2021

How Emotions Shape Feminist Coalitions

Nancy Whittier
Smith College, nwhittie@smith.edu

Recommended Citation

How emotions shape feminist coalitions

Nancy Whittier,
Smith College, USA

Abstract

This paper develops a framework for conceptualizing the emotional dimensions of coalitions, with particular focus on how power operates through emotion in different varieties of feminist coalitions. The paper proposes three interrelated areas in which emotion shapes feminist coalitions. 1) Feelings toward coalition partners: Feelings of mistrust, anger, fear or their reverse grow from histories of interaction and unequal power. These make up the emotional landscape of intersectional coalitions, which operate through a tension between negative emotions and attempts at empathy or mutual acceptance. 2) Shared feelings: Feminist coalitions build on shared fear of threat or anger at a common enemy. 3) Emergent emotions in collective action. Coalition partners possess distinct emotion cultures. Joint collective action can cement bonds when all participants' emotion cultures are reflected, or weaken coalitions when the reverse is true. In all three of these areas, organizers engage in emotional labour in order to create or maintain coalitions. These three dynamics are illustrated with examples from intersectional feminist coalitions, the Women's Marches, and interactions between feminists and conservatives opposed to pornography.

Key Words: Coalitions, emotion, feminism, intersectionality, women's movement

Introduction

Feminism is built around coalitions across race, class, sexuality, nation, and other axes of inequality (Carasthasis, 2013; Lugones, 1994; Predelli and Halsaa, 2012). Feminists also form coalitions with other movements, those that are ideologically similar and those with only narrow points of commonality (Binnie and Klesse, 2012; Bystydzienski and Schact, 2001; Gilmore, 2008; Stoltz, et al., 2019; Whittier, 2018a; Yuval-Davis, 2011). Feminist coalitions have important emotional dimensions that can both facilitate and impede alliances. Although coalition and emotion are central to feminist and social movement theories, there is relatively little work that brings emotions and coalitions together. Understanding what emotions <u>do</u> (Ahmed, 2014) in feminist coalitions deepens our understanding of their dynamics (Ciccia and Roggeband, 2021; Einwohner, et al., 2019). The aim of this paper is to develop a framework for conceptualizing the

emotional dimensions of coalitions, with particular focus on how power operates through emotion in feminist coalitions.

The emotional dimensions of feminist coalitions have mostly been conceptualized in terms of intersectional or affective solidarity and empathy or an ethic of care (Åhäll, 2018; Hemmings, 2012; Nash, 2013; Pedwell, 2012; Pedwell and Whitehead, 2012; Yuval-Davis, 2011). Indeed, durable coalitions rely on mutual trust and empathy, shared values and commitments, and are cemented by hope, fear, anger, and joy as the work over time (Poma and Gravante, 2017a; Ransan-Cooper and Duus, 2018; Kleres and Wettergren, 2017). Analyses of feminist coalitions across power inequalities such as race or nationality, however, point to how failures to adopt a transformative intersectional praxis can prevent or destroy coalition not only because of political disagreements, but because of their emotional dimensions (Cole and Luna, 2010; Hemmings, 2012; Luna, 2010). Similarly, research on the emotional dimensions of transnational coalitions shows how "culture clash" between the emotional cultures of activists from different countries or between NGOs and local activists can lead to conflict (Pieck, 2013; Kleres and Wettergren, 2017) and foreclose the potentially emotionally transformative and energizing effects of participating in actions such as demonstrations or forums (Flesher Fominaya, 2015; Harrison and Risager, 2016).

Drawing on these literatures, this paper proposes three interrelated areas in which emotion shapes feminist coalitions. 1) Feelings toward coalition partners: Feelings of mistrust, anger, fear or their reverse grow from, histories of interaction and unequal power. These make up the emotional landscape of intersectional praxis. Intersectional coalitions operate through a tension between negative emotions and attempts at empathy or mutual acceptance. 2) Shared feelings: Feminist coalitions build on "collective emotions" such as fear of threat or anger at a common enemy (Poma and Gravante, 2017b:205). This often entails a transformation of gendered emotions (Reger, 2004; Whittier, 2009). 3) Emergent emotions in collective action: Coalition partners possess distinct emotion cultures, with norms of feeling and expression (Flesher Fominaya, 2015; Gould, 2000; Kleres and Wettergren, 2017). Joint collective action can cement bonds when all participants' emotion cultures are reflected, but can weaken coalitions when the reverse is true. In all three of these areas, organizers engage in emotional labour in order to create or maintain coalitions. I focus on these three areas because they reflect the major emotional dynamics focused on by existing research on emotions and social movements, but they are doubtless not the only emotional dimensions of coalitions. Future research may examine other areas of inquiry such as affective dimensions of coalitions, how less-studied emotions like grief affect coalitions, or how external emotional contexts shape coalitions.

Feminist coalitions are shaped by collective identity, networks, ideologies, goals, and other factors in addition to emotion. However, analysing emotion helps understand the effects of histories of interaction, successes and failures at intersectional praxis, and how coalitional actions affect future alliances. The emotional dimensions of feminist coalitions are often implicit

both in activists' interactions and in academic analysis. Making them explicit helps understand the forces that draw feminists together at some points and repel them at others.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: I first briefly outline the theoretical underpinnings from feminist and social movement theories of emotion. Then, I lay out the three areas through which emotion shapes coalitions in some depth, building on feminist and social movement theories about emotion, intersectional praxis, and emotion and coalition. I then use secondary literature and my previous research (Whittier 2018a) to briefly illustrate how feelings toward coalition partners, shared emotions, and emergent emotions in collective action shaped intersectional feminist coalitions, the Women's Marches, and interactions between feminists and conservatives opposed to pornography. I selected these examples to represent a range of types of coalitions and to illustrate the three main theoretical processes. They are intended to to clarify the conceptual framework of the paper and encourage further empirical work.

Feminist and social movement theories of emotion

Key theorists of emotion – such as Arlie Hochschild and Sara Ahmed – are grounded in feminist scholarship and are among the foremost theorists of how emotion links to social structures and inequalities. Research on women's movements also has been important in developing theory on emotion and social movements, including the ethic of care (V. Taylor, 1996; Yuval-Davis, 2011), emotion culture (Guenther, 2009), emotional opportunities (Guenther, 2009; Whittier, 2001), and emotional transformation as a movement outcome (Whittier, 2009; Wulff et al., 2015). Feminist theories of emotion provide the conceptual tools for understanding how feelings may change in coalitions and the emotional sources of barriers to solidarity.

Emotion is culturally gendered with women expected to feel and display fear or shame, not anger. Feminist movements include cultivating new emotions – what Helena Flam (2008) calls "emotional liberation" – as both an explicit feminist goal and a by-product of activism, as participants resist shame, embrace anger, and engage in "self-help" practices of emotional transformation (Delap, 2018; Guenther, 2009; Poma and Gravante, 2016; Reger, 2004; Védie this issue).

Feminist theorists view both emotion and affect – the bodily or unspoken components of feelings – as connected to social contexts and gendered, sexualized, racialized and classed relations of power" (Ahmed, 2014; Pedwell and Whitehead, 2012:115). As Åhäll (2018:38) writes, affect is basic to feminism because it "generates questions about how the world works." These questions, growing from an affective dissonance such as "rage at injustice" are part of the impulse toward feminism (Hemmings, 2012, quoted in Åhäll, 2018:150). Affect "tends to 'stick' at sites of cultural tension" as "oppression is often carried out at an affective level" (Whitehead, 2012:124, 181).

Considerable feminist theorizing about emotion focuses on empathy, which has the potential to connect groups across difference and thus is relevant to theorizing anti-racist feminism (Pedwell, 2012). Scholars see empathy as important because it "allows activists to overcome prejudices towards other actors" (Poma and Gravante, 2017a:906) and has "the potential to dislodge and rearticulate dominant assumptions, truths and boundaries which underscore gendered, racialised and classed hierarchies" (Pedwell, 2012:164). Empathy's potential "emotional charge" is limited, however, for groups that are distant in geography or status and when it is unidirectional, in which the privileged are transformed through empathy with the marginalized, who remain unchanged (Pedwell, 2012:166; Flam, 2018). Some theorists conceptualize affect as a framework for understanding what can "work to align individuals with collectives…through the very intensity of their attachments" (Ahmed, 2004:26). Hemmings (2012) suggests that recognizing the standpoint of the other creates affective dissonance as one recognizes one's own standpoint as partial, creating potential "affective solidarity." However, because affect is shaped by inequalities just as emotion is, affective solidarity carries many of the same limitations as empathy.

Like feminist theories, social movement theory understands emotion as shaped by social structures. Emotions are crucial to the emergence and maintenance of activism (Van Ness and Sommers-Effler, 2018; Yang, 2000). As Poma and Gravante (2017a:901) put it, "emotional liberation … makes it possible to transform cementing emotions, which underpin the relation of domination, into subversive, mobilizing emotions that bring about social change." Emotions include longstanding positive or negative loyalties and can also be produced in interaction and change over time (Jasper, 2011; Flam, 2015). They are part of groups' cultures, governed by feeling rules, and produced through interactive processes, emotional labour, and past histories (Poma and Gravante, 2016). Social movement theory on emotions provides four important ideas about coalition and emotions: activist groups possess distinct emotion cultures, they rely on emotional labour and on positive emotional ties, and emotions are shaped by power imbalances.

Previous research on emotions and coalitions mainly focuses on emotions arising from inequality between coalition partners and the effects of different emotion cultures on coalitions. Feelings of connection, anger, trust, or alienation toward coalition partners can motivate or deter coalitions. Kleres and Wettergren (2017:82) analyse how emotions "create the social bonds that unite activists from different parts of the globe." They conceptualize solidarity as an emotion that entails empathy. Through interaction, activists generate emotional bonds and establish feeling rules. When feeling rules emphasized inclusivity by rejecting negative feelings "in favor of consensus and harmonious togetherness" (88), activists from the Global South and non-English speakers were unable to raise the resentment that grew from their "emotional experience of structural disadvantage." Consequently, their "emotional energy" for participation in the transnational coalition diminished (90). Emotional labour is important to managing issues like this and feelings in general in social movements (Poma and Gravante, 2017a). Although existing

analyses focus on emotional labour *within* social movements, we can generalize the idea to coalitions.

Pieck (2013), Flesher Fominaya (2015: 26), Harrison and Risager (2016), and Ranson-Cooper and Duus (2018) are among very few explicit analyses of emotions in coalitions. All point to interaction's potential to "produce positive emotional energy, moral commitments and solidarity" along with the barriers posed by differences in coalition partners' emotion cultures. Successful coalition formation depends on compatible pre-existing qualities of coalition partners (McCammon and Van Dyke, 2010), including similar emotion culture and feeling rules. This hinders coalition across difference and inequality. Social movement groups' "emotional habitus" shapes their emotion culture (Gould, 2009; Flesher Fominaya, 2015, including norms for expressing or discussing feelings. Each coalition partner has its own taken-for-granted understandings of how deliberative processes and collective should occur, for example the balance between participation, incorporating participants' feelings, or including fun activities alongside serious ones. For example, Poma and Gravante (2017a) describe an emotion culture among environmentalists in Mexico that emphasizes their affective bond to place, loyalty toward each other, and hatred of enemies.

Using these insights from feminist and social movement theories, I next elaborate on the three areas where emotions shape coalitions.

Feelings toward coalition partners: Intersectional solidarity and empathy

Coalitions rely on overlapping networks to coordinate actions frames, and resources (Levi and Murphy, 2006; Van Dyke and McCammon, 2010). Just as individual recruitment to social movements occurs through social ties that have a positive emotional valence (Jasper 2011), coalitions form through positive ties between organizations (Van Dyke and Amos, 2017). Feelings of trust and shared purpose make a strong basis for joint strategizing, while mistrust and suspicion make such strategizing difficult or impossible. Movement organizations and participants develop feelings about one another from their experiences of interaction and longer movement histories, beyond direct interactions (Ahrens and Meier, 2019). Groups with previous ties can readily work together again, if they retain positive mutual affect, trust, and a sense of solidarity, while negative feelings toward each other can factionalise or prevent a coalition. While negative feelings can develop between any coalition partners, they are especially intense in coalitions across power differentials. As Pedwell (2012:176) writes, emotions are an "important (embodied) circuit through which power is felt, imagined, mediated, negotiated and/or contested."

Intersectional solidarity and emotion

Feminists have paid extensive attention to how to achieve coalitions across race, class, or other inequalities. Intersectional praxis refers to the "strategies activists use to negotiate the dynamics of solidarity and difference in coalitions" (Zavella, 2017: 509). Black feminists particularly have

emphasized intersectional praxis, including decentring whiteness, recognizing structural and interactional racism, and forming genuinely inclusive organizations that "explicitly affirm group differences...[and] substantively engage diverse groups in deliberation" including through organizational rules (Einwohner, et al., 2019:2; Hill Collins and Bilge, 2016; Lugones, 1994; Srivastava, 2015). Intersectional praxis – and the emotions that are part of it – occur both "from within" white-dominant organizations that push for inclusion of people of colour and "at the margins" as people of colour organize autonomously (Labelle, 2019, 207). Such practices may lead to intersectional solidarity, which Ciccia and Roggeband (2021:1) define as encompassing framing and "transformative praxis to redress disparities in resources and representation." Many groups do not successfully practice intersectional solidarity. Emotions are part of the barrier.

Confronting differences of structural location and experience within coalitions entails grappling with how power and position shape emotions and feeling rules for both the dominant and the subjugated (Srivastava, 2015). Positions of lesser power are associated with feelings of fear, anger, and frustration, while those of greater power are associated with guilt and shame (Jasper, 2011; Kemper, 2001). Consequently, intersectional coalitions are often accompanied by feelings of disappointment, betrayal, anger, mistrust and guilt (Ahrens and Meier, 2019; Delap, 2018; Einwohner, et al., 2019; Evans, 2016; Evans and Lépinard, 2019b; Kennedy-MacFoy, 2012; Lugones, 1994; Luna 2010). At the individual level, such emotions threaten "friendship and solidarity bonds" (Flam, 2015: 4). In coalitions, such feelings are directed toward coalition partners, based on their relative power due to identity composition, location, or organizational influence. For example, bell hooks described "black female rage towards white women...rooted in the historical servant-served relationship where white women have used power to dominate, exploit, and oppress" (hooks, 1989: 177-82). In addition, anger, shame, or guilt of the more powerful inhibit intersectional praxis in coalitions as "longstanding [structurally privileged] activists who feel marginalized and unacknowledged may come to express their anger" (Flam, 2015:4; Cole and Luna, 2010; Srivastava, 2015). As Yuval-Davis (2011) points out, even as coalitions solidify, they may include not just feeling "at home" in a "safe space," but also feeling "angry, resentful, ashamed, indignant."

Empathy

As discussed above, empathy or affective solidarity may foster connection in intersectional coalitions. Unpacking its emotional dimensions helps understand how. Flam (2018:318) argues that coalition partners' "compassion" for "distant suffering" is only a "feel-good" emotion for the privileged. In a different vein, Black feminist theorist Jennifer Nash (2013:3) argues for political community "rooted in a radical ethic of care" that she calls "affective politics." Rather than reifying or ignoring identity, affective politics is "rooted in affiliation and a shared set of feelings" (Nash 2013:14). Patricia Hill Collins (2000) also suggests empathy as a persistent theme in Black feminist thought. Yuval-Davis (2011:14) views this version of care as at the core of a "feminist political project of belonging" that provides a sense of safety that permits "emotional engagement to be, at times, angry, resentful, ashamed, indignant." Yuval-Davis and

374

Hill Collins refer to this as transversal politics, a form of coalition that builds on common values and distinct standpoints to establish solidarity and mutual trust.

Emotional labour and intersectional praxis

In intersectional coalitions, coalition brokers, leaders, and participants engage in emotional labour to manage feelings about each other and their relationship and ensure participation and influence by less-powerful participants (Guenther, 2009). Coalition brokers and leaders can foster solidarity and trust through practices that attempt to empower marginalized members, such as prioritizing their participation in meetings and leadership and using frames and rituals that resonate with diverse constituencies (Ahrens and Meier, 2019; Guenther, 2009; Zavella, 2017). Gawerc (2021:5) found that such efforts allowed groups to "unite around shared principles while engaging difference." Doerr (2018) suggests cultural alongside linguistic translation, in which participants' positions of relative power and their cultural assumptions are translated for one another.

Workshops or consciousness-raising sessions for members of dominant groups are another technique of emotional labour, aimed at challenging feelings of superiority, anger, or resentment and channelling feelings of guilt into action (Delap, 2018). When coalition brokers and leaders reinforce privilege instead of managing and challenging the emotions associated with it, resulting coalitions are unlikely to practice intersectional solidarity (De Almagro, 2019). While white and otherwise-privileged feminists express "hurt feelings" that can inhibit the formation of coalition (DiAngelo, 2018; Flam, 2015: 5), emotional labour by organizers could increase capacity to challenge one's own privilege (Gould, 2009). But common techniques of emotion management – such as "rituals of emotional expression and personal experience" in anti-racist discussions or consciousness raising – risk focusing on white women's individual self-image and defence of an anti-racist identity (Srivastava, 2015: 41). Emotional expressions of anger, tears, guilt, and empathy do not move participants toward effective intersectional action (Srivastava, 2015).

In sum, past and present experiences of marginalization engender feelings of mistrust that work against coalition formation (Davis, 2019). Conversely, painstakingly-forged interactional coalitions that deliberately begin to shift these emotions of power imbalance can set groups on a path to ongoing coalition. As Cole and Luna (2010) and Luna (2010) show, even apparently "successful" coalitions are plagued with "tensions" that exhaust participants. Thus, understanding the emotional dimensions of inequality and emotional labour to manage them are crucial to intersectional praxis.

Shared emotions as a basis for coalition

In addition to feelings toward coalition partners, shared feelings toward others can be a basis for coalition. Shared feelings are well-documented as important for mobilization (Flam, 2015; Jasper, 2011; Poma and Gravante, 2017a). Commitments to shared goals also have strong emotional dimensions, grounded in moral emotions, feelings that are "based on moral intuitions

375

and principles" (Jasper, 2011: 287). But perhaps the most important shared emotion underlying coalitions is threat.

Threat is well-documented as a basis for coalition (McCammon and Van Dyke, 2010), but its emotional components have been left mostly unstated. Under threat, coalition partners are connected by urgent feelings of fear and anger directed toward a common enemy. Fear can inhibit mobilization, but it can also motivate action, especially when the level of repression is low and activists fear a future danger more than a present one. Einwohner, et al. (2019) suggest that threat is conducive to creating "capacious oppositional identities" that are important to intersectional practice. Anger at authorities is also widely recognized as a mobilizing emotion (Flam, 2008; Jasper, 2011; Ransan-Cooper and Duus, 2018). When anger is shared, it can foster coalition.

In addition to feelings around threat, many studies have shown that participating in activism produces emotional transformations against gender norms (Poma and Gravante, 2016, 2017b). Fischer (2020: 987, 1001), in a study of Irish feminists' campaigning for abortion rights, shows how they resisted shame through visibility. Through public testimony that displayed "grief, hurt, and loss," their "affective vulnerability" transformed their own feelings and those of others. Similarly, Whittier (2009) shows how activists against child sexual abuse countered their shame through visibility. In the latter case, this shared emotional practice solidified a politically-diverse coalition of survivor activists.

The "emotions ladder" metaphorically describes how emotions can intensify or change over time (Woods, et al. 2012). As movements progress, their successes, failures, and other significant events can shift participants' feelings and groups' emotion cultures. Ransan-Cooper and Duus (2018: 636) note that "anger about a perceived threat … can easily escalate further to feelings of frustration." If feelings change similarly for all coalition partners, this does not jeopardize coalition, but when coalition partners' emotions diverge over time, ongoing coalition is unlikely.

Emergent emotions and emotion cultures in collective action

Emergent feelings in collective action

Feminist coalitions across difference can evoke powerful positive emotions of solidarity and hope (Davis, 2007). For example, Cole and Luna (2010) and Luna (2016) show that the construction of actual and imagined community among women of color across geographic, ethnic, or experiential bases can produce strong feelings of belonging. As Black feminist leader Barbara Smith wrote, talking about class, race, and sexual differences was important "Not for the purpose of divisiveness, but for the purpose of understanding and greater closeness" (quoted in Breines, 2006: 169). As lesbian Puerto Rican activist Carmen Vásquez described, an experience in which she could express and "integrat[e] all of [her identities]" was "a living, joyful, experience" (Carasthasis, 2013: 957).

This feeling of belonging with coalition partners develops through interaction (Jasper, 2011; Poma and Gravante, 2016; Van Ness and Sommers-Effler, 2018). By participating in joint collective action, participants show that they are "emotionally invested" in the coalition (Gawerc, 2021:8). Mass protests and rituals of singing, chanting, or story-telling can produce strong feelings of solidarity (Carasthasis, 2013; Gantt-Shafer, et al., 2019). For example, Zavella (2017) shows how practices of storytelling and spirituality helped connect diverse supporters of reproductive rights. This is especially effective when participants share an emotion culture (Gantt-Shafer, et al., 2019).

Emotion culture compatibility and clash

Feeling rules about emotional expression vary by race, class, and nationality and are an important part of the cultural differences that face feminists in multi-racial organizations (Carasthasis, 2013; Chun, et al., 2013; Zavella, 2017). When interactions between coalition partners highlight their differences or rituals are meaningful within the emotion culture of only one partner, participants feel not solidarity, but alienation or negative feelings, making an ongoing relationship less likely (Gantt-Shafer, et al., 2019).

Several studies show how differences in emotion culture between activists from different countries led to "culture clashes," (Flesher Fominaya, 2015). In transnational European Global Justice network gatherings in the early 2000s, when Spanish activists with a more "serious" movement culture interacted with U.K activists who preferred incorporating feelings, art, and humour into meetings, neither was able to consider the other's perspective. The culture clash produced "frustration, alienation…and a loss of ability to establish mutual solidarity" (Flesher Fominaya (2015: 26). Similarly, divergent emotion cultures impeded coalition between indigenous Amazonian environmental groups and NGOs. Pieck (2013: 134) found that "[B]ureaucratized, professional organizations were shocked at the strong emotions … and seemed more comfortable with orderly, structured procedures. In contrast, radical NGOs and indigenous leaders seemed more at home with processes deemed 'inefficient' by others" and were more emotionally expressive. Ultimately, the coalition split along those lines.

Harrison and Risager (2016: 846) similarly found that Danish participants in a transnational protest against the European Central Bank reacted emotionally according to "their own criteria." Nevertheless, the intense experience of coalitional protest, including repression by authorities, changed participants as their assumptions about "acceptable forms of activism and organization unravel and are reshaped." Whereas initially clashing cultures led them to feel "out of place," the experience led them "to finding one's place in the mass protest event itself" (Harrison and Risager, 2016:846). Participants across organizations shared an adversary which, in turn, facilitated the formation of collective identity, an important component of coalitions. In other words, emotion culture and its transformation through experience can facilitate or impede the formation of coalitional collective identity.

Similar emotion cultures, conversely, can promote coalition. Ransan-Cooper and Duus (2018) find that anger at a shared adversary motivated a politically-diverse coalition between Australian farmers and environmentalists opposed to coal-seam gas. Although anger sparked the coalition, the "joy" of community interaction maintained it. Norms of politeness in the rural community and active emotional labor by participants allowed them to avoid confrontation. In this case, a shared emotion culture provided a basis for relatively harmonious coalition across political differences. In contrast, in the transnational global justice movements, political agreement often was insufficient to facilitate harmonious coalition in the face of diverging emotion cultures.

Illustrating emotion in coalitions

These three emotional aspects of coalitions – feelings toward the other, shared emotions, and emotions emerging in collective action – play out differently in different types of coalitions, as I illustrate next. I briefly sketch emotion's role in intersectional feminist coalitions, the Women's Marches, and interactions between feminists and conservatives working against pornography. I use these brief examples to illustrate various ways that these three emotional aspects interact to shape coalitions.

Intersectional feminist coalitions

The 1970s and 1980s feminist movement in the Americas and Europe included deliberately separate organizing by Black, Latina, Asian, Indigenous, working-class, and lesbian groups, as well as often-difficult coalitions and organizations with participation across these lines (Breines, 2006; Predelli, et al., 2012; B. Roth, 2003; S. Roth, 2005). Coalitions among different groups of women of colour also have long been fraught, from 1960s and 1970s pan-ethnic groups like the Third World Women's Alliance (TWWA), to efforts in Britain and Europe to expand "political blackness" to include all racialized minorities (Springer, 2005; Ohene-Nyako, 2019). Differences of race, class, and sexuality between white women and women of colour and among women of colour continue to challenge multi-racial, coalitional feminist organizing (Bygnes, 2013; Cole and Luna, 2010; Luna, 2016; Luna, 2010; Springer, 2005; Evans 2016; Evans and Lépinard, 2019a; Lépinard, 2014; Predelli, et al., 2012; Thun, 2012).

Coalitions typically form through ties between leaders (McCammon and Van Dyke, 2010), but as we have seen, this is less likely when the ties carry negative feelings. Histories of marginalization by predominantly-white feminist organizations led to negative feelings among feminists of colour. As Asian-American feminist Kathy Gong wrote after a 1981 conference, it "stirred up a lot of anger in me. Anger towards my white sisters, and toward sisters of colour, for seeing me as white, not coloured enough, or not seeing me at all" (quoted in Breines, 2006: 183).

Commitments to reproductive justice brought together some of the most persistent multi-racial coalitions (Luna, 2010; Zavella, 2017). Luna's important (2010) work illustrates how such histories shaped a coalition between SisterSong, a women of colour reproductive justice organization, and predominantly-white feminist organizations around a national US march.

Longer-term SisterSong members felt betrayed and mistrustful from their experience of previous marches, in which women of colour had not been included as speakers. In contrast, younger members' more recent ties to white feminist organizers did not carry the same negative history. They were thus more willing to enter into coalition. The key emotional dynamic here is the emotion attached to network ties. Partners' feelings about each other, such as mistrust, disappointment, and betrayal, were a major challenge to reproductive justice coalitions. Feelings of anger, fear, guilt, or shock on the part of white members, as well as moral emotions of (dis)approval from all sides, emerged in planning meetings (Luna, 2010). These experiences, in turn, set the emotional stage for new interactions around the Women's March.

Women's Marches

Coming together rapidly after the election of Trump to the US presidency, the worldwide 2016 Women's Marches protested sexism, racism, economic inequality, heterosexism, xenophobia, climate change, and right-wing populism ((Berry and Chenoweth, 2018; Fisher, et al., 2018; Reger, 2019). Subsequent Women's Marches and other protests (around, e.g., climate, science, immigration, and gun violence) included overlapping participants and cosponsors, suggesting an ongoing, shifting coalition (Fisher, 2019). Whereas reproductive justice coalitions involved more extended face-to-face interaction, the Women's March coalition involved distant participants who interacted in short-term planning and mass demonstrations. As in transnational coalitions (Flesher Fominaya, 2015; Kleres and Wettergren, 2017), clashes of emotion culture occurred, along with emotional challenges of intersectional solidarity.

The Women's March coalition was spurred by shared fear and anger in response to threat. Organizations with diverse priorities united around their "mutual sense of emergency" (Berry and Chenoweth, 2018: 80). Because the threat was broad and fear widely felt, the coalition that mobilized was similarly broad.

Participants' feelings toward each other reflected similar tensions and histories around race and marginalization as in intersectional feminism. The first challenge for intersectional praxis was the march's name and organizers. The march was proposed by two white women and named "Million Women March" and then "Women's March on Washington," which many saw as appropriating the iconic 1963 civil rights March on Washington and a similarly-named Black women's march (Gantt-Shafer, et al., 2019). This evoked the emotional histories of women of colour working with white feminists. Quickly, a new, majority-women of colour, organizing team took over, changed the name, and recruited major national organizations from feminist and multiple other progressive movements as co-sponsors (Women's March, 2019). Large women's movement organizations in the US, like many in Europe, had positive ties and mutual trust from their long relationships with other movement organizations, enabling rapid mobilization of this broad coalition (Binnie and Klesse, 2012).

Organizers named intersectionality as their "guiding principle" (Gantt-Shafer, et al., 2019: 222)., but questions of racial inclusivity remained. Local marches grappled with white women's

379

Preprint

leadership and how to prioritize intersectionality (Berry and Chenoweth, 2018). Some transgender activists critiqued the signature "pink pussy" hats as promoting a biological view of gender that privileged cisgender women, while some women of colour critiqued the hats as racially coded white (Reger, 2019). These questions were emotionally charged by histories of exclusion and privilege within women's movements.

In terms of emotions emerging in collective action, the majority-white composition of marches meant that "many women of colour perceived the solidarity of white feminism to be displayed in a 'very superficial way'" (Rose-Redwood and Rose-Redwood, 2017:648). Participants included experienced activists, including women of colour, and often-inexperienced, more privileged activists who were unfamiliar with intersectionality. These groups had no reservoir of mutual trust to draw from and their interactions often were negatively emotionally charged, with often-younger intersectional activists mistrusting often-older and less-experienced white activists, who in turn felt shame or guilt, along with defensiveness (Whittier, 2018b). Although many participants, across race, "felt solidarity was being fostered at the marches," many were uncertain about whether it would last (Gantt-Shafer, et al., 2019:231-2).

Despite the difficulties of intersectional praxis, the marches produced powerful feelings of solidarity. Rituals like marching together, chanting, and singing, produce the emotions of solidarity: feelings of joy, hope, connection to others, and cathartic grief (Collins, 2014). Mundane feelings of impatience with long waits and difficulty hearing speakers co-existed with the emotions of solidarity but, as Gantt-Shafer, et al. (2019: 234) illustrates, rituals could transform these "ugly feelings." At the Washington, DC march, as the "mothers of the movement" (whose Black children had been killed by police) encouraged attendees to say their children's names, a white attendee exhorted an impatient white woman nearby in the crowd to listen. As she participated, the feeling of impatience was transformed "into a new affective intensity of joy and connection."

Because many marchers had relatively few ties to other participants and the sponsoring organizations (Berry and Chenoweth, 2018; Fisher, 2019), rituals and the resulting feelings of hope, catharsis, and connection to others were especially significant. Participants' "affective intensities linked disparate bodies [and] constituted the march as a movement" (Gantt-Shafer, et al., 2019: 222). Many marchers went on to participate in multi-issue groups (Fisher, 2019), illustrating how the emotions experienced in collective action (alongside the networks formed) helps emotionally cement connections across movements.

Eventually, debates over intersectionality combined with lack of strong bonds and trust to fragment the Women's March coalition as debates over Palestinian rights erupted around the 2019 marches (Reger, 2019). Persistent anger and mistrust across race, ideology, and organization combined with the emotions of fear, anger, guilt, and shame that are linked to power inequalities. The strong shared anger toward a common enemy and the feelings of

380

solidarity formed in collective action were insufficient in the long run to transcend the negative feelings of coalition partners toward each other.

We see in this example how the three aspects of emotions and coalitions are interconnected. Shared feelings of fear and anger in response to external threat brought the coalition together and predisposed some participants positively toward each other, while emotional tensions and histories around race pulled others toward mutual anger and mistrust. The powerful positive and negative emotions that emerged in the marches also affected participants' feelings toward each (which, in turn, shaped their interactions and emergent emotions during the marches).

Feminists and conservatives opposing pornography

Organizing against pornography by feminists and conservatives illustrates a different interaction of the processes of coalition and emotion (see Whittier 2018a and 2014 for a detailed discussion). In the 1970s and 1980s, some feminists, including US leaders Catherine McKinnon and Andrea Dworkin and the organization Women Against Pornography, opposed pornography on the basis that it fostered violence against women. As feminist opposition to pornography gained visibility in the 1980s, longstanding conservative opponents of pornography echoed parts of feminist rhetoric to argue that pornography harmed women. Feminists and conservatives briefly collaborated on municipal anti-pornography ordinances and feminists also attempted (mostly unsuccessfully) to influence federal anti-pornography action by the conservative-controlled U.S. government and in Canada.

Mistrust and negative feelings toward one another, along with power imbalances, prevented substantial coalition between feminist and conservatives in this case. The major axes of power distinguishing antipornography feminists and conservatives were gender and conservatives' greater political influence. Conservatives cultivated a few women leaders but made no effort at intersectional praxis to navigate gender or political inequalities. Feminists and conservatives were deeply mistrustful of each other. Their few ties were charged with dislike, anger, and fear. As much because of these emotions as their ideological differences, they never formed a formal coalition.

However, they shared strong moral disapproval of pornography, with feelings of outrage, disgust, and grief directed at the pornography industry. Feminists connected these emotions to sexism, while conservatives connected them to the depravity of modern culture. But both sides feared the growing social acceptability of pornography. Even with different underpinnings, moral disapproval strongly motivated both feminists and conservatives to engage in the same campaigns.

The expression of empathy – but not towards each other – also was important to the limited collaboration. Feminists and conservatives expressed empathy publicly toward pornography's "victims" at hearings before government bodies. Testimony by "victims of pornography" before city or federal government bodies was often highly emotional, following the feminist practice of

reducing shame through visibility (Whittier, 2012). Government officials and feminist and conservative activists regularly commented on the difficulty and importance of listening to such testimony. In a typical comment, an official said, "I would like to [thank] the people that have shared their stories tonight. I know it was extremely painful for them, for me, [and] for the women to share their stories" (MacKinnon and Dworkin, 1997: 103, 120). Such ritualized expressions of empathy allowed feminists and conservatives to find limited common ground.

In addition to negative feelings toward each other, different emotion cultures between feminists and conservatives foreclosed affective solidarity. Conservative opposition to pornography was grounded in evangelical Christian culture, which relied on religious ritual, prayer, and traditional gender values. Although conservatives sometimes expressed anger at protests or in print, their anger was often couched in religious terms; sadness or dismay at the decay of secular society was more common. Feminist opposition to pornography was grounded in the women's movement, expressing anger at men and patriarchy, with a radical challenge to conventional gender values. Their negative feelings toward each other limited their joint collective action, circumscribing possible emergent emotions. In sum, their disparate emotion cultures and mutual distrust combined with their other differences to prevent further coalition despite shared moral emotions.

Conclusion

Emotion operates in many ways to help initiate, sustain, and divide feminist coalitions. The illustrative examples show how, in intersectional feminist coalitions, the ties through which coalitions form are freighted with histories of white feminist betrayal of women of colour and women of colour's mistrust and anger (Luna, 2010). Emotional labour and important shared goals continue to sustain such coalitions, but the emotional aspects of intersectional praxis are challenging. The Women's Marches came out of this history, motivated by fear and anger over a broad threat. Major organizations from different movements worked with feminists based on positive pre-existing ties. Collective action fostered feelings of solidarity but emotionally-charged conflicts over race and gender identification, mistrust, anger, and guilt ultimately unravelled the coalition. In activism against pornography, the negative emotional valence of pre-existing ties and diverging emotion cultures limited coalition between feminists and conservatives. Instead, shared moral abhorrence and emotional rituals affirming empathy for victims' pain linked feminist and conservative opponents of pornography.

Drawing on feminist and social movement theories of emotion and coalition, I have outlined three areas where emotions affect coalitions: feelings toward coalition partners; feelings shared with coalition partners; and emergent emotions in collective action. The emotional valence of partners' pre-existing ties and longer histories, their shared feelings toward common enemies and moral commitments to shared goals help determine whether a coalition forms and whether it is close or distant. Interaction across power inequalities has significant emotional components that challenge intersectional coalitions. Coalition partners with different amounts of power are prone

to feelings of betrayal, anger, guilt, or shame; emotional labour is thus crucial for intersectional praxis. Feelings about coalition partners also develop through interaction. Shared collective action can foster solidarity, but divergent emotion cultures can instead produce felt separation. Groups whose emotion cultures differ dramatically may persistently misunderstand each other feel marginalized during joint events, which can otherwise foster emotions of solidarity. Although emotional dynamics in movements are shaped by gender, these dynamics are not unique to feminist movements. While I have illustrated these processes with several examples, further research is needed to detail how they play out more broadly.

References

Åhäll, L (2018). Affect as methodology. *International Political Sociology, 12*(1), 36-52.

Ahrens P and Meier P (2019) Changing Core Business? Institutionalized Feminisms and Intersectionality in Belgium and Germany. In: Evans E and Lépinard É (eds) *Intersectionality in Feminist and Queer Movements.* London: Routledge, 64-82.

Ahmed, S (2004). Collective Feelings. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *21*(2), 25–42.

Ahmed, S (2014). *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Berry M and Chenoweth E (2018) Who Made the Women's March? *The Resistance: The Dawn of the Anti-Trump Opposition Movement*: 75-89.

Binnie J and Klesse C (2012) Solidarities and tensions: Feminism and transnational LGBTQ politics in Poland. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 19(4): 444-459.

Breines W (2006) *The Trouble between US.* Oxford/New York : Oxford University Press.

Bygnes S (2013) 'We are in Complete Agreement': The Diversity Issue, Disagreement and Change in the European Women's Lobby. *Social Movement Studies* 12(2): 199-213.

Bystydzienski J and Schact S (2001) *Forging Radical Alliances Across Difference.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Carastathis A (2013) Identity Categories as Potential Coalitions. *Signs* 38(4): 941-965.

Chun J, Lipsitz G and Shin Y (2013) Intersectionality as a Social Movement Strategy. *Signs* 38(4): 917-940.

Ciccia, R., & Roggeband, C (2021). Unpacking intersectional solidarity. *European Journal of Politics and Gender.*

Cole ER and Luna ZT (2010) Making Coalitions Work. *Feminist Studies* 36(1): 71-98.

Collins R (2014) *Interaction Ritual Chains.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Davis K (2007) *The Making of our Bodies, Ourselves.* Durham, NC : Duke University Press.

de Almagro M (2019) Borders, Boundaries, and Brokers. In: Evans E and Lépinard É (eds) *Intersectionality in Feminist and Queer Movements.* London: Routledge, 29-45.

Delap L (2018) Feminism, Masculinities, and Emotional Politics in Late Twentieth Century Britain. *Cultural and Social History* 15(4): 571-593.

DiAngelo R (2018) *White Fragility.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Doerr, N. (2018) *Political Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Einwohner, R L, K Kelly-Thompson, V Sinclair-Chapman, F Tormos-Aponte, S L Weldon, M Wright, C Wu (2019). Active Solidarity. *Social Politics.* https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxz052

Evans E (2016) Intersectionality as Feminist Praxis in the UK. *Women's Studies International Forum* 59:67-75.

Evans E (2019) Disability and Intersectionality. In: Evans E and Lépinard É (eds) *Intersectionality in Feminist and Queer Movements.* London: Routledge, 143-161.

Evans E and Lépinard É (2019a) Confronting Privilege in Feminist and Queer Movements In: Evans E and Lépinard É (eds) *Intersectionality in Feminist and Queer Movements.* London: Routledge, 289-295.

Evans E and Lépinard É (2019b) Privileges Confronted? In: Evans E and Lépinard É (eds) *Intersectionality in Feminist and Queer Movements.* London: Routledge, 289-295.

Fischer, C. (2020). Feminists redraw public and private spheres. *Signs, 45*(4), 985-1010.

Fisher D (2019) *American Resistance.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Fisher D, Jasny L and Dow D (2018) Why are We Here? Patterns of Intersectional Motivations Across the Resistance. *Mobilization* 23(4): 451-468.

Flam, H. (2018). Solidarity, 'feel good' activism and emotional domino effects in transnational social movements. In M. Schulz (Ed.), *Frontiers of Global Sociology*. Berlin/NY: ISA Research, 305--313

Flam H (2015) *Micromobilization and Emotions.* Oxford University Press Oxford.

Flam H (2008) Emotion's Map. In: Flam H and King D (eds) *Emotions and Social Movements.* London and New York: Routledge, 19-40.

Flesher Fominaya, C. (2015). Cultural barriers to activist networking. *Antipode Journal, 41(1)*, 151--171.

Preprint

Gantt-Shafer J, Wallis C and Miles C (2019) Intersectionality, (Dis)unity, and Processes of Becoming at the 2017 Women's March. *Women's Studies in Communication* 42(2): 221-240.

Gawerc, M. I. (2021). Coalition-building and the forging of solidarity across difference and inequality. *Sociology Compass, 15*(3), e12858.

Gilmore S (2008) *Feminist Coalitions.* Champagne: University of Illinois Press.

Gould DB (2009) *Moving Politics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Guenther KM (2009) The Impact of Emotional Opportunities on The Emotion Cultures of Feminist Organizations. *Gender and Society* 23(3): 337-362.

Harrison, Y. N. A., & Risager, B. S. (2016). Convergence as Organization. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *36*(11/12), 722-725.

Hemmings, C. (2012). Affective solidarity. Feminist Theory, 13(2), 147–161.

Hill Collins P (2000) *Black Feminist Thought.* New York: Routledge.

Hill Collins P and Bilge S (2016) *Intersectionality.* New York: Polity.

Hochschild AR (2012) *The Managed Heart.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

hooks b (2015) *Talking Back.* New York: Routledge.

Hughes, B., McKie, L., Hopkins, D., & Watson, N. (2005). Love's labours lost?. *Sociology, 39*(2), 259-275.

Jasper JM (2011) Emotions and social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology* 37: 285-303.

Kemper T (2001) A structural approach to social movement emotions. In: Goodwin J, Jasper J and Polletta F (eds) *Passionate Politics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 58-73.

Kennedy-Macfoy M (2012) Researching difference and diversity within women's movements: FEMCIT. *Women's Studies International Forum* 35(3): 135-137.

Kleres, J., & Wettergren, Å. (2017). Fear, hope, anger, and guilt in climate activism.*16*(5), 507-519.

Labelle A (2019) Intersectional Praxis from Within and Without. In: Evans E and Lépinard É (eds) *Intersectionality in Feminist and Queer Movements.* London: Routledge, 202-218.

Lépinard É (2014) Doing Intersectionality: Repertoires of Feminist Practices in France and Canada. *Gender & Society* 28(6): 877-903.

Levi M and Murphy GH (2006) Coalitions of Contention. *Political Studies* 54(4): 651-670.

Lugones M (1994) Purity, impurity, and separation. *Signs* 19(2): 458.

385

Luna ZT (2016) "Truly a Women of Color Organization". *Gender & Society* 30(5): 769-790.

Luna ZT (2010) Marching Toward Reproductive Justice. *Sociological Inquiry* 80(4): 554-578.

MacKinnon C and Dworkin A (1997) *In Harm's Way.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McCammon H and Van Dyke N (2010) Applying Qualitative Comparative Analysis to Empirical Studies of Social Movement Coalition Formation. In: McCammon H and Van Dyke N (eds) *Strategic Alliances.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 292-315.

Nash, J. C. (2013). Practicing love. *Meridians, 11*(2), 1-24.

Ohene-Nyako, P (2019) Black Female Political Subjectivities and Europeanization, 1986-1997. *Paper presented at Workshop on Feminism in the 21st Century*, 9-11 September, Université de Lausanne, Switzerland.

Pedwell, C. (2012). Affective (self-) transformations. Feminist Theory, 13(2), 163–179.

Pedwell, C., & Whitehead, A. (2012). Affecting feminism. *Feminist Theory, 13*(2), 115-129.

Pieck, S. K. (2013). Transnational activist networks. *Social Movement Studies, 12*(2), 121-137.

Poma A and Gravante T (2016) 'This Struggle Bound Us.' An Analysis of the Emotional Dimension of Protest Based on the Study of Four Grassroots Resistances in Spain and Mexico. *Qualitative Sociology Review* 12(1): 142-61.

Poma, A., & Gravante, T. (2017a). Emotions in interaction in environmental resistances. Partecipazione e Conflitto, 10(3), 896--925.

Poma, A., & Gravante, T. (2017b). Protest, emotion and change. *Interface*, 9(1), 204--229.

Predelli L, Halsaa B, Sandu A, Thun C and Nyhagen L (2012) *Majority-Minority Relations in Contemporary Women's Movements.* London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Ransan-Cooper, H., & Duus, S. (2018). When anger meets joy. *Social Movement Studies*, 17(6), 635--657.

Reagon BJ (1998) Coalition Politics. *Feminism and Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 242-253.

Reger J (2018) The Making of a March. In: Reger J (ed) *Nevertheless, they Persisted.* New York: Routledge, 1-22.

Reger J (2004) Organizational "Emotion Work" through Consciousness-Raising. *Qualitative Sociology* 27(2): 205-222.

Rose-Redwood C and Rose-Redwood R (2017) It Definitely Felt Very White. *Gender, Place & Culture* 24(5): 645--654.

Roth B (2003) *Separate Roads to Feminism.* New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

Roth S (2005) Sisterhood and exclusionary solidarity in a labor women's organization. *Emotions and Social Movements*: 189.

Springer K, (2005) *Living for the Revolution.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Srivastava S (2005) "You're calling me a racist?". *Signs* 31(1): 29-62.

Stoltz P, Halsaa B and Stormhøj C (2019) Generational Conflict and the Politics of Inclusion in Two Feminist Events. In: Evans E and Lépinard É (eds) *Intersectionality in Feminist and Queer Movements.* London: Routledge, 271-288.

Taylor V (2016) *Rock-a-by Baby.* New York: Routledge.

Thun C (2012) "Norwegian Women Got Gender Equality Through Their Mothers' Milk, But Anti-racism Is Another Story". *NORA: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies* 20(1): 37-56.

Van Dyke N and Amos B (2017) Social Movement Coalitions. *Sociology Compass* 11(7): e12489.

Van Dyke N and McCammon H (2010) *Strategic Alliances.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Van Ness J and Summers-Effler E (2018) Emotions in Social Movements. *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*: 411-428.

Whittier N (2018a) *Frenemies: Feminists, Conservatives, and Sexual Violence.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Whittier N (2018b) Generational Spillover in the Resistance to Trump. In: Meyer DS and Tarrow S (eds) *The Resistance.* New York: Oxford, 207-229.

Whittier N (2012) The Politics of Visibility. In: Goodwin J, Kutz-Flamenbaum R, Maney G and Rohlinger D (eds) *Making History.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Whittier N (2009) *The Politics of Child Sexual Abuse.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Whittier N (2001) Emotional Opportunities. In: Goodwin J, Jasper J and Polletta F (eds) *Passionate Politics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 267-81.

Woods, M., Anderson, J., Guilbert, S., & Watkin, S. (2012). "The country(side) is angry". *Social & Cultural Geography*, 13(6), 567–585.

Wulff S, Bernstein M and Karatasli S (2015) New Theoretical Directions from the Study of Gender and Sexuality Movements. *The Oxford Handbook of Social Movements*: 108-130.

Yang G (2000) Achieving Emotions in Collective Action. *The Sociological Quarterly* 41(4): 593-614.

Yuval-Davis N (2011) *The Politics of Belonging.* London: Sage.

Zavella P (2017) Intersectional Praxis in the Movement for Reproductive Justice. *Signs:* 42(2): 509-533.