Introduction

The tapestry of geographical ideas on emotion and affect is rich. In writing this chapter on emotion and affect, we are acutely aware of the vast canon of literature built around each, as well as both, of the terms. Nevertheless, to make the most effective use of the concepts, it is worth being explicit about how one intends to use the expressions.

Affect theory’s application is eclectic. It traverses psychoanalysis, psychology and psychiatry, and the literature has an interdisciplinary and malleable ‘feel’. In the past three decades, geography has seen an abundance of theoretically astute research on affect.1 These works sit beside interdisciplinary borrowings and geographical analyses of affect in philosophy (Ahmed 2004; Deleuze and Guattari 1988; Massumi 2002; Sedgwick and Frank 1995), in political theory (Bennett 2010; Williams 2007) and feminist studies (Berlant 2000; Probyn 2005; Riley 2005). Emotion and affect are themes that have attracted attention in human geography since the early 2000s (Pile 2010). Feminist geographers have sought to critically absorb and promote the strength of these frames into their work. However, scholars have considered emotion and/or affect individually and together; some cleave the terms, while others stake a claim to usefully connect the two.

From early on, feminist geographers argued for emotion to have a place in ‘serious’ scholarship (Davidson and Milligan 2004; Davidson et al. 2005; McDowell 1992; Smith et al. 2009). Drawing on poststructuralist ideas, feminist geographers destabilized the binaries (a set of interrelated and mutually reinforcing dualisms that explain the ‘naturalization’ of hegemonic gender oppressions) in which knowledge production takes place. Accordingly, men equate with traits such as rationality, superiority, science, independence, public space and culture, while women equate with traits such as irrationality, emotion, dependence and private space and nature (Longhurst 2001; McDowell 1999; Women, Geography Study Group (WGSG) 1997).

With a shared ontology of fluidity, emotion appears the more accessible subject. Affect, conversely, can be somewhat difficult to articulate clearly, given its ephemeral character. Thus, Joanne Sharp (2009) discusses a debate that kindled over the distinction between emotion and affect, such that emotion is often times considered as individual/personal and affect as transhuman/political. We consider that the separation of emotion and affect follows masculinist
Traditions, relegating and feminizing emotion to the personal level and favouring affect as a theoretically more advanced concept (Thien 2005). With terms such as immediacy, immanence and the virtual, the focus on the abstract centre of affect theory (McCormack 2012) is proposed here to be inattentive to power and geopolitics, and strangely disembodied.

Accordingly, we share the position that feminist scholars present, such that emotion and affect are mutually sustaining (see Ahmed 2004; Bondi and Davidson 2011; Thien 2005; Wright 2010). Indeed, Liz Bondi and Joyce Davidson (2011) surmise that emotion and affect do not quite map directly, one over the other, when they argue that ‘emotions and affects might be considered disagreeable in many ways, but their rough edges, the very wildness that frustrates domestication is precisely what gives them such power’ (Bondi and Davidson 2011, 595). We reflect that theories of emotion and affect are understandings of orientation, or starting points (Ahmed 2006), and draw on critical feminist scholarship to explain human and nonhuman complexities.

This chapter deliberates on feminist geographers’ scholarship on emotion and affect, including our own. Paula Smith undertook a Masters in social science on the emotional and affective impacts of relationship challenges on the meanings of home. Her thesis examines practices of homemaking, unmaking and remaking of ten heterosexual individuals who have experienced relationship challenges and have homes in the Waikato region of Aotearoa New Zealand. Our connection is through supervision. Gail Adams-Hutcheson was one of Paula’s supervisors (the other being Lynda Johnston). Gail’s research is on emotion, affect and critical feminist analyses of transient communities. The communities included post-disaster survivors who relocated from Christchurch to Waikato after the devastating Christchurch earthquakes. More recently, she has been working with sharemilkers (non-landowners who milk dairy cows), a transitory community in the Waikato dairy industry.

In each of the following sections, we draw on our own, plus others’, research to reflect on the gendered geographies of feeling, emotion and affect. Throughout this chapter, we understand emotion and affect to be intimately connected and use the terms interchangeably. Therefore, we review how emotion and affect apply in feminist geographical scholarship at different spaces and scales.

The first section pays critical attention to the body as a spatial scale, and we describe feelings, emotion and affect in relation to skin, trauma, sweat and breastfeeding. In the second section, Sara Ahmed’s (2008) work is crucial to linking bodies to public space and collective feelings. Managing emotions and the (un)comfortability of sweating and breastfeeding draw attention to the politics of public space and how emotion and affect are managed. We then move to explore private space via a focus on home, love and relationship breakup. The scale of the home is important to feminist geographers (Blunt and Dowling 2006). In particular, Paula’s work on emotion and affect when homes ‘dissolve’ and couple relationships end allows inspection of material items and their entanglement in intergenerational bonds. The final section overviews emotions in the field, their stickiness and ‘doing’ affect. Feminist geographers have been at the forefront of interrogating research spaces, ethically, emotionally and affectually for close to three decades. Here, we draw on Gail’s contemporary methodological discussion on transference, suicide and rhythm to explore the transformative potential of research methods, including Skype and semi-structured interviews.

The body: affective politics of shame and disgust

The body is a central locus for critical feminist geographies in a number of crucial ways. Feminist poststructural analyses of bodies and space (Longhurst 1995, 2001, 2004; McDowell 1999; Rose 1993) incorporated performance, representation, surveillance and identity politics. Of further
importance was to dismantle the dualistic structure of Western thinking that sustained an identity politics of man/woman, rationality/irrationality, production/reproduction and mind/body. Contemporarily, though, scholars seek to include the fleshy body, in all its messy materiality (Longhurst and Johnston 2014) and push further to see what bodies can do (Colls 2012; Slocum 2008) in a ‘Deleuze-inspired corporeal feminism’ (Waitt and Stanes 2015, 31). In all its complexity, affect is frequently used in geographical literature in the Spinozian sense as the bodily capacity to affect and be affected. Bharuch Spinoza (2000/1677) understands the body as a series of intensities that are constantly in relation and in connection to other bodies (as opposed to ‘the [static] body’). Using the fleshy body, affected and affecting and struck through with emotion, feminist scholars draw on the transformative potential of Julia Kristeva’s (1982), Elspeth Probyn’s (2005) and Iris Marion Young’s (1990) work to examine the affective politics of shame and abjection. It is Young’s (1990, 145) early work that links body aesthetics to ‘racism, sexism, homophobia, ageism and ableism which, are partially structured by abjection – an involuntary, unconscious judgement of ugliness and loathing’. Abjection is the affect or feeling of anxiety. Kristeva (1982) argues that the abject provokes fear and disgust because it exposes a border between self and Other; it also exposes the fragility of borders and how they can be threatened (by dirt, disorder, disease, pain and trauma).

Robyn Longhurst (2001) has examined the aversion to body fluids, as fluids rupture boundaries that are supposed to be shored up, solid and impermeable. More recently, these ideas have inspired Adams-Hutcheson (2016) to examine the affective disruption of trauma as something that defies boundaries, playing across the skin, unsettling the spatial connections between people and places. Ideas of skin are utilized in two key ways: first, as a metaphorical container for elucidating how respondents kept trauma at bay and their fear of trauma escaping beyond bounded skin; second, the skin (or crust) of the earth is deemed to be abject and traumatic when its boundaries are ruptured through the seeping of liquefaction in the post-disaster city of Christchurch. When elements (like liquefaction) flow across usually augmented boundaries, they pose a challenge to the dominant symbolic order; it then becomes the mark of the abject (Adams-Hutcheson 2016). Significantly, disgust and abjection are not necessarily voluntary responses, as bodily reactions to certain Others are sometimes unconscious. Often, we feel shame at our own feelings of disgust. It is imperative that feminist geographers recognize the affective responses of shame when confronting that which is Other (Longhurst et al. 2008) because, as Probyn (2000, 2005) states, this might pave the way to understanding and acceptance.

Shame has been a key lens through which to consider emotions and the affective capacities of bodies. Similar to abjection, shame is a visceral response, an affect that forces people to confront ‘the proximity of ourselves to Others’ and prompts reflection on subjectivities, individually and collectively (Probyn 2000, 132, 2005). The notion of shame is integral to feminist geographers’ work on fat bodies, where ‘fat shaming’ and ‘fat phobia’ reconstitute bodies in public spaces (Evans 2006; Hopkins 2012; Longhurst 2005). Fat bodies are marginalized and stigmatized, and the distaste for fat continues. Hopkins (2012) links this to affective bodily responses when he interrogates the idea that, for many, fat people occupy the position of having ‘ugly, fearful, or loathsome bodies’ (Young 1990, 124). These ideas draw together in Gordon Waitt and Elyse Stanes’ (2015) work on sweat and masculinities. Sweaty bodies can be sites of shame or pride, with the fit sweaty body often revered while the fat sweaty body is reviled. Sweat leaks from the body, it smells and exposes the fragility of bodily spatial boundaries. Sweaty bodies are central in continuing to pay attention to the messy, fleshy material body often omitted from mainstream geography. Crucially though, these works offer a stark glimpse into how emotion and affect structure spatial relationships that expose the dominant discourses of acceptability and Otherness and how place plays a central role. Signalling embodiment also serves to underscore
the eminence of place. The sweaty body is ‘in place’ in the gym, for example, but ‘out of place’ in crowded transport. Whether public or private, spaces script emotion, affect and their collective transfer in different, ambivalent and complex ways.

In the next two sections, we describe public and private space and the connection to encountering emotion and affect.

**Public space: breasts, sweat and (dis)connection**

Emotions and affects are bound up with how we inhabit the world ‘with’ others. They are about the intimate relations between selves, objects and others (Ahmed 2004), and they are not divorced from their public and/or private situated context. Jennifer Harding and Deidre Pribram (2002) argue that affective geographies should draw our attention exactly because they dissolve public/private boundaries, working across individual bodies to affect and change collective ones. However, we wish to underscore that place matters and is crucial when managing emotions and the opaqueness of affect.

Public space often denotes a collective atmosphere. People, emotion and affect converge in interesting ways, as when Teresa Brennan (2004, 1) asks, ‘Is there anyone who has not, at least once, walked into a room and “felt” the atmosphere?’ Affect links to something like ‘collective impressions’, a ‘felt’ atmosphere or perhaps an overall mood. It may be understood as the experience of being ‘sapped’, ‘tired’ or ‘depressed’ in the company of someone, while conversely feeling ‘energized’, ‘inspired’ or ‘invigorated’ by others (Brennan 2004). In this way, Brennan (2004) sees affect as a process that is transmittable, transmutable, picked up, transformed, reshaped and reshared between and among a collective. However, we want to complicate the idea of affective translation from body to body.

We contemplate what happens when feelings and affects are discordant or are not returned nor shared, perhaps because they are masked, misinterpreted or require management. Collective impressions may alienate, confound or confuse a sense of social sharing among the collective. In Gail’s PhD research, Christchurch participants acted out their responses to stress and anxiety in ambivalent ways. In some cases, emotion and affect were deployed strategically to mask fear, such as, for example, Liz’s mother and brothers, who ‘acted tough and nonchalant’ during the earthquake’s aftershocks (Adams-Hutcheson 2014, 159). Their nonchalant behaviour, however, alienated Liz, who felt her alarm and panic rising after each bout of shaking. Liz ultimately felt that the family was dismissive of her terror. Ahmed (2008) uses the idea of an affect ‘alien’ to examine how affective practice can alienate as well as connect; that is, sometimes emotion and affect simply do not line up with the collective impression from others. Sadly, as a result, Liz left Christchurch without saying a last goodbye at the airport, because she thought that the family did not support or understand her emotionally.

Managing emotions and affect is linked to the idea of ‘masking’, or the conscious projection of particular emotions by creating a façade. Being outwardly calm while seething, for example, challenges the argument that emotion is tied only to the body and that affect is non-conscious. Paula interviewed women who had experienced relationship break up and the division of home and contents. She found that, for some respondents, their public performances of post-relationship breakdown were complicated. Participants’ public performances – healed, strong and capable – contrasted markedly to those in private moments that were understood as emotionally raw, shaky and containing emotional outbursts. Paula (Smith 2017, 41) notes that:

While I stayed with Coco, she was candid about her experiences, but I felt she projected a mostly accepting and positive outlook about her situation as a single mum
dealing with significant challenges. But when we got to her [empty at the weekend] work space – a space she helped design and adores – I noticed a change. Her vulnerableness and deep sadness were more apparent, with tears, and wobbly voice as she articulated her feelings.

The most revealing aspect of these examples is the complexity of emotion and affect, which illustrates bodily projection as one state while simultaneously feeling the opposite. Public actions and reactions embed Byzantine-like webs of interactions choreographed by space. Therefore, people are able to knowingly direct their reactions, bodily compositions and demeanour to portray a particular outer countenance (rather than non-conscious affect), such as remaining outwardly calm while crumbling with terror inside. As Ahmed (2008, 11) argues, ‘we might even become strangers or affect aliens, at such moments’. How these affective registers are drawn on and received collectively remains variable and is far from transparent.

Kate Boyer’s (2012) work on breastfeeding in public spaces unpacks public attitudes and comfortability by building on feminist geographers’ work that frames subjectivity and the politics of public space. High levels of commitment to breastfeeding and a ‘willingness to engage in counter-normative behaviour’ (Boyer 2012, 554) shaped women’s experiences, not least breastmilk’s ‘suspect’ (that is, abject) status as a potentially contaminating fluid, which may leak or transgress bodily boundaries. Breastfeeding can raise deep-seated anxieties about bodily fluids, and it highlights the ways in which difference is materially and affectively experienced. Breastfeeding women are marked and marginalized in the public sphere, and are ‘responsible for the comfort of others through risk censure’ (Boyer 2012, 553). Both Boyer’s (2012) and Waitt and Stanes’ (2015) work situates the importance of public space(s) as crucial to comfortability – or not. Ahmed (2010) observes that maintaining public comfort requires certain (other) bodies ‘to go along with it’ (2010, 584). The sweating or breastfeeding body is not problematic in itself but can become so in public places, and is managed in various ways. Disentangling space is not straightforward, and we do not wish to (re)inscribe a dichotomous separation of public from private space. Yet, in doing so, the strength of gendered analysis of space and place retains its political integrity. As outlined above, public space can be problematic for some bodies (frequently marginalized through different forms of oppression) and not others.

Next, we attend to private space, the quintessential feminine space of home and love, albeit one that has had to be fought to be included in the mainstream academy.

**Private space: love and materiality in unmade homes**

Home is a key geographical site for feminist geographers to examine gender roles and relations, sexuality, embodied differences and identity politics (Blunt and Dowling 2006). More recently, love (Morrison, Johnston and Longhurst 2012), domesticity (Gorman-Murray 2008) and material objects (Morrison 2010, 2012) have been key sites of framing for feminist geographers engaged with emotion and affect at the scale of home.

When thinking of broken hearts and broken homes (Smith 2017), love has been considered a contentious term academically, a feminized topic associated with private spaces, individualized feelings and perhaps ‘gossip’ (Morrison, Johnston and Longhurst 2012). Margaret Toye (2010, 41) argues that, rather than avoiding the concept of love, ‘feminist scholars should have a special interest in the topic because of the ways the discourse of love has not just been associated with women, but has been used against them’. Feminist theorists, then, have illustrated that the concept – and its hegemonic bedfellow, marriage – is a means by which women are restricted and subordinated (Ahmed 2004; D’Emilio and Freedman 2012; Jackson 2014; Miller 1996).
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This ideology, while illustrating the gendered binary of power relations present in so many heterosexual intimate relationships, stops short of describing love as ‘spatial, relational and political’ (Morrison, Johnston and Longhurst 2012, 506). Love is complex, contradictory and political; it is a queer feeling (Berlant 2001) that destabilizes binaries, such that love engulfs anger, shame and fighting into its sphere. Disruptions to our most intimate relationships create (emotional) movement between joy and sadness, in either and both directions (Ahmed 2004). With such turbulent emotions circulating, there is considerable transference of affect, not just between bodies but also between matter and humans (Bennett 2010).

Like Jane Bennett (2010), Paula and Gail’s research uses Spinozian thinking on affect in two ways; that is, Spinoza’s explanation of the ability or force within bodies to affect and are affected, and the ways in which he alludes to materiality and immateriality and subjective affective atmospheres (bodies impact bodies à la Spinoza), affective materiality is not reducible to individual subjective experience. Examining her work with sharemilkers, Adams-Hutcheson (2017) describes how fluctuating weather conditions work their way across human and nonhuman bodies (researcher, researched and cows) in a farming context. The troposphere leaves an impression, such that a sunny day is affectively different from wind and rain. The weather creates an affective atmosphere that explains how materiality and immateriality mesh, transfer and, importantly, are shared (Adams-Hutcheson 2017). These ideas gather in Paula’s examination of the affective resonance of material items that travel among homes and relationships. Thus, both Spinoza and Bennett (2010) are drawn on to describe how bodies and household items have a particular vitality. Again, by linking materiality and immateriality, it is argued that people feel and are affected by material items.

By extrapolating the material geographies of home, Andrew Gorman-Murray (2008, 283) points to this call to “re-materialize” research in social and cultural geography as a way of investigating the role of domestic spaces in identity formation and management. Within a feminist framework, the concept of ‘stickiness’ of emotions (Ahmed 2004) is noted. This stickiness carries through and attaches itself to materialities, due to the emotions that summon and attach themselves to material items and contribute to identity (re)formation. Things such as household items are passed on. Items may be handed on generationally, between friends, or may be returned, sold, loved, pre-loved, mended and marked. In Paula’s project, materials took a central role. Restored chairs, furniture, travel souvenirs, statues, paintings and a rug were weighted with emotional and affective significance. Smith (2017, 98) explains that, for respondent Jen, who let go of some material items but not others in divorce settlement, a rug holds a strong attachment. The emotional and affective transfer that the rug signifies allows Jen to re-engage with the past, a time of building her first home with her husband and the arrival of their first child. Loved items are able to ‘matter’ affect. Household items transferred in these ways are not necessarily of great financial value; rather, the worth of the items is determined by emotional attachment. The process of dividing the material objects and collections often adds affective layers of pain to an already distressing breakup. Material objects are frequently the focus of legal proceedings, as networks of feelings are disentangled, cleaving what was once imagined as one entity back into two. Accordingly, power struggles are observed to be enacted through ‘rights’ to such items (Goode 2007).

When intimate couple relationships and normative constructs of love are challenged, home is changed in a myriad of ways both materially and in the imaginary. These changes may be positive or negative, or fluctuate ferociously between the two. The increasingly ‘fragmented and reconstituted families or intra-familial negotiations across multiple generations’ (Valentine 2008, 2101) demonstrate that material items become emotional and affectual detritus floating between home(s). Passing items from generation to generation is common practice, and is
viewed by many as a means of displaying love for and of home and, by association, family (Morrison 2013). Changes may take the form of spatial changes – in the ways in which the materials are removed, replaced, or rearranged – but, also, the home itself may be vacated, to be rebuilt and reimagined. Reconstruction of the home could be in an entirely new geographical location, or else remade in the current space, in both cases with new or reconstructed meanings and materialities, each step saturated with emotion and affect (Smith 2017).

In the final section, we discuss emotion and affect as a highly useful frame to investigate research spaces, human connection and the feminist politics of ‘doing’ research.

‘Doing’ feminist research

A core strength of feminist geography has been the critical attention paid to research moments, power relations and the ethical politics of conducting research with others. In utilizing emotion and affect in feminist scholarship there is a sense of attempting to, in Eve Sedgwick’s (2003, 62) words, ‘touch the textures of social life’, which brings enchanting, funny, humbling and harsh emotion and affect into the realm of academic scrutiny. Emotion and affect are judged as being ‘free radicals’ (Sedgwick 2003), in that there can never be a carefully circumscribed emotional or affectual geography, neatly separate from other geographies. When scholars work with microscopic intensity, there is sensitivity to the researcher and the researched’s ‘volatile body’ (Grosz 1994), whose experiences in place emerge ‘though the sensation of spacing that is material and immaterial, human and animal, organic and inorganic’ (Dewsbury 2010, 36). Such experiences allow insight into how bodies extend into and through the corporeality of the researcher, affecting and affective of each other. Emotion and affect draw in different intensities and ways of paying attention to space and place through: rhythm (Duffy et al. 2011); the body (Longurst, Ho and Johnston 2008); emotions (Davidson and Bondi 2004; Sharp 2009; Widdowfield 2000); listening and music (Duffy 2013; Wood and Smith 2004); and through technologies (Longhurst 2013, 2016), to name but a few.

Acknowledging Liz Bondi’s (2004, 2005) work on psychoanalysis and geography, the interview space is shared as an oscillation of thoughts and feelings. The intersubjectivity that weaves in and out of the interview conversation takes on an almost felt atmosphere or ‘presence’. In most human interactions there is either a conscious or subconscious desire to connect and share in some way. Then again, research is a purposeful interaction with various levels of power-laden differences that weave in and out of the exchange and colour the experience at every level. Feminist geographers are cognizant of the affective dimensions within research as a political motivation for conducting ethical analyses of space and place.

Bondi (2005) discusses the researcher and some of the unconscious impacts that another person’s distress or happiness can have on a researcher. Using emotion and affect as a frame highlights moments of lightness, hope and laughter, sadness and trauma, and so on, which exchange through non-cognitive impacts. Bondi (2005, 71) maintains that most of these personal interchanges within interview moments are done non-cognitively and non-verbally, and that the participant can then feel understood ‘emotionally and experientially as well as cognitively’. Using empathy and psychoanalytical methods, feminist scholars have honed in on emotion and affect and how these transfer from the researcher to the researched (and back) in oscillation. For instance, Gail’s PhD participants sweated, shifted in their seats, laughed, cried, fell silent, reddened, sighed and shared a myriad of other intensities, beyond language, which help to create momentary collectivities or shared spaces of learning (Hutcheson 2013). An investigation of research interactions and relationships also entails thinking about how interviews and focus group meetings are dynamic exchanges of intersubjectivity.
The spaces of research and how intersubjectivity may be achieved have been further interrogated by examination of research technologies. A feminist analysis of Skype challenges the separation of public and private space, as well as proximity and distance. Skype, it is argued, creates definitive affective atmospheres but may also be mistranslated when there is disembodiment and lack of ‘touch’ (Adams-Hutcheson and Longhurst 2016). Conversation, control of routines, speaking spaces and emotions are sometimes fractured and discordant via technologies such as Skype. Rhythms, when disrupted, are often difficult to re-establish without familiar, embodied social cues. This lack of the organizational processes of rhythm can lead to discomfort and anxiety, which are generally difficult to smooth from behind a screen or at a distance (Adams-Hutcheson and Longhurst 2016; Longhurst 2013, 2016).

These touching moments and staying in touch via Skype build on Lynda Johnston’s (2012) work in considering the haptic geographies of drag queens in Aotearoa New Zealand. Lynda argues that touch reminds us of the fragility of femininities and masculinities and points to the affectual language of ‘excess’. Drag queens utilize the performing body excessively to evoke strong emotions. Audiences, through their complex emotional responses, highlight how emotions and bodily sensations are used strategically to seek political and erotic justice (Johnston 2012): ‘A focus on drag queens and touch creates a space in which sexualities can be explored in each affectual and emotional encounter. Body to body touch is an intimate sensual encounter which is always situated somewhere’ (Johnston 2012, 8). Place is crucial to the ways in which bodies may, or may not touch, connect or disconnect. At the heart of conversations about emotion and affect are similarity and difference, affinity and distance.

Why was it that some experiences are intimately shared and yet, with others, the ‘sharing’ is on a relatively superficial level? Using the body as a research instrument (Longhurst et al. 2008) and taking on a sensorial knowledge framework mean admitting desire, disgust, angst, friendliness and a range of complex emotions and affects, which ebb and flow as forces of knowledge construction within the research environment. Emotion and affect are then, political, gendered and spatially articulated in both obvious and less-obvious ways. Gorton (2007) argues that our actions are guided not just by what we think but also by how we feel and our bodily response to those feelings.

Recently, feminist scholars have begun to examine intimate moments of research spaces and how these leave impressions emotionally and affectively on researchers (Moss and Donovan 2017). Attending to the circulation and stickiness of emotion and affect gives insight into how researchers are entangled in the field (Ahmed 2004), and also once one has left the field. Adams-Hutcheson and Longhurst (2017) describe a research encounter that happened during the data-gathering phase, four years prior to the dissemination of Gail’s PhD project. It took years to want to pay close attention to a respondent’s admission of her intention to commit suicide and the unknown outcome of her phone call to Gail. The authors tackle the consequences of suppressing data, as well as studying what it may mean to illuminate such a taboo topic as suicide (Adams-Hutcheson and Longhurst 2017). Feminist geographers (like many others) wield enormous power at the editing table, and questions are beginning to be asked about emotion and affect that are too raw or intimate to be included in analyses. Consequently, they argue that grittier, messy, unsettling and intimate work remains (Adams-Hutcheson 2017) to fully grapple with emotion and affect that are deemed to be too revealing yet that continue to challenge reason and masculinism in the academy.

Conclusions

There is important geographical work done on emotion and affect. In this chapter, we have framed the complex and vibrant field from the critical feminist geography perspective. We have
deliberately encompassed critical works that pay attention to the power, ethics, intersubjectivity and spatial scales that are important to feminist geographers. Terms such as becoming, potentiality, immediacy, immanent and the virtual all hold together complex literatures that seem strangely disembodied and perhaps, at times, drift toward universalist rather than geopolitical framings. Space in these literatures is ontogenetically multiple, rhizomatic and fascinating (Deleuze and Guattari 1988) yet, often, the bodily, emotionally messy research practices never make it to print.

Feminist geographers have responded to the lack of geopolitical and embodied research that uses emotion and affect as a lens. Emotion and affect are examined within politically active and critical frames of analyses. Thus, we have chosen to illuminate power geometries, intimacy, shame, love, sweat, abjection and fleshy bodies, among other things, as empirically important to feminist geographers. Space and place, too, make a difference to how bodies can be touched, read, managed and/or perceived. Emotion and affect simply do not always line up and are purposefully directed at times, leading to opaqueness in public spaces. We employ the idea of a façade that may be presented outwardly, while inner turmoil roils. This discussion embeds Ahmed’s (2008) ideas of the affect ‘alien’, by absorbing emotion as a wilful and directed manifestation of conscious affect. Furthermore, we direct our attention to nonhuman objects, materials, relations and technologies, which embrace and return emotion and affect in circular patterns. We extrapolate from all sorts of unlikely materials that are caught up in vital connections to and with individuals.

This chapter promotes an active, material, sensing (nonhuman) body with a progressive politics that desires to open up lines of engagement, connection and communication among feminist geographers and others.

Notes

2 The Waikato area was chosen as a research location, as Paula and Gail live and attend university in the area. Further, Gail’s respondents moved out of post-disaster Christchurch (South Island) to the Waikato (North Island) largely due to its geological stability. For more information and a map, see Hutcheson 2013.

3 In choosing the order of this chapter, we realize that scales are unable to be discrete and neatly contained (Marston, Jones and Woodward 2005). The material leaks across these conceptual boundaries with ease. We also acknowledge the selective use of scholarship, which is far from exhaustive and risks glossing over deeply rich work.
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