## 1ac

### 1ac ugliness

#### The Presidency as such is nothing more than a glorified beauty contest – the historical legacy that defines the presidency is one that privileges that which is thought of as beautiful – elections have been won or lost on something as trivial as a scowl or posture – this desire to be beautiful gets to the heart of topic – why is it that those who have wielded presidential powers are those who fit within a certain narrative of what is considered acceptable? The answer is the aesthetic category of beauty:

#### Presidential elections are therefore a sham – political debates are a useful point of analysis – voters want to look at their authoritative President with admiration – this problem pervades analysis of those debates themselves by subordinating arguments to objective beauty criteria

Buruma 12 professor of democracy and human rights at Bard College, doctorate in theology (Ian, 10/10/12, “Beauty and campaigning for the American presidency,” <http://www.praguepost.com/opinion/14488-beauty-and-campaigning-for-the-american-presidency.html>, RBatra)

What is the point of a presidential debate? In the context of American presidential elections, "debate" is something of a misnomer. When former French President Nicolas Sarkozy faced his Socialist challenger, François Hollande, that was a debate - addressing substantive issues and lasting more than two hours. By contrast, presidential debates in the United States are more like **staged performances**, where the answers to every possible question have been rehearsed endlessly with teams of coaches and advisers. The candidates in U.S. debates address carefully selected journalists who rarely follow up on a question. And the candidates' performances are scrutinized **less on the substance of their arguments** than on their presentation, body language, facial tics, unguarded sighs, smiles, sneers and inadvertent eye rolling. Does the candidate come across as a snob or a friendly guy whom one can trust? Do the smiles look real or fake? These "optics" can be of great importance. After all, Richard Nixon's race against John Kennedy in 1960 is said to have been lost on television: **Kennedy looked** cool and handsome**, while Nixon scowled into the camera**, with sweat trickling down his 5 o'clock shadow. In his debates with Ronald Reagan in 1980, Jimmy Carter came across as smug and humorless and Reagan as a friendly old uncle. Carter lost. In 2000, Al Gore was unable to make up his mind about which role he wished to play in his debates with George W. Bush, **so he looked shifty and inauthentic**, changing from arrogant to patronizing and back again. He had the better arguments, but he lost the "debates" (and the election) nonetheless. We are told that the debates this month between President Barack Obama and the Republican challenger, Mitt Romney, might decide the election. It is, according to the pundits, Romney's last chance. If Obama comes across as an elitist professor, he might lose. If Romney gets angry or makes a bad joke, his chances could be blown. Again, this is not a question of who has the best policies, or the soundest ideas; it is all about presentation. More than 67 million Americans watched the first of this year's three debates. According to public opinion polls, only about 17 percent of eligible voters have not yet made up their minds about which candidate to support. That is surprising, given the widening political gap between America's two main political parties. In private, Obama and Romney may be able to agree on many things. But the Republican Party has moved far to the right of Obama's moderate liberalism, and Romney has been pulled along with it. Then there is the great unspoken factor of racial prejudice, something even hard-core right-wing Republicans try not to express openly. A certain percentage of American voters will not vote for a black man, whatever he says or however good he looks in a debate. If policies or prejudices have not persuaded that undecided 17 percent of voters, they must be looking for something else. They want to see whether they like one man better than the other. To them, one can only assume, the debates are nothing more than a personality contest. In past elections, when there sometimes really was not much political difference between Democrats and Republicans, this made a certain sense. Broadly speaking, on economics and foreign policy, the candidates often would be in accord, with Republicans more inclined to favor the interests of big business and Democrats defending the interests of labor. So voters could not always be blamed for finding it hard to make up their minds. Since they could not make a rational choice, they followed their instincts and voted for the candidate they found most sympathetic. This time, there seems to be much less justification for such arbitrary choices. The political differences are too stark. And yet there is a reason not to dismiss the personality contest entirely. After all, the U.S. presidency is a quasi-monarchical institution, as well as a political one. The president and first lady are the king and queen of the American republic, **the official faces that the U.S. presents to the outside world**. It is not utterly absurd, therefore, that voters want to like the look of their presidents, quite apart from the merit of their policies. Choosing the country's most powerful politician on the basis of his presentability on television might seem arbitrary, even frivolous. But it is no more arbitrary than the accident of birth, which determines the right of kings and queens to reign over their countries. The difference is, of course, that most modern kings and queens are constitutional monarchs with no political power. And the man whom U.S. voters choose to lead their country will affect the lives of everyone, not just Americans. Because non-Americans cannot vote in U.S. elections (a pity for Obama, who would probably win a global vote by a landslide), we have to depend on the judgment of that 17 percent of undecided voters watching television this month. **That is not exactly reassuring.** But the American republic has one merit that monarchies lack. Good or bad, the quasi-king can be booted out every four years. Then the competition - part ideological, part beauty contest - can start all over again.

#### The beauty contest is based on rigid exclusion, it isn’t objective nor neutral – this manifests in ossified party structures

Global Research 12 (10/18/12, The Presidential Debates Are Nothing But Scripted Beauty Contests, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-presidential-debates-are-nothing-but-scripted-beauty-contests/5308726?print=1>, RBatra)

The moderators were selected to ensure that nothing unexpected is asked and that only the most staid and establishment views are heard. As journalism professor Jay Rosen put it when the names of the moderators were unveiled, using terms to describe those views that are acceptable in Washington media circles and those which are “fringe”: “In order to be considered as a candidate for moderator you have to be soaked in the sphere of consensus, likely to stay within the predictable inner rings of the sphere of legitimate controversy, and unlikely in the extreme to select any questions from the sphere of deviance.” Here then, within this one process of structuring the presidential debates, we have every active ingredient that typically **defines, and degrades, US democracy**. The two parties collude in secret. The have the same interests and goals. Everything is done to ensure that the political process is completely scripted and devoid of any spontaneity or reality. **All views that reside outside the narrow confines of the two parties are rigidly excluded. Anyone who might challenge or subvert the two-party duopoly is** rendered invisible**.** Lobbyists who enrich themselves by peddling their influence run everything behind the scenes. Corporations pay for the process, which they exploit and is then run to bolster rather than threaten their interests. The media’s role is to keep the discourse as restrictive and unthreatening as possible while peddling the delusion that it’s all vibrant and free and independent and unrestrained. And it all ends up distorting political realities far more than illuminating them while wildly exaggerating the choices available to citizens and concealing the similarities between the two parties. To understand the US political process, one can just look to how these sham debates are organized and how they function. This is the same process that repeats itself endlessly in virtually every other political realm.

#### This aesthetic tendency mirrors the way that political practices operate – It’s no surprise that the dominant group is the one that gets to define beauty – this has historically been used as a tool to marginalize and otherize

Craig 2k6 (Maxine, “Race, beauty, and the tangled knot of a guilty pleasure” Feminist Theory 2006 7: 159)

Discourses of race and beauty are often intertwined. Racist ideologies commonly promote the appearance of the dominant group against the purported ugliness of a subordinate group. When, in his ‘Notes on the State of Virginia’ Thomas Jefferson sought to defend a continued separation of the races, he pointed to what he considered the self-evident beauty of whites (Jefferson, 1975: 187). Likewise, Nazis used assertions of superior Aryan beauty to build anti-Semitism (Mosse, 1985: 139). Claims of beauty have also been central to anti-racist resistance. When Marcus Garvey built a mass African-American movement in the early 20th century, he implored black people to ‘take down the pictures of white women from your walls. Elevate your own women to that place of honor’ (Garvey, 1968: 29). In Garvey’s nationalist rhetoric, racial pride began with an appreciation of the beauty of black women. Despite the close connections between discourses of beauty and racial politics, race has often been left out of feminist analyses of beauty. If we take the 1968 Miss America pageant protest as a historical beginning point for second wave feminist activist critiques of beauty regimes in the United States, we can see that an analysis of the interpenetration of racism and beauty regimes was present at the beginning. The organizers of the 1968 Miss America contest protest decried the racial exclusivity of the pageant, noting that there had never been a black finalist nor a single Puerto Rican, Alaskan, Hawaiian or Mexican-American winner (Morgan, 1970: 586). Though early activists found and critiqued racism and sexism in institutions of beauty, an analysis of race escaped some of the most widely read academic feminist writing on beauty that followed. This section traces the presence, absence and reappearance of race in feminist theories of beauty. My account cannot be strictly chronological, as in some cases early writers and activists had greater sensitivity to issues of race than writers who followed them. In this narrative, I organize the works considered into those that are foundational, those that engaged in a project of specifying differences in women’s experiences of beauty, and those that complicated existing theory by addressing questions of agency. Given the wealth of feminist writing relating to beauty, **this survey is necessarily incomplete and will inevitably omit important work**. Works are included here because they articulate central tendencies within the literature. Lois Banner’s 1983 American Beauty laid important historical groundwork for subsequent feminist scholarship on beauty. By chronicling the transformation of beauty standards in the United States, Banner demonstrated the constructed and historically specific character of ideals of beauty. As written by Banner, however, beauty’s American history is a white women’s history. Joan Jacobs Brumberg’s study of decades of young women’s diaries documents the way that the expansion of marketing to young women increased women’s self-consciousness regarding their bodies. Given that women who have enjoyed certain privileges are more likely to keep diaries and have them collected by archives, the experience documented in Brumberg’s study was primarily that lived by white middle- and upper-class women. Nonetheless, Brumberg’s 1997 The Body Project importantly challenged the common assumption that young women have always been anxious about the appearance of their bodies. Young women’s diaries written in the 19th century were less focused on outer beauty. As the reach of marketing increased throughout the 20th century, young women were more likely to write about their bodies in their diaries and more frequently expressed dissatisfaction with their shapes and weight. Published in the 1980s, essays by Iris Marion Young and Sandra Lee Bartky were also foundational.1 Young and Bartky articulated feminist analyses of women’s beauty work as a disciplinary practice policed by the force of a coercive and pervasive male gaze. These works were indispensable for later feminist writing and practice relating to beauty, yet the woman who was their subject was a racially unmarked, implicitly heterosexual woman of an unspecified class. In Young’s essay ‘Throwing Like a Girl’, the essence of the female experience is a physical passivity caused by ‘the ever-present possibility that one will be gazed upon as a mere body, as shape and flesh that presents itself as the potential object of another subject’s intentions and manipulations, rather than as a living manifestation of action and intention’ (Young, 1980: 154). Women take up the view of themselves as things ‘looked at and acted upon’, and use cosmetics, diets, and other disciplinary practices in attempts to craft themselves into more beautiful things (Young, 1980: 148). In this argument, a woman sees herself as men see her, and the embodied actions a woman takes are usurped by male intentions. She acts upon herself to realize the will of a generalized male gaze. From the present vantage point, Young’s argument appears not incorrect but incomplete. Young’s essay vividly describes and explains the selfconsciousness regarding appearance that male domination imposes on women. Whether measured by the grossly disproportionate amounts of money spent by women on beauty care or the higher rates of eating disorders and cosmetic surgery use among women, it is clear that women, as a group, work to change their appearance more than men do. The feelings of inadequacy produced by the presence of beauty standards in women’s lives are, arguably, among the most personal manifestations of gender inequality in our lives. That being said, the essential woman she describes is that racially unmarked, implicitly heterosexual woman, of unspecified class. Connected to no community, she stands alone under the male gaze. The gazing male is similarly unspecified. What happens if we rethink the argument, with the understanding that the woman under the gaze has a race, a sexual identity, an age, abilities, and more or less wealth? Does she still stand alone in relation to the gaze? Which techniques of transformation are available to her, which are impossible, and what are the meanings of those techniques within her community? When, and if, she sees herself through the eyes of a male, what is his race and how does his race affect her assumptions about what he sees? Is he **also the target of an objectifying gaze?** Sandra Lee Bartky similarly describes beauty work as a product of the female self-surveillance that arises from the male gaze. Yet she describes the beautifying woman as active rather than passive. According to Bartky, women actively construct feminine selves, the only selves that patriarchal regimes support, or risk the ‘annihilation’ that awaits those who refuse to embrace socially acceptable subjectivities (Bartky, 1988: 78). Bartky’s self-monitoring women, like Young’s, are generalized women who stand alone. Each woman, because she is not envisioned as a member of any social group based on race, class, age, sexuality, or ability, is equally alone, and subject to a generalized male gaze. Beginning in the 1980s, and continuing to the present, a sizeable group of scholars has engaged in a project of specifying, in various ways, women’s experiences of beauty standards. These works document and analyse the racism inherent in dominant beauty standards (Banet-Weiser, 1999; Banks, 2000; Bordo, 1993; Candelario, 2000; Chapkis, 1986; Craig, 2002; DuCille, 1996; Espiritu, 1997; Gilman, 1985; Hobson, 2003; Kaw, 2003; Lakoff and Scherr, 1984; Peiss, 1998; Weitz, 2004). Focusing on the diverse and particular ways that dominant beauty standards positioned white, black, and Asian women, these scholars argue that beauty standards maintained racial inequality as well as gender inequality. Much of this scholarship addressed the polarized positions of black women and white women in dominant beauty regimes. Dominant beauty standards that idealized fair skin, small noses and lips, and long flowing hair defined black women’s dark skin colour, facial features, and tightly curled, short hair as ugly. In many, but not all representations, black women’s bodies were also stigmatized as hypersexual, a characterization that positioned black women as the moral opposites of pure white women. The ordeal of Saartjie Baartman, the black South African woman who was transported to London and Paris in 1810 and exhibited barely clothed as an entertaining spectacle, is emblematic of the abusive representation of black women as the hypersexual other (Gilman, 1985). Saartjie Baartman was dubbed the ‘Hottentot Venus’, a name that identified her as a stigmatizing symbol of beauty for a defamed group within a colonial context (Hobson, 2003). The exclusion of non-white women, or their marginalization within representations of beauty, supported the place of white women within beauty regimes. That is, racists defined white and chaste beauty in opposition to the imputed ugliness and hypersexuality of other, racially marked, groups of women (Collins, 2004; hooks, 1992; Omolade, 1983). Writers who have considered the position of contemporary non-white women in beauty regimes have variously found categorical exclusion of women of colour, appreciation of the beauty of women of colour to the extent that they approached the appearance of whiteness, or the inclusion of a changing spectrum of women of colour in the marginalized and marked position of the exotic beauty. A shifting economic and geopolitical context underlies these alternative and unstable positions of women of colour in beauty regimes. Asian women were portrayed as monstrous in 19th-century caricatures drawn by whites engaged in nativist politics. In later periods, when exclusionary immigration laws removed Asian workers from competition with American workers, Asian women were represented as exotic beauties (Espiritu, 1997). African-American women, who were categorically excluded from representations of beauty prior to the Civil Rights Movement, have, within the past forty years, along with the emergence of a sizeable black middle class, gained inclusion in fashion industry and cinematic representations of beauty, albeit often in ways that continue to mark them as exotic (DuCille, 1996). Among these authors Susan Bordo provides the broadest theoretical basis for understanding how beauty regimes locate women in specific valued or devalued positions. She argues that representations of beauty produce norms for women, ‘against which the self continually measures, judges, “disciplines,” and “corrects” itself’ (Bordo, 1993: 25). Her argument was more than a restatement of that advanced by Bartky and Young, because of Bordo’s sustained consideration of the ways that race matters in women’s experience of dominant beauty standards. Racism and sexism intertwine in the form of a normalizing discourse that marks women of colour as abnormal and thus flawed.

#### We repudiate the application of objective beauty standards to political or social contexts, as it applies to the presidency, as it applies to war powers, as it applies to politics, and as it applies to socialization itself.

#### Vote aff to affirm the politics of ugliness.

#### Beauty as a concept allows for violence. Our advocacy functions to reclaim and transform aesthetics to affirm the perspectives of the ugly

Mingus 2011 (Mia, Full text of a keynote address for the Femmes of Colour symposium, queer physically disabled woman of color, korean transracial and transnational adoptee writer and organizer “moving towards the ugly” <http://leavingevidence.wordpress.com/2011/08/22/moving-toward-the-ugly-a-politic-beyond-desirability/>)

As femmes of color—**however we identify**—we have to push ourselves to go deeper than consumerism, ableism, transphobia and building a politic of desirability. Especially as femmes of color. We cannot leave our folks behind, just to join the femmes of color contingent in the giant white femme parade. As the (generational) effects of global capitalism, genocide, violence, oppression and trauma settle into our bodies, we must build new understandings of bodies and gender that can reflect our **histories and our resiliency, not our oppressor or our self-shame and loathing.** We must shift from a politic of desirability and beauty to a politic of ugly and magnificence. That moves us closer to bodies and movements that disrupt, dismantle, disturb. Bodies and movements ready to throw down and create a different way for all of us, not just some of us. [\*share North Carolina story] The magnificence of a body that shakes, spills out, takes up space, needs help, moseys, slinks, limps, drools, rocks, curls over on itself. The magnificence of a body that doesn’t get to choose when to go to the bathroom, let alone which bathroom to use. A body that doesn’t get to choose what to wear in the morning, what hairstyle to sport, how they’re going to move or stand, or what time they’re going to bed. The magnificence of bodies that have been coded, not just undesirable and ugly, but un-human. The magnificence of bodies that are understanding gender in far more complex ways than I could explain in an hour. Moving beyond a politic of desirability to loving the ugly. Respecting Ugly for how it has shaped us and been exiled. Seeing its power and magic, seeing the reasons it has been feared. Seeing it for what it is: some of our greatest strength. Because we all do it. We all run from the ugly. And the farther we run from it, the more we stigmatize it and the more power we give beauty. Our communities are obsessed with being beautiful and gorgeous and hot. What would it mean if we were ugly? What would it mean if we didn’t run from our own ugliness or each other’s? How do we take the sting out of “ugly?” What would it mean to acknowledge our ugliness for all it has given us, how it has shaped our brilliance and taught us about how we never want to make anyone else feel? What would it take for us to be able to risk being ugly, in whatever that means for us. What would happen if we stopped apologizing for our ugly, stopped being ashamed of it? What if we let go of being beautiful, stopped chasing “pretty,” stopped sucking in and shrinking and spending enormous amounts of money and time on things that don’t make us magnificent? Where is the Ugly in you? What is it trying to teach you? And I am not saying it is easy to be ugly without apology. It is hard as fuck. It threatens our survival. I recognize the brilliance in our instinct to move toward beauty and desirability. And it takes time and for some of us it may be impossible. I know it is complicated. …And I also know that though it may be a way to survive, it will not be a way to thrive, to grow the kind of genders and world we need. And it is not attainable to everyone, even those who want it to be. What do we do with bodies that can’t change no matter how much we dress them up or down; no matter how much we want them to? What about those of us who are freaks, in the most powerful sense of the word? Freakery is that piece of disability and ableism where bodies that are deformed, disfigured, scarred and non-normatively physically disabled live. Its roots come out of monsters and goblins and beasts; from the freak shows of the 1800’s where physically disabled folks, trans and gender non-conforming folks, indigenous folks and people of color were displayed side-by-side. It is where “beauty” and “freak” got constructed day in and day out, where “whiteness” and “other” got burned into our brains. It is part of the legacy of Ugly and it is part of my legacy as a queer disabled woman of color. It is a part of all of our history as queer people of color. It is how I know we must never let ourselves be on the side of the gawking crowd ever again in any way. It is the part of me that doesn’t show my leg. It is the part of me that knows that building my gender—my anything—around desirability or beauty is not just an ableist notion of what’s important, but will always keep me chasing what doesn’t want me. Will always keep me hurling swords at the very core of me. There is only the illusion of solace in beauty. If age and disability teach us anything, it is that investing in beauty will never set us free. Beauty has always been hurled as a weapon. It has always taken the form of an exclusive club; and supposed protection against violence, isolation and pain, but this is a myth. It is not true, even for those accepted in to the club. I don’t think we can reclaim beauty. Magnificence has always been with us. Always been there in the freak shows—staring back at the gawking crowd, in the back rooms of the brothels, in the fields fresh with cotton, on the street corners in the middle of the night, as the bombs drop, in our breaths after surviving the doctor’s office, crossing the border, in the first quiet moments of a bloody face after the attack is done. Magnificence was there. Magnificence was with me in the car rides home after long days being dehumanized, abused and steeled in the medical industrial complex. It was there with me when I took my first breaths in my mother’s arms in Korea, and a week later those first days alone without her realizing I wasn’t going home. Magnificence has always been with us. If we are ever unsure about what femme should be or how to be femme, we must move toward the ugly. Not just the ugly in ourselves, but the people and communities that are ugly, undesirable, unwanted, disposable, hidden, displaced. This is the only way that we will ever create a femme-ness that can hold physically disabled folks, dark skinned people, trans and gender non-conforming folks, poor and working class folks, HIV positive folks, people living in the global south and so many more of us who are the freaks, monsters, criminals, villains of our fairytales, movies, news stories, neighborhoods and world. This is our work as femmes of color: to take the notion of beauty (and most importantly the value placed upon it) **and dismantle it (challenge it), not just in gender, but** wherever it is being used to harm people, to exclude people, to shame people; as a justification for violence, colonization and genocide. If you leave with anything today, leave with this: you are magnificent. There is magnificence in our ugliness. There is power in it, far greater than beauty can ever wield. Work to not be afraid of the Ugly—in each other or ourselves. Work to learn from it, to value it. Know that every time we turn away from ugliness, we turn away from ourselves. And always remember this: I would rather you be magnificent, than beautiful, any day of the week. I would rather you be ugly—magnificently ugly.

#### Beauty is defined by difference—it requires ugly as a condition of existence—this value structure manifests in intersecting forms of oppression

Kuhne 2010 (Thomas “Struggling for Beauty: Body Aesthetics and Social Conflict in Modern History”

<http://www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/KuehneStrugglingforBeauty.pdf>)

Beauty matters. That it matters can be easily measured by the amount of money and the time people spend on making their bodies beautiful. Since the 1990s, beauty, understood as body aesthetics, has drawn scholarly attention in various disciplines, but has escaped closer examination in social and cultural history. Sociology, psychology, literature, and visual arts have focused on hegemonic discourses; black studies and gender studies have investigated in nonhegemonic body aesthetics. Inspired by these works, Struggling for Beauty provides what is missing in current academic and popular discussions: an inquiry in the historical fluidity of rivaling body aesthetics. Which notions of beauty have been constructed by different societies? In a book-length essay focusing on the period from the eighteenth century to the present, I will link issues of self and society, body culture and visual culture, regional particularities and globalization to show how and why modern societies struggle for beauty. Beauty defines difference on its own—beautiful versus ugly—and has been seen as a marker of virtue, strength, and wealth. In modern societies, it has often been linked to other categories of social difference such as race and gender. I shall examine such linkages as well as how beauty has emerged as a special category of difference. Though racist and gendered notions of beauty always have been powerful, in the late nineteenth century a new conception of beauty emerged—beauty as the visual expression of physical health, to be achieved individually by regular exercise, healthy nutrition and appropriate lifestyle. Since that time, the idea that beauty is available to everyone has been popularized by mass media, consumer goods, mass sports, star cults, beauty pageants, and cosmetic surgery. The message is clear: You can do it! Everyone can get it! Body aesthetics have grown into a defining feature of the self, of individual identity. In praising the young, slim, athletic, and ‘Aryan’ body, the modern beauty cult has commodified racist ideas of the Enlightenment philosophers. Yet the beauty cult has operated paradoxically to make race, gender, and class invisible. East Asians seeking plastic surgery to ‘westernize’ their eyelids and to lengthen their children’s leg bones indicate the globalization of the western beauty cult. Western fashion and cosmetics seduce consumers all over the world by merging social, sexual and racial diversity into a vision of cosmopolitan harmony. When did this development start and who supported it? In fact, the praise of the blond, slim, fit and ‘sexy’ body has been opposed by ethnic, religious, youth and regional cultures, by feminist movements, scientific institutions, and different lifestyles. Regional beauty pageants sometimes require that contestants adopt an “authentically” local appearance: their antagonism toward national or global beauty queens is not subtle. Afros, dreadlocks, and “natural” hairstyles may (though they need not) signal a visual protest against whatever is considered oppressive or “unmodern” in dominant culture. What counts in many religious cultures is “inner” beauty or, rather, how close one comes to an idealized image of “goodness” (indicated for example by the earlocks of orthodox Jews). Economic considerations are seldom irrelevant. Peasant societies appreciated corpulence in either sex as beautiful rather than as ugly. Why? In subsistence societies corpulence indicates wealth, health, and, in females, fertility and motherhood.

#### Our engagement with ugliness should be understood within the context of unease with non-normative aesthetics – recognition of the POWER of ugliness pushes back against cultural norms of shunning – the 1ac isn’t a reclaiming of beauty but rather an affirmation of ugly

Devereaux 2k5 (Mary, Ph.D., is a philosopher in the Research Ethics Program at the University of California, San Diego “The Ugly” <http://www.aesthetics-online.org/articles/index.php?articles_id=24>)

Ugliness is a topic largely neglected by aestheticians. This neglect no doubt has many roots. Here I’d like to explore just one, namely our uneasiness with saying that people are ugly. We speak readily enough about the moral failings of our fellows, e.g., the duplicity of political leaders or the psychological shortcomings of neighbors, relatives and co-workers. Why then does calling someone ugly make us so uneasy? We shun mention of the ugly, it seems to me, for a number of reasons. First, we naturally enough do not want to think of ourselves as ugly – especially not in the present tense. The thought that others might find us ugly is unsettling and embarrassing, particularly in a culture such as ours, where, rightly or wrongly, success, esteem and love rest so heavily upon physical appearance. So, too we generally try to avoid attributing ugliness to others. Calling the ugly ‘ugly’ – recognizing someone as ugly – is thought to be undemocratic and cruel. Undemocratic because even with a pluralistic conception of beauty, some people are going to lose. It’s bad luck, but a fact. Recognizing the ugly is cruel because, whether the judgment is mistaken (as in the case of Pecola’s self-hatred in Toni Morrison’s The Bluest Eye) or correct (as with Frankenstein’s monster), calling someone ugly may do as much or more damage as calling them a liar or a cheat. Unlike lying or cheating, ugliness seems to have few excuses, a situation worsened, ironically, by the readily availability of the cosmetic fix and the raising of the bar of “standard” good looks. Hence many of us are rightly reluctant to apply the predicate ‘ugly’ to human beings. The discomfort I am describing is intensified by a long intellectual tradition associating beauty with goodness and ugliness with evil. While a extensive line of physically attractive villains from Vronsky to Rhett Butler attests to the falseness of this connection, an equally entrenched narrative tradition insists upon its truth, using ugliness as a mark of bad character if not downright wickedness (e.g., the ugly stepmothers and stepsisters of Grimm’s fairytales). Alternatively, ugliness and the social ostracism it (unfairly) provokes may turn the good man bad, as the tale of Frankenstein’s creature and a range of others illustrate. The point is that one way or another, an ugly face is frequently associated with a form of moral badness. Medical and scientific traditions take a different slant, linking ugliness with physical rather than moral flaws, specifically with forms of ill-health. Thus the ugly comes to be taken as a reminder of our own aging, vulnerability to illness, disability, and death. Lastly, there’s the connection between beauty and happiness (or success). Aristotle’s answer to the question of whether an ugly man can be truly happy was “No,” although for reasons too complicated to pursue here. We needn’t agree of course. (Literature holds out the promise that Beauty will fall in love with the Beast – although notice, in story after story, the ‘Beast’ turns out to be a handsome prince in disguise). Recent empirical investigations of the strong correlation between felicitous looks and success in the workplace or marriage market auger even less well for the uncomely. Now in all three of these accounts, ugliness is identified with a form of badness, but the negativity in question is extrinsic. In the first case, the real object of our negative judgment is not ugliness itself but the bad moral character with which it is (wrongly) associated. In the second case, the real object of our negative judgment is again not ugliness itself, but its purported relationship with poor health and human vulnerability. So, too, in the third case where the real object of our negative judgment is the ill-fortune presumed to follow from poor looks. In each of these instances we have good reason to be suspicious of the judgments in question because of the unsavory political and social agendas with which they are associated. **The more closely we look, the more evident the inappropriateness or unfairness of the negative value attached to ugliness and the more obvious the reasons why it is not discussed**. The topic is largely avoided. But should it be? Is the role of the ugly fully accounted for by reference to fashion and prejudice? Or is there something bad about ugliness itself? Once we separate the ugly from its connection with views about morality, health and happiness, does any of its badness remain? Or is it the aim of an analysis of the ugly that no one turns out to be ugly? Is the idea to embrace a kind of eliminitivism about the ugly? **The eliminativist analysis of the ugly parallels eliminitivism about race**. On this account, no one turns out to be ugly because there is no such thing as ugliness (only, for example, veiled misogyny, racism, ageism and intolerance of difference) just as we’re to suppose, there is no such thing as a genuine, i.e., intersubjectively valid, standard of beauty. Clearly there is a tension between not wanting to embrace the eliminativist position – one that denies the proposition that we do find some people ugly – and not wanting to endorse the proposition that some people are just ugly. Perhaps judgments of the ugly would cause less trouble if we could avoid predicating ugliness of people. But a culture enthralled with the possibilities of cosmetic transformation makes it difficult to avoid the conclusion not that a few of us are ugly, but that most of us are. And while we may accept that we should not say that people are ugly, it is another thing altogether to insist that we should not find them so. In short, what I am raising in these remarks is possibility that the idea of the ugly – and in particular aesthetic judgments of the ugly – bears further investigation. With this proposal, I suspect, no one will disagree. Moving in this direction builds directly on the revival of interest in the concept of beauty and work at the intersection of aesthetics with race studies, disabilities studies, feminist theory and the history of cosmetic surgery. More controversial perhaps is the idea that the ugly bears examination in its own right. What I have been pointing to is that there seem to be (some) judgments of ugliness, period. What I have in mind here is a category of judgment that attributes intrinsic ugliness to its object, characteristics that are visibly unpleasant in their own right, independent of assumptions about bad health, bad character or ill-fortune. What leads me to this claim is this. Many feminists and other cultural critics assume that certain features or looks (small breasts, a wrinkled brow, the so-called Jewish nose) are falsely presented as ugly. The idea is that such negative judgments are or may be mistaken. If this is right, then in order to tell that such judgments are wrong, we have to have some idea of what it would be to make a correct judgment of ugliness. We need, in other words, some standard by which to separate intrinsic from extrinsic attributions of ugliness and for this we need a philosophical analysis of the ugly. We need in other words to answer the question of how ugliness in its own right is to be understood. And that, of course, is a question for aesthetics. Undertaking such an analysis may of course open aestheticians to certain political or social objections. Many of the same reasons that make talk of ugliness objectionable on racialist or gendered grounds may lead aestheticians to want to deny any possibility of intrinsic ugliness. This reluctance, particularly where human beings are concerned, is natural and proper. But it should, I suggest, be tempered by a willingness to acknowledge that social anxieties about personal misfortune, unfairness and the intractability of our attraction to beauty constitute a meaningful component of life as well as art. Perhaps it is time for the ugly to garner some of the attention routinely bestowed on its more comely cousin, beauty.

#### Even if beauty is good, we should reject its objective imposition – even if we can't change the way society has been structured, we can only weaken those dichotomies by rupturing their conceptual integrity

Craig 2k6 (Maxine, “Race, beauty, and the tangled knot of a guilty pleasure” Feminist Theory 2006 7: 159)

In 1968 inside the convention centre in Atlantic City, fifty women competed to be crowned Miss America. On the boardwalk outside of the hall, another group of women dumped bras, girdles, and false eyelashes into a trash bin to protest ‘the degrading mindless-boob-girlie symbol’ (Morgan, 1970: 585–6). The Women’s Liberation protest at the Miss America pageant attracted extensive news coverage and brought the second wave of the feminist movement into the awareness of a broader public. Many women appreciated the demonstration, which, regardless of its use of theatrical techniques, took seriously the ways in which beauty standards were oppressive to women. For others, the demonstration suggested that the women’s movement was out of touch with women’s ambivalence regarding beauty. The protesters did not seem to see that, despite the coercive pressures of beauty standards, women derive pleasure from beauty. The meaning of beauty in women’s lives continues to be a problem for feminist theory. Feminist scholarship remains caught between two competing analyses of beauty. One frames beauty as part of a structure of oppression. The other describes beauty as a potentially pleasurable instrument of female agency. Perhaps feminist theory remains stalled in this dichotomy because it has been asking the wrong questions about beauty. Michel Foucault raised new questions about the guilty pleasures of sex when he theorized sex as a product of disciplinary institutions and knowledge regimes. He encouraged his readers to ask of any ‘specific discourse on sex . . . appearing historically and in specific places . . . what were the most immediate, the most local power relations at work’ (Foucault, 1990: 97). This paper examines several specific instances of the deployment of beauty. It asks which women claimed beauty for themselves, who proclaimed the beauty of others, and what was at stake when beauty was claimed. As I explore the deployment of beauty, I will put race at the centre of my analysis. I do this with the understanding that race is co-constructed with gender and class. Thus, to write accurately about race, I also write about gender and class. The difficulty of theorizing beauty is that any body which might possibly be characterized as beautiful exists at a congested crossroads of forces. Bodies provide us with a principal means of expression, yet our bodies are read in ways that defy our intentions. We act on others through our bodies, but nonetheless our bodies are the sites of the embodiment of social controls. The body is the locus of our pleasures and it is the vehicle through which we consume. Our bodies are the targets and the subjects of advertisements.

Our bodies mark us in ways that place us in social categories and these categories may form the bases of political solidarities. Each of these uses and meanings of the body can involve beauty. The meeting of these diverse forces in our bodies confounds broad generalizations we might make about the meaning of beauty in women’s lives. I suggest that we look at beauty as a gendered, racialized, and contested symbolic resource. Since beauty is contested, at any given moment there will be multiple standards of beauty in circulation. By thinking about competing beauty standards and their uses by men and women in particular social locations, we can ask about the local power relations at work in discourses and practices of beauty and examine the penalties or pleasures they produce. If we take this approach, oppression and the production of pleasure, domination and resistance no longer exclude each other. Our dichotomies will collapse.

#### All politics is aesthetic—subordinating our 1ac to the goals of a prior political commitment is a depoliticizing move to void the interruptive potential of that aesthetic

**Schlag, '2** [Pierre, Dheidt’s Real Father/BFF and Byron White Professor of Law, University of Colorado School of Law, “Commentary: The Aesthetics of American Law” 115 Harv. L. Rev. 1047]

The various aesthetics, as suggested, are more or less conducive to various political or ethical tendencies. Perhaps a more helpful way of putting it is that political or ethical tendencies are themselves expressed in terms of the various aesthetics. It would be difficult, for instance, to articulate what we call "progressive legal thought" without the energy aesthetic and its images of energy, motion, and change. Similarly, it would be difficult to articulate multiculturalism or identity-politics without perspectivism. And similarly, it would be difficult to articulate conservatism without at some point relying on the notion of status quo and some notion of the grid. Not only do political tendencies depend upon aesthetic commitments, but arguably, it is also an intrinsic aspect of a political tendency (progressive change, multiculturalism, conservatism, etc.) to assert and affirm its own aesthetic. To put it yet another way, none of the political tendencies mentioned above are indifferent to aesthetics. **To be a conservative or a progressive is not just to take certain "substantive" positions, but to be committed to a particular aesthetic of social and political life.** At the same time, a political tendency is often obliged to play on someone else's aesthetic turf. Sometimes, even the insistent assertion of one's own aesthetic will encounter resistance, perhaps fatal resistance. Recall the failed attempts of the Supreme Court at the turn of the twentieth century to limit Congress's commerce power by drawing a grid-like distinction between commerce, on the one hand, and manufacturing, mining, and agriculture, on the other. [n222](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n222) Or recall the "all deliberate speed" and "prompt start" formulae of Brown II, [n223](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n223) which despite the invocation of an energy aesthetic, failed to summon the energy [\*1111] necessary to overcome the inertia of well-entrenched, architecturally inscribed dual school systems. [n224](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n224) Another reason that a political tendency cannot simply be yoked to a particular aesthetic is that there are political objectives that each political tendency will strive to reach (the energy aesthetic), certain positions it cannot surrender (the grid aesthetic), contextual considerations that must be accommodated (the perspectivist aesthetic), and things that must be fudged because they cannot be stabilized (the dissociative aesthetic). [n225](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n225) All of this is to say that despite its own irreducible aesthetic, each political tendency is also driven by its "substantive commitments." And in service of those commitments, any political tendency will at times opportunistically compromise or even jettison its own aesthetic. Arguably, **within any political tendency there are trade-offs, conscious or not, between form and substance, aesthetics and politics**. Viewed from the dissociative aesthetic, this very point is suspect. Indeed, it is not clear at all that politics and aesthetics are sufficiently well differentiated either conceptually or as social formations to allow us to speak cogently of a "trade-off." The relation of form and substance only arises as a political problem once form has been somehow differentiated from substance. [n226](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n226) The felt need as well as the attempt to link form to substance and law to politics depends upon a prior separation of the two. Simply to presume an unproblematic separation is to eclipse an important point about politics and power: if law is an aesthetic construct, then **the moment at which an aesthetic is** asserted or **deployed is a** **moment of power**. [n227](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n227) This is the point at which someone affirms a certain distinction - the grid - or asserts a normative goal - energy. The dissociative aesthetic enables us to step back and look askance: Why picture [\*1112] the situation in terms of a distinction, or a goal, at all? Why are these positions helpful or even possible? B. On Being Taken in There are, of course, **rhetorical uses of the aesthetics**. To the extent that these aesthetics are recognizable forms in law or legal thought, it becomes possible to characterize positions, arguments, and views as instances of this or that aesthetic. In other words, **a "substantive position**" **can be characterized/distorted**, for instance, **as** energy-like and then be criticized in terms of the vices characteristic of the energy **aesthetic**. Such rhetorical efforts can work precisely because we are accustomed to seeing law, legal arguments, theories, and the like in terms of these aesthetics. **Consciously or not, we will read "substantive positions" in terms of these aesthetics**. To the extent that **legal professionals** are unaware of the aesthetics of law, they **can be induced or seduced into accepting political or moral conclusions that they would not otherwise accept**. A wonderful example is provided by a typical reaction to the opinions in Griswold v. Connecticut.[n228](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n228) Typically, law students want to find the "uncommonly silly law" [n229](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n229) banning the sale of contraceptives unconstitutional. They also wish to recognize a constitutional right of privacy. Nonetheless, they experience Justice Stewart's dissent, which denies the existence of a constitutional right of privacy, as a solid and compelling argument. Justice Stewart writes: As to the First, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Amendments, I can find nothing in any of them to invalidate this Connecticut law ... . ... . What provision ... then, does make this state law invalid? The Court says it is the right of privacy "created by several fundamental constitutional guarantees." With all deference, I can find no such general right of privacy in the Bill of Rights, in any other part of the Constitution, or in any case ever before decided by this Court. [n230](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n230) Why is this argument compelling? In particular, why does it seem compelling to legal professionals, including possibly Justice Stewart himself, who wanted to find this "uncommonly silly law" unconstitutional? By way of answer, notice the aesthetic representation of the Constitution in Justice Stewart's dissent. Justice Stewart repeatedly divides "The Constitution" into discrete parts: discrete provisions, distinct constitutional amendments, separate cases. He invokes and evokes the [\*1113] grid. If Justice Stewart's argument seems compelling, it is because he has pictured the Constitution as an inert thing subdivided into "parts" and "provisions," none of which contain the words "right of privacy." Correspondingly, Justice Stewart exemplifies the image of the ideal grid judge. The boundaries of the law have already been set. The grid is in place, and the question is: can a judge find a right of privacy anywhere within the boundaries of any part of the Constitution? No. Look in any part of the Constitution. It's just not there. So if Justice Stewart's ultimate conclusion seems convincing, it is largely because his grid-like depiction of the Constitution is compelling. Justice Stewart's Constitution and his argument are clear, fixed, static, and solid. His opinion has the sobriety of law. By contrast, Justice Douglas's opinion for the Court reads more like an amateur exercise in metaphysical poetry than law. Justice Douglas's Constitution is in motion. Indeed, it is so much in motion that its trajectories can seem somewhat confusing. According to Justice Douglas, the specific guarantees of the Bill of Rights yield certain "emanations"; these in turn form "penumbras." [n231](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n231) In this case, those penumbras "create" (a word used repeatedly by Justice Douglas) a "zone of privacy." [n232](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n232) His opinion evokes motion, expansion, sweep, light, and shadow. One will recognize the energy aesthetic at work. Justice Douglas's Constitution is energized: it moves; it does actual work. Strikingly though, his argument seems unpersuasive. The reason is simple: it looks like all the reasoning is being done by a patchwork of images and metaphors. The reader almost cannot fail to recognize that Justice Douglas's images are doing all the work (and that these images seem contrived). This contrasts sharply with Justice Stewart's opinion, in which the aesthetic remains hidden. It is hard to be taken in by an aesthetic when someone throws it in your face, which is precisely what Justice Douglas does. Notice, however, that once the aesthetics are revealed, Justice Stewart's image of the Constitution as a collection of parts organized in an inert grid is no more obviously compelling than Justice Douglas's view of the Constitution as extending the protection of rights. In fact, once we cast Justice Douglas's hyperboles aside, what he does for constitutional rights in Griswold is not very different from what Chief Justice Marshall did somewhat more elegantly for the powers of Congress in M'Culloch v. Maryland. [n233](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n233) [\*1114] The point is that one can be taken in by the aesthetics of law. A position that may seem inexorable, or compelling, may upon reflection turn out to be an effect of operating or thinking within a particular aesthetic - **one that is itself neither necessary nor particularly appealing**. In Griswold, for instance, once one recognizes Justice Stewart's deployment of a grid-like aesthetic, his opinion loses much of its rhetorical power. [n234](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1285963865432&returnToKey=20_T10249922497&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.350160.1565320562#n234)Legal professionals can be taken in by aesthetic images for the simple reason that the aesthetics are taken to be the articulation of law itself. And one ends up, as often as not, working within an aesthetic that is not at all hospitable to one's own political or ethical views. The reverse, of course, is also true: one is sometimes taken in by a political or ethical view that is not at all conducive to one's own aesthetics.

## 2ac

### Appropriation (przybylo)

#### Public spaces are key – performative embrace of ugliness shapes the debate space through disrupting and deconstructing binaries existing in arguments and performances in the activity now

Przybyło 2010 (Ela, currently completing a PhD in Women's Studies at York University, “The Politics of Ugliness” <http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_180322_en.pdf>)

Second, ugliness may be deployed strategically, through an active and exaggerated performance of ugliness in public spaces. Since the production of beauty requires not only a specific appearance but also a certain code of behaviours, feminists may strategically enact „ugly‟ behaviours as a means of deconstructing binaries such as beauty/ugliness, clean/dirty, public/private, and man/woman. Bartky refers to „disciplinary practices that produce a body which in gesture and appearance is recognizably feminine‟ (1990, p.65, emphasis added). These disciplinary practices function to prescribe the body’s sizes and contours, its appetite, posture, gestures and general comportment in space and the appearance of each of its visible parts. (p.80) An excessive performance, performative confusion, or complete disregard of these normative behaviours and practices thus allows for a disruption of the conventions of beauty. Karina Eileraas, in „Witches, Bitches, and Fluids‟, explores the performed ugliness of punk and rock girl bands such as Hole. They deploy ugliness through ugly shrieks and wails (1997, p.127), ripped stockings and smudged make-up (p.129), ugly stage aggression (p.129), and the presence of ugly, dirty bodily fluids (p.132). In such ways, Eileraas argues, some girl bands perform ugliness, dismember femininity and normative feminine behaviours, and actively deconstruct spaces of beauty/ugliness and masculinity/femininity through „parad[ing], parrot[ing], and parody[ing]‟ (1997, p.135). It is exactly such multidimensional and excessive performances of ugliness, which create spaces of binary ambiguity and flux. Through acting ugly, and „doing‟ ugly, ugliness is privileged as a site of expression and as an effective feminist tool for unsettling prescriptive norms of behaviour. Finally, ugliness can be deployed strategically through the very act of performative self-naming. At the beginning of this essay, I discussed Kincaid‟s strategy of deploying ugliness against neocolonizers. Edwidge Danticat, on the other hand, provides an instance of the reappropriation or „embrace‟ of the category of ugliness through a deployment of it onto herself. Speaking of the multiple oppressions that Haitian women face, she rallies around a Haitian idiom: we must scream this as far as the wind can carry our voices. “Nou lèd, nou la!” We are ugly, but we are here! (2003, p.27, emphasis added) Through applying the label of ugliness onto herself (and „her people‟), Danticat immobilizes anyone who might want to hurt her by way of using the term „ugly‟ against her. She performs ugliness strategically, through „embracing‟ the category, deploying it in her own name, and reassembling it as something to be proud of. Acknowledging the political implications behind „ugliness‟ – such as racism, colonialism, sexism, and poverty – Danticat refuses to be immobilized by ugliness or by people who may use the term against her. Instead, she exploits it to her own uses, performs it, and deconstructs its meaning through reconfiguring it as a site of pride: as a site of presence, struggle, and endurance.

### Taylor (finished in 1ar)

#### Regardless of the beneficial movement politics attached to their speech act the attempt to prioritize their own bodies through negation is deeply solipsistic . If you don't have a clear idea of what saying no the aff means you should use the permutation as a concrete challenge to the canonization of aesthetic hierarchies. Identifying with the 1AC as a symbolic action to promote humane social orders is a reason to vote aff that should frame your ballot

**Taylor, '98** [Clyde R. Taylor, film scholar and literary/cultural essayist, is Professor at the Gallatin School and in Africana Studies, New York University. His publications include Vietnam and Black America and the script for Midnight Ramble, a documentary about early Black independent cinema.“The Mask of Art—breaking the aesthetic contract”]

No form of discursive irony is more important to this analytical frame­work than radical resistance. Without radical resistance, there would be no return of the repressed, no challenge to the canon, or the curriculum, no serious interruption to the monologue of European narcissism—no crisis of knowledge. For all the value of the Aesopian voice, its subtleties, complexities, and relative openness to multiple points of view, that voice might ring with an unsettling hollowness, suggestive of abnegation, lack­ing the presence of another voice and perspective in the neighborhood, less tentative, more promising of a full and complete humanity existing apart from the authorized possibilities and determined to fight for its pre­rogatives. Without doubt, the insinuations of resistance form part of the ex­change among the rivals and competitors for Power, and between Power and its victims, even when those insinuations go unvoiced. Power, para­doxically, longs to hear its rebuttal from its victims, and spends idle mo­ments of reverie elaborately imagining them. **But it is the terrible genius of radical resistance, when it finally breaks into speech, that it is full of unwanted surprises, carrying a menace not really anticipated in the day­dreams of confrontation and debate entertained by the powerful.** Far from what is often imagined, **radical resistance is much more com­plicated than just saying "no" to repression**. Radical resistance comprises the highest consciousness of the politics of representation standing out­side the privileged circle of expression. **The goal of radical resistance must be to find effective forms of symbolic action promoting a more hu­mane social order**. **This may be very different from hurling inflammatory language** at the Palace walls. **The rhetoric or resentment sometimes in­cludes the simplistic reversal of the law of the authorities**, **or worse, the mere exchange of identities between oppressor and oppressed, without any reduction in the universe of abuse**. "To turn their evil backwards isto live," was one anagramatic formulation of this impulse.' But of course such a "radical" strategy ends by replicating the influence of the center, co-signing its alienations. Radical resistance carries its own internal contradictions—confusing gestures reaching toward liberation but hampered by the fears and psy­chic burdens that distort the movement toward a more positive social or­der. Gross hyperbole often arises out of a fear of reproducing in oneself the blindness of Cyclopism or the moral ambiguities of Weak Aesopian-ism. That same fear may also lead to muzzling the name of the colonizer, as though that name, like a ghost, will haunt and control one's own thinking. **Equally limiting is the politics of** *ressentirnent,* of spite, the dim politics of emotional venting, blind **rage**, or fantasies of extravagant, hos­tile conspiracies, **or competitions in excess verbiage rampant among the alienated.** **Beyond these simplistic reflex gestures and their momentary narcissis­tic satisfactions**, radical resistance includes the understanding that what must be resisted, as well as offensive portrayals, is a regime of represen­tation that has been centuries in the making. The logic of the present cri­sis demands a particular self-consciousness about its immanence, an awareness of its particular secret, which the dominant order wishes to keep hidden—that the future of that order is not guaranteed. That logic also insists on a double vision regarding representations, viewing them in terms of their specific historical moment, but at the same time as they function within a large-scale historical framework. Within this logic, **the alerted reader will** **never allow herself to accept the idea that a discussion about racial representation** in the Uncle Remus tales, for instance, or Charlie Chan, the Richard Pryor movie *The Toy,* or *The Emperor Jones, Imi­tation of Life, The Birth of a Nation, Amos 'n Andy, The Adventures of Huckle­berry Finn,* a racialized item on the eleven o'clock news, racist Disney films like *Jungle Book* or *Aladdin,* or the liberal lesbian movie, *Fried Green Tomatoes****,* is an isolated moment and not a fragment of a discursive se­quence intimately related to the foundation of modern slavery and high colonialism** **as they flourished in the nineteenth century** and the ration­ales for these systems laid down in the European Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. The ironies of discourse set up a situation where knowledge is being continually recoded—where one narrative is continually challenged by a counternarrative. But this inescapable fact of language is given a new ur­gency in our present historical period. Received wisdom has come under assault since the 195os on a scale unlike anything since the Euro-enlight‑enment. The present crisis of knowledge has sharpened these ironies into the needling debates of countless culture wars. Broadly speaking, the battle rages between dominant, old knowledge and resistant, new perspectives. (The usual provisos need be entered here: dominant knowl­edge is not monolithic; it is always contested from within as well as from without; and despite labels such as PC, new perspectives are also not monolithic.) At the heart of our contemporary search for reliable ways of knowing lies the fact that the systems of knowledge sponsored by the l'alace have been used in monumental lies about those outside its con­fines, and those who have been lied to and lied about have abruptly made themselves heard through withering critiques. Since World War II a bat­tery of contradictions loom before monological Euro-centered knowl­edge, accelerating toward a showdown. Indeed, the Japanese nationalism of World War II was as much a violent resistance to Western domination as was the non-violent anti-colonial movement of Ghandianism that be­gan long before that Great War. The history of global cultural resistance has yet to be written. But that resistance has grown in form and substance to give Monopolated Light and Power an unwanted, shadowy double; **wherever we encounter domi­nant, centered Western ideology, we are now aware that there is**, some­where in the immediate environment, **another story waiting to be told**. One sure sign of this doubling of discourse is the proliferation of brilliant cultural alternatives, flaunting their pagan difference from authorized "civilized" mores: the spirituals, the blues, the calinda, rumba, folktales, ragtime, *cinema nuovo,* jazz, rhythm and blues, bossa nova, Soul, reggae, highlife, zouk, hip hop. **The intent of the many alternative narratives that now contest the au­thorized version is to revise or recode its interpretations of reality**. Our father, who art in heaven The white man owe me eleven and give me seven; Thy kingdom come, they will be done, If I hadn't took that I wouldn't got none.' This ditty from enslaved Africans in the United States parodies the bib­lical "Lord's Prayer" not merely to interrogate Christianity and the West­ern claim to authority over Christian knowledge, but also as rebuttal to Christian apologies for slavery. It insinuates a hidden knowledge, based in material, economic experience as opposed to the idealistic rationales of "civilized" discourse. If the delicate, modest poems of Phillis Wheatley, the African-born slave girl who became a gifted protegee of a New En‑gland family and author of chiseled neo-classical verse, give us an early example of Weak Aesopianism, this slave song exemplifies an early in­stance of radical resistance to authorized truth.

### View from nowhere (disch)

#### Only our distancing of identity from advocacy allows for us to occupy multiple perspectives from our diverse intersection of identites and histories -- this is not a view from nowhere but rather involves engagin with a plurality of historically situated positions. Their insistence on proximity to oppression as a yardstick for authenticity only reifies power relations -- this turns the aff

**DISCH ‘93** (Lisa J.; Professor of Political Theory – University of Minnesota, “More Truth Than Fact: Storytelling as Critical Understanding in the Writings of Hannah Arendt,” Political Theory 21:4, November)

What Hannah Arendt called “my old fashioned storytelling”7 is at once the most elusive and the most provocative aspect of her political philosophy. The apologies she sometimes made for it are well known, but few scholars have attempted to discern from these “scattered remarks” as statement of epistemology or method.8 Though Arendt alluded to its importance throughout her writings in comments like the one that prefaces this essay, this offhandedness left an important question about storytelling unanswered: how can thought that is “bound” to experience as its only “guidepost” possibly be critical? I discern an answer to this question in Arendt’s conception of storytelling, which implicitly redefines conventional understandings of objectivity and impartiality. Arendt failed to explain what she herself termed a “rather unusual approach”9 to political theory because she considered methodological discussions to be self-indulgent and irrelevant to real political problems.10 This reticence did her a disservice because by failing to explain how storytelling creates a vantage point that is both critical and experiential she left herself open to charges of subjectivism.11 As Richard Bernstein has argued, however, what makes Hannah Arendt distinctive is that she is neither a subjectivist nor a foundationalist but, rather, attempts to move “beyond objectivism and relativism.”12 I argue that Arendt’s apologies for her storytelling were disingenuous; she regarded it not as an anachronistic or nostalgic way of thinking but as an innovative approach to critical understanding. Arendt’s storytelling proposes an alternative to the model of impartiality defined as detached reasoning. In Arendt’s terms, impartiality involves telling oneself the story of an event or situation form the plurality of perspectives that constitute it as a public phenomenon. This critical vantage point, not from outside but from within a plurality of contesting standpoints, is what I term “situated impartiality.” Situated impartial knowledge is neither objective disinterested nor explicitly identified with a single particularistic interest. Consequently, its validity does not turn on what Donna Haraway calls the “god trick,” the claim to an omnipotent, disembodied vision that is capable of “seeing everything from nowhere.”13 But neither does it turn on a claim to insight premised on the experience of subjugation, which purportedly gives oppressed peoples a privileged understanding of structures of domination and exonerates them of using power to oppress. The two versions of standpoint claims – the privileged claim to disembodied vision and the embodied claim to “antiprivilege” from oppression – are equally suspect because they are simply antithetical. Both define knowledge positionally, in terms of proximity to power; they differ only in that they assign the privilege of “objective” understanding to opposite poles of the knowledge/power axis. Haraway argues that standpoint claims are insufficient as critical theory because they ignore the complex of social relations that mediate the connection between knowledge and power. She counters that any claim to knowledge, whether advanced by the oppressed or their oppressors, is partial. No one can justifiably lay claim to abstract truth, Haraway argues, but only to “embodied objectivity,” which she argues “means quite simply situated knowledges.”14 There is a connection between Arendt’s defense of storytelling and Haraway’s project, in that both define theory as a critical enterprise whose purpose is not to defend abstract principles or objective facts but to tell provocative stories that invite contestation form rival perspectives.15

### Root Cause

#### Aesthetic exclusion is the root cause of racism

Pontynen 2k2 (Arthur, “THE AESTHETICS OF RACE VERSUS THE BEAUTY OF HUMANITY”

http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/700191/posts

There is no cultural issue more explosive today than race. It is a matter that continually evades any attempt at rational analysis and instead distorts our politics and inflames the passions. A sad consequence is the debasement of our cultural life. Rather than being united by objects of love, by shared and commonly embraced ideals, we are increasingly divided along racial lines by competing objects of desire, all presumed to be of equal value, each demanding its due. Such competing desires, because they make exclusive, universal claims, cannot possibly be satisfied. At the heart of the deep racial divisions in our nation today is the concept of race itself, which wrongly extrapolates from superficial, physical differences (skin color) to conclusions about substantial, moral differences (ways of perceiving the world, values, and ideas). Consider just a few of the controversies afflicting us recently. Potentially a source of common civic inspiration, the proposed New York City firefighters memorial commemorating heroic responses to the World Trade Center disaster quickly became the focus of an uncivil dispute pitting simple truth and historical accuracy against racial representation and “inclusiveness.” . . . What makes these disputes so utterly puerile is that, for all their superficial differences, both sides agree on a fundamental assumption: that culture is aesthetic, meaning that it is composed solely of facts and feelings of individual and group experiences. The tragedy is that when culture is viewed as aesthetic, race must necessarily dominate our thinking and our values, with no possibility for improvement. Fortunately, we do have a way out of the conundrum of race, and that is to reject it precisely because it is an aesthetic concept—a development that resulted, rather recently, from the Enlightenment—and return to what Western culture perennially strives for: the apprehension, appreciations and realization of beauty. Beauty and Aesthetics The suggestion that racism is an aesthetic-based problem that can be solved by a renewed appreciation for beauty may strike some as odd or naïve. Nonetheless, aesthetics, which came to replace the perennial ideal of beauty, is foundational to the very idea of racism. Let’s clarify our terms to avoid inflaming further an already contentious debate. Just what do we mean by aesthetics and beauty? The term aesthetic is a relatively recent one, coined only in the eighteenth century by philosopher Alexander Baumgarten (Aesthetica, 1750). It literally refers to that which is immediate to experience, that which concerns facts or feelings. The notion of aesthetics is associated with the rise of what is erroneously called the Enlightenment. It coincides with and is based on the rise of scientism (a belief that facts provide all that we can know of the world and life) and emotivism (the premise that moral judgments are mere statements of preference, not obligatory principles measured against some universal standard; thus, to say, “Murder is wrong,” means only, “I hate murder!”). Today the termaesthetic is widely viewed as synonymous with beauty, just as fact is falsely equated with truth. These are false equations, however, because the words represent very different understandings of reality and life. From an aesthetic point of view, reality and life are purposeless; their meaning is a matter of one’s individual tastes. But according to the perennial conception of beauty, reality and life are purposeful and inherently infused with meaning.

#### Embracing ugliness comes ontologically prior to the 1NC

Zizek 1996 (Slavoj, “From desire to drive: Why Lacan is not Lacanian**”** http://zizek.livejournal.com/2266.html)

The Lacanian name for this "regulation of madness" is the symbolization of the real by means of which the formless, "ugly," real is (trans)formed into reality. Contrary to the standard idealist argument which conceives ugliness as the defective mode of beauty, as its distortion, one should assert the ontological primacy of ugliness: it is beauty which is a kind of defense against the Ugly in its repulsive existence or, rather, existence tout court, since, as we shall see, what is ugly is ultimately the brutal fact of existence (of the real) as such [4]. The ugly object is an object which is in the wrong place, which "shouldn't be there." This does not mean simply that the ugly object is no longer ugly the moment that we relocate it to its proper place; the point is rather that an ugly object is "in itself" out of place, on account of the distorted balance between its "representation" (the symbolic features we perceive) and "existence" - ugly, out of place, is the excess of existence over representation. Ugliness is thus a topological category; it designates an object which is in a way "larger than itself," whose existence is larger than its representation. The ontological presupposition of ugliness is therefore a gap between an object and the space it occupies, or - to make the same point in a different way - between the outside (surface) of an object (captured by its representation) and its inside (formless stuff). In the case of beauty, we have a perfect isomorphism in both respects, while in the case of ugliness, the inside of an object somehow is (appears) larger than the outside of its surface-representation (like the uncanny buildings in Kafka's novels which, once we enter them, appear much more voluminous than what they seemed when viewed from the outside). Another way to put it is to say that what makes an object "out of place" is that it is too close to me, like the Statue of Liberty in Hitchcock's Foreign Correspondent: seen from the extreme proximity, it loses its dignity and acquires disgusting, obscene features. In courtly love, the figure of die Frau-Welt obeys the same logic: she appears beautiful from the proper distance, but the moment the poet or the knight serving her approaches her too closely (or when she asks him to come close to her so that she can repay him for his faithful service), she turns her other, reverse side to him, and what was previously the semblance of a fascinating beauty, is suddenly revealed as putrefied flesh, crawling with snakes and worms, the disgusting substance of life, as in the films of David Lynch, where an object turns into the disgusting substance of Life as soon as the camera gets too close to it. The gap that separates beauty from ugliness is thus the very gap that separates reality from the Real: the kernel of reality is horror, horror of the Real, and that which constitutes reality is the minimum of idealization which the subject needs in order to be able to sustain the Real. Another way to make the same point is to define ugliness as the excess of stuff which penetrates through the pores in the surface, from science-fiction aliens whose liquid materiality overwhelms their surfaces (see the evil alien in Terminator 2 or, of course, the alien from Alien itself), to the films of David Lynch (especially Dune), in which the raw flesh beneath the surface constantly threatens to emerge on the surface. In our standard phenomenological attitude towards the body of another person, we conceive the surface (of a face, for example) as directly expressing the "soul" - we suspend the knowledge of what actually exists beneath the skin surface (glands, flesh...). The shock of ugliness occurs when the surface is actually cut, opened up, so that the direct insight into the actual depth of the skinless flesh dispels the spiritual, immaterial, pseudo-depth. In the case of beauty, the outside of a thing - its surface - encloses and overcoats its interior, whereas in the case of ugliness, this proportionality is perturbed by the excess of the interior stuff which threatens to overwhelm and engulf the subject. This opens up the space for the opposite excess, that of something which is not there and should be, like the missing nose which makes the "phantom of the opera" so ugly. Here, we have the case of a lack which also functions as an excess, the excess of a ghostly, spectral materiality in search of a "proper," "real" body. Ghosts and vampires are shadowy forms in desperate search for the life-substance (blood) in us, actually existing humans. The excess of stuff is thus strictly correlative to the excess of spectral form: Deleuze has already pointed out how the "place without an object" is sustained by an "object lacking its proper place" - it is not possible for the two lacks to cancel each other. What we have here are the two aspects of the real, existence without properties and an object with properties without existence. Suffice it to recall the well-known scene from Terry Gilliam's Brasil, in which the waiter in a high-class restaurant recommends the best offers from the daily menu to his customers ("Today, our tournedos is really special!" etc.), yet, what the customers are given on making their choice is a dazzling color photo of the meal on a stand above the plate, and, on the plate itself, a loathsome excremental paste-like lump: this split between the image of the food and the real of its formless, excremental remainder perfectly exemplifies the two modes of ugliness, the ghost-like substanceless appearance ("representation without existence") and the raw stuff of the real ("existence without appearance"). One should not underestimate the weight of this gap, which separates the "ugly" Real from the fully-formed objects in "reality:" Lacan's fundamental thesis is that a minimum of "idealization," of the interposition of a fantasmatic frame by means of which the subject assumes a distance from the Real, is constitutive of our "sense of reality" - "reality" occurs insofar as it is not (it does
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### Subotnik

#### Our argument isn't “hey, what about white people” – its that the threshold they have for why we automatically lose is disingenuous and can ONLY lead to cynicism

**Subotnik 1998** – professor of law, Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center (7 Cornell J. L. & Pub. Pol'y 681)

Having traced a major strand in the development of CRT, we turn now to the strands' effect on the relationships of CRATs with each other and with outsiders. As the foregoing material suggests, the central CRT message is not simply that minorities are being treated unfairly, or even that individuals out there are in pain - assertions for which there are data to serve as grist for the academic mill - but that **the minority scholar** himself or herself hurts and hurts badly.

An important problem that concerns the very definition of the scholarly enterprise now comes into focus. What can an academic trained to [\*694] question and to doubt n72 possibly say to Patricia Williams when effectively she announces, "I hurt bad"? n73 "No, you don't hurt"? "You shouldn't hurt"? "Other people hurt too"? Or, most dangerously - and perhaps most tellingly - "What do you expect when you keep shooting yourself in the foot?" If the majority were perceived as having the well- being of minority groups in mind, these responses might be acceptable, even welcomed. And they might lead to real conversation. But, writes Williams, the failure by those "cushioned within the invisible privileges of race and power... to incorporate a sense of precarious connection as a part of our lives is... ultimately obliterating." n74

"Precarious." "Obliterating." These words will clearly invite responses only from fools and sociopaths; they will, by **effectively precluding objection**, disconcert and disunite others. "I hurt," in academic discourse, has three broad though interrelated effects. First, it demands priority from the reader's conscience. It is for this reason that law review editors, waiving usual standards, have privileged a long trail of undisciplined - even silly n75 - destructive and, above all, self-destructive arti [\*695] cles. n76 Second, by emphasizing the emotional bond between those who hurt in a similar way, "I hurt" discourages fellow sufferers from abstracting themselves from their pain in order to gain perspective on their condition. n77

[\*696] Last, as we have seen, it precludes the possibility of **open and structured conversation** with others. n78

[\*697] It is because of this conversation-stopping effect of what they insensitively call "first-person agony stories" that Farber and Sherry deplore their use. "The norms of academic civility hamper readers from challenging the accuracy of the researcher's account; it would be rather difficult, for example, to criticize a law review article by questioning the author's emotional stability or veracity." n79 Perhaps, a better practice would be to put the scholar's experience on the table, along with other relevant material, but to subject that experience to the same level of scrutiny.

If through the foregoing rhetorical strategies CRATs succeeded in limiting academic debate, why do they not have greater influence on public policy? Discouraging white legal scholars from entering the national conversation about race, n80 I suggest, has generated a kind of cynicism in white audiences which, in turn, has had precisely the reverse effect of that ostensibly desired by CRATs. It drives the American public to the right and ensures that anything CRT offers is reflexively rejected.

In the absence of scholarly work by white males in the area of race, of course, it is difficult to be sure what reasons they would give for not having rallied behind CRT. Two things, however, are certain. First, the kinds of issues raised by Williams are too important in their implications  [\*698]  for American life to be confined to communities of color. If the lives of minorities are heavily constrained, if not fully defined, by the thoughts and actions of the majority elements in society, it would seem to be of great importance that white thinkers and doers participate in open discourse to bring about change. Second, given the lack of engagement of CRT by the community of legal scholars as a whole, the discourse that should be taking place at the highest scholarly levels has, by default, been displaced to faculty offices and, more generally, the streets and the airwaves.