The Capture of Affect: (Homo)normalizations of Affective Relationality in the Non-Profit Industrial Complex

By
Matthew Bakko

Abstract

This thesis explores affective processes of normalization that actualize through the "Non-Profit Industrial Complex" (NPIC) in the United States. Through utilizing Deleuzian-inspired affect theory, I attempt to examine social structure through affect, the relational and bodily impact that produces a shift in another body's own capacity to affect and be affected. The analytical move of embedding affect within structure shifts our attention to how affective change is delimited, or "captured," through the institutional embeddedness of affect, and how this engenders norms of affective relationality that sustains structure. I argue that the NPIC is a territorial assemblage and apparatus of affective relationality that connects the non-profit system to foundations, wealthy donors, and the associated neoliberal state and corporate sector. Affective processes are transmitted through the NPIC in such a way that engenders patterned refrains of doing social change work that actualize as material practices that sustain the affective relationality of the NPIC. I explore how this is a normalization of affective relationality that mediates the capacity to affect and be affected, delimiting the potential for radical deterritorializations of the NPIC to actualize. I will examine connections between the lesbian and gay movement and the NPIC as a case example, specifically in regards to processes of homonormativity that (homo)normalize affective relations in the NPIC through the relational promise of belonging and access to dominant institutions. This demonstrates that social change work actualized through the NPIC is complicit in delimiting the openness and indeterminacy of affect, and consequently the capacity for actualizing new affective connections, assemblages, and worlds.

i

Acknowledgements

I have been deeply "affected" by so many in the actualization of this research. I am indebted to Allaine Cerwonka and Eszter Timár for their critical influence on this project, mentorship, and encouragement when I pondered diving into unknown depths. Thank you to my fellow students and colleagues for the incredible intellectual journey we continue to go through together. I am eternally grateful to Ivan for his support, patience, calming aura, and love. Thank you to my parents for their enthusiasm, pride, and flights home. Lastly, this thesis would not have been possible without the social workers, activists, and organizers who have nurtured and inspired me over the years. I am in awe of your dedication to social change.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

CEU eTD Collection

Introduction

  The basis for this research is in a question that troubles many activists who do their social change work in the non-profit and non-governmental organization (NGO) world: Why does the radical social change that so many in the social change business seek to enact not happen? While this question takes different scholars in numerous theoretical and empirical directions, the lens through which I consider it is permeated by reflections of my own everyday experiences of working and volunteering for years in the non-profit and NGO system in the United States. I recall the countless hours of researching, writing, and evaluating grant proposals. I recall endless meetings with co-workers and boards of directors where we strategized our message for upcoming site visits from potential or current funders. I recall going on staff retreat trainings to increase our individual fundraising capacity, or to finely tune our organizational strategic plan to ensure that our vision, goals, objectives, and action steps were clearly stated in a measurable way for funders. I recall vast amounts of creative energy being used to tweak organizations' "values" so that they were flexible enough to match the values and funding priorities of diverse donors and foundations. In sum, what I often recall is how much time, energy, and resources were not spent working directly on the social issues that concerned us, particularly with our grassroots supporters or constituents. Why did so much of my work involve fundraising? When did social change work become so occupied with fulfilling the wishes of donors? How do the very institutions implicated in the neoliberal state and corporate sector, of which we are so critical, operate in such a way to affect our social change work and us?

  This thesis will explore such questions by utilizing the "Non-Profit Industrial Complex" (NPIC) as a phenomenon that locates social change work through the non-profit system as implicated in dominant structures of power, but will expand upon this notion by examining it through the framework of affect theory. Affect, as utilized here, prompts an

attention to the everyday relational processes of bodies that produce indeterminate change. While often placed in opposition to post-structuralist approaches to power and structure, significantly, this research attempts to elucidate the connections between affect and post-structuralism by exploring relational affective processes saturated with power that work through and upon structure. As such, this thesis makes a critical intervention in affect theory by prioritizing an affective analysis of power-laden institutions that are produced by and productive of continuous processes of affective relationality. The analytical move of embedding affect within structure not only enriches current notions of affect as a productive force for continuous change by considering institutions themselves as affective entities, but it also shifts our attention to how affective change is delimited, or "captured," through the institutional embeddedness of affect, and how this engenders norms of affective relationality that sustains structure.

This research will engage with the NPIC as one such affective structure, particularly because this connects the dominant structure through which bodies do deliberate social change work with a theory of processual and relational change. In other words, affect allows us to observe better the processes of social change that occur in the institutionalized business of social change. Additionally, as contemporary social change work often materializes in the context of identity politics, this research will explore affective processes in regards to one such identity-based movement, the lesbian and gay movement in the United States, thereby theorizing the movement's homonormativity as normalizations of affective relationality.

As affect theory is a broad field that offers multiple, and often divergent, conceptualizations of affect, Chapter I of this thesis will offer a theoretical overview of affect as utilized in this research, specifically in terms of affects relation to structure. While it provides a brief overview of affect theory, the majority of the chapter presents a variety of related sub-concepts of affect that derive from Deleuzian-inspired work on affect. This

2

introduction to affective concepts that relate to structure will provide a basis for exploring the connections between post-structuralism and affect theory, which I argue enhances our understanding of structure, power, change, and the social.

Chapter II will introduce the NPIC through the anthology *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*, but will expand upon this work by exploring the affective processes of the NPIC. I will first discuss the historical emergence of the NPIC as a system that connects the social change work of non-profits to foundations and wealthy donors, and thereby to the neoliberal state and corporate sector. As such, the NPIC will be considered an affective apparatus that captures affect, thereby mediating the capacity to affect and be affected of those involved in social change work. This mediation can be observed through examining core processes of the NPIC that engender refrains for doing social change work, including the agenda setting power of foundations and wealthy donors through the grant process, everyday practices of non-profits that actualize as professionalized competitions for funding, and the formation of the NPIC as a system of knowledge for doing social change work. I will argue that these affective processes are transmitted through the NPIC in such a way that sustains and normalizes its affective relationality, delimiting the potential for radical deterritorializations to occur.

Chapter III will further develop the arguments of the previous chapter by exploring the affective processes of the lesbian and gay movement in the United States. I will present a selective history of this movement, in as far as it emerged as part of the NPIC, and argue that the increasing growth in connections between non-profits, foundations, and wealthy donors works to capture affect and set agendas for social change work in the movement. As such, the contemporary movement not only actualizes homonormative social change that promises access to the neoliberal state and corporate sector, but it does so through actualizing fundraising practices that connect social change work to foundations and wealthy donors,

thereby offering through this connection the possibility to realize the promise of homonormative belonging. I will argue that this results in homonormalizations of affective relationality that mediate the capacity to affect, which increases the capacity of bodies to actualize social change work that sustains the NPIC, while decreasing the capacity to enact radical deterritorializations of it, and ultimately, delimiting the indeterminacy of affect.

Chapter 1

Affect

This chapter will serve as an introduction to affect theory. It will present a constellation of connected sub-concepts of affect, specifically those that are integral for facilitating links between affect and social structure. The central part of the chapter is organized to present these concepts in their own specificity and as building upon each other in an interlocking manner, coalescing to form what will be called "affect" in this research. My attempt is to do this as lucidly as possible, utilizing concise case examples when deemed helpful. In doing so, I hope to challenge portrayals of post-structuralism as incompatible with theorizations of affect, and will utilize Clare Hemmings's critique of this perceived incongruence to elucidate connections between affect and the social. Additionally, John Protevi's concept of "bodies politic" will serve as an exemplar of a framework that theorizes affect and the social together. Deleuze and Guattari (1994) have stated that "philosophy is the art of forming, inventing, and fabricating concepts" (p. 2). While not defined as a philosophical text, this chapter is indebted to the creators of concepts of affect, and in a Deleuzian spirit, hopes to find new nuances and uses for them.

1.1 Foundations of Critical Affect Theory

Over the last two decades, affect theory has increased in predominance in a variety of fields across the humanities and sciences. This is so much so that Patricia Clough (2007) has dubbed its rise as the "Affective Turn," positioning the trend towards affect on a similar level to the linguistic or cultural turns. What has prompted the turn to affect, and related, what is so productive about affect that it gains the status of being deemed a "turn?" Here I will give a brief genealogy of affect theory that will partially illuminate the turn towards it, and which

will concomitantly establish a foundation for describing the major framework of affect theory that I will be utilizing in this research.

Much of contemporary affect theory has been inspired and stimulated by two major frameworks set forth by two influential essays, both published in 1995. The first essay is "Shame in the Cybernetic Fold: Reading Silvan Tomkins" by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Adam Frank, while the other is "The Autonomy of Affect" by Brian Massumi. These essays invited readers to think outside of, go beyond, challenge, and respond to the dominance of post-structuralism and epistemology in critical theory, presenting affect as the approach for shifting our focus towards the ontological (Seigworth & Gregg, 2010). In these essays and in other work, both Massumi and Sedgwick evaluate post-structuralist scholarship as saturated by social determinism, to the point where, politically, escape from the confines of structure seems impossible, and, conceptually, theorists continuously occupy themselves in uncovering further and further the workings of determinant dominating structures (Hemmings, 2005). The research presented here challenges Massumi and Sedgwick's generalized portrayal of post-structuralism, as well as its essential disparateness from affect theory, but will briefly present their interpretation here since it is foundational to much current scholarship on affect theory.

Both scholars offer up affect, albeit from different foundations and approaches, as a way to move critical theory beyond what they view as the social determinism of post-structuralism. For Massumi (2002), this involves a Deleuzian move from "position" to movement, where positionality is the determined location of a subject resulting from its entrenchment in an "ideological master structure" (p. 3), and movement is the indeterminate process of change, transformation, and becoming that is foreclosed through post-structural conceptualizations of the social (pp. 4-5). For Sedgwick and Frank (1995), affect is a way of destabilizing "the seemingly near-inescapable habits of thought that Foucault groups together

6

under the term *repressive hypothesis*" (p. 500), by offering the possibility of unexpected reparative possibilities and transformations of attachment, connection, and relationality through reworkings of and across emotional systems. Additionally, these scholars depict post-structuralism as obsessed with an epistemological urge to use techniques of deconstruction to reveal the controlling mediation of ideological structure. They see a theoretical move towards the ontological, exemplified through attending to affect, as offering a way to account for real difference that escapes, or could become an escape, from social determinism (Hemmings, 2005).

In their essay, Sedgwick and Frank (1995) frame their move towards affect through reading psychologist Silvin Tomkins's work in terms of its possibilities to "challenge [the] habits and procedures" (p. 487) of critical theory.[1] In his work, Tomkins identified nine primary and differential bodily affects, such as joy, anger, shame, and fear, that form an emotional system that is separate from, but in relation to the cognitive and drive systems. Sedgwick and Frank employ Tomkins's work to present the relationality of the body and its systems, with affect as the system of change that works with and upon other bodily systems to produce multiple, differentiated, and potentially unexpected outcomes. In short, Tomkins inspired these authors to see a new possibility for affect to be theorized and utilized as a radical force for creating connections and possibilities in the social world, beyond what they

---

[1]   While it may seem strange to associate "habit and procedure" with critical theory, Sedgwick and Frank outline four profuse tendencies. These include 1) distancing critical projects from biology in order account for difference in the social; 2) language as the most beneficial framework for understanding representation; 3) the destabilization of dominant/subordinate power relations and the tools of domination; and 4) the deconstruction of problematic, socially constructed binaries.

view as imaginable through more socially deterministic post-structuralist and epistemological theorizing.

In terms of the framework I will be utilizing in this research, Massumi's essay provides the foundation for an affect theory as influenced by the work of French philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, who themselves were inspired Baruch Spinoza's work on affect. In a similar vein to Sedgwick's use of Tomkins, Massumi (1995) utilizes Deleuzian thinking to describe affect as a relational force through which bodies and worlds change and emerge. However, Massumi's conceptualization of affect is distinct through his use of Deleuze's focus on affective capacities. This affect is the indeterminate, always in process, potential and force for changes in the capacity to relate. At its most general, affect is utilized in this research through the lens of Spinoza's view of affect as the capacity to affect and to be affected. The next section of this chapter will give a detailed description of this and key concepts of Deleuzian-inspired affect theory, specifically those that are crucial for understanding the arguments and analysis of this research. In this research, the theoretical Massumi-Deleuze-Guattari-Spinoza connection will be hereafter referred to as "Deleuzian-inspired affect theory."

1.2 Some Concepts of Deleuzian-Inspired Affect Theory[2]

1.2.1 The Relational Body

The body is central to affect. This is illustrated by the working definition of affect provided by Brian Massumi in the translation notes of Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) *A*

---

[2]   This section is partially indebted to Jason Lim's (2007) excellent discussion on concepts of affect, which helped guide my selection, understanding, and reference choices regarding certain affective concepts.

Thousand Plateaus: Affect "is an ability to affect and be affected. It is a prepersonal intensity corresponding to the passage from one experiential state of the body to another and implying an augmentation or diminution in that body's capacity to act" (p. xvi). This definition that is utilized here and in much Deleuzian-inspired affect theory comes from Spinoza. In doing a close reading of it, there are two essential points to highlight. The first is that affect is relational; it is about the capacity of bodies to affect and be affected by other bodies, or putting the latter in other terms, "a susceptibility to be affected" (Massumi, 2002, p. 61). The second is in regards to the "passage" of the body. In affecting and being affected the body is in movement, in the sense that movement itself is change. That is to say, affect is the relational and bodily impact that produces a movement, or a shift, in another body's own capacity to affect and be affected. The "prepersonal" aspect of affect is discussed further below.

For Deleuzian-inspired affect theory, it is through the body's affective relationality with other bodies, and the constant changes that occur through this relationality, that the body is seen as what Brian Massumi (2002) calls "indeterminate": "We know nothing about a body until we know what it can do, in other words, what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects, with the affects of another body, either to destroy that body or to be destroyed by it, either to exchange actions and passions with it or to join with it in composing a more powerful body" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 257). In other words, bodies are indeterminate because of their affective interactions with other bodies, during which, through relational movement, bodies are constantly changing, even in very small degrees, including changes in their capacity to affect and be affected further.[3] It is

---

[3]   It is not possible to generalize what exactly is affecting and is affected for Deleuze (1988), as this will vary greatly upon each encounter and context. For example, while a torrential rainstorm may uproot a plant, affecting its capacity to live, a light rain may increase

9

important to note that this means that a body and its capacity to affect can only be understood in terms of its relation to other bodies and their affects (Lim, 2007, pp. 55-56). Therefore, bodies are not understood in Deleuzian-inspired affect theory as something that can be identified as an isolatable, mechanistic form, but they are understood in their differential, processual capacities to affect and be affected relationally (Deleuze, 1988, p. 124).

Additionally, a greater openness is brought to bodies and what they can do when thinking of them as indeterminate in their affective relationality and capacities (Lim, 2007, pp. 54-56). For example, the body does not need to be merely understood as that which is dictated by ideological power, where the body is nothing more than constructed by and "a local embodiment *of* ideology" (Massumi, 2002, p. 3). That is, the relational, affective body can be understood as or become something different from what is seemingly determined through social structure. Through affect, new relations, capacities, assemblages and bodily forms are possible. For example, in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, what greater capacities for survival were produced through the formation of affective communities of solidarity, especially in the face of bureaucratic attempts to control such communities on the part of United States bureaucracy (Protevi, 2009, pp. 163-183)? Affect fosters an attention to such questions and new potentials by helping us look at the differential capacities of bodies to change through being in relation to other bodies, offering the possibility of new affective connections, modes of being and becoming, and worlds that possibly do not circumscribe to social determinism (Lim, 2007, pp. 55-56). Thus, throughout this research, I will "call the openness of an interaction to being affected by something new in a way that qualitatively

the plant's capacity for growth, pollination, and nourishment of others (Deleuze, 1988, p. 125). The list of what can affect and be affected is seemingly endless, ranging from atomic physiology, to emotions and sensations, to all manner of external objects. The point is that everything on such a list changes relationally.

changes its dynamic nature *relationality*" (Massumi, 2002, p. 224). However, while this may initially sound positive and limitless, I will argue later that, in line with post-structuralist approaches to power and structure, affect does work upon and through forms of power as well, power which labors to alter capacities to affect and be affected. This will be the subject of much of my research in later chapters.

Finally, as the body is not understood as something that can be stably defined, it is important to note that "body" is understood broadly in Deleuzian thought (Lim, 2007, p. 54): "A body can be anything; it can be an animal, a body of sounds, a mind or an idea; it can be a linguistic corpus, a social body, a collectivity" (Deleuze, 1988, p. 127). A body is, in short, an assemblage of parts. An assemblage is "the 'holding together' of heterogeneous elements" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 323). The assorted parts of a whole retain a level of individual distinctiveness, but the functions and force of these parts differentiate and are fundamentally transformed by being part of a whole (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 325). Not only may parts leave one assemblage and form up with other parts to form a different assemblage, but whole assemblages come together to form more complex assemblages. For instance, the human body can be considered an assemblage of biological, psychological, and semiotic parts, to name a few types, and can relationally join with other bodies to form collective assemblages. The latitude offered by this conceptualization of the body is apt for an affect theory that conceives of the open potential of the body to change into new forms, capacities, and formations (Lim, 2007, pp. 54-56), perhaps regardless of or even in response to attempts at subsumption by ideological structure. Thinking in terms of relational assemblages and affect helps us to consider "how do individuals enter into composition with one another in order to form a higher individual, ad finitum? How can a being take on another being into its world, but while preserving or respecting the other's own relations and world?" (Deleuze, 1988, p. 126).

1.2.2 Virtual/Actual(ization)

The body is indeterminate and processual through its participation in the Virtual and the Actual, fundamental concepts in Deleuzian-inspired affect theory. Brian Massumi's (1995, 2002) work on affect is saturated with these concepts and reference to his work will prove helpful here. In his Deleuzian-inspired works on affect, the Virtual is the field of multiplicitous potential, or what could happen, and the Actual is the singular manifestation of a potential out of the Virtual field, or what actually does happen. This will be explained in full.

In any given moment, the body is capable of multiple things: movements, sounds, and thoughts, among others. This is not to say that what the body is capable of is limitless, as the body is constrained in certain ways by such things as its physicality, ability, and context. What this is saying though is that in any given moment the body does have multiple ways of moving, making sound, and thinking that could be enacted (Lim, 2007, p. 56). The Virtual is this multiplicity of potential things that the body may enact in a moment. The Actual is that one potential thing that does become enacted. The enacting of a Virtual potential is called an "actualization" (Massumi, 1995, pp. 102-105).

To help understand this in terms of the body, Massumi (2002, pp. 71-78) provides the example of soccer. Let us take the body of the soccer player as a body of Virtual potential. During the soccer match, the player's body may perform a variety of actions. These potential actions that exist in the Virtual are actualized and manifest on the soccer field as the game unfolds. However, there are certain conditions that affect their actualization. The soccer game is played in a field. The game centers on a ball, and has rules and goals. The ultimate goal of the game is to move the ball, mostly through the rule of kicking, into the opposing team's net. The rules and goals of the game present in a field, signified as a field for playing soccer, as

12

well as what is physically possible with the bodies and ball on the field, affect the actualization of a movement by the soccer player. Due to this, they manifest as movements such as kicking a ball, head butting a ball, or passing signals to other players. Additionally and importantly, future-oriented cognitive assessments, strategies, and guesses about teammates, opposing players, and the ball affect actualization as well. In short, the field and the game within it affect the actualization of Virtual potentials so that "every gesture of the players is supercharged toward scoring a goal or toward repelling one" (Massumi, 2002, p. 72).

The body participates in the Virtual and the Actual, and thus can be understood as indeterminate and processual, through affect (Lim, 2007, p. 56). In affecting other bodies and being affected by them the body is in movement. Whether what is affecting or being affected is an arm, a collection of voices, brainwaves and cognitions, or pheromones, some virtual potential is actualized through some form of motion and often as motion, and thus affect itself. For Massumi (2002), "in motion, a body is in an immediate, unfolding relation to its own nonpresent potential to vary" (p. 4). The Virtual, the field of not (yet) present potential, is in relation to the body through the body's movement because movement produces and is itself a change, however small, in the body, a change that is the actualizing of a potential out of the Virtual field. Therefore, in Deleuzian-inspired affect theory the in-motion body is theorized in its "openness to an elsewhere and otherwise than it is…" (Massumi, 2002, p. 5), a becoming otherwise inextricably linked to affective movement. In contrast to the perceived determined positionality of post-structuralism discussed earlier, Massumi is offering us a paradigm shift towards thinking in terms of process and continual change.

In order to understand the complexity of the Virtual and Actual, it is helpful to think of their relationship in terms of "emergence." Massumi utilizes a notion of emergence as a phenomenon whereby many processes "are locked in resonance together...[for] triggering a

13

process of complexifying self-organization" (Massumi, 2002, p. 33-34). Emergence could be considered an actualization in the sense that a more complex actualized potential, or assemblage, is the result of many forces and processes relationally impacting its actualization (Massumi, 2002, pp. 32-35), much like in the game of soccer where the actualization of movement is affected by numerous elements in relation. In short, emergence can be thought of as a "coming forth" of an actualization out of Virtual potential. Massumi (2002), in thinking through the works of philosopher Henri Bergson, who himself is another influence on Deleuze, states, "positionality is an emergent quality of movement" (p. 8). A Virtual potential emerges, and thus actualizes, through affective movement. This emerged actualization is the position, or structure, that results from movement. In turn, the actualized structure works as part of a feedback "loop" with the Virtual. Just as a potential emerges and is actualized from the Virtual, an actualization in turn presents new conditions for the Virtual in terms of its further potential actualizations.

This looping can be observed if we return to the example of a soccer match, the emerged actualization of a goalie catching a ball that previously was kicked towards the goal net creates the condition for new and/or different potentials to emerge from the multiplicity of Virtual potentials, such as the goalie throwing the ball across the field. The actualization of this throw would not be possible if there was not a prior actualization of a kicked ball towards the goalie, the goalie catching it, and numerous other factors that form the changing, complex assemblage of the game. It is in this way that "feedback from the dimension of the emerged (the Actual) re-conditions the conditions of emergence…that conditions of emergence change" (Massumi, 2002, p.10). Significantly, what this means is that the openness of affect to change also depends upon the actualization of a potential, sometimes called the "closure" of affect, and vice versa. Thus, the relationship between the Virtual and Actual can be thought of as a loop of affective emergence in which there is "the simultaneous participation

14

of the virtual in the actual and the actual in the virtual, as one arises from and returns to the other" (Massumi, 1995, p. 96).

1.2.3 Deterritorialization and the Event

While emergence is a helpful concept to explain the aspect of the Virtual/Actual loop that concerns the coming forth of a Virtual Potential into the Actual, it is less useful for describing how this actualization "returns to" the Virtual. A concept that helps describe this latter process is "deterritorialization." To begin with, in both *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus* Deleuze and Guattari (1983, 1987) help us think of a territory as the position or structure mentioned in the previous section. Territories can include such actualizations as emotions, spaces, discourses, institutions, signs, and bodies (Bertelsen & Murphie, 2010, p. 142). Each of these territories is one of many Virtual potentials that could me actualized out of a multiplicity of potentials. As with the body, Deleuzian-inspired affect theory also conceives of other actualized territories as affective, indeterminate, relational, and in-process. As such, a territory is open to deterritorialization, and therefore "reterritorialization" as explained below. In terms of the Virtual/Actual loop, deterritorialization means that a territory in the Actual will "return to" the Virtual, from where a new Potential may emerge. In other words, through affecting and being affected, an actualized territory may change.

Let us take the example of the territory of the banking system in the United States. The banking system affected and was affected by the recession that began in 2009. Due to the affective dynamics between the banking system and the recession, and the multiple affective responses to this connection from other territories, the banking system deterritorialized into the Virtual from where a new potential emerged. This included the actualization of a banking system with new rules pertaining to loans and investment, as well as new relationships to the

15

government and citizens through policy and bailouts. Through affecting and being affected by the recession, the banking system deterritorialized and emerged as something new.

While the United States banking system exists in much similarity to the system that existed prior to the recession, it did and is still emerging as something different. However, that a new structure or territory did emerge from this deterritorialization is indicative of what Deleuze and Guattari (1983) term "reterritorialization." Reterritorialization is the emergence of a new structure due to the deterritorialization of structure. Reterritorialization always accompanies deterritorialization, and is therefore always in process: "It may be impossible to distinguish deterritorialization from reterritorialization, since they are mutually enmeshed, or like opposite faces of one and the same process" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 258). Since territories are always in process, and are therefore always open to both deterritorializing and reterritorializing, this importantly suggests that Deleuze and Guattari do not see potential for the total end of structure, but only changes to it.

What is the catalyst for deterritorialization, and thus for a new potential to actualize? It is perhaps not precise enough only to say that a territory was affected and then changes. In Deleuzian-inspired affect theory this catalyst is called the "event" (Lim, 2007, p. 56). While the event is a complex, multifaceted concept, for our purposes here "event" will be used in relation to the actualized structure or territory to which I have been relating affect. I find useful John Protevi's (2009) description of the event as that which brings a territory to its "threshold" (p. 13) for change. While "threshold" must remain unspecified itself as it will be as unique as the event is for each territory and structure (Massumi, 2002, p. 222), it can be thought of as the tipping point needed for deterritorialization to occur. Moreover, the deterritorializing event is Actual in its effects, yet Virtual in that not only is it a potential actualization itself, but new potentials and events are possible through it (Bertelsen & Murphie, 2010, p. 142).

16

For Deleuze (1990) an event is considered to be a "counter-actualization" (p. 150), or what works against the reterritorialization of structure. This is not to say that it prevents reterritorialization from occurring, but that it is "against (re)generation (the re-production of a structure)" (Massumi, 1995, p. 87-88). What this means is that the event is what causes a structure or territory to deterritorialize and then reterritorialize as something other than it was. It "repatterns a system" (Protevi, 2009, p. 13). It is what returns the Actual to the Virtual, opening up the possibility for new potentials and structures, for a different Virtual and Actual.

1.2.4 Excess and its Capture

While the description of deterritorialization and the event provides an answer to the question of how territories or structures change in relation to the Virtual and Actual, the missing puzzle piece is the aspect of affect that allows events to bring about deterritorialization. What is it about territories or structures that allow for affective change through events? When a territory or structure becomes actualized or reterritorialized from the Virtual there must be something about that territory or structure that is resistant to its own total sedimentation, something that provides for a certain capacity to deterritorialize. For Deleuzian-inspired affect theory, what allows for this is called affective "excess." In the actualization of a territory, excess is what "remains unactualized, inseparable from but unassimilable" (Massumi, 1995, p. 96) to that territory. Excess is that aspect of a territory or structure that remains variable and open to change. As such, it is the Virtual part of an actualization: a territory's potential to change that is immanent to that territory.

A helpful example for understanding this can be found in Massumi's (2002, pp. 208-212) analysis of early twentieth century researcher David Katz's experiments on color. Part of Katz's research involved asking research participants to select a color from a palette that

17

matched the color of an object the participant had previously seen, specifically the color "blue." While this is seen by Katz as primarily a matching experiment in order to test the consistency and standardization of color in memory, Massumi (2002, pp. 208-209) writes how affect worked in the experiment in excess of this standardization. When asked to identify the color of blue that each participant previously saw in an eye, the participants frequently performed a mismatch between the two colors. They selected a color blue that was "too bright to match a bright object,' 'too dark to match a dark object,' and 'too saturated to match an object which is known to have a distinct hue" (Massumi, 2002, p. 210). Massumi (2002) takes this result to mean that the memory of the color is in excess, that it is "*too* 'blue'" (p. 210) in that it is beyond what is generalized as blue through the boundaries of the experiment.

Though Katz attempted to observe the matching of the color blue through standardized language and signification, there was something affective about the color blue that escaped such attempts at standardization. What escaped was the Virtual excess of the color blue, blue's potential to be other. Blue had affectively "struck, and without either the subject or experimenter willing it so, it has exceeded. It has gone over the instituted line, pushed past the mark set for it by the laboratory setup…" (Massumi, 2002, p. 211). What is crucially important about this in terms of affect is that the experimenter tried to capture the exact hue of blue (or we can say for our purposes that it is the territory or structure called "blue"), and he attempted to do so by excluding affect and the changeability it brings to blue. Blue escaped by having something in excess of itself that was *"too* blue," and as such blue became something else through the participant's affective experience with it. This "*too"* is the Virtual part of the actualized blue that is its potential to be different from what it is. Blue and its excess happen because affect is relational. In other words, blue could be something different to each participant because it is constituted relationally through the encounter between the participant and the color, involving complex connections between sensation,

memory, cognition, and language. Thus, relationality brings an openness to something new that "is the potential for singular effects or qualitative change to occur in excess over or as a supplement to objective interactions" (Massumi, 2002, p. 225).

The attempt at standardizing a territory such as blue, generalizing what was once singular about it, is an attempt to "capture" excess. While this will be discussed to a greater extent in the following chapters, it can be said now that one conception of power in affect theory is that of something that works to standardize, or sustain, territory and prevent radical deterritorializations that may actualize something *too* new or different, a territory that will possibly be less implicated in that power. Since the excess of a territory is what allows for its Virtual potential and changeability, affective excess is what is targeted by power (Anderson, 2010). Therefore, in this research, the "capture of affect" will be seen as the capture of affective excess, which delimits the capacity to affect and be affected, and thus, to change. However, as we have seen in the blue experiment, while power may attempt to capture affective excess, something always escapes. Thus, "there is always already an excess that power must work to recuperate but is destined and doomed to miss" (Anderson, 2010, p. 167). While Massumi conceptualizes power as something that works upon an, at least partially, autonomous affective excess, I will explore later in my own research how power works through affective relationality to sustain structure, particularly through actualizing patterned refrains.

1.2.5 The Refrain

Despite the changeability that excess brings to territories and structure, why do territories seem to repeat themselves over time? How do we account for the way that certain Virtual potentials are actualized more often than others, sometimes even repetitively? In other words, how do bodies navigate towards the actualization of certain Virtual potentials over

others? Is there a way that excess is captured to produce "tendencies" to affect in certain ways (Lim, 2007, p. 61; Massumi, 2002, p. 30)? These questions can be answered through Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the "refrain."

A refrain is "any aggregate of matters of expression that draws a territory and develops into territorial motifs and landscapes" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 323). This description can be broken down into two key elements. First, "aggregate of matters" helps us think of the refrain as a territorial assemblage in which multiple parts constitute the whole. Second, thinking in terms of assemblages developing into "motifs" allows the refrain to be understood as a pattern of territories. In this way, the refrain is "a gathering of forces" (Bertelsen & Murphie, 2010, p. 145), or territorial processes that build off one another to form a tendency towards actualizing a certain potential over others.

Here I will argue that the refrain illustrates how power works on and through affect. For example, we can think of the refrain in terms of the conservative and fear-based affective climate of the last decade in (at least) the United States. This climate emerged through multiple affective forces refraining together. Some of the more obvious ones include the attacks of September 11th as an affective event, the rise of the terrorist as a discursive figure of immanent danger, policy windows opening for the passage of bills such as the Patriot Act to "protect" American citizens, changes to airport safety protocol, including the terror color coding system, and increases in the use of war and aggression to "defend" American interests abroad, among many others. These actualized territories refrain with each other that, though unstable due to the ever present escape of affective excess and potential, establishes an evolving pattern of actualiz*ing*. Thus, the refrain can be seen as an attempt to determine the indeterminate. It is a repetition, or regularity of affect. As such, it is a form of the capture of affective excess in the sense that it influences and "enters the process of selection of how to affect and be affected by other bodies" (Lim, 2007, p. 62). Power can work upon the refrain

20

to produce a tendency towards certain patternings, which is an attempt to determine affect through social structure.

On a final, but important note, while the research presented here is mostly concerned with the closure of affect the refrain brings, Bertelsen and Murphie (2010) remind us that "it is often forgotten that refrains are not just closures but openings to possible change" (p. 145). Since there is always some level of affective potential and territorial indeterminacy in that affective excess escapes, the refrain does not establish patterns to such an extent that change is foreclosed. This is because refrains are territorial assemblages. As such, refrains, or parts of a refrain, could form assemblages with other refrains, producing openings for change through new processes of affective relationality between territories.

1.2.6 The Ethical Project of Affect

As stated above, the very affective, relational excess that allows for new potentials to emerge is also the target of power. Through the capturing of excess, power attempts to prevent radical deterritorializations while sedimenting structure for its own purposes. As such, an ethical project for affect emerges.

In the translation notes of *A Thousand Plateaus* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), Massumi reminds us that there are two words for "power" in French that must be distinguished in order to grasp the meaning of the text. The first is *"pouvoir."* Its use is "very close to Foucault's, as an instituted and reproducible relation of force, a selective concretization of potential" (Massumi in Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. xvii). This form of power is the force associated with actualization, the emergence of a singular potential out of the Virtual. In contrast, when affect is described as the "capacity or ability to affect and be affected," "*puissance*" is this capacity. This is not just the relational potential of a body to differentially affect and be affected, but also the capacity for bodies to change through relational encounters: the

21

"capacity to multiply connections that may be realized by a given 'body' to varying degrees in different situations" (Massumi in Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. xvii). Thus, "*puissance*" can be thought of as a form of positive power that is an enhancement of the capacity of bodies to form mutually constitutive relations for change. It follows then that "*puissance*" is associated with Virtual potential, as "*pouvoir*" is with the Actual (Massumi in Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. xvii).

Taking these two forms of power into account, John Protevi (2009) asks how affect can "increase the *puissance* of the bodies, that is, does it enable them to form new and mutually empowering encounters outside the original encounter? (p. 51). This becomes the ethical, political project of affect: to work for the increase of "puissance," while keeping a critical eye on "*pouvoir*," and the relation to regulatory power that sustains affective patterns in the latter. In other words, an ethical, political project of affect is to resist the structural capture of affective excess in the name of increasing the capacity for new affective connections, assemblages, modes of being and becoming, and worlds (Protevi, 2009, p. 49).

I find Massumi's (2002) conception of radical politics, and its connection to philosophy, particularly resonant, fitting, and mobilizing for this research project that attends to the ethical, political project of affect:

> Politics is philosophy continued by other means. Correction: an exploratory politics of *change* is philosophy pursued by other means—a radical politics equal to the "radicality" of the expanded empirical field itself. Radical politics is an inherently risky undertaking because it cannot predict the outcome of its actions with certainty. If it could, it wouldn't be radical but reactive, a movement dedicated to capture and containment, operating entirely in the realm of the already possible, in a priori refusal of the new. Radical politics

22

must tweak and wait: for the coming, collective determination of the

community. (pp. 243-244)

Radical politics, then, is a politics that is invested in the relational, indeterminacy of affect,

and the Virtual potential for processual change.[4] As will be asserted in later chapters, such a

politics is relevant to discussions of the Non-Profit Industrial Complex (NPIC) as the

structure works to engender refrains of social change work and actualize norms of affective

relationality so that affect is captured and its indeterminacy and openness is delimited.

1.3 The Ontological Issues of Affect

Before moving on to the next chapter, it is first necessary to discuss relevant

ontological issues when utilizing Deleuzian-inspired affect theory in this research,

particularly the "prepersonal" aspect of affect heretofore not discussed. To recollect,

Massumi's definition of affect does not only indicate that affect is the capacity to affect and

be affected, but also that it is a "prepersonal intensity" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. xvi) that

causes changes to bodies (see p. 8 of this chapter for Massumi's full definition of affect). For

Massumi (2002), the prepersonal aspect of affect means that affect, to a certain extent, is

outside of culture, social signification, and ideology. In other words, for affect to be

prepersonal, affect must be outside of social processes in which the subject is embedded.

This is what Massumi (1995) means when he insists upon affect's "autonomy." As

autonomous, affect is that part of the world that is not captured or determined by the social.

---

4   See Foster (2003) for an excellent example of affective radical politics that nurtures

"*puissance*" and resists "pouvoir." Foster (2003) theorizes the relational physicality of

protesting bodies in ACT UP in order to place "the body in a central role as enabling human

beings to work together to create social betterment" (p. 397) and form "articulated network[s]

of resistance" (p. 410).

23

The Virtual field is crucial for this autonomy: "the *autonomy* of affect is its participation in the virtual" (Massumi, 1995, p. 96). This participation in the Virtual is, of course, dependent on the escape of affective excess from the capture of affect in the Actual. Therefore, to be more precise, what Massumi considers to be autonomous is affect that escapes capture and can loop into the field of Virtual potential from where new affective potentials may emerge. Some excess always manages to escape, and it is in this escaped excess that the autonomy of affect lies.

For Massumi, it then seems like the analytical move towards affect is due to its potential to escape social determinism. Indeed, Massumi (2002) begins *Parables for the Virtual* with a series of questions that highlight his frustration with contemporary social and cultural theory:

> Aren't the possibilities for the entire gamut of cultural emplacements, including the 'subversive' ones, precoded into the ideological master structure? Is the body as linked to a particular subject position anything more than a local embodiment *of* ideology? Where has the potential for change gone? How does a body perform its way out of a definitional framework that is not only responsible for its very 'construction,' but seems to prescript every possible signifying and countersignifying move as a selection from a repertoire of possible permutations on a limited set of predetermined terms? (p. 3)

In response, Massumi's conceptualization of affect as outside of the social, and its related productive possibilities, relies upon his view of ideology as a non-total force of inescapable power: "For although ideology is very much with us, often in the most virulent forms, it is no longer encompassing. It no longer defines the global mode of functioning of power. It is now one mode of power in a larger field that is not defined, overall, by ideology" (Massumi, 1995, p. 104). In seeking to illuminate and separate the power of affect from the

ideological, Massumi (1995) devotes a section of his influential essay on "The Autonomy of Affect" to a discussion of United States President Ronald Reagan. Massumi describes how Reagen's capacity to affect did not come from ideological framing, but through such affective forces as his voice and gesture. Massumi argues that these latter forces were registered pre-consciously[5] by the American public, prior to or outside of ideological structure, and contributed significantly to his power and influence. This is not to say that the ideological was not influential, but Massumi is suggesting that the affective can partially be separated out from the ideological as a force in and of itself. Thus, Massumi asserts how Reagan's real power was on the affective, rather than just ideological level. Massumi believes that this offers us a way to think of power beyond or outside of ideology and social determinism, and perhaps even a way of finding "counter-tactics" (Massumi, 1995, p. 106) since affect can be disconnected from or even escape such seemingly hegemonic power.

The consideration of affect as (even partially) outside of ideological power is a significant ontological issue for critical theorists. Clare Hemmings (2005) offers a powerful critique of Massumi and the general turn towards affect, at least to the extent that affect is conceived as outside of social structure. Hemmings (2005) views the turn towards affect exemplified in Massumi, here called the "ontological turn" (p. 548), as an intentional move

---

[5]   Many theorists of affect grapple with the relationship between affect and consciousness. While this question is largely outside the scope of this research, most Deleuzian-inspired affect theory conceives of affect as prior to cognition, through inextricably linked to it. Hemmings (2005) explains briefly explains their connection: "If judgment is always secondary to bodily response, poised above it, but crucially tied to it, the intensity of that response must also presumably be curtailed or extended by that judgment, forming an affective cycle in which each element has the capacity to affect (intensify or diminish) the other" (p. 564).

away from epistemology and poststructuralism and their focus on "approaches to power, framed as hegemonic in their negativity and insistence of social structures..." (p. 548) towards an ontology of affect that offers "the hope of freedom from social constraint" and "the capacity to restructure social meaning" (p. 550). While she views affect as a useful concept to assist in critical analysis, Hemmings prompts several critical questions in regards to the conceptualization of affect as autonomous from the social: Does conceptualizing affect as prepersonal or autonomous from the social rely upon an understanding of the social as limited in terms of its ability to have an effect on the affective level of the body? Does this mean that our affective, bodily responses to events, our capacity to affect and be affected, are not affected and/or reactive to sustained ideological power structures? Does this not suggest a "relative lack of organisation of the virtual field" (Lim, 2007, p. 60) in as much as the Virtual and its potentials are not necessarily affected by the social? Other theorists, particularly those coming out of geography (Lim, 2007; Thien, 2005; Tolia-Kelly, 2006), have raised similar questions. This has included questioning how the Virtual does not take into account differential identity and power (Thien, 2005, p. 452), and related, how difference can be accounted for by affect if affect is outside of social and ideological systems that are very much produced by and productive of difference (Lim, 2007, p. 60).

In response to her own challenge to affect's autonomy, Hemmings asserts affects connection to the social by stressing the importance of the long-term temporal aspect of affect. If we keep in mind that "affective cycles form *patterns* that are subject to reflective or political, rather than momentary or arbitrary judgment" (Hemmings, 2005, p. 564), we see that the Actual, as a field organized in the social, is also organized *by* the social to the extent that its cycling with the Virtual field and its potentials is organized by the social. This reflects the aforementioned that structures and bodies have limitations to their potential for change, limitations that are often affected by the social, which organizes and sets the limits of the

field of Virtual potentials from which new actualizations may emerge, forming a looping affective pattern affected by the social. In other words, the social mediates the conditions of emergence and the emerged, and is therefore an organizing force upon both the Virtual and the Actual. Moreover, through discussing affect in terms of patterns, Hemmings seems to endorse the importance of looping as long-term, and accordingly the importance of the refrain and how it is implicated in social. This is reflective of the example of the soccer game above where the Virtual field affects and is affected by patterned rules and goals of the game.[6] Thus, both affect and social structure have an effect on each other, and as such, affect and are affected by the Virtual field of potentials.

Hemmings (2005) ends her essay by suggesting "affect might in fact be valuable to the extent that it is not autonomous" (p. 565), or in other words, affect is useful for understanding the social world due to its possible connections to the social world rather than separateness from it. This presents a useful opening for connecting affect with post-

---

[6]   The game of soccer is Massumi's (1995, pp. 71-78) example. While I agree with Hemmings that Massumi repeatedly insists upon an independence of affect from the social, his affective analysis of the soccer game does seem to demonstrate an understanding of affect as at least somewhat implicated in the social, such as through rules, goals, and the game itself, all of which can be considered influences on the capacity to affect and be affected, and thus an influence on the organization of the Virtual. While it may be somewhat of an unfair reading of Massumi on the part of Hemmings to say that Massumi views affect as so outside of the social, Hemmings (2005) does focus much of her essay on Massumi's unambiguous *diminishment* of the connection between the social and affect, and her reading of Massumi in which he views "affect [as] important to the extent that it is autonomous and outside social signification" (p. 549).

structuralist thought. The research presented here takes the critique of Massumi's autonomous affect seriously, and seeks to understand better the relatedness between affect and the social. Accordingly, this research is situated among more recent approaches to affect theory that attempt to understand "persistent, repetitive practices of power [that] can simultaneously provide a body (or, better, collectivized bodies) with predicaments and potentials for realizing a world that subsists within and exceeds the horizons and boundaries of the norm" (Seigworth & Gregg, 2010, p. 7). Rather than a project on affect that explores its potentials for change to the extent that affect exists on a separate circuit from the social, this research regards the theorization of affect and the social as mutually constitutive as a critically important intervention for understanding power, change, and practices of normalization.

1.4 Bringing Affect and the Social Together

John Protevi's (2009) concept of "bodies politic" in *Political Affect* provides an excellent example of a framework for theorizing affect and the social together. While much of his monograph is composed of a complex analysis of the relationship between affective cognition, neuroscience, and the political, I will mostly be exploring "bodies politic" as a node that connects the micro and macro affectively.[7] For this research, "bodies politic" means the following:

---

[7] Analyzing the cognitive level of the affective body is a core component of bodies politic and Protevi's analysis. While attending to the cognitive is outside the scope of this research, and as such this can be considered a limitation of it, bodies politic still provides a way to connect the micro level of the individual body with the macro level of the social, as shall be seen below, without evacuating it of meaning. In this research the "bodily," or the "somatic," rather than referring to the cognitive, will instead be utilized in terms of the body's relationality and capacity for change.

28

The concept of bodies politic is meant to capture the emergent—that is, the embodied

and embedded—character of subjectivity: the production, bypassing, and

surpassing of subjectivity in the imbrications of somatic and social

systems...affect is concretely the imbrication of the social and somatic,

tracking the ways our bodies change in relation to the changing situations in

which they find themselves. (Protevi, 2009, p. 33)

Multiple aspects of bodies politic should be highlighted here. First, affective emergence, the actualization of a Virtual potential, is necessarily connected to embodied and embedded subjectivity that is imbricated in, meaning overlapping and intersecting, but not determined by, somatic and social systems. This is to say that individual, embodied subjectivity emerges and changes through an embeddedness in social, political, cultural, and bodily systems. This also means that the Virtual field and the actualization of potential are inextricably linked to connections between social and bodily processes. In other words, the social, through its reciprocal connection and impact on the body, helps form the Virtual. Second, in support of his argument regarding embodiment and embeddedness, Protevi (2009) notes further that "bodies politic are not just embodied: they are also sociopolitically and historically embedded" (p. 45). In noting the historical embeddedness of bodies, Protevi opens up bodies politic to be read in terms of patterns of affective looping and refrains, and how these affect and are affected by the social. Finally and crucially, affect, as an embodied process embedded in the social, is the way our bodies change in the social. In other words, in affecting and being affecting by the social, body's change, including their capacity to affect and be affected. Methodologically, this means that exploring how body's are imbricated in the social is crucial for understanding changes in the body's capacity to affect and be affected by other bodies and the social.

29

To help make this more lucid and functional, Protevi (2009, pp. 37-41) identifies three different, but relational levels of bodies politic. These are the personal, group, and civic bodies politic. The personal is equated with the individual body, the group with a relational collection of individual bodies, and the civic with institutions. All three levels are interdependent. Individual bodies, with different capacities to affect and be affected, are in interactive, affective relationships with other individual bodies, forming a group bodies politic. While this affective relationality forms the group, patterns or customs for affecting develop within the group, affecting the capacity of the individual bodies to affect and be affected. The civic level of bodies politic has been reached when these patterns for affecting become institutionalized in social structures. Being socially embedded within the civic bodies politic affects the other two levels in their capacities to affect and be affected. This is not meant to provide a linear model of affect, but to provide a useful theoretical framework for discussing how the micro and macro are connected affectively in a multilayered way. In fact, this framework very much incorporates the complex looping of affect in that different actualizations at all levels will set the limits of Virtual potentials to be actualized at other levels.

Protevi (2009) utilizes this leveled framework to demonstrate that "affect is inherently political: bodies are part of an ecosocial matrix of other bodies, affecting them and being affected by them; affect is part of the basic constitution of bodies politic" (p. 50). The political, multileveled aspect of affective bodies politics is framed by Protevi (2009, pp. 49-51) as being within the ethical project of affect outlined above, namely increasing "*puissance*," the indeterminate openness affect, and keeping a critical watch on "*pouvoir*," the capture of affective excess and delimiting mediation in the capacity to affect and be affected. While one may initially argue that individual bodies, groups, and institutions just affect differentially, this would be to deny the vast "*pouvoir*" of institutions to capture affect and

30

delimit individual's and group's capacities to affect and be affected. The levels of bodies politic are not equal in terms of their capacity to affect and be affected. This research is mindful of this differential capacity and seeks to examine institutional "*pouvoir*" and how it affects the capacity for social change work and "*puissance*" on the other levels of bodies politic.

This is meant to suggest that Protevi provides an opening for productively connecting affect to structural power, exemplifying a more recent generation of theorizing affect in terms of its connection to the social, not distance from it. By composing a framework that connects the affective processes of multiple assemblages, Protevi offers an approach for studying institutional structures as affective entities that affect and are affected by groups and individuals from within and without. The Non-Profit Industrial Complex (NPIC) is one such structure.

This chapter has presented an overview of affect theory and a myriad of related Deleuzian-inspired affective concepts that help facilitate connections between affect and structure. Just as affect works upon and through the social, the social affects and mediates the Virtual field from where actualizations emerge. The critical theorizations of affect by Hemmings and the bodies politic framework of Protevi help to further illuminate affects connection and relevance to the social. Chapter II will put the affective concepts and arguments presented here to task by examining the NPIC in terms of affective processes that work on and through power.

31

Chapter 2

The Non-Profit Industrial Complex

This chapter will present the Non-Profit Industrial Complex (NPIC) as an institutional structure implicated in affective processes. It will first discuss the historical emergence of the NPIC in the United States in relation to contextual political processes and events that contributed to actualizing a coherent affective apparatus now known as the NPIC. Analyzing the NPIC as an apparatus means that it will be presented as a conduit for the transmission of affect, which through its connecting of the neoliberal state, its private, corporate sector, and the non-profit system, mediates the capacity to affect and be affected of those involved in social change work. In other words, the NPIC will be considered an apparatus that captures affective excess, the attribute of territories necessary for deterritorialization to occur. As such, a significant part of this chapter will introduce several core processes of the NPIC that engender refrains of doing social change work, and in doing so, alter the capacity to affect and actualize norms of affective relationality complicit with *pouvoir*, the power that delimits the capacity for deterritorializations, and therefore, the openness to change. This chapter will end by arguing that the normalization of affective bodily relations delimits the potential of *puissance*, the indeterminate capacity of bodies to form mutually constitutive relations for change, of those bodies involved in social change work.

The research presented here utilizes the Deleuzian-inspired conceptualization of affect as presented in the previous chapter, as the relational and bodily impact that produces a shift in another body's own capacity to affect and be affected. Here, this understanding of affect will be extended to incorporate the capacity to actualize social change. The impact of affect always actualizes change, but it is critical to note that this change is not necessarily singular or unidirectional. As such, this chapter will discuss multiple relational affective processes that work to not only decrease the actualization of certain forms of social change work, but also

increase others at the same time. Further, while affect theory considers processes of social change, and thus de- and reterritorializations, as occurring constantly within structure, power works through the NPIC to decrease the capacity for more radical deterritorializations that would actualize it and its affective relationality as something less implicated in the power sustained by its affective processes. However, this is not to say that such deterritorializations would necessarily actualize without the power-laden affective processes of the NPIC. Rather, it is the indeterminacy of affect to potentially actualize such deterritorializations that is delimited by the NPIC. As stated in the previous chapter, resisting this structural capture is the ethical project of affect.

The primary source and inspiration for this discussion on the NPIC comes from the anthology *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex* edited by the anti-racist feminist organization Incite! Women of Color Against Violence. This collaborative text grew out of a 2004 conference attended by academics and political activists, organized by the Women of Color Collective at the University of California, Santa Barbara (Smith, 2007). Based upon years of critical commentary directed at the non-profit system, together the conference and anthology have conceptualized this system as intimately and problematically connected to the neoliberal state and corporate sector. The research presented here builds upon this important work by supplementing it with an analysis of affective processes that mediate the capacity of social change to occur through the institutional structure of the NPIC. As such, this is a significant analytical move for broader affect theory as it illuminates the relationality between affect and structure.

2.1 Historical Emergence of the Non-Profit Industrial Complex

The emergence of the NPIC as an affective apparatus is the effect of multiplicitous everyday interactions, political processes, and major events. Outlining such a broad and

multifaceted history is outside of the scope of this research. Instead, this section will discuss the NPIC's emergence in terms of certain events, catalysts that trigger de- and reterritorializations, which prompted macro changes in the structural institutionalization of social change by facilitating connections between the neoliberal state, the corporate sector, and the non-profit system.

While this history can be traced back to at least the Elizabethan Poor Laws at the turn of the seventeenth century in England, I will begin in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century when there occurred a major shift in the focus of social change efforts. Prior to this time, social change work mainly consisted of charitable giving to impoverished individuals on the part of local individuals and small charity organizations (Smith, 2007, p. 3). However, the capacity for this type of work changed dramatically due to the vast amount of wealth accumulated by industrialists such as Rockefeller, Carnegie, and others. These millionaires began to form institutionalized foundations, which due to being largely unregulated and minimally taxed by the state at the time, served as opportune shelters for wealth from taxes. While the public face of these foundations was to provide organized philanthropic and charitable services to help solve social problems, this type of work was actually minimal and served to conceal the primary purpose of foundations as tax shelters for the wealthy to be able to pass on inheritances while avoiding estate taxes. Due to this, the structure of social change work de-territorialized, re-territorializing with foundations as an integral part, becoming a multibillion-dollar system (Smith, 2007, p. 4).

By "the early 1960s, foundations were growing at a rate of 1,200 per year, and financial magazines routinely promoted foundations as tax-shelter tools" (Smith, 2007, p. 5), prompting the United States government to take their regulation more seriously. The national Tax Reform Act of 1969 was an event that:

34

imposed a 4 percent excise tax on foundations' net investment income, put

restrictions on the ability of foundations to engage in business operations (thus

curtailing the abilities of corporations to operate tax-free as ostensible

foundations), and required foundations to annually spend at least 6 percent of

net investment income (reduced to 5 percent in 1988) to prevent them from

growing without serving their ostensible charitable purposes. (Smith, 2007, p.

6)

Additionally and crucially, this Act also made it possible for foundations to provide tax-deductible donations to those organizations registered as non-profits (Smith, 2007, p. 6).

Tax-deductible donations can be made to organizations that have been granted formal non-profit 501(c)(3) status from the United States government. In brief, non-profits with this status are those whose main purpose is focused on religious, charitable, scientific, and/or educational activities (Internal Revenue Service, 2011). In general, only organizations that have attained non-profit status may receive grants from the majority of foundations. Thus, as the number of foundations with a wide variety of purposes and funding opportunities has risen, so have a number of diverse non-profits. The number of non-profits has increased twentyfold since the mid-twentieth century, with around one million non-profit organizations registered today (Smith, 2007, pp. 6-7).

Just as the number of non-profits has increased due to foundation-based tax incentives for the private sector, they have also increased due to their connections to the state. As governmental agencies in the post-New Deal era began to shed their service provision-based missions, rather than de-territorializing in total, these agencies re-territorialized as bureaucratic regulatory bodies for managing service provision on the part of voluntary non-profit organizations. The possibility for organizations to receive contracted work from the government stimulated an increase in non-profits, which in order to receive such funding,

35

were required to file for formal non-profit status with the government (Gilmore, 2007, pp. 44-45). This formal status offered a "stable financial and operational infrastructure while avoiding the transience, messiness, and possible legal complications of working under decentralized, informal, or 'underground' auspices" (Rodriguez, 2007, p. 29). The explosion and presence of non-profits in society is so great that they have been subsumed under the notion of the third sector in society, in relation to, but separate and different from the public/state and private/corporate sectors. This "civil society" is seen as a sector with the ability to remedy the faults and shortcomings of the state and corporate sectors, allowing citizens a third way to participate in democracy (Cohen & Arato, 1992).

However, could there be another reason, beyond the growth of contracts with the state or the granting of a tax-deductable relationship with foundations, as to why non-profits have emerged as a central institutional component of the re-territorialized social change structure? Could there be a reason that places the notion of non-profits as neutrally disconnected from both the state and corporate sectors in jeopardy? Scholars of the NPIC have also considered the growth in non-profits as a response to the New Social Movements that materialized in the 1960's and 1970's, such as the civil rights, women's liberation, antiwar, student, and gay liberation movements, among others. Prior to this period, most people involved in social change work and activism did not work for state-sanctioned non-profit agencies. As such, unpaid community members comprised the largest number of those involved in the New Social Movements and their often radical tactics and rhetoric. Foundations began to strategize on how to de-radicalize these movements in the face of mass protests and demonstrations that were critical of both the corporate and state sectors. Their solution was to filter social change work, and those involved in it, into the grant-seeking non-profit system (Kivel, 2007, p. 138).

An excellent example of this is provided by Robert Allen's 1969 "Black Awakening in Capitalist America," the seminal text in studies on the NPIC. It illuminates attempts by the

Ford Foundation to de-radicalize the militant Black Power movement and its organizations, "which were believed to wield some influence over the angry young blacks who are trapped in the urban chaos" (Allen, 2007, p. 55). Part of Allen's analysis focuses on the Ford Foundation's decision to offer grant money to an organization in the black power movement. Rather than funding one of the many organizations in the movement that sought radical transformations of the governmental and corporate sectors, the Ford Foundations selected an organization that espoused rhetoric germane to black oppression, but sought a solution to this oppression through access to dominant institutions. This organization was the Cleveland-based Congress for Racial Equality (CORE).

Allen's analysis of this new funding relationship is suggestive of the Ford Foundation's intention to co-opt the Black Power movement by pacifying black youth and cultivating a black elite complicit with the corporate system. For example, the formal purpose of CORE's funding from the Ford Foundation was for the "training of Cleveland youth and adult community workers, voter registration efforts, exploration of economic-development programs, and attempts to improve program planning among civil rights groups" (Allen, 2007, p. 56). However, statements made by top-level implementers of CORE's projects indicate a desire to pacify the broader black power movement. For instance, the director of the youth program stated that this "project hoped to show that 'the legitimate hostilities and aggressions of black youth' could be 'programmed' into socially acceptable channels" (Allen, 2007, p. 57). Additionally a Ford Foundation employee in charge of program monitoring stated that CORE's access-based projects demonstrated "a flowering of what black power could be" (Allen, 2007, p. 57). Such foundation-based funding increased the power and influence of organizations like CORE, working to redirect the energies of the broader black power movement towards access to institutions, rather than opposition to them. This is suggestive of the Ford Foundation's power that, through the granting of funding to

community organizations, increased the capacity of members of radical social movements to actualize more reformist forms of social change, while decreasing their capacity to directly challenge the dominant governmental and economic system upon which foundations, their wealthy donors, and now organizations like CORE rely. This argument is supported by later research that documented the formal relationship between the Ford Foundation and the CIA, with the latter strategically filtering money to non-profits through the former's grant process in order to direct social change (King & Osayande, 20007, p.88).

Due to numerous case studies such as this, scholars of the NPIC such as Christine Ahn (2007) advocate for "social justice organizations [to] abandon any notion that foundations are *not* established for a donor's private gain" (p. 64). In a similar vein to the military and prison industrial complexes, describing the non-profit system as an industrial complex means to get at this intimate connection between non-profits, the neoliberal state, and its private, corporate sector that has been normalized today (Gilmore, 2007, pp. 42-43). If the goal of civil society advocates is to "guarantee the autonomy of the modern state and economy while simultaneously protecting civil society from destructive penetration and functionalization by the imperatives of these two sphere," (Cohen & Arato, 1992, p. 25), then they have failed. Examining the social change system as an industrial complex means exposing that "the dream of a civil society that could serve as an equilibrium-seeking, democratic counterpull to the profoundly undemocratic, crisis-ridden, creative chaos of the capitalist supersystem is just that: a dream. This is the principle of *complicity*, or untranscendable control" (Massumi, 1998, p. 58).

At the broadest level, through events that granted government-sanctioned non-profit status with conferred tax benefits, and fostered the concurrent rise of foundations as a structure funded by private donors that offers specified funding opportunities to non-profits, social change work has re-territorialized into a non-profit-based structure that is mediated by

and complicit with *pouvoir*. This mediation is an increase in the capacity to actualize forms of social change work that relatively align with the interests of the state and corporate sector, while decreasing the capacity of social change that is resistant to these structures. Beyond the events through which the NPIC emerged, what are the processes of the NPIC that continuously connect social change work to the neoliberal state and its corporate sector? How do these processes alter capacities for social change work? In affective terms, how can we view these processes as refrains that attempt to capture affective excess, thereby actualizing norms of affective relationality complicit with *pouvoir*, the power that delimits the indeterminate openness of change? In exploring these questions, the NPIC will be presented as an apparatus that mediates the capacity to affect and be affected by those involved in social change work. However, prior to this discussion, it is first necessary to introduce briefly the concept of "apparatus."

2.2 Apparatus: Althusserian and Foucauldian

With a basis in classical Marxist thought, "Apparatus" gained greater traction for conceptual use in critical theory through French philosopher Louis Althusser's (1984) work on "Ideological State Apparatuses." Althusser wanted to theorize how ideology functions in such a way so that systems reproduce themselves through the formation of subjects that actively sustain those same systems (Ricoeur, 1994). Apparatuses are the structural and institutional entities that facilitate this subjection. In order to comprehend better the ideological function of state apparatuses, Althusser first contrasted Ideological State Apparatuses to Repressive State Apparatuses. Whereas the latter works to ensure maintenance of the system primarily through overt coercion and violence towards subjects, Ideological State Apparatuses, such as those institutions that are religious, educational, political, and governmental, to name a few, can be called as such when they function through

39

ideology (Althusser, 1984, pp. 16-22). In Marxist thought, ideology is the "the system of the ideas and representations which dominate the mind of a man or a social group" (Althusser, 1984, p. 32).

Althusser puts forth two main arguments as to how ideology functions to form subjects that maintain systems. First, as a Marxist concerned with material conditions, Althusser (1984) asserted that ideology is the "imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence" (p. 36), which means that there is an ideological "illusion" (p. 36) that displaces the real oppression of subjects. Second, instead of conceptualizing ideology as something composed of intangible ideas and beliefs, Althusser (1984) states that rather, "ideology has a material existence" (p. 39). This means that ideology exists in material bodies and institutions through their practices and actions (Althusser, 1984, p. 40).

Through this material basis, Althusser (1984) sets forth his thesis on how ideology works upon subjects through Ideological State Apparatuses:

> It therefore appears that the subject acts insofar as he is acted by the following system (set out in the order of its real determination): ideology existing in a material ideological apparatus, prescribing material practices governed by a material ritual, which practices exist in the material actions of a subject acting in all consciousness according to his belief. (p. 44)

In other words, institutions saturated with certain governing ideologies set forth patterned practices that are enacted by the subject through everyday actions. In stating that these actions are carried out "in all consciousness according to his belief," Althusser (1984) is getting at how subjects are interpellated by ideology, or in other words, transformed into subjects in the mirror image of ideology, to the effect that subjects act freely, but in a way that sustains ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (pp. 44-51). This is to say, "the individual *is interpellated as a (free) subject in order that he shall submit freely to the*

commandments of the Subject, i.e. in order that he shall (freely) accept his subjection..."
(Althusser, 1984, p. 56).

Additionally, as a Marxist, Althusser (1984) views the diverse number of Ideological State Apparatuses as unified into mutually supportive coherence by being subsumed under "the ideology of 'the ruling class" (p. 20). In other words, whatever other ideological functions differential Ideological State Apparatuses have, the ideology of the ruling class is the master ideology of all Ideological State Apparatuses, and consequently the functions of these apparatuses work to sustain the systems of power relations beneficial to that class. This presentation of ideology's functioning demonstrates that Althusser conceives of the relationship between ideology and power as a top-down process, where ideology is dominant and determinate, and power is an effect of it through ideological apparatuses.

Inspired by Althusser's work on Ideological State Apparatuses, "apparatus" is also a critical concept in the work of Michel Foucault. Foucault however does not privilege ideology as the defining element of apparatuses as Althusser does. In contrast to Althusser's conception of apparatuses as mainly determinate ideology-based structures that produce power relations in a linear top-down process, Foucault (1980) views each apparatus as a heterogeneous system that is "always inscribed in a play of power, but it is also always linked to certain coordinates of knowledge which issue from it but, to an equal degree, condition it" (p. 196). First, this means that power is always already present in the formation of apparatuses, suggesting that just as there is "movement from above to below there has to be a capillarity from below to above at the same time" (Foucault, 1980, p. 201). This challenges Althusser's ideological top-down conception of apparatuses as productive of power, but not vice versa. Second, power also works with and through forms of knowledge, which are produced by and productive of apparatuses. This will be addressed in a later section of this chapter. Third, in being heterogeneous, an apparatus is a "system of relations" (Foucault,

1980, p. 194) that interconnects a variety of seemingly disparate elements such as discourses, policies, and institutions. These elements form a coherent apparatus through contextual processes whereby each element "enters into resonance or contradiction with the others" (Foucault, 1980, p. 195), modifying each other and the apparatus in process. What each element is and how together they form a coherent apparatus is the job of developing "a grid of analysis which makes possible an analytic of relations of power" (Foucault, 1980, p. 199).

This research will take up Foucault's conceptualization of apparatuses as relational and material systems of heterogeneous elements produced by and productive of power and knowledge that intersect from multiple micro and macro locations. This focus on multiple locations fits well with Protevi's concept of "bodies politic" presented in the previous chapter, where the individual, group, and civil levels are affectively interconnected and productive of each other. The concept of "apparatus" helps us understand what it is that connects all these levels and how.

Additionally, while this research is critical of Althusser's privileging of ruling class ideology as the master ideology of subjection, which will be evident through a focus on the power dynamics of sexuality in Chapter III, this research does take seriously Althusser's notion that subject's are formed to freely act in a way that sustains apparatuses.[8] As affect theory is resistant to the notion that this is a complete ideological mirroring process, the research presented here will treat the NPIC as an apparatus that actualizes refrained norms of affective relationality that correspondingly sustain the NPIC. In line with this, methodologically this research will maintain Althusser's analytical focus on material practices and rituals. In doing so, the next section of this chapter will explore how norms of affective relationality actualize through the capture of affective excess on the part of the

_____

[8] This can be related to Foucault's (2008) late work on governmentality, self-governance, and biopolitics.

NPIC apparatus, its core processes, and the resulting material practices and system of knowledge, which engender refrains (rituals) of doing social change work, mediating and altering the capacity to affect. In doing so, the concept of "apparatus" will be developed further in affective terms.

2.3 Core Affective Processes of the Non-Profit Industrial Complex

Dylan Rodriguez (2007) provides a useful definition of the NPIC that will guide the elaboration of its processes: "the NPIC is the set of symbiotic relationships that link together political and financial technologies of state and owning-class proctorship and surveillance over public political intercourse, including and especially emergent progressive and leftist social movements, since about the mid-1970s" (pp. 21-22). As an apparatus, the NPIC is a system that connects the neoliberal state and the private, corporate sector to social change work through the non-profit system. The ways that the NPIC does so are multiplicitous and interlocking, but for analytical purposes, they can be subsumed under three main categories. They are: 1) the agenda setting power of foundations through the grant process; 2) material practices that actualize NPIC work and culture into professionalized competitions for funding; 3) a system of knowledge for doing social change work. They each will be discussed, including in terms of how they support the NPIC structure.

2.3.1 Agenda Setting and the Grant Process

The discussion presented above regarding Robert Allen's work on the co-optation of the Black Power movement by the Ford Foundation is suggestive of this first category. To recall, the state laws that form a philanthropic, tax incentive-based relationship between foundations and non-profits served as a convenient cover for the Ford Foundation to further their own reformist agenda through granting money to organizations in the Black Power

movement. This is indicative of how the corporate sector, through foundations, works to produce the agenda and activities of social change work. While often conceived of as benign institutions that provide funding opportunities to non-profits for the purposes of resolving social problems, foundations rarely create funding opportunities that would enable non-profits to work on fundamentally restructuring the neoliberal system that produced such problems. Instead, foundations provide grants that increase the capacity to affect in terms of micro-level social service provision, or education trainings for oppressed groups so that they may attempt to gain capacity to enter and thrive in the dominant system, or by granting funds for short-term projects that decrease the capacity of non-profits to do long-term movement building (Gilmore, 2007, p. 47). Thus, foundations ultimately work to foster "appropriate avenues and protocols of agitation for social change, which drastically delimits the form and substance that socially transformative and liberationist activisms can assume in the short and long terms" (Rodriguez, 2007, p. 26).

What structural processes contribute to the ability of foundations to do such agenda setting work that alters capacities to affect? As corporate entities, foundations often follow the same operating structure as large businesses in the private sector in that boards of directors control them. These boards are comprised of individuals who are often major donors to their respective foundations, frequently paid large sums of money to serve as trustees. These directors form the funding priorities of foundations (Ahn, 2007, p. 66). As the wealthy "benefit personally and ideologically from the current social and economic order" (Ahn, 2007, p. 67), wealthy directors do not create non-profit funding opportunities intended for the systemic and radical restructuring of that order.

Non-profits that are successful in obtaining grants from foundations are those that write grant proposals that demonstrate an alignment with the "values" of the granting foundation. The values must inform not just the mission of the non-profit, but also the goals,

44

objectives, and activities proposed in the grant application. Since most non-profits require funding to survive, grant writers tweak the contents of their grant proposals to align with what they think foundations would like to see. If the non-profit is successful in obtaining funding through this process, foundations ensure that the non-profit will abide by their grant contract through rigorous reviews of project reports and financial documents. Therefore, the very act of writing, fulfilling, and reporting on a grant project is mediated by the desires of foundations and their wealthy boards.

Giorgio Agamben is useful for understanding how the grant making process works to capture affect. Agamben (2009) expands upon Foucault's conception of apparatuses:

> I shall call an apparatus literally anything that has in some way the capacity to capture, orient, determine, intercept, model, control, or secure the gestures, behaviors, opinions, or discourses of living beings. Not only, therefore, prisons, madhouses, the panopticon, schools, confession, factories, disciplines, juridical measures, and so forth (whose connection with power is in a certain sense evident), but also the pen, writing, literature, philosophy, agriculture, cigarettes, navigation, computers, cellular telephones... (p. 14)

In this view, not just the NPIC, but aspects of the grant making process itself are apparatuses. This can include territories such as grant documents, computers and the internet for communicating about grants, reports, grant writing trainings, and numerous other elements used to write and execute grants "properly" for foundations. Each of these territories is an apparatus that mediates how bodies in non-profits obtain the means to do social change work. Together they form a territorial assemblage that produces a refrain, or a tendency, towards actualizing a certain way of obtaining money. Concomitantly, this assemblage is part of and works through the larger assembled NPIC apparatus, and as such, is a major part of

45

how the NPIC increases the capacity to actualize certain Virtual potentials of doing social change work over others.

The power of the NPIC, through foundations that are a territorial assemblage of at least wealthy donors, their agenda setting roles, and the grant making process, captures affective excess, the part of a territory open to deterritorialization and change, producing refrained norms of affective relationality. This is a multilayered affective process: since non-profits generally conform to the funding priorities and granting process of foundations in order to survive, foundation and grant-based social change work is actualized as projects and activities in line with the goals and agendas of granting foundations. The actualized projects and activities are generally ones that do not challenge foundations and the NPIC structure. In other words, the NPIC is an apparatus that structurally and financially connects corporate foundations to non-profits through sanctions of the state, and therefore the social change work that actualizes through this connection and its related practices tends to be complicit in sustaining the NPIC, rather than potentially challenging to it, its power, and the associated corporate sector and neoliberal state.

This means that the bodies of individuals and groups are affected by the institutional power of the NPIC, mediating their capacity to do social change work. This mediation is a capture of affective excess in that being affected by the NPIC's structural power alters bodies' capacity to affect. In other words, there is an increase in the capacity to affect and do social change work through the programmatic funding opportunities offered by foundations, and a decrease in the capacity to do social change work that is less implicated in the agenda setting power of the NPIC. Territorial elements of the NPIC assemblage, such as wealthy donors, their agenda setting roles, and the grant making process, engender a refrain towards actualizing certain forms of social change work. As refrains work through the NPIC structure to continually actualize certain Virtual potentials over others, such as grant-based programs

46

and activities, social change work becomes more determined and complicit in the NPIC's

power and structure. As implicated in, rather than in opposition to the NPIC structure, bodies

involved in such social change work are delimited from enacting radical de- and

reterritorializations of the NPIC. This delimitation produces, and is reinforced by,

normalizations of affective relationality, actualized as certain refrained material practices of

doing social change work, that have the effect of sustaining the NPIC structure.

The next section will explore some of these material practices and situate them in the

everyday micro location of non-profit work and culture. This will complicate the

Althusserian conceptualization of apparatuses as ideologically producing power through top-

down processes. Instead, a Foucauldian notion of apparatuses will be advanced, which views

the NPIC as a relational and material system of heterogeneous elements always already

saturated with power and knowledge from multiple micro and macro locations.

2.3.2 Material Practices of Non-Profit Work and Culture: Professionalized Competitions for Funding

According to Rodriguez (2007), the:

bureaucratization of social change and dissent...tends to create an *institutionalized*

inside/outside to aspiring social movements by funneling activists into the

hierarchical rituals and restrictive professionalism of discrete campaigns, think

tanks, and organizations, outside of which it is usually profoundly difficult to

organize a critical mass of political movement. (p. 26)

In being part of the NPIC apparatus, non-profits are part of this inside. Through affective

relations with corporate foundations and the neoliberal state, everyday material practices of

non-profit work actualize as professionalized competitions for scarce resources, which

47

support social change work that sustains the NPIC. Each part of this argument will be explained in this section.

First, non-profits compete with each other for funding. As stated in the previous section, non-profits generally attain funds for social change work through applying for foundation-based grants. These grants are typically competitive, with multiple non-profits vying for a limited number of dollars. This requires that non-profit grant writers must write their grants in order to "sell" their project and activity proposals, meaning that social change "work becomes compartmentalized products, desired or undesired by the foundation market, rated by trends or political relationships rather than depth of work" (Guilloud & Cordery, 2007, p. 108). The culture of non-profit work becomes a battle for funding, which prevents non-profits from collaborating with each other to form a more cohesive assemblage around similar issues.

In order to survive in the NPIC structure, fundraising becomes the central practice of non-profits. This means that money is often spent on hiring professional grant writers to secure funding, and that "valuable time is spent securing cozy relationships with major donors instead of organizing to dismantle the very systems of oppression" (King & Osayande, 2007, p. 85) that provide foundations with such huge financial resources and power in the first place. Non-profits turn themselves into "mini-corporations" (Jones de Almeida, 2007, p.187), where fundraising is privileged and the actual activities of social change work are relegated as mere consequences of fundraising.[9] Critically, this means that "as organizations became non-profitized they began to lose political autonomy (form the state and funders), and their sense of accountability shifted from their constituents to their funders" (Durazo, 2007, p. 117). Thus, the NPIC is a classed apparatus in the sense that it is conducive

---

[9] For a thorough discussion on how social change work occurs through the mobilization of resources, see (McCarthy & Zaid, 1977).

for forming assemblages between bodies doing social change work and wealthy donors and foundations, and less conducive for forming assemblages between non-profits and oppressed groups. In other words, a norm actualizes that privileges affective relationality between bodies doing social change work and the wealthy.

Second, social change work is increasingly done by professionalized activists. Not only does this mean that employees of non-profits are often expected to have technical grant writing skills to obtain funds from foundations (Rodriguez, 2007, p. 27), but those who carry out grant-based programs and activities are those who have formally trained skills in program development, management, and evaluation, and specialized knowledge of relevant social issues. In fact, it is common for foundation-based grant applications to include a required section in which the non-profit outlines the formal qualifications of those who will fulfill the programmatic obligations of the grant. Due to this, the professionalization of activism, in which activism becomes a "career" (Thunder Hawk, 2007, p. 106), actualizes as a norm for doing social change work.

Paul Kivel (2007) offers a theoretical framework for understanding how the professionalization of social change work produces a normalized "buffer zone" (p. 134) that sustains the power of the NPIC. This buffer zone contains non-profits and professionalized activists who serve as a mediating barrier between those in power and the oppressed, preventing the oppressed from organizing together to challenge dominant power. The ways this mediation occurs according to Kivel (2007, pp. 134-136) can be adapted to the NPIC to better demonstrate their everyday practices. First, non-profits receive grant money from foundations, which gives professional activists the power to filter this money into programs of their selection. Since non-profits will only receive grants if their selected programs do not overtly challenge the system supportive of foundations, professionalized non-profits tend to create programs that help alleviate some of the problems caused by inequality, which shifts

organizations away from organizing work that challenges the systems that cause inequality and oppression. Second, non-profits provide opportunities for a few select members of oppressed groups to do social change work. As such, a main focus of professionalized non-profits becomes developing the capacity of their employees to do social change work, through trainings and continuing education. Foundations often expect this type of capacity building from their grantees. This creates a system of legitimacy where the professionalized are viewed as superior in their ability to do social change work, delegitimizing, discouraging, and demobilizing those not professionalized. This also engenders an affective assemblage between professionalized activists, while disconnecting other members of oppressed groups from formal social change work through non-profits.

Both of these forms of mediation have the effect of situating professionalized non-profits as the managers of how social change work is done. Due to their ability to obtain grant-based funding, professionalized non-profits are in a superior position to regulate the kinds of social change work that can happen and who is involved. Ultimately, the professionalization of social change functions to buffer the NPIC from "social change work [that] challenges the root causes of exploitation and violence" (Kivel, 2007, p. 129).

For example, activist Madonna Thunder Hawk (2007) discusses how the emergence of the professionalized non-profit system fundamentally altered her experience of doing social change work in native communities. Prior to this emergence, Thunder Hawk describes multiple examples of social change work that were grassroots-based and even directly challenging towards the state, such as opposing the state and Indian Health Services on its environmental contamination practices or advocating for improvements in nutritional services on reservations. Non-profits have generally taken over this type of social change work in Thunder Hawk's (2007) native communities, except that now "the focus turned to raising money to keep the organization going, while the actual work of activism became secondary

50

and watered down" (p. 105). She states that the desire of professionals in non-profits to keep their jobs funded and organizations afloat prevents non-profits from challenging structures upon which they rely for funding. Professionalized competitions for funding become the centralized focus on their work.

Additionally, the forms of social change work that actualize are altered due to an affective connection with funders. Thunder Hawk (2007) discusses how community-based organizing for changes in governmental nutrition policies have morphed into educational programming that often funds little more than informational material. She sees a direct link between the funding practices of non-profits and the decrease in the capacity to organize in a way that challenges the state: "if the government is funding the [informational] pamphlet, then an organization is not going to address the impact of US colonialism on Native diets because they don't want to lose funding" (Thunder Hawk, 2007, p. 105).

The need for non-profits to acquire funding to do social change work results in a competition for scarce resources where professional activists are more likely to be the victors of funds that increase their capacity to actualize certain forms of social change work, such as educational programming, and decrease their capacity to actualize social change work that challenges funding bodies. This demonstrates that the bodies in the multiple capillaries of the NPIC apparatus support the power of the structure. Deleuze (1992) discusses this very same Foucauldian-based argument, proposing that the power of apparatuses works "through the marginalized existence of the 'outsider'" (p. 161); the outsiders here being members of oppressed groups who become professional activists in a way that sustains the NPIC. The apparatus, as affective, can then be usefully conceptualized in terms of it engendering a "process of becoming" (Deleuze, 1992, p. 164), whereby bodies, by being affected by the apparatus, continuously become something other than what they were. In the case of the

51

NPIC, bodies become territories for continuously actualizing everyday material practices that sustain the NPIC structure.

Another illustrative example is provided by Amara H. Perez (2007), the executive director of the non-profit Sisters in Action for Power. She describes how her organization was in financial trouble and received advice from a number of sources on how to raise funds. In order to stay afloat, Perez (2007, pp. 92-93) and her organization began to compete for foundation-based funding by writing numerous grant proposals and reports, organizing site visits from funders, formulating a business-like organizational structure and practices, and carrying out complicated legal and administrative tasks in order to become a formal non-profit. The energy required to undertake these tasks "shifted the focus from strategies for radical change to charts and tables that demonstrate how successfully the work has satisfied foundation-based benchmarks" (Perez, 2007, p. 93). Thus, non-profit culture, with an obsession for funding at its center, became privileged at the expense of the grassroots activist concerns of the organization (Perez, 2007, p. 92). Perez (2007) describes how this actualized a "normalized corporate culture" (p. 93) in which repetitious competitions for funds became the organizations modus operandi, delimiting the capacity for resistance to funders, and the connected neoliberal state and corporate sector.

The practices of bodies doing social change work, such as Perez's, are actualized as a result of the NPIC's capture of affect. They actualize to form a territorial assemblage of relational micro-elements that refrain together as norms of affective relationality for doing social change work. These norms sustain the NPIC and its continual capture of affect, preventing radical deterritorializations of it. In sum, the ways that bodies continuously relate with and are affected by the NPIC, in a way that is supportive of the NPIC as presented in this section, results in a system of normalized affective relationality for doing social change work. In other words, bodies affect in such a way that the NPIC becomes a sustained

structure for actualizing certain forms of social change work, maintaining itself through the normalization of how bodies affect within the affective relationality of the NPIC. This is a continuous delimiting of the openness, indeterminacy and changeability of affect.

The final part of this section will argue that the NPIC structure and its material practices that sustain it have refrained in such a way to actualize a system of knowledge on how to do social change work. This affectively builds on Foucault's assertion that apparatuses are not just saturated with power, but also produced by and productive of knowledges. The actualization of this knowledge will be viewed as the capture of affect par excellence, working to sustain the NPIC structure and its norms of affective relationality.

2.3.3 The Non-Profit Industrial Complex as a System of Knowledge

A process that facilitates the sustaining of the NPIC is the production of "an epistemology—literally, *a way of knowing* social change and resistance praxis—that is difficult to escape or rupture" (Rodriguez, 2007, p. 31). The capture of affective excess through refrained material practices produces an altered capacity to affect that delimits radical deterritorializations of the NPIC, resulting in such a normalized affective relationality for doing social change work that it is difficult for many activists to actualize this work outside of or in resistance to the NPIC structure. The benefits to actualizing social change work in the NPIC structure, such as access to funding, trainings, and legitimacy, seems to outweigh the perils of enacting social change outside of it (Rodriguez, 2007, p. 27). Indeed, there are also many structural factors that produce dangerous or impossible conditions for actualizing social change work outside of the NPIC. There is a:

> fundamental political constriction—through everything from restrictive tax laws on
> community-based organizations to the arbitrary enforcement of repressive
> laws banning certain forms of public congregation (for example, the California

53

'antigang' statutes that have effectively criminalized Black and Brown public

existence on a massive scale)—of the appropriate avenues and protocols of

agitation for social change. (Rodriguez, 2007, p. 26)

Thus, doing social change work through the NPIC becomes *the* systematic way to do it,

almost without an imaginable outside.[10]

This reflects Foucault's claim that forms of knowledge intersect with power to

produce apparatuses. The knowledge that privileges the NPIC as *the* structure through which

to do social change work is an especially entrenched example of the capture of affect by the

apparatus. According to Brian Massumi (1998), the tendency for apparatuses to capture affect

is one of its defining processes (p. 55). He says that apparatuses do this by employing their

power "on points of indeterminacy," transforming these points into "determinabilities...a

particularized possibility for the exercise of power" (Massumi, 1998, pp. 54-55).[11] In this

view, the variable variety of social change work becomes actualized as less variable and less

---

[10] This argument is similar to Cindy Patton's (2002, p. 201) description of nation building

as a performative homology. Patton argues that the production of nations on a mass scale

requires the notion of a broader community of nations with an unthinkable outside. This

notion is performative in that it is productive of a system of homologous nations. The NPIC,

as a way of knowing how to do social change, seems to function performatively in a similar

way.

[11] Massumi (2002, pp. 128-130) discusses how systems even work upon human agency in

order to actualize it as something more determinate. Humans are fed into a system where

their agency is captured and determined in a way more apt towards meeting the needs of the

system. Agential acts are therefore seen as less voluntary, and more inseparable from the

system in which they occur. Thus, the "capacity to affect" is a phrase that could be considered

as already incorporating an implied delimitation in its indeterminate potential.

various through the power of the NPIC, normalizing its actualization as the structure through which to do social change work (Massumi, 1998, p. 57).

Capturing affect through a system of knowledge actualizes a material relationship to the NPIC that directs the energy and imaginations of activists towards actualizing social change work through the apparatus. As such, this is one way that the NPIC works to determine social change work, while also mediating the capacity of bodies to affect through actualizing material practices that sustain the NPIC. This determination and mediation is the normalization of affective relationality between different elements of the NPIC, including the affective connections between non-profits, foundations, and the neoliberal state, as well as the apparatuses agenda setting process, material practices of professionalized competitions, and system of knowledge. The final section of this chapter will characterize these connections as a territorial assemblage that forms a conduit for the transmission of affect and will explore what this means in terms of the ethical project of affect, that of increasing *puissance*.

2.4 The Transmission of Affect and **Puissance**

In her influential work on affective transmission, the late Teresa Brennan (2004) states, "by the transmission of affect, I mean simply that the emotions or affects of one person, and the enhancing or depressing energies these affects entail, can enter into another" (p. 3). This definition implies that affect works through bodies to the effect of increasing or decreasing a capacity to affect in the affecting and affected bodies. While for Brennan this affective transmission happens through the body of a "person," Deleuze (1988) broadens the conceptualization of bodies to include a multiplicity of territorial assemblages that includes the corporeal and the non-corporeal (see The Relational Body section of Chapter I). Affective transmission through a broader conceptualization of bodies is evident in the works of other scholars of affective transmission, such as Julian Henriques (2010), who has theorized how

55

affect may be transmitted through a "medium" (p. 58). In the research presented here, the NPIC apparatus is such a medium. As a territorial assemblage, it transmits affect through its heterogeneous territories, through which they are differentially affected, and their capacity to affect is altered. In Ben Anderson's (2009) words, this would constitute the NPIC as an "atmosphere" for the transmission of affect:

> atmospheres are generated by bodies – of multiple types – affecting one another as some form of 'envelopment' is produced. Atmospheres do not float free from the bodies that come together and apart to compose situations. Affective qualities emanate from the assembling of the human bodies, discursive bodies, non-human bodies, and all the other bodies that make up everyday situations. (p. 80)

In other words, bodies affect with each other to form an affective atmosphere. This atmosphere then works upon and through the bodies that are part of that atmosphere. Therefore, affect is transmitted through the NPIC to the very bodies that work to actualize and sustain it through their own relational affective processes.

However, utilizing a multi-leveled bodies politic framework sensitive to *puissance* shows that the various elements of the NPIC are not equal in terms of their capacity to affect and be affected by other elements (see Bringing Affect and the Social Together section of Chapter I). To recall, the civic level of bodies politic is actualized through the institutionalization of patterns of affecting among those grouped individuals that are socially embedded and embodied within the civic level. Once actualized, the civic level then works to capture affect, sedimenting the patterns that formed it. It does so by transmitting norms of affective relationality through its constitutive elements, actualized as refrained material practices. This alters the capacity to affect and enact deterritorializations of the civic level. The NPIC apparatus is this institutionalized civic level.

56

As the NPIC works to alter bodies' capacity to affect, increasing the capacity for actualizing social change work complicit with sustaining the NPIC, the potential for *puissance*, the indeterminate capacity of bodies to form mutually constitutive relations for change, decreases. This is at the heart of NPIC's power: it brings certain bodies together for social change work, but mediates how this social change work can actualize. According to Rodriguez's (2007) damning critique of the NPIC, "the US state has found in its coalition with the NPIC a far less spectacular, generally demilitarized, and still highly effective apparatus of political discipline and repression that (to this point) has not provoked a significant critical mass of opposition or political outrage" (p. 29). The capacity to assemble a "critical mass of opposition" is decreased by the NPIC through the refrained norms of affective relationality presented above. Likewise, the NPIC apparatus is an assemblage of certain territories that increases *pouvoir*, the power that sustains normalized affective relations between territories, delimiting the capacity for deterritorializations. What is possibly foreclosed by this is an assemblage for social change work that could potentially offer new affective relations, becomings, and radical social change, for the increase of *puissance*. This latter assemblage would be one that privileges the indeterminacy and openness of affect and the Virtual potential for processual change, where social change work would be considered "organizing as *producing* the communities, as generating community, as building communities of struggle" (Angela Davis cited in Bierria, 2007, p.161).

This chapter has argued that the NPIC is a territorial assemblage that connects bodies doing social change work in the non-profit system to foundations and their wealthy donors, and the associated neoliberal state and corporate sector. The NPIC is an apparatus saturated with affective processes, which through agenda-setting practices, engenders refrains of doing social change work, actualized as professionalized competitions for funding that sustain the affective relationality of the NPIC from multiple locations. This increases the capacity to

57

actualize social change work that is aligned with the programmatic funding opportunities

offered by foundations, while decreasing the capacity to actualize social change work that

directly challenges the NPIC, the neoliberal state, and corporate sector. This works to

legitimize the NPIC as nearly the only imaginable structure through which to actualize social

change work, normalizing its affective relationality through continuous actualizations of its

affective processes. This normalization is a capture of affect in that it delimits the capacity for

radical deterritorializations of the NPIC apparatus upon which non-profits funding relies,

thereby also delimiting *puissance* and the indeterminate openness of affect to change

affective relations.

Chapter 3

Affective Homonormalizations

This chapter will explore affective processes of social change work in regards to the lesbian and gay movement in the United States, thereby further developing and illuminating the arguments of the previous chapter. It will first discuss a brief history of the institutionalization of the lesbian and gay movement, but will also incorporate into this history an account of the growth of foundation funding in the movement, arguing that this growth was critical to the emergence of the contemporary movement. This will implicate the lesbian and gay movement in the NPIC apparatus, and will demonstrate the agenda-setting capture of affective excess on the part of foundations and wealthy donors. As presented in the previous chapter, in order for the NPIC, and particularly its capture of affect, to be sustained, it must alter the capacity of bodies to affect by engendering refrains of doing social change work, which normalize the affective relationality of the NPIC. As such, this chapter will argue that in the lesbian and gay movement the NPIC is sustained through affective processes of homonormativity that can be observed through the everyday material practices of bodies doing social change work in the movement. In exploring critical aspects of homonormativity as affective processes in the NPIC, the normalization of affective relationality in the lesbian and gay movement that works to sustain the NPIC structure will be read as processes of affective homonormalization that continuously delimit the indeterminacy of affect.

In many ways, this chapter treats the lesbian and gay movement in the United States as a case study through which to demonstrate the capture of affect through the NPIC apparatus, particularly the three core processes of the NPIC as presented in Chapter II. As such, various micro-case examples of affective relationality in the NPIC will presented, especially in regards to everyday material practices that sustain the NPIC. Practices of the Human Rights Campaign, a well known non-profit in the lesbian and gay movement, will be

examined through the memoir of its founder, Steve Endean. Likewise, the voice of Urvashi Vaid, former director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, will be present throughout the text. Their voices and related case examples will augment the history of the lesbian and gay movement presented here, and significantly, will demonstrate how affect works on and through processes of normalization in a form of identity-based politics.

3.1 The Emergence of the Lesbian and Gay Movement and the NPIC: Convergences

This section presents a history of the lesbian and gay movement in the United States. However, it is not meant to summarize a comprehensive history of the movement, a very large and unfeasible task, but rather to spotlight events and developments that contributed to the movement's actualization as institutionalized and implicated in the NPIC. In doing so, it goes beyond the work of historians such as Stephen Engel (2002), who has explored how the movement formed due to "changing opportunity, pre-existing organizational strength, and cognitive liberation which leads to collective identity formation" (p. 378), by incorporating the role of foundation's and philanthropy into the history of the movements emergence.

Before exploring this brief history, it is first critical to explain the specific focus on the lesbian and gay movement, rather than a broader lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) movement. This chapter is based upon the understanding that the LGBTQ movement is affected by internal tensions that often marginalize the issues and voices of bisexual, transgender, and queer people. While this marginalization is certainly connected to homonormativity, I certainly do not wish to reproduce homonormativity through a lazy

exclusion of these identities, voices, and issues.[12] My intentional choice to focus primarily on the lesbian and gay movement in this chapter is because this movement has emerged as lesbian, and even more so, gay-dominant partially because of the role of foundations and the NPIC in it. While bisexual issues have been largely rendered invisible, it is only very recently that foundations have taken an interest in funding transgender or queer issues (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, p. 20). Therefore, the history of the social movement around sexuality in the United States is not only presented here as lesbian and gay-dominant due to its institutional actualization as a lesbian and gay-dominant movement, but also because foundations enmeshed themselves into the social change work of lesbians and gay-based movements far prior to doing so in the work of bisexual, transgender, or queer people, thus facilitating this domination.

The organized lesbian and gay movement that flourished in the latter half of the twentieth century has its roots in the formation of lesbian and gay communities in the 1920s and 1930s. These communities were largely the result of increasing urbanization, through which women and men with same-sex desire came into greater contact with each other, resulting in shared self-identifications around their desires (Taylor, Kaminski, & Dugan, 2002, p. 101). A variety of same sex desire-based identifications materialized, often actualizing through intersections with class, such as the working-class, effeminate "fairy" men, or the more masculine "husbands" out of the gay middle-class (Taylor et al., 2002, p. 102). The growth of these subcultures, as well as the public policing of more effeminate gay men, led to the development of spatialized gay communities, such as bars, clubs, and ghettoized neighborhoods, where particularly gay men could meet in relatively greater safety (Taylor et al., 2002, p. 104). The formation of these gay spaces helped to further develop and

---

[12] To better understand the marginalization of transgender voices and knowledge in history, see the work of Susan Stryker (2008).

solidify a gay culture and community, and allowed lesbians and gay men to perform "everyday acts of resistance" (Taylor et al, 2002, p. 104) in the face of the dominant heteronormative society.

Hostility towards lesbians and gay men and their spaces, particularly from the police, grew in the increasingly conservative climate following World War II. This planted the seeds of community resistance that would contribute to actualizing the first organized lesbian and gay movement, termed the "homophile movement" (Engel, 2002, pp. 380-382). Harry Hay founded the first formal gay organization in the United States, the Mattachine Society, and based its structure and vision on Marxist principles. In line with this, the Mattachine Society conceptualized gay people as a uniquely oppressed class and advocated consciousness raising work, much like the Marxist proletariat, in order to be liberated and achieve equality. However, the communist leanings of the organization and its leadership during 1950's McCarthyism eventually led the Mattachine Society to reject these Marxist principles and take a more reformist stance towards sexual politics (Engel, 2002, p. 382). Like its lesbian counterpart, the Daughters of Bilitis, the Mattachine Society de-politicized and took an "assimilationist" (Engel, 2002, p. 383) position that emphasized "integrat[ing] the homosexual into heterosexual society by de-emphasizing sexual difference and seeking acceptance from the majority culture" (Engel, 2002, p. 383).

Most popular conceptions of the lesbian and gay movement history in the United States would typically jump here to the 1969 Stonewall Riot and the dawn of what is termed "gay liberation." However, this erases the broader social, political, and cultural changes that fostered the liberationist climate to which Stonewalls happening is indebted. The development of the New Social Movements in the 1960s, such as the black power and feminist movements, each with their own particular histories, cultivated a more radical, confrontational political environment that deeply affected the homophile movement and

lesbian and gay communities (Engels, 2002, pp. 383-384). This, combined with the increasing police harassment and brutality of gay people and spaces, provided some of the conditions necessary for the Stonewall Riot, the first widely recognized militant response to such oppression, to occur (Taylor et al., 2002, p. 106).[13]

The new gay liberationist movement abandoned the assimilationist politics of the homophile movement (Taylor et al., 2002, p. 106). However, rather than simply returning to its Marxist, sexuality-as-a-class roots, gay liberation broadened its focus towards intersectional cultural change that not only challenged the normalization of heterosexuality, but also had the goal of "overturning the white male hegemony that characterized modern capitalism (Engel, 2002, p. 387). As such, gay liberation began as a coalitional politics with other New Social Movements, gaining valuable frameworks and tactics for organizing against their mutual, interlocking oppressions. Indeed, "phrases such as 'gay power' belie how dependent the gay liberation movement was on the precedent-setting cultural frames used by both the black power and radical feminist movements" (Engel, 2002, p. 386).

This catalyzed the mass institutionalization of the lesbian and gay movement. Not only did gay liberation lead to an explosion of gay cultural spaces, but also many lesbian and gay political organizations were founded (Engel, 2002, p. 386; Taylor et al., 2002, p. 106). Before the Stonewall Riot there were only fifty homophile organizations loosely scattered across the United States. By the mid-1970's however, the number of gay liberation

---

[13] I say "widely recognized" because, while many historians of the lesbian and gay movement cite the Stonewall Riot as the beginning of liberationist politics in the LGBTQ movement, the Compton Cafeteria riot in San Francisco preceded it by three years. This latter riot was specifically against "antitransgender discrimination." Stryker (2008) discusses it and the politics of its erasure.

63

organizations that existed had grown to nearly a thousand, and totaled several thousand by the end of the decade (Engel, 2002, p. 389).

The Gay Liberation Front was the organization that exemplified the new politics of gay liberation. It abandoned the rights-based assimilationist discourse and social change work of the earlier homophile movement, instead emphasizing structural changes to the capitalist system through consciousness-raising activities among lesbians and gay men (Engel, 2002, p. 387), and correspondingly, advocated coming out as practice to publicly "conflate the personal and political" (Engel, 2002, p. 388). This politicization of sexuality through coming out was epitomized in the proliferation of "gay pride" discourse and events that gave the lesbian and gay movement a new level of visibility (Chasin, 2000, p. 210).

There was very little foundation-based grant support for the lesbian and gay movement prior to the gay liberation era. Most organizations relied upon funding from members of the lesbian and gay community itself (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, p. 6). As discussed in the previous chapter, the tax-deductible relationship between non-profits and foundations was not made possible until the national Tax Reform Act of 1969, relatively simultaneous to the rise of gay liberation. It was not until 1970 that an organization in the lesbian and gay movement would be awarded a grant from a foundation. This first grant from the foundation RESIST was awarded to the Gay Liberation Front to help with its grassroots and activist organizing (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, p. 6). However, this type of grant that seemed beneficial to the goals of gay liberation was an anomaly. The vast majority of the few foundation-based grants that were awarded during the first years of this era focused primarily on developing counseling programs and health-related services (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, pp. 6-7). The awarding of these grants is reflective of the service-based type of funding frequently offered to organizations in other New Social Movements by

private foundations during this time (see Historical Emergence of the Non-Profit Industrial Complex section of Chapter II).

It was not until the gay liberation movement began to splinter that a broader range of grants was offered to organizations in the lesbian and gay movement. This splintering was evident through the formation of the Gay Activist Alliance, which similarly politicized sexuality as the Gay Liberation Front did, but advocated more reform-based changes inside the dominant system (Engel, 2002, p. 388; Vaid, 1995, p. 59-60). Additionally, many lesbians in the early to mid-1970s began to leave these gay liberation organizations for organizations in the feminist movement because gay liberation "ignore[d] the structural oppression which lesbians faced as women" (Engel, 2002, p. 389). This splintering greatly hindered the goals of gay liberation and contributed to the dissolution of many larger gay liberation organizations, including the Gay Liberation Front, by the mid-1970s (Engel, 2002, p. 389). Soon after however, many smaller organizations that worked on youth and/or women's issues began to form and receive programming support grants, and foundations began funding some work on civil and legal rights advocacy as well (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, pp. 8-10).

A significant increase in foundation-based funding to the lesbian and gay movement occurred in the early 1980s with the onset of the AIDS epidemic. AIDS emerged in the gay community during a shift towards political conservatism in the United States, with dramatic cuts to government-based welfare and human services. With this decreased structural capacity of the government to provide human services, and its concomitant silence regarding AIDS, the gay community rallied to increase their own capacity to actualize its own social services in response to the crisis. Hundreds of organizations were established from within the gay community, providing health-related services to those living with AIDS, as well as political advocacy directed at the government. These advocacy efforts eventually had the

65

effect of giving the lesbian and gay movement unprecedented political visibility, particularly nationally (Engel, 2002, p. 391; Vaid, 1995, pp. 79-93).

The focus granted to the lesbian and gay movement through HIV/AIDS also led to a greater affective relationality between the broader movement and foundations, with a general increase in foundation support to other issues important to the movement, including civil rights work, anti-violence, and even the first US-based grants to fund international lesbian and gay issues (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, pp. 12-14). While foundation-based funding to lesbian and gay organizations tripled in the first few years of the AIDS crisis, it reached nearly twenty times this amount by the early 1990s, totally over 21 million dollars in funding. Additionally, the number of foundations granting money to organizations in the lesbian and gay movement went from 17 to 124 during the crisis (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, pp. 9-13). Funding lesbian and gay organizations became an increasingly institutionalized avenue through which foundations did grant-making.

While the AIDS crisis increased the level of funding to the lesbian and gay movement, specifically what resulted was a growth mainly towards service provision and health care (Vaid, 1995, p. 88). While this type of funding was certainly necessary during a health crisis, according to Urvashi Vaid (1995), this increased funding for gay social services also "depoliticized" (p. 86) the lesbian and gay movement:

> In place of liberation, the AIDS movement substituted nondiscrimination; instead of building a movement, it built agencies and bureaucracies; instead of placing its political faith in training and organizing gay and lesbian people, and our allies, into an electoral coalition, it placed its faith in friends in high places. (p. 91)

Hence, not only did the AIDS movement have the effect of incorporating the lesbian and gay movement into the non-profit service-based agency system, but Vaid is also getting at how grassroots mobilizations of the lesbian and gay community for the purposes of institutional

66

change were largely abandoned and replaced by a service-based reliance on wealthy donors and their foundations to fund the movement.

Vaid (1995) seems to make an implicit and direct connection to the NPIC in terms of how this reliance on wealthy donors to fund social services depoliticizes the movement:

> ...social service agencies will never be forces for progressive social change. To the extent that such groups depend on the government for their financial survival, they will not challenge the government. To the extent that our service organizations depend on private funding from wealthy individuals, their boards are controlled by people with a stake in maintaining the status quo. (p. 228)

Thus, the affective relationality between non-profits and donors worked to increase the capacity for actualizing social service-based work, while decreasing the capacity to actualize social change work that could potentially oppose donors, and the associated state and corporate sectors.

Even when organizations in the lesbian and gay movement did policy advocacy work during the AIDS crisis, this work primarily took place on the national level, sacrificing energy at the grassroots level (Engel, 2002, p. 393; Vaid, 1995, pp. 88-89).[14] While national policy advocacy was essential in the 1980s due to the lack of governmental response towards AIDS, Vaid (1995) believes that service provision could have been supplemented with grassroots organizing:

> If each gay and AIDS organization engaged in even the most basic kinds of political education of its clients, volunteers, and supporters—encouraging them to

---

[14] Of course ACT UP was conducting vitally influential grassroots actions during the AIDS crisis, with many of their actions explicitly critical of the service-based trend of the lesbian and gay movement during the crisis (Gould, 2009)

register and vote, informing them of the voting records on gay and AIDS

issues of local politicians, and fostering debate and discussion of the problems

gay people face at the national or local level—gay and lesbian communities

across the country would be far more politicized and mobilized. (p. 228)

Thus, the actualization of organizations in the lesbian and gay movement as primarily

service-based during the AIDS crisis was not an unaffected, natural outcome of the crisis. It

actualized as such, at least partially, due to an affective relationality between non-profits,

wealthy donors, and their foundations that provided funding specifically for the purposes of

service provision. Indeed, as stated above, the majority of funding to organizations in the

lesbian and gay movement was for AIDS-based service provision. Concurrently, it is critical

to note that "of all the HIV/AIDS funding that was awarded in the early 1980s, more than 30

percent came from lesbian and gay foundations" (Funders for LGBTQ, 2012a, p. 11),

suggesting an internal depoliticization as well.

The AIDs crisis was critical for actualizing a general trend towards financing the

lesbian and gay movement through foundations, many of which were founded by wealthy

lesbian and gay men. The mid to late-1990s saw "the largest number of new private

foundations established by lesbian and gay donors" (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, p.

15) in the history of the lesbian and gay movement. This occurred not only because a number

of lesbians and gay men grew wealthy during the 1990s technology boom (Funders for

LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, p. 15), but perhaps also because a more general shift transpired

towards mainstream lesbian and gay acceptance in US media that engendered a relatively

safer culture of visibility, at least for those who fit a certain normative gay profile (Engel,

2002, pp. 396-397). While AIDS was an issue that still received a large portion of foundation

funding every year, the new Clinton administration in the national government formed

political relationships with wealthy lesbian and gay donors who contributed to Clinton's

campaign. This access opened a policy window for these donors to expand the lesbian and gay movement beyond AIDS, leading to a greater focus on civil rights related issues at the national level (Vaid, 1995, pp. 159-164).

Thus, the turn of the millennium saw a large increase of funding from foundations towards non-profits working on gay-related civil, human, and legal rights issues. Of particular note was the explosion in grant money towards enacting domestic partnership and marriage related policy and advocacy programs. Marriage has been at the forefront of the lesbian and gay movement during a period (years 2000 – 2010) where nearly 90% of the total grant funding in the history of the lesbian and gay movement has been awarded (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, p. 27), "making it the largest single lesbian and gay issue receiving foundation support in the movement's history, aside from general civil rights" (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2102a, p. 18). This outcome was largely due to the first major grant from a foundation towards gay marriage coming from the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund. This not only resulted in the formation of the influential non-profit Freedom to Marry, but also signified marriage as a central issue for major funders of the lesbian and gay movement (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, pp. 18-19). As such, grant money towards the issue accelerated rapidly after this point.

The history of the lesbian and gay movement demonstrates a growth in connections between its non-profit organizations, foundations, and their wealthy donors. Between 1970 and 2010, over 60% of all grant money came from private, corporate foundations (figure 1). Additionally, nearly one-third of all foundation-based grants to non-profits in the movement were awarded for civil rights and marriage-related issues (figure 2). Therefore, as "today, LGBTQ concerns garner some $100 million in annual institutional support" (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, p. 24), and that "the current trend seems to be moving away from general support and more to project specific support" (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, p.

69

25) with around two-thirds of all grant money going to latter (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012b, p. 7), foundations exert an incredible amount of agenda setting power over the forms of social change work that actualize in the movement. It has thereby actualized as a movement implicated in the NPIC.

DISTRIBUTION BY FOUNDATION TYPE, 1970–2010	DOLLARS		GRANTS	
	TOTAL DOLLARS	% OF TOTAL	TOTAL GRANTS	% OF TOTAL
Private	$486,250,059	63.1%	14,725	41.0%
Public Foundations	$126,579,536	16.4%	14,198	39.5%
Other[1]	$ 76,263,557	9.9%	333	0.9%
Community Foundations	$ 47,494,043	6.2%	4,423	12.3%
Corporate Foundations/ Corporate Giving Programs	$ 26,938,831	3.5%	1,764	4.9%
Nonprofits	$ 7,541,924	1.0%	472	1.3%

[1]"Other" includes anonymous and unspecified gifts/donors.

Figure 1. Distribution by Foundation Type, 1970-2010

(Funders for LGTBQ Issues, 2012a, p. 28)

DISTRIBUTION BY ISSUE ADDRESSED, 1970–2010	TOTAL DOLLARS	% TOTAL DOLLARS	TOTAL GRANTS
Civil Rights	$152,341,645	19.6%	4,776
Marriage/Civil Unions	$ 75,280,127	9.8%	1,532
Multi-Issue	$ 68,429,103	8.9%	2,861
Health	$ 64,518,951	8.4%	3,111
Education/Safe Schools	$ 64,001,727	8.3%	3,217
HIV/AIDS	$ 59,447,348	7.7%	3,423
Human Rights	$ 56,500,767	7.3%	1,586
Community Building	$ 43,862,262	5.7%	5,907
Visibility	$ 34,086,250	4.4%	1,490
Religion	$ 33,570,424	4.4%	1,104
Philanthropy	$ 25,464,621	3.3%	1,494
Strengthening Families	$ 15,691,217	2.0%	814
Gender Identity	$ 14,580,455	1.9%	945
Military	$ 13,194,116	1.8%	767
Anti-Violence	$ 12,301,321	1.6%	892
Homophobia	$ 9,694,935	1.3%	877
Housing	$ 9,306,786	1.2%	431
Juvenile Justice	$ 6,087,354	0.8%	47
Foster Care	$ 6,042,991	0.8%	140
Labor/Employment	$ 4,127,734	0.5%	216
Other	$ 2,567,051	0.3%	112
Unspecified	$ 970,764	0.1%	174

Figure 2. Distribution by Issues Addressed, 1970-2010

(Foundation for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, p. 36)

This territorial assemblage in the lesbian and gay movement of non-profits, foundations, wealthy donors, and their agenda setting roles, engender refrains towards actualizing certain forms of social change work. When receiving grant-based funding from foundations, the projects and activities that actualize in lesbian and gay movements are those that generally conform to the agenda setting desires of the granting foundations. This is a capture of affective excess in the sense that it mediates the capacity of bodies in the lesbian and gay movement to do social change work. This mediation is an increase in the capacity to affect in certain ways, around issues of marriage and civil rights for example, but also a lessening of the capacity to affect in ways that could challenge and enact radical deterritorializations of the neoliberal state and the corporate sector, which are supportive of

71

foundations and their wealthy donors. This altered capacity produces and is reinforced by, a normalized affective relationality, actualized as refrained practices that continuously connect social change work to foundations and the NPIC structure, which delimits the indeterminate openness towards affective deterritorializations of structure, thereby sustaining the NPIC. This complex argument will be discussed in detail later in this chapter.

This normalized affective relationality in the lesbian and gay movement could be characterized as the normalization of, in Vaid's (1995) words, elitism, which "stress[es] access to power, money and media visibility..." (p. 350). As argued above, an increasing tendency in the lesbian and gay movement is that those bodies doing social change work in non-profits are forming affective relations with wealthy donors and foundations. Through grant-based processes, this affective connection affects which programs are established (Vaid, 1995, p. 269), as well as who makes decisions through the board of directors, often comprised of donors (Vaid, 1995, p. 270). For Vaid, these connections foster a movement where the power comes from the top-down, in comparison to a more grassroots model.

The elitist model of organizing is encapsulated in Vaid's (1995, pp. 271-273) discussion of her encounter with Jeff Soref, a wealthy gay donor, fundraiser, and member of the non-profit Gay Men's Health Crisis board of directors. During their conversation, Soref emphasized that movements must be built from the top through money, the goals of wealthy people in the movement are the same as everyone's, and grassroots organizing negatively implies "poor, disenfranchised, [and] angry" (Vaid, 1995, p. 272). While Vaid disagrees with these points, according to her account, she also had difficulty getting many words into the conversation. Vaid's (1995) assessment of the conversation is suggestive of its affective relevance to the broader movement: "My conversation with Soref embodied all the classic tensions between movement activists and rich people: frustration and defensiveness on the part of the wealthier person; being obsequious, guarded, and supplicant on the part of the less

72

wealthy activist" (p. 273). While this indicates a classed affective tension, it also suggests on the micro level a power laden affective relationality in the movement between the dominant wealthy and more submissive grassroots.

The following statement is indicative of how Vaid's (1995) view of the lesbian and gay movement as dominated by a problematic relationship with the wealthy can be considered as mediating capacities to affect and do social change work:

> What impact does the class composition of leaders of the gay and lesbian movement have on its politics today? There is a huge difference between a movement rooted in middle-class values and one focused on the problems caused by poverty. Thus, our movement gets very passionate about issues that deal with workplace discrimination, but that presupposes that people have jobs. We are involved in fighting for domestic partnership benefits, but that presupposes that we work for companies offering those benefits. (Many of us do not.) We are far less passionate about raising the minimum wage, welfare reform, AFDC programs, free school lunches, immigration, poverty, and other issues that affect gay and lesbian families and individuals—but do not affect the middle-class people who are most involved in our movement. (p. 270-271)

Therefore, being implicated in the NPIC assemblage does increase the overall capacity for the movement to actualize social change work beneficial to people like wealthier donors who fund much of the movement. However, it also decreases the capacity to affect around issues related to poverty. This means that without the agenda-setting influence of wealthy donors it is more possible that the capacity to affect could increase for actualizing social change work that could potentially enact radical, structural deterritorializations of the NPIC, and the associated corporate sector and neoliberal state. However, the potential indeterminacy of this latter affective capacity is delimited through the movement's implication in the NPIC.

73

This elitist trend in the 1990s lesbian and gay movement that Vaid discusses became theoretically conceptualized as "homonormativity" in the early 2000s. As homonormativity is a complex, multifaceted concept with which multiple scholars have engaged, the next section of this chapter will give a brief and selective overview of the concept. In doing so, homonormativity will be subsequently correlated to the affective relationality of the lesbian and gay movement as a crucial element of the NPIC assemblage.

3.2 Homonormativity and Affective Belonging

Homonormativity owes its conceptual emergence to the notion of heteronormativity, a term coined by queer theorist Michael Warner (1993). Heteronormativity is "the ways that heterosexual bodies, subjects, norms, and practices are always articulated and naturalized *in relation to* nonnormative genders and sexualities…" (Ward & Schneider, 2009, p. 434). Moreover, "heteronormativity frames heterosexuality as a universal norm making it publicly invisible..." (Jeppesen, 2010, p. 464). Thus, heteronormativity is a central organizing structure of society that relies upon its own uncontested naturalness, while concomitantly reifying its naturalness through abjecting those who do not embody its norms. While those abjected certainly include gays and lesbians, critical analysis of the gay and lesbian movement has explored a prevalent shift towards complicity with heteronormativity, rather than active resistance to it. The concept of homonormativity developed as a way to describe such complicity.

Homonormativity became articulated for scholarly analysis through Lisa Duggan's work in the early 2000's. According to Duggan (2002), homonormativity "is a politics that does not contest dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions but upholds and sustains them while promising the possibility of a demobilized gay constituency and a privatized, depoliticized gay culture anchored in domesticity and consumption" (p. 179).

74

Duggan (2002) sees the shift of gay politics towards privatization and consumption as symptomatic of the larger expansion of global neoliberalism, with its privileging of private profit over communal distribution (p. 178). Neoliberalism shows its effects on the gay movement through a "remapping of public/private boundaries designed to shrink gay public spheres and redefine gay equality against 'the civil rights agenda' and 'liberationism,' as access to the institutions of domestic privacy, the 'free' market, and patriotism" (Duggan, 2002, p. 179). In terms of our broader discussion on the elitist changes in the lesbian and gay movement:

> The privacy-in-public claims and publicizing strategies of 'the gay movement' are rejected in favor of public recognition of a domesticated, depoliticized privacy...'equality' becomes narrow, formal access to a few conservatizing institutions, 'freedom' becomes impunity for bigotry and vast inequalities in commercial life and civil society, the 'right to privacy' becomes domestic confinement, and democratic politics itself becomes something to be escaped. (Duggan, 2002, p. 190)

Thus, neoliberalism's influence has produced a general shift in gay politics away from challenging the norms of heterosexual society towards desiring access to its institutions, demonstrating that "neoliberalism in fact *has* a sexual politics" (Duggan, 2002, p. 177).

How can the homonormativity of lesbian and gay politics be understood as a form of affective relationality? Agathangelou, Bassichis, and Spira (2008) understand homonormativity as a mode of "belonging and ascension within a larger promise project that offers to some the tenuous promise of mobility, freedom, and equality" (p. 123). In this view, the chance and desire to gain the benefits of proper sexual citizenship is a motivating hope that has altered and reoriented the lesbian and gay movement. However, this promise can only be granted through the actualization of a "good queer citizen," (Agathangelou et al.,

2008, p. 124), whose sexuality is allowed to be incorporated into the national body through embodying whiteness, patriotism, and economic mobility, a hierarchically privileged triad of the good, proper citizen. Moreover, the goodness of the queer citizen can only be signified as good through being in a binary relationship to the bad queer, who by not embodying the privileged social locations listed above, is abjected from the promise of national belonging (Agathangelou et al., 2008, pp. 124-128). Thus, the goal of the lesbian and gay movement becomes that of gaining the belonging that is promised through structurally embodying the good queer citizen itself. This is a "seduction towards something better" where "collusion becomes the price of belonging" (Agathangelou et al., 2002, p. 129). This move towards complicit homonormative belonging affectively connects bodies and organizations in the lesbian and gay movement to the NPIC apparatus and its processes, as will be explained more fully in the next section.

However, this complicity must be continuously in process:

While first and foremost queers outside of this elite or national racial strata are produced as exterminable sodomites, the category of the abject and killable always threatens even elite queers in first world spaces. This is part of the politico-economic and affective logics that have fueled the frenzied search for an end to pain: continue imperial soldiering in exchange for a mirage of security, or spend your energies fighting other queers for a prized space as most radical. With such a paucity of choices, our energies are directed away from building solidarities and exhausted by fixing on individualized solutions and fueling the (re)production of neoliberal, neoconservative, homonormative, and ultimately heteronormative worlds. (Agathangelou et al., 2002, p. 137)

Therefore, organizations in the lesbian and gay movement that seek the homonormative promise of belonging must continuously fulfill the traits of the good queer citizen. Affective

relationality with the neoliberal state and the corporate sector assists in this process of belonging and is therefore a form of homonormativity itself, which actualizes refrains of doing social change work that are complicit with sustaining the NPIC. The next section of this chapter will examine the centralization of refrained fundraising practices in the everyday work of non-profit culture, through which affective processes of homonormativity can be observed.

3.3 Homonormalizations of Affective Relationality: Fundraising

In Chapter II, I argued that the central practice of non-profits in the NPIC had become professionalized competitions for scarce resources through grant-based funding. Additionally, as the recent history shows, relationships to foundations and their wealthy donors have become increasingly crucial to non-profits in the lesbian and gay movement doing social change work. However, the funding granted from foundations is often program-based, often requiring non-profits to look elsewhere for general operating funds. While some non-profits do look towards their grassroots base for supplementary funding, the affective relationality established between non-profits and the elite through foundations has produced refrains for seeking larger sums of money, often from small groups of wealthy individuals. This section will discuss three material practices for obtaining such funding that supplement and go beyond the grant writing process discussed in Chapter II. They are black-tie dinners, donor's membership clubs, and "asks." Examining these refrained practices will demonstrate how they support social change work that sustains the NPIC and the homonormativity of the lesbian and gay movement.

The Human Rights Campaign (HRC) is a model organization for discussing these material practices. Founded in 1980, the HRC is a non-profit that primarily focuses on policy advocacy work at the national level, but also does education programming, information

dissemination, and local community outreach projects (Human Rights Campaign, n.d.c).

According to their mission statement, the HRC is "America's largest civil rights organization

working to achieve lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender equality. By inspiring and

engaging all Americans, HRC strives to end discrimination against LGBT citizens and realize

a nation that achieves fundamental fairness and equality for all" (Human Rights Campaign,

n.d.e). With a long history of visible policy work on the national level, HRC has become the

most recognizable lesbian and gay rights organization in the movement. It is also known for

excelling at fundraising through cultivating relationships with wealthy supporters (Vaid,

1995, p. 92). As the staff and leadership of the organization is composed of professionals and

experienced fundraisers, it is exemplary for demonstrating the professionalization of non-

profit work (Human Rights Campaign, n.d.d). Additionally, rather than organizing local

communities for direct participation in the organization, widespread support for the HRC is

mainly done through donations. Their website offers a diversity of options for monetarily

supporting the HRC's work, including one-time donations, bequests, purchasing HRC

merchandise in their online store, and even donating cars (Human Rights Campaign, n.d.f).

While this kind of support is important for the HRC to maintain their operations, it does not

grant access to the leaders and decision-makers of the organization. As will be demonstrated,

those donors who give vast sums of money to the HRC are the ones who have an increased

capacity to influence its work and agenda.

The black-tie dinner is one fundraising practice that the HRC popularized within the

lesbian and gay movement, which also increased the capacity of wealthy donors to influence

the organization. These dinners are formal events organized by the HRC, with tickets costing

hundreds to thousands of dollars. According to Steve Endean (2006), founder of the HRC, a

black-tie dinner is "a very impressive event to savvy politicians: more than 750 people in

black ties and gowns who care enough about lesbian and gay rights to pay $150 each" (p.

78

187). By purchasing an expensive ticket that supports the HRC, dinner guests listen to speakers, network with other donors and HRC leadership, and even gain access to politicians who attend.

The dinners provide a venue through which HRC can influence politicians through their wealthy donors. For example, Endean (2006) discusses how congressional representative Ben Jones came to speak at one of these dinners and how wealthy donors assisted in influencing his choice to cosponsor a national lesbian and gay civil rights bill:

> Rep. Jones was extremely moved by the thunderous applause he received from the assembled crowd. Afterward he spent time listening to a number of individuals who impressed him with their knowledge of the issues, and he told several people that night that he would become a cosponsor. (p. 187)

It is not only the persuasive approval of wealthy donors that influences Representatives like Jones to support the homonormative agenda of the lesbian and gay rights movement; wealthy donors also contribute to the campaign finances of these politicians. The HRC brings politicians and wealthy donors together through dinners so that the latter can influence the former through the conditional promise of future financial support.

However, these dinners also provide a space in which the affective relationality between the HRC non-profit and its wealthy donors is sustained. In return for raising tens of thousands of dollars in just one evening and influencing politicians, the agenda setting capacity of wealthy donors to affect how the HRC actualizes social change work is increased. These wealthy donors are so influential not only because they work to persuade politicians through money, but also because organizations like the HRC wish to maintain their levels of funding in the future and not alienate their wealthy donors through actualizing social change work that would be contrary to the donors' interests. This pattern is what Vaid (1995) describes as the HRCs "self-preserving" (p. 92) orientation towards social change. The

desires of the wealthy elite contribute to setting the agenda of organizations such as the HRC in the lesbian and gay movement, actualizing refrains of doing social change work that sustains this agenda setting influence. In other words, these dinners assist in aligning the agendas of the wealthy donors with that of the non-profit.

The use of donor membership clubs provides an even more lucid example of a fundraising practice that sustains the affective relationality of the NPIC. The HRC began organizing a membership club of wealthy donors in 1982 (Endean, 2006, p. 72). This club, called "The 48," would consist of "major donors who would give at least $1,200 a year to the organization and its ongoing work" (Endean, 2006, p. 81). The members of this club were from cities all across the United States, and as Endean admits, he developed strong relationships with the small group of donors who joined (Endean, 2006, p. 82). The benefits to joining the club were numerous:

> The "privileges" of being in "The 48" were modest: a monthly report from me on current Capitol Hill developments, occasional cocktail parties in San Francisco to meet other major donors and help us solicit additional ones, acknowledgement in our publications of their participation, and an annual meeting in Washington, DC. In additional to reviewing the group's goals and objective, those that attended "The 48" meeting met with various members of Congress, both informally and at presentations at our luncheons. (Endean, 2006, pp. 82-83)

While Endean may consider the benefits "modest," membership in the donor club offered unparalleled access to networking with other donors, HRC leadership, and high-level politicians.

Today, what started as "The 48" club has developed into what is called the "HRC Federal Club Council" (Human Rights Campaign, n.d.b). According to the HRC (n.d.a), "the

Federal Club program has more than 4,000 members in 32 communities across the country who are committed to the cause of LGBT equality. This group of leaders provides nearly 30% of the funds to support HRC's important political and advocacy work." The benefits given to members of the Federal Club Council seem to be similar to those of "The 48," yet the HRC website also lists different levels of membership, based upon the amount of money donated, which may come with their own unique perks. While the lowest level of membership is called the "House Council," the highest level, reached when donating over $250,000 annually, is called the "President's Cabinet," suggesting various levels of intimate relationship with the leadership of the HRC (n.d.b), where spatial proximity to leadership is hierarchically differentiated by donation amount. Thus, membership clubs such as the HRC's demonstrate a level of affective relationality between non-profits and wealthy donors generally foreclosed to those without financial resources. Additionally, the access and benefits granted to donors offers an increased capacity to affect the social change work that is actualized by non-profits.

Finally, the practice of doing "asks" is the most individualized and targeted of all non-profit fundraising. Logically, an "ask" is when a member of an organization seeks out an individual who will likely support the non-profit and then asks directly for money. However, this seemingly simple task involves complex messaging strategies and relationship building over time. While non-profits frequently do "small asks," it is a common practice for them to prioritize "big asks." These "asks" are big precisely because they are directed at exceptionally wealthy people who have the capacity to donate big sums of money at once.

In her memoir, Vaid (1995) discusses at length the time and energy she devoted to "big asks." One of these was directed towards gay billionaire David Geffen, and was conducted as "an all-out guerilla campaign" (Vaid, 1995, p. 241). Vaid began by doing exhaustive research on Geffen, his political leanings, donation history, and general interests.

81

She spent large amounts of time arranging a meeting with him, including letter-writing, phone calls to his assistants, and informally approaching his friends, but to no avail. She finally met Geffen randomly and unexpectedly at a party in California, where after a curt conversation, he was quickly dismissive of her (Vaid, 1995, pp. 241-243). Vaid's (1995) reasoning for sharing this story illuminates how affective relations with wealthy donors sacrifices other types of non-profit work, in that it reveals:

> our desperation for adequate levels of funding, the disproportionate attention commanded by the wealthy, the debasing nature of the process of fundraising, the pitfalls our political leaders encounter when investing so much energy in fundraising, and the fundamental lack of common purpose among the powerful and wealthy in our communities and those who do the unglamorous work of community organizing and political activism. (p. 243)

However, the "big ask" sometimes does lead to financial rewards, and Vaid discusses a specific example of what she often must endure as an activist to please wealthy donors in order to get their money. This "ask" was towards Allan Morrow, a wealthy donor to the lesbian and gay movement in New York. According to Vaid (1995), Morrow spent nearly the whole of their meeting criticizing her organization and the movement to the point that she "felt afraid, then embarrassed, then angry, and above all ashamed—as if I had done something wrong, as if this powerful man who was so sure he was right was, in fact, right" (p. 244). Vaid did not discuss with Morrow these feelings or her objections to his views because she needed his financial support. This domineering exchange is indicative of the power wealthy donors have over bodies and non-profits who actualize social change work. Not only is time and energy spent acquiring money from donors, but due to their financial resources, donors are placed in a powerful position to influence the social change work that is actualized. If non-profits wish to continue to receive money from these donors, it is generally

necessary for the social change work they actualize to be aligned with the interests of the donors.

It is the self-interest of these donors, and their agenda-setting affective connection to non-profits in the NPIC apparatus, that has partially shifted the lesbian and gay movement towards actualizing homonormative social change work. Through affective relations with wealthy donors that are invested in the dominant system that makes them wealthy, the agenda of the movement has emerged as refrains of actualizing social change work that seek assimilationist access to the benefits of the neoliberal state and the corporate sector. Moreover, these wealthy donors often embody the hierarchically privileged good queer citizen discussed in the last section, and therefore they represent the promise of belonging. Organizations in the lesbian and gay movement are seduced into seeking the fulfillment of this promise by forming affective relations with these wealthy donors who seem to already belong. This affective relationality with wealthy donors increases the capacity of bodies to actualize social change work with the perceived potential to incorporate lesbian and gay bodies into that which belongs. As such, non-profits attempt to structurally embody the good queer citizen through affective relations. Therefore, the affective relations in the NPIC apparatus that connect non-profits in the lesbian and gay movement with wealthy donors are a form of homonormativity that can be observed through the refrained material practices actualized through this connection. The final section of this chapter will argue that this connection is legitimized in the lesbian and gay movement, thereby actualizing processes of affective homonormalization that sustain the NPIC and continuously delimit the indeterminacy of affect.

3.4 Homonormalization Legitimation

The NPIC apparatus, which connects and transmits affect differentially through non-profits, foundations, and their wealthy donors, that characterizes the contemporary lesbian and gay movement has become a normalized structure of affective relationality through which to actualize social change work. While this normalization is certainly bolstered by the emergence of the NPIC as a general epistemological system of knowledge, as argued in Chapter II, certain bodies have developed and reinforced this notion specifically in the lesbian and gay movement. For example, the influential organization that would become Funders for LGBTQ Issues, began in the early 1980s as a work group that advocated increased philanthropy in the lesbian and gay movement (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, 2012a, p. 12). The non-profits mission of assisting in achieving equality in the LGBTQ community is carried out through advocating for an increase and enhancement in grant making to organizations doing social change work in the lesbian and gay movement (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, n.d.a). To assist its work in increasing philanthropy in the movement, it has received grants from various foundations, such as Ms., MacArthur, and Ford (Funders for LGBTQ Issues, n.d.b).

The work of Funders for LGBTQ Issues reinforces and normalizes the affective relationality between non-profits, foundations, and wealthy donors as *the* systematic way of actualizing social change work in the lesbian and gay movement. This is suggestive of what Diane Richardson (2005) terms a "professionalisation of knowledge" (p. 528) around issues of sexuality, where social change work actualized through the affective relationality of the NPIC is hierarchically legitimated. The legitimacy granted to social change work that actualizes through philanthropy supports the elitist agenda setting power of foundations and wealthy donors, as well as the fundraising practices actualized by non-profits that sustain the affective relations of the NPIC.

This contributes to the capture of affect in the sense that it reinforces the affective relationality that mediates and alters the capacity to affect in the NPIC. While bodies in the lesbian and gay movement, by being implicated in the NPIC, have an increased capacity to fundraise and actualize homonormative forms of social change, they also have a decreased capacity for actualizing social change work that could potentially enact radical deterritorializations of the NPIC, and the associated neoliberal state and corporate sector. Thus, the lesbian and gay movement is implicated in an assemblage that operates to increase *pouvoir*, thereby continuously sustaining the NPIC by delimiting the openness, indeterminacy, and changeability of affect, or in other words, restricting the actualization of other forms of social change work that do not conform to the power of the NPIC. In the lesbian and gay movement, the delimitation of indeterminacy that sustains the NPIC apparatus is produced by and productive of the homonormalization of affective relationality.

This chapter has argued that the history of the lesbian and gay movement demonstrates an increasing growth in the connection between non-profit organizations, foundations, and their wealthy donors. Thus, the lesbian and gay movement has actualized as part of the NPIC apparatus. This apparatus is a territorial assemblage that engenders refrains of social change work, which actualizes as material practices, with fundraising as a central element. Fundraising practices that prioritize connections to foundations, and particularly wealthy donors, are actualized due to the possibility of achieving the homonormative belonging that they promise. While this increases the capacity for doing social change work that seeks access to neoliberal institutions, these fundraising practices are also legitimized as the way to achieve this access, which decreases the capacity to actualize forms of social change work with a greater potential to enact deterritorializations of the NPIC, the apparatus through which such access is possible, thus reinforcing and sustaining the affective relations of the NPIC assemblage. Therefore, the NPIC works to capture affect by actualizing

85

homonormalizations of affective relationality that engender certain refrains of doing social change work, and in doing so, delimit the ethical project of affect of increasing *puissance* and the indeterminate change that affect brings.

Conclusion

This thesis has argued that the NPIC apparatus is produced by and productive of a normalized affective relationality that transmit affective processes that sustains it and its connections between the non-profit system, the neoliberal state and the corporate sector. This territorial assemblage does so by engendering refrains of doing social change work, such as grant writing and fundraising, that structurally and financially connects bodies doing social work through non-profits to foundations and wealthy donors. This centralizes the practice of fundraising in non-profits, consequently forming a system of knowledge that privileges and legitimizes the affective connections between bodies doing social change work and donors. This affective connection mediates the capacity to affect in the sense that it increases the capacity to actualize forms of social change complicit with the NPIC, its donors and foundations, and the related neoliberal state and corporate sector, while decreasing the capacity to actualize forms of social change work resistant or challenging to the NPIC structure. This is a capture of affect, of the indeterminate changeability of structure, in that there is a delimited capacity for enacting radical deterritorializations of the NPIC structure when the everyday social change work of bodies is so implicated in the affective relations that permeate the apparatus. In the case of the lesbian and gay movement, this affective relationality is a form of homonormativity in that it connects bodies doing social change work through non-profits to foundations and wealthy donors through the relational promise of national belonging and access to dominant institutions. Ultimately, social change work actualized through the NPIC, including that of the lesbian and gay movement, is complicit in increasing *pouvoir* in that it sustains the NPIC, delimiting the openness and changeability of affect, and thus also the ethical project of affect of increasing *puissance*, the indeterminate capacity for new affective connections, assemblages and worlds.

In broader terms, this research has demonstrated how affect and structure can be connected to enhance our understanding of how power works through affect to actualize changes in the social. Indeed, the first chapter provided a conceptual vocabulary that assists in doing so. It is also significant to note that for a thesis so preoccupied with the delimiting capture of affect, it offers many affective openings for future research on the relationship to affect and structure. For example, research on affective relationality could be enriched by supplementing it with theorizations of interior processes. How is pre-conscious or co-conscious cognition involved in sustaining structure? Similarly, what is the function of consciousness or cognition in regards to mediating the capacity of affect? How do affect and structure operate together to form normalized affective subjects? What internal processes are stimulated through and productive of affective subjectification? How do processes of identity subject formation intersect with affect across multiple social locations?

Perhaps most related to this research, what is the capacity of those bodies implicated in structural affective relations to refuse or disconnect from affective relationality? If such a capacity exists, how is such a refusal to affect actualized? How would theorizing refusals to affect expand upon current conceptualizations of agency and agential capacity?

A few activists who do social change work in the NPIC have imagined what such a refusal would look like. For some, the NPIC structure can be utilized and its affective relationality can be transformed to meet the needs of radical change. For example, non-profits can intentionally shift their attention from donors to constituents by elevating the latter to leadership roles, advisory boards, or collective decision-making bodies (Rank and Filer, 2011). For others, non-profits can be utilized in terms of their capacity for partnership and support, in which grassroots movements would deliberately avoid dependence upon non-profits by utilizing them minimally and strategically to access technical aid and financial services (Koon, 2010). Such a coexistence could assist in relieving grassroots organizations

from professionalized competitions with non-profit organizations for the same types of funding, while also actualizing a less interdependent affective relationality with non-profits, foundations, the neoliberal state, and the corporate sector.

However, others believe that the NPIC structure should be rejected altogether. Durazo (2007, p. 125) advocates "disinvesting" from the NPIC, in which social change organizations abandon their formal non-profit status, reject foundation-based funding, and reorient their work and fundraising practices towards the grassroots populations they initially intended to serve. Moreover, Rodriguez (2007) already sees forms of social change work that are actualizing outside of the NPIC apparatus:

> Organized, under-organized, and ad hoc movements of imprisoned, homeless, and undocumented people, as well as activists committed to working beneath and relatively autonomous of the NPIC's political apparatus, may well embody the beginnings of an alternative US-based praxis that displaces the NPIC's apparent domination of political discourse and possibility. (p. 31)

Regardless of how these refusals are imagined or actualized, what is clear is that they themselves are also an affective production of the NPIC. A refusal to affect does not imply complete autonomy and disconnection from the NPIC, but rather a relational detachment that owes its actualization to the structure from which it detaches. In other words, as affect is continuous processual change, and as such always manages to escape structural capture in some indeterminate way that alters the field of Virtual potentials from which new actualizations emerge, it is the very capture of affect that produces a possibility of affects escape and the actualization of something new. Thus, even in the ostensible dominating capture of affect by structure, there is hope for harnessing *puissance*, for new approaches to social change work, and for more ways of relating to each other and the world.

Bibliography

Agamben, G. (2009). What is an apparatus?. In G. Agamben (Ed.), *What is an apparatus?: And other essays* (pp. 1-24). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Agathangelou, A. M., Bassichis, M. D., & Spira, T. L. (2008). Intimate investments: Homonormativity, global lockdown, and the seductions of empire. *Radical History Review*, (100), 120-143.

Ahn, C. E. (2007). Democratizing american philanthropy. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 63-76). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Allen, R. L. (2007). Black awakening in capitalist america. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 53-62). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Althusser, L. (1984). *Essays on ideology*. London and New York: Verso.

Anderson, B. (2009). Affective atmospheres. *Emotion, Space and Society, 2*(2), 77-81.

Anderson, B. (2010). Modulating the excess of affect: Morale in a state of "total war." In M. Gregg & G. Siegworth (Eds.), *The affect theory reader* (pp. 162-185). Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Bertelsen, L., & Murphie, A. (2010). An ethics of everyday infinities and powers: Felix Guattari on affect and the refrain. In M. Gregg & G. Siegworth (Eds.), *The affect theory reader* (pp. 138-157). Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Bierria, A. (2007). Pursuing a radical anti-violence agenda inside/outside a non-profit structure. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 151-163). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Brennen, T. (2004). *The transmission of affect*. Ithica, New York: Cornell University Press.

Chasin, A. (2000). *Selling out: The gay and lesbian movement goes to market*. New York: Palgrave.

Clough, P. T. (2007). Introduction. In P. T. Clough (Ed.), *The Affective Turn* (pp. 1-33). Durham: Duke University Press.

Cohen, J. L., & Arato, A. (1992). *Civil society and political theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical philosophy*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Deleuze, G. (1990). *The logic of sense*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1992). What is a dispositif?. In T. J. Armstrong (Ed.), *Michel foucault: Philosopher* (pp. 159-168). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-oedipus*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Duggan, L. (2002). The new homonormativity: The sexual politics of neoliberalism. In R. Castronovo & D. Nelson (Eds.), *Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics* (pp. 175-194). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Durazo, A. C. R. (2007). "We were never meant to survive": Fighting violence against women and the fourth world war. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 113-128). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Endean, S. (2006). *Bringing gay and lesbian rights into the mainstream: Twenty years of progress.* Binghamton, New York: Harrington Park Press.

Engel, S. (2002). Making a minority: Understanding the formation of the gay and lesbian movement in the united states. In D. Richardson & S. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of lesbian and gay studies* (pp. 377-402). London: Sage Publications.

Foucault, M. (1980). The confession of the flesh. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings 1972-1977 (pp. 194-228).* New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the collège de france, 1978-1979.* NewYork: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foster, S. L. (2003). Choreographies of protest. *Theatre journal, 55*(2), 395-412.

Funders for LGBTQ Issues. (n.d.a). *About us*. Retrieved from http://www.lgbtfunders.org/about/index.cfm

Funders for LGBTQ Issues. (n.d.b). *History*. Retrieved from http://www.lgbtfunders.org/about/history.cfm

Funders for LGBTQ Issues. (2012a). *Forty years of lgbtq philanthropy: 1970-2010*. New York: Bowen, A.

Funders for LGBTQ Issues. (2012b). *Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer grantmaking by u.s. foundations*. New York: Cunningham, N.

Gilmore, R. W. (2007). In the shadow of the shadow state. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 41-52). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Gould, D. (2009). *Moving politics: Emotion and act up's fight against aids.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Guilloud, S., & Cordery, W. (2007). Fundraising is not a dirty word: Community-based economic strategies for the long haul. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence

(Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 107-111). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Hemmings, C. (2005). Invoking affect: Cultural theory and the ontological turn. *Cultural Studies*, *19*(5), 548-567.

Henriques, J. (2010). The vibrations of affect and their propagation on a night out on kingston's dancehall scene. *Body & Society*, *16*(1), 57-89.

Human Rights Campaign. (n.d.a). *Federal club program internships*. Retrieved from http://www.hrc.org/the-hrc-story/federal-club-program-internship

Human Rights Campaign. (n.d.b). *Hrc federal club council*. Retrieved from http://www.hrc.org/support/hrc-federal-club-council

Human Rights Campaign. (n.d.c). *Hrc foundation*. Retrieved from http://www.hrc.org/the-hrcstory/hrc-foundation

Human Rights Campaign. (n.d.d). *Leadership*. Retrieved from http://www.hrc.org/the-hrc-story/leadership

Human Rights Campaign. (n.d.e). *Mission statement*. Retrieved from http://www.hrc.org/the-hrcstory/mission-statement

Human Rights Campaign. (n.d.f). *Ways to get involved*. Retrieved from http://www.hrc.org/support/ways-to-get-involved

Internal Revenue Service. (2011). *Section 501(c)(3) organizations* (Publication 557). Retrieved from website: http://www.irs.gov/publications/p557/ch03.html

Jeppesen, S. (2010). Queer anarchist autonomous zones and publics: Direct action vomiting against homonormative consumerism. *Sexualities*, *13*(4), 463-478.

Jones de Almeida, A. F. (2007). Radical social change: Searching for a new foundation. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded:*

Beyond the non-profit industrial complex (pp. 185-195). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

King, T. L., & Osayande, E. (2007). The filth on philanthropy: Progressive philanthropy's agenda to misdirect social justice movements. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 79-89). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Kivel, P. (2007). Social service or social change? In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 129-149). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Koon, J. (2010, June). *Beyond non-profit models*. Retrieved from http://www.rankandfiler.net/beyond-non-profit-models/

Lim, J. (2007). Queer critique and the politics of affect. In K. Browne, J. Lim, & G. Brown (Eds.), *Geographies of sexualities: Theory, practices, and politics* (pp. 53-67). London: Ashgate.

Massumi, B. (1995). The Autonomy of Affect. *Cultural critique, 31*, 83-109.

Massumi, B. (1998). Requiem for our prospective dead: Towards a participatory critique of capitalist power. In E. Kaufman & K. J. Heller (Eds.), *Deleuze and guattari: New mappings in politics, philosophy, and culture* (pp. 40-63). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. Durham: Duke University Press.

McCarthy, J. D., & Zaid, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *82*(6), 1212-1241.

Patton, C. (2002). Stealth bombers of desire: The globalization of 'alterity' in emerging democracies. In A. Cruz-Malavé & M. F. Manalansan IV (Eds.), *Queer*

globalizations: Citizenship and the afterlife of colonialism (pp. 195-218). New York: New York University Press.

Perez, A. H. (2007). Between radical theory and community practice: Reflections on organizing and the non-profit industrial complex. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 91-99). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Protevi, J. (2009). *Political affect: Connecting the social and the somatic.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rank and Filer. (2011, March). *Turning the complex upside down: Rethinking nonprofit structures*. Retrieved from

http://www.rankandfiler.net/turning-the-complex-upside-down/

Richardson, D. (2005). Desiring sameness?: The rise of neoliberal politics of normalisation. *Antipode*, *37*(3), 515-535.

Ricoeur, P. (1994). Althusser's theory of ideology. In G. Elliott (Ed.), *Althusser: A critical reader* (pp. 44-72). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Rodriquez, D. (2007). The political logic of the non-profit industrial complex. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 21-40). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Sedgwick, E. K., & Frank, A. (1995). Shame in the cybernetic fold: Reading silvan tomkins. *Critical inquiry*, *21*(2), 496-522.

Siegworth, G., & Gregg, M. (2010). An inventory of shimmers. In M. Gregg & G. Siegworth (Eds.), *The affect theory reader* (pp. 1-25). Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Smith, A. (2007). Introduction: The revolution will not be funded. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Stryker, S. (2008). Transgender history, homonormativity, and disciplinarity. *Radical History Review*, (100), 145-157.

Taylor, V., Kaminski, E., & Dugan, K. (2002). From the bowery to the castro: Communities, identities and movements. In D. Richardson & S. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of lesbian and gay studies* (pp. 99-114). London: Sage Publications.

Thien, D. (2005). After or beyond feeling?: A consideration of affect and emotion in geography. *Area*, *37*(4), 450-456.

Thunder Hawk, M. (2007). Native organizing before the non-profit industrial complex. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.), *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 101-106). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Tolia-Kelly, D. P. (2006). Affect-an ethnocentric encounter?: Exploring the 'universalist' imperative of emotional/affectual geographies. *Area*, *38*(2), 213-217.

Vaid, U. (1995). *Virtual equality: The mainstreaming of gay and lesbian liberation.* New York: Doubelday.

Ward, J., & Schneider, B. (2009). The reaches of heteronormativity: An introduction. *Gender & Society*, *23*(4), 433-439.

Warner, M. (1993). *Fear of a queer planet: Queer politics and social theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.