

Leadership and the Hazards of Solidarity

Cynthia Burack
Department of Women's Studies
The Ohio State University
286 University Hall
230 N. Oval Mall
Columbus, OH
burack.1@osu.edu



Paper prepared for presentation at the Scientific Meeting of the A.K. Rice Institute

Boston, MA, September 18-21

Leadership and the Hazards of Solidarity¹

Reparative Group Discourse

This paper is part of a larger project that uses both black feminist thought and interpersonal psychoanalysis (theories of groups and the psychoanalytic political theory that has emerged at the intersection of politics and psychodynamic theory) to examine the contours of reparative discourse in the realm of large-scale identity groups. I borrow the terminology of “reparativeness” from Melanie Klein and I rely on Klein as well as on a broad array of other clinicians and theorists in the object relations/interpersonal tradition for the psychodynamic side of this analysis. For black feminist theory, I rely on a variety of theorists and writers across vocations and disciplinary boundaries. My thesis is that while political scientists and others express fear about the tragedy of group identifications and the harm that those motivated by group identifications can do, some psychoanalytic thought suggests the possibility of a reparative group discourse.

I find one such reparative discourse in black feminist thought, and I set out to trace the themes and patterns in that discourse. To do this, I move back and forth between black feminism and the group-oriented psychoanalytic theory that contains both strong cautions and some more hopeful observations about groups. I acknowledge both cooperative and hostile aspects of groups by examining identity group discourse—the public “speech” that group members produce about their own and other groups. Identity group discourses give students of groups information about processes of group formation

and the feelings that attend group membership. Group discourses constitute perhaps the most accessible source of information about the interplay of the political and the psychological in the identity groups to which people are committed in everyday social life. They also help make sense of the ways in which cultural contexts of group membership can vary enormously, creating seedbeds of hatred or of neutrality toward those outside one's own group.² If identity groups are key political actors, as even critics of identity politics would no doubt agree they are, the discourses created by these groups are political texts that can help us to decipher what some might refer to in shorthand as the "mind" of the group.³

Along the way, I suggest some ways in which psychoanalytically-oriented theorists of groups can adjust their general theories to account for the social and historical differences within which groups speak and act. Groups are both alike (the psychological intuition) and different (the political intuition), and a fruitful combination of psychoanalysis and political thought will account for these similarities and differences by analyzing group speech and group actions. Black feminist thought is one fertile site in which to execute such a task. Here, I look specifically at some aspects of solidarity from the perspectives of psychoanalytic thought and black feminism.

Although solidarity among black women has been complicated by many challenges, black feminists and womanists both valorize the bonds that connect black women and skeptically analyze the terrain of black women's relations and communities. Indeed, black feminists whose theoretical preoccupations focus on the differences among

women of color are most incisive at problematizing solidarity and laying the foundation for a reparative group discourse. Hortense Spillers argues that “avoiding the interior”—avoiding analysis of internal relations in black community—discourages interpretations of gendered community practices and ideology. But Spillers’ criticism is of a larger black community whose institutional and discursive leaders do not always theorize intersections of race, gender and sexuality.⁴ As a group discourse, black feminist thought looks inward as well as outward at relations between black women and members of other identity groups.

Because identification, cohesiveness and shared purposes can be constructive or destructive, both to group members and to non-members, interpersonal group psychoanalytic theory suggests many costs and benefits of group bonding. Indeed, theorists of groups maintain a critical perspective on bonding and solidarity, while black feminists discursively work through quite distinct reparative and regressive dimensions of solidarity.

Bonding in Interpersonal Psychoanalysis

What is often spoken of as “solidarity” in social and political groups and movements is rendered by psychoanalysts as “bonding,” “attachment,” “libidinal ties” or “identification.” This distinction is more than just a matter of terminology. Solidarity is cognitive, intentional, and driven by the weighing of shared interests. “Solidarity is knowledge of, respect for, and unity with persons whose identities are in certain essential

ways common with one's own."⁵ On the other hand, bonding, attachment, and identification are largely, if not entirely, unconscious maneuvers with emotional dimensions that may confound and embarrass the ostensibly rational political actor. Of course, these differences of perspective reflect divergent disciplinary agendas. But the failure of much political science and feminist thought to theorize the unconscious emotional functions and implications of political solidarity leaves a conceptual deficit in the study of social and political "groupishness."

Clinicians and theorists in the interpersonal tradition focus on the human need for relationality and group identification. Indeed, that human beings are "object seeking," and not simply drive-invested, is the basic essentialist assumption of interpersonal theory.⁶ John Bowlby elucidates the human need for "attachment" by turning to ethology, noting similarities between the biological needs of human beings and animals and the irresistible pursuit of relational attachment and nurturance for thriving.⁷ For group analysts, the tendency toward attachment can only be measured or perceived indirectly through the efforts and responsiveness of individual members to various group discourses and configurations. Yet the search for emotional connection—the need for love and identification as well as "the need to hang on, to be held and carried"—is a major theme of clinical and theoretical writings on groups.⁸

Psychoanalysis employs two perspectives to think through the issue of group solidarity. The first is Freud's method for conceptualizing group bonding, which is largely in terms of vertical ties between group members and a leader. In Freud's

psychology, the most significant psychic process that takes place in, and creates, the group is group members' identification with the group leader. Members abdicate to the leader both central aspects of their own psychic functioning and the status of "individual."⁹ The second perspective, associated with a broad variety of analysts, is to include leaders in a more horizontal perspective that also takes into account the psychic acts of group members with one another. It is in this second perspective that we find Bion's work with groups and the work of group analysts influenced by him. Their clinical investigations yield three major themes related to solidarity: unconscious forms of group organization shared by group members, the significance of shared projection systems, and the holding, or containing, function of groups.

Psychodynamic theorists of large groups emphasize unconscious defenses as vehicles for communication between group members. One of the most common ways for analysts of groups to talk about human relations from couples to large social groups is as "projection systems." In popular culture, projection is understood as the human tendency to attribute hated or feared qualities of the self to others in an attempt to disown them; as such, it has a negative connotation. On the other hand, psychoanalytic theorists acknowledge how ubiquitous and central projection is to the development of human relations of all sorts. Psychoanalysts in the interpersonal tradition stress the importance of projection for learning about the other--for exploring similarities and differences between self and other through arduous processes of claiming and disclaiming projections.¹⁰ In small-scale interactions, this process of claiming and disclaiming projections, or reality-

testing, can be carried out in a way that, over time, permits individual learning about the other, even though such learning is never complete and may be interrupted by other psychological dilemmas and conflicts.

However, it is precisely projection and subsequent reality testing, so crucial to work group functioning, that are typically disrupted and derailed within groups. Group psychoanalysts agree that “malignant” projection, the disruption of reality testing and unchecked, even “psychotic anxiety” are common features of group psychology.¹¹ Indeed, they hold that the primary fear of group members is the fear of loss of individual identity in and to the group. This fear is driven not only by the size and anonymity of the group, but also by the outcome of processes of projection necessary to try to know and be known by other group members. Solitary subjects always sense that anonymous groups threaten to overwhelm the helpless individual.

In attempts to learn about, and therefore become less frightened of, others, group members project onto other members aspects of their own preferences, capacities, impulses, ideals, and conflicts. The result is the common “chain reaction,”—often referred to as “emotional contagion”—that Hinshelwood calls the “unconscious linking-up process.”¹² However, in groups, even large clinical groups, it is virtually impossible for group members to test and respond adequately to the many projections that abound in the group. Under these circumstances, reality testing cannot occur. “It is not merely that in the large group the singleton is subjected to a continuous bombardment of responses—‘there is so much noise I cannot hear myself think’—and that responses come from all

directions, near and far, but also that the quality of the responses offered is poor.”¹³

Group members are left feeling depleted by the imagined loss of positive qualities and capacities—including the capacity for judgment. They are left feeling disabled by the receipt through projective identification of qualities that are experienced as foreign, confusing, and sometimes malignant.

Bonding in Psychoanalytic Political Theory

However, projection systems do not merely operate within the boundaries of the group. Projections across group boundaries are both inevitable and inextricably related to the projections that operate inside the group. Because of their preoccupation with relations between groups, psychoanalytic political theorists are more concerned with what happens when projective processes give birth to the group and the group responds in the social field it shares with other groups. Nonetheless, analytic theorists of large groups outline the basic elements of the imagined points of contact and friction between groups. Simply put, the group provides a site in which positive and negative projections can be sorted out and assigned to different objects and in which the group equates itself with the good and the other with the bad. Such an equation fixes and stabilizes the perception of intra-group and inter-group realities that allay anxieties, particularly paranoid-schizoid anxieties that are either personal in their etiology or arise from membership in the group itself. “The group helps the individual defend against both [personal and group] kinds of anxiety. By transforming private anxieties into shared ones,

the group helps the individual project his anxiety outward, where it may be confronted as an objective threat to the goodness of the group.”¹⁴

Like the political conservatives and reactionaries against which they define themselves, feminists and other progressives frequently do not question the processes by which rightness and wrongness, goodness and badness, are attributed to politically-oriented groups.¹⁵ Indeed, groups with political agendas distinguish themselves from one another by staking ethical and political claims to goodness or, to put it another way, by denying that such claims are in any way psychological, as well as political, acts. “All progressive social movements work to place the “bad” back onto the oppressors in reclaiming the goodness and creative power of the group. Rallying slogans such as “sisterhood is powerful” and “black is beautiful” facilitate this necessary reclamation of an idealized goodness from under the shadow of the oppressor.”¹⁶ As Janice Haaken suggests, politically progressive groups, like their reactionary foes, may display a tendency to constitute themselves in opposition to the existence or ideology of other groups and may reap benefits and costs internal to the group from doing so.

One important benefit of solidarity is the ability to manage potential conflict within the group—to create group solidarity by mobilizing against a group of enemies and directing aggression outward from the group. One cost of this psychological strategy, however, is that groups may “defensively distort their perceptions” of real enemies, leading groups to battle increasingly fantastical foes in ways that bear a diminishing relation to the realities of group positioning.¹⁷ This insight is key in psychoanalytic

political theory. Groups engage in intricate balancing acts to protect themselves not only from material threats but from threats associated with depressive knowledge and self-understanding. Recognizing that one's own group does not monopolize goodness and that disparately positioned groups share elements of good and malign motives, wishes and, sometimes, acts may persuade group leaders and members away from defensive distortions that impair reality testing.

Following and expanding upon the insights of group analysts, psychoanalytic political theorists sometimes employ concepts of holding and containing to describe the internal life-world of groups. Most accounts of holding/containing focus on the role of leaders in groups, and more particularly the role of leaders in validating or generating for members symbols, ideologies, ideals and enemies, many of which emerge historically or psychologically from the group or political milieu itself. Symbols, ideologies and the like function in large social groups as interpretations do in small clinical groups, providing and sanctioning meaning for group members. Like clinical interpretation, "interpretation" in the large social group "mitigates . . . anxiety, rendering it less overwhelming, less prone to disintegrate the self, and hence more manageable."¹⁸

What this social group approach suggests is that holding/containing can perform a similar psychic function for group members while being either positive or negative in its social and political consequences, depending upon the ideological content of the material expressed in the group. Compare two statements: the first is an excerpt from Pat Buchanan's widely quoted statement at the 1992 Republican Convention.

There is a religious war going on in this country. It is a cultural war as critical to the kind of nation we shall be as the Cold War itself—for this war is for the soul of America. And in that struggle for the soul of America, Clinton and Clinton are on the one side; and George Bush is on our side (Applause).¹⁹

The second is a passage from the writing of bell hooks.

I think it important that we remember that forgiveness does not mean that we cease to assertively identify wrongs, hold others to account, and demand justice. It is because we can practice “forgiveness” and be transformed that we have the compassion and insight to see that the same is true for those who might appear to be “enemies.” This is the true realization of justice—that we want what is peaceful and life-sustaining for all and not just for ourselves.²⁰

For all their differences, these passages constitute an attempt to persuade group members of some orientation toward perceived enemies, albeit in ways that are as diametrically opposed as rhetoric on a common theme can be. Court Reporting Services, Inc. helpfully notes the enthusiasm at the Republican National Convention to Buchanan’s divisive words, shared perhaps even by members of the crowd who did not already identify themselves with the virtually exclusively white and disproportionately male constituency denoted by the label “Buchanan brigades.” Hooks’ words were not delivered in a partisan public setting, and the salience of her rhetoric for group members is not easy to assess. Nonetheless, to the extent that interpretations of these sorts represent reality and render

“anxiety less overwhelming,” they may fulfill a containing function, regardless of the reparativeness of the message.

Psychoanalytic political theory takes a different perspective than that of clinical group literature on holding. This is so because of a feature that divides clinical from social groups: the action orientation of social and political groups versus the therapeutic orientation of clinical groups. The action orientation of social groups matters because immediate rewards may accompany the translation of aggression and unmediated negative images of the other into policy and political practice. “Moderate and moderating” leaders hold groups by being receptive to raw psychic content and ideas within a group, moderating their content, and delivering them back to the group in a more realistic and integrated form. “More immature, ‘bad’” leaders use the projections that emanate from the group to “whip up polarization, intolerance, extremism, and aggressive behavior.”²¹ Yet, however uncommon moderate and moderating holding is in political practice, the capacities of leaders to tolerate archaic feelings and thoughts and risk reality-testing and interpretation remains essential to the creation of reparative groups.

Solidarity in Black Feminism

The willingness of black feminists to engage disagreeable passions (of rage, hate, and grief) as well as more agreeable ones (of empathy, love, and compassion) positions students of black feminism to grapple with “the interior” of identity group relations. There is an irony to this insight: emotion in the social and political thought of black

women is generally held to react to and comment upon relations between black women and others. Its significance for those outside the group is usually understood to be pedagogical in the sense of encouraging transformation of institutions and social practices whose consequences are borne more heavily by black women than by members of other groups. It is unusual to focus on the emotional modalities of discourse itself for what they communicate and may teach about group relations.

Explorations of black women's solidarity are often socio-political and historical. Scholars and writers relate the ways in which black women have committed themselves to work together to confront racism; educate themselves and other members of black community; end practices such as segregation, discrimination, and lynching; and agitate for economic and political rights. These narratives often recount the activities of black women who came together to form particular organizations. However, there is also in such accounts a broader story of black women's solidarity that is not contingent on leadership of, or membership in, particular organizations. This broader story addresses themes of identification, belonging, safety, boundaries, and trust, not necessarily in organizations that are formed for particular purposes, but in black women's understandings of what it means to be a member of an identity group.

How should group solidarity be built? Many black feminists reject the construction of solidarity through such shared psychological operations as splitting and projection. They accomplish this rejection in three ways: by complicating assumptions of likeness and natural affiliation, by complicating assumptions about the characteristics

that distinguish group members from others, and by declining the strategy of naming consistent enemies for the group. The first of these operations is evident in filmmaker and theorist Pratibha Parmar's reflections on the "politics of articulation" in black feminist thought. Parmar begins by noting that simplistic notions of identity politics driven by static conceptions of gender, race, and sexual identities are belied by the multiplicity of black women's subjectivities and their locations in world diasporas. Parmar briefly traces the political organizing among black British women in the 1970s and 80s to emphasize the ways in which black women's sense of collective identity was in part a function of "collective self-confidence" forged in political activity.²² Ironically, the racist politics of Britain during this period provided a crucible for political struggle and for the consolidation of social identity.²³

To elucidate the question of collective identity, Parmar turns to a conversation she carried on with June Jordan in 1987. In the transcript of this conversation, Parmar notes that assumptions about shared identity often are contradicted and transformed in the process of political activity. Jordan suggests that although collective responses to such social ills as racism and sexism generally begin with recognizing, and organizing around, the identities of victims, such a politics can easily become self-perpetuating and self-defeating. Instead of focusing on the presumed likenesses of those who are affected by social problems, she stresses politics over identity. Such a choice means refusing to valorize "unity" as a goal. Indeed, Jordan notes both that the individuality of group members exceeds the shared dimensions of group identity—"I think it's important to

understand that each one of us is more than what cannot be changed about us”—and that those with similar identities will pursue different kinds of political causes and solutions.²⁴

For Jordan, refusing the seduction of uncritical unity does not mean refusing political action in concert with those with whom one shares dimensions of identity. It is merely that, as Jordan puts it, “There are enough of us to go around, and you don’t have to do what I do and vice versa. I do this and you do that, there is plenty of room.”²⁵

Responding directly to the need for unity on the part of minority group members, feminist theorists resist the ever-present possibility of identifying consistent enemies upon which group members can focus aggression and through whom members can build and consolidate solidarity. Some resist this possibility explicitly, as when Collins warns that “one powerful catalyst fostering group solidarity is the presence of a common enemy,”²⁶ and Lorde contends that solidarity against enemies cannot substitute for group members “cherishing each other.”²⁷ The problem in political life is that these phenomena are often simultaneous and virtually impossible to differentiate. Attacks by outsiders, such as those that occurred on New York and Washington, D.C., present leaders with easy opportunities to encourage bonding and care for group members grounded in fury against the enemy. Indeed, group members may regret the fading of empathic concern for others in the group, just as many Americans express regret for a diminution of the warm solidarities of the early days after the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

It is tempting to respond to attacks, whether contemporary or historical, with solidarity that yields both supportive bonding and fierce group-based harm-doing. In spite of this temptation, black feminist thought does not privilege black women or, for that matter, all oppressed peoples, in definitions of justice. Instead, the discourse emphasizes reparation, recognition, and reconciliation between groups. The emphasis on inclusion and careful analysis of the specificities of victimizing and victimization is consistent with a discourse that eschews a division of groups into categories—inherently virtuous and inherently evil. Indeed, just as Collins enjoins black women against establishing solidarity based on hatred of an enemy, hooks discourages black women from using victimization and narratives of injury as a principal means of bonding.²⁸ Among other pernicious effects, both strategies may make group members more receptive to group idealization to the detriment of reality testing.

More than many other leaders of identity groups, black feminists and womanists explicitly offer their writings in the spirit of dialogue with other group members. Invoking family members, friends, students, academic colleagues, and fellow political activists as readers and respondents, black feminists and womanists invite group members into processes of questioning, correction, debate, concurrence, and cooperation. These theorists also respond to one another critically in ways that are consistent with processes of scholarly investigation and debate. Although this kind of process is unremarkable in an academic context, it has great significance as intra-group dialogue. Intra-group disagreement, refinement of ideas, attribution and response: all these bolster

the ability of group members to test and learn about others and to tolerate differences of identity, perspective, and purposes that emerge from within the group.

Toward a Chastened Solidarity

While conflict almost always bears a negative connotation, solidarity is a positively connoted term in the lexicon of group life.²⁹ Black feminist theorists write in a variety of ways about the possibilities of solidarity for improving black women's prospects and well-being. For them, solidarity is essential to the social and political work that has been and must be done by and for black women. At the same time, both black feminists and psychoanalytic political theorists acknowledge the anxieties and problems that are aroused and, sometimes, merely exposed by group membership and the forms of solidarity practiced within groups.

Many group leaders who foment group feelings and set agendas for political action "hold" the groups over which they exercise authority by reciting the grounds of supposedly natural forms of solidarity in the group, by reiterating the characteristics that distinguish group members from others, and by directing the group's attention to enemies. These interpretations of social and political realities may take the form of obvious diatribes and invitations to violence against members of other groups or they may be more subtle reconstructions of history that appeal to virtue, respectability, martyrdom, or godliness.

Groups that have the strongest bonds, the least dissent, and the most internal conformity are, as psychoanalytic political theorists fear, likely to be dangerous both to group members and to those outside the group's boundaries. In cross-cultural studies of political conflict, Marc Howard Ross finds that one result of limits on internal group conflict is an enhanced likelihood of "aggression against an outside group."³⁰ Far from being a necessary condition of solidarity, discipline and a requirement of "authentic" identity enhance the probability of group punitiveness in both directions—inside and outside the group that wields it. In spite of frequent assumptions to the contrary, solidarity is not an unambiguously positive feature of the life of groups. Neither is conflict an unambiguously negative feature of group life. Rather, both solidarity and conflict have positive and negative effects, in groups and for the individuals who identify with them as members. Giving careful attention to these effects carries us into the psychodynamics of coalition politics and the culturally- and historically-situated politics of coalition psychodynamics.

Notes

¹ This paper is excerpted from a book manuscript soon to be published by Cornell University Press in its series, "Psychoanalysis and Social Thought."

² See Mary Herring, Thomas B. Jankowski, and Ronald E. Brown, "Pro-Black Doesn't Mean Anti-White: The Structure of African-American Group Identity," The Journal of Politics 61, no. 2 (1999), 379. Herring, et. al., emphasize the role of "the cultural milieu

in which individuals learn the meaning and value of the group” in determining how strongly associated “ingroup favoritism” is with “outgroup dislike.”

³ Jacqueline Bobo writes of the relation of black feminist theory to the black women to whom it is addressed: “in a sort of symbiotic relationship, black women’s texts nourish and sustain their readers, while the readers are indispensable for interpreting the works appropriately.” Jacqueline Bobo, Black Women as Cultural Readers (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 6.

⁴ For one exception to this conclusion, see Wahneema Lubiano, “Introduction,” in The House That Race Built, ed. Wahneema Lubiano (New York: Vintage, 1998), viii.

Lubiano writes that one merit of the anthology is that it “presents work that addresses within-the-group dynamics of black Americans.”

⁵ Gail Pheterson, “Alliances Between Women: Overcoming Internalized Oppression and Internalized Domination,” in Bridges of Power: Women’s Multicultural Alliances, eds. Lisa Albrecht and Rose M. Brewer (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1990), 36. Emphasis in the original.

⁶ Jane Flax, Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 111.

⁷ John Bowlby, The Making and Breaking of Affectional Bonds (London: Tavistock, 1979).

⁸ Anzieu Didier, Group and the Unconscious (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), 75.

-
- ⁹ Sigmund Freud, Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, trans. and ed. James Strachey (New York: W.W. Norton and Co, 1959).
- ¹⁰ See W.R. Bion, “Attacks on Linking” in Second Thoughts: Selected Papers on Psycho-Analysis, 93-109 (New York: Jason Aronson, 1984).
- ¹¹ Tom Main, “Some Psychodynamics of Large Groups” in The Large Group: Dynamics and Therapy, ed. Lionel Kreeger, 57-86 (Ithaca: F.E. Peacock, 1975).
- ¹² R.D. Hinshelwood, Thinking About Institutions (London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2001), 131-134.
- ¹³ Turquet, “Threats to Identity in the Large Group,” in The Large Group: Dynamics and Therapy, ed. Lionel Kreeger, 87-144 (Ithaca: F.E. Peacock, 1975).
- ¹⁴ C. Fred Alford, Melanie Klein and Critical Social Theory: An Account of Art, Reason and Politics Based on Her Psychoanalytic Theory (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 59.
- ¹⁵ For a counter-example that is a political, rather than a psychological, analysis see Chris Bull and John Gallagher, Perfect Enemies: The Religious Right, The Gay Movement, and the Politics of the 1990s (New York: Crown Publishers, 1996).
- ¹⁶ Janice Haaken, Pillar of Salt: Gender, Memory, and the Perils of Looking Back (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 192.
- ¹⁷ Haaken, Pillar of Salt, 193.
- ¹⁸ Alford, Melanie Klein, 64.

¹⁹ Patrick J. Buchanon, "Address By Patrick J. Buchanon," in Official Report of the Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Republican National Convention (Washington, D.C.: Republican National Committee, 1992), 374.

²⁰ bell hooks, Sisters of the Yam: Black Women and Self-Recovery (Boston: South End, 1993), 172.

²¹ Rafael Moses, "The Leader and the Led: A Dyadic Relationship" in The Psychodynamics of International Relationships. Volume 1: Concepts and Theories, ed. Vamik D Volkan, Demetrios A. Julius, and Joseph V. Montville," 211-12 (Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1990).

²² Pratibha Parmar, "Black Feminism: The Politics of Articulation" in Identity: Community, Culture, Differences, ed. Jonathan Rutherford, 103 (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990).

²³ For an account of racial and sexual politics during the period, See Anna Marie Smith, New Right Discourse on Race and Sexuality: Britain 1968-1990 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

²⁴ June Jordan, in Parmar, "Black Feminism," 109.

²⁵ Jordon, in Parmar, "Black Feminism," 113. See also June Jordan, Affirmative Acts: Political Essays (New York: Doubleday, 1998).

²⁶ Patricia Hill Collins, "Toward a New Vision: Race, Class, and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection," in The Social Construction of Race and Ethnicity in the United States, eds. Joan Ferrante and Prince Brown, Jr. (New York: Longman, 1998),

491.

²⁷ Audre Lorde, Sister/Outsider: Essays and Speeches (Trumansburg: Crossing Press, 1984), 169.

²⁸ bell hooks, Black Looks: Race and Representation (Boston: South End, 1992), 44-45.

²⁹ For an argument in favor of the effects of political solidarities see Nancy L.

Rosenblum, Membership and Morals: The Personal Uses of Pluralism in America (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000).

³⁰ Marc Howard Ross, The Culture of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 35.