

# CROSSROADS

An interdisciplinary journal for the study  
of history, philosophy, religion and classics

VOLUME II ISSUE I 2007

ISSN: 1833-878X

Pages 14-21

**Sean Corbin**

*Sartre's Conception of Vulgarly, Authenticity and Freedom as Explored in Louis Sachar's Holes*

## ABSTRACT

In the following paper, I apply Sartre's concepts of vulgarly, authenticity and freedom to Stanley's journey in Louis Sachar's novel *Holes*. The application is germane not only because of the ethical content that pervades *Holes*, but also because of the narrative similarity between *Holes* and existentialist prison literature popularized by Sartre and Camus during the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. In the essay, I draw out, through close reading, the philosophical importance of Stanley's actions in relation to Sartrean philosophy. I further draw on Sartre's own experiences in a prison camp during WWII in order to elucidate the philosophical harmonies between Sartre, and Sachar's characterization of Stanley. I take great lengths to avoid committing the biographical fallacy by not considering Sachar's *intention* to compose a rewriting of an existentialist prison narrative; instead, I merely catalogue and expound upon the overwhelming narrative, ethical and philosophical similarities found between Sachar's novel and Sartre's philosophy.

## BIOGRAPHY

I received my B.A. in English from UC Santa Barbara in 2002 and my M.A. in English with an emphasis in American Literature from San Diego State University in 2004. I will begin work on my Ph.D. in English in the fall of 2007. My short stories, poetry and articles have appeared in the *UCSB Literary Annual*, *Haggard & Halloo*, and *The Daily Nexus*. I presented an earlier draft of this paper (then entitled 'Vulgarly, Authenticity

and Freedom in Louis Sachar's *Holes*) at the Children's Literature Association Conference in Fresno, CA in 2004. I currently teach at Maric College in San Diego, CA.

## SARTRE'S CONCEPTION OF VULGARITY, AUTHENTICITY AND FREEDOM AS EXPLORED IN LOUIS SACHAR'S *HOLES*

### PLOT SKETCH OF *HOLES*

Most of the essay will be spent dealing largely with conceptual issues raised by Sartre. However, because *Holes* is the text around which our analysis centers, it is essential for the reader to have a general understanding of the novel's plot, which revolves around two curses that are allegedly inherited from the distant past.

#### *The First Curse*

The great-great-grandfather of our protagonist, Stanley Yelnats (a.k.a. Caveman), buys a pig from Madame Zeroni, the great-great-great-grandmother of Hector Zeroni (a.k.a. Zero), who comes to be Stanley's best friend. Stanley's great-great-grandfather agrees to carry Madame Zeroni to the top of a mountain as payment for the pig. He breaks his promise and Madame Zeroni allegedly places a curse upon him. Stanley, whose mother thinks the curse is ridiculous, is nonetheless convinced that all his bad luck can be blamed on the curse.

#### *The Second Curse*

One hundred and ten years before Stanley's story begins, Kate Barlow, a teacher at Green Lake, falls in love with Sam, a black man who makes medicinal remedies from the onions he grows on a nearby mountain. Charles Walker, the son of a wealthy man in Green Lake, loves Kate and is consumed with jealousy when he finds out that she loves Sam. Kate and Sam kiss. The townspeople, under the direction of Charles Walker, try to arrest Sam, but both he and Kate attempt to flee by boating across the lake. The Walkers, however, catch up with them on the water and shoot Sam dead.

Mysteriously, after Sam's death, it no longer rains in Green Lake, which causes the lake to dry up completely. Furthermore, as retribution for Sam's death, Kate turns outlaw, robbing from and often killing those she happens upon. Coincidentally, Stanley's great-grandfather (not his *great-great-grandfather*) ends up traveling through Green Lake on his way from New York to California. Kate robs him and buries his fortune somewhere in the dried lakebed.

#### *Stanley's Story*

The main plot begins when a thief, who later turns out to be Zero, throws the stolen shoes of Clyde Livingston, a famous baseball player, off the side of an overpass. The shoes fall on Stanley, who is later arrested and convicted of theft. As punishment, he is sent to Camp Green Lake, a juvenile detention facility, and is housed in D tent. The Warden, as she is called, is the head of the camp. Those working at the camp have only one task: dig a five by five by five hole every day. To Stanley and the others, the task seems meaningless, but the Warden, who happens to be a descendant of Charles Walker, is looking for Kate's buried treasure.

Stanley slowly adjusts to life at the camp and befriends Zero, who never speaks. One day, Zero assaults a guard and flees to Big Thumb, where Stanley's great-grandfather happened to flee after being robbed by Kate Barlow one hundred years ago. Stanley follows Zero and finds him nearly dead on the mountain. Stanley then carries Zero on his back to the top of Big Thumb, where they find Sam's onion patch, the nourishment from which saves their lives. Having taken responsibility for his own actions and having carried Hector Zeroni (Zero's real name) to the top of Big Thumb, Stanley breaks the curse placed by Madame Zeroni on his great-great-grandfather.

The two boys return to camp and end up finding a suitcase labeled 'Stanley Yelnats,' which was also Stanley's great-grandfather's name, in one of the holes. The Warden tries to take the treasure, but in a *deus ex machina*, Stanley's lawyer arrives to inform the Warden that Stanley has been proven innocent. The lawyer also ends up finding out about the corruption at Camp Green Lake and arranges for Stanley and Zero to leave with the money they've found.

The story closes with Zero, Clyde Livingston and his wife, and Stanley and his parents watching a commercial in which Clyde Livingston promotes Stanley's father's new invention: an anti-odour spray for use in sneakers. Stanley and Zero live happily, and richly, ever after.

## VULGARITY, AUTHENTICITY AND FREEDOM

Sartre's conception of the dialectic between vulgarity and civility allowed him to pursue his own authenticity in what he perceived as a duplicitous and hypocritical society. Through vulgarity, concern with surfaces can be destroyed and one's alienation from oneself and one's body can be assuaged. This attitude toward vulgarity is manifested in *Holes* by Louis Sachar, in which Stanley's immersion in a vulgar environment helps him to develop an authentic self, one that, though inevitably defined through Others, becomes unfettered from their sanction. In being placed in the position of the Other, Stanley is able to become both aware of his freedom and unafraid of exercising it.

In Sartre's view, for the middle-class the fundamental boundary between the Self and Other is the boundary between civility and vulgarity: the point where one defines oneself by what one is not.<sup>i</sup> For the civilized French bourgeoisie, vulgarity was a term applied to all those qualities—such as nakedness, profanity, bad manners, poor hygiene, body odour and public excretion—which were resident in the lower class. Vulgarity stands in contrast to civility, a term defined through the negation of the former; that is, civility is the lack of nakedness, profanity, bad manners, poor hygiene, body odour and excrement. For Sartre, this physically, emotionally, and verbally sterile environment helped to conceal the viciousness and hypocrisy of the bourgeois ethic, one which privileged repression above expression and a truth of essence above a truth of existence, wherein essence is the surface and existence is what precedes it.<sup>ii</sup>

This superficial veneer that the 'civilized' place over the fundamental human drives and desires exposed by Freud was more than a cultural problem for Sartre; it was an existential problem.<sup>iii</sup> The pursuit of an accurate understanding of oneself is necessary for an accurate relationship between oneself and Others, as well as for one to be able to live in accordance with his or her free will: the goal is authenticity:

Since respectability and civility have regularly served merely to cloak the exploitation and repression of individuals and groups who are not in power, those who question the societal *status quo* have sometimes transformed their stigma of vulgarity into a badge of authenticity. Sartre himself regarded vulgarity as an heroic stance expressing a bold and refreshing passion for life in place of insipid respectability.<sup>iv</sup>

Vulgarity therefore becomes a weapon by which one resists the repressive force of civilization in favor of a more direct relationship to the Self, a relationship that, according to Sartre, is nothing without the Other:

Consider for example shame; Shame therefore realizes an intimate relation of myself to myself. Through shame I have discovered an aspect of *my* being. Yet although certain complex forms derived from shame can appear on the reflective plane, shame is not originally a phenomenon of reflection. In fact no matter what results one can obtain in solitude by the religious *practice* of shame, it is in its primary structure shame *before somebody* I am ashamed of myself as I appear to the Other.<sup>v</sup>

That is, though shame is something that *becomes* available for self-reflection, it is a phenomenon that is derived principally and originally from one's *being-for-Others*.<sup>vi</sup> Shame can only exist after one recognizes that there are Others who are as free as one, and who can judge one. For Sartre, shame is the defining emotion of middle-class life, and it is through overcoming one's own shame of oneself, primarily in the form of the body and its biological processes—and in recognizing the arbitrariness and irrelevance of words like smelly, dirty, white and black—that one is able to gain a more deliberate and hence more moral existence.<sup>vii</sup>

In *Holes*, any pretense of civility is destroyed by the conditions under which the prisoners are forced to live. Their dirtiness is definitive for Stanley, 'They were dripping with sweat, and their faces were so dirty that it took Stanley a moment to notice that one kid was white and the other black.'<sup>viii</sup> The bourgeoisie fears vulgarity precisely because it exposes the intrinsic equality of all people. We are all 'chained' within the same fleshy bodies, which shit, cum and piss without prejudice. It is this destructive, equalizing effect which appealed to Sartre, and which is manifested in the novel.

This vulgarity when villainized by those who believe in the virtue of civility can be used both as a way to atomize members of a society from each other through the sterilizing practices of bathing, deodorizing and perfuming, and as a way to strengthen the differentiation between the civilized members of a society and the vulgar Other. However, this vulgarity, when it is not shied away from, but instead becomes a defining component of a society such as the one depicted in D tent, can serve to form strong human bonds:

He couldn't for the life of him figure out why anyone would want to be called Armpit. In a way, it made him feel a little bit better about having to sleep in a cot that had been used by somebody named Barf Bag. Maybe it was a term of respect.<sup>ix</sup>

Charmé comments with a similar sentiment about Sartre's time in a Nazi prisoner of war camp, where the inmates were forced to shit and piss in front of one another:

He did not feel degraded or dehumanized by the impossibility of maintaining traditional customs of civility in regard to personal hygiene, as others may have been. Nor did he focus on the fact of regularly being seen by others as he was involved in the normally private act of defecation. Rather, he felt linked to the other inmates because of it.<sup>x</sup>

It is also interesting to note that the inmates at Camp Green Lake must shit publicly when digging their holes.<sup>xi</sup> This physical intimacy makes politeness and bourgeois civility seem ridiculous. Through it, one is presented to oneself without shame, for there becomes an equality of vulgarity in which each member participates, as with the ritual of spitting in the hole one has just dug.<sup>xii</sup> If all are vulgar, then all are free from the shame of that vulgarity.

For Sartre as well as for our reading of *Holes*, vulgarity as both a destructive and constructive force is beneficial only insofar as it allows one to resist the hypocritical, repressive constructs of civilization which tend to obscure one from the fundamental existential truth: 'man being condemned to be free carries the weight of the whole world on his shoulders; he is responsible for the world and for himself as a way of being.'<sup>xiii</sup> That is, civility implicitly posits that there are intrinsic human truths and norms that rely on institutions and constructions of power which lie outside of individual control. This is useful for society in that it removes from one the responsibility of defining for oneself proper action; however, it is deceptive and oppressive for the individual, because it also attempts to remove from one the freedom of defining for oneself proper action. Vulgarity is neither truth nor authenticity; nevertheless, through vulgarity one dismantles the social construction of civility, within which one can never truly understand one's freedom.

According to this framework, women occupy a peculiar position in civilized society: they are at once inextricably linked to the body through pregnancy and menstruation, yet are, perhaps because of this, subject to the most intense strictures concerning cleanliness and delicacy. According to Simone de Beauvoir, Sartre's intellectual compatriot and longtime partner, it is no surprise that women have been historically viewed with such animosity and condescension, for it is in women that biological reality—the cycle of birth and, more importantly, death—can be the least denied: 'Woman? Very simple, say the fanciers of simple formulas: she is a womb, an ovary; she is a female – this word is sufficient to define her; it imprisons her in her sex; and if this sex seems to man to be contemptible and inimical even in harmless dumb animals, it is evidently because of the uneasy hostility stirred up in him by woman.'<sup>xiv</sup> Therefore, in Beauvoir's view, women unsettle men insofar as women *represent* the body, all bodies, in general. Each cycle of menstruation, each birth and miscarriage, each act of carnal passion, is an indelible blemish upon the otherwise 'clean' image of civilization as transcendent, and hence immortal.

None of this, however, implies that women do not fear death, or do not come to loathe their own bodies. On the contrary, in a civilized society fraught with an artificial division between the vulgar and the clean, women are equally susceptible to the sterilizing influence. However, whereas only that which is dead can be excreted from the male body, upon giving birth a woman experiences excretion as a vivifying act, a process of rejuvenation from which men are intersubjectively excluded.<sup>xv</sup> It is this power that men fear, the power to participate in the body-as-life, as opposed to the body-as-death.<sup>xvi</sup>

It is therefore natural that men should apply firm sexual codes upon women, for it is the female body that is the most carnal and, hence, must be the most steadfastly guarded against corruption. In *Holes*, woman-as-body is explored through the relationship between Kate, a white woman, and Sam, a black man. For Sartre, race is a category of vulgarity. As Sartre writes, 'I have questioned a hundred people on the reasons for their anti-Semitism; [Some say], 'I *detest* them because they are selfish, intriguing, persistent, *oily*, tactless, etc.'<sup>xvii</sup> In other words, race becomes synonymous with all aspects of vulgarity; to be a racial Other is to be immediately demarcated as vulgar. Furthermore, blackness—or Jewishness, depending on the prevalent cultural mood—is as 'corrupting' as any bodily excretion.<sup>xviii</sup> Sam's job as onion farmer predictably conflates his race with his standing in the civilized-vulgar dialectic. In kissing Sam—in bringing his body into passionate contact with her own—Kate has dirtied herself, made herself unclean. It is important, also, that in the civilized-vulgar dialectic, when cleanliness comes into contact with filthiness—when the white woman comes into contact with the black man<sup>xix</sup>—the clean is made filthy, but the filthy is never made clean:

'It's against the law for a Negro to kiss a white woman.'  
'Well, then you'll have to hang me, too,' said Katherine. 'Because I kissed him back.'  
'It ain't against the law for you to kiss him,' the sheriff explained. 'Just for him to kiss you.'  
'We're all equal under the eyes of God,' she declared.  
The sheriff laughed.<sup>xx</sup>

In his laughter, the sheriff encapsulates the racist attitude: blacks are vulgar; they are unclean; they are to be kept out of white women just as mud is kept out of clean homes. Sam's occupation as an onion farmer accentuates his status as unclean: his job not only causes him to smell like onions, but it also compels him to work long hours in the mud. Kate's corruption can be washed off, but Sam's 'filthiness' cannot be made clean—except in death. Kate's body, being capable of birth, stands in for *all bodies*; hence, corrupting it with a black man's kiss is tantamount to vulgarizing all the townspeople of Green Lake, who in turn represent, civilization itself, in micro.

Subsequently, Kate reacts to her newfound 'filthy' status by leaving civilization entirely and becoming an outlaw. This constitutes the quintessential subversion of the civil-vulgar boundary, as Sartre conceived it. However, where Kate transgresses the boundary, she also reinforces it. Unlike Stanley, who ultimately reenters the 'civilized' world devoid of the arbitrary internal division between the civil and the vulgar—because he comes to an understanding of himself as the sole source of his actions—Kate marks herself as an outsider, and thus merely serves to reinforce the false dichotomy. That she does so can only be explained by the fact that she does not fully accept her unmitigated autonomy, but instead chooses to act only *in reaction* to others. She never comes full circle to *being-in-itself*, but becomes *being-for-others* entirely. She subsumes her free action to her status as outlaw, and thus does not truly accept her existential position. In this way, she constitutes the perfect, and perhaps ironic,<sup>xxi</sup> foil for Stanley.

For Stanley, the outcome is different only because the struggle is different. Throughout the narrative, Stanley is engaged in an oscillation between his disgust with the vulgar and his apathetic awareness of the vulgar. This oscillation tends to parallel the oscillation he experiences between destiny and free will, where destiny is ontologically linked with civil disgust as free will is linked with vulgar apathy. These concepts form a dialectic, with neither ultimately displacing the other in Stanley's mind, instead creating an alternate consciousness through their conflict.<sup>xxii</sup>

          Around him, the smell became stronger. It was the bitter smell of despair.  
Even if he could somehow climb Big Thumb, he knew he wouldn't find water. How could there be water at the top of a giant rock? The weeds and bugs survived only by an occasional rainstorm, like the one he had seen from camp.  
          Still, he continued toward it. If nothing else, he wanted to at least reach the Thumb. He wiped the dirt off of it and realized it was an onion.  
          He bit into it without peeling it. The hot bitter juice burst into his mouth. He could feel it all the way up to his eyes. And when he swallowed, he felt its warmth move down his throat into his stomach.<sup>xxiii</sup>

In this scene, where Stanley had initially been disgusted by the odour of his cot, he is now apathetic to the stench that emanates from the ground.<sup>xxiv</sup> Though he is still aware of it, he is no longer apprehensive about it; he has become acclimated to odour. This corresponds to the emphasis of free will in the passage. Where he had originally blamed everything on his 'no-good-dirty-rotten-pig-stealing-great-great-grandfather,'<sup>xxv</sup> Stanley now ignores the irrelevant impulse towards blaming exterior scapegoats, and instead focuses on immediate choices, with all their unlikelihood of success, which his free will can distinguish between through action.

This focus on odor continues when Stanley begins to think about going back to camp, when the civil prohibition against foulness will become a consideration once more: 'he knew he had no choice but to eventually return to Camp Green Lake. They couldn't live on onions forever. 'Two hundred and eight onions,' said Zero. Stanley smiled. 'I bet we really stink.'<sup>xxvi</sup> It is interesting to note that Stanley's comment implies that they cannot smell one another, that their mutual foulness negates the concept of foulness, but that once they return to Camp Green Lake, their foulness will once again become an issue. This projected return, and the return of his concern with civil prohibitions, correlates as predicted with his rumination on destiny, 'When the shoes first fell from the sky, he remembered thinking that destiny had struck him. Now, he thought so again. It was more than a coincidence. It had to be destiny.'<sup>xxvii</sup> Once safe from his immediate relationship to death, the relationship that forced him to accept without restriction his own freedom and responsibility, Stanley falls back into the pleasing illusion of destiny; although, it must be stressed that this slight regression does not place him where he was before, for he does not hesitate in the future to assert his freedom.

This change can be understood by briefly returning to the topic of authenticity and shame. Just before his rumination on destiny, Stanley sits and stares at the stars:

It occurred to him that he couldn't remember the last time he felt happiness. It wasn't just being sent to Camp Green Lake that had made his life miserable. Before that he'd been unhappy at school, where he had no friends, and bullies like Derrick Dunne picked on him. No one liked him, and the truth was, he didn't especially like himself.

He liked himself now.<sup>xxviii</sup>

Here, what delineates Stanley's new position in relation to destiny is that before, Stanley's sense of shame and impotence caused him to view destiny as a malevolent force that justified his own impotence; however, having gained a certain authenticity and having therefore formed a potent Self, destiny becomes a bolstering crutch with which to justify action and potency, 'Maybe they wouldn't have to return to Camp Green Lake, he thought. Maybe they could make it past the camp, then follow the dirt road back to civilization.'<sup>xxix</sup>

In pursuing, and to a certain degree attaining authenticity, Stanley is able to choose deliberately *and* freely. Here, we strike upon the dialectic of vulgarity and civility once more. Charmé begins by quoting Sartre:

'What infuriates people is that I'm doubly a 'traitor.' I'm a bourgeois and I speak harshly of the bourgeoisie.'

Could it be that in this position of double treason, Sartre found some basis for his identity? To be totally accepted and socially legitimate is also to be a faker, to be existentially illegitimate. The 'I' that flees its bourgeois roots by seeking a kind of solidarity and existential legitimacy with the nonbourgeois Other suffers a different sort of alienation, that is, a betrayal of its own foundation.<sup>xxx</sup>

In other words, to make the civil as definitively Other as the civil makes the vulgar is to be as inauthentic as the civilized society one is trying to flee. What is important in transgressing the boundary between the civil and the vulgar is recognizing through action the arbitrary nature of that boundary; however, in villainizing the civil, one arbitrarily cements the boundary once more. Once the boundary has been devalued, authenticity becomes the recognition that to be vulgar or to be civil is a choice that should be guided by one's desires.

In this way Stanley becomes both free and authentic at the close of the novel:

'He wasn't lying,' said the woman who sat next to Clyde. 'I couldn't even be in the same room with his socks.'

The other people at the party laughed.

The woman continued. 'I'm not joking. It was so bad'

'You've made your point,' said Clyde, covering her mouth with his hand. He looked back at Stanley, 'Will you do me a favor, Stanley?'

'I'm going to get more caviar,' said Clyde. 'Keep your hand over my wife's mouth.'

He patted Stanley on the shoulder as he rose from the couch.

Stanley looked uncertainly at his hand, then at Clyde Livingston's wife.<sup>xxxi</sup>

It is important to note that when the *other people* in the room laugh at all the derisive jokes being made about Clyde's previous foot odour, Stanley does not laugh. He just sits there, silently, seemingly unconcerned about what is going on around him. When Clyde asks him to cover his wife's mouth, Stanley just looks uncertainly at his hand, not knowing which choice is the proper one. This apathy towards, yet inclusion in a society of civility in which vulgar odours are mocked can be seen as characteristic of the authentic existential hero—a title as easily applied to Zero, who throughout the novel behaves as Stanley behaves in this last section. They do not loathe the civility they are surrounded by; they merely recognize its arbitrary construction and are thus sometimes confused to the point of inaction when confronted with it—even though they are aware that they are free to choose whatever they like at any point. In short, they reach a point where they *choose* to not choose.

In conclusion, the conception of vulgarity presented by Sartre, and the utility of this conception for destroying the arbitrary constructions of civilized society and constructing an alternate social order, manifests itself in *Holes*. This vulgarity allows Stanley a space devoid of the stifling pretensions of civility, one in which a person's actions become a person's measure. Within this environment, and after realizing his own freedom, Stanley has attained authenticity in the Sartrean sense: a self-definition devoid of hypocrisy or delusion. That he once again becomes a part of the civilized society from which he came is not problematic because in transgressing the boundary between civility and vulgarity, Stanley's return marks a choice and not an oppressive circumstance. Having realized the irrelevance of arbitrary social constructions, Stanley becomes deliberate and

free. This freedom, and therefore his choice to remain within society, instead of being a defeat, is in fact the final victory of his existential struggle: ‘They both slipped on some ice and fell and rolled down a snow-covered hillside. He and his mother climbed back up the hill and rolled down again, *this time on purpose*.’<sup>xxxii</sup>

---

## REFERENCES

- <sup>i</sup> Stuart Zane Charmé, *Vulgarity and Authenticity: Dimensions of Otherness in the World of Jean-Paul Sartre* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1991), 20.
- <sup>ii</sup> Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1984), 4.
- <sup>iii</sup> Stuart Zane Charmé, *Vulgarity and Authenticity*, 19.
- <sup>iv</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.
- <sup>v</sup> Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1984), 305-306.
- <sup>vi</sup> *Ibid.*, 300.
- <sup>vii</sup> Stuart Zane Charmé, *Vulgarity and Authenticity*, 23.
- <sup>viii</sup> Louis Sachar, *Holes* (New York: Dell Yearling, 1998), 17.
- <sup>ix</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.
- <sup>x</sup> Stuart Zane Charmé, *Vulgarity and Authenticity*, 24.
- <sup>xi</sup> Louis Sachar, *Holes*, 36.
- <sup>xii</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.
- <sup>xiii</sup> Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 707.
- <sup>xiv</sup> Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (New York: Vintage, 1989), 3.
- <sup>xv</sup> *Ibid.*, 3-38.
- <sup>xvi</sup> Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 3-38.
- <sup>xvii</sup> Jean-Paul Sartre, *Anti-Semite and Jew: An Exploration of the Etiology of Hate* (New York: Schocken Books, 1976), 11.
- <sup>xviii</sup> Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1967), 7-17.
- <sup>xix</sup> *Ibid.*, 63-81.
- <sup>xx</sup> Louis Sachar, *Holes*, 113-114.
- <sup>xxi</sup> Ironic only because both Sartre and Beauvoir argue that women, in being subjugated by an artificial power hierarchy, develop the same master/slave psychology common to other oppressed minorities. They find themselves with what Frantz Fanon would call a double-consciousness. On the one hand, they are unique; they are themselves. However, they are always defined through men, through men’s definition of women. Therefore, it is ironic that Kate succeeds in transgressing the civilized boundary, only to have it resolidify once she has crossed it—given that she has still only reacted. By living for vengeance, she cannot find an authentic self.
- <sup>xxii</sup> Robert C. Solomon, *From Hegel to Existentialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 47-54.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Louis Sachar, *Holes*, 171-172.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.
- <sup>xxv</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> *Ibid.*, 185-186.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.
- <sup>xxviii</sup> *Ibid.*, 186.
- <sup>xxix</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.
- <sup>xxx</sup> Stuart Zane Charmé, *Vulgarity and Authenticity*, 23.
- <sup>xxxi</sup> Louis Sachar, *Holes*, 232.
- <sup>xxxii</sup> *Ibid.*, 209.