political contestation where memory, identity, and perception are shaped by racial ideology. Ellison reveals that psychological instability is not an individual pathology but a structural condition produced by the contradictions of a society that proclaims equality while enforcing exclusion. Drawing on discourses of psychiatry, primitivism, and modern psychology, the novel exposes how Black consciousness is simultaneously denied complexity and subjected to intense scrutiny. This chapter argues that the language of madness, neurosis, and fragmentation functions as a political tool in which dissent is pathologized, historical awareness is suppressed, and internal conflict becomes the cost of a world that demands both submission

and performance. Through the narrator's divided consciousness, the grandfather's paradoxical philosophy, and the violence of institutional "treatment," Ellison demonstrates that democracy depends upon the management of Black psychological life, rendering political insight itself a form of perceived disorder (Ellison 235).

The tension between legality, freedom, and ontological recognition constitutes a central political problem in Ellison's work. As Calvin Warren observes, Black existence in America occupies a paradoxical space: legally free yet excluded from the ontological structures that render law meaningful. Freedom, in this sense, is not equivalent to emancipation. While the law may recognize Black individuals as juridical persons, it cannot grant access to the ontological grounding necessary for human subjectivity. Through the narrator's divided consciousness and the grandfather's deathbed wisdom, Ellison dramatizes the transformation of external oppression into an internalized psychological struggle. Survival demands a performance while maintaining covert forms of resistance. In this way, Ellison's novel redefines democracy itself as dependent upon strategic subordination and invisibility of Black life, revealing how racialized exclusion underwrites claims to both freedom and equality.

Political Critiques of Democracy & White Supremacy

Ellison offers a profound political critique of American democracy by revealing how white supremacy, in practice, depends upon racial exclusion, strategic invisibility, and the manipulation of truth. Through the narrator's experiences, the novel demonstrates that democracy's promises of equality, merit, and representation are sustained by mythmaking. The text suggests that white supremacy is not a deviation from democratic ideals but is embedded within the nation's institutions and narratives. In Ellison's framework, invisibility, blindness, and

mask-wearing are not discrete phenomena but interdependent mechanisms through which democracy regulates perception, determining who can see, who must remain unseen, and who is compelled to perform in order to exist at all.

Religion becomes a common language in which hierarchy is naturalized and democratic contradictions are masked. Reverend Barbee represents the fusion of religion and institutional mythos. His speech about the founder transforms the founder into a sacred myth. He proclaims, "a great seed had been planted, a seed which has continued to put forth its fruit in its season," invoking Biblical agricultural imagery (Ellison 132). The metaphor of the "seed" echoes scripture, positioning the Founder as a prophetic sower whose legacy unfolds according to divine timing. At the same time, the act of producing continuous "fruit" implies that the Founder's ideology is repeatedly reproduced. This language shifts the Founder's work from historical contingency to sacred inevitability. The narrative of racial uplift becomes providential rather than political. Barbee intensifies this sanctification by declaring that the current leader has become the Founder's "living agent, his physical presence" (Ellison 132). The rhetoric resembles theological speech patterns, in which the Founder lives again in his successor. Leadership becomes apostolic succession. The audience is urged, "Be not afraid to undertake the burdens of your leader," a phrase reminiscent of Biblical exhortation (Ellison 133). In this sermon, the college's mission is framed not as an educational project within American democracy but as a holy experiment that demands obedience and faith. The act of questioning leadership becomes a defiant act of obedience and divine order. However, Ellison undercuts this mythmaking with a devastating revelation: "Homer A. Barbee was blind" (Ellison 133). The blindness is literal but also functions metaphorically. The man who sees the Founder's vision most profoundly lacks

sight himself. This irony exposes the narrative's constructed nature. The institution's history is constructed on sightless notions grounded in faith but detached from material reality.

Blindness becomes a metaphor for ideological devotion; an epistemological failure rooted in what Ellison describes as "a peculiar disposition of the eyes," through which reality is selectively perceived and contradiction rendered invisible (Ellison 3). The Founder himself operates as a political symbol rather than a fully human figure. He is repeatedly described in exalted terms resembling a pseudo-god: "I can see the fruits produced by the land that your great Founder has transformed from barren clay to fertile soil" (Ellison 45). The Founder's story becomes a national allegory of Black progress within white America. Through him, accommodation is sanctified. His narrative reassures both Black and white audiences that advancement is possible through patience, humility, and loyalty to existing power structures. In this way, myth substitutes for structural change and complements the Weaponization of Biblical language to reinforce racist frameworks. The Founder's legend disciplines aspiration, as success must follow the "straight and narrow path that he and the Founder had stretched before us" (Ellison 99). The usage of religious language surrounding a folk legend narrows political possibilities.

Dr. Bledsoe, the college president, reveals the machinery that allows the myth to function. Unlike Barbee, Bledsoe is not blinded by faith; he is acutely aware of power dynamics. He boasts, "power is confident, self-assuring…when you buck against me, you're bucking against power, rich white folk's power, the nation's power, which means government power" (Ellison 142). His language strips away the spiritual alignment and names the institutional situation beneath the college's rhetoric. The school does not represent communal Black advancement; it tethers wealthy white patrons and the state. However, Bledsoe participates in the

myth publicly. He reprimands the narrator for jeopardizing the institution's reputation: “I gave you an opportunity to serve one of our best white friends, a man who could make your fortune. But in return you dragged the entire race into the slime” (Ellison 141). Honesty is framed as a disservice to whiteness, and deviation from black subservience with truth is racial betrayal. The moral vocabulary mirrors Barbee’s religious tone. To threaten the college’s image is to commit a crime. The narrator later reflects, “any act that endangered the continuity of the dream was an act of treason," (Ellison 134). The “dream” functions as a sacred doctrine; protecting it justifies punishment. Bledsoe’s most revealing admission of “had to act like a n****r” exposes what Black literary tradition describes as “‘mask-wearing’”, “the conscious adoption of a false identity which hides…the ‘true’ identity beneath” (Lieber 87). However, this performance is not solely strategic; it is structurally compelled by invisibility itself. Bledsoe consciously embodies the stereotype expected by white benefactors, maintaining the guise of docility and gratitude to preserve institutional survival and personal authority. Religion and myth here are not naive beliefs but strategic tools. Bledsoe manipulates white expectations while simultaneously disciplining Black students into compliance. He preserves the narrative of harmony between the races, even as he acknowledges its falseness.

Ellison’s critique of American Democracy is further clarified by his insistence that the central political struggle in the United States is not only over rights or representation but over reality itself. As Ellison argues in a lecture he gave in 1964, the writer’s task is “‘to give as thorough a report of social reality as possible,’” a responsibility that becomes political because it determines what counts as “fact” within democratic discourse (qtd. in Turner 656). Chapter 16 of *Invisible Man* highlights this struggle through the narrator's induction speech into the Brotherhood, where reality is not discovered but staged, managed, and performed. Before he

speaks, the narrator experiences a profound dislocation of self, asking himself, “What’s your name?” revealing the instability of identity within institutional structures that demand ideological conformity (Ellison 334). The rally itself is orchestrated as spectacle: the narrator is placed “last,” held back until “the height of their impatience,” and then thrust into a blinding spotlight that renders the audience visible to him only as sound, while he himself is fully exposed, “as though a semi-transparent curtain had dropped between us” (Ellison 333-341). This asymmetry of vision literalizes invisibility as a political condition; he is seen, consumed, and mobilized, but cannot truly see. Like Barbee, who narrates a vision he cannot physically perceive, the narrator becomes an instrument of a reality structured by others: like Bledsoe, he learns—though not yet consciously—to perform within it. Ellison makes explicit that “the struggle against white supremacy was a ‘struggle over the nature of reality,’” revealing that racial domination depends upon the production of illusions that reconcile democratic ideals with antidemocratic practices (Turner 656). Barbee’s religious mythmaking and Bledsoe’s strategic mask-wearing operate within what Ellison describes as a broader cultural condition in which individuals are “all too prone to see reality selectively,” clinging to narratives that stabilize identity and suppress contradiction (Turner 656).

Through these characters, Ellison demonstrates that mythmaking stabilizes democracy’s racial contradictions. The college presents itself as evidence of progress, a “great and noble experiment,” suggesting that American democracy works (Ellison 133). Religious language becomes prophetic, dissent becomes treason. Meanwhile, the material realities of dependency on white wealth and governmental power remain obscured. Ellison’s critique devastatingly reveals that white supremacy endures not only through violence or explicit exclusion but through sacred oral performance that demands belief. By revealing Barbee’s blindness and Bledsoe’s cynicism,

the novel exposes how institutions manufacture reverence to control perception. Religion becomes political theater, and myth becomes governance. The national narrative of democratic uplift is sustained by faith in symbols rather than confrontation with power.

Capitalism, Space, and Expulsion

Readers of Ellison's text have long debated how to interpret the Trueblood episode in *Invisible Man.* The dominant evaluation has been in both psychological and sociological fields, in which Trueblood's confession of incest is perceived as literal. These readings suggest that the episode reveals the social degradation and moral contradictions of the rural Black South. More recent scholarship, however, complicates this assumption. Gillian Johns argues that Trueblood's story functions less as a confession than as a performance. She suggests that the sharecropper deliberately tells a tall tale to exploit white audiences' fascination with Black sexuality. Johns performs a rhetorical reading of the chapter through which she determines Ellison's utilization of Trueblood's character as a dramatic means of manipulating Mr. Norton's incestuous fantasies, exposing the instability of racial interpretation. While this reading highlights Ellison's sophisticated usage of dramatic irony and vernacular storytelling, it risks overlooking the psychological stakes for the narrator. Regardless of whether Trueblood's account is factual or strategic, the episode produces a profound crisis of racial representation for the protagonist, revealing how narratives of Black sexuality circulate as psychological burdens within the structures of American racial ideology.

Johns taps into a valuable, underdeveloped area of dominant interpretations of the Trueblood story. Rather than agreeing with previous scholarship on the topic, Johns suggests that the story may function as a challenge to internal biases through rhetorical performance. She argues that Trueblood's narrative should be classified as a tall tale, a genre defined as: "'a comic

fiction disguised as fact, deliberately exaggerated to the limits of credibility'" (Johns 239). In accordance with this definition, the story becomes a strategic manipulation of white desire rather than a transparent representation of Black sexuality. Johns explains that the storyteller "plays a rhetorically sophisticated game that, rather than offering definitive truth about how Trueblood's daughter got pregnant, gambles successfully on repressed white male sexual desires so that he and his children survive" (Johns 245). From this perspective, Trueblood exploits his daughter's pregnancy as a means to profit from gullible white audiences like Mr. Norton, who transforms his racist fantasies into material advantage when Norton gives him money. Johns's reading highlights vernacular storytelling and interpretive competition in Ellison's text, emphasizing the possibility that Trueblood consciously manipulates racial stereotypes. Yet this rhetorical framing puts the narrator's psychological trauma from the scene at stake. The protagonist does not experience the story as ironic commentary; rather, he experiences it as a humiliating spectacle that confirms white stereotypes about Black sexuality. The narrator perceives the scene as anxiety-inducing about racial representation and collective shame. The narrator's inability to interpret the performance is itself psychologically revealing, demonstrating how deeply he has internalized the pressures associated with being an educated and worthy Black person and the fear of reinforcing racist stereotypes in the midst of white audiences.

Moreover, the dynamics of the scene reveal that the narrative's power lies less in its truth value than in its social circulation. Johns notes that Trueblood's tall tale can be persuasive based on the audiences' willingness to participate in it, describing tall narrative as: "a contest between the teller and his audience with belief as the stake to be won" (Johns 248). However, within the novel's racial context, belief is not merely a literary game. The plausibility of Trueblood's confession depends upon longstanding racial myths that associate Blackness with uncontrolled

sexuality and moral deviance. When Norton listens to the story with fascination—and "something like envy"—the scene demonstrates how such fantasies structure white perception (Ellison 51). Whether the story is true or exaggerated, it gains power because it aligns with existing racist rhetoric. The narrator's distress within the chapter therefore reflects the psychological violence embedded within the narrative. As a student at a Black institution, the narrator is groomed by Black middle-class society to appeal to white benefactors like Norton. Trueblood's story shatters this fragile ideology that the protagonist upholds. The narrator explains that men like Trueblood had "brought disgrace upon the black community," revealing the class tensions between the educated Black institution and the rural poor as well as the burden of collective representation imposed upon Black bodies (Ellison 46). In this sense, the possible strategic exploitation conducted by Trueblood also reproduces degrading portraits of Black life to secure survival—even at the expense of his wife and daughter. The interpretive ambiguity Johns identifies, therefore, does not diminish the scene's significance; rather, it intensifies it. Trueblood's admission operates simultaneously as a possible fiction, social performance, and racial evidence, demonstrating how stories of Black deviance spread with American racial ideology. Legitimacy aside, the incest scene produces real consequences: it is a spectacle and a means of projection for Norton, it acts as a catalyst for the narrator's unraveling, and it reinforces the racial curiosities that structure the social world of the novel. Trueblood's account reveals not merely a rhetorical contest, but the profound psychological pressures placed upon Black identity within a system that translates individual behavior as synonymous with racial proof.

Trueblood's act produces both material reward and social banishment, situating him within a spatial and moral double bind; he is condemned by Black institutional authority while rewarded by white spectatorship. His body, sexuality, and poverty become objects of

dissemination. This dynamic is not isolated but staged through the narrator's encounter with Trueblood, which unfolds when he is tasked with chauffeuring a northern white trustee, Mr. Norton, on an off-campus drive from the southern black college he attends. During the drive, the narrator becomes distracted by Mr. Norton's speech on achieving a "pleasant fate," which leads him to veer towards the formerly enslaved quarters (Ellison 40). The physical setting of Trueblood's home underscores this economy of degradation. The narrator describes "a collection of shacks and log cabins…bleached white and warped by the weather," with "Sun-tortured shingles" spread "like decks of water-soaked cards" (Ellison 46). The simile of aged shingles as ruined playing cards suggests both chance and fate in which Black individuals are dealt a losing hand by structural poverty. The space is beyond architecturally minimal—"two square rooms joined together by a common floor and roof"—a compressed, airless space that reflects the constriction of economic possibility (Ellison 46). Space is not neutral here; it is pressurized and restricted, produced by capital deprivation. The "Black Belt" landscape becomes a zone of social expulsion, where those excluded from economic mobility are stored (Ellison 47). Within this compressed domestic space, moral chaos unfolds.

Scholars of racial capitalism argue that anti-Black violence and economic exploitation are structurally intertwined rather than historically accidental. As A. Bledsoe and W.J. Wright argue in their article, capitalism does not simply produce racial inequality as a byproduct; rather, anti-Blackness operates as "an always-present precondition for capital accumulation" (Bledsoe and Wright 5). Systems of accumulation have historically depended on the devaluation of Black life, from slavery and colonial extraction to modern forms of spatial marginalization and economic exclusion. Bledsoe and Wright cite Afro-Pessimist analyses stating that anti-Black racism is both global and ever-present in order "'for expansion and unending space within the symbolic

economy of settlement'" (Bledsoe and Wright 5). Capitalism continuously reorganizes space through processes such as white flight, deindustrialization, urban renewal, and gentrification, pushing Black communities into impoverished and vulnerable environments that later become sites for redevelopment and profit. These factors reflect "spatial fix," a term Bledsoe and Wright derive from David Harvey, in which capital restructures geography to sustain accumulation (Bledsoe and Wright 9). According to this framework, Black communities are frequently perceived as illegitimate and vacant—an ideological inheritance of slavery that treated Black people as property rather than as social actors capable of producing habitable areas. Bledsoe and Wright draw from scholars Katherine McKittrick and Frank Wilderson to demonstrate that Black communities are the "lands of no one" and are rendered disposable and open to exploitation due to Wilderson's term of "deterritorialization"—a geographical concept that describes the violent stripping of Black beings' existence and territory (Bledsoe and Wright 6).

This theoretical frame clarifies the economic and spatial dynamics that structure *Invisible Man.* The narrator initially embraces the college's model of racial uplift rooted in education, labor, and respectability, learning to emulate Dr. Bledsoe's "posture of humility and meekness" while appealing to white patrons like Mr. Norton (Ellison 115). Nevertheless, Ellison's novel reveals that Black advancement within these institutions remains embedded in capitalist systems that rely on exploitation and expulsion. The narrator's trajectory through the college, Liberty Paints Factory, and the Brotherhood illustrates a recurring "systemic movement from integration to expulsion," demonstrating how promises of inclusion collapse once Black labor or representation ceases to serve institutional interests (O'Brien 82). At Liberty Paints, for example, Black workers are hired not for racial equality purposes but to weaken labor protections. Regular (assumed white workers) are fired, and "colored college boys" are put on so "they don't have to

pay union wages" (Ellison 197). Even within the industrial system, Black workers are reduced to instruments of production, which Liberty Paints employee Brockway describes as "*the machines inside the machine*" (Ellison 217). Race, according to Stuart Hall, therefore, becomes "'the modality by which class is 'lived'" (qtd. in O'Brien 98).

Ellison suggests how material conditions and spatial confinement intensify psychic and bodily pressures. Trueblood himself is described as a "small man" and is said to have such "familiarity" with his space that he "covered the yard," as though he had dominion over it (Ellison 50). Trueblood's characterization as "small" diminishes him physically and symbolically, suggesting emasculation within dominant patriarchal norms. Yet the verb "covered" implies a metaphorical depiction of his perceived possession of the inhabitants of the yard. This paradox reflects the contradictions of racial capitalism, in which he possesses nothing yet exerts authority over the only space available to him. The yard becomes a liminal space between the pre- and post-incestuous act, between private sin and public spectacle. The "blackest darkness" functions as a metaphorical moral transgression in which Trueblood maintains the same air of "certainty" (Ellison 50). The "darkness," a metaphor for sin, becomes habitable for him, a space in which he profits from the misery of the women around him. He is not expelled from his environment; instead, he is reabsorbed into it as a figure of grotesque fascination.

Trueblood's narration of the assault intensifies this moral ambiguity. He claims that "she was tryin' to push me away…then I'm pullin' away… when she grabs holt of me and holds tight" (Ellison 60). The oscillation between pushing and pulling, staying and leaving, and trying develops a rhetoric of mutual entanglement that blurs agency. He states, "I found out that I didn't want to go neither," revealing a repressed desire under the guise of fatalism (Ellison 60). He repeatedly frames the act as something he had been "tryin" not to commit, reinforcing an evasion

of responsibility and an invocation of destiny. This implication of inevitability mirrors broader structures, just as poverty appears fated in the Black Belt, as does sexual transgression as it becomes framed as unavoidable. Yet this fatalism masks agency. The confession “I stayed” illuminates choice disguised as compulsion (Ellison 60). His language reframes violence as mutual desire, exposing repressed impulses rather than uncontrollable destiny. This repression surfaces explicitly in his objectification of his daughter. “The gal looks just like the ole lady did when she was young and I first met her, only better lookin” (Ellison 54). He collapses both mother and daughter into interchangeable bodies, reducing both to reproductive objects. The comparison perverts the maternal bond; the daughter becomes a younger, improved version of the wife. His desire is less paternal than possessive, rooted in nostalgia for his lost youth. When he recalls, "I likes to recall them Mobile days” and links that memory to hearing Matty Lou say “Daddy,” he actively overlays his daughter with former sexual partners (Ellison 56). He reinforces her sexualization in his claim, “I’m realizin’ that she’s a woman now…like a woman says when she wants to tease and please a man” (Ellison 56). He strips her of childhood; womanhood is defined by pleasing male desire. Trueblood reframes parental recognition as erotic awakening. His anger, “I gits mad wonderin’ if it’s that boy,” reveals jealousy, as though another man was claiming his property (Ellison 56). She becomes valuable to him as a woman. She is young, desirable, and economically convertible. Her body becomes a reminder of his vitality and, after the scandal, a means of generating white charity. The perversion lies not only in the act but in the interpretive lens that renders his child as legible primarily as a sexual being.

The disturbing scene is almost sensationalized. The narrator admits, “we dared not laugh at the crude, high, plaintively animal sounds Jim Trueblood made” (Ellison 47). The language of “animal sounds” invokes racist stereotypes of Black barbarism and hypersexuality, exposing how

Black sexuality is coded as a deviant spectacle. The college officials' "contempt sharpened by hate" is "charged with fear" (Ellison 47). That fear signals anxiety about proximity, specifically the thin line separating the middle-class institution and its values from the "peasants" of the Black Belt (Ellison 47). The narrator recognizes that "all of us at the college hated the black-belt people" (Ellison 47). This intra-racial class division reveals how middle-class values of discipline, sexual restraint, and respectability are internalized as survival strategies within white supremacy.

Trueblood threatens this fragile performance. His deviance risks confirming white stereotypes: "How can he tell this to white men, I thought, when he knows they'll say that all Negroes do such things?" (Ellison 58). The narrator's question exposes the radicalized burden of representation that structures the entire episode. The question implies both shame and collective consequence. Trueblood's confession does not remain an individual matter. In a white supremacist society, Black identity is treated as monolithic; one man's transgression becomes proof of racial pathology. The fear embedded in the narrator's thought reveals an acute awareness that black subjects are denied individuality; they stand in for the entire race. The phrase "white men" is crucial because it names the audience whose gaze determines societal perception. Trueblood's story, when told within Black spaces, is scandalous but contained. When told to white men, it becomes racial evidence. The narrator anticipates a generalization, "they'll say that all Negroes do such things," which exposes how Black sexuality is already preconceived as deviant, hypersexual, and animalistic (Ellison 58). This moment points toward the narrator's own class positioning. He fears contamination by association. His horror is not solely at the incest but at its public circulation. The college's mission depends upon presenting Black people as morally upright and deserving of equality. Trueblood's openness destabilizes that carefully

curated image. While Trueblood tells his story plainly, Bledsoe and the College manage appearances.

Psychological Dimensions of Memory, Historical Erasure, & Identity

The political structure of American democracy is revealed through the politicized language of madness in *Invisible Man*. Through the novel's psychological themes, Ellison exposes how racial domination produces conflict. Psychological instability is treated as representative of a black monolith rather than as an individual pathology. As J. Bradford Campbell explains in "The Schizophrenic Solution: Dialectics of Neurosis and Anti-psychiatric Animus in Ralph Ellison's Invisible Man," "no textual representation of mental illness or literary engagement with psychiatry is entirely self-contained" (Campbell 447). Instead, mental health must be understood through "various discourses—popular, scientific, medical, and otherwise—that seek to condition what mental illness means" (Campbell 447). Within this historical framework, psychological discourse becomes a mechanism through which social hierarchies are interpreted, regulated, and normalized. These discourses do not merely define mental illness; they also regulate what can be remembered, producing a cultural logic in which Black suffering is both pathologized and historically erased. Psychiatry and cultural narratives about mental health, therefore, participate in shaping racial identity by defining who is and is not capable of psychological complexity.

Black psychological complexity has been historically denied as a result of racial ideology in the United States. Primitivist racial discourse portrayed African Americans as emotionally simple, instinctive, and immune to the internal conflicts associated with internal life. According to this concept, "primitivist assumptions and prejudices worked to create a specific understanding of mental illness that posited Blacks as '"primitive"' and therefore free (and,

moreover, incapable) of the supposedly refined and civilized neuroses of modernity" (Campbell 447). Black people were perceived as naturally joyful and instinctive beings who enjoyed life '"for its own sake"' and were "inherently incapable of 'introspection'" (Campbell 448). As a result of this notion, Black people were believed to be "'biologically' invulnerable to neurosis" (Campbell 448). These ideas functioned ideologically rather than scientifically. As Campbell continues to note, the romanticization of Black life: "under the guise of celebrating black as 'better,' this romanticizing reinforces racist stereotypes by denying African Americans a complex subjectivity" (Campbell 450). By representing Black Americans as psychologically "simple," American culture attempted to erase the possibility that Black suffering might be the result of structural oppression (Campbell 447). *Invisible Man* directly intervenes in this primitivist discourse through Ellison's assertion that Black Americans are not outside modernity but are, in fact, some of the most psychologically burdened. Campbell argues that "Ellison's suggestion of a fundamental relationship between black racial experience and neurosis…stake(s) a claim to modernity" (Campbell 450). African Americans are depicted as "indigenous products of (rather than out of place in) modern civilization," and the psychological conflicts that arise are because they live with its most violent contradictions (Campbell 450). In this sense, neurosis becomes evidence of historical awareness rather than psychological deficiency. Ellison redefines the origin of psychological distress, reasserting that neuroses arise not primarily from family dynamics like classical Freudian theory suggested but from "material circumstances like poverty, racism, and oppression" (Campbell 450). The novel, therefore, reframes mental instability as the product of structural forces embedded within American democracy itself.

The psychological consequences of racism and the suppressed truths about American democracy are strongly interpreted through the relationship between psychology and resistance

in the Invisible Man's Grandfather's deathbed advice. The novel opens with the grandfather's confession, in which he declares: "our life is a war and I have been a traitor all my born days, a spy in the enemy's country ever since I give up my gun back in the Reconstruction" (Ellison 16). This statement reframes Black life in America as a permanent condition of conflict. His reference to Reconstruction situates his experience within the unfinished political struggle following emancipation. The war he references is not merely metaphorical but historical, as the collapse of Reconstruction marked the violent reassertion of white supremacy and the transformation of Black freedom into a state of surveillance, terror, and accommodation. The grandfather's admission that he gave "up [his] gun" suggests that open resistance has become virtually impossible. In its place, a new strategy emerges in which the struggle on the battlefield is transitioned to the psychological realm. The grandfather does not simply describe himself as a traitor but as a spy. The distinction is crucial as treason implies betrayal, while espionage implies strategy. By combining the terms, the grandfather reveals the paradox of Black survival under white supremacy—what outwardly appears as submission may be a covert form of resistance. His advice makes this duality explicit: "Live with your head in the lion's mouth…overcome 'em with yeses, undermine 'em with grins, agree 'em to death and destruction" (Ellison 16). The metaphor and imagery are striking and violent. Living with "your head in the lion's mouth" implies constant proximity to danger. Survival requires remaining in the jaws of power while avoiding annihilation. The strategy of "yeses" and "grins" serves as a mask in which the outward performance of servility conceals an inner opposition. The advice reveals a sophisticated understanding of domination, grounded in experience. Under conditions where confrontation would lead to death or imprisonment, resistance becomes covert, psychological, and strategic.

The grandfather's method of resistance encourages sabotage by exaggerating white authority's expectations; the oppressed subject exposes the system's absurdity. Yet the protagonist does not recognize the speech as subversive but rather as psychological torment. Within him resides what he describes as "the dissenting voice… the traitor self that always threatened internal discord" (Ellison 335). The "traitor self" references the internal survival of his grandfather's wisdom. Even though the narrator attempts to suppress it, the voice continues to question the legitimacy of the system he is trying to navigate. The narrator must constantly monitor and suppress his own thoughts to maintain the appearance of conformity. He explains, "I knew that I'd have to keep it pressed down" (Ellison 335). Through this metaphor for suppression, the narrator treats his critical awareness as something dangerous that must be buried within his psyche. Political insight thus becomes indistinguishable from psychological disturbance.

The narrator's divided consciousness dramatizes how systems of domination force individuals to internalize conflict rather than confront injustice directly. This psychological division, termed "double consciousness" by W. E. B. Du Bois, speaks to what: "African Americans have had to know themselves in part through their disfigurement by whites—a disfigurement that whites refuse to acknowledge and, according to Ellison, may be incapable of perceiving" (Parrish 657). In the narrator's case, this sense of being "split" develops through enforced forgetting of historical mistreatment and an attempt to assimilate into the dominant culture (Scott 114). This internalization of conflict also reveals why Black resistance is frequently interpreted as madness within American culture. American identity has often been constructed through the suppression of its own past. Ellison stated in his essay "Blues People" that "'Americans are known as a people without memory,'" a society that has "'trained ourselves

to suppress, if not forget, troublesome details of the national memory'" (qtd. in Booth 688). Such forgetting is not passive but political. "American memory…is intermingled with the forgetting of injustice," and "such forgetting is itself an injury" (Booth 688-89). The erasure of slavery and racial violence produces a national identity that depends on disavowing its own history. As a result, Black existence becomes the living trace of what the nation refuses to remember. When the oppressed subject expresses dissent or skepticism, that response appears as irrational from the perspective of the dominant ideology. Because the system insists on its own ideology, any refusal to accept it must be explained as a psychological abnormality. The narrator's divided consciousness, therefore, becomes evidence of a broader cultural process. His struggle reflects a society in which the recognition of injustice is itself pathologized. The "dissenting voice" in his head, which he associates with treachery and discord, is actually a testament to the persistence of political awareness in a world determined to suppress it (Ellison 335).

Ellison dramatizes this dynamic through the narrator's own fractured consciousness. His loss of identity following psychiatric "treatment"—electroshocks—presents the Black body as a site to be dominated and continuously stripped of continuity (235). The suffering body becomes an epistemological object whose movements appear to validate racist assumptions. The doctor's explanation of the machine intensifies this process of dehumanization by translating the narrator's consciousness into the language of experimental science. One physician boldly describes the device: "The machine will produce the results of a prefrontal lobotomy without the negative effects of the knife" (Ellison 236). The sentence reframes the narrator's mind as a mechanical system whose output can be engineered. Rather than treating him as a patient with subjective experience, the doctor speaks of his personality as something that can be rehabilitated. The explanation continues with an emphasis on the technical precision: "We apply pressure in

the proper degrees to the major centers of nerve control, our concept is Gestalt, and the result is as complete a change of personality" (Ellison 236). Terms such as "pressure," "degree," and "centers of nerve control" reflect a mechanistic worldview in which personality is treated as a manipulable system. The reference to Gestalt psychology lends scientific authority to the procedure, masking the violence being performed. The most revealing moment occurs when a doctor asks about the protagonist's psychological state: "'But what of his psychology?' 'Absolutely of no importance!'" (Ellison 236). This exchange exposes the underlying logic of the experiment. The narrator's inner life—his memories, emotions, and sense of self— is dismissed as irrelevant. The doctor elaborates: "The patient will live as he has to live, and…society will suffer no traumata on his account" (Ellison 236). This statement reveals that the goal of the treatment is not healing but social regulation. The narrator's individuality is subordinated to the stability of the social order. The phrase "as he has to live" implies that his role in society is predetermined; the machine ensures he will occupy it without resistance. In this sense, the novel directly ties psychiatry to racial control, reproducing what the novel links to slavery: "with straitjackets replacing the chains and electrodes replacing the whips" (Campbell 458). These institutions do not seek to restore memory; they attempt to erase it by severing the subject from historical consciousness in order to produce a docile social identity.

The Black Being, Law, Freedom, and Ontological Exclusion

The paradox at the center of Black political existence can be framed by a deceptively simple question: What does it mean to be legally free yet remain an outlaw within the very system that proclaims freedom? In modern democratic societies, law presents itself as the guarantor of liberty, citizenship, and protection. Yet the historical condition of Black life reveals that legal freedom does not necessarily produce ontological recognition. Instead, Black existence

often occupies a contradictory space in which the subject is formally emancipated yet structurally positioned outside the community that the law claims to defend. This paradox raises a deeper issue concerning the relationship between law and democracy itself. If democratic law is meant to secure the freedom of the political community, it has historically done so by establishing the boundaries of that community through exclusion. In this sense, the protection of democratic order frequently depends upon the abandonment of the Black being as a fully recognized subject of law. The figure of the "free" Black person thus exposes a profound contradiction: emancipation grants judicial status while leaving intact a structure in which Black existence remains socially suspect, politically vulnerable, and ontologically unstable (Warren 88). As Calvin Warren suggests in his book *Ontological Terror: Blackness, Nihilism, and Emancipation*, the problem is not merely that Black people were denied the promises of democracy, but that those promises were historically stabilized through the very structures that positioned Black life at the limits of the human and outside the protections that freedom was meant to secure.

Black existence is not simply marginalized within legal systems; it is positioned outside the ontological structure that makes law meaningful. The concept of ontological difference is not available to the Black subject. As Warren states, "The ontological difference that preconditions the human's freedom and citizenship… is not a difference that provides grounding for the black" (Warren 65). Warren argues that Black being is historically constructed as "available equipment," a term drawn from Heidegger's description of objects that exist primarily as tools for human use (Warren 65). Within the metaphysical order of anti-Blackness, the Black body is treated not as a being that participated in the unfolding of Being but as an object through which the human subject understands its own position in the world. This ontological positioning has

profound implications. If the human subject's freedom and citizenship depend on the relation between being and beings, then those excluded from this relation cannot appeal to law as a source of ontological grounding. Black existence becomes a paradoxical entity: present in the physical world but excluded from the ontological framework that recognizes human subjectivity. Warren suggests that "The physical black body is a distortion and an ontic illusion" (Warren 65). It consults the breakdown of ontological differences while simultaneously making that breakdown visible. In other words, Blackness exposes the fragility of the philosophical structures that claim to ground humanity, law, and freedom. This argument challenges humanist theories that assume universal humanity as the foundation of political and legal systems. If Blackness is positioned outside the ontological category of the human, then appeals to human rights or universal equality cannot resolve the problem. The issue is not simply legal discrimination but a deeper ontological exclusion.

The distinction between emancipation and freedom is central to the analysis of freedom in America. Conventional historical narratives treat emancipation, particularly the abolition of slavery, as the moment when Black people entered the realm of freedom. However, Warren argues that emancipation and freedom are fundamentally different concepts. He believes that based on the "ontological presumptions of these terms… We have not witnessed (nor ever will) a free black in an antiblack world" (Warren 86). Emancipation is a legal process, an instrument of the law that changes the juridical status of a person. Freedom, by contrast, is an ontological condition rooted in the relation between human existence and Being. Because Blackness is excluded from this ontological relation, emancipation cannot produce freedom. Historical documents illustrate this contradiction. Nineteenth-century observers frequently described the "free Negro" as a paradox (Warren 87). Even after emancipation, Black individuals were not

recognized as men “in the true and proper sense of the term” (Warren 87). This contradiction reveals the limits of legal transformation. Emancipation changed the legal status of Black individuals but did not alter the ontological framework that defined them as non-human. Rather than restoring Black humanity, emancipation deepened the rift between the Black body and the possibility of ontological recognition. It produced what Warren calls “ontological catachresis”—a term that describes a concept without a proper referent (Warren 88). The “free Black” becomes a linguistic and philosophical contradiction because the ontological category necessary for such freedom does not exist within an anti-Black world (Warren 88). In this sense, emancipation functions as a technology of ontological terror. It creates the illusion of freedom while preserving the underlying structure that denies Black being its ontological grounding.

Blackness, however, must also be understood not only as an ontological exclusion but as a symbolic and experiential formation produced through language, narrative, and embodied encounter. As Fanon suggests, the figure of the Black subject is “‘woven out of a thousand details, anecdotes, stories,’” a sociogenic construction that renders Blackness both a lived reality and an imposed representation (qtd. in Scott 95). In this regard, Blackness operates as a kind of code in which multiple meanings are projected onto the body, transforming it into what might be called a site of legibility for the anxieties of the Western world. According to Scott, the Black body becomes a “patchwork of narratives condensed on the skin,” functioning simultaneously as object, symbol, and repository for fears surrounding morality, sexuality, and disorder (Scott 95). Yet this symbolic construction is not simply restrictive; it is also paradoxically generative. Because Blackness is produced through unstable and contingent means, it reveals the fragility of the categories: human, citizen, subject, that law claims to stabilize. The experience of abjection, particularly in episodes of racial terror such as the violent treatment scene in Chapter 11 of

Invisible Man, operates as a forced confrontation with what Fanon describes as the splitting of the self, where the subject becomes both object and witness to its own negation. This encounter produces what might be understood as ontological terror—a recognition of one's vulnerability to being reduced to mere flesh outside the protections of law and humanity. However, this moment of abjection also exposes what Warren's framework alone does not fully articulate—the possibility that Blackness, in its proximity to the void, grants a unique access to the instability of Being itself. In other words, Blackness not only marks exclusion from the ontological order but also reveals its foundational structure, creating space for reimagining the terms of subjectivity, freedom, and social existence beyond the limits imposed by law.

Ellison's *Invisible Man* renders this paradox of Blackness as both ontological negation and epistemological exposure through the lived experience of the narrator, whose body becomes the primary site where these contradictions are enacted. The narrator's invisibility is not simply a metaphor for social marginalization but an ontological condition produced by the refusal of recognition; he exists within the world of law and governance yet remains outside its structure of meaning. This is most evident in moments such as the factory hospital scene, where his body is reduced to an object of observation and manipulation, echoing Warren's description of the Black subject as "available equipment" (Warren 65). However, as in the Fanonian framework, this reduction does not merely erase the subject but reveals the mechanisms by which subjectivity itself is produced. The narrator's fragmented consciousness, his oscillation between roles, and his inability to stabilize identity reflect a deeper truth that the categories of personhood, rationality, and citizenship are contingent constructions sustained through exclusion. In this way, *Invisible Man* does not simply depict the effects of ontological exclusion but exposes the underlying

structure that makes such exclusion possible, positioning Blackness as the critical site through which the contradictions of law, democracy, and humanism become visible.

Ellison dramatizes the relationship between modern institutions and the production of racialized subjectivity. Through surreal and often violent episodes, the novel reveals how systems that claim to produce rational order in education, science, politics, and law frequently function as technologies of domination. One of the most revealing examples occurs in Chapter 11, when the narrator undergoes electroshock "treatment" in the Factory Hospital following an explosion at Liberty Paints factory (Ellison 235). The scene becomes a symbolic laboratory in which the narrator's identity is dismantled and reconstructed under the authority of medical science. The narrator's body is transformed into an object of spectacle to highlight the violence of the protagonist's identity stripping. Observers whom readers are led to believe are doctors watch the narrator's body convulse as if witnessing a performance: "Look, he's dancing…they really do have rhythm, don't they? Get hot, boy! Get hot!" (Ellison 237). This brief exchange reveals the social logic governing the scene. The narrator's involuntary spasms are interpreted as dance, collapsing physical suffering into entertainment. The imperative "look" situates the observers as spectators, while the phrase "they really do have rhythm" shifts attention from the individual body to the racial collective. The narrator is not perceived as a person experiencing pain but as evidence confirming a stereotype about Black physicality. The command "get hot, boy!" further reinforces the structure of domination. The word "boy" infantilizes the narrator, while the language of performance frames his pain as rhythmic expression. In 2011, Sexton wrote in accordance with Afro-Pessimism this as: "'a political ontology dividing the Slave from the world of the Human,'" (qtd. in O'Brien 93). The procedure, therefore, becomes a

technological method for producing compliant subjects whose internal conflicts will not disrupt the broader system.

The relationship between Blackness and law cannot be resolved through traditional legal reforms or appeals to universal humanity. Law itself is implicated in the ontological exclusion that defines Black existence within modernity. Black being emerges as the exception that sustains the structure of law while simultaneously exposing its contradictions. Emancipation, rights discourse, and legal recognition do not resolve this problem because they operate within the metaphysical framework that produced the exclusion in the first place. Understanding the relationship between Blackness, law, and freedom, therefore, requires confronting the underlying ontological foundations of modern political thought. The question is not merely how law can be reformed but whether the ontological order that sustains law can accommodate Black being at all. Based on this, the condition of Black existence reveals a fundamental truth about modernity: the ideals of freedom, justice, and humanity are sustained through the exclusion of those who bear the burden of nothing within the order of Being.

Taken together, the episodes examined in this project demonstrate that Ellison's critique of American democracy extends far beyond institutional hypocrisy or social satire; it penetrates the philosophical and structural foundations of modern political life. Figures such as Reverend Barbee, the symbolic Founder, and Dr. Bledsoe reveal how institutions rely not only on material authority but on the careful orchestration of myth, spectacle, and belief to maintain hierarchical control. Barbee sanctifies history, transforming leaders into divine archetypes whose authority demands obedience, while Bledsoe deliberately embodies the expectations of white patrons, disciplining Black students into compliance and shaping performance as survival. In this way, Ellison shows that institutional power is maintained as much through narrative, ritual, and

expectation as through law, wealth, or violence. Similarly, episodes such as Trueblood's story reveal how Black bodies, sexuality, and stories are circulated as spectacles within white perception, producing psychic and social burdens that reinforce systemic oppression. The narrative demonstrates that control over belief, attention, and interpretation is central to sustaining the appearance of democratic inclusion while masking the realities of exploitation and exclusion.

Ellison's critique further exposes the economic and spatial dimensions of racial domination. Through Liberty Paints, the southern college, and the Black Belt, the novel illustrates how Black labor, territory, and material life are continuously subordinated to capitalist imperatives. Black communities are rendered vulnerable and disposable, their labor exploited and their spaces commodified in ways that reproduce economic inequality and reinforce social hierarchies. This structural exploitation is inseparable from the symbolic and psychological forms of control explored in the text: the performance of docility, the pressures of collective representation, and the internalization of fear and self-surveillance. The narrator's struggle reflects the cumulative impact of these intersecting forces, revealing how racialized subjects are required to navigate systems that both promise inclusion and demand subjugation.

At the philosophical level, Ellison interrogates the very meaning of freedom, law, and democratic legitimacy. Legal emancipation, citizenship, and formal equality are repeatedly shown to be insufficient when Black being is excluded from the ontological structures that undergird political life. As the narrator's experiences, from the college to the factory hospital, illustrate, recognition within democracy is conditional: the Black subject may be visible, but that visibility is tightly policed, contingent upon compliance, performance, or the reproduction of white-sanctioned narratives. Ellison redefines the psychological stakes of this exclusion, showing

how dissent, self-awareness, and internal resistance are pathologized and disciplined, rendering political insight itself a source of psychic conflict. Freedom is presented not as a legal status but as an ontological condition, one systematically denied to Black subjects, revealing the enduring contradictions of American democracy: the very ideals of equality and human dignity are sustained by practices that render Black life marginal, surveilled, and structurally unprotected.

Ellison's text forces readers to confront the complex interplay of myth, institutional authority, racial capitalism, psychological regulation, and ontological exclusion that underpins the American democratic project. Ellison's work demonstrates that the apparent stability of democracy depends upon mechanisms that conceal exploitation, normalize obedience, and ritualize belief. The narrator's invisibility, his psychic conflicts, and the social spectacles he witnesses reveal that Black life is central to, yet systematically excluded from, the realization of democratic ideals. By situating Black existence at the limits of political, economic, and philosophical recognition, Ellison illuminates a fundamental paradox of modern society: the promises of freedom, justice, and equality are upheld by the very structures that deny Black beings full recognition and autonomy. In this manner, the novel is not only a critique of racialized institutions but a profound meditation on the fragility of democratic ideals themselves, compelling readers to confront the moral and political consequences of a society whose freedoms are contingent upon the invisibility and containment of those it refuses to see.

Works Cited:

Bledsoe, A., & Wright, W. J. (2018). The anti-Blackness of global capital. Environment and Planning D, 37(1), 8-26. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775818805102 (Original work published 2019)

Booth, W. James. "The Color of Memory: Reading Race with Ralph Ellison." *Political Theory*, vol. 36, no. 5, 2008, pp. 683–707. JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20452661.

Campbell, J. Bradford. "The Schizophrenic Solution: Dialectics of Neurosis and Anti-Psychiatric Animus in Ralph Ellison's Invisible Man." Novel, vol. 43, no. 3, 2010, pp. 443–465. https://doi.org/10.1215/00295132-2010-024.

Ellison, Ralph. *Invisible Man.* Vintage, 1995.

Johns, Gillian. "Jim Trueblood and His Critic-Readers: Ralph Ellison's Rhetoric of Dramatic Irony and Tall Humor in the Mid-Century American Literary Public Sphere." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 49, no. 3, 2007, pp. 230–64. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40755486..

Lieber, Todd M. "Ralph Ellison and the Metaphor of Invisibility in Black Literary Tradition." American Quarterly, vol. 24, no. 1, 1972, pp. 86–100. JSTOR, https://doi.org/10.2307/2711916.

O'Brien, Sean. "Blacking Out: Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man* and the Historicity of Antiblackness." *Cultural Critique*, vol. 105, 2019, pp. 80–105. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.5749/culturalcritique.105.2019.0080.

Parrish, Timothy. "Ralph Ellison, Finished and Unfinished: Aesthetic Achievements and Political

Legacies." *Ralph Ellison: A Biography; So Black and Blue: Ralph Ellison and the Occasion of Criticism; Shadowing Ralph Ellison* by Arnold Rampersad et al. *Contemporary Literature*, vol. 48, no. 4, 2007, pp. 639–64. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/27563774.

Scott, Darieck. "'A Race That Could Be So Dealt With': Terror, Time, and (Black) Power." *Extravagant Abjection: Blackness, Power, and Sexuality in the African American Literary Imagination*, NYU Press, 2010, pp. 95–125. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt9qgcxr.6.

Turner, Jack. "Awakening to Race: Ralph Ellison and Democratic Individuality." Political Theory, vol. 36, no. 5, 2008, pp. 655–682. JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20452660.

Warren, Calvin L. "OUTLAWING." *Ontological Terror: Blackness, Nihilism, and Emancipation*, Duke University Press, 2018, pp. 62–109. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11316xh.6.