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Abstract
Because emotion plays such a large part in the creation of the hegemony of consumerist ideology, we contend that any complete understanding of consumer resistance movements must also take into account the role of emotion in fighting against consumerist ideologies and global corporate control. In this article, we theorize about the role emotion plays in consumer resistance social movements – especially those using the resistance tactic of culture jamming. Drawing upon the frameworks of emotional hegemony and emotion management, we present an emotion cycle of resistance associated with consumer resistance activism. We illustrate the cycle by using examples from culture jamming enacted by groups such as Adbusters and Reverend Billy and the Church of Stop Shopping.
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INTRODUCTION
In this article, we theorize about the role emotion plays in consumer resistance social movements. We argue that because emotion plays such a large
part in the creation of the emotional hegemony of consumerist ideology, any complete understanding of consumer resistance must also take into account the role of emotion in fighting against consumerist ideology. However, few researchers have explored the role emotion plays in such social movements. Therefore, in this article, we draw from the frameworks of emotional hegemony and emotion management to theorize the important role of emotion in consumer resistance social movements, especially those using the resistance tactic of culture jamming.

The rise of consumerism and consumerist ideology has been clearly linked in sociological and consumer behavior literature to emotion. This literature openly acknowledges the manipulation of consumer emotion (Boden and Williams, 2002), with the purpose of furthering instrumental organizational or political ends through encouraging consumerism, both on individual and societal levels (e.g. Cranney-Francis, 1994). Emotional control is attempted, for example, by identifying consumer preferences, by determining environmental factors (such as music) that encourage purchases, or by detailing the specific emotional contexts salespersons can create to maximize profit (Howard and Gengler, 2001). Other literature has focused on how the mass media and culture industries have focused on emotion to help construct consumerist ideology (Horkheimer and Adorno, 1972). Indeed, more recent work has called upon incorporating emotion as an explicit mechanism to facilitate brand loyalty, thereby increasing profit margins (Gobé, 2001, 2007). However, researchers in fields such as sociology, cultural studies, and consumer behavior have long pointed out that consumers are not simply passive dupes who are manipulated by the culture industries (Arnould and Thompson, 2005; Dobscha and Ozanne, 2001; Fiske, 2000; Gabriel and Lang, 1995; Hall, 1980; Kozinets, 2002; Shields, 1992). Rather, there has been a long history of consumer resistance, through traditional consumer rights movements (Friedman, 1999), more radical anti-consumption and anti-global corporation social movements (Kozinets and Handelman, 2004), and ethical and sustainable consumerism movements (Harrison et al., 2005).

To date, however, very little of the literature on consumer resistance has focused on the role emotion plays in such resistance. The few exceptions we found include Fournier (1998), who argues that the emotion of disgust is a universally felt human emotion tied into the resistance of consumerism and hyperconsumption, and who urges further research into this emerging area. Kates and Belk (2001: 417), in their exploration of resistance to and through consumption at Lesbian and Gay Pride Day celebrations, also describe participants’ feelings of disgust ‘with the increasingly
commercial nature of these celebrations’, which lead some of them to decry the loss of authenticity, political power, community solidarity, and empowerment traditionally associated with the festivals. Additionally, the data presented in Kozinets and Handelman’s (2004) study of consumer resistance also contain many references to emotion, although Kozinets and Handelman do not fully explore that facet of their data.

We are particularly interested in the more radical consumer resistance social movements described by Sklair (1995) and Kozinets and Handelman (2004). Kozinets and Handelman (2004: 692) define these movements as those in which the ‘goal is not only the changing of principles, practices, and policies but also a fundamental change to the ideology and culture of consumerism’. These social movements ‘attempt to transform various elements of the social order surrounding consumption and marketing’ (Kozinets and Handelman, 2004: 691). These more radical consumer social movements question the taken-for-granted assumption that consuming is natural and good and aim to disrupt the naturalization of consumer culture; they also seek to create systems of production and consumption that are more humane and less dominated by global corporate hypercapitalism (Princen et al., 2002; Rumbo, 2002; Sandlin, 2005; Sandlin and Milam, 2008; Sklair, 1995). We place these social movements under a broad umbrella that contains similar movements, such as those that question globalization as an intolerably exploitative system (McLaren, 2005), and those that advocate ethical and sustainable consumerism (Harrison et al., 2005; Schor, 1998).

Many of these consumer resistance social movements employ the resistance strategy of *culture jamming*, which is an ‘activity aimed at countering the continuous, recombinant barrage of capitalist laden messages fed through the mass media’ (Handelman, 1999: 399). Recently, literature has emerged lauding culture jamming for, in Haiven’s (2007: 85) words, its ‘pedagogical promise and seemingly radical politics’ and for its potential for countering and fighting against over-consumption and overly-commodified and overly-corporatized ways of life (Bordwell, 2002; Boyd, 2002; Darts, 2004; Grote, 2002; Jordan, 2002; Tavin et al., 2003). Literature has also emerged critiquing culture jamming. Haiven (2007), for example, argues that culture jamming in general, and Adbusters more specifically, is ineffective as a means of countering the politics of neoliberalism and is, in fact, complicit in those politics. Rumbo (2002: 143) argues that culture jamming is easily co-opted and commodified by the market, which tends to ‘defuse’ its potential for consumer resistance. Likewise Harold (2004) posits that the culture jamming strategy of *rhetorical sabotage*, used by
Adbusters, is easily incorporated and appropriated by clever advertising agencies, and thus is not a very powerful means of social change. Harold (2004) also, however, argues that the culture jamming strategy of *pranksterism* holds more promise. Still other recent literature has focused on culture jamming’s potential for *both* resistance and reproduction (Sandlin and Milam, 2008). The general consensus among many researchers focusing on culture jamming, however, is that while some research has been conducted on such practices, there remains a need to understand it further (Carducci, 2006; Handelman, 1999; Kozinets and Handelman, 2004), and particularly to better understand its potential (or lack thereof) for enacting fundamental social change.

Furthermore, we are surprised at the dearth of research on consumer resistance and counter-corporate social movements paying attention to the role of *emotion* in these movements. While there is a growing body of literature addressing emotion in other social movements (e.g., Collins, 2001; Jasper, 1998; Summers-Effler, 2002), consumer resistance social movements are conspicuously absent in the dialogue regarding emotion and social movements. Further, with few exceptions, the dialogue on emotion and social movements generally focuses on the emotional processes that lead individuals to join and engage in activism within political and religious social movements (Stein, 2001). Few researchers focus on how activists use emotion as a tool to influence others for social change, and those who do leave many questions unanswered. For example, Cadena-Roa (2005) explores how dramaturgy can be used as a strategic technique to invoke the public’s emotional response through symbolism highly relevant to the target audience. In a more direct treatment of affecting ‘bystander’ emotions, Kemper (2001) briefly states that emotional dissonance may be the catalyst for longer lasting social change. Finally, Collins (2001) argues social movements attempt to create a *conscience constituency* by using dramatized emotion symbols to draw upon emotional biases of potential members. However, none of these studies fully explicates the process through which the emotions of audience members are engaged. Our purpose, therefore, is to clarify this process.

We hope to contribute to the ongoing dialogue within consumer research that focuses on consumer resistance by providing another way of understanding the problems and possibilities that arise in such movements, through a specific focus on the role of emotion in culture jamming as consumer resistance. For example, paying more attention to emotion helps consumer researchers further understand the conflict that Kozinets and Handelman (2004) found between these movements and mainstream
consumers. We also hope to further illuminate the kinds of critiques of culture jamming presented above, by explicitly focusing on the kinds of problems and possibilities that arise out of the emotion management culture jammers are practicing.

In this article, we argue that consumer resistance through culture jamming is intimately tied to emotion. We theorize about the role emotion plays in anti-consumption social movements and provide a framework for consumer researchers to examine emotion in these movements. We explicate a process through which activists use emotion as a means of resistance for both external and internal ends. That is, they use emotion to both initiate action and interest amongst mainstream consumers, and also to attempt to bolster a sense of solidarity and ‘collective effervescence’ (Durkheim, 1947) within the movement itself.

CONSUMERIST IDEOLOGY AND EMOTIONAL MANIPULATION

Before turning to a discussion of the role of emotions in resisting consumerism, we first provide a brief overview of the link between emotion and the creation and reproduction of consumerist ideology. As Sklair (1995) points out, it has become commonplace to state that a consumerist ideology permeates modern life. The mass media and culture industries, and specifically the development of advertising (Rumbo, 2002), have fostered this ideology of consumerism, in part by drawing upon emotional appeals and connecting emotion to consumption. Indeed, mass media and advertising are important parts of an ‘emotional economy’ in which emotions and experiences are the objects of production (Ooi, 2002). Consumerism expanded greatly with the growth of advertising campaigns (Gabriel and Lang, 1995). While early forms of advertising simply informed people about the availability of goods (Williams, 1976), contemporary advertising:

is forged on the assumption that consumers have different means of satisfying needs, indeed, that consumers can derive pleasures and satisfactions which have little to do with needs. Modern advertising makes no secret of its aim to stimulate desire rather than to propose the means for satisfying needs. (Gabriel and Lang, 1995: 16–17)

The ideology of consumerism is thus intimately related to emotion management, as it relies on advertising and other mass media to create particular emotions in consumers that draw them to buy products and experiences. Gobé (2001) reinforces the power of emotional appeals in advertising by highlighting the conscious inclusion of emotion in highly
successful media campaigns to elicit brand loyalty. Mass media thus deliberately and systematically evoke, manage, and shape our emotions by packaging consumer products and experiences with emotional appeals, even though there may be little relationship between the product and the manipulated emotion (Gobé, 2001; Ooi, 2002).

However, it has been pointed out by many social scientists that the ‘advertising-creates-false-needs’ argument has been thoroughly discredited, as research has increasingly focused on consumer agency – for instance, on audiences’ abilities to negotiate their own meanings from advertisements, on audiences’ experiences of the pleasures they derive from consumption, and on consumers’ abilities to produce their own new meanings through creative use of products (Arnould and Thompson, 2005; deCerteau, 1984; Hall, 1980; McCracken, 1986; Willis, 1990). Indeed, this was a foundational belief of entire schools of thought in sociology and cultural studies (see, for instance, the work of the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies, most notably Stuart Hall (1980), Raymond Williams (1977) and Richard Hoggart (1990[1957]), and the work of Dick Hebdige (1979) and Angela McRobbie (1991), cultural studies theorists who focused on youth subcultures). The power of the media to shape emotions and reproduce consumerist ideologies remains strong, however, and Gabriel and Lang (1995) caution against too quickly dismissing the power of advertising. They argue that while one should not attribute to advertisers ‘demonic powers of deception and persuasion,’ it is also wrong to ‘overlook the cumulative effect of advertising on culture’ (Gabriel and Lang 1995: 17). The substance of advertising campaigns, regardless of their success or audience, is that happiness and fulfillment can be obtained through commodities. This discourse reinforces capitalism and champions materialist consumerism by suggesting that commodities are the vehicles through which individuals can improve their lives (Rumbo, 2002).

EMOTIONAL HEGEMONY, EMOTION MANAGEMENT, AND POSTEMOTIONALISM

The manipulation of consumer emotions is situated within a broader societal milieu of emotional hegemony. Our current societal-level hegemonic emotional state, or what Williams (1975) calls a ‘structure of feeling,’ can be conceptualized as postemotionalism (Mestrovic, 1997). We suggest consumer resistance groups attempt to change this prevailing structure of feeling through actively seeking to disrupt emotional harmony, which in turn leads to emotional dissonance and deviance (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1987).
Structures of feeling are the dominant articulations of emotion constructions in any given historical context (Williams, 1975). Thus, structures of feeling address not only the actual experience and expression of emotion by collectives of individuals during particular periods of history, but also the implicit guidelines beyond espoused beliefs and values that influence the experiential dimension of emotions. These guidelines can be seen as cultural representations of Hochschild’s (1979) ‘feeling rules’, which provide sometimes latent insights to individuals regarding how they should want to try to feel. Harding and Pribam (2004) note that Williams’s (1975) conceptualization of ‘structures of feeling’ moves emotions beyond solely individual conceptions and instead embeds them within cultural contexts of society.

Thus, structures of feeling represent the dominant emotional discourses of a society (Harding and Pribam, 2004); in other words, structures of feeling can be seen as the prevailing emotional hegemony of any given society. We suggest that western society’s current structure of feeling is best described through Mestrovic’s concept of postemotionalism. Postemotionalism posits that western society has become numbed to emotional implications of events by overuse of emotionally laden language and images in mass media (Mestrovic, 1997). This condition of mechanized, synthetic emotions is a hallmark of a postemotional society. The concept of postemotionalism is associated with social and cultural developments in the USA starting in the 1960s (Mestrovic, 1997), or perhaps even as early as the 1940s, as Riesman (1950) contends. These cultural developments include the rise of mass media and mass consumption, and specifically the popularization of television watching as the dominant leisure time activity. The manipulation of emotions, especially through mass media, has become so pervasive that it has created a ‘bland, mechanical, mass produced yet oppressive ethic of niceness’ (Mestrovic, 1997: 44) that constitutes a new form of hegemony – *emotional* hegemony. This hegemony is related to the kind of totalitarianism Marcuse (1964) described, but is harder to spot and harder to resist.

Postemotionalism consists of three primary components – other directedness, mechanization of emotion, and voyeuristic inaction (Mestrovic, 1997). First, western society externalizes emotion in such a way that emotions are no longer only private spaces of reflection moving one towards action. Like Williams’s (1975) conception of structures of feeling, emotions constitute an outwardly directed phenomenon that influences social contexts. Postemotional other-directedness builds on Riesman’s (1950) notion of other-directedness, yet suggests that
individuals are not ‘unemotional’ (the ultimate end for other-directed individuals from Riesman’s perspective). Instead, their emotions are manufactured through media-based social constructions (Mestrovic, 1997). Emotions are other-directed vehicles for communicating a perceived ‘correct’ expression; and, in today’s society, that correct expression is one of niceness and civility.

Second, emotions pass through a cognitive filter to gain instrumental ends for individuals. Reminiscent of Hochschild’s (1979) concerns about the commodification of emotion, postemotionalism holds that emotions have been mechanized into merely another resource that can be manipulated by self and others (Rice, 1998). The inundation of emotional messages in the culture industry has numbed individuals to genuine emotion, thus rendering emotion banal. This mechanization of emotion does not nullify the existence of ‘authentic’ or ‘spontaneous’ emotion, however. Like in much of Mestrovic’s work, within the notion of postemotionalism there exists a dynamic tension between authenticity and mechanization (Carrette, 2004). Nevertheless, the pull toward mechanization and postemotionalism is strong.

And finally, because our other-directed culture of niceness disavows negative emotions, the culture media transmits images of pain, suffering, and anger to create an outlet for these emotions. Witnessing suffering through the filter of visual media has numbed society to the genuine suffering that exists all around us. Mestrovic (1997) suggests this filtering has created a false perception in society that individuals are powerless to do anything to alleviate suffering.

According to Mestrovic (1997), the means to stem the growth of this emotional hegemony is to reignite a ‘collective effervescence’ (Durkheim, 1947) of genuine caring and empathy toward others. While Durkheim’s interest focused on the collective, not the individual, the concept of postemotionalism blurs the distinctions between individual and collective because Mestrovic (1997) contends that ‘private emotions have a social correlate’ (Carrette, 2004: 287). By focusing, as we do, on the emotions of individuals in relation to a collective we have, in an ironic way, attempted to co-opt the postemotional social strategy of mass influence, or control, of emotions as a means to generate collective action. Consumer resistance groups thus walk a fine line between manipulation and authentic engagement of emotion; we thus must ask to what extent do their attempts to thwart the numbing effects of mass media cause they themselves to fall victim to postemotionalism? Nevertheless, we suggest that it is through collective effervescence that consumers (and resisters) might
potentially regain their agency to resist the emotion-numbing images of mass media.

Carrette (2004) suggests this is possible because the seeds of authenticity remain in Mestrovic’s postemotional society; a point Mestrovic (1997) takes pains to point out in his treatise on postemotionalism. What individuals need to do in order to re-engage with their emotions and act with otherwise latent agency to resist mechanization is create communal cultural activities that encourage ritual and symbolic belief in an atmosphere of sharing and caring. Grossberg (1984) suggests emotions are vehicles through which individuals enact power within a cultural context. To effect change and create a sense of collective effervescence, those who would resist the dominant emotional paradigm must ‘identify the strategies and sites where affective empowerment might be possible, beginning with popular culture forms that resonate affectively for consumers’ (Harding and Pribam, 2004: 874). Thus, we suggest culture jamming activism may be a potential site for resisting the effects of postemotionalism, because culture jamming efforts engage emotion to challenge dominant emotional discourses.

The ways in which culture jammers use emotion to resist consumerism and the emotional hegemony of postemotionalism can be articulated through Rafaeli and Sutton’s (1987) tri-partite conception of emotional harmony, emotional dissonance, and emotional deviance. These concepts are grounded in the sociology of emotion (Hochschild, 1979, 1983), an area of study so significant it is considered a sub-field of its own within sociology (Calhoun, 2001). Hochschild (1983: ix) refers to her work as ‘emotion systems theory’, which consists of individual acts to manage emotions, social ‘feeling rules’, and public and private interactions between individuals incorporating feeling rules and emotion management.

There are several types of emotion management; the most widely recognized are emotion work and emotional labor (Callahan and McCollum, 2002). The distinction between these forms of emotion management is based on Marx’s conception of use and exchange value (Hochschild, 1983). Emotion work is based on use value – the management of emotions is performed because it serves an intrinsic value for the individual without expectation of receiving something in exchange; emotional labor is based on exchange value – it is done in exchange for goods or services, for example as part of a job. Emotion management within social movements is typically positioned as constituting emotion work as opposed to emotional labor because the actions of activists are not remunerated as part of a job requirement.
However, following Arvidsson’s (2005) recent work on immaterial labor and his analysis of how the process of brand management exploits consumers by appropriating their productive work in the service of capital, the unpaid emotion work of mainstream consumers (and possibly of culture jammers as well, as authors such as Muniz and O’Guinn (2001) and Heath and Potter (2004) might argue) can also work in the service of capital, and thus can become not simply productive activity serving particular use-values for individuals, but can turn into emotional labor as use-value is subsumed by capital and is harnessed to bolster the economic value of corporations and their brands. Furthermore, just as brands appropriate the immaterial labor of consumers, culture jammers can also be seen as appropriating the emotional labor of mainstream consumers as a strategy of détournement (which we discuss, below). However, while the appropriation strategies they use may be similar, brands do so in the service of capital, while it can be argued that culture jammers do so to resist and exploit capital (while at the same time seeking to bolster their own ‘brand community’). In an ironic twist, however, consumer resistance through culture jamming can also become another kind of emotional labor that is captured and commodified by the market; culture jammers thus can become a new niche to which corporations can market products and services (Heath and Potter, 2004). Indeed the aesthetics and tactics of culture jamming are increasingly being used by corporate brands themselves, and ‘resistance’ is increasingly commodified and sold back to ‘alternative’-leaning customers (Klein, 2000).

Despite this dark twist to viewing the nature of culture jamming and emotion management, we still concur with Collins (2001) that activists generally base their involvement in social movements because of a personal interest in a social, political, or religious context. Thus, we ground our exploration of the role of emotions in culture jamming consumer resistance through the emotion management lens of emotion work. Emotional engagement in social movements such as consumer resistance involves individuals acting upon and using emotions that are likely to challenge commonly accepted guidelines about how to experience and express emotions in interactions with individuals internal and external to the movement.

Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) suggest that an individual can have three basic emotion management responses, which are based on the fit between an individual’s experienced emotion, expressed emotion, and the feeling rules guiding specific situations. A consistent fit results in emotional harmony and an inconsistent fit results in either emotional dissonance or emotional deviance.
Emotional harmony occurs when an individual’s expressed and experienced emotions are consistent with the expectations of the cultural emotion norms for any given situation. We suggest that the current milieu of emotional hegemony – postemotionalism – has created a false sense of emotional harmony. Emotional dissonance, however, occurs when an individual’s expressed emotions are consistent with emotional norms, but the experienced emotions are in conflict with those norms. A classic example of this phenomenon is the customer service representative who, because of job performance expectations, smiles and remains pleasant to an irritating customer who has generated feelings of anger and frustration. Finally, emotional deviance occurs when an individual simply breaks emotional norms and chooses to express genuinely experienced emotion instead of remaining in emotional dissonance. While Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) confine their conceptions of harmony, dissonance, and deviance to emotions within organizational contexts, we draw upon cultural conceptions of emotions (e.g. Harding and Pribam, 2004; Jasper, 1998) to suggest that these concepts can be elevated as a heuristic to the societal level to challenge structures of feeling.

CULTURE JAMMING AS CONSUMER RESISTANCE

Fournier (1998: 88) defines resistance as involving ‘an opposing or retarding force; it concerns activities that exert oneself so as to counteract or defeat.’ Consumer resistance, then, includes the ways in which consumers counteract a variety of market practices and the ideology of consumerism, or the ways in which consumers enact ‘a broad set of oppositional consumption meanings’ (Kates and Belk, 2001: 401). While scholars within cultural studies have since the 1960s focused on resistance to dominant hegemony of all kinds through consumption (de Certeau, 1984; Fiske, 2000; Hebdige, 1979; Shields, 1992; Storey, 1996) there has been little research devoted to resistance to consumption (Fournier, 1998; Princen et al., 2002). Recently, Dobscha (1998) noted that, with few notable exceptions, those who research consumer behavior rarely discuss consumer resistance.

While there is a wide range of consumer resistance, Penalooza and Price (1993: 123) state that research on consumer resistance has been ‘limited and focused primarily on collective (organized) actions directed at changes in marketing mix structure and composition’. Indeed, those who have chosen to study consumer resistance have typically limited their investigations of resistance to several major types of resistant behavior that seek changes in market composition: consumer boycotts, which can be either individual – in terms of ‘exiting’ (Hirschman, 1970) or refusing to buy products from a particular business – or more collective in nature (Friedman, 1991;
Garrett, 1987; Herrmann 1993; Stolle et al., 2005); complaining behavior (Hunt, 1991; Penaloza and Price, 1993); and the creation of alternative goods and markets (Herrmann, 1993). Penaloza and Price (1993: 123) argue that by focusing on this narrow range of actions, consumer researchers are ignoring or neglecting a wide range of other types of consumer resistance, including actions focused on ‘altering the meanings of consumption and consumption objects’ and tactics that appropriate ‘marketing institutions and agents as their tools of resistance’.

More recently, consumer researchers have begun exploring consumer resistance using more poststructuralist and postmodern conceptions of what ‘counts’ as consumer resistance; some of these projects have taken up, for instance, the theoretical position of cultural theorist Michel de Certeau (1984), which describes symbolic production-through-consumption that is aimed at altering the ‘prescribed’ or ‘intended’ meanings of goods and products (Dobscha, 1998; Kates and Belk, 2001) and thus aims to cast the marketplace as a ‘structure of domination’ (Poster, 1992) and to capture the power dynamics inherent in consumption and its resistance. In the same vein, during this time period interest has grown among researchers in exploring radical consumer resistance social movements that have arisen to challenge and change consumer society (Kozinets and Handelman, 2004). These social movements do not simply seek to change market mix and composition; instead, they seek ‘a fundamental change to the ideology and culture of consumerism’ (Kozinets and Handelman (2004: 692). These movements are concerned with the ideologies and meanings of consumption, and they often use the forms and tactics of marketing itself to cast a critical eye on marketing practices and consumer ideology.

One tactic or mechanism used by many of these radical consumer social movements is culture jamming (Binay, 2005; Bordwell, 2002; Carducci, 2006; Handelman, 1999; Kozinets and Handelman, 2004; Thompson and Arsel, 2004; Tietichen, 2001). The phrase ‘culture jamming’ was coined in 1984 by the San Francisco-based eletronica band Negitivland in reference to illegal signal interruptions in ham radio (Carducci, 2006), but has its roots in various countercultural and anarchist groups of the 1950s and 1960s. One especially influential group was a European anarchist group active in the 1950s called the ‘Situationists’ who were led by Guy Debord. Members of this group were committed to living ‘a life of permanent novelty’ and fought against structures that countered spontaneity and free will (Lasn, 1999).

The Situationists argued that the spontaneity of everyday life had been stolen or eroded away by the ‘spectacle’ of modern life, which included
everything from advertising to radio to television (Lasn, 1999). Situationists posited that, whereas in the past humans experienced life directly, that real kind of living was replaced by prepackaged and mediated experiences. Culture jammers believe that through spontaneous acts, they can bring about a détournement (a "turning around"), wherein the spectacle of modern life is rejected and replaced with a more authentic experience. For the Situationists, détournement ‘involved rerouting spectacular images, environments, ambiences and events to reverse or subvert their meanings, thus reclaiming them’ (Lasn, 1999: 103). According to many culture jammers, when culture jamming is effective, it should bring about a change in perspective, or détournement.

Culture jammers seek to resist rampant consumerism and corporatization of life through a variety of activities including organizing and participating in campaigns such as ‘Buy Nothing Day’ and ‘TV Turnoff Week,’ producing cyber petitions, hosting and participating in virtual sit-ins and virtual protests using the internet, producing ‘subvertisements’ and placing them in public spaces, and creating and enacting ‘placejamming’ projects where public spaces are reclaimed and nature is re-introduced into urban places. Culture jamming ‘seeks to undermine the marketing rhetoric of multinational corporations, specifically through such practices as media hoaxing, corporate sabotage, billboard ‘liberation’, and trademark infringement’ (Harold, 2004: 190). Examples of groups who practice culture jamming include Adbusters Media Foundation, Reverend Billy and the Church of Stop Shopping, the Billboard Liberation Front, Guerilla Girls, and The Yes Men.

THE EMOTION CYCLE OF CONSUMER RESISTANCE THROUGH CULTURE JAMMING

We see emotion playing important roles in both the external ‘public education’ dimension of culture jamming, and also in the internal dimension, which consists of the actions and interactions of the activists themselves. That is, culture jammers target audience emotions as a means of delivering their messages of resistance; they also engage their own emotions as they take action to subvert cultural messages. These two dimensions of the emotion cycle of consumer resistance can be seen in Figure 1. The external dimension encompasses the full model emanating from the emotional deviance enacted by culture jammers, while the internal dimension is seen in the feedback loop from social action to deviance as culture jammers engage mainstream consumers to join the consumer resistance movement and to enact their own emotional deviance.
Figure 1: Emotion cycle of consumer resistance
The external dimension

First, in the external focus, culture jammers attempt to shake consumers out of their perceived false sense of emotional harmony by confronting them with symbols and activities causing emotional dissonance; culture jammers seek to cause this dissonance by demonstrating emotional deviance through their culture jamming activism. In other words, culture jammers seek to use emotional deviance to create emotional dissonance amongst consumers in an attempt to disrupt the perceived mechanized false state of emotional harmony that Mestrovic (1997) argues constitutes postemotional society. This false harmony can be interpreted as the mechanistic experience of inauthentic emotion suggested in postemotionalism (Mestrovic, 1997). Further, this inauthenticity, and subsequent false harmony, is a result of what Ooi (2002) refers to as ‘decentering’, or the outcome when fictions masquerade as realities.

Indeed, Wettergren (2005) argues that within radical social movements such as the culture jamming movement, the ‘emotional culture’ of a movement is likely to be oppositional to the emotional culture of dominant society. She argues, specifically with regard to Adbusters:

Lasn’s [the founder of Adbusters] repeated claims that consumer culture manipulates our real emotions indicate that the culture jamming movement is, indeed, partly about breaking dominant emotion rules (Stearns, 1994). (Wettergren, 2005: 128).

Thus, as Wettergren (2005: 127) puts it, social movements must ‘literally ‘move’ people’ – social movement actors must do something to bystanders that pushes them to feel anger and moral indignation. Gamson (1992: 7) argues that these feelings of anger and outrage are not simply cognitive judgements about ‘what is equitable but also . . . a hot cognition – one that is laden with emotion’. In Jasper’s (1998) terms, this feeling of outrage constitutes a ‘moral shock’, which he argues is necessary for moving people into action. To Jasper (1998: 409), a moral shock ‘occurs when an unexpected event or piece of information raises such a sense of outrage in a person that she becomes inclined toward political action’. We argue that this ‘moral shock’ can occur when bystanders are released from emotional harmony, and can be achieved through the production of emotional dissonance. Being exposed to the emotional deviance of culture jammers is one way consumers can enter the cycle of resistance, which is depicted in Figure 1 by the dashed lines separating the state of false harmony of consumers and the acts of emotional deviance by jammers.
In using deviance in hopes of creating dissonance amongst consumers, culture jammers seek to trigger an emotional sequence in audience members that will lead to behavior change and political action. Jammers first attempt to shock consumers – and create emotional dissonance among audiences – through using a variety of techniques likely to cause shame, fear, or anger. These techniques include all of the tactics – subvertising, activist theater, space reclaiming projects – used in the practice of culture jamming. The kinds of emotions aroused among audiences in the dissonance phase – shock, shame, anger, fear – are foundational to effecting social action (Summers-Effler, 2002). When audiences experience emotional dissonance, this can be accompanied by either positive or negative emotional energy (Collins, 1990); audience members can then take one of two paths depending on which kind of emotional energy they are experiencing.

Summers-Effler (2002: 42) suggests that effective social movement resistance is a product of positive emotional energy, which is ‘a long-term level of enthusiasm, personal strength, a sense of social connectedness, and/or willingness to initiate interaction’. When an audience member is confronted with an emotionally deviant encounter, and the emotional dissonance of feeling shame or fear couples with positive emotional energy, this can lead to anger at consumerism, which leads to feeling there is some hope of changing society, which then leads to consumers taking action, either individually or collectively. This path ultimately leads towards social change and the creation of authentic harmony. This path also contains the feedback loop leading back to deviance, in which audience members can become part of the culture jamming collective.

However, when emotional dissonance is coupled with negative emotional energy, this path can lead to feelings of anger not at consumerism, but at the culture jammers themselves; this path can also lead to impotence in the face of the situation. Negative emotional energy occurs when the emotional cost of engaging with the group, or going against the dominant discourse, is seen as higher than the emotional rewards for taking action (Collins, 1993). What influences an individual to engage in acts of resistance is the availability of positive emotional energy to counteract the dominant discourse through hope that action will make the situation better. With only negative emotional energy, a consumer is more likely to feel powerlessness in confronting the situation; as a result, alienation ensues. This alienation can, in turn, lead to even stronger entrenchment in the false harmony that characterizes western society.
The internal dimension

Summers-Effler (2002) argues that the positive emotional energy so necessary for effective social action can be generated in two ways: (1) through solidarity by engaging in interaction rituals and, thereby, creating collective effervescence; or (2) through power by interacting with individuals who occupy a lower hierarchical status position and drawing positive energy from those individuals. Culture jammers engage their emotions in both of these ways; thus, the second way emotion works in the emotion cycle of consumer resistance is internally among culture jammers.

The internal dimension of the emotion cycle, like the external dimension, also begins with deviance – culture jamming acts or performances are both the means of inciting dissonance among viewers and also sites of the creation of positive emotional energy among culture jamming activists. Within these sites of deviance culture jammers create positive emotional energy in both of the ways described by Summers-Effler (2002); we argue, however, that culture jammers are most effective in enacting social change and in garnering greater support for the movement when they use the first strategy of creating interaction rituals.

As sites of interaction rituals, culture jamming performances are spaces where positive emotional energy can be generated by those participating in the jams (Sandlin and Milam, 2008), through a sort of secular ‘collective effervescence’ akin to the phenomenon discussed by Durkheim (1947) and Mestrovic (1997). Rawls (2004: 170), following Durkheim, defines collective effervescence as ‘the effect that participants feel when moral forces act upon them . . . it is directly felt by all as a physical reaction to the enactment of the rite. Moral force produces collective emotions that are common to all participants’. Jacobs and Smith (1999: 75), also following Durkheim, describe collective effervescence as ‘solidaristic feelings of communitas’. As members of collectives express emotion, they are simultaneously strengthening that emotion. Through collective effervescence, participants are ‘transported into an entirely different world from the one they have before their eyes’ (Durkheim, 1947: 226). Collective effervescence binds participants together into tight communities, and provides comfort, closeness, solidarity, and support for individuals as part of a group. Collective rituals also help to provide ‘a perpetual sustenance for our moral nature’ (Durkheim, 1947: 211), and often cause groups to alter the informal rules structuring normative public behavior. Tucker (1996) argues that collective rituals are the spaces where civil society is formed and sustained, and Smith (1999) agrees that collective effervescence can help alter public space and lead to social change towards a more democratic society.
However, another way of creating positive emotional energy among culture jammers is to absorb it from individuals who are perceived as being less powerful – in other words, those ‘typical consumers’ who have not joined the community of culture jamming. Taking part in a solidarity ritual, such as culture jamming, can give activists a sense of power; they can begin to see themselves as somehow ‘elevated above the multitude of duped consumers’ (Kozinets and Handelman, 2004: 696). This sense of power can generate positive emotional energy for those who feel powerful and can foster negative emotional energy from those who are perceived and treated as ‘subordinate’ (Collins, 1990). When this happens, this positive emotional energy can be created at the risk of alienating the very individuals jammers hope to recruit to their cause. That is, if positive emotional energy is created amongst activists as a result of absorbing it from audience members that they consider ‘inferior’ to them, this tactic could ‘backfire’ on them, and thus create consumers who rebel against the activists. These same consumers could then be led not to question, but, rather, to even more fully embrace consumerism, as a reaction to what they might perceive as condescension towards them on the part of the culture jammers. We believe that while this can lead to positive emotional energy being created internally for the activists, it can at the same time create negative emotional energy for the audience members.

ENACTING EMOTIONS IN CULTURE JAMMING

We illustrate the enactment of the emotion cycle depicted in Figure 1 by drawing upon data from the website of the culture jamming group Adbusters, from Lasn’s (1999) culture jamming manifesto, from various issues of Adbusters magazine, from the website of Reverend Billy and the Church of Stop Shopping along with Reverend Billy’s various sermons and songs, from recent documentaries about culture jamming that feature culture jammers such as the Billboard Liberation Front and Reverend Billy and the Church of Stop Shopping (Post and Palacios, 2006; Sharpe, 2001), and from various articles written by culture jamming activists (see, for instance, Grote, 2002). We first present examples of how and where emotion appears in the process of culture jamming. Using the framework of emotion management, we then turn to a discussion of how culture jammers manage audiences’ emotions in order to facilitate the resistance of emotional hegemony and how culture jammers experience their own growing sense of collective effervescence.
Culture jamming as emotional deviance

First, culture jammers use emotion to try to jar mainstream consumers out of their emotional numbness and bring about ‘détournement’. That is, culture jammers’ practices of cultural resistance (Duncombe, 2002) employ emotional imagery to elicit emotional responses in the viewing or experiencing public. We see this use of emotion in two particular culture jamming tactics that are widely used among various culture jamming groups: subvertisements and various kinds of pranks such as political theater.

Subvertising, and the related activity of altering or jamming advertising, is one of the most popular forms of culture jamming. Subvertisements are akin to anti-advertisements against large corporations, and have targeted such brands as the Gap, McDonald’s, and Absolut vodka. Through subvertising, culture jamming organizations such as the Billboard Liberation Front and the Adbusters Media Foundation, which publishes Adbusters magazine, seek to raise the critical consciousness of consumers about the power and various impacts (cultural, environmental, psychological, social) of advertising and the corporations that create and plaster our culture with advertisements. What Lasn (1999: 131) believes makes these subvertisements so effective, so memorable and attention-grabbing, is that they mimic ‘the look and feel of the target ad, prompting the classic double take as viewers realize what they’re seeing is in fact the very opposite of what they expected’. More importantly, they use images and text specifically designed to shock, disgust, or scare consumers. For example, a subvertisement of Calvin Klein’s ‘Obsession’ campaign shows a naked young woman, with bones protruding, vomiting into a toilet basin; the subvertisement serves as a call for resistance against the harmful body images for women portrayed by media that result in eating disorders and other psychological dysfunctions. In this way, culture jammers directly confront consumption through the very vehicles of advertisement crafted by corporations; this provides a catalyst for people to choose engagement over false harmony (Bordwell, 2002). Thus, through these subvertisements culture jammers seek to create consumers who are critical of the consumer world and the tools used to create adherence to that world.

Subvertisements seek to interrupt, and give new meanings to the ‘memes’ of our culture. The idea of ‘memes’ was popularized by geneticist Richard Dawkins (1989) and later taken up by cultural critics such as Douglas Rushkoff (1996), who popularized the phrase ‘media virus’. Dawkins (1989) states that a meme is a ‘unit of cultural transmission’ that replicates itself in ways similar to biological genes. Dawkins (1989) explains
how memes work: ‘just as genes propagate themselves in the gene pool by leaping from body to body via sperm or eggs, so memes propagate themselves in the meme pool by leaping from brain to brain via a process which, in the broad sense, can be called imitation’ (1989: 192). Memes have also been likened to viruses that spread rapidly through culture via various modes of transmission – including media of all kinds, advertising, YouTube, television shows, movies, and word of mouth – infecting their ‘ideological codes’ into anyone who comes into contact with them (Rushkoff, 1996: 10). Memes can change as they are spread (mutate), or can be replicated more or less exactly (cloned). Examples of memes include urban legends, trendy fashions, or inane advertising jingles (Duncombe, 2002). Culture jammers take advantage of the power of memes that are already part of most consumers’ consciousness, but they subvert the ideological codes of those memes; culture jammers thus fight ‘virus with virus’ (Boyd, 2002: 377). Through this kind of ‘meme warfare’ (Boyd, 2002), subvertisements work on an emotional level in a way that rational critique of advertising or of corporations fails to do. Boyd (2002) argues that, while rational discourse may be ineffective, culture jamming may be effective because it is grounded in emotional appeal instead of cognitive reasoning. Subvertisements can be positioned as ‘meme vaccines’ (Boyd, 2002: 377) that break our false sense of harmony and inoculate us against passive acceptance of media messages. Indeed, many culture jammers believe that the important battle of our time is over the ‘mental environment’, including memes. Herein lies the potential for social change: ‘Potent memes can change minds, alter behavior, catalyze collective mindshifts and transform cultures . . . Whoever has the memes has the power’ (Lasn 1999: 123).

Culture jammers who employ pranksterism (Harold, 2004) also enact emotional deviance through their activism, and attempt to elicit emotional responses in viewers. Culture jammers as pranksters resist ‘less through negating and opposing dominant rhetorics than by playfully and provocatively folding existing culture forms in on themselves’, through a kind of ‘rhetorical jujitsu’ (Harold 2004, 191). One example is Reverend Billy, who is a New York City-based anti-consumption performance art activist who, along with the Church of Stop Shopping that he leads, engages in acts of emotional deviance designed to awaken the emotions of the general public. Reverend Billy performs what he calls ‘retail interventions’ in public spaces and retail stores, targeting corporations such as Starbucks, Victoria’s Secret, and the Disney Company. During these interventions he preaches in the style of a Southern evangelist; instead of preaching about Christianity, however, he preaches against rampant commercialism, capi-
talism, the commodification of experiences, and issues such as labor prac-
tices, exploitation of workers, and the erosion of neighborhoods and
community. He also stages comic church services, with ‘readings from the
saints (or the devils), public confessions, collective exorcisms, the honoring
of new saints, donations to the cause, a lively choir, and a rousing sermon’
(Lane, 2002: 61). He whips audiences into emotional frenzies as he rages
against capitalism, consumerism, and over-consumption (see Figure 2).

We must stress, however, that these descriptions of the aims and
intended purposes of culture jamming come in large part from culture
jammers themselves; there has been little systematic data collected to see
what actual effect culture jamming in its various forms has on audiences.
Anecdotal evidence collected for another research project suggests that the
pranksterism of Reverend Billy does indeed cause some audience members
to change their perspectives on consumption and their everyday consump-
tive practices (Sandlin and Milam, 2008). The one piece of empirical
research we located on the effects of subvertising, Binay’s (2005) disser-
tation, found that subvertisements affected consumers in the same way
advertisements did; that is, subvertisements worked in favor of the brands
that were ‘jammed’ in them – they acted in essence as advertisements for
those brands. This finding clearly complicates the claims of culture jammers

Figure 2: Audience members in emotional ecstasy. Photo courtesy of Fred Askew
such as Lasn (1999). However, it only reflects one empirical study, and thus much more data needs to be collected on audience reactions to culture jamming.

**Creating audience dissonance**

One reason activists practice culture jamming is that they perceive that the general public lacks genuine emotions. Reverend Billy, for instance, states:

*We’re just buying things and we think that that’s the way that we construct the meaning in our lives. And we wonder why we have that empty feeling, a dull feeling. Of course they want us to have that empty dull feeling because we just get into that vicious cycle where we have to go back and buy something else.* (Reverend Billy, as interviewed in Sharpe, 2001)

Reverend Billy acknowledges that existing in this consumerist trance is easy – indeed, it is the path of least resistance. But only when people break out of that state of false harmony can authentic living occur. One way Reverend Billy attempts to shake people out of this consumerist trance is through exposing them to unexpected exhortations of emotions and out-of-the-ordinary acts of protest.

We argue, then, that culture jammers seek to bring about détourner-ment by using emotion as the catalyst to turn around popular mindsets. An example of how culture jamming accomplishes this is illustrated through the Nike ‘subvertisement’ in Figure 3. Upon first glance, the viewer sees (or thinks she sees) an advertisement for Nike shoes. This subvertisement is based on the Nike ‘Why do I run?’ campaign from the 1990s, which featured photographs of runners with inspirational text explaining why they run. A viewer familiar with the Nike memes would, at first glance, think this subvertisement shows a picture of a dedicated runner and would think the text contains inspirational phrases about being dedicated to the art and sport of running. In what can be described as a double-take, however, the viewer sees what is really featured in this ad – an Indonesian shoe factory worker who is running (barefoot, without the Nike shoes she makes but cannot afford to buy) to escape the harsh working conditions she must endure to earn a tiny bit of money by making the expensive shoes sold to consumers much like the one reading the ad. If the reaction works as intended, the reader begins to experience ‘détournement’. The viewer feels off-balance because the expectations for and the reality of the ad are at such odds. This realization produces a variety of emotions in the viewer –
outrage at the unfair labor practices and guilt over buying (perhaps, even at that moment *wearing*) Nike products – and hopefully shocks the reader into viewing the Nike company in a different light, and into changing his or her consumption practices with regard to Nike. Lasn (1999: 107) captures quite well the emotional response détournement brings about:

> What does the perceptual shift feel like when it comes? Imagine a desperately down-and-out soul who suddenly finds God. Now try to imagine the opposite of that process. This moment of reckoning is not so much like suddenly seeing heaven in a world you thought was hell as it is suddenly seeing hell in a world you thought was heaven.

Figure 3: A Nike ‘subvertisement’. Image courtesy of Adbusters
Another example of ‘détournement’ comes from Reverend Billy, who describes how audiences often react to his preaching with confusion:

I love it if I see someone and their jaw’s down and their eyes are . . . [demonstrates a confused look] . . . ‘What is this? – What is this guy doing – What? Mickey’s the devil but he’s not a Christian? – What? – What? – Is he an actor or is this a stunt?’ – And you can see them looking at the cameras they’re trying to add it up – as soon as they can add it up it’s less important to them. If that suspension takes place for two or three or four minutes, they’re gonna take that home and they’re gonna still be thinking about it a week later. They might even hesitate to buy a Disney product. (Reverend Billy interviewed in Sharpe, 2001)

The unexpected and emotionally jarring experience of seeing and hearing a ‘preacher’ preaching inside a retail space such as the Disney store leads audience members outside of cognitive rationality and into the realm of emotion. In these instances, audiences members are confused and suspended in this moment where they cannot make sense of what is happening. Reverend Billy explains that these moments hold the possibilities of change. In these moments, audience members ‘are no longer in possession of themselves and that’s good – that means something real might be changing in them or something’ (Reverend Billy interviewed in Post and Palacios, 2006).

From dissonance to anger: Creating effervescence or alienation?

To help consumers shake out of the ‘empty dull feeling’ of consumerism, culture jammers employ a variety of pranks, including political theater, to capture the emotions of consumers as a means to jar them into action. For example, one audience member wrote to Reverend Billy (on his website, Reverend Billy, n.d.) to explain his emotional reaction to viewing one of Reverend Billy’s public appearances:

HELLO REV.! i heard you on the Majority Report wed. night as i sat in my car (‘90 volvo, a real mess) and watched the beautiful snow flakes whirl about. it could not have been more powerful. your words about buying gifts within walking distance really moved me . . . yes, i AM a consumer sinner. i feebly try to do the best i can, and feel guilty about not doing enough! commercial society repulses me and the last thing i want to do is feed the beast that tries to rule our planet. i am
weak. but your message helps me stay strong and inspires me to keep working and spread the word of CHANGE!!!! . . . Bill

This emotional reaction of suddenly feeling moved stirred up a sense of hope within the reader that is leading to a reconceptualization of his identity.

In another culture jamming action captured on film by Sharpe (2001), Reverend Billy preaches against sweatshops and corporate power in a Walt Disney store. Right after the performance, Sharpe’s videographer captures this conversation between two women in the audience:

Woman 1: I’m just offended by what just happened in the store. Where I spend my money and where I go to shop is my business and not anyone else’s. Especially an idiot like whoever he was.

Woman 2: Oh, you were offended by what he had to say?

Woman 1: Right.

Woman 2: I’m more offended that Disney has sweatshops. I can see Kathy Gifford, but Disney? Disney? I’m gonna check it out, I’ll tell you, cause I spend a lot of money in Disney. Disney with all their billions of dollars, that’s the least they can do is pay a decent wage and not to underage children.

(interviewed in Sharpe, 2001)

At this same performance, Reverend Billy and his followers are outside the Disney store, where they are holding large wooden crosses with Mickey Mouse and Minnie Mouse ‘crucified’ on (actually tied to) the crosses. An angry man walks up to them and yells, ‘Take the mouse off the cross! Because I’m a Catholic and I find that very very offensive – that you’re taking a symbol of my religion and putting a friggin’ toy on it like it means nothing. It is very very offensive’ (Sharpe, 2001).

Audience members also have emotional reactions to Adbusters. A participant in an online discussion about culture jamming stated, for instance:

I HATE Adbusters. Why? Because they have this preachy holier-than-thou attitude. In the same way that MADD public service announcements make me want a double Maker’s Mark on the rocks, and ‘Smoking Is Really, Really Bad For The Children’ ads make me want a big fucking cigar, Adbusters make me want to do nothing more than rent a Ford Excursion and drive straight to McDonald’s. And I doubt I’m the only one who feels that way. (Sulli, 2002)
Another participant on a different forum simply proclaims, ‘I hate adbusters for being propagandistic’ (Miriam, 2004). Heath and Potter (2004) also highlight that perceived hypocrisy on the part of culture jammers is likely to generate irritation by observers:

During the famous Seattle riots of 1999, the downtown Niketown was trashed by protestors, but videotape recorded at the scene showed several protestors kicking in the front window wearing Nike shoes. It occurred to many people that if you think Nike is the root of all evil, you really should not be wearing their shoes. (2004: 4)

In these examples, one sees several different emotional responses to Reverend Billy’s and Adbusters’ culture jamming, including excitement, anger, and offense. Some viewers respond with anger at the target the culture jammers are aiming at, for example, the Disney Corporation. Other viewers target their anger at the culture jammers themselves. In these cases, it is evident that rather than [re]considering their own subject positions or participation in what culture jammers would deem the social and political hegemony of consumerism, the viewer sees the jammers (and their actions) as offensive, judgmental, and oppressive. We see illustrated here, then, consumers who are poised to follow one of two different trajectories outlined in the model in Figure 1. One trajectory creates a sense of solidarity with the culture jammers and results in positive emotional energy; the other trajectory generates alienation and entrenchment and results in negative emotional energy for the individual.

The first trajectory fosters anger at consumerism, which may lead audience members to hope that change can occur which, in turn, leads to social action, and possibly to joining the collective of culture jamming. We posit that this type of audience member resonated with the positive emotional energy being created through the interaction ritual of the culture jamming activity. We also posit that these audience members experienced with the culture jammers what Schrock et al. (2004) call ‘emotional resonance.’ This notion of ‘emotional resonance’ is a way of expanding Snow and Benford’s (1988) idea of frame resonance, which posits that social movements frame themselves in particular ways, which resonate more or less with individuals. The more the frame resonates with an individual, the more likely that individual is to join the movement. Schrock et al. (2004: 62) argue that Snow and Benford’s model focuses almost entirely on cognitive aspects of framing resonance, such as ‘the congruency between frames and knowledge of real world events, between collective frames and cultural
narratives and myths’, and so on. Schrock et al. (2004: 62) posit that an important aspect of resonance involves emotion; they state that emotional resonance is ‘the emotional harmony and/or tension between collective action frames (Snow et al., 1986) and the emotional lives of potential recruits’. In the case of audience members who experience dissonance that leads to anger and to political action or behavioral change, we posit that they experienced a positive resonance between the emotional appeals of the culture jammers, and their own emotional lives.

The second trajectory also fosters anger but, in this case, the anger is directed at the culture jammers themselves. These audience members are likely to follow a trajectory that leads to alienation from the culture jammers and entrenchment in the false harmony of the broader societal discourse. We contend that these individuals experience the culture jammers’ activities as power interactions. In other words, it is possible that they believe, subconsciously or consciously, that the culture jammers were creating positive emotional energy for themselves at the expense of the audience. In this case, these audience members would have experienced tension between the emotional frames of the culture jammers and their own emotional lives. Because present emotional experiences are grounded in and interpreted through the lenses of previous experiences (Ooi, 2002; Parvez, 2006), different audience members will react to culture jamming activities in unique ways.

Creating internal collective effervescence

As argued above, the process of culture jamming itself is an intensely emotional experience for those doing the jamming; thus, those doing the jamming are engaging their own emotions in addition to the emotions of audience members. Many culture jammers initially join the jamming movement as a result of emotions such as frustration with or sadness about consumer culture. As a reaction to this frustration, they feel they have to do something – to take some action. Carly Stasko, a culture jammer from Toronto, says, ‘I’m frustrated. I would always feel really bad after reading Seventeen magazine. I started cutting them up and it made me feel more powerful, like I had more control’ (Carly Stasko interviewed in Sharpe 2001).

The act of participating in culture jamming also brings out intense emotions in activists. As they jam, they are engaging in ‘authentic’ acts involving real emotions. As Reverend Billy exclaims,

It feels great when you do it! It feels GREAT! . . . I feel SO GOOD preaching in a Disney store! . . . It is time to be rude. It
is time to be embarrassed. If you really do something that just makes you SHAKE with the feeling of being inappropriate, you’ve probably found a strut, a structure of their culture that was supposed to be there. You’ve violated something. You’ve discovered their power. (Reverend Billy interviewed in Sharpe, 2001)

Culture jammers such as the members of the Billboard Liberation Front also emphasize the group cohesion and collective emotional energy that comes out of participating in culture jamming activities. One member states:

It’s fun. It has to be fun. Anything we do, if we’re not having fun, we lose. Making fun of corporations is all good and dandy, but if we’re not enjoying ourselves or get too strident, like, why the hell do it? Why the hell do it? They win. If you have a stick up your butt, they win. (Billboard Liberation Front member interviewed in Sharpe, 2001)

Another member explains that culture jamming has to do with ‘being with other human beings and having an adventure – where you’re not just consuming prepackaged events or experiences’ (Billboard Liberation Front member interviewed in Sharpe, 2001).

We posit that these intense emotional experiences created for culture jammers through the process of jamming are similar to the ‘collective effervescence’ Durkheim (1947) describes as being part of religious or sacred rituals. For instance, Church of Stop Shopping member Jason Grote (2002: 359) describes an emotional connection that occurred among culture jammers during their retail interventions in the Disney store:

I have noticed that there is a collective upswell of emotion that seems to occur at demonstrations, or at least at the good ones. I think it would be dangerous if I were to feel it more often: a mix of inspiration, sentimentality, camaraderie, self-righteousness, righteous anger, abject fear, and what I think Che Guevara must have been talking about when he said that the true revolutionary was guided by great feelings of love: a deep, abiding compassion for everything and everyone.

These culture jammers, then, are creating and participating in a kind of collective effervescence that manifests as the emotional excitement that occurs when individuals gather for collective rituals (Durkheim, 1947).
During collective rituals, a sort of ‘electricity is formed’ by the process of gathering together, which transports participants to an ‘extraordinary degree of exaltation’ (Durkheim, 1947: 215).

We refer to this form of collective effervescence as authentic harmony, as depicted in Figure 1. Mestrovic (1997) suggests that authentic emotions can only emerge from a community imbued with collective effervescence. As noted in our model, authentic harmony is the outcome of a cycle of consumer resistance that uses emotion to seek change. It is this action toward change that serves as a key indicator of authenticity. Salmela (2005: 211) notes that ‘superficiality of such emotions is indicated by their subjects’ failure to follow the emotion into action’. In other words, if an audience member is moved to a change in behavior, that marks a step toward authentic harmony.

DISCUSSION
In this article we explored the role of emotion in consumer resistance movements. We argued that culture jammers who practice consumer resistance use emotion as they attempt to jar consumers out of the false emotional harmony that constitutes the current emotional hegemony of postemotionalism, with the ultimate goal of leading consumers towards more authentic emotional harmony. We believe that focusing on the emotion cycle in culture jamming can help illuminate some of the problems and possibilities that consumer researchers have pointed to in their previous discussions of consumer resistance groups.

An important part of our argument centers on the ways in which culture jammers attempt to use emotional deviance to counteract the current emotional hegemony of postemotionalism. This is seen, for instance, in how culture jammers try to create within audiences a sense of détournement – jammers want to help audiences create authentic emotions to help consumers shake themselves free of inauthentic, emotionally scripted lives. While postemotionalism is deeply engrained in current western society, Mestrovic (1997) argues that one way to begin counteracting this emotional hegemony is to reignite a ‘collective effervescence’ of genuine caring and empathy toward others (Durkheim, 1947). He posits that the way to do this is by reengaging in communal cultural activities that encourage ritual and symbolic belief in an atmosphere of sharing and caring. We have argued that consumer resistance social movements are possible sites of affective resistance, as they have the potential to create secular forms of collective effervescence that might challenge postemotionalism.
In fact, we see evidence of collective effervescence in the work of previous researchers who have focused on consumer resistance groups. For instance, we believe the anti-advertising, anti-Nike, and anti-genetically engineered food activists studied by Kozinets and Handelman (2004) experience a kind of secular collective effervescence. While Kozinets and Handelman (2004) do not use that term, their descriptions of the activists’ emotions certainly seem to fit. For instance, in their study they liken the activists’ emotional experiences to the spiritual expression of religious converts, complete with ‘epiphanies’, ‘transcendence’, and ‘deeply emotional conversions’ (Kozinets and Handelman, 2004, 696). The activists in their study experience the kinds of ‘depth of lasting commitment, legitimacy, and authenticity that can be found mainly in the realms of traditional community and religion’ (Kozinets and Handelman, 2004: 702). Kozinets and Handelman (2004: 702) argue, for instance, that ‘spiritual and religious connections constitute individual identity into the lasting communal and institutional forms necessary for sustained and successful consumer movements. Through them, community, authenticity, and self-realization are often cast in opposition to consumerism.’

However, in Kozinets and Handelman’s (2004) study, while this sense of collective effervescence helped bind individuals within the movement together, it did not always lead to the changes among mainstream consumers that activists desired. In fact, Kozinets and Handelman (2004: 703) conclude that these anti-consumption activist groups walk a fine line between ‘conviction and conversion’ and they often actually alienate the very consumers they are trying to influence. We suggest this can be explained in terms of the emotion cycle we presented, and specifically in terms of how the positive emotional energy feeding the activists is being created, and how well it resonates with particular audience members. When culture jammers’ acts of emotional deviance lead to emotional dissonance coupled with negative emotional energy, mainstream consumers can turn their anger against culture jammers themselves. We believe that the anti-consumption activists in Kozinets and Handelman’s study often followed this emotion cycle, as they created their own positive emotional energy while creating negative emotional energy among mainstream consumers.

Kozinets and Handelman (2004: 703) argue, for example, that activists show disdain for mainstream consumers, and thus often turn those consumers into their ‘adversaries’ as the activists place themselves in opposition to mainstream consumers. The activists in Kozinets and Handelman’s (2004: 702) study depicted mainstream consumers as ‘unaware, hypnotized,
selfish, and lazy’ while they represented themselves as ‘aware, free, altruistic, and mobilized’. Kozinets and Handelman (2004) further note that anti-consumption social movement activists tend to see their audiences through two lenses. On the one hand, activists perceive mainstream consumers as blind to their role in consumerist ideology (we would interpret this as a state of existing in false harmony) and, therefore, activists position them as part of the enemy system of consumption. On the other hand, activists are trying to save consumers and change the larger social system to create authentic harmony. The activists in Kozinets and Handelman’s study felt disgust towards consumers and saw ‘typical’ consumers as being asleep in a consumer trance, while they reveled in feelings of effervescence among themselves. Similar negative attitudes towards ‘typical consumers’ appear in culture jamming activism. For instance, a ‘holier-than-thou’ attitude comes across in Adbusters magazines, as contributors and editors define for readers how they are supposed to think and live, and sometimes rant against what they perceive as ‘consumer sheep’. For instance, in the July/August 2003 issue, contributor Hunter S. Thompson asks, ‘Who does vote for these dishonest skinheads? Who among us can be happy and proud of having all this innocent blood on our hands? Who are these swine? These flag-sucking half-wits who get fleeced and fooled by stupid little rich kids like George Bush? . . . I piss down the throats of these Nazis’ (cited in Center for Consumer Freedom, 2008, para. 29).

The activists in Kozinets and Handelman’s study, as well as the Adbusters culture jammers quoted above, thus create positive energy by absorbing it from those they consider beneath them. This leads to a strong internal focus amongst the activists. As we argued above, we believe that while this can lead to positive emotional energy being created internally for the activists, it can at the same time create negative emotional energy for the audience members. Indeed, Kozinets and Handelman (2004: 701) stated that in their study ‘consumers responded to this activist intransigence with recalcitrance’. Mainstream consumers confronted with such behavior thus channel their feelings of dissonance into anger at the activists.

These challenges of ‘opposition’ (Kozinets and Handelman, 2004: 702) can be framed in emotional terms as the negative emotional energy that emerges from the dynamics of power interactions. And, yet, the counter-balance of ‘identity’ (Kozinets and Handelman, 2004: 701) can be seen as fostering the positive emotional energy associated with the solidarity that occurs through interaction rituals. The lure of engaging in the dark side of anti-consumerist activities – that is, adopting an elitist perspective toward consumers in order to feel more powerful – is strong. However, perhaps
the use of intense emotions can work to influence consumer behavior if there is a significant galvanizing event that facilitates the emergence of collective effervescence that awakens citizens to the implications of consumerism. If that occurs, culture jammers may have the opportunity to extend the collective effervescence outside of their own groups, to include the mainstream consumers around them.

We conclude with a sobering reflection on the state of anti-consumption activism. These activists are, in fact, battling for consumer emotions in a postemotional society in which emotions are manufactured, displaced, misplaced, and mechanized. By attempting to manipulate emotions, as we noted earlier, these movements might simply be exacerbating existing emotional hegemony. Ironically, the strategies employed by culture jammers may actually inhibit substantive action. The emotions crafted among the jammers may give them a false sense of emotional authenticity. Thus, culture jammers may themselves be victims of emotional hegemony even while they are struggling to resist it.

Note
1. We do not wish to suggest that culture jamming is the only way consumers can enter the cycle of resistance we depict in our theoretical model. A sense of ‘moral shock’ could also arise after experiencing or interacting with any number of sites of ‘critical public pedagogy’ (Giroux, 2000) that focus on revealing the cultural, social, and environmental costs of hyperconsumption, including books such as Naomi Klein’s (2000) No Logo or Eric Schlosser’s (2001) Fast Food Nation, or films such as Morgan Spurlock’s (2004) Super Size Me. However, while emotional responses could arise when engaging with these sites of critical public pedagogy, these sites do not necessarily hinge on emotional appeals. We choose to focus on culture jamming in particular because of its conscious use of emotional appeals designed to disorient the viewer, as well as its appropriation and re-use of the same kinds of tools utilized by mass media and advertisers.
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