Staking Her Colonial Claim: Colonial Discourses, Assimilation, Soul-making, and Ass-kicking in Buffy the Vampire Slayer

[1] From Byron to Bram Stoker to Buffy the Vampire Slayer, the myth of the vampire has endured as a cultural icon of Western horror, achieving the kind of social immortality that mirrors vampires’ existence as the undying undead. Since the nineteenth century’s popularization of the blood-drinking, stake-fearing creature of the night, the figure of the vampire has been reimagined and reproduced through a number of cultural mediums, such as film, television, and literature, always recognizable as vampiric despite the different forms and meanings it might assume. As a number of critics have argued, the cultural staying power of the vampire can be, at least partially, attributed to its ability to assume diverse metaphoric significance depending on the anxiety and concerns of its contemporary zeitgeist. The vampire’s ability to shift its cultural meaning contributes to its enduring allure and allows it to remain a relevant staple of the Western tradition of horror.

[2] The vampire, then, becomes a figure through which cultural tensions, fears, and anxieties are embodied and explored. The source of this anxiety ranges from class antagonisms to immigration to decadence and consumerism to female sexual assertion and homosexuality and AIDs and generational conflict. Since its inception as European folklore, one of the many symbolic functions performed by the vampire has been the role of the Other in opposition to the social and racial norms of the culture which produced it. In its earliest form, the vampire legend connected the undead with Jews, pagans, and heretics, all culturally marginalized Others (McClelland 76-77). Indeed, the vampire as outsider is integral to the vampire myth. Not living, not dead, in human form, but not human, the vampire exists in the outskirts of society and as a liminal life (or undeath) form. It exists in relation to, but apart from, the culture it menaces.

[3] Because of its association with the outsider, the vampire has long functioned as a convenient embodiment for racial fears and anxieties about colonization, and considerable scholarly attention has been devoted to exploring the vampire’s role as racialized outsider. Much of this work has been focused on Bram Stoker’s 1897 novel Dracula. Considered one of the founding texts of the Western vampire myth, an examination of Dracula’s racial politics reveals the legend’s concern with issues of ethnicity, race, and colonization. Indeed, Bruce A. McClelland argues that an understanding of racial and colonial anxieties is imperative to comprehending the cultural import of Dracula: “The overriding theme of Dracula is bound up with unmistakable Anglocentric Orientalism... The evil Count Dracula as a monstrous invader—a subversive, destructive threat to British imperial order” (McClelland 16-17). According to McClelland, Dracula’s origins in the “exotic Near East” code him as an insidious foreigner attacking England in a form of inverted colonialism (18). Like McClelland, Erik Butler points to Dracula’s origins in Transylvania, the “uncivilized’ side of Europe” (Butler 37). Jimmie Cain connects this fear of the invading Other to Anglican anxieties about the influx of Russian Jewish immigrants during the 1880s and 1890s (127-29). Dracula, he argues, is coded Jewish and represents the cultural fears about this increase in the unwelcome presence of the ethnic Other.

[4] However, as Santiago Lucendo notes in his nuanced argument about the vampire as Other, the vampire is not an emblem of the East, but an emblem of the Western notion of the East. “It should be acknowledged,” he explains, “that the vampire is not a figure imported from the ‘East,’ but rather a series of fears and fancies projected over a geographic territory badly or totally unknown” (115). The vampire, then,
represents distinctly British colonialist conceptions of the Other. As Stephen Arata notes, Stoker’s position as an Irishman living in London rendered him particularly alert to the implications of British Imperialism, colonial oppression, and the British construction of the colonized Other (633-34). According to Arata, the vampire comes to embody not only the colonist’s fear of reverse colonization or colonial uprising, but also the exploitative nature of imperialism (634). Thus, the role of Dracula is two-fold: he represents both colonial fear and imperialist failings (622, 640, 643). The vampire is constructed to reveal more about the cultural anxieties and collective guilt of the English than the actual East.

So what does this have to do with Buffy the Vampire Slayer? Airing exactly one hundred years after the publication of Stoker’s novel, Joss Whedon’s television series Buffy the Vampire Slayer follows the life of Buffy Summers (Sarah Michelle Gellar), the Slayer, the Chosen One, who is destined to fight the forces of evil, which she does with help of her friends and allies for seven seasons (1997-2003). Whedon resurrected the concept of Buffy, the petite blond girl with superhuman strength and the ability to kick vampire ass, after the disappointing 1992 film by the same name, reimagining it as a television series. Whedon, a self-proclaimed feminist, envisioned the movie and later the television show as embracing and celebrating female empowerment. In an often quoted statement, he explains the impetus for Buffy: “The first thing I thought of when I thought of Buffy—the little blonde girl who goes into a dark alley and gets killed in every horror movie. The idea of Buffy was to subvert that idea, and create someone who was the hero where she had always been a victim” (Whedon, “Welcome to the Hellmouth,” DVD Commentary). Despite the somewhat silly sounding name and, at times, campy special effects, the tongue-in-cheek horror and wit of the show earned it a mostly favorable reception from critics. The series ran for seven years, inspired one spin-off, Angel, 6 which ran for five years, and has developed a small, but devoted, cult following.

One of the major criticisms of the show, however, is its normalization and universalization of middle class whiteness and its reliance on demons and vampires to metaphorically represent the Other. This has led a number of critics to interrogate the racialized representations of evil on Buffy and analyze the political and ideological implications of the show’s normalization of whiteness and the marginalization and demonization of darkness. Ewan Kirkland analyzes the complexities of whiteness in Buffy, while Lynne Edwards demonstrates the way in which one of the few non-white characters on the show, Kendra, a Slayer who appears and is quickly dispatched during the course of the second season, conforms to the stereotypes of the tragic mulatta. Kent A. Ono discusses the way in which the “darkness” of vampires and demons comes to literalize the “darkness” of the racial Other, and Neal King examines the fascist implications of Buffy’s battle against evil. Critics Renee Cox and Wendy Olson scrutinize the role of the soul in the privileged construction of goodness and humanness as a means by which to distinguish between the self and the Other in the Buffyverse. Mary Alice Money and Naomi Alderman and Annette Seidel-Arpani address the importance of assimilation for the “reformed” vampiric and demonic characters of the Buffy: the acceptance the Slayer’s moral and cultural code offering one of the few means by which they can avoid her stake. In this article, I will examine the ways in which these racial themes, when examined in conjunction with the work of postcolonial theorist like Akira Mizuta Lippit, Frantz Fanon, Giorgio Agamben, Lisa Lowe, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, demonstrate Buffy’s reliance on and replication of colonial binaries, the language of imperial superiority, and the ideology of assimilation to justify the slaughter of the demonic and vampiric Other, thereby constructing and validating Buffy as the empowered feminine hero of the human “race.”

In order to empower the Slayer, Buffy relies on reproducing and employing the cultural discourses of U.S. domestic colonization and policies of assimilation. Within the ideological discourse of the show, demons and vampires come to represent the colonized Other: oppressed, massacred, and relegated to the margins of society. The oppression of demons within the Buffyverse can be shown to rely on the same colonial discourses and ideologies used to justify the subjugation and slaughter of the subjects of
Euro-American colonization, depending on the same binaries of good vs. evil, self vs. Other, and human vs. subhuman (or demon in the supernatural case of *Buffy*) to legitimatize the treatment of the nonhuman, subaltern Other. The show is invested in maintaining and validating this colonial oppression and the discourses that support it, because it is through the subjugation and slaying of demons and vampires that Buffy becomes the empowered woman envisioned by Whedon. But by utilizing these discourses, *Buffy* reifies, legitimizes, and reproduces the same ideological assumptions used to endorse racist colonial practices.

Although the show engages only marginally with the actual postcolonial world, the demon population of Sunnydale offers its own representations of colonization and assimilation, as established by the show’s discourses of colonial domination. Indeed, the Buffyverse’s entire creation mythology is based on colonization. In the second episode of the series Giles explains the supernatural history of the earth: “This world is older than any of you know, and contrary to popular mythology, it did not begin as a paradise. For untold eons, demons walked the earth, made it their home, their, uh, their hell. But in time they lost their purchase on this reality, and the way was made for mortal animals. All that remains of the old ones are vestiges, certain magics, certain creatures” (“The Harvest”). This creation myth is disturbingly vague, especially in relation to how exactly the demons “lost their purchase on this reality” and how “way was made for mortal animals.” Such vagueness recalls other colonial narratives, where Europeans “discovered” and claimed the “unowned” land inhabited by indigenous peoples, who were slaughtered, displaced, or enslaved to “make way for” European settlers. Gregory Stevenson reads this myth as suggesting that demons dominated the earth “until humans drove them out and claimed the earth for themselves” (62). He argues that Buffy’s constant struggle against evil represents a continuation of this “territorial battle” (62). While Stevenson never makes this connection explicit, there is a form of colonization occurring within the mythology of *Buffy*.

If humans are the colonizers, then demons must assume the role of the oppressed indigenous Other. In his often cited essay, “To Be a Vampire on *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*: Race and (“Other”) Socially Marginalizing Positions on Horror TV,” Kent A. Ono investigates the representation and demonization of race on *Buffy*. He argues that the “the marginalization of vampires on the show takes the place of racial marginalization in the world outside” (172). The vampires, then, according to Ono, function as a metaphor for race, particularly African Americans, and the conflict between Buffy and the various demons and vampires she fights is symbolic of race relations.

Ono argues that the show’s use of minority characters as evil or disposable, indicates its problematic racial politics. In particular, he points to a speech made by the character, Mr. Trick, an African American vampire: “Sunnydale. Town’s got quaint… I mean, admittedly, it’s not a haven for the brothers. You know, strictly the Caucasian persuasion in the ’Dale. But, you know, you just gotta stand up and salute that death rate. I ran a statistical analysis, and hello darkness. Makes D.C. look like Mayberry, and ain’t nobody saying boo about that” (“Faith, Hope and Trick,” 3.3). Ono asserts that this speech, which equates the racial violence in D.C. to the racialized violence of Sunnydale, conflates the *Buffy’s* metaphor with a literal representation of race. According to Ono, “Mr. Trick overtly clarifies the racial metaphor underlying the show’s narrative by comparing African Americans in Washington, D.C., with vampires in Sunnydale and by conceiving both as examples of darkness” (Ono 178). By having a black vampire deliver this line, then, the show demonstrates the connection between racial persecution and marginalization and the Othering of vampires and demons.

The dialogue of the show supports this reading of vampires and demons as racialized Others, revealing the racial tensions with which the show grapples. Buffy and her friends refer to vampires and demons as “animals” and “things” (“Angel,” 1.7; “Smashed,” 6.9; “Entropy,” 6.18; “Potential,” 7.12), decisively relegating them to the realm of the subhuman and mirroring colonial discourses that similarly demonize and dehumanize the colonized. The importance of language when constructing race is
acknowledged by Buffy and the show. In the episode “When She Was Bad,” Buffy snaps at Angel, “Because I don’t trust you. You’re a vampire. Oh, I’m sorry. Was that an offensive term? Should I say ‘undead American’?” (2.1). This play with terminology is later mirrored in the dialogue of “Pangs” (4.8):

Buffy: And Native American...We don't say “Indian.”

Giles: Oh, oh, right! Yes, yes. Um, always behind on the terms. Still trying not to refer to you lot as “bloody colonials.”

Buffy’s apparent awareness of racial terms when paired with her racist and mocking political correctness directed toward Angel helps to establish the racially marginalized status of vampires and racialist ideology of the Slayer and her friends. Like African Americans and Native Americans, Undead Americans are Othered, defined as different and separate from the normalized whiteness of the show: the unqualified Americans.

[12] In addition to language, the Otherness of the vampire is also established through the visual aesthetic of Buffy. Most of the demons seen on the show are visibly recognizable as the non-human Other. They have horns or scales or leathery skin which comes in an array of colors, and are therefore recognizably ugly, evil, and Other (Pateman 94). Often, these demonic attributes are animalistic in nature, separating the demons from humans and presenting them as inferior, lower, and more bestial.

[13] This is also true of vampires. Although they can appear human, vampires also possess a vampface which reveals their “true demonic visage” (“Welcome to the Hellmouth,” 1.1). The vampire’s eyes become yellow, teeth become fangs, and their brow bridge becomes lower and more pronounced. Thus, their faces become animalistic and racially coded (the lowered brow bridge recalling racial stereotypes about people of African decent). Ono argues that vampface functions in a way similar to “the racist practices of Blackface and Yellowface,” because it permits these characters to be played by white actors while remaining decidedly Other (184). Vampface is clearly coded to evoke a sense of racial Othering, visually marking of the Otherness of the vampire. As Matthew Pateman and Lorna Jowett note, “good” vampires like Angel and, eventually, Spike, spend less time in vampface than the really “evil” vampires (Pateman 94, Jowett 72). This reduction in the use of vampface serves to humanize these reformed vampires, rendering them less Other, essentially functioning the Buffy equivalent of a lighter complexion.

[14] In offering his reasons for vampface, Whedon explains, “I didn’t think I really wanted to put a show on the air about a high school girl who was stabbing normal-looking people in the heart. I thought somehow that might send the wrong message, but when they are clearly monsters, it takes it to a level of fantasy that is safer” (Whedon, “Welcome to the Hellmouth,” DVD commentary). The logic behind vampface, then, is to distance the viewer from the vampire, to deny identification with the monstrous Other. The vampires are clearly and visually distinguished from “normal-looking people,” i.e. the people whom it is not acceptable to stab. Vampface then visually and ethically separates the vampire from the sympathy of the viewer, rendering them Other and killable.

[15] Death, too, establishes the vampires of the show as Other. One of the defining characteristics of vampires is their apparent immortality. Of course, the paradox of the immortality of vampires is that they cannot die because they are already dead. It is not eternal life they experience, but eternal undead. However, this does not mean that vampires cannot be killed (again); Buffy is, after all, the Slayer of Vampires. A stake through the heart, fire (including sunlight), and decapitation will all effectively and permanently exterminate a vamp. Vampires, then, occupy a position between life and death; they are both alive and dead, both immortal and vulnerable to death. However, this, it would seem, is in opposition to the frequent comparisons made between vampires and animals within the discourses of Buffy. As Akira Mizuta Lippit explains, philosophers like Epicurus, Heidegger, and Bataille maintain that animals are incapable of a “proper death”: “That is, because animals are said to have no knowledge of death as such, they
simply perish without experiencing death as death” (Lippit 11). Animals cannot know death, but vampires are death.

[16] And yet, vampires on Buffy the Vampire Slayer are also denied a “proper death” within the mythology of the show. When a vampire dies, its corpse (including whatever clothing it is wearing) turns to dust. Thus, vampires in the Buffyverse do not die, they are dusted. Whedon explains that this device was established for practical reasons (although he does admit that he thinks it “looks really cool”). He explains that, in addition to avoiding “fifteen minutes of let’s clean up the bodies” at the end of every episode, secrecy was the other reason for dusting the vampires: “part of this has to be hidden, people can’t know that there are vampires everywhere” (“Welcome to the Hellmouth” DVD commentary). By this logic, then, the vampire dusting not only makes killing vampires easier within the Buffyverse, “Makes you appreciate vampires,” Buffy quips after killing a non “poof[ing]” demon, “No fuss, no muss” (“The Wish”), it also negates their death, indeed, their entire existence. Although vampires are clearly killable, they are not allowed to properly die.

[17] Part of the reason why dead vampires are never shown seems similar to Lippit’s description of the problematic dead animal: “to kill an individual animal is to grant it singularity, allowing it to become unique, to become-human” (Lippit 11). In contrast to the singularity of death, vampires are made multitudinous and anonymous through their dusty ends. Their individual bodies literally fragment into dust and their individual identity is lost. The dusting also tends to be instantaneous, denying the viewer the opportunity to identify with the suffering of the newly departed vampire. In contrast, a corpse would appear human, and would invite identification. Indeed, with death, the demon essence possessing the human body would, ostensibly, depart, and the vampire would “become human.” Thus, dusting is a form of Othering: it makes vampires less human, more monstrous and animalistic, distances them further from the viewer, and makes them more killable.

[18] Within the discourse of Buffy the Vampire Slayer, then, binaries are established: white/black, human/demon, good/evil, self/Other, unkillable/killable. Although these binaries are not always upheld on an individual basis (Oz, Angel, Anya, Faith, Clem, and Spike all demonstrate the instability of the binaries), they are, for the most part, universalized by the show. Although she sees Angel and eventually Spike as “good demons,” Buffy slays hundreds of other vampires and demons, often with little provocation. She is shown staking vampires just as they emerge from the grave, killing them before they have the opportunity to act evil or otherwise, simply because “it’s [her] job” (“Sleeper,” 7.8). However, these actions are justified within ideological parameters of the Buffyverse because vampires are all inherently evil: “It’s her job” to kill them, because it’s their nature to be evil. Two interconnected colonial discourses are used to condone and justify Buffy’s violence against vampires and demons: the moral discourse of evil and the existential discourse of the soul. Within both of these discourses, the vampires and demons are Othered from the humans of show, presented as morally depraved and sub-human, reprehensible and animalistic.

[19] The first of these discourses is couched within the moral terms of good and evil. The characterization of vampires and demons as “evil” contributes to their status as racial Other and validates Buffy’s colonial discourse. The construction the racial and colonial Other as evil is deeply embedded within the colonial tradition. In The Wretched of the Earth, Frantz Fanon explains this employment of “evilness”: “As if to illustrate the totalitarian nature of colonial exploitation, the colonist turns the colonized into a kind of quintessence of evil... The ‘native’ is declared impervious to ethics, representing not only the absence of values but also the negation of values. He is, dare we say it, the enemy of value. In other words, absolute evil” (Fanon, Wretched, 6). In Buffy, this discourse becomes literalized. The racial and colonial Other really is a monster, and the show presents most of these monsters as unequivocally evil.

[20] However, it is important to note that the concepts of goodness and evilness are constructed by the colonists within the discourses of the show. The evilness of the
vampires is, like the eastern Otherness of Dracula, the product of the protagonists, a representation of their values and their conception of morality. The viewer learns about the evilness of vampires, not only from the vampires’ actions, but from the explanation of these actions provided by the protagonists of the show:

Buffy: Can a vampire ever be a good person? Couldn’t it happen?
Giles: A vampire isn’t a person at all. It may have the movements, the memories, even the personality of the person it took over, but it's still a demon at the core. There is no halfway.
Willow: So that’d be a no, huh? (“Angel”).

Despite the fact that Angel has done nothing evil, indeed, he has done good by helping Buffy, Giles insists that he is evil and nonhuman, not even a “person.” He explains Angel’s evilness by virtue of his vampiric nature: “Vampires hunt and kill, that’s what they do... [he was] like all of them: a vicious violent animal” (“Angel”). According to the established essentialist ethos of the show, vampires are evil, Angel is a vampire, ergo Angel is evil (he is only later exempted from this logic because he has a soul). Such explanations help to further detach the viewer from the vampires. Evil, demonic, and animalistic, the show constructs its vampires so that they are denied personhood, distanced from the viewer, and removed from empathy and identification.

[21] The demons’ evilness is also reified through their conflicts with Buffy. Their depravity is defined in opposition to her goodness, which is implicit in the narrative of the show. By conferring the status of “evil” on the vampires and demons, the show conflates the status of Other with a discourse of morality. The humans of the Buffyverse are distinguished from the “forces of darkness,” not only racially but ethically, and their action against vampires and demons, no matter how brutal, are justified. To be good within the colonial discourse of the show, then, is to be human, civilized, and ensouled.

[22] It should be noted that not all of the humans on Buffy are “good” as the show defines it. Amy’s mother (“Witch,” 1.3), Billy Ford (“Lie to Me,” 2.7), the lunch lady who plans to poison the school (“Earshot,” 2.18), Ethan Lane (“Halloween,” 2.6; “A New Man,” 4.12), Maggie Walsh (“The I in Team,” 4.13), Ben (“The Weight of the World,” 5.21; “The Gift,” 5.22), and Warren (“Dead Things,” 6.13; “Seeing Red,” 6.19; “Villains,” 6.20) are all “evil” within the discourse of the show. However, even these evil human do not deserve to die, at least not at the hands of the Slayer. As Giles explains to Ben, what makes Buffy “a hero” is her absolute refusal to take human life (“The Gift”). This strict prohibition against killing humans elevates even the evil ones. They may not be as “good” as Buffy and her friends, but they are not monsters either. This differentiation demonstrates the show’s ideological bias against the subhuman Other. Evil demons deserve to die, and Buffy kills them; evil humans often do die, but usually as a result of their actions and not at the end of the Slayer’s stake.

[23] This elevation of humans, even evil ones, can be attributed to the fact that although misguided and depraved, they still have a soul. As J. Reneé Cox notes, the discourse of the soul as another means through which the ideology of the show justifies all that troublesome violence against and oppression of vampires and demons. Cox suggests that within the ideological context of the Buffyverse, a clear distinction is made between those characters with souls and those who lack one. “The concept of the soul” she argues, “was being used to incite a philosophical relationship to a ‘We are superior, you are inferior’ world view” (31). As Cox asserts, the presence of a soul or lack of a soul is used to justify brutal behavior and oppressive actions. The Slayer’s aggression against vampires is justified within the discursive ideology of the show simply because Buffy and her friends have souls and the demons do not. “Soul,” it seems, takes the place of “reason,” “civility,” and “culture,” as the colonial justification of violent domination.

[24] Buffy, then, employs what Giorgio Agamben describes as “the machine of the moderns” in the construction of humans and the definition of humanity. The distinction between human and animal is produced by “excluding as not (yet) human an already human being from itself, that is, by animalizing the human, by isolating the nonhuman
within the human" (37). This “exclusion of an inside” (37) marks the differentiation of the human from the nonhuman, the man from the beast. Within the context of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, the soul functions as the marker of humanity, the inside that is excluded in the animal, the vampire, the Other.

[25] According to the mythology of the Buffyverse, when people become vampires, they lose their soul. Once sired, the human form becomes occupied by the demon, thereby losing its fundamental humanity. Angel describes the transformation: “When you become a vampire the demon takes your body, but it doesn’t get your soul. That’s gone” (“Angel”). Becoming a vampire, then, requires an exclusion of humanness. The internal essence of what rendered a person human is lost. “I walk like a man, but I’m not one,” Angel tells Buffy (“Angel”). The essential characteristic of humanness, i.e. the soul, is gone once the possession by and transformation into the demon Other occurs. The change destroys one’s human identity. “You die,” Buffy explains to a wanna-be vampire, “and a demon sets up shop in your old house, and it walks, and it talks, and it remembers your life, but it’s not you” (“Lie to Me”). The demon soul or essence that possesses the newly sired vampire, displaces the human soul, removing what, within the ideology of the show, distinguishes humans from vampires, demons, and animals. Within the context of *Buffy*, the act of siring, then, is an act of “excluding the inside,” an act of demonizing, animalizing, and Othering.

[26] Spike’s quest for a soul at the end of season six demonstrates its central significance within the colonial discourse of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Despite all the “good” Spike has done and his almost complete acceptance and internalization of Buffy’s ideology, Spike still remains the Other. Spike, then, continues in a liminal space, existing as a kind of mimic man. He is clearly not fully accepted by Buffy, but he has internalized her ideology. Buffy taunts him: “Look at you, you idiot! Poor Spikey. Can’t be a human. Can’t be a vampire. Where the hell do you fit in?” (“Smashed”). He can perform vampiriness and evilness, but cannot truly be evil; he can perform humanness and goodness, but cannot really be human. The problem is that without a soul, Spike does not “fit in” anywhere.

[27] Wendy Olson observes that “According to Buffy, Spike can only truly be good—be civilized—if he possesses what Angel possesses: a soul. Without a soul, Spike is outside the realm of human potential” (25). One cannot be truly good, fully assimilated, really human, without a soul. Once he regains his, he can finally be incorporated into Buffy’s life, conforming to her criteria of goodness: as he cryptically tells Buffy, his quest for a soul was a search for “The missing… the piece that fit… that would make me fit” (“Beneath You,” 7.2). He requires a soul to “fit” in with the human world from which he has been so long separated. So, he becomes, morally, ideologically, and soulfully, like the humans who have colonized him, totally assimilated.

[28] This assimilation through the restoration of Spike’s soul marks a change in his relationship to Buffy.12 Whereas she once abused him and berated him as a “thing,” she now consistently refers to him as a man. “Listen to me . . . ” she tells him, “You’re alive because I saw you change. Because I saw your penance... It would be easier, wouldn’t it, if it were an act. But its not. You faced the monster inside of you and you fought back. You risked everything to be a better man... and you can be. You are. You may not see it. But I do. I do. I believe in you, Spike” (“Never Leave Me,” 7.9). Now that Spike has a soul, he is no longer simply performing her values; he has embraced and embodied them. He is no longer an Othered monster. He has become a man within the ideological system of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*.

[29] Thus, racial, moral, and existential distinctions justify the violence against and subjugation of the Other, while negating the oppressive implications of Buffy’s ideological agenda. In his essay, “Brownskirts: Fascism, Christianity, and the Eternal Demon,” Neal King, too, reads vampires and demons as representing the cultural Other, arguing that the show is “merrily racist” (199). Drawing on the historical connection between vampires and Jews, King argues that Buffy’s destruction of other races, i.e. demons and vampires, in order to protect the superior race of humans, borders on fascism.
The show consciously, but unsuccessfully, works against this reading; by relying on its moral ideology and injecting ambiguities into the discourses of the Buffyverse, Buffy attempts to create a narrative that protects the Slayer from overtly appearing as the inhumane oppressor. Such ambiguities seek to conceal the colonial fascism of Buffy and her friends. Buffy emphatically asserts that she does not prescribe to the “demons bad, people good” philosophy of Riley and The Initiative, a classified government military organization concerned with the extermination of HSTs (Hostile Subterraneans). Although Spike initially believes that Buffy is behind The Initiative (“The Initiative”), the show tries to clearly and carefully separate Buffy from the overtly fascist government agency by demonstrating her seeming rejection of The Initiative’s ethos and their politics concerning the demon races. While Riley sees the world in black and white terms, good and evil, human and monster, Buffy insists that she does not. She confronts Riley’s prejudices:

Buffy: You sounded like Mr. Initiative: Demons bad, people good.
Riley: Is there something wrong with that theorem?
Buffy: There’s different degrees of...
Riley: Evil.
Buffy: It’s just different with different demons. There are creatures, vampires for example, that aren’t evil at all.
Riley: Name one (“New Moon Rising”).

Buffy recognizes that not all demons are evil, just as not all humans are good. However, although Buffy verbally asserts this belief, she does not often act on it.

Buffy’s treatment of Spike during the fifth and sixth season of the show problematizes her assertion that it is “different with different demon,” demonstrating a discrepancy between her expressed beliefs and her actions. Despite everything that Spike has done for Buffy, Dawn, and the Scoobies, she refuses to acknowledge that he has changed. When declaring his love for her, Spike tells Buffy that he can be good, “I’ve changed, Buffy.” She dismisses this change: “What? That chip in your head. That’s not change. That’s just holding you back. You’re like a serial killer in jail” (“Crush”). She insists that because he is a demon, a vampire, and soulless, he cannot be good. When he asserts that “a man can change,” Buffy tells him, “You’re not a man. You’re a thing... An evil disgusting thing” (“Smashed”). She marginalizes him, dismissing his efforts to change and relegating him to the status of the subaltern Other. Spike, in a W.E.B. DuBoisian state of double consciousness, cannot help but see his identity as fractured between evil demon and “good man.” He tells Buffy, “I know you’ll never love me. I know I’m a monster. But you treat me like a man” (“The Gift”). Because he has internalized Buffy’s ideological prejudices, Spike has also internalized her view of him as the soulless monster, the inferior Other.

Throughout the course of their violent and passionate sexual relationship, Buffy frequently feels the need to dehumanize Spike, emphasize his badness, his evilness, his demon-ness. She does this in reaction to her attraction to him, the need to reaffirm and over-emphasize her values. “I am not your girl!” she tells him as she repeatedly and brutally punches his face, “You don’t . . . have a soul! There is nothing good or clean in you. You are dead inside! You can’t feel anything real! I could never . . . be your girl!” (“Dead Things”). Her insistence on this division between human and demon, good and evil, reveals her own anxieties that she “came back wrong... a little less human” (“Smashed”). She projects her anxieties about herself onto Spike, abusing him to mitigate her own self-loathing and reaffirming her position as non-Other. By drawing these rigid ideological distinctions, Buffy can reaffirm herself as human and good. However, this instance on a black and white division between good and bad, human and demon, self and other, contradicts her earlier assertions that it is “different with different
demons.” Thus, although the show attempts to rhetorically distance Buffy in the overt colonial fascism of The Initiative, she subscribes to many of the same foundational ideological principles, participates in similar imperialist policies, and employs her own discourses of colonial fascism.

For Buffy, the relative goodness or evilness, i.e. whether a demon should be killed or not, relies almost entirely on whether or not they have adopted her value system, whether or not they have assimilated into her postmodern American culture. They are good only in relation to their performance of humanness, their assimilation to human culture. In “Family” (5.6), Anya,20 a now human ex-vengeance demon, explains, “What kind of demon is she? There’s a lot of different kinds. Some are very very evil, and some have been considered to be useful members of society.”21 Demons are either “very very evil,” or they have assimilated to become “useful members of society.” Naomi Alderman and Annette Seidel-Arpn discuss the importance of assimilation within the Buffyverse: “‘Doing good,’ for ex-demons, such as Angel, Anya and, latterly, Spike, is inextricably linked to becoming part of a new, acceptable group, and giving up old associations. The weird ‘tribes’ and individuals in Buffy and Angel have to either drop their cultural habits and history to be assimilated, or remain ‘other’ and face the ultimate sanction of the stake” (49). Thus, while these demons remain racially distinct, their assimilation to the cultural reality of Buffy marks them as nonthreatening and, therefore, “good.” Buffy’s tolerance of “different demons,” then, is limited to what Spike refers to as the “Uncle Toms” (“School Hard,” 2.3), the race traitors, the demons that are different because they have become like her. Buffy does not prescribe to multiculturalism, but to an ideology of assimilation.

The narrative arc of Spike, his transformation from bad boy vamp to ensouled sacrificial Champion, demonstrates the show’s existential investment in the colonization and assimilation of the demon world. He “turns his back on all evil” for Buffy (“Crush”), becoming her ally and assimilating to her cultural and ideological expectation. He renounces human blood, “I’m not sampling, I’ll have you know. I mean, look at all these lovely blood covered people. I could. But not a taste for Spike. Not a lick. I knew you wouldn’t like it” (“Triangle,” 5.11), fights with her against demons and even other vampires, and eventually regains his soul in an act of complete assimilation. Olson argues that “his demonization and consequent redemption affords somber consequences for how nature, ‘otherness,’ and—by implication—race are read and controlled within the Buffyverse” (Olson 31). The transformation of Spike, then, demonstrates how the racialized Other is both controlled and used within the colonial discourse of Buffy the Vampire Slayer. He becomes truly good and truly accepted only when he has completely assimilated, regained his soul, and has become morally and culturally like Buffy and the Scoobies.

In Angel, too, this ideological distinction is drawn. In “The Bachelor Party” (1.7), Doyle’s ex-wife, Harriet, an “entho-demonologist,”22 plans to marry Richard, an Ano-movic demon. Angel and Doyle suspect that Richard’s intentions are nefarious, but Harriet explains that Richard and his family are “good” demons, a “peaceful clan. Totally assimilated into our culture.”. As the episode progresses, it becomes clear that Richard is evil, not because he is a demon per se, but because he is not exactly “totally assimilated.” He invites Doyle to his bachelor party so that he can eat his brains, following an ancient Ano-movic custom. This is in keeping with Fanon, who argues that “The customs of the colonized, their traditions, their myths... are the very mark of this indigence and innate depravedness” (Fanon 7). The taboo foreignness and cannibalistic savagery of the custom codes it as “depraved.” Richard’s evilness, then, is not located solely in the fact that he is a demon, but because he has not truly assimilated to a human, “good,” way of life.

The theme is again explored in “That Old Gang of Mine” (3.3). Angel, Wesley, and Gunn investigate a sudden rash of demon killings. The members of Angel Investigations find themselves in an ethically uncomfortable position; usually the ones
killing the demons, they are now hunting for a demon killer. A conversation between Wesley and Charles highlights the moral ambiguity of their situation:

Wesley: Charles, things are not always so simple as just going out and slaying the big bad ugly. There are in this world shades of grey.

Charles: Yeah. And shades of green, and a kind of sickly looking yellow with pink eyes and sometimes puce with horns, too. I get it. What I don’t get is why we’re suddenly playing cleanup crew to a bunch of lowlife demons! …. So we find this demon killing machine. We gonna stop it or thank it?

Wesley: I don’t know… From everything I can determine, this victim was fully assimilated. No history of violence, no threat to anyone. Of the other six, at least two of those would have to be classified as irredeemably evil. … Whatever is responsible for these attacks is not making any distinctions. It’s just killing (“That Old Gang of Mine”).

Despite his instance of “shades of grey,” Wesley, like Buffy, offers only two options for demons: “fully assimilated” or “irredeemably evil.” Demons can be good, he believes, but only if they act like humans, prescribing to conventional human morality and ideology. The thing that is killing the demons (which turns out to be Charles’ old demon-fighting street gang) must be stopped not because it is killing and attacking demons, but because it is not discriminating between the two kinds of demons, those that are good, i.e. like us, and those that are “irredeemably evil,” i.e. completely Other.

[37] The problem with this equation of goodness with assimilation is that it recreates the conditions of colonization. In her reading of Fanon, Lisa Lowe asserts that assimilation as “response to colonialism… reproduces the same structure of domination” (73). Buffy and the other human characters’ support of the assimilated demons, then, does not release them from the colonial order, but implicates them further in it. Although assimilation might save certain demons from the colonial oppression of the ax or the crossbow, it cannot save them from the colonial system because it “enunciates the old order” (Lowe 73). Assimilation, then, is simply the reproduction of the values and ideology of the colonizer through the colonized. It retains the colonial order, maintaining the hierarchies and binaries established by the colonizer and enforcing a cultural and social hegemony.

[38] However, Buffy the Vampire Slayer is not interested or invested in deconstructing these binaries, but in reproducing them. Indeed, these binaries are necessary for the feminist agenda of the show. Buffy’s feminist empowerment necessarily comes through the oppression of the demonic Other. Buffy is defined in opposition to forces of evil she battles: her empowerment necessitates their oppression. This narrative of empowerment through oppression and marginalization of the Other recalls Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s discussion of Anglo-American feminism as established through colonial narratives. In her reading of Jane Eyre and Wide Sargasso Sea, Spivak asserts that within the discourse of imperial England “[Bertha] must play out her role, act out the transformation of her ‘self’ into that fictive Other, set fire to the house and kill herself, so that Jane Eyre can become the feminist individualist heroine of British fiction” (127). Although Buffy is a long way from Jane Eyre, her empowerment comes from the same source, the disenfranchisement and destruction of the colonial Other. Buffy’s vampires and demons must be evil, must perform their role as demonic Other, so that she can perform her role as empowered, ass-kicking female Slayer.

[39] Whedon’s feminist agenda complements Spivak’s reading of feminism and colonial discourses. For Spivak what is “at stake” for feminist individualism in the age of imperialism is represented through two distinct registers: childrearing and soul-making—“The first is domestic-society-through-sexual-reproduction cathected as ‘compassionate love’; the second is the imperialist project cathected as civil-society-through-social-mission” (116). For Buffy, what is “at stake” is maintaining the colonial discourses that facilitate female empowerment. While most of Buffy’s empowerment comes through
violence, brutal and coercive colonization, her power also comes from maintenance of the colonial order through soul-making and the reproduction of the Slayer mythology.

[40] Within the narrative of the show, Willow and Buffy are literal soul-makers. Willow, a powerful witch, uses magic to twice re-ensoul Angel (“Becoming Part II,” 2.22; “Orpheus,” 4.15). Spike’s love for Buffy leads him to regain his soul. In both instances, the empowered female colonial helps the colonial subject to become more human, thereby reasserting the colonizers’ superiority and the colonized’s bestial and monstrous inferiority. It is only through the colonizer that the Other can be brought to humanity. Spivak describes this phenomenon of colonial soul-making: “the categoric imperative can justify the imperialist project by producing the following formula: make the heathen into a human so that he can be treated as an end in himself... yesterday’s imperialism, today’s “Development”” (Spivak 123). The resoulment of Angel and Spike makes monster into man and marks a similar ontological “development.” By regaining their souls, these demons can finally be considered, within the ideological parameters of the show, “good men.” The colonial agenda of the show is justified through the “development” of these vampires, their regained humanity supporting the imperialist imperative of Buffy and her friends. Their elevation from “thing” to “more than human” (“Chosen”) demonstrates the humanizing and civilizing effects of the soul-making colonial project of Buffy the Vampire Slayer, simultaneously justifying the ideological and imperial importance of the soul and reaffirming the moral and racial superiority of the humans who are able to bestow them.

[41] Unlike her imperial predecessors, Buffy does not participate in the “making of human beings” through biological reproduction, but rather through the reproduction of the conditions which support and reify the Buffyverse’s ideological and colonial discourses. Inherent in the Slayer mythology is the need for reproduction:

Andrew: Alas, the existence of a slayer is often brutal and short-lived. And the “primitive,” as she was called, boasted no exception. But . . . the elders had foreseen this inevitability and . . . and devised a way for her power to live on.

Fred: In every generation, one is chosen.

Andrew:...There are many potentials, as we experts call them... But only one can be chosen (“Damage,” 5.11).

When a Slayer dies, a new Slayer is called to take her place in the fight against the forces of darkness. The Slayer line, then, is self-reproducing, generating a new Slayer when necessary to retain the conditions of colonial domination.

[42] In season seven of Buffy the Vampire Slayer, the big bad, The First Evil, attacks the Slayer line: “The First. That’s what it wants... with all the potentials gone and no way of making another... it’s the end. No more Slayer. Ever” (“Bring on the Night,” 7.10). The First’s tactic of aborting the potential Slayers threatens the Buffyverse’s means of retaining the colonial order through the reproduction of the Slayer. In order to combat this threat to the colonial order, Buffy and Willow decide to imbue every potential with the power of the Slayer. “From now on, every girl in the world who might be a Slayer will be a Slayer,” Buffy triumphantly declares (“Chosen,” 7.22). While Whedon intended this to be a message of female empowerment, this dispensation of Slayer superpowers may be read as the reproduction and proliferation of the colonial and moral order established through the discourses of the show. By creating and training all of these new Slayers, Buffy ensures the recreation and strengthening of the colonial conditions on which Buffy’s power depends.

[43] This formulation of the construction of power occurs because Buffy, even with her army of newly empowered Slayers, cannot completely defeat The First Evil. She destroys the First’s army and collapses the Hellmouth, but evil endures. Existentially, Buffy requires evil to remain in the world. Indeed, Buffy’s goodness depends on the evilness of the Other, and the show is careful to maintain this balance between good and evil. Buffy cannot ever completely defeat evil, because she needs it to reproduce and
validate her colonial power. Therefore, evil must endure to ensure the continuance of the empowered female slayer.

[44] Without the discourses of good and evil, self and Other, human and demon, the colonial ideology of the Buffyverse collapses and with that Buffy’s powers disintegrate. Without any demons to kill or vampires to slay, Buffy the Vampire Slayer becomes redundant and unnecessary and the source of her empowerment disappears. Buffy and the Scoobies’ relentless struggle against the forces of darkness not only enacts the colonial struggle of domination and the mythology of superiority, but guarantees that Buffy will have something to fight against. The show’s interest in maintaining the interconnected discourses of morality, colonization, and demonization is motivated by the urge to retain Buffy’s status as empowered female. With no evils, no Others, in the world, no colonial order to maintain, no fight to win, Buffy has no way to prove that she is strong. As Spivak notes, “the female individualist, not-quite-not-male, articulates herself in shifting relationship to what is at stake” (117); in Buffy, this is done by staking her colonial claim of female empowerment through the domination, ass-kicking or assimilation, of the demonic Other.
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Notes
1 The vampires of Stephanie Meyer’s Twilight Saga are very different from Stoker’s Count Dracula, but despite this dissimilarity, both are clearly presented as vampire.
2 See Nina Auerbach, Tim Kane, Erik Butler, George A. Waller, William Patrick Day, Bruce A. McClelland, Joan Gordon and Veronica Hollinger, Matthew Gibson, and John Edgar Browning and Caroline Joan (Kay) Picart for a fuller analysis of this phenomenon.
3 For this reason, this paper will limit its historical survey of vampire as Other to critical readings of Dracula. For a fuller analysis of vampires and race see John Edgar Browning and Caroline Joan (Kay) Picart and Erik Butler.
4 This association between vampire and Jew is seen again in Friedrich Wilhelm Murnau’s Nosferatu (1922). Butler discusses the various means through which Nosferatu is coded Jewish, including his appearance, which compounds a number of anti-Semitic stereotypes including a hooked nose and clawlike hands (156-165). The film, then, like Stoker’s novel, reveals racial tensions, employing the vampire to embody the Other and justify prejudices against the Other. Nosferatu not only engages with German anti-Semitism but validates it. After all, he literalizes the metaphor of the racial Other as evil, demonic, and threatening.
5 The true feminist success of this project has been debated by feminist critics, most thoroughly by Lorna Jowett.
6 Although this paper will focus primarily on Buffy the Vampire Slayer, references will be made to Angel. Also created by Joss Whedon and closely related to Buffy, including numerous cross-overs and shared characters, Angel is a part of the Buffyverse and upholds much of the supernatural mythology presented in Buffy. Unlike Buffy (which does not introduce a major character of color until the seventh season with the inauguration of Principal Robin Wood (D.W. Woodside)), Angel introduces Charles Gunn (J. August Richards), an African American demon fighter in the first season. He becomes a cast regular in the second season and remains on the show until its finale. For an analysis of Charles Gunn see Michaela D. E. Meyer’s essay, “From Rogue in the ‘Hood to Suave in a Suit: Black Masculinity and the Transformation of Charles Gunn.”
7 Those critics focusing on the troubling whiteness and race relations of Buffy the Vampire Slayer include Neal King, J. Renee Cox, Matthew Pateman, Kent A. Ono, Dominic Alessio, Chris Richards, Wendy Olson, Ewan Kirkland, Lynne Edwards, Lorna Jowett, Jeffrey Middents, Cynthia Fuchs, and Naomi Alderman and Annette Seidel-Arpací.
8 Within the Buffyverse even the limited interactions with the developing world are couched in supernatural evil (although Kendra, a Slayer, is coded as Other and presented as originating from Jamaica; see Ono and Edwards). The postcolonial world appears in the form of a pack of hyenas that possess a group of high school students (“The Pack”), a resurrected Inca virgin sacrifice draining the life force away from the men she kisses (“Inca Mummy Girl”), an African mask that turns party-goers into zombies (“Dead Man’s
Party”), and, of course, the vengeful Chumash spirit warriors (“Pangs”). Until the fifth season of Angel, only vampires and demons cross the boundaries designating the developing world from the developed world (Spike kills his first Slayer in China during the Boxer Rebellion (“Fool for Love”); Spike and Dru are shown in South America after leaving Sunnydale at the end of season two (“Fool for Love”); Angel travels to Sri Lanka after learning about Buffy’s death (“Heartthrob”); and Spike must go to Africa to pass the trials necessary to regain his soul (“Villains”). The movement of vampires and demons from the developed to the developing world and back again demonstrates their marginalized and racialized status within the discourse of the show. Their position, racially and geographically, is differentiated from the human characters on the show. 

His analysis focuses primarily on the character of Kendra, a Slayer of Jamaican decent, who is killed off during the same season in which she is introduced; Ampata, the Inca Mummy Girl who sucks the life spirit out of men with her kiss; and Mr. Trick, an African American vampire.

There are a few moments when this visual clarity breaks down. For example, the big bad of season five, Glory, appears in the guise of a human female. Another notable exception is Ted, the serial murdering cyborg, Buffy’s mom Joyce dates. Buffy pushes this abusive and domineering potential step-father and believes that she has killed him. Buffy experiences a moral crisis, believing that she has killed a human. When she learns that Ted was not only a robot but an evil robot at that, the crisis is resolved (“Ted,” 2.11).

Because of their ability to appear human, vampires can “pass” for human, and are often seen interacting with humans who are unaware that they are vampires. Several Angel episodes, including “Hero” (1.9), in which Doyle, a half demon passing as human, finally embraces his demon heritage and dies to save a family of half-breed demons, and “Are You Now or Have you Ever Been” (2.2), where Angel’s struggles to assimilate to the human world are explored in relation to a young woman of color passing as white in L.A. 1952, focus on the theme of passing.

Once Spike has a soul, the oppressive chip becomes, according to Buffy, evil. When it begins malfunctioning, causing him intense pain without any provocation, Buffy decides to have the chip removed. When Giles questions this decision she informs him, “When Spike had that chip it was like having him in a muzzle. It was wrong. You can’t beat evil by doing evil. I know that” (“First Date,” 7.14). However, during the three years Spike had the chip, Buffy gave little indication that she found it morally abhorrent. In fact, she frequently worried about what would happen if he ever had it removed or if it ceased functioning (“Crush,” 5.14). But now, because Spike is human and no longer an inferior Other, the restraining brutality of the chip is evil. The markers of the older, more violent, more overt colonial order are condemned, in favor of the narrative of development and assimilation.

Later it is revealed that The Initiative also captures and experiments on demons and vampires, a practice recalling the Nazi experimentation on Jews in concentration camp. Adam, the human and demon cyborg Frankensteinian product of these experiments, desires to create a “master race” of hybrids (“New Moon Rising,” 4.19). Indeed, The Initiative is explicitly equated with the Nazis. After being captured, Spike, who it is revealed in Angel’s “Why We Fight” [5.13] was, in fact, captured by the Nazis who intended to experiment on him, wonders who is holding him: “And they are? The govern-
ment, Nazis, major cosmetics companies” (“The Initiative,” 4.7). Thus, Spike explicitly links The Initiative’s actions with the fascist racial policies of the Third Reich.

Indeed, for most of the season, the Initiative is just as much Buffy’s enemy as the demon and vampires she faces. Professor Walsh, who runs the Initiative, plots to have Buffy killed, because she asks too many questions (“The I in Team,” 4.13; “Good-bye Iowa,” 4.14), undermining the authority of the operation. By casting the Initiative as, ultimately, evil, the show rejects and condemns the fascist operations of the militarized operation, while concealing Buffy’s own fascist colonial ideology.

When Riley learns that Oz, Willow’s ex-boyfriend, is a werewolf, he exclaims, “I didn’t think Willow was that kind of girl.” Buffy quickly chastises him, “What kind of girl? . . . God, I never knew you were such a bigot.” To which Riley responds, “Whoa, hey, how did we get to bigot? I’m just saying it’s a little weird to date someone who tries to eat you once a month” (“New Moon Rising”). Because Riley has adopted The Initiative philosophy that all vampires, demons, and Other HSTs are evil, he does not see his comments as prejudicial. According to his racial schema, such prejudices are justified and rationalized because they are true; after all, once a month Oz does turn into a monster. Buffy, however, insists that all of the other nights, when Oz is human, are just as the important as the three each month when he takes werewolf form.

Riley’s insistence that she “name one,” indicates another facet of The Initiative’s dehumanizing treatment of the demon races. Riley and the other members of The Initiative refer to Spike as “Hostile 17,” reducing him to a number, not unlike the Nazi treatment of the Jews in WWII concentration camps. By refusing to give their captives a name, The Initiative denies the vampires or demons any individualization. For The Initiative, there are not “different demons,” only demons.

W.E.B. DuBois argues that the colonized Other lives in “a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness” (DuBois 3).

Throughout the series, Buffy struggles with her identity as the Slayer, often questioning her own humanity and fearing the demonic and non-human side of her power. (“Restless,” 4.22; “Buffy verses Dracula,” 5.1; “Intervention,” 5.18; “Dead Things,” 6.13; “Get It Done,” 7.15). This darkness is synecdochically represented through the First Slayer, a “primitive” aboriginal, faceless behind her war paint and denied the power of speech. At the end of her dream in “Restless,” Buffy defeats the First Slayer by denying her power and mocking her apparent “primitiveness.” “You’re really going to have to get over the whole primal power thing,” Buffy taunts her, “you are not the source of me. Also in terms of hair care, you really want to say to yourself, what kind
of impression am I making in the workplace…” (“Restless”). Buffy does not acknowledge her connection to this Othered Slayer, the dark source of her power, but denies it, also denying, as Fuchs notes, that she, too, might be racially Other (98). Her verbal quips about the First Slayer’s hair and hygiene serve to further separate her from her dark ancestry through her conscious privileging of and conformation to Western and white values.

A similar privileging occurs when Buffy confronts the Shadow Men, the African shamans who created the first Slayer. They are presented as oppressive patriarchs chaining the First Slayer and then Buffy to the earth, and complaining that Buffy, unlike the speechless First Slayer, talks too much (“Get it Done”). They promise Buffy more power; however, in exchange she must allow them to place a demon’s “essence,” “spirit,” “heart” in side of her (“Get it done”). As Olson notes, “The shadow men are depicted as uncivilized and unsophisticated… During these moments the Buffyverse unwittingly employs the kind of racialized tropes used during the Enlightenment to justify white supremacy” (Olson 35). Their close association with demon-ness and otherness also furthers Buffy’s racialized depiction of demons and vampires as colonial Other. In the end, Buffy refuses. She will not become “less human” in order to have more power, i.e. physical strength (“Get it done”). She will not allow herself to become more demonic, more Other, refuses to become like the primitive First Slayer.

Buffy’s confrontation with the Shadow Men is paralleled by Spike’s fight with a demon he needs to kill in order to bring Buffy back through the portal she entered to find the men. Ironically, earlier in the episode, Buffy demanded that Spike become less human. She tells him that he was a “better fighter” before he regained the soul, and “what [she] want[s] is the Spike that’s dangerous. The Spike that tried to kill [her] when [they] first met” (“Get It Done”). Spikes marginalization as demonic Other means that his humanity can be sacrificed, while Buffy’s is not so expendable.

Anya is another demon who assimilates. She first appears in season three of Buffy the Vampire Slayer as a vengeance demon. When Giles destroys her pendant, dispossessing her of her powers and rendering her human, she must learn how to be human, how to assimilate into the Scooby culture. Her lack of knowledge about human life and demonic idiosyncrasies are often a source of humor in the show. However, because Anya is still learning to be human, still in the process of assimilation, she remains an outsider to the group: “That’s very humorous. Make fun of the ex-demon! I can just hear you in private. ‘I dislike that Anya. She’s newly human and strangely literal’ (“Into the Woods,” 5.10), she complains, vocalizing her marginalized status within the human world.

In this episode, Tara, a witch and Willow’s girlfriend, is confronted by her family, clearly coded lower class southern conservatives (and therefore in opposition to
liberal values upheld by Buffy and the Scoobies). Her father insists that she must return with home with him, because “the women in [their] family have demon in them,” which begins presenting when they become adults. Spike is the first to realize that this family folklore is “just bit spin to keep the ladies in line” (“Family,” 5.6). Thus, demonization is connected to oppression and marginalization, as the family patriarchy uses the demon “spin” to oppress and control the female members of the family.

As Mary Alice Money notes, this assimilation, which she refers to as “rehabilitation” (note the moral connotations and ethical implications in this word choice: to assimilate is to become good), “undemonizes” these characters: “On a deeper level,” she explains, “these rehabilitated humans and demons the main characters and the audience confront as Other: the marginalized figures who are worthy of inclusion, the nonhumans who are people after all, the strangers who become us” (98). Money’s description of this “undemonizing” is telling: in order to become good, be “rehabilitated,” demons must become like humans; Othered characters must become “like us.” Undemonization, then, while undoubtedly a “humanizing” process, retains the ideological principles of the Buffyverse. In order for vampires and demons to be good, they must be like humans. They must assimilate to the culture of the colonizers.

A profession obviously parodying ethnologists, and further working to establish a link between the demons and vampires of the show and the racial and colonial Other.

As mentioned above, Charles’ status an African American emphasizes the racialized nature of the scene. Most of the members of Charles’ old gang are also black. The string of murders they commit evokes the lynch mob justice of the American South, provoked simply by the race of the victims. Gio’s declaration that “A monster lover ain’t no better than a monster,” echoes Southern condemnation of those sympathetic to the plight of African Americans as “nigger lovers.”

It is true that Spike fights for and regains his soul on his own. However, Buffy provides the impetus for him to do so. Had he not fallen in love with Buffy and then attempted to rape the woman he loved, it is unlikely that Spike would have fought for his soul. Indeed, Jowett consistently refers to Buffy’s power to “civilize” men (162). Although she never explicitly connects this to colonization, an implicit connotative connection is established. Several times during the final season he informs her that he regained his soul for her (“Beneath You,” “Sleeper,” “Never Leave Me,” “Get It Done”). Therefore, Buffy can be viewed as a soul-maker.

In fact, throughout the entire series, not one of the main characters has a child. In Angel, human pregnancy is often presented as a threat. Cordelia is twice impregnated by demons throughout the course of the show (“Expecting,” 1.12, and “Inside Out,” 4.17). The only two characters to have a human child in the show are Darla and Angel, two vampires.

This is most clearly evidenced by the consequences of Buffy’s resurrection. By bringing the goodness of Buffy back into the world, her friends inadvertently release a demon (“After Life,” 6.3) and activate The First (“Bring on the Night,” 7.10).