October 2013

“A Story to Pass On”: *Beloved* and the Recasting of the Past

Jeremy Colangelo
jcolang2@uwo.ca

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/wordhoard

Part of the Arts and Humanities Commons

Recommended Citation
Available at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/wordhoard/vol1/iss2/8
"A Story to Pass On":
Beloved and the Recasting of the Past
by Jeremy Colangelo

Toni Morrison’s use of the Margaret Garner story as inspiration for Beloved has become necessary foreknowledge for any scholarly reading of the novel, but what few critics seem to acknowledge is the conceptual inconsistency that this origin creates. Beloved’s final driving-out by the townspeople at the end of the novel is frequently read as an indication that the town has moved beyond its historic trauma. But how can this reading exist alongside the widespread retelling of Garner’s real, historical trauma that Beloved’s dissemination caused? This question is not a quibble, but is instead an interrogation of a serious contradiction present in the novel’s relationship to the history it describes. How can it spend so many pages describing a traumatic past only to then say that such a past should be forgotten, that “it was not a story to pass on” (323)? I argue that this question is only problematic so long as we continue to see the driving out of Beloved as a totally beneficial act, rather than a temporary reprieve from an endemic problem. Arguments along this line often posit the character Beloved as an avatar for (or physical manifestation of) the historical trauma suffered by African-Americans from the first kidnappings across the Middle Passage to just after the American Civil War, which is when most of the novel takes place. Beloved’s final banishment, then, brings closure to the traumas suffered, as it allows the characters to escape the haunting of their past traumas and instead look forward towards a better existence. I argue instead that in Beloved, it is not the re-telling of history that inflicts trauma, but instead the creation of a historical narrative that re-inflicts the past instead of testifying on it.

Evidence in favour of this reading can be found in both Beloved’s birth (and later re-birth), which both occur during periods of relative happiness, and also the nature of Beloved’s subsequent parasitic relationship with Sethe. Put simply, the trouble that Beloved causes is quite closely connected to African-American collective trauma—but it is an ongoing trauma, and not a historical one, which causes this trouble to occur. Problems like Sethe’s difficult financial situation, her abandonment by the town, and the mistreatment she receives from several white characters all stem from social issues that will still be present for decades after the book takes place (and arguably still exist...
These issues come together in Sethe’s role as Beloved’s mother: a role that is completely undermined by the echoes of slavery, and that makes it impossible for Sethe to control the present manifestations of her trauma, the impoverished position inherited from history making it impossible to reclaim control of that history’s contemporary manifestation. In *Beloved*, the trauma of the past is contiguous with the trauma of the present, and in fact it is the inability to define and conceptualise the past that (as I will show) is what allows it to continue to do harm—a reading that grows stronger once we consider the racial politics of the time in which the novel was written.

I.

Beloved, the character, has been read as a figurative representation of African-American history for almost as long as *Beloved* has been studied. “She is a composite symbol,” writes Terry Otten, “not just Sethe’s dead child . . . but also the representative of the ‘Sixty Million and More’ to whom Morrison alludes in her headnote” (83). Her “presence,” writes Sam Durrant, constitutes “the materialisation of racial memory” (101). But these readings elide several complicating factors present in Beloved’s origin and development. In Beloved’s first corporeal appearance she experiences a second birth as a “fully dressed woman [who] walked out of the water . . . [with] new skin, lineless and smooth, including the knuckles on her hands” (61). As Beloved emerges, Sethe experiences an uncontrollable urge to urinate, and does so in such quantity that she compares the flow to that which was released as her water broke when she gave birth to Denver (61). The birth scene establishes immediately Beloved’s liminal identity. Beloved’s smooth skin distinguishes her from her heritage first by giving her the un-humanlike (and uncanny) quality of having no wrinkles on her hands or joints, second by showing no marks from her violent death (wounds which, had she survived them, would have left a scar), and third by establishing Beloved as her mother’s opposite by way of the large scar on Sethe’s back, which resembles a “chokecherry tree” (18). Beloved’s emergence from the water also recalls the transportation of slaves over the Middle Passage. The river is, however, also the town’s main source of transit and income—“this is a city of water,” Mr Garner tells Baby Suggs as he drives her in to town (168)—which establishes that Beloved has emerged not only from Sethe’s metaphorical womb, but also from both the town’s shared historical trauma and its relatively more prosperous present. Beloved is therefore born of the conflict between the horror elicited from the traumatic past and the townspeople’s need to move past that horror in order to construct a viable post-slavery identity. Beloved’s function as the avatar of history becomes clearer once we take into account Morrison’s inspiration—the aforementioned story of Margaret Garner, the ex-slave who killed her children to keep them safe from an approaching party of slave-catchers. Beloved’s origin is therefore mired in paradox. Her first appearance suggests a
second birth out of Sethe, but much about the circumstances of that birth, along with Beloved’s physical appearance, makes her apart from her mother. Morrison reiterates this conflict in the novel’s coda, describing Beloved as “the girl who waited to be loved” (323, emphasis mine), with the difference between “being loved” (i.e. “beloved”) and “waiting to be loved” amounting only to a space on the page. Beloved’s description in the coda establishes that the origin of her parasitic relationship with Sethe lies in her hunger for affection.

Beloved’s dangerous love derives from the conflict between the degree to which she demands intimacy from those around her and the estrangement between physical and emotional intimacy established by slavery. The most striking appearance of this conflict of intimacy is the murder, where Sethe takes on the role of the self-sacrificial mother while also doing violence to her children, and as a result becomes alienated from her two surviving sons (both of whom run away) and also from Beloved, with whom she later fruitlessly tries to re-connect via excessive care and dotage. The emotional intimacy of Sethe’s intent problematizes the physical violence of her actions. This conflict extends also to the origin of Beloved’s name. After Sethe is released from prison, she goes to plant a headstone on her daughter’s grave. Lacking money, she agrees to sleep with the engraver for “ten minutes for seven letters,” cutting “Dearly Beloved” down to just the second word (5). The manner by which Beloved received her name is, again, a conflict between emotional intimacy and physical intimacy. Sethe wants the gravestone to be an expression of her love for her dead child, but in order to have the gravestone Sethe needs to sleep with the engraver and truncate the intended epitaph. This necessity resulted from the financial limitations imposed on Sethe by racial discrimination, which made it impossible for Sethe to earn more than a living wage. Slavery, and its aftermath, has forced Sethe into a position where, in order to make even a basic expression of emotional intimacy with her daughter, she has to engage in the sham-physical intimacy of prostituting herself to the engraver. Further alienating the sexual exchange from any emotional connection is the language by which Morrison narrates the deal. The agreement is treated as a bartering of services, with the number of minutes that Sethe would agree to spend with the engraver acting as currency. Sethe gets seven letters for ten minutes, but she wonders whether “with another ten could she have gotten ‘Dearly’ too?” (5). The story of the gravestone—and, by extension, Beloved’s name—is therefore the story of a deliberately un-intimate act being used as a means to express affection. It is also the start of Sethe’s self-destructive drive to give Beloved love.

In both killing and naming Beloved, Sethe engaged in actions that left the two physically estranged while making them emotionally closer. In both cases, Sethe is performing—in an extreme form—the social function of a parent. By sleeping with the engraver, she is able to name her child, and by killing her daughter, she was able to protect her other children. Her
parenting has been deformed by the paradoxes and doublethink that sprang up from slavery’s discourse, the lingering effects of which continue to subvert the parent/child relationship even after slavery’s cessation.

Slavery’s systematic undermining of parenthood is a persistent theme throughout the novel—afflicting both Baby Suggs and Sethe’s mother in addition to Sethe herself. The three mothers, however, all respond differently to the attack on their maternity. Sethe’s mother simply disappears, and it is in her that the undermining is most complete. All of the children that Sethe’s mother bore from white men, we discover, had been thrown away (74)—an infanticide quite different from Sethe’s. Though both women killed their children as a result of the slave trade’s interference, Sethe’s murder was carried out from a desire to protect her children while Sethe’s mother had rejected outright those children who were the products of rape. Baby Suggs, meanwhile, did not give her children up, but instead had them taken from her (6). Whereas Sethe responded to the undermining of her motherhood by recoiling into her house, Baby Suggs—following the loss of Halle, her final child—instead took on the extremely public role of a preacher (102-03). Her response to the loss of her family and her parenthood is to seek the role of a community builder and public figure.

What draws the various portrayals of subverted parenthood together—and what connects them back to Beloved’s role as history’s avatar—is the shared paradox of affection being introduced into their relationships by slavery and its supporters. Beloved is in need of affection, but the novel concludes with her being driven out, presumably resulting in a material improvement in Sethe and Denver’s lives. If Beloved is a physical manifestation of the trauma inflicted by slavery, then it is easy to read the final confrontation between the villagers and Beloved as the banishment of the traumatic past to make room for a better future. However, by giving this trauma a human body, Morrison has also ascribed to it human emotional needs, including the need for intimacy. If we are to read Beloved as the avatar of a trauma in need of eviction, then what are we to make of the fact that her actions—as damaging as they are—are still the result of events entirely out of Beloved’s control, that slavery’s undermining of the family structure is hardly her fault, and that the need for affection which drives her is clearly the result of extreme trauma? If Beloved is history’s representative then how do we reconcile these mitigating factors? Part of the answer lies in the difference between cultural history and individual testimony and in the different ways that these modes of communication bestow control of the past onto those who describe it.

II.

In her foreword to the 2004 Vintage edition of Beloved, Morrison describes “the shock of liberation” that she felt after leaving her day-job in order to write full time (xvi). Her description of this “shock” is quite similar to Baby
Suggs’s reaction to her own freedom (166). In both cases, the euphoric realization of freedom does not come at the moment that it is gained but instead follows an epiphany during which the newly freed person crosses the gap between the formal achievement of emancipation (Baby Suggs’s freedom papers, for example) and the realization of that freedom both cognitively and in lived experience.

The key to the trauma experienced by Beloved’s protagonists therefore lies in the gap between the fact of freedom and the experience of freedom, and examining the moment of Suggs’s epiphany leads to a map by which that gap can be crossed. During her epiphany, Baby Suggs focuses on her ownership of her own limbs and organs, reacting in shock at the discovery of “her own heartbeat” (166). After settling into her new home and establishing herself as a preacher, Baby Suggs gives a sermon in which she defines “freedom” in terms of one’s relationship to one’s body, telling the assembly to “love your hands . . . raise them up and kiss them . . . flesh that needs to be loved” (103-04, my emphasis). Importantly, Baby Suggs’s sermon does not simply recount the uplifting moment of emancipation but also recalls the trauma inflicted by the absence of ownership over her body which she, and other ex-slaves, suffered—“they [slave owners] do not love your hands,” nor do they love African-American faces, throats, or organs (103-04). It is the resulting trauma, and the release from it, to which Baby Suggs gives testimony, and through which she seeks to emancipate the other ex-slaves who have come to hear her speak.

The giving of testimony is, in Beloved, an act of empathy by which the giver can instigate an emotional response in the receiver similar to what the giver felt while experiencing the trauma being testified to. Much in Beloved therefore anticipates the theories described by Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub in their study on the testimonials of Holocaust survivors. To give testimony, says Laub, “there needs to be a bonding, the intimate and total presence of an other—in the position of one who hears . . . the witnesses are talking to somebody: to somebody they have been waiting for for a long time” (“Bearing Witness” 70-71, original emphasis). Baby Suggs’s desire to become a preacher—to tell her story to someone—is consistent with this model. To be in possession of both a traumatic memory and the desire to speak it therefore leads logically to the need for an audience, with testimony demanding a listener by its definition. However, to be the receiver of testimony is to be in an emotionally dangerous place. Laub lists several reactions that listeners often have to traumatic testimony—these responses ranging from “a sense of total paralysis” and “numbness” to an extreme emotional response that leaves the testifier “drowned and lost in the listener’s defensive affectivity” (72-73). The common strand between these responses is the empathy of the listener—the trauma felt by the giver of the testimony being transferred over to the receiver. The responses are the subject’s subconscious attempts to mitigate these responses, to “protect himself from the offshoots of the trauma . . . that, through the testimony, comes to be directed toward him” (73).
A further intersection between *Beloved* and Laub’s description of testimony’s psychological effects is the witness’s compulsion to testify, which becomes for them an existential imperative. According to Laub, “the [Holocaust] survivors did not only need to survive so that they could tell their story. They also needed to tell their story in order to survive” (“An Event” 78). However, it is in the effects of giving testimony that *Testimony* and *Beloved* diverge. For Laub’s patients, the trauma of the Holocaust is simply too great for any amount of testifying to be enough. Describing a series of in-depth interviews that she performed as a contribution to the Yale Video Archive, Laub says that many of the subjects ended the sessions “realiz[ing] that they have only begun the long process of witnessing now—forty years after the event” (79). The events are simply so big and so overwhelming that any attempt to lock them down into words fails, leading to a “collapse of witnessing” that leaves the events distorted in the minds of the people who expressed them (80). The traumatic events have exceeded the language’s capacity to communicate, this failure of language leading to the trauma’s perpetuity in the minds of the afflicted. Thus, while testimony can help assuage the trauma suffered, it can only do so when the depth of that trauma does not overwhelm the subject’s ability to speak.

Thus, an important way in which *Beloved* goes beyond the scope of Laub’s argument is through the explication of the variability between witnesses and the degrees of difference between being rendered inarticulate and being impelled to testify—a part of the effect to which Laub gives less treatment, likely because the trauma inflicted by the Holocaust was so great that no subject could contain it. John Duvall points out an instance in which *Beloved* seems to approach, and then recede from, Laub’s construction of testimony—that being Schoolteacher’s nephew’s verbal paralysis, which he experienced after witnessing Sethe’s infanticide, and which renders him “unable to explain” what he saw (Duvall 128). This paralysis follows the pattern set out by Laub, the horror of what the nephew witnessed being too great for him to articulate. The murder does not, however, have the same effect on everyone, as it is revealed elsewhere that an abolitionist group had used it as “political capitol” to advance their campaign (*Beloved* 128-29). Laub notwithstanding, Sethe’s story was put into words, and those words served their task well enough to aid the abolitionist movement. Someone had to have witnessed the event and then intelligibly described it in order for it to have become available to the abolitionist group. Thus, the trauma that Sethe’s murder inflicts is therefore established as not being overpowering to the point that it overwhelms everyone who encounters it but is still traumatic enough that some who had seen it would face the similar problems of articulation as the Holocaust victims did. Another instance of the murders being testified occurs during Sethe’s attempts to gain Beloved’s forgiveness, which drive Sethe to describe exactly what she
had done and why (Beloved 284). Not only is Sethe giving testimony on her trauma, she is also giving that testimony to the same person whose murder she is recounting. Sethe proves unusually able to give testimony on the traumas inflicted upon her, and this ability means that the model for testimony expressed in Testimony cannot be applied to Beloved unmodified.

The divergence can be explained in terms of the difference between what Dominick LaCapra calls “writing trauma” and “writing about trauma.” An author “writing trauma” engages in a “process of acting out, working over, and to some extent working through in analyzing and ‘giving voice’ to the past,” whereas an author “writing about trauma” takes part in “the project of reconstructing the past as objectively as possible” in order to create a historical text (186). Thus, the testimony in Beloved differs from the testimony of those Laub interviewed in that the interviewees were attempting to “write about” the trauma that they had suffered (the context of the “Video Archive” implicitly historicising their interviews), whereas in Beloved Sethe and Baby Suggs’s testimonies are part of a larger attempt to “write” the trauma suffered as a result of slavery—a trauma which had up until that point remained suppressed.

We see a further iteration of this point in Morrison’s essay “Unspeakable Things Unspoken,” in which she argued that African-American writers had become “the subjects of [their] own narrative, witnesses to and participants in [their] own experience, and . . . in the experiences of those with whom [they] have come in contact” (375). Morrison argues that American literary tradition had, in order to continue suppressing the vast African-American influence on American history and culture, chosen “romanticism” over “verisimilitude” in its description of inter-racial relations, a decision that Morrison says has often “succeeded in paralyzing both the work and its criticism” and had caused “a virtual infantilization of the writer’s intellect” that rendered harmless any attack on the white male hegemony (378). Following these lines, Angelyn Mitchell argues for Beloved being in part a response to the “retrograde” racial politics of the Regan administration, which “played to the fears of White America” in order to undermine affirmative action (106). Mitchell argues that Morrison was writing “against the possibility of contemporary disenfranchisement”—with Mitchell’s primary example here being the so-called “welfare queen”—by establishing history’s continuity in the present, and “forc[ing] her readers . . . to rethink what they know about their own existence in the context of a history of bondage” (107). The “welfare queen” social construct was an idea that gained currency in the nineteen eighties and nineties and can be considered a more racialized version of the so-called “undeserving poor”—that is, a subset of those who live off government assistance but, for a variety of cultural and ideological reasons, are thought to be doing too little to remedy their financial situation and therefore are “undeserving” of aid. The prototypical “welfare
queen” usually appears as a grab-bag of racial stereotypes and wishes only to remain on welfare as long as possible, having no interest in finding work. To give testimony on the trauma of the past was therefore an imperative not only in a literary and cultural sense but in a political and historical one as well. The invention of the “welfare queen” was, essentially, the invention of a distorted African-American cultural identity by a group of white men who did so in order to undermine exactly the kind of programs that were needed to undo the damage caused by the prior enslavement of the African-American population. In subverting these programs, and in doing so through cultural appropriation, the creators of the “welfare queen” had disclaimed any cultural responsibility for the economic hardships faced by the benefactors of affirmative action and—by implication—were acting as if slavery had never happened.

The problem faced by African-American writers at the time of Beloved’s publication is exactly a lack of testimony—not because the trauma of the events involved was too great, but because those writers had been subject to a decades-long campaign of disinformation through which their work was rendered harmless to the status quo. As Laub’s Holocaust survivors show, those who have suffered a great trauma will feel the need to testify on it, and will continue to do so even after their language fails them. Morrison argues that the failure of earlier African-American literature to give this testimony is not due to the writers’ failure to encapsulate the trauma in their work (for Beloved indicates that such testimony is possible) but instead because of a deliberate act of suppression on the part of the literary establishment. Thus, Beloved’s mission is to fill this gap by “writing” the trauma with the “verisimilitude” that earlier (white) accounts had eschewed. It is due to this goal that Beloved’s depiction of testimony’s effect and function differs from Laub’s. In both cases, the giving and receiving of testimony is an act of empathy, with the listener experiencing emotions similar to those felt by the giver. Because Beloved seeks to use its testimony to fill in a gap in the literary tradition, and to allow those who have suffered to move beyond it, giving testimony becomes a vital component of the construction of an affirmative African-American cultural identity.

III.

It is in Beloved that history and testimony come together to fulfil the goals that Beloved has set out with. In light of the role of testimony and the historical and intellectual context in which the novel was written, I argue that the final driving-out of Beloved near the end of the book is not, as it might first seem, a rejection of the traumatic past but instead a call for that past to be drawn out into the open, exposed, and thereby taken under the control of the African-American community. Testifying on the trauma of the past robs the dominant power structures of the ability to define the standards against which
African-American cultural production is to be judged, in defiance of the “welfare queen” story that would be otherwise established if control over the racial discourse were to be handed back to the white hegemony.

*Beloved’s* coda (323-24) would seem at first to contradict this reading. The refrain, “it was not a story to pass on,” appears to be the most obvious counterpoint. However, in order to read the refrain as a command to avoid communicating the trauma of the past, one has to also argue that the three lines in question are the declarations of the author—or at least of some omniscient narrator—and are not reflections of the mindsets of the people who had witnessed the events taking place at 124 Bluestone Road. The inverse seems true. Through the chapter, the paragraphs that describe the events following Beloved’s eviction are clearly descriptions of what those people doing the eviction were thinking at the time. The first paragraph begins by stating, inclusively, that “everybody knew what she was called, but nobody anywhere knew her name” (323). This opening establishes, first, that the narration refers to a group of people (“everybody”) and that the narrator is privy to that group’s collective thoughts (“everybody knew”). The “she” and “her” clearly refer to Beloved. The other paragraphs all clearly describe events related to the preceding story—the “motion, unlike a ship’s” in the first paragraph, for example, being another reference to the Middle Passage. The third paragraph’s rhetorical question, “what made her think her fingernails could open locks the rain rained on,” alludes to both Paul D’s figurative “rusty tobacco tin” (first mentioned on 133) which Beloved opened (137-38), and the “closed portion of [Paul D’s] head” that Sethe “opened like a greased lock” (49). Finally, the fourth paragraph of the coda explicitly mentions 124 (324). The last two paragraphs, read in conjunction with the first, amount to an anthropomorphized description of the trauma of slavery and its after-effects within the group of evictors. In describing not only Beloved’s “footprints” but also the “water” that washed them away (324), the novel binds Beloved’s “birth” from the river, the Middle Passage, and the deliberate but hidden suppression of African-American culture into a single image. However, the memory of this trauma is not gone, regardless of whether its effects are dismissed as “just weather” and “certainly no clamour for a kiss” (324). If “Beloved” is to be treated as a portmanteau of “be loved,” and if Beloved is a product of slavery’s undermining of the family structure and the associated denial of familial affection, and if the coda is to be read as the narrated thoughts of the African-American community, then the narrator’s denial that the wind constitutes “a clamour for a kiss” represents the effacement of the existence of the historical suffering of African-Americans and the subsequent denial of their right to lay claim to that suffering through the giving of testimony.

If, though, the coda is an indictment of the ignorance of the past, then what of the refrain, which would seem to declare the opposite?
Their separation from the paragraphs might suggest that they are removed from this cultural memory—that while the paragraphs constitute descriptions of the thoughts and memories of the townspeople, the separated sentences’ privileged placement on the page indicates that they are to be read apart. However, there is at least one instance of the body paragraphs interacting with the refrain, which occurs during the transition between paragraphs three and four (324). Paragraph three concludes with a description of the townspeople forgetting Beloved (“in the end, they forgot her too”) before repeating the refrain “it was not a story to pass on.” The fourth paragraph, unlike all of the others, begins its first sentence with a conjunction—“so they forgot her.” The “so” suggests that the paragraph follows conceptually from something preceding it, the two candidates being the preceding paragraph and the refrain. The first option—that the “so” of the fourth paragraph picks up after the content of the third paragraph—makes little sense given the content of paragraph three. In that paragraph, the decision to forget has already been made; “the memory of the smile under her chin” has already vanished, and one cannot forget something that has already been forgotten. Furthermore, the last sentence of the third paragraph does not conjoin syntactically with the first of the fourth. If we push them together, the phrase becomes “what made her think her fingernails could open locks the rain rained on? So they forgot her,” which makes no grammatical sense. However, if we combine the refrain between the two paragraphs with the first sentence of paragraph four, it becomes the more readable: “it was not a story to pass on. So they forgot her.” Thus, the refrain is not removed from the descriptions but instead constitutes the repetition of an idea that has permeated the town’s local culture as a result of the events of the novel, and which eventually allowed others to tell their story for them—leading to the problems that the “welfare queen” image encapsulates.

To read Beloved as a rejection of history is therefore misguided. Beloved is indeed in part a cautionary tale on the uses of history, but it is neither cautioning against the embracing of history nor against facing the trauma of the past. Rather, Beloved advocates the reclamation of history, the giving of testimony about the past, and the appropriation of the racial discourse on terms free from “retrograde” political rhetoric and the “romantic,” white-dominated literary establishment. Beloved is undoubtedly history’s avatar, and her effect on Sethe at the novel’s end is quite harmful. But it is not Beloved’s presence per se which inflicts harm on Sethe, but rather the resulting inversion of the mother/daughter relationship, an inversion that is clearly the result of factors entirely out of either woman’s control. Beloved is dangerous not because she manifests the traumatic past, but because she has been allowed to slip out of Sethe’s influence. While the townspeople evicting Beloved did save Sethe’s life, their subsequent decision that the incident “was not a story to pass on” repre-
resents a tragedy—that tragedy being the failure (in Morrison’s view) of the African-American community to take control of the discourse, a failure that lead to the unsustainable state of affairs that constituted the political and cultural environment in which Beloved was written. The supposed paradox of Beloved being an a-historical historical novel is therefore an illusion. It seeks not to reject history but to reclaim it.
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1 For Morrison’s recounting of the novel’s inspiration, see her foreword to the 2004 Vintage edition (xvii-xviii).

2 For recent examples of this reading, see Moly Abel Travis’s 2010 article, “Beyond Empathy: Narrative Distancing and Ethics in Toni Morrison’s Beloved and J. M. Coetzee’s Disgrace,” in which she describes Beloved as “the return of a repressed racial memory” (233).

3 For fuller descriptions of the history of the “welfare queen” construct, see Myth of the Welfare Queen by David Zucchino and, more recently, The Politics of Disgust by Ange-Marie Hancock.
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