From Passionate Politics

Chapter Three

A Structural Approach to Social Movement Emotions

Theodore D. Kemper

Social movements are awash in emotions. Anger, fear, envy, guilt, pity, shame, awe, passion, and other feelings play a part either in the formation of social movements, in their relations with their targets who are either antagonists or possible collaborators, and in the lives of potential recruits and members. Without the emotions engaged in movement environments, dynamics, and structure, it would be hard to explain how social movements arise, amass critical levels of support, maintain such support in long-enduring campaigns in the face of often intense opposition, and provide means for recruiting and sustaining supporters, both as active members and as favorably disposed publics and bystanders. Unquestionably, understanding the dynamics of emotions clarifies social movement dynamics.

Social movement researchers who are interested in examining the emotional elements of movement issues cannot be expected to be expert both in social movements and in emotions theory. The modern segmentation of scientific fields generally inhibits such types of dual competence. This chapter is intended to supply a brief grounding in what is termed a *structural* approach to emotions, which is particularly suited to a multiplicity of emotion-related questions that social movement researchers and theorists are likely to confront.

Modern sociological theories of emotions of potential interest to social movement researchers are of two main types: cultural and structural, a division that Goodwin and Jasper (1999) assert marks the general field of social movement studies itself. Cultural theories of emotions (Hochschild 1979, 1983; Gordon 1990; Stearns and Stearns 1986) are generally concerned with such questions as: What are the norms for emotions in given populations in given situations, i.e., what emotions are prescribed and are at least modal in given groups? What changes have occurred in such norms over time? And what social conditions give rise to such changes? These are important and valid questions about emotions that apply in many contexts of interest to social movement researchers, as Jasper (1998) has shown.

A structural approach to emotions, by contrast, examines social structural conditions to explain why specific emotions are either prevalent or likely to arise as the structural conditions either change or continue as before.[1] The structural approach to emotions presents a broad foundation of empirically supported grounds for examining many questions about social movement structure and dynamics.

A Structural Approach to Emotions

A structural approach to emotions derives from the following proposition: A very large class of emotions results from real, anticipated, recollected, or imagined outcomes of social relationships (Kemper 1978a: 43). This is a general statement, but it is easily seen how it applies to social movement issues. For example, what kinds of social relational conditions provoke the emotions that ripen the grounds for social movement emergence or recruitment? What kinds of social relational conditions produce emotions that enable social movements to obtain concessions from targets or opponents? What kinds of social relational conditions favor emotions that enable social movements to recruit members to take on often difficult tasks and to sustain them during periods of scant movement success? What kinds of social relational conditions lead to the emotions that signify a waning of social movement support? These and many similar questions entail consideration of the emotional matrix that the social relational conditions engender. A structural theory of emotions supplies a useful point of entry to the examination of these questions.

It should be apparent that the above general proposition on social relations and emotions is valuable only if the social relational conditions can be specified. Here, the structural theory is particularly fortunate in having available a strong empirical generalization to support a useful model of social relations for present purposes. A truly impressive number of studies in a variety of domains have remarkably converged on a limited

number of dimensions of social relations. These dimensions derive from observation in social psychology laboratories, surveys of behavior in a variety of populations, cross-cultural analyses, examinations of underlying semantic dimensions of scores of languages, and have an unusual and persuasive degree of ethological support. Physiological processes are also linked via the emotions to the relational dimensions (see Collins 1975; Kemper 1978a, 1978b; Heise 1979; Kemper and Collins 1990; Kemper 1991). Macrostructures and macroprocesses, both within and between societies, and including issues pertinent to social movements, such as class as well as international conflict, support this model of relationships (Kemper 1992; Kemper and Collins 1990).

The foregoing research has settled on two major dimensions of relationship: *power* and *status*.[2] Variation in these basic relational or structural conditions, as will be presented below, can explain a very large class of human emotions. Power, which is of central interest to social movement researchers, is defined in the structural theory of emotions as the process, or (when the process leads to more or less stable and predictable outcomes) the relationship or structure, within which one actor is able to realize his or her interests in interaction with another actor, even over the opposition of the other actor (cf. Weber 1946: 181). In power relations, one actor's compliance with the wishes or demands of another actor is involuntary. Behaviorally, power entails the full panoply of coercive actions and manipulations, ranging from threat and intimidation to violence, both physical and verbal; from deprivation of simple attention and access to social rewards conventional in a culture to deprivation of major life-sustaining resources, such as adequate nutrition, shelter, and means to maintain health. More subtle types of power use include lies, deceptions, and manipulations designed to overcome resistance covertly. A borderline type of power, of particular relevance to students of social movements, is the tactical use of nonviolence. In nonviolence, which appears at first glance not to be a power mechanism, the coercive impact derives either from the threat of the relatively massive number of those who congregate to engage in nonviolent protest, thus straining the control (counterpower) resources of the opposition (frequently government) toward which the nonviolent protest is directed, or by the fact that the nonviolence enlists the legal or moral standards of the opposition, thus evoking guilt or shame, to nullify its ability to act forcefully against the nonviolent protesters. Clearly, power is a tool that is used pandemically in society, both by dominant groups and by social movements seeking to overthrow them.

Power is also prevalent in institutionalized settings, but it is carefully delimited by formal or informal law, and, by virtue of this, it becomes *authority*. Authority is marked by legitimacy, which means that those under the scope of the authority agree to abide by requests or commands that are understood to be within the range of delimited power. With respect to the emotions that power engenders, authority is a grey area, since authority holders and those subject to authority often disagree about the boundary between legitimate and illegitimate commands, and what constitutes coercion.

Status-accord (or status, in brief), the second relational dimension, is the form of relationship in which one actor willingly complies with the actual or supposed interests or wishes of another actor, without threat, intimidation, or coercion, and without an expected quid pro quo, such as occurs in relations of social exchange. Thus one actor accords status to another actor by esteeming and valuing the other, verbally and/or materially; by defending the other actor's interests; by seeking opportunities for the other actor; or by contributing in a variety of ways available in the culture to the other actor's well-being. Not surprisingly, the ultimate of such status-accord is what many would define as love, i.e., where one actor actually or potentially accords another actor an unlimited amount of status. This could include giving one's life to protect and defend the loved one, or suffering any deprivation to save the loved one from deprivation. Most human relationships, despite occasional peaks, are restricted to relatively moderate levels of both power and status.

Power and status relations can be conceptualized as behavior or as structure. If considered as behavior, they comprise all of the types of indicative behavior referred to above. But behaviors tend over time to lead to structures, so that the behavior itself may vanish in some respect from the relational setting. For example, after a series of power encounters in which one actor consistently defeats another actor, the defeated one may end his or her resistance and the ongoing interaction no longer manifests the types of power behaviors, e.g., threat and violence, that occurred during the defining period. But now the relationship is a stable, largely uncontested structure, in which the more powerful actor can have his or her wishes more often satisfied by the less powerful actor, even though the latter does not wish to do so, but without any manifest sign of power behavior. In the discussion of emotion below, we will deal with both the behavioral and the structural implications of power and status for emotion.

Although power is a manifest concern in social movement analysis, status may seem to have less relevance. But this is to miss the fact that social movements are not always on the "firing line," so to speak. A sub-

stantial amount of social movement interaction is internal, thus oriented toward the satisfaction of its members, or collaborational, and thus oriented toward organizations and publics whose sympathy and support it hopes to recruit. In these domains, status concerns are paramount. No social movement can succeed through coercion of its, at least nominally, voluntary members, or by alienating its potential public supporters, whose mobilization in any degree is a victory over the opposition.

Power and status relations also give rise to emotions. Rephrasing the proposition at the head of this section, we can say that a very large class of emotions results from real, anticipated, recollected, and imagined outcomes of power and status relations. That is, individual or collective actors engage in social, i.e., power and status, relations with other actors, and one result of those interactions is emotion—in both actors. To move from the general statement to specific emotions, we can specify the following about social relations as modeled by the power and status dimensions.

In a relationship between actor A and actor B (actors may be individuals or collectivities), every interaction between them has a number of potential relational outcomes: actor A's power can rise, fall, or remain the same; actor B's power can rise, fall, or remain the same; actor A's status can rise, fall, or remain the same; and actor B's status can rise, fall, or remain the same. This sums to twelve possible outcomes. Four of these will actually occur as outcomes of any given interaction between A and B, reflecting the change (and/or stability) in the power and status standing of the two actors.

What does it mean to say that power or status rises or falls? Power in the relational or structural sense results from successful power acts. These acts obtain compliance from another actor through overcoming that actor's resistance by invoking fear of the consequences of noncompliance. A louder, more insistent voice may sometimes suffice as an effective power act, or it may be a forceful physical blow, or a threat of greater deprivation, and so on. These elevate or enlarge the scope of one actor's power over another actor. Power declines or falls when one actor is able to withstand whatever power acts are directed against him or her, and thus is less constrained to comply with the first actor's demands. Status rises when one actor confers, or is willing to confer, more esteem, attention, deference, material and symbolic goods, and so on, on the other. Status decline is, of course, the reverse process.[3]

Crucially, each of the twelve possible relational outcomes detailed above can be linked to an emotion. This alerts us to three important

considerations about social relations and emotions: (1) Emotional space is not unidimensional, i.e., one emotion per interaction; rather, each interaction generates a multiplicity of emotions, although not all of them will necessarily be intense, or experienced simultaneously. (2) We must be aware of mixed emotions, in the sense that a given actor's power-status outcomes can have both a positive and a negative element, for example, an actor's status may decline, but power may remain constant, though it was expected to decline. In many instances, there will be a dominant emotion and this will be one the social movement analyst will be most concerned with, but the structural approach allows for recognition of nondominant emotions. Some of these can operate to intensify or moderate the dominant emotion. (3) Actors have emotions not only about their own power and status outcomes but also about the power and status outcomes of the other actor. Thus, each actor experiences four emotions, two regarding his or her own power and status outcomes and two regarding the other actor's power and status outcomes. Reducing this complexity somewhat is the contraction of effects in the power domain: The emotions relating to the power of self and of other are generally reciprocal. Thus, if one's own power rises, it produces the same emotion as when the other actor's power falls. If the other actor's power rises, it produces the same emotion as when one's own power falls.

What emotions follow from the outcomes of power and status relations?

Own Power

1. When one's own power rises, this gives rise to a feeling of *safety* and *security,* since it warrants that one is less vulnerable to the power of the other, should the other use his or her power. But when the rise in power results from one's own excess use of power, the resulting emotion is *guilt.* That is, guilt results from sensing that one has wronged another, by employing to excess any of the manifold ways that power can be wielded. Clearly, it requires applying a moral or legal standard to come to such a judgment about one's use of power. (Guilt stems from power use and is different from shame, which is discussed below.) On the other hand, even a very great use of power, when deemed legitimate by the power user, can produce *satisfaction* as well as security, as when one has overwhelmed an enemy or defeated someone deemed evil.

2. When one's own power falls, this gives rise to *fear* or *anxiety,* since it warrants that one is more vulnerable to the power moves of the

other actor. When one's own power falls, but not as much as was anticipated, this gives rise to cautious *optimism* or *hope.*

3. When one's own power remains the same, the emotions depend on prior expectations and desires for the outcome. If expectations were for higher power, then stability engenders both *disappointment* and some *anxiety,* although not as much as when power falls. If on the other hand, expectations were for decline, then the emotions include *security,* although not as much as when power rises, as well as cautious *optimism* or *hope.*

From a social movement perspective, a common relational issue is not rising or falling power, but stable low power relative to the dominant opponent. Emotions in such circumstances may be considerably muted, with only a low level of the kind of discontent that is usually a precursor to movement emergence. Instead, the generally deprived state may lead to pervasive apathy and depression.

Own Status

1. When one's own status rises (this happens when the other has accorded more status than previously), this gives rise to a complex of positive emotions: *satisfaction, happiness,* or *pleasure,* depending on how much status the other accorded; *liking* for the other, again depending on how much status the other accorded; *pride,* depending on whether the status was accorded for an attainment or achievement. But there is also the possibility that one will feel *dissatisfied* and *unhappy,* and will *dislike* the other despite the fact that the other has accorded status. This will be true when one expected even more status than was accorded. On the other hand, expectations can produce a positive multiplier when the status one received was more than one expected.

2. When one's own status falls (the other has withdrawn status he or she previously accorded, or has accorded less than was promised or expected), this also gives rise to a complex of emotions, in this case, negative ones: *disappointment, anger, depression,* and *shame,* and *dislike* for the other, depending both on the amount of the shortfall of status accord and on the sense of agency, i.e., who caused the shortfall. Disappointment and anger result when the actor deems the other the agent—the willing, knowing actor who failed to accord sufficient status. Depression results when the loss of status is deemed to be irremediable, somewhat like Fate, or in the nature of things. For example, the other is dead, or has broken off the relationship and will no longer provide status.

Anger and depression are thus both possible, since the other may be deemed the agent, and the case may be irremediable. Shame results when one is oneself the agent of the loss of status. That is, although the other must still be the active depriver, one senses one is oneself the cause of the deprivation. Basically, shame results from the recognition (and confirmation) of the fact that one has not acted in a manner to deserve one's usual due of status, or that one has acted in an unworthy manner. In its focus on status, shame differs from guilt and its focus on the power dimension.

3. When one's own status remains stable, the emotional outcome depends on expectations and desires. If they were for increase, the emotion is *disappointment* or *anger;* if they were for decline, then the emotion is *satisfaction* and perhaps *gratitude* toward the other; if they were for stability, the emotion is likely to be muted.

Other's Power

1. When the other's power rises, it gives rise to *fear* or *anxiety.* Understandably, these are the same emotions as when one's own power falls. Although power relations in the structural model are not zero-sum, the emotions related to rise and fall are equivalent to what they would be were the zero-sum model to apply.

2. When the other's power falls, it gives rise to *safety* and *security,* the same emotions as when one's own power rises.

3. When the other's power remains the same, the emotion depends on what was expected or desired. If decline in the other's power was expected, then *disappointment* and *anxiety* arise. If rise in the other's power was expected, this gives rise to a feeling of *relief.* If stability was expected, then the emotion is muted.

Other's Status

1. In the power-status relational model, when the other's status rises, it is due to one's own accord of status to the other. As discussed above, this is voluntary. Since one desires to accord more status, *satisfaction* or *pleasure* ensues from doing so and in having evidence of success in doing so. (Since the structural model treats one relational exchange at a time, it requires a second analysis to examine the emotions of actor A when actor B does not acknowledge or express appreciation after actor A has accorded increased status to actor B. Actor B may have expected more status and thus be disappointed or angry. But from actor A's point

TABLE 1 Power and Status Sources of Emotions

Emotions	Relational Sources of Emotions
Safety, security	Own power increases, or other's power decreases
Fear, anxiety	Own power decreases, or other's power increases
Guilt	One has used power in excess
Trust	Confidence other will not use power
Satisfaction, happiness, pleasure	Other accords status
Pride	Status is accorded for one's achievement
Anger, resentment	Other withdraws status
Shame	One is not worthy of the amount of status accorded
Depression	Irremediable loss of status
Liking	Directed to other who gives status
Contempt, disgust	Directed to other who claims more than deserved status
Envy	Desire for same high status accorded to other by a third party
Dislike	Directed to other who gives less status than one deserves
Disappointment	Power or status gain less than expected
Relief	Power or status loss less than expected
Optimism/hope	Anticipation of improvement in power or status standing
Consternation	Power or status loss much greater than expected

of view, actor B's failure to acknowledge or appreciate would constitute a loss of status for actor A—his or her gift of more status was taken for granted, or treated as unimportant.) Ordinarily, one increases another actor's status within a context of either *liking* or *loving*, that is, a strong positive feeling toward the other is already present. (Liking and loving are different emotions and stem from different relational conditions [see Kemper 1989 for details].)

2. When the other actor's status falls, it is because one has reduced the amount of status accorded to the other. This usually occurs within a context of anger or retaliation against the other for power acts or status-withdrawal acts (real or imagined) by the other actor. *Satisfaction* in anticipation of the other actor's disappointment is highly likely. *Dislike* is also prevalent in such a situation, but because the other actor may retaliate, there is also some *anxiety* about his or her impending use of counterpower.

3. When the other actor's status remains stable, it usually evokes little or no emotion, since it is a routine situation, with no resonance. On the other hand, if one is aware that the other expected an increase in status, then the same emotional spectrum as in 2 above is likely.

This concludes the presentation of the major emotions that the structural model predicts from an examination of power and status relational outcomes. Table 1 summarizes the results. Other power-status related emotions will emerge in the discussion below. We turn now to implications for social movements.

Structural Emotions Applied to Social Movements

The structural approach to emotions allows social movement researchers to approach their data and research sites with improved understanding of the dynamic conditions under observation. Some applications follow.

Types of Discontent

It is well known that social movements often arise from a sense of grievance and/or of injustice.[4] This points toward status issues between some who deny adequate status to others and others who feel they are denied the amount of status they deserve.[5] The main emotion of the denied is anger. But this says nothing about the power dimension and its main emotion, namely fear. When fear is high along with anger, the emotional resultant is *hate* (Kemper 1978a: 124). This is another order of magnitude in the spectrum of negative emotions and can become the basis for extremely violent actions, including terrorism, assassinations, and other means of punishing or overthrowing the opponent. Social movements often splinter on the basis of such tactics and the emotions underlying them. Where fear dominates, anger is less likely to lead to violence. Where anger dominates, then fear tends to be suppressed. Leaders then require considerable courage and willingness to endure extreme punishment if they are taken by the opposition. The resulting actions often then define the movement for a considerable time to come, either as a violent fraction, e.g., the Irish Republican Army, or a more mainstream move-

ment that keeps at least within sight of the boundary between what is legitimate and what is prohibited. Social movement researchers who study nascent movements can gauge which way a movement is likely to develop based on whether status or power issues are at stake for members. Different membership segments may reflect the prevalence of one or another emotion. This may occur also as a result of different attitudinal or cultural views of the opposition, e.g., their intentions, malignity, susceptibility to pressure, etc.

In some cases, the dearth of status may be long institutionalized, e.g., the denial of voting rights to blacks for many years in the South, and thus manifestations of power may tend to be few, although these are available to the deniers when needed. In such cases, anger is likely to be modest and fear muted. A social movement that wishes to change this state must contemplate that to raise consciousness of status-denial and to release its emotion, anger, will necessarily arouse relatively quiescent power relations, hence fear.

Discontent may also move individuals to join social movements even though they are not themselves subject to the deprivations the movement seeks to alleviate. The motive may be moral outrage or noblesse oblige. These are guilt and/or shame phenomena. At its simplest, the relational "other" in this emotional context is the group of intended beneficiaries. To fail to act in their behalf is to court feelings of having wronged them or having failed to act in a worthy, status-deserving manner with respect to them. In another scenario, the "other" in the relationship may be God, with whom one must keep emotionally straight so as to avoid guilt and/or shame.

Emotions as the Manifest Symptom

Often, emotions are the first line of observation in a situation that is ripe for social movement mobilization. Whether it is anger, fear, or apathy, these emotions derive from social relations that have achieved structural stability.[6] Social movement organizers, and students of movements, can use the manifest emotions to read back to the power-status relations that give rise to them. This is important, since it is not the emotions but the structural conditions that give rise to them that are the target of the movement and the critical point for analysis by the researcher. Thus, examining emotions enables an assessment of (1) the important relational conditions of the problematic setting; (2) the efficacy of the means to be employed in changing the problematic conditions associated with unsatisfactory social relations of that setting; and (3) the degree of

success or failure, that is, whether the problematic relational conditions actually changed.

The Emotional Content of Framing

Jasper (1998) has pointed out that the frame alignment approach of Snow et al. (1986) must be more than simply cognitive, but also emotional to evoke social movement participation. But lacking a formal theory of emotions by means of which to examine framing techniques, Jasper is relegated to speculation. The structural approach to emotions can "read" the framing methods in their relational significance and hence lead directly to predicted emotions. Snow et al. present four types of frame alignment:

1. Frame bridging refers to the "linkage of two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem" (Snow et al. 1986: 467). Although this is stated as a cognitive issue, i.e., as ideology, the possibility of bridging occurs when separate groups have the same power and status relations, hence emotions, vis-à-vis a common other. This other can be government, an interest group, or semi-organized collectivities, such as Eastern liberals or the Christian right. One of the main emotional effects of bridging comes from the aggregation of members. This will ordinarily work in the power dimension, giving individual members a sense of greater, perhaps indomitable, strength and power, thus reducing fear and increasing security.

2. Frame amplification refers to "clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame," whether through "value" amplification or "belief" amplification (Snow et al. 1986: 469). In respect to values, Kemper (1992) has argued that the power-status model implies two central values: *freedom* (concerned with the power dimension and hence the relevant emotions of security and fear) and *justice* (concerned with the status dimension and hence the relevant emotions of satisfaction and anger). Any amplification of values can be analyzed in terms of the relational dimensions and the emotions they entail. Beliefs too are understandable as being about the prevailing relational dimensions: who has the power, the status, the authority, and how much? Changing beliefs thus entails not merely cognitive but emotional change as new relational conditions are entertained. Snow et al. (1986) do point out some of the emotional ramifications of changing beliefs about power and status relations with dominant groups, for example optimism when the power of the opposition is under-

stood to be lower than previously believed. A systematic power-status examination can reveal a full spectrum of pertinent emotions.

3. Frame extension refers to how a social movement extends "the boundaries of its framework so as to encompass interests or points of view that are incidental to its primary objectives but of considerable salience to potential adherents" (Snow et al. 1986: 472). Here the issue is how the movement extends its relational context to include new antagonists who arouse new cadres of potential supporters. It is a case of "the enemy of my enemy is my friend." Ordinarily a social movement will attempt such a frame extension only when the new constituency does not also bring with it an enemy that overmatches the movement undertaking the extension.

4. Frame transformation refers to a reinterpretation of an existing understanding so that it instigates action among those who have been mainly quiescent (Snow et al. 1986: 474). Snow et al. speak of attributional processes, which are equivalent to agency as presented in the discussion of emotions above. Thus to redirect the understanding of agency is to reconstitute the emotions in the given relational setting. If one regards oneself as the agent of one's own low status, the emotion is shame. But if one regards the other as agent, the emotion is anger. Frame transformation is essentially emotional transformation. The power-status model focuses attention on the relational conditions that evoke both the old and new emotions.

Bystander Emotions

Since no social movement recruits more than a small number of active members from its potential recruitment population, among the most important issues facing any social movement is how bystanders will regard it and its issues. Some bystanders will reject the movement as a threat to their interests, even though the movement intends to speak in the name of such persons. Others will remain moderately interested in the aims and activities of the movement, but without extending themselves even as far as making a monetary contribution. Yet the sentiment of such bystanders can be crucial to a movement's success. Here the issue may become one of which emotion to engender in such a population, and to what degree? The distinction between shame and guilt applies importantly here.

Shame results from status considerations, e.g., am I worthy of the status I claim from others? Guilt on the other hand results from power

considerations, e.g., what I did (or didn't do) harmed another person and was wrong. As the structural approach to emotions shows, a person can feel both shame and guilt. But clearly the distinction is a matter of focus, that is, which relational dimension is being activated? Social movements may fail to activate bystander sympathy because they evoke the wrong emotion for the population at hand. Instead they alienate potential sympathizers.

Social movements can alienate bystanders through instigating fear, anger, disgust, or distrust (disgust, like contempt, results from excessive status-demands by another; distrust is reluctance to put oneself in the power of the other), in bystanders who may even be basically sympathetic, by acts that transcend bystanders' beliefs about what constitutes a legitimate form of opposition. The bombing of the University of Wisconsin Mathematics Research Center in 1970 clearly went beyond what even a sympathetic left-leaning student constituency would tolerate. They wanted social change, but not at the cost of life itself. To endorse that would have meant endorsing power behaviors that evoked guilt. There is a distinction too between coercive shaming, a power move based on arousing fear of social judgment, and what may be called self-induced shame, in which there is an authentic sense that one does not deserve the status one claims. In the former, the bystander is subjected to direct pressure, as were many Chinese students during the Tiananmen Square dissent period (Zhao 1998). They went along, but to an unknown extent they also carried with them anger or resentment against the activists who enlisted them against their will. In self-induced shame, there is a discrepancy between a claimed quality, for example, a standard for ethical conduct, and actual behavior. The bystander must then resolve the emotional dissonance. Self-induced shame will require a longer time to change behavior than coercive shaming, but the change may be longer lasting, with significant benefits from this for the social movement goal in the future.

Multiple Relational Channels

Although the structural theory of emotions is best illustrated in dyadic relations, it is applicable also when there are multiple relational channels. In social movement analysis, there may be as many as four focal groups to consider: (1) the movement, (2) the target group whose policy or behavior the social movement is trying to change, (3) the bystander public, including both potential allies and potential allies of the opponent,

and (4) government. Sometimes the target is the government, or at least a pivotal segment of it, e.g., regulators, legislators, the executive, etc. In any case, the movement must necessarily consider the relational dynamics not only between itself and the other groups, but the relations between the other groups, exclusive of the movement. Further, these groups have internal power-status dynamics which may affect the group's standing vis-à-vis the movement, as shown in Jenkins and Perrow's (1977) examination of how internal conflict within the government mitigated the government's unsympathetic attitude toward migrant farm workers in the late 1950s.

Nor must one overlook relational, hence emotional, dynamics within the movement itself. Few movements are free of internal division over strategy and tactics, and often a good deal of movement energy is consumed in a struggle for power. Each side usually has *contempt* for the other. (Contempt is the disgust one feels toward others who are claiming more status than one believes they deserve. See also note 1 on culture and beliefs and values.) How could those people believe they have the true interests of the movement at heart! Think Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Each side dislikes the other, since each side feels the other denies it the status it deserves. And each side has its full complement of *envy*. (Envy is the resentment toward another who receives high status from a third party when one desires but does not receive the same status oneself.) Although movements take their place in history by what they do on the stage of history, internally they are often cauldrons of emotions at the boil. Important cues to these internal conflicts and struggles for ascendancy are the relational patterns prevailing between standard categories in society: age, gender, class, race, occupation, and so on. Generational differences are particularly critical, since they often represent differences in degree of adaptation to the very conditions that the movement intends to change. In both the civil rights and the feminist movements, generational differences were widely noted (Morris 1984; Freeman 1973; Whittier 1995). These categories give rise to conflicts over status—who will be regarded as more important in the movement—and over power—who is to control the movement's destiny.

As indicated at the outset, a cultural view of emotions in social movements provides a valuable point of departure when the issues can be formulated in normative, belief, or value terms. On the other hand, when the issues are better formulated in interaction terms, with outcomes that define either stable or changing relationships, especially of power and/or status, a structural approach is preferable.

Notes

1. The structural approach depends on culture to the extent that cultural beliefs and values define important elements of structure, e. g., how much power is legitimate; what constitutes excess power; what acts deserve status accord, and to what degree; how much status shall be accorded to a particular social position, etc. (For extensive discussion of the culture-social structure link, see Kemper 1995.)

2. Power and status, identified by various nomenclatures (see Kemper and Collins 1990), are the most consistently found dimensions of *relationship*. One frequently found additional dimension, designated task or technical activity, reflects the division of labor rather than relationship between group members. Kemper and Collins (1990) discuss this distinction.

3. Although there is constraint toward a roughly shared understanding or agreement on how much power and status each actor has in a relationship, disagreement may predominate. Where agreement is absent, the structure tends to be unstable or even unattainable (Heinicke and Bales 1953).

4. Unless otherwise required, it is useful to treat a social movement collectivity as a single unit with respect to power/status and emotion. Even if not every member feels precisely the same emotion in a given instance, movement leadership acts in a representative role to express the effective emotion of the collectivity: "We are angry that . . . ," "We are pleased that. . . ." Alternatively, collective action—sometimes spontaneous, sometimes not—may bespeak the emotion of the movement as a whole. In no sense, however, is a "group mind" implied here.

5. For present purposes, the only relevant power/status relationship in view is between movement members, considered collectively, and the opposition, or government, or bystanders. Taken individually, members of the same movement may have widely varying power/status positions in society at large, e.g., some are physicians, some are housewives. Despite such variation, by virtue of their movement membership, they have a common power/status position vis-à-vis the movement's opponents and other publics.

6. It is also possible for changes in social structure to induce emotions that give rise to social movements. For example, an enfeebled repressive regime may relax its control, hence reducing fear and enhancing optimism in the repressed population. Such a situation is ripe for the emergence of an opposition movement.