“THERE’S A REASON TO FIGHT”
RACIAL JUSTICE, AFFECT, AND COLLECTIVE IDENTITY
IN AN ANTI-GENTRIFICATION STRUGGLE

by

Melissa A. Archer

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Sociology

Fall 2014

© 2014 Melissa Archer
All Rights Reserved
“THERE’S A REASON TO FIGHT”
RACIAL JUSTICE, AFFECT, AND COLLECTIVE IDENTITY
IN AN ANTI-GENTRIFICATION STRUGGLE

by
Melissa A. Archer

Approved: ____________________________________________
Benjamin Fleury-Steiner, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of thesis on behalf of the Advisory Committee

Approved: ____________________________________________
Kirk Williams, Ph.D.
Chair of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice

Approved: ____________________________________________
George H. Watson, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: ____________________________________________
James G. Richards, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Ben Fleury-Steiner, the chair of my thesis committee, for his immense and invaluable support and assistance with this project. I am likewise tremendously grateful to the other members of my thesis committee, Dr. Joanne Nigg and Dr. Gerald Turkel, for their support and insightful suggestions throughout this process. Furthermore, this research would not have been possible without the “COEP” activists who generously devoted their time to participate in this study. An extra special thank you to “Mitsy” for the time and energy she took out of her busy life to connect me with “COEP.” Finally, I am deeply thankful for the continual encouragement from my partner, Brett Alvaré, my family, and my cohort companions, Brandie Pugh, Kai Lin, Jess Boatwright and Colin MacFarlane.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ........................................................................................................ vi
ABSTRACT ................................................................................................................ vii

Chapter

1 INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................... 1

2 LITERATURE REVIEW ............................................................................................... 5

Prior Research on Displacement and Anti-Gentrification Activism ................... 5
Collective Identity and Affect ..................................................................................... 8
The Role of Racial Identity and Racial Consciousness in Collective Action ..... 9

3 METHODOLOGY ......................................................................................................... 12

Sample .......................................................................................................................... 13
Interviews ..................................................................................................................... 14
Insights from Social Media ......................................................................................... 15
Analysis ......................................................................................................................... 16

4 FINDINGS .................................................................................................................... 17

Motivations .................................................................................................................. 18
Personal Motives ......................................................................................................... 19
Social Justice Motivations ...................................................................................... 22
Attentiveness to Racial Justice ............................................................................... 24
Collective Actions that Build Racial Solidarity ...................................................... 27
Perserverence Amidst Challenges .................................................................... 28
Using the Adversary’s "Dirty Work" to their Advantage .................................. 34
Mobilizing Positive Emotions and Generating Pride ............................................ 35

5 CONCLUSION ............................................................................................................. 39

REFERENCES ............................................................................................................... 42
Appendix

IRB APPROVAL LETTER .................................................................................. 46
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Sample Characteristics of COEP Members Interviewed ................................. 14
ABSTRACT

While social scientists have extensively studied gentrification, scant attention has been given to cases of resistance against gentrification. The present study offers a nuanced account of anti-gentrification collective action through a focus on an activist group referred to as the Community Organizers of Edgewood Park (COEP). COEP is a small, multiracial organization of activists protesting what they describe as exclusionary development in their gentrifying neighborhood. Since the group’s founding in 2012, COEP activists have been targeted by local developers who utilize racist and sexist tactics to intimidate and denounce them. This thesis explores how COEP—a relatively under-resourced neighborhood organization—remains galvanized in their resistance efforts while facing vicious personal attacks and ridicule from a far better-resource opposition. Drawing from interviews with COEP activists and social media produced by COEP and local developers, this study demonstrates the significance of emotions, collective identity, and attention to racial justice in building and sustaining collective action in the context of urban gentrification.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Despite the vast amount of literature on gentrification, there have been few studies on resistance efforts against gentrification. Focused academic attention on anti-gentrification activism has been overshadowed by attention to the cause and effects of the process, policy implications, and the experiences of middle-class professionals (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2010). Accordingly, the present study provides a nuanced account of anti-gentrification collective action through a focus on the Community Organizers of Edgewood Park\(^1\) (COEP), a small organization of black and white, long-time and new residents of the Edgewood Park neighborhood in a prominent Mid-Atlantic city. COEP organizers are resisting gentrification and advocating for racial and economic justice.

Many Edgewood Park residents are critical of the aggressive development tactics that have occurred over the last decade. The diminishing affordable housing and rising taxes are creating challenges (at the most extreme, displacement) for Edgewood Park’s poorest and most marginalized residents. The demographic shifts caused by gentrification are evident. Between 2000 and 2010, the black population in Edgewood Park declined by 20 percent while the white population increased by 38

\(^1\) Pseudonyms are used for all organizations, individuals, and their geographic locations to protect respondents’ identities.
percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2010). COEP formed in the fall of 2012 with the intention of mobilizing their working class neighbors. Though this organization is addressing multiple local working-class issues, their principal struggle (and that which has received the most local media attention) has been challenging what they perceive to be exclusionary development. That is to say, the developer’s efforts are perceived as harmful for the neighborhood’s poorer, disproportionately African American residents as well working class residents of different races. Local newspapers, online city forums, and various bloggers illuminate Edgewood Park as a battlefield. This is depicted in the very contentious relations between COEP members and CVB Realty founder and chief developer, Colin Brooks and his allies (i.e., “pro-gentrification figures”). COEP’s website highlights pro-gentrification figures as going to extreme lengths to silence COEP activists. This can be seen vividly in the use of racist and sexist tactics designed to intimidate and ultimately stymie COEP’s efforts.

The conflict over gentrification in Edgewood Park has become very divisive and emotionally volatile. In this way, COEP demonstrates the importance of emotional work and affective dynamics in contentious activism (e.g., Jasper 2011; Polletta and Jasper 2001; Ruiz-Junco 2013). Pro-gentrification figures use of intimidating and dehumanizing tactics has created an environment where one might expect a relatively under-resourced neighborhood group like COEP to have folded. Yet they have endured since the group was founded in the fall of 2012. What conditions enable COEP members to stay committed to their cause? What sustains them in a conflict that has involved vicious personal attacks and ridicule by a far
better-resourced opposition who has already succeeded in carrying out substantial aspects of its exclusionary agenda (e.g., the creation of more expensive housing designed to lure more affluent residents to Edgewood Park)? To explore these questions, this paper explores how COEP organizes their resistance and how members establish and maintain a *collective identity*—a key concept for the present analysis as it highlights how collective action is rooted in the emotional connections between members in the midst of a decidedly uneven conflict. Focusing on collective identity points to several key questions that guide the foregoing analysis: How is collective identity formed and sustained among COEP members? How is emotional work important for understanding organizational survival? Because it has been well documented that race is a crucial factor in the politics of gentrification (e.g., Betancur 2002; 2010; Mele 2013) and is an obviously key aspect for understanding the Edgewood Park conflict, I additionally explore whether racial justice informs activists’ individual motives for sustaining their commitment to COEP. Through interviews with COEP participants and content analysis of relevant local social media, I attend to the particulars of COEP’s collective identity formation and the salience of emotion and racial consciousness within their struggle.

I begin by reviewing relevant empirical research on gentrification that emphasizes prior studies of anti-gentrification activism. I then review literature relevant for developing my analytical strategy, especially prior research that explores collective identity and emotions in social movements. Although studies of racial consciousness among activists are not typically explored in the context of emotions
and collective identity, I briefly review this literature for insights that may allow me to bridge relevant gaps between these literatures. In the following section I outline my research methods and the theoretical expectations that guided my analysis. The primary finding of this analysis is that emotions matter in a multitude of important ways. Despite the emotional challenges of intimidation and denunciation, I show through the accounts of COEP members how strong relationships are catalyzed by empathy and anger that sustain an enduring pride and thus commitment to racial justice among COEP’s diverse activists.
Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Prior Research on Displacement and Anti-Gentrification Activism

Although gentrification is often presented positively as “reinvestment” or “a liberation from blight,” many scholars have demonstrated that the rewards of gentrification are unevenly distributed (e.g., Lees et al. 2010). While developers may portray themselves as “civic-minded heroes” (e.g., Smith 1996:21), for established lower income residents, they are anything but. Specifically, gentrification catalyzes a number of negative impacts, including increased property taxes, diminishing affordable housing options, disintegration of community efficacy, and eventually displacement from the community. Although an imposing literature demonstrates how gentrification is especially harmful to disproportionally poor people of color (e.g., Hartman 2010), there is a dearth of research that explores the actual experiences of these crucial members of the community (e.g., Lees et al. 2010).

The few studies that have attended to lived experiences and resistance to gentrification are instructive. One ethnographic study of a Puerto Rican community in Chicago suggests that race-based resistance and advocacy for low-income housing may have positive effects, including delayed gentrification in certain sections of the city (Bentacur 2002). This study also illuminates the power of newly elected pro-
gentrification politicians who provide so called “pro-growth” groups with the legal
cover to aggressively pursue their agenda. Perhaps most interestingly, this study
demonstrates how such gentrification efforts work to intimidate neighborhood activists
on the ground, including expressions of overt racism toward Puerto Ricans (e.g.,
Bentacour 2002). While anti-gentrification activists described the overt racism they
faced and equated gentrification to colonization, Betancur does not explicitly attend to
this counter-frame in the context of collective identity. This study thus sheds little
light on neighborhood anti-gentrification struggles beyond the ideological level of
analysis.

While attention to racially contentious politics of gentrification struggles is
limited, a few studies have shown the importance of inter-organizational dynamics of
anti-gentrification activism. Martin’s (2007) study of neighborhood organizations in
gentrifying communities demonstrates that contesting groups respond differently to
perceived threats. Specifically, long-time residents are more likely to address the
potential for political displacement (i.e. the loss of political influence as a repercussion
of gentrification). This observation raises important questions about the potentially
varying motivations in an organization of both long-time and newer residents. While
Martin explores the polarized struggle between long-time resident activists and newer
pro-gentrification residents, she does not attend to the complexities of
socioeconomically diverse coalitions such as COEP.

While not exploring gentrification specifically, one other exemplary study
provides additional insight. Focusing on neighborhood activism for housing equality,
Maekelbergh (2012) finds how socially and politically marginalized groups confront extremely powerful companies and developers. This study provides an important window into the tactics of an East Harlem-based community movement where ‘housing’ is a collective frame employed by community activists to highlight “a forced mobility (through displacement or threat of displacement) that is actively resisted” (Maekelbergh 2012:657). Yet like the other studies reviewed, neither affect or collective identity is explored and thus it is not possible to fully understand how East Harlem community activists *persevered* in the face of major development corporations and the networks that support their exclusionary development efforts.

A final study comes the closest in presenting an account of anti-gentrification activism that is at least suggestive of complex intra-organizational dynamics. Specifically, Martin’s (2008) study of “place frames” suggests how pride in the community builds solidarity in local level activism. Importantly, this study illustrates the need to explore motive and goal-centered language and practices when analyzing collective-action.

Taken together these studies raise an important question for the present project: *How do emotions such as anger and pride shape tactics and drive activism?* There is a strong suggestion in prior research that racism produces important affective dynamics that may shed greater light on anti-gentrification activism involving poor communities of color. The present study provides a first step in filling this gap in the literature. By investigating internal group dynamics with particular attention to collective identity and the affective discourses that shape and sustain COEP, this study
seeks to illuminate a much thicker understanding of an urban neighborhood’s anti-gentrification campaign.

**Collective Identity and Affect**

Sociologists of collective action and social movements have long called for more thickly contextualized case studies that attend to the goals, motivations, and meanings that produce collective identity (e.g., Melucci 1996). Because collective action does not necessarily imply unified frameworks among actors, it is imperative to attend to how collective identity is shaped through individuals’ interests, interactions, and understandings of their environments (Melucci 1995; Polletta and Jasper 2001). That is to say, collective identities involve shared sentiments and deep emotions that generate and strengthen feelings of unity and pride that enable activists to make sense of their objectives (e.g., Jasper 1998; Melucci 1995; Pinard 2011). Scrutinizing the “emotional risks, costs, and benefits” that assist in shaping decisions and actions is crucial for understanding collective action (Jasper 2011:296). Yet early collective behavior theories suggested that participants of social movements were excessively emotional and irrational. Accordingly, between the 1970s and the 1990s social movement scholars were disinclined to focus on the role of emotions in social protest or activism (Ruiz-Junco 2013). By the early 21st century, however, a new body of work on emotions and social movements emerged, including the seminal volume *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements* (Polletta, Jasper, and Goodwin 2001).
In a recent review of this new literature by Jasper (2011) it is clear that there is an “emotional renaissance” in social movement theorizing. One prevalent line of inquiry has involved exploring the negative experiences and emotions that incite participation in collective action. For example, a sense of threat, anger, or fear holds the potential to galvanize new protest participants (Jasper 2011). The most recent reviews of this literature calls particular attention to how different emotions (both negative and positive) intersect in instances of collective action and are actively fused together to mobilize action (e.g., Japer 2011; Ruiz-Junco 2013).

Prominent social movement scholars such as Aminzade and McAdam similarly suggest that future research focus on the role of emotions and emotion-generating actions in building the energy required to form and sustain collective political identities (2001:23). It is critical to investigate how members of a collective stay grounded and persevere in the face of conflict and intimidation from adversaries. Jasper (2011) makes the important observation that feelings of connection and belonging to a group sustain participation in collective action; he refers to these sustaining features as “affective loyalties” that have the capacity to heighten emotional energy and excitement (among other satisfactions produced by collective action) and thus become key motivational capital for sustaining collective action.

**The Role of Racial Identity and Racial Consciousness in Collective Action**

Because COEP’s membership is socially diverse, it is critical to analyze activists’ individual social identities and what influence they have on the collective’s
identity. Such a line of inquiry is critical for understanding the complex “intertwining” of race, class, and gender identities in collective action campaigns (Checker 2010:173). Social identities represent significant values and ideals particular to activist contexts. In The Price of Progressive Politics, Ernst (2010) demonstrates how one’s attention to a singular form of oppression (i.e. focusing on class inequality) in the absence of race can reproduce colorblindness as activists fail to recognize the significance of multiple oppressions converging. Stockdill (2003) argues that when activists come from different social locations, their unique experiences and identities can create conflicting ideological frames that lead to contention within movements and thus, may undermine effective collective action campaigns. Recent studies of the Occupy Wall Street Movement, moreover, show how claims of racial inclusivity were largely undermined by a pervasive color-blind ideology (e.g., Juris et al. 2012; Maharawal 2012; Olson 2012; Pickerill and Krinsky 2012).

While acknowledging that previous studies have suggested the significance of class struggle around gentrification, it is evident that race is a crucial factor in the politics of gentrification (e.g., Bentacur 2002). As Mele cogently argues, “advanced marginalization of racial minorities is fundamental” to gentrification “rather than simply a consequence or unfortunate outcome of exclusionary redevelopment” (Mele 2013:600). While exploring whether or not COEP organizers subscribe to color-blind ideologies is important, matters of racial injustice are intimately tied to affect. From Ernst’s (2010) important study of the modern welfare rights movement we acquire
valuable insights about ideology, but her analysis lacks attention to the affective processes that accompany colorblindness and how these emotions result in the anger, sadness, and in most instances, alienation, of the black women in her study.
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METHODOLOGY

Collective identity is not a static entity. An analysis of collective identity must attend to a compilation of meanings and relations articulated by numerous individuals (e.g., Melucci, 1995). To study how COEP builds collective identity, I investigated how participants’ motivations, experiences, and reactions to conflict with pro-gentrification adversaries impact group cohesion in the midst of a contentious struggle for the future of the Edgewood Park neighborhood. I focus on how COEP members maintain solidarity and persevere in the midst of an admittedly uphill struggle against personally threatening and hostile pro-gentrification figures.

To this end, I purposefully attend to affective dynamics that provide insights into the motives that guide protest tactics. In such an analysis, I therefore explore the power, force, and “the sensuous experience of emotions” (Gould 2004:160) to make sense of COEP activists’ experiences and actions. My investigation attends to the emotions used in tactics, but furthermore analyzes how personal neighborhood affinities and relationships contribute to COEP’s collective identity. I use semi-structured interviews to explore how organizers articulate their individual and collective grievances, the dynamics of their organization, and meanings they attribute to their work. Additionally, I draw on relevant social media content, as the use of
online tactics has become increasingly common among protest groups (e.g., Rapp et al. 2009).

Although including observations as a primary research method would strengthen this research, I was not able to attend COEP’s meetings. This was so because COEP organizers are firmly committed to confidentiality. Accordingly, they do not permit non-members to attend COEP meetings. Though I was able to attend one formal COEP event, my focus in this analysis centers on data collected through interviews and social media materials.

Sample

I conducted nine in-depth interviews. Seven respondents are core activists in COEP. I conducted two additional interviews with residents who are not core members of COEP, but have more recently joined COEP’s efforts. The table below provides relevant characteristics of my sample. I was given approval to study this organization through University of Delaware’s IRB and provided initial access from a COEP organizer who is also a longtime friend. After a preliminary meeting about my research interests, my friend was crucial in persuading COEP members to participate in this study.
Table 1. Sample Characteristics of COEP Members Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Name</th>
<th>Racial Identity</th>
<th>Neighborhood status</th>
<th>COEP status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Fairly new resident</td>
<td>Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>New resident</td>
<td>Core organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>New resident</td>
<td>Core organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Long-time resident</td>
<td>Core organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>New resident</td>
<td>Core organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Not a resident</td>
<td>Core organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Candace</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Long-time resident</td>
<td>Core organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitsy</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>New resident</td>
<td>Core organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Long-time resident</td>
<td>Participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews

The semi-structured interviews employed open-ended questions designed to encourage participants to construct their own identities and meanings as they relate to their work with COEP. Interviews ranged between 45 and 75 minutes long and were conducted at locations of the respondents’ choice (most were held in local cafes or respondents’ homes). Though I utilized an interview guide, I allowed for informal dialogue to emerge. Interviews were conducted over a three-month period between February and April 2014.

Interviews addressed questions about personal experiences, grievances, and motivating factors that led respondents to identify with COEP, as well as their experiences and relationships as members of the organization. I asked respondents about their individual motivations for their work, their perceptions of gentrification in Edgewood Park, and the conflict between COEP and pro-gentrification figures. In discussing such conflicts, I asked questions about the challenges the group has faced.
by inquiring about what has kept COEP together amidst strong opposition to their group.

Following Van Stekelenburg and Klandermans’ (2007:161) insight that collective identities are always “under construction,” and that the actions of a group shape collective identity, the interview questions addressed the tactics and actions COEP utilized and whether or not they believe their efforts were effective. Furthermore, I asked COEP activists about the intentions behind their activism and the emotions that manifest throughout such challenging work.

**Insights from Social Media**

As previously noted, much of the contention between COEP and those promoting gentrification has occurred online via social media. In addition to interviews, I thus examined COEP’s website (which details their grievances with developer Colin Brooks and his allies), their Facebook page, YouTube videos (which showcase footage from recent actions), and the blog sites written by pro-gentrification figures who intimidate COEP members in racist and sexually vulgar terms. My examination of how COEP organizers used social media enhanced my understanding of how the Internet served as a means for articulating their opposition to gentrification. Exploring anti-COEP discourse—which the group often re-posted to their website—provided an important background perspective.

Investigating hostile and threatening discourse online provided insight into the emotionally charged situation that COEP continues to confront and accordingly
provided rich material for exploring affect. While I did not engage in extensive coding of these documents and media, content analysis provided essential contextual information that assisted me in the creation of my interview questions.

Analysis

The deductive codes I used in my initial reading of interview transcripts were related to motivations, grievances, tactics, and challenges. In a second round of coding, I developed the following inductive codes: *attention to racial injustice*, *developers’ “dirty work,”* *resentment over neighborhood rebranding,* and *organizers’ bonds.* I additionally coded for emotions as respondents discussed their experiences. Once interview data were coded, statements from the transcripts that appeared to be prevalent throughout the data and exemplary of potential themes were copied into a Word document. These specific quotations were read through several times and analyzed to uncover emergent themes, which I present below.
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FINDINGS

COEP’s collective identity is shaped by organizers’ emotionally-charged environment and a shared recognition of economic and racial injustice in the gentrification of Edgewood Park. As Melucci (1995) argues, scholars must observe collective identities as plural, meaningful, and interactive social productions that cannot be understood by the summation of actors’ opinions or ideologies. Although respondents’ motivations for participation vary, all are clearly conscious of the injustice in Edgewood Park. Specifically, I find that racial justice is—beyond a collective action frame for COEP members—a key affective motivating factor in COEP’s work.

The presentation of my findings proceeds in three steps. I begin by elaborating on the motivations of COEP participants, as this is important for uncovering collective identity formation. I then explore respondents’ racial consciousness as an important component of COEP’s collective identity. The next sections explore how COEP is able to sustain itself in the face of daunting challenges created by pro-gentrification figures. Specifically, I focus on how particular emotions (e.g., care, support, pride, etc.) enable COEP participants to continue their struggle.
Motivations

A focus on collective identity requires attention to the various motivations for action within a group (Melucci 1995). Given that the nine respondents I interviewed come from different social positions, it is not surprising that they discuss different motivations for engaging in collective action against the gentrification of Edgewood Park. As Goodwin et al. (2001) note, the incentive to protest is laden with emotions. In this section, I focus on the issues, concerns and interrelated emotions that motivate respondents to organize against the gentrification of Edgewood Park.

Pinard (2011) argues that deprivations and grievances are two of the most essential motivational components that compel analysis in contentious collective action. He typifies actors based on their motivations into two categories: the self-interested (i.e. those with felt deprivations) and the altruistic actors (i.e. those “moved solely by a sense of moral obligation”) (Pinard 2011:93). The typology of actors that I find in COEP is similar. However, I find personal motives (i.e. respondents are motivated to engage with COEP based on personal issues/changes impacting them directly) and social justice motives (i.e. observations and theoretical understandings of how gentrification reproduces inequality, and accordingly, a resultant sense of duty to protest) more accurately describe respondents’ motivations. Mitsy, a core activist in COEP, provides an account that exemplifies what I identify as a “social justice motive”:

So I was just watching [the consequences of gentrification] happen and feeling like it was really unfair, but I didn’t know how to articulate why. It just made
me feel bad and gross. *I didn’t want to be part of it, and I felt like as a young white person, I could be part of it, or I could be against it.* By not doing anything, you’re part of it, you know?

As I demonstrate below, personal motivating factors are expectedly emotional, and many of the more theoretical motives described by respondents are also tied to affect, particularly those related to racial injustice.

**Personal Motives**

The personal motivations for protesting the gentrification of Edgewood Park are particularly potent and emotional for Calvin and Miss Candace, two African American, long-time residents of Edgewood Park. Calvin, a young African-American male, described growing up and witnessing the disinvestment in his neighborhood: “the neighborhood was gutted, the funds were stripped away from the community programs and different local centers, and schools.” He expressed that he was initially excited to see new development in his neighborhood, but explained that it simultaneously made him curious about who was benefiting from the cafes and other new amenities. When I asked him if he knew anyone potentially at risk for displacement because of the new development, our conversation instantly became more emotional.

Yeah... my mother. About a year ago she came to me with a letter in her hand. She was like, “[Calvin], read this with me.” It was a notice that the taxes were gonna go up significantly… and we both sat there crying. Like how do we pay for this? We don’t come from means, you know? I see my neighbors are dealing with this, family members in [this city] are dealing with this, and it was this moment with my mother. Like do they want [her] out on the street? It was just this realization [of] unfairness.”
Calvin told me that he feels “angry” and “hurt”… “like we, the long term members of this neighborhood, aren’t wanted.” These words highlight Calvin’s feelings of alienation and demonstrate the extremely personal and emotional motivations that clarify his initial commitment to the group. Miss Candace, a 74-year-old African American woman who was born and raised in the Edgewood Park area similarly has lived-experience that motivated her to join COEP. She is retired and on a fixed income, therefore subsequent skyrocketing increases in taxes have impacted her considerably. Indeed, she does not believe she can keep her home of forty-four years. Regardless of whether Miss Candace will be displaced by the rising taxes caused by gentrification, she wants to leave the city and find housing elsewhere. As she explained, “I want to get so far away from [this city and this state]… Because of the political games they play. The governor, the mayor, they don’t really seem to care about us.” Both Calvin and Miss Candace articulate their perception that the major players in the development of Edgewood Park do not care about “them”—the long-time residents of the neighborhood.

Though most members of COEP are not personally threatened by the immediate risk of displacement, many discussed their personal and emotional reactions to the displacement of their neighbors as a motivation for their activism. The displacement of neighbors generates empathy and often profound expressions of sadness. As Amy, a white Edgewood Park resident shared, “it effects me when other residents who I’ve built relationships with have to leave.” Likewise Tara, a long-term African American resident described her sadness:
I know people who have issues being able to afford their taxes now. I also know a couple people that were offered what they considered good money for their homes, so they sold them and left…and that’s kind of sad, you know, when someone wasn’t planning on leaving. That makes me sad.

Participation in collective action is often fueled by a mix of grievances and emotions (e.g., Pinard 2010). One specific grievance that was frequently echoed throughout the interviews, and accompanied by a variety of emotions, was resentment towards pro-gentrification figures’ purposeful “rebranding” of Edgewood Park. To put this grievance into proper perspective it should be noted that several years ago a developer took the liberty of renaming a large section of Edgewood Park “Asbury.”

Two long-time African American residents’ express anger and frustration around this sudden and unannounced renaming of their neighborhood:

Tara: *I don’t like when people come and try to take over a neighborhood like there weren’t people there already—pulling that Christopher Columbus shit… Why does the neighborhood have to be renamed? It has a name already! And what is [Asbury]? Who is [Asbury]? I don’t know anything about that. It’s been [Edgewood Park] since my dad was a little boy and he’s 71, and probably since before that…probably when my grandparents were younger. I don’t know why it’s necessary to change it…*

Miss Candace: *But why do you want to change [this area’s] name? I feel as though it’s [Edgewood Park] and it was [Edgewood Park] when I came here. What’s the big difference [with] changing the name? Are you trying to establish your part of it? You’re staring to divide when you do that. You’re doing a great job of dividing if that was your plan.*

COEP participants also took issue with the ways that pro-gentrification figures painted Edgewood Park as *in need* of revitalization. As Amy explained, “It’s in [the developer’s] best interests for outsiders to think this neighborhood is really poor, really uneducated, and really rowdy because then anything he does, people see it as a
Anthropologist and geographer Neil Smith (1996) argues that the images of urban neighborhoods are often manipulated to encourage investment. Indeed, as respondents’ words describe, revitalization “suggests that affected neighborhoods were somehow devitalized or culturally moribund prior to gentrification” (1996:32-33). The insult that comes from witnessing white developers “swooping in to rescue” the “poor and blighted” Edgewood Park provokes a deeply personal motivation for long-time residents to engage in collective action against the gentrification of their neighborhood. As participants discussed “the invention of Asbury,” they expressed a constellation of emotions, especially outrage, frustration, and deep resentment.

Social Justice Motivations

Newer residents and those respondents who are not as threatened by the risk of displacement often reported being motivated to protest out of their awareness of the social injustice inherent in the gentrification of Edgewood Park. The response below from my interview with COEP organizer Gregory shows how racial diversity is realized in COEP. For Gregory, a white man who lives outside the neighborhood, his theoretical understanding of the injustice fosters a sense of responsibility to stand against it.

[Black organizers’] lived experiences are different from mine. Because they’re black, they’ve had a different experience in life. I’m at the top of the ladder. My understanding of oppression is not so much lived or experienced, it’s theorized…What’s happening in Edgewood Park [is that] you have these residents that have lived there for generations that have lived during the shittiest times in [this city], when the factories were closing, with the segregation, with
blatant oppression… now white people decided that their neighborhood is desirable, so [the long time residents] are getting booted out. It’s not something I can stand for or watch happen and be a part of.

Other respondents discussed being troubled by the $400,000 homes being built in a neighborhood where the median income is around $28,000. Additionally, they discuss disapproval in the relative lack of opportunities for residents to share their concerns about the neighborhood, including economic changes that result in hardship. For example, COEP organizer Angela describes how a new tax abatement is “making it harder for people who have lived here and struggled here for years to stay here [while] making it very easy for other people to come in.”

The new tax abatement certifies that the taxes for new homebuyers will not increase for many years. Mitsy, a young white new homeowner in Edgewood Park provides a complimentary perspective. While she knows the tax abatement benefits her, she is more distressed at the harms it creates for long-time residents who will bare the burden of a severe taxes increase:

My taxes are [low] and people on my block’s taxes are [increasing] because I’m living on the block now. My young whiteness and homeownership adds “value” to the block, which means [my neighbors’] houses are more valuable, which means they pay more taxes. But I’m paying really, really low taxes and I will for the next ten years…I can’t give [the tax abatement] back, but I think it’s really really regressive.

Though this interview excerpt might suggest that Mitsy’s participation in COEP is driven by feelings of white guilt, her interview revealed that her motives extend beyond guilt alone. As she explained, “I love this neighborhood. I care about this neighborhood. I don’t want it to turn into [a neighborhood for just wealthy people].”
Several other interviewees discussed the changing character of the community and their desires to maintain Edgewood Park as a working-class neighborhood.

Additionally, every interviewee expressed deep resentment toward CVB realty owner and developer Colin Brooks. While COEP’s conflict with Brooks and his allies are further elaborated in subsequent sections, it is important to note that the rebranding of Edgewood Park was perceived by many as an aggressive and exclusionary approach to development. Brooks’ disregard for Edgewood Park residents’ complaints served as potent motivations for protest. All respondents perceive the new development as entirely profit driven, and not at all beneficial to long-term residents or less affluent newcomers.

**Attentiveness to Racial Justice**

As noted above, research has documented that white activists in social and economic justice campaigns tend to subscribe to color-blind ideologies and neglect to recognize or address the role of racism (e.g., Ernst 2010). As I asked interviewees about what COEP represents for them, white respondents described how racial justice was crucial for understanding COEP’s collective identity:

Andrea: To me, politically, what COEP represents is an effort to organize across racial lines for a shared class interests, but with the particular experiences of the Black community shaping the issues that we pick and the stances that we take.

Danielle: We’re saying we want a working-class Edgewood Park, and we want to be aware of the role that racism has played in hurting and pulling resources
away from the neighborhood, and also the way it will also be a part of playing into the changing of the neighborhood when people feel like it’s now prime real estate.

Gregory: [Some organizations] hold a very stringent class analysis and don’t adjust their activity to include enough of a race analysis….The struggle of the U.S. needs to be led by African Americans, especially women. COEP was the only organization I found that held that analysis and its program is reflective of that. To me, that’s the most pragmatic way we an achieve power and confront the system as it exists.

These three interview excerpts demonstrate how white activists in COEP are explicitly attentive to racial injustice and, at least in Gregory’s account, gender oppression as well.

Black respondents were less inclined to discuss racial injustice. One young black resident, Calvin, did discuss how pro-development blogs used “old stereotypical narratives of black people’s neighborhood such as the welfare queen [and] ‘dumb po black folks’,” but he and the other black respondents did not seem inclined to unpack the racism inherent in gentrification or the racist rhetoric the characterizes their particular conflict. Miss Candace told me that she did not wish to elaborate too much on the racism and sexism because she “hate[s] the prejudice going around.” In her words, “I don’t handle that well. I was raised in an area where color didn’t matter that much. We knew were different but we were still all together.” While she did acknowledge that the displacement and conflict are related to race, she did not want to discuss it further. Neither Tara, a long-time African American resident, or Angela, a newer African American resident explicitly discussed matters of race during our interviews.
While black respondents may have been less explicitly forthcoming about racial matters, additional content analysis of COEP’s website and social media sites highlight the group’s clear commitment to racial justice. In a statement posted on COEP’s website in November 2013, organizers describe fighting for the right to a neighborhood where “African-American communities and all working class people”\(^2\) have access to resources and political power. While COEP could have simply framed this as a working-class neighborhood’s issue, they deliberately highlight the fight for African-American communities in particular. In discussing the condemnation of COEP organizers by the chief developers and his allies, they purposefully call attention the racist and sexist tactics that they have faced as an organization. They note that it is obvious that the developer and his allies are trying to promote racist fears of long-term residents, who pro-gentrification figures construct as “criminals and parasites.”

COEP’s website describes CVB and allies’ dehumanization of long-time black residents as a method for justifying their gentrification model that displaces them. Andrea, a white founder of COEP, elaborated on these ideas in our interview. Specifically, she describes how racism and sexism make it easy to discredit the work of black female organizers that stand up against the developers’ plans. Though she was quite poised and even-tempered through our interview, she discussed her deep anger around the racism and sexism COEP had been subjected to. I recognized this

\(^2\) I am not referencing COEP’s website as to protect the confidentiality of participants.
sentiment when Danielle, Mitsy, and Amy spoke about these matters as well. In this way, it appears that the struggle for racial justice and anti-sexism create important emotions that motivate action and sustain COEP’s collective identity. COEP’s Facebook page also reflects the salience of racial justice and anti-sexism in COEP’s collective identity. Specifically, hyperlinks to articles and commentaries related to current racial issues are frequently posted.

**Collective Actions that Build Racial Solidarity**

Beyond social media, COEP’s collective actions are explicitly planned around the goal of building racial solidarity. At least three of COEP’s past events reflect their deep attention to racial justice, one of which additionally demonstrates COEP’s explicit focus on women’s concerns. COEP’s first action was a community meeting in which black women from Edgewood Park congregated to discuss the impact of the 2012 presidential election for women (i.e. comparing President Obama’s and Mitt Romney’s approaches to women’s issues). After President Obama’s reelection, COEP held another community meeting, which they called “President Obama was reelected. Now what? Addressing the Unfinished Business of the Civil Rights Movement.” COEP’s largest event to date was a local march for affordable housing and jobs. The march was intentionally held on the 50th anniversary of Martin Luther King Jr.’s March on Washington. In viewing video footage from this march, I observed that a
racially diverse group of at least one hundred marchers sang the classic African American spiritual “This Little Light of Mine.”

Such collective actions actively reflect important components of collective identity (e.g., Polletta and Jasper 2001). COEP’s racial solidarity building actions demonstrate that the initiative for racial justice is tied to a deep sense of pride, an emotion that is vital in understanding how COEP’s sustains its identity (an observation I discuss in more detail in subsequent sections).

Perseverance Amidst Challenges

COEP organizers have been the targets of considerable condemnation. This is in full evidence on city real estate blogs and other social media that present examples of how CVB realty owner/developer Colin Brooks and his allies denounce and intentionally threaten activists who speak out against his aggressive development model. Yet COEP members have not wilted under these repeated attacks. In this section, I then explore how COEP members persevere. To provide important substantive context, I begin by summarizing several examples of the kind of denunciation and intimidation COEP has experienced.

- A known advocate for CVB realty posted an entry in his real estate blog with vulgar and threatening statements as well as an image of two white men in a control room (filled with computers) that reads, “When we take over your neighborhood the only thing you’ll be able to afford is the bullet to kill yourself with.” Below this bolded message, in smaller print, reads: “Gentrification. It’s worse than gun violence, drug abuse, adult illiteracy, or this city ignoring your
block for the past 35 years. Combined. The ground where your children play will soon turn into a Starbucks unless you ACT NOW.”

- In multiple posts, this same author continues to harshly ridicule COEP participants. The myriad of comments on these blogs generally support the author’s claims, continue to paint COEP organizers and Edgewood Park residents as incapable of taking care of their neighborhood, and accuse them of reverse racism (i.e. not wanting white people to move into Edgewood Park).

- In a post on a city-wide public forum, a man identified as a close CVB ally writes that Edgewood Park’s community organization consists of “Po Black People” that are against prosperity.

- A mock COEP Facebook page was created, which describes the group as a community organization of communists that “seek to end growth in the community.” Postings ridicule the group and its individual organizers through photo-shopped images, videos, and text.

- After COEP’s community march, photos of COEP organizers were posted to various real estate blogs. Alongside the photos, individual female organizers were called ugly, dumpy, and manly, among other degrading comments about their physical appearances. Sexualizing comments were also used to ridicule an older African American woman’s appearance.

- Brooks attempted to block COEP’s permit for their public match by planning a block party with a moon bounce that would impede their route. A police officer told a COEP organizer that Brooks tried to financially bribe the police department to revoke COEP’s permit.

- On the day of COEP’s march to commemorate the March on Washington, COEP was framed for vandalism. Purportedly, the owner of CVB realty (Brooks) paid someone to throw a cement block through the CVB coffee shop’s window. Brooks told media sources that COEP was responsible for the vandalism.

- Colin Brooks, upset by an Edgewood Park resident’s petition against a specific site of development on her block, tracked her IP address, located where she worked, and called her supervisor in an attempt to have her disciplined. This woman believes this was an intimidation tactic to prevent her from testifying against his plans at an upcoming zoning board meeting.

- CVB allies threatened to sue two COEP members for defamation.
CVB allies posted the photos and addresses of COEP organizers online, while simultaneously taunting them.

In my analysis of respondents’ perseverance in the face of such an openly hostile climate, I focus on how COEP organizers make sense of such dehumanizing treatment. Specifically, I explore participants’ emotional responses to pro-gentrification figures attacks. Unsurprisingly, COEP organizers report that being ridiculed and intimidated did produce negative emotions at the individual level (e.g., pain, fear, insecurity, and anger, among others). Yet simultaneously many COEP organizers discussed the negative attention and attempts at intimidation as having a positive effect—namely, it provides evidence that they have gotten the attention of pro-gentrification figures. Below I elaborate on respondents’ negative and the optimistic reactions. Taken together, I conclude that the pro-gentrification figures’ campaign of hostility has actually strengthened COEP’s collective identity and perseverance.

COEP’s co-founder Andrea told me that she understood from the beginning that there were real risks involved in an anti-gentrification campaign. Yet as she explains, “I don’t think we knew quite how ugly it was going to get.” Most respondents discussed these online postings as emotionally taxing; their statements reveal deep resentment towards pro-gentrification supporters’ blatantly racist and sexist discourse. Danielle’s words accurately describe the emotional force of the situation: “It really is intense. It shows you how land battles are fucking deep. There’s a lot you have to deal with emotionally, psychologically, politically.” In response to
being personally ridiculed online about her physical appearance, Danielle explained that she at first “just laughed it off…”

But then it kind of hits you, this person is so ignorant, they’re just able to say such hurtful things. Where did that stem from? *It’s a deep level of not recognizing people’s humanity. What does that mean for you to say I’m ugly? So in your eyes, I’m not valuable as a human being? So what I say doesn’t matter because I’m a woman and I’m ugly?*

In addition to Danielle’s account, Miss Candace’s words capture succinctly how dehumanized the women in COEP felt: “they talk about us as if we’re animals.”

However, beyond just insulting personal attacks, COEP organizers perceive this sexism and dehumanization as convenient, but not particularly effective, tools to silence and discredit female organizers.

Regarding pro-gentrification figures’ intimidation tactics, Amy experienced Colin Brooks’ intimidation at her workplace. Specifically, Brooks tracked Amy’s IP address and sought to have her fired for using a work computer to criticize his development tactics online. Brooks also personally threatened to sue Amy, which resulted in considerable anxiety for her. She believes Brooks’ tactics were purposefully calculated to “create that feeling of ‘I can get you, I know where you live, I know what you do.’” Although Brooks ultimately failed in breaking Amy, his tactics nonetheless produced significant angst in her life.

Even those who were not individually targeted by Brooks described perceiving COEP’s work as risky. While Calvin was not subjected to personal attacks he still expressed personal concern for his own safety: “I think I wouldn’t be honest if I said hearing about friends and neighbors that have been harassed that I wasn’t concerned
about my personal safety or emotional safety, you know?” Nonetheless, Calvin and fellow-organizers are steadfast in their resolve. COEP participants discuss a sense of duty to continue their struggle. In this way, the pro-gentrification groups’ intimidation tactics worked to create fear and anxiety in COEP activists, but intimidation did not short-circuit collective activism. Indeed, it ultimately emboldened COEP’s sense of collective identity.

Consider Mitsy’s experience of considerable ridicule on real estate blogs and other social media. While she described the experience as emotionally upsetting, Mitsy, as other COEP activists, views these personal attacks as evidence that COEP is having an impact on pro-gentrification figures. These desperate acts of personal intimidation reveal to activists such as Misty that Brooks and his allies clearly take the organization very seriously. In speaking about how people are attempting to “red-bait” COEP and frame them as “misguided communists,” Mitsy explained:

> Obviously, people who have money interests in the neighborhood try to discredit us and say we don’t do anything [and that] we’re pointless...but they wouldn’t be talking about us if they weren’t afraid of us.

When I asked about her perceptions of the negative criticism COEP receives, Angela echoed Mitsy’s sentiments:

> It makes me feel like we’re doing something right. We’re agitating people and making them feel uncomfortable about things and [they’re] giving what we’re saying validity by reacting this way.”

As I asked COEP participants about how they endure in the midst of ongoing challenges, it was common for respondents to discuss a strong bond they shared as a collective. Indeed, Miss Candace believes COEP stays together precisely because
members deeply care for one another and love each other: “We’re no longer a group that goes out and tries to get things done. We’re a family that sticks together and tries to get things done.” Other respondents similarly described COEP as an emotional support system for those personally targeted by Brooks and his CVB allies. As respondents expressed their anger at the mistreatment of their fellow organizers, it was evident that an ethic of genuine care is present. When I inquired further about how COEP organizers perceive the relationships within their organization, Andrea provided insight about the depth of relationships built in the midst of contentious activism.

There’s a level of struggle in our relationships that I don’t think is common…I have so much love for these people and we’ve had deep struggles. One of the things about the relationships you build when you’re in a fight [is that they’re] not like any other relationship, because there are stresses on you that aren’t in relationships in [other types] of organizations….

Andrea went on to explain that when “under attack and trying to implement a strategy,” it often requires people to move beyond their comfort zones and engage in situations that provoke fear. Thus, COEP’s internal work requires strong support and collective motivation to continue a long and obviously uphill battle.

Danielle also believes that those involved in a “fighting organization” need to realize the profound challenges such work entails. Here, she discusses the benefits of persevering in the midst of challenges:

When you keep fighting, it does increase your confidence and strength and I think good leadership is being able to support someone through that. There’s still opportunity and strength that come from being in a fight and getting through that fight actually builds your confidence…. Being battled is a transforming experience…. there’s a reason to fight.
As respondents discussed what keeps them personally involved and motivated to continue with COEP, several noted that the negative attention actually strengthened their commitment. Mitsy expressed this sentiment as she told me that the silencing tactics make her want to be “louder and more visible.”

Using the Adversary’s “Dirty Work” to their Advantage

Pro-gentrification figures’ tactics served to embolden COEP’s mission. A primary method COEP uses to mobilize their neighbors is door-to-door canvassing to discuss major neighborhood issues and encourage supporters to get involved or attend COEP events and meetings. While “on the doors” COEP organizers report sharing examples of “Brooks’ dirty work” to mobilize outrage and thus support from those outside of COEP. As Gregory described, such offensive comments were re-purposed by COEP to mobilize supporters. Specifically, COEP members ask Edgewood Park residents, “do you want someone like that taking over this neighborhood?” Likewise, Amy seizes any opportunity to share her story of being personally attacked by Brooks. As she explained, “the more we keep sharing our stories, hopefully, the weaker he’ll get.”

COEP’s website serves as an additional resource for turning the tables against pro-gentrification figures. Vivid examples of intimidation tactics, use of legal threats, and racist and sexist characterizations of COEP organizers are on full display. In October of 2013, COEP featured on their website Brooks’ “cultivation of hate” as
instrumental to his gentrification objectives. COEP thus provides concrete evidence of how pro-gentrification figures use multiple attack platforms to push their agenda.

Prior research shows how activist organizers evaluate both support among fellow activists and the effectiveness of different tactics against targeted opponents. It is critical to scrutinize how an organization’s tactics reflect their identity and goals (e.g., Nepstad 2004; Givan, Roberts, and Soule 2010). In the case of COEP’s anti-gentrification campaign, organizers deliberately develop tactics to undermine their adversaries and simultaneously appeal to supporters. Both in canvassing and on their website, COEP takes prides in holding Brooks and CVB allies accountable for their offensive commentaries and hostile actions. By publicly showcasing this “dirty work,” COEP tries to both generate outrage against pro-gentrification figures and build community support for their mission.

Mobilizing Positive Emotions and Generating Pride

In scrutinizing collective action, it is essential to explore the emotions that “lead, accompany, and result” from actions and focus on how emotional processes are frequently combined (Jasper 2011:296). Building on Gregory’s observation of mobilizing residents through negative emotions, Mitsy describes canvassing in Edgewood Park as activating multiple emotions:

So you get people mad, then you give them hope, then you give them a plan. That’s door-knocking 101: anger, hope, plan. You get people fucking pissed… then you say, but we can do this.
Canvassing door-to-door deliberately appeals to Edgewood Park residents’ emotions to garner support and participation in COEP’s actions. COEP organizers report being fairly successful in turning out residents to their actions. In this way, a synthesis of different emotions (such as anger and hope) has the tangible result of mobilizing more residents.

Canvassing door-to-door may also fail to mobilize Edgewood Park residents, especially those who feel hopeless and thus reluctant to engage in activism of any kind. Andrea admits that it is often very challenging to motivate people whose lives are in crisis. Mitsy similarly expressed that going door-to-door to mobilize participation can be frustrating because residents feel hopeless:

*People are scared and [they’re] used to the way things are. And more than anything, they think things just have to be like this. They don’t know another option because we are so beat down. We’re taught not to believe in ourselves.*

Tara claims that this is a primary reason why some residents will not get involved with COEP:

[T]hey don’t necessarily feel like they can help. They don’t feel like they can do anything without money. They don’t feel like anyone’s going to listen to them.

Angela explained to me that this collective sentiment of powerlessness was impetus to bring people together for their community march in August 2013. This was the march (mentioned in a previous section) held on the 50th anniversary of the historic March on Washington. In describing the march, it was clear that this action generated profound emotions for those involved: pride, hope, excitement, and solidarity, to name a few.
The march was largely described as a huge success, a victory that invigorated participants and called attention to the possibilities of building “people power” and solidarity among the working-class residents of Edgewood Park.

Calvin described the feeling of marching alongside his neighbors as “a beautiful moment.” Miss Candace reports feeling as though she were “on top of the world” during the march. Additionally, respondents stated that the march demonstrated that there was widespread collective outrage towards Brooks and CVB Realty. Angela believes the march elucidated for Edgewood Park residents that the struggle is not about individual problems or issues that reflect personal shortcomings but rather, a shared conflict over deeper social inequalities. Amy described the march as empowering and explained how it “released fear” because people realized they were not alone in the struggle.

COEP members’ statements articulate the important “emotional energy” (Collins 2001: 29) that generates solidarity and catharsis. Perhaps more than any other emotion, COEP’s march fostered pride among community members. Indeed, pride was an emotion deliberately developed during the civil rights and gay rights movements (e.g., Britt an Heise 2000). More specifically, prior research shows the potential for collective action to transform feelings of isolation into pride (e.g., Britt and Hesse 2000).

COEP’s march transformed emotions of anger, fear, resentment, and hopelessness into profound sentiments of pride among sizable numbers of Edgewood Park neighbors. Pride accompanies a deep feeling of group connection in the midst of
coping with fears, anger over neighborhood changes, and insult over the “rebranding” of their neighborhood. Like the 1963 march on Washington, COEP’s march shows how pride is more powerful than ideology alone. A class-based or racial ideology did not generate the march or the feelings of pride that ensued, a powerful display of collective action in response to the racial and class-based injustice did.

In addition to powerful acts of pride building, COEP has also mobilized Edgewood Park residents in successful campaigns against Brooks and CVB. Specifically, as the result of their efforts, pro-gentrification figures were denied permission to build multiple homes in an area zoned for only two homes. Andrea reported that such victories “give people fuel” to keep fighting. Calvin similarly expressed this sentiment and told me that his motivation to continue fighting with COEP is strengthened by such victories:

> When the developer got his zoning power denied, people power did that. That’s amazing to me. I know we can [do this]. So that’s what keeps me going.

Such affirmations of “people power” help to sustain Calvin’s individual commitment to the group. Indeed, feeling and observing this pride “keeps him going.” The words of these COEP organizers illustrate that the pride that comes from collective action and victories are crucial in sustaining COEP’s collective identity as a grassroots group that’s worth fighting for.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

This study provides a nuanced account of how emotions, identity, and racial consciousness are important features for building and sustaining collective action in the context of resistance against gentrification. Though I initially suspected that emotions would be most powerful for respondents who are immediately impacted by gentrification, I found that for those who are less threatened (or not directly threatened at all) by gentrification, emotions such as empathy, outrage, and pride lead to a diverse and committed collective.

Although the denunciation and intimidation tactics by pro-gentrification figures negatively impact individual organizers, COEP seems to serve as a support system that aids in the healing of emotional injuries and thus sustains collective efforts even in the most challenging of times. Each COEP member emphasized strong emotional bonds of support and love that they perceive as characterizing their entire organization. Respondents describe their struggles as resulting ultimately in stronger affective loyalties (e.g., Jasper 2011) and thus a durable collective identity that enables them to continue in their racial justice-centered activism in Edgewood Park. By publically showcasing the hateful messages and intimidation tactics of pro-gentrification figures, they simultaneously work to produce outrage and support from fellow neighbors.
This study additionally contributes to research on the fusion and intersections of different emotions in collective action. Specifically, varying emotions are found to operate often simultaneously to mobilize collective action. In mobilizing neighborhood support, COEP members deliberately utilize the fusion of negative affect (outrage, fear, and empathy) and positive emotions such as hope and pride to build solidarity. Indeed, they work to catalyze what COEP organizers aptly describe as “people power.” Furthermore, positive emotional energy that is generated by COEP’s actions (e.g., the march and zoning board victory) generates pride and group efficacy.

While previous research highlights the corrosive effects of color-blind racism on collective action (e.g., Ernst 2010), COEP demonstrates that this is not always the case. Indeed, racial justice is both a prevailing ideology and affective motivation within their organization.

One avenue for future research might be to compare successful organizations such as COEP with groups that were not able to sustain their activism. We might expect that there are many examples of such groups as Smith and Williams describe that fighting gentrification “is like fighting a brush fire” (1986:221). That is to say, given the increasingly challenging conditions that have intensified inequalities in the U.S., future research should also explore comparatively how COEP is able to persevere while other groups resisting gentrification have not survived (e.g., Betancur 2010). By extending research in this way, it might be possible to understand in more detail the importance of racial justice, affect, and collective identity in sustaining
resistance in the face of increasingly aggressive pro-gentrification efforts across the U.S. and the globe (e.g., Harris 2008).
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