



This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Husso, Marita; Karkulehto, Sanna; Saresma, Tuija; Eilola, Jari; Siltala, Heli; Laitila, Aarno

Title: Ideological, Institutional and Affective Practices of Interpersonal Violence

Year: 2021

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © 2021 the Authors

Rights: In Copyright

Rights url: <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

Please cite the original version:

Husso, M., Karkulehto, S., Saresma, T., Eilola, J., Siltala, H., & Laitila, A. (2021). Ideological, Institutional and Affective Practices of Interpersonal Violence. In M. Husso, S. Karkulehto, T. Saresma, A. Laitila, J. Eilola, & H. Siltala (Eds.), Violence, Gender and Affect : Interpersonal, Institutional and Ideological Practices (pp. 3-26). Palgrave Macmillan. Palgrave Studies in Victims and Victimology. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56930-3_1

1 Ideological, Institutional and Affective Practices of Interpersonal Violence

Marita Husso <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3714-8477>

Sanna Karkulehto <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7267-9612>

Tuija Saresma <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0635-4902>

Jari Eilola <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1546-4097>

Heli Siltala <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9267-6117>

Aarno Laitila <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0314-5008>

Violence is a multidimensional phenomenon that involves violation, suffering, trauma and loss. It appears to be universal, established and widespread across the world and throughout human history (Besteman 2002; Krug 2002; De Haan 2009; Larry 2011; Ray 2011; Kilby 2013; Dobash and Dobash 2015). The concept of violence includes psychological threat, blame, humiliation and devaluation as well as the actual use of physical force or power, which may result in injury, death, psychological harm or deprivation. Violence is embedded in the social structures of power, inequality, institutions and regimes as well as in the symbolic order (Walby 2012, 2017; Hearn 2013; Husso, Virkki, Notko et al. 2017). It is manifested in human interaction, institutional and affective practices and ideological structures of cultural discourses and representations.

Violence not only reflects social conditions, attitudes and conceptions but also involves a wide range of mental processes intertwined with material, bodily and ‘carnal ways of being’ – affects – as well as emotions and feelings (Liljeström and Paasonen 2010). It arouses emotions, produces sensations and bears several kinds of passions and intensities that are considered mostly negative, such as anger, rage, fear and disgust. In witnesses of violence, it also evokes secondary complex emotions and moral sentiments, such as empathy, compassion and care, although secondary social emotions, such as hate, shame, embarrassment, frustration and guilt, may be present as well (Greco and Stenner 2008; Keen 2011; Hemmings 2012; Pedwell and Whitehead 2012; Pinker 2012; Åhäll 2018).

Affect and emotion influence the ways in which we think about, act in relation to and experience violence and violation, and they also, in part, frame how we make judgements in everyday life and draw conclusions. Emotion has a cognitive consequence. When it impacts how we think or our judgements and, ultimately, the way we act, it also impacts our ideological, institutional and affective practices (see Pedwell and Whitehead 2012; Smith et al. 2018).

At the intersection of violence, gender and affect

The current understanding of violence is based on the development of the modern state. In the early modern period, the growing sphere of central administration gave new meaning to the term ‘violence’, which had the aim of legitimating the governmental monopoly on violence. Physical violence as a medium of social control and conflict resolution was taken under the control of the centralised modern state, which imposed norms through consistent legislation and punishments. The new judicial system had the power to, on one hand, offer people peaceful means of resolving conflicts and, on the other hand, to punish those who did not follow the norms that it enacted (Ylikangas et al. 2000; Dinges 2004; Schwerhoff 2004). Since then, there have been tensions in attempts to define violence. Over the course of time, the negative connotations have strengthened and violence has been associated generally with illegitimate and unlawful behaviour (Sandmo 1999).

Violence is a context-dependent phenomenon, and what counts as violence in a certain time or place also varies. Generally, it can be said that there has been a downward trend in male-on-male violence and homicides over time in many so-called Western and Eurocentric countries. Simultaneously, certain patterns of serious violent acts have remained quite static over the centuries (Eisner 2003; Eibach 2016). Disciplining, for example, from a historical perspective, has had legitimacy in patriarchal societies; thus, men’s violence towards their wives and children has lingered in the grey area between legitimate discipline and criminalised violence. The contemporaries who witnessed the violence of men against their wives evaluated it as unacceptable or cruel depending on the personal circumstances or characteristics of the victim. However, the majority of violent acts were understood as a legitimate correction of insubordinate behaviour (Foyster 2005; Lindstedt Cronberg 2009).

Already in the premodern era, there were attempts to restrict violent behaviour and despotism and to reconcile disunity between spouses. However, these attempts expressed the Lutheran doctrine and patriarchal hierarchy (Roper 1991; Bailey 2003; Fiebranz 2005; Eibach 2016).

Patriarchy as a practice, ideology and form of structural violence exemplifies an unequal gender order in which men's hegemony dominates women and people of non-normative gender and sexuality, as well as other subordinated men in society. In other words, not only women and other marginalised people but also men who are structurally positioned in unequal relations are often violently shown their allegedly lower place in society.

Furthermore, for people of, for example, lower class, education and income, for people of colour, bodily or mentally non-normative or disabled people, patriarchal order causes unequal and harmful living conditions. The concept of patriarchy still has currency in understanding ideological, institutional and affective practices of violence. Recently, for example, the multitude of digital and online violence and abuse, online misogyny, decriminalisation of domestic violence against women and criminalisation of abortion in different parts of the world have addressed a new rise of a patriarchal ideology and hierarchical societal order (Saresma 2018a; Pease 2019). Moreover, daily reported violent crimes and increased hate speech especially on digital and social media affect our conceptions and emotions and influence the ways in which we act when encountering violence and violating practices (Saresma 2018b).

Emotion, affect and corporeality generate human agency, and gendered differences are produced by the prevailing ideological, institutional and affective practices where people live. Thereby, gender becomes 'a lived social relation' rather than a fixed location within societal relations (McNay 2004, 2008; Probyn 2005; Husso 2008; Husso and Hirvonen 2009, 2012; Connell and Pearse 2015; Husso, Virkki, Hirvonen et al. 2017). In the contemporary scholarly understanding, gender is regarded as a cultural construct. However, it is not

articulated only as a structural and societal phenomenon but also as an individual and private phenomenon, internalised in personal psychic and bodily experiences and lived realities.

These structural and personal dimensions as well as the context always affect the meaning and understanding of gender. Moreover, gender is constructed in performative repetitions and reiterations that produce the cultural understanding and idea of gender, be they repetitions of bodily gestures, expressions, positions or movements, or cultural discourses and representations producing meanings of gender (Butler 1990, 1993, 2004; Karkulehto and Rossi 2017). As structurally bound but also constantly constructed in situated, interactional and institutional conduct, gender differences are reproduced in a way that can be difficult to recognise, and such misrecognition can become a source of social suffering. However, gendered conventions and habits can also be reflected, learnt and negotiated once they are explicated (Husso 2016; Husso et al. 2017a). Thus, to recognise these differences, it is crucial to understand the intersection of violence, gender and affect.

Affect has an important role in gendered violent deeds and practices. In justifying violence both at the individual and collective levels, mobilising affect, such as fear or hatred, is vital. It is, however, not only the affective mobilisation of aggressive feelings, such as hate, but also shame and feelings of insufficiency on the part of the perpetrator that may motivate violence. The affect that victims or targets of violence experience can range from shame and humiliation to despair and exhaustion. In addition, those who witness violence – such as family members, proximates, professionals working in institutions or volunteers – experience sensations that are often neglected. On the subject of ethical responses to the grief, loss and pain of others, Ahmed (2004, p. 160; see also Boscacci 2018; Ettinger 2004) proposes the concept of “‘withness’ of intimacy, which involves the process of being affected by others”.

Affect as a theoretical approach allows for analysing violence from various perspectives ranging from social and cultural situations to experiences, practices and acts. Affect as a

concept facilitates scrutinising the effects of emotions or bodily feelings in meaning-making processes and identifying the factors that direct our actions even without our recognition. On one hand, the concept of affect is tied to our inner sensations even at the unconscious level, and on the other hand, they become manifested in conscious acts and may have cognitive representations (Rinne et al. 2020). Affect can be understood either as separate from cognitive processes or as a part of them (Wetherell 2012). Affect is regarded as a range of precognitive bodily sensations, and emotions are seen as discursively constructed, circulated social and cultural practices (Ahmed 2004). This understanding of affect, which Ahmed (2004) and Wetherell (2012) promote, does not separate (unconscious, bodily) affect from (cognitive, rational) emotion. Affect and emotion are not distinct but relational, and they have a special shared function in shaping feelings (Ahmed 2004, pp. 6–9, 44–45; see also Ngai 2005, p. 26; Strange and Cribb 2014, p. 6–8). This kind of understanding is particularly useful in its emphasis on the interconnectedness of embodied corporeality, representations and cultural and societal contexts. This multi-layered quality is characteristic of affective experiences and practices. An affective practice is an understanding that what we do, how we act and how we bring particular practices into being are emotionally laden (Smith et al. 2018; Piippo et al. in this volume). Affect, then, is present in all forms of violence and violation, from personal experiences and interpersonal encounters to institutional practices and detrimental ideologies. Thus, studying these forms of violence and violation from an interdisciplinary perspective is not only recommended but imperative to capture the linkages of affect to multiple forms of gendered violence.

Continuities of violence, violations and violating practices

In *Violence, Gender and Affect*, we aim to uncover and analyse the structures of violence and violating practices from interpersonal, institutional and ideological viewpoints. Although suffering is an individual experience, it is produced by the social structures and practices in which it is experienced. We take seriously the claim that suffering is a product of social forces and the incentive to study people's own experiences, but we nevertheless approach this question, above all, from a structural point of view (Bourdieu, 1999). For its part, the analysis of violence and violation also means facing the fact that exposing people to violence, violation and vulnerability, and protecting people from these attributes, is always also socially negotiated. Therefore, it is essential to pay attention to the question of whose experiences of hurting are taken seriously and what kinds of experiences of being hurt we are exposed to and protected against.

Theoretically, Gherardi's (2006) advice to start analysis with practices – not with either the individual or the collective actor – is utilised. The concept of practices is fruitful because it enables an analysis of the intersections between individuals, collectives and institutions and the situated contexts in which such connections take specific forms. Practices constitute the terrain on which subjects and objects take shape, language becomes discourse and knowledge is mobilised and maintained. In this way, the field of practices is the context in which the continuities of different forms of violence, concrete activities of encountering and intervening in violence and hidden forms of violating practices become visible and observable.

Violence and violating practices create challenges for perception and representation. It is confrontational to see, hear and sense violence without an obvious perpetrator (i.e. that seems to 'just happen'). Slow violence, for example, has been deemed a violence that occurs gradually and out of sight and "a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all" (Nixon 2011, p. 2). As a violating practice, slow violence includes structures, actions, events and

experiences which violate or cause violation or are considered violating. An essential feature of slow violence as well as a violating practice is that it is maintained by silence. Therefore, the challenge for research on the topic is to develop conceptual tools for analysing this silent, not easily observable, but fundamental reality of practices (Hearn and Parkin 2001; Husso, Virkki, Notko et al. 2017).

In this book, we consider the consequences of different forms of violence and violating practices for those who have been hurt. As a point of departure, vulnerability means recognising the fragility of human beings. Fragility as such is not a negative attribute. It is one of the central qualities of corporeal, feeling and thinking human beings and is a dimension consisting of sensitivity, flexibility and the ability to feel empathy and intimacy. However, it seems that in our culture, vulnerability has become a source of shame (Näre and Ronkainen 2007; Husso 2008). This manifests in our ways of responding to victims of violence and experiences and representations of weakness in general: when nobody wants to be a victim, people would rather focus on protecting their own psyche than on constructing empathy, opposing violence and protecting victims.

Although violence takes different forms in different contexts – in different times and places, in different institutions and social structures – and in different relationships and interactions, the continuities and interconnections between different forms of violence are extensive, and interdisciplinary perspectives on violence are required for understanding the intersections of violence, gender and affect (Hamby 2011; Hamby and Grych 2013). For example, gender-specific, pre-eminently misogynous online hate and hostility (Saresma 2018c) collectively represent a digitally mediated form of violence. This is a relatively new phenomenon as well as an integral part of the chain of violence. As a form of violent practice, such hate and hostility can manifest in the most intimate relationships (Al-Alosi 2017) and as ideological and political violence (Horsti and Saresma 2020). These kinds of practices are not only

violent themselves but also pave the way for an ideological readiness to use other types of violence (see Saresma et al. in this volume).

The necessity of recognising and acknowledging ideological, institutional and affective practices of violence concerns individuals, communities and societies suffering from violence and their need to deal with its effects. The sharing of experiences of violence is, thus, also a question of both communal and societal relationships and the global political order.

Objectifying and oppressive attitudes related to violence, violation and violating practices are also present in other social situations, ways of knowing and attempts to control and manage the world. They hinder the possibilities of forging relationships and inhabiting spaces that are based on reciprocity, where mutual recognition and acknowledgement can exist. At the same time, such attitudes uphold the existence of violence as a logical solution to problems – as a behaviour or practice that is attributable to circumstances or the characteristics of victims (Husso et. al 2017b; Husso et al. 2020).

To sum up, *Violence, Gender and Affect* introduces views and concepts that grasp the continuities of the multi-faceted phenomena of violence and violating practices and the intersection of violence, gender and affect in ways that exceed the limits of categorisation between the individual and the societal, the private and the public, thought and action, body and mind, reason and emotion and corporeal and digital. Accordingly, the objective of this interdisciplinary anthology is to analyse and uncover the structures of violence and violating practices from the perspective of vulnerability and social suffering.

Aim of the Book

This book is positioned at the intersection of violence, gender and affect. It reflects the historically and culturally specific understandings and theoretical considerations of the three

aforementioned multidimensional phenomena that have been under-researched together. It introduces diverse and often ignored and denied affect, feelings and emotions that are inextricably intertwined when working with violence, be it interpersonal, institutional, discursive, representational or ideological. In exploring these issues, the contributors to this book draw on a growing body of research that attends to the physically and emotionally abusive forms of violence and regards these expressions of violence as practices and social problems.

The chapters offer multidisciplinary perspectives on various forms of interpersonal, institutional and ideological violence and their affectivity based on recent studies conducted in different parts of the world, including Europe, the US, Africa and Australia. They present research results from various disciplines, such as cultural studies, environmental humanities, gender studies, history, linguistics, literature, media studies, psychology, social policy, social psychology, social work and sociology. From the perspective of violence studies, our emphasis is on addressing violating interpersonal, institutional and ideological practices as gendered and affective processes in daily life and institutions and in media and culture. In doing so, the book presents empirically and theoretically informed approaches to the intersection of violence, gender and affect and introduces interpersonal violence as a source of social inequality and as an integral part of structured power and social relations. The aim is to challenge conventional explanations, raise new questions and offer insights for understanding and resolving social problems related to violence and its prevention. The book's interdisciplinary approach calls for new conceptual and theoretical approaches to violence, gender and affect. In response, it offers theoretical and conceptual support alongside practical and pragmatic support for people suffering from violating practices, violence and violent affect or affect caused by violence. Further, the analyses and explanations that the chapters provide have value in amplifying the voices of those exposed

to violence, those witnessing violence and victims of violence. The book also offers a solid research basis for better violence prevention planning, policy formation and programme development. With its comprehensive and integrative approach, this book is meant to propose new ideas and tools for academics and practitioners to improve their theoretical and practical understandings of these phenomena in a globalised world.

Structure of the book

The book is divided into four parts to present differing but overlapping intersections of violence, gender and affect. After this introduction (Part I), the subsequent sections respectively deal with interpersonal violence (Part II), institutional violence (Part III) and ideological violence (Part IV).

Part II, Interpersonal Violence, lays the basis for understanding violence as a contextual, structural and gendered phenomenon by collecting chapters with historical, theoretical and conceptual accounts of gendered interpersonal and domestic violence and their interconnectedness with affect. The focus is on interpersonal violence as a phenomenon intertwined with emotions and affective practices in different historical times, places and relationships. The academic understanding of gender has broadened, whilst performing gender in more ways than just in the frame of a rigid binary gender system has become more culturally acceptable. This notwithstanding, a constant cross-cultural bias in interpersonal violence seems to go on and on; the majority of the perpetrators have historically been and still are male, whereas the majority of the victims of domestic and intimate partner violence have been and still are women. This part addresses the gendered groundwork of interpersonal violence: the conservative gender order and patriarchy as evident constituents of familial control, domestic homicides, men's violence against both women and men and, finally, the

emotions of gravity in violence prevention work and research of violence. The theme running through these chapters is that the early modern normative and patriarchal interpretation of gender roles, family and domestic hierarchies has shaped and is still shaping practices and regimes, such as judicial and cultural norms, which continue to emphasise gendered interpretations of the causes of certain acts of violence. At the same time, the tendency to explain violence and criminal behaviour either as a consequence of the victim's behaviour or as a socially restricted problem has prevented contemporaries from seeing the violating ideological, institutional and affective practices and, in part, rendered violence interventions ineffective.

Chapter 2, 'Familial Control, Collectivity and Gendered Shame: Past and Present Vulnerabilities' by Satu Lidman, focuses on familial control of women and gendered shame both historically and in contemporary culture. The author demonstrates the link between domestic violence and an understanding of shame and honour as collectively shared and how they are tied to heteronormativity and gendered perceptions of acceptable behaviour. Thus, questions concerning who has the right to use violence and against whom and who has the right to control are at the very heart of this chapter. Lidman argues that domestic violence and honour-related violence are entwined and that it would be unethical to either fully juxtapose them or keep silent about their partial parallels. By analysing the manifestations of honour-related violence both in contemporary and pre-modern Europe, she suggests that religion is not its major driving force, although honour-related violence is often associated with Islam. She highlights that it has been very common also in Christian Europe, as indeed all over the world, for patriarchal systems to dictate women's position and behaviour as wives, daughters or sisters. The patriarchal gender order is, thus, a more crucial factor behind honour-related violence than religion. Patriarchy is used to justify the use of power by elderly males over other family members, such as wives and daughters, thus tying familial relations with a

profoundly gendered honour code. In this patriarchal order, honour and shame are understood as collective rather than individual. In this context, male family members are allowed and obligated to control and punish ‘their’ women if they break the strict gendered norms. Lidman maintains that it is necessary to consider whether and in what contexts patriarchal gender roles, which emphasise collectivity, and other social norms may contribute to violence in close relationships. She suggests that in dealing with honour-related violence, shifting the shame from the victims to the perpetrators and describing honour-related violence as abuse will help in preventing it.

In Chapter 3, ‘Domestic Homicide and Emotions from the Late 19th Century to the 1920s’, Anna Kantanen and Jari Eilola continue the historical analysis of transformations of violence as a phenomenon and what counts as violence. They study the different forms of lethal domestic violence in Finland between the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Taking as their starting point the observation that there was a qualitative change in homicides and violence in Europe during that time, they enquire into how this ‘fatalistic violence’ (Cottier and Raciti 2013) is described in their archival materials. Fatalistic violence is characterised by strong feelings between the perpetrators and their victims. Perpetrators in 1890–1930 were, as they still are, most often male, and the victims were lovers or spouses, children and other relatives. The authors analyse archival materials from this period and suggest that many violent crimes were not impulsive but planned. Domestic violence cases ranged from killing one’s spouse (most often wives) to stabbing male siblings to murdering or poisoning multiple family members. Affect, such as hate, anger, fear and frustration, was frequently present. The perpetrators often meant to kill the victim and then commit suicide, and there was frequently evidence of their emotional disturbance. Kantanen and Eilola deepen the understanding of historical European domestic homicides by demonstrating that abusive relationships and prolonged violence were major causes of those homicides. They argue that the majority of

domestic violence cases exemplify the traditional and persistent forms of family violence, as homicide and severe violence were closely related to questions of household authority or inconsistencies in property disputes.

Bob Pease claims in Chapter 4, ‘Gendering Violence: Theorising the Links Between Men, Masculinities and Violence’, that instead of men’s violence against women being substantially different from men’s violence against men, there are actually commonalities between them that merit attention. He criticises individualistic approaches to violence and suggests that it should be acknowledged that all violence – including men’s violence against men – is gendered. Pease, thus, emphasises the patriarchal gender relations behind men’s violence against both men and women and the need to analyse patriarchy as structural violence and masculinity as a patriarchy-based ideology instead of analysing masculinities as individual and without a broader structural and ideological context. He states, ‘the ideological beliefs held by men who are violent towards women are the same beliefs informing men’s violence towards men’, including ‘a traditional understanding of manhood and masculinity, achieving status through fighting and a view of women as property’. Moreover, Pease encourages ‘intersectionalising’ men’s violence against men, acknowledging that it is not only women who are oppressed by patriarchy. Men’s power and privileges vary according to their social class, age, race and sexuality, to mention but a few of the intersecting differences. Pease’s examples of men’s violence – school shootings and homophobic and racist hate crimes – are based on the hierarchy of hegemonic masculinities and masculinities inferior to them.

In chapter 5, ‘Serious Emotions of Gravity: On Working on Men’s Violences and Violences to Women’, Jeff Hearn scrutinises the many emotional aspects of researching violence. He presents a multi-dimensional reflection of his vast experience of working with emotions and

violence since the late 1970s and brings forward emotions of gravity in various phases of the research process. He invites readers to a retrospective and intimate inspection of the violence prevention work done in the field and the academic research of violence in the past couple of decades. In doing so, he is focusing on the affects and emotions involved and substantiating how interpersonal, institutional and ideological practices are unavoidably intertwined in studying violence and violence prevention. He suggests that violence in itself and researching violence engender emotions, mostly negative, and stresses that awareness of these emotions is a vital part of researching violence. While many of the tasks in the work on violence elicit negative emotions, Hearn also refers to positive aspects, such as the importance of collegiality and togetherness. He discusses the challenges of the gendering of men and connecting feminist research and being male in researching men's violence in a profeminist way. The chapter shows that critical research on men's violence is urgently needed, although at the same time, there is a pressing ongoing call for both deepening and widening the scope of violence research. This book, for its part, offers some answers to that call, too.

Part III, titled *Institutional Violence*, comprises contributions regarding institutional and affective practices in different contexts of social and health care and the governmental processes of deporting asylum seekers. Whereas the previous sections mainly address gendered interpersonal and domestic violence and their intersections with affect, the four chapters in this part illuminate different forms and consequences of institutional violence: the affective practices of domestic violence interventions in social work as well as reporting, reflecting and recognising emotions in therapeutic work with domestic violence perpetrators; good and bad care and violent institutional practices in nursing homes; and deportations as a

form of slow violence from the perspective of anti-deportation protests. All four chapters address the continuities of violence from the perspective of institutional and affective practices and emotions as embodied experiences of judgements. In these chapters, affective practices draw on the idea that emotions influence the ways in which we think and act.

Special attention is paid to gendered practices and conceptions and to examining the ideological and institutional practices that affect the kinds of experiences and emotions of being hurt to which people are exposed and protected against.

In Chapter 6, ‘Institutional and Affective Practices of Domestic Violence Interventions in Social Work: Malignant Positioning of the Victims’, Sisko Piippo, Marita Husso, Pasi Hirvonen, Marianne Notko and Kateřina Glumbíková investigate the institutional and affective practices of domestic violence interventions in social work. The study examines the expressions of Finnish social workers’ emotions related to intervening in domestic violence and how these expressions position the victims. The process of encountering and intervening in domestic violence is often challenging; ideological presumptions, conceptions, gender-neutral discussions and misrecognition of violence influence institutional arrangements and practices and the ways in which professionals feel about and respond to the violence. The authors use positioning theory to analyse social workers’ focus group interview data. They consider, first, how emotions expressed by social workers assign positions and moral assumptions to the social workers’ and victims’ rights and duties and, second, how the display of emotions is connected to the social workers’ positioning of the victims. The findings suggest that gender neutrality, as an ideological and institutional practice, can be used to rationalise and justify the rejection of violence as a phenomenon as well as professional inactivity in addressing gendered violence. Therefore, changing institutional and affective practices that enable the malignant positioning of victims of violence requires

changing gender-neutral rhetoric in the conceptualisation of violence as well as ideological and institutional practices related to ignorance and the rejection of violence.

In Chapter 7, ‘Reporting, Reflecting and Recognising Emotions in Therapeutic Work with Domestic Violence Perpetrators: Experiences of the Jyväskylä Group Model’ by Heli Siltala, Helena Päivinen and Aarno Laitila, the view shifts to situations where domestic violence has been recognised and is being addressed by professionals. The chapter discusses the various ways in which professionals can focus on emotions in working with perpetrators of domestic violence. The analysed data comprise therapeutic group discussions with perpetrators participating in the Jyväskylä model for domestic violence. Theory-oriented content analysis of the data suggests that perpetrators’ self-regulation can be promoted by recognising and addressing primary feelings (vulnerability, fear, jealousy, etc.) that may manifest as anger and aggressive behaviour. Additionally, emotional processing may be utilised in promoting victim empathy and taking responsibility for one’s violent behaviour. The authors argue that long-term change towards non-violence requires understanding and processing emotions at several levels. Such emotion work can be highly beneficial, but it is also challenging for professionals, who must differentiate between accepting emotions and disapproving of violent behaviour. The authors also highlight that violence should not be conceptualised solely as a personal problem, as it is also strongly associated with ideological and institutional practices and factors such as power relations, the gendered orders and societal environment.

In Chapter 8, ‘(In)visibility of Good and Bad Practices in Nursing Homes: A Vicious Circle’, Ana Paula Gil discusses in more detail the ways in which institutional practices and detrimental working conditions constitute structural and institutional violence. The chapter explores insufficient and inadequate elderly care as forms of abuse and neglect and highlights the interdependence between working conditions and quality of care practices. The chapter is

based on interviews with care workers in Portuguese care homes. The data shed light on the differences between good and bad care and show how working conditions interfere in care quality practices in institutional settings. The findings reveal that excessive workloads and harsh working conditions, low qualifications and poor pay and organisational conflict lead to high staff turnover and staff shortages, which are the main factors underlying elder mistreatment in care practices. The poor working conditions affect the emotions and feelings and physical and mental health of care workers and, consequently, those in need of care. Thus, the lack of recognition of care work, poor wages and difficult working conditions of care workers have a direct impact on the quality of care, and these issues need to be addressed more efficiently to avoid institutional violence, abuse and neglect and ensure quality care for the elderly. The chapter addresses care work as a source of tension and inequalities of gender, age, race and immigration status.

In Chapter 9, ‘The Slow Violence of Deportability’, Karina Horsti and Päivi Pirkkalainen theorise deportation as an institutional practice and a form of slow violence that hurts not only its main target but also the people nearby. In 2015, European countries received an unprecedented number of asylum seekers. Later, the deportation of those whose requests for asylum had been rejected began. The Finnish Immigration Service significantly tightened its policies, and increasingly strict asylum criteria resulted in deportations at an unprecedented level. Consequently, protests against deportations increased and became publicly salient. While forced removal can be seen as a single, potentially violent act, deportability is a slow process. The violence ‘happens’ rather than ‘is done’ and, therefore, deportability may not be understood as violence. By analysing thematic interviews with people who have contested deportations, the authors examine how citizens who are proximate to deportable migrants ‘witness’ deportability and how they begin to see and feel the invisible, slow violence done to others and decide to act. Thus, making visible violence and violating ideological and

institutional practices that would otherwise remain unrecognized is crucial in current anti-deportation activism.

Part IV, *Ideological Violence*, discusses violence at a structural, political and belief-systems level. In this part, gendered and violent physical and verbal practices and cultural and political beliefs are explored in the framework of ideological violence. The section introduces four distinct approaches that dismantle the ways in which ideologies work behind or at the intersection of violence, gender and affect: racist verbal and physical humiliation and violence as a means of colonialism and white masculine power, hate speech as a form of verbal digital violence that circulates misogyny and racism, right-wing populist discourse and xenophobic policies as means of structural violence, and environmental slow violence as an example of anthropocentrism. These approaches pay special critical attention to gender and various masculinities and men's detrimental behaviour, behaviour of men holding hegemonic positions in particular. Alongside men's direct violence against women and men as manifestations of patriarchy, masculine manifestations of racism, white power, right-wing populist ideology and, on a wider scale, anthropocentrism are explored in a broader political context: colonialism, influential populist politicians' online communication, Brexit and climate change.

In Chapter 10, 'Humiliation and Violence in Kenyan History', Brett L. Shadle examines aspects of the history of violence, humiliation and racialised power dynamics in 20th-century Kenya. In colonial Kenya, it was whites who exercised violence and humiliation using both verbal and physical, often impulsive, violence to protect their status and to enforce a racial hierarchy. African Gikuyu men were powerless. They had to show deference and suffer

violence and humiliation. Shadle reads works produced by Gikuyu men, which often mention the humiliation and violence that they experienced. Besides physical humiliation, the authors of these accounts bitterly recall the actions and words that struck their self-image and challenged their self-understanding as full members of the community and as mature, responsible, adult men. The emotionally charged moments of violence and humiliation that the Gikuyu men endured were intensely personal and yet, within a larger colonial context, they experienced the attacks as less for their individual failings than for their race. The Gikuyu authors were compelled by humiliation and violence to think not just about themselves and their personal bitterness for being called ‘boy’ or being slapped but also about colonialism and neo-colonialism as ideologies. Whereas violence and humiliation left them deprived of human dignity, it also served as the basis of new understandings of racism and racial solidarity and, thus, of political action.

In Chapter 11, ‘Gendered Violence Online: Hate Speech as an Intersection of Misogyny and Racism’, Tuija Saresma, Sanna Karkulehto and Piia Varis continue scrutinising ideological violence by men as intersectional, turning their gaze to violent texts published on social media. They analyse misogynous and racist discourses that right-wing populist leaders Donald Trump in the United States and Jussi Halla-aho in Finland circulate in their tweets and blogs as a part of the contemporary right-wing populist upheaval. The authors argue that this type of gender-specific and racialising online hostility is a new, digitally mediated form of violence. Furthermore, they suggest that despite being a relatively new phenomenon, it is an integral part of the chain of violence. They emphasise that online discussions are not a separate sphere but that the effects of misogynous and racist online hate speech targeted at ‘others’ – be they women, immigrants or other marginalised people in society – also affect offline realities, preparing the ground for physical violence against certain kinds of people as enemies. Hate speech often utilises the affective rhetoric and binary logic of populism that

constructs ‘us’ and ‘them’ as hierarchic and adversarial groups. The authors apply the concept of stochastic violence to refer to ‘the simultaneously predictable and unpredictable nature of violent speech and its consequences’. Using the concept of stochastic violence, they emphasise that violent, hate-inciting speech, specifically as it appears in online environments, works to naturalise ‘others’ and the understanding of them as threats and targets of hostility, aggression and violence. They demonstrate that in justifying violence, inciting and mobilising affect, such as fear and hatred, is vital.

In Chapter 12, ‘Violence and Harm in the Context of Brexit – Gender, Class and the Migrant “Other”’, Marianne Hester discusses violence in the context of Brexit. She, too, emphasises the right-wing ideological background of present-day currents, arguing that neoliberalism generates increased inequalities which, in turn, generate violence. Hester analyses the processes of lying and xenophobia related to the Brexit campaign as structural violence and focuses on the roles of class, gender, sexuality and the geographical and ‘ethnic’ origins of migrants and citizens in the referendum campaign. She conceptualises the Brexit campaign, the referendum and their consequences as cultural violence using autoethnographically her own experiences as a non-UK EU citizen living in Britain. She brings to the fore questions of gender, race and sexuality in her analysis of Brexit, showing how far-right politics and the creation of a ‘hostile environment for illegal immigrants’ worked in the Brexit campaign by inciting fear and confusion in not only racialised others but also white middle class academic non-UK EU citizens. Hester deals with existential issues of identity and belonging, describing the anxieties that Brexit caused at the individual level while simultaneously reminding us of the big picture: the structural and ideological levels of right-wing nationalist, xenophobic and misogynous violence.

Part IV, *Ideological Violence*, closes with ‘Environmental Violence and Postnatural Oceans: Low Trophic Theory in the Registers of Feminist Posthumanities’, in which Marietta Radomska and Cecilia Åsberg take a new stance and discuss the latest and perhaps most invasive form of violence: environmental violence. Radomska and Åsberg enquire into how environmental violence is often hardly seen, as it occurs gradually, out of sight and on a long-term scale as subtle, slow violence. They also point out the gendered as well as ideological background and logic behind environmental violence and the ways in which it affects both the environment and the people. The future does not look promising, and it is justifiable to ask, as they do, what are our ethical obligations to our fellow species and the entire planet to right the violent practices and their consequences, which we have caused? Their answer is to engage in an ethics of cohabitation (cf. Karkulehto et al. 2020) and mutual flourishing ‘to confront our past mistakes, our current violences, our voracity, and the unknown harms we may be inflicting’. This kind of ethical approach of responsibility and care is indispensable and very much needed also when preventing gendered, ideological violence and scrutinising its related affect. The aim of this anthology is to bring this kind of ethics to the essential levels where violence occurs and affects us all: the interpersonal, the institutional and the ideological.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2004). *Cultural politics of emotion*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Al-Alosi, H. (2017). Cyber-violence: Digital abuse in the context of domestic violence. *UNSW Law Journal*, 40(4), 1573–1603.
- Bailey, J. (2003). *Unquiet lives: Marriage and marriage breakdown in England, 1660–1800*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Besteman, C. (Ed.) (2002). *Violence: A reader*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boscacci, L. (2018). Wit(h)nessing. *Environmental Humanities*, 10(1), 343–347.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999). *The weight of the world. Social suffering in contemporary society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Butler, J. (1990/1999). *Gender trouble. Feminism and the subversion of identity* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter. On the discursive limits of sex*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Connell, R., & Pearse, R. (2015). *Gender: In world perspective* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Cottier, M., & Raciti, S. (2013). From honour to subjectivity: Interpersonal violence in Basel 1750–1868 and Berne 1861–1944. *Crime, Histoire & Sociétés/Crime, History & Societies*, 17(2), pp. 101–124.
- De Haan, W. (2009). Violence as an essentially contested concept. In S. Body-Gendrot & P. Spierenburg (Eds.), *Violence in Europe: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 27–40). New York, NY: Springer.
- Dinges, M. (2004). The uses of justice as a form of social control in early modern Europe. In H. Roodenburg & P. Spierenburg (Eds.), *Social control in Europe. Volume 1: 1500–1800* (pp. 159–175). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (2015). *When men murder women*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Eibach, J. (2016). Violence and masculinity. In P. Knepper & A. Johansen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the history of crime and criminal justice* (pp. 229–249). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Eisner, M. (2003). Long-term historical trends in violent crime. *Crime and Justice*, 30, 83–142.
- Ettinger, B. (2004). Weaving a woman artist with-in the matrixial encounter-event. *Theory, Culture, and Society*, 21(1), 69–94.
- Fiebranz, R. (2005). Marital conflict over the gender division of labour in agrarian households, Sweden 1750–1850. In M. Ågren & A. L. Erickson (Eds.), *The marital economy in Scandinavia and Britain 1400–1900* (pp. 141–156). London, UK: Routledge.
- Foyster, E. (2005). *Marital violence: An English family history, 1660–1857*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gherardi, S. (2006). *Organizational knowledge: The texture of workplace learning*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Hamby, S. (2011). The second wave of violence scholarship: Integrating and broadening theories of violence. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(3), pp. 163–165.
- Hamby, S., & Grych, J. (2013). *The web of violence: Exploring connections among different forms of interpersonal violence and abuse*. London, UK: Springer.
- Hearn, J. (2013). The sociological significance of domestic violence: Tensions, paradoxes and implications. *Current Sociology, Special Issue: Violence and Society*, 61(2), 152–170.
- Hearn, J., Strid, S., Humbert, A.L., Balkmar, D., & Delaunay, M. (2020). From Gender Regimes to Violence Regimes: Re-thinking the Position of Violence. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, jxa022, <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxa022>
- Hearn, J., & Parkin, W. (2001). *Gender, sexuality and violence in organizations. The unspoken forces of organization violations*. London, UK: Sage.
- Horsti, K., & Saresma, T. (2020). Media technology in the rise of nationalist populism. In H. Tumbler & S. Waisbord (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to media misrepresentation and populism*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Husso, M. (2008). Book review: Elsbeth Probyn, Blush: Faces of Shame. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 11(3), 377–379. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1367549408091851>
- Husso, M. (2016). Sukupuoli tapaisutena ja elettyä suhteena. In Husso, M. & Heiskala, R. (Eds.), *Sukupuolikysymys* (pp. 73-91). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Husso, M., & Hirvonen, H. (2009). Feminism, embodied experience and recognition. An interview with Lois McNay. *NORA – Nordic Journal of Gender Research*, 17(1), 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740802694463>
- Husso, M., & Hirvonen, H. (2012). Gendered agency and emotions in the field of care work. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 19, 29–51.

Husso, M., Hirvonen, H., & Notko, M. (2017). From rejection to understanding: Towards a synthetic approach to interpersonal violence. In M. Husso, T. Virkki, M. Notko, H. Hirvonen, & J. Eilola (Eds.), *Interpersonal violence: Differences and connections* (pp. 227–234). London, UK: Routledge.

Husso, M., Notko, M., Virkki, T., Holma, J., Laitila, A., & Siltala, H. (2020). Domestic violence interventions in social and health care settings: Challenges of temporary projects and short-term solutions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1–22. Online first
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519898438>

Husso, M., Virkki, T., Hirvonen, H., Eilola, J., & Notko, M. (2017). A spatial-temporal, intersectional and institutional approach to interpersonal violence. In M. Husso, T. Virkki, M. Notko, H. Hirvonen, & J. Eilola (Eds.), *Interpersonal violence: Differences and connections* (pp. 1–13). London, UK: Routledge.

Husso, M., Virkki, T., Notko, M., Hirvonen, H., & Eilola, J. (Eds.) (2017). *Interpersonal violence: Differences and connections*. London, UK: Routledge.

Karkulehto, S., Koistinen, A-K., Lummaa, K., & Varis, E. (2020). Reconfiguring human, nonhuman and posthuman: Striving for more ethical cohabitation. In S. Karkulehto, A-K. Koistinen, & E. Varis (Eds.), Reconfiguring human, nonhuman and posthuman in literature and culture (pp. 1–19). New York, NY: Routledge.

Karkulehto, S., & Rossi, L-M. (2017). Lukemisen etiikkaa ja poliittikaan – sukupuolen ja väkivallan risteyksessä. In S. Karkulehto & L-M. Rossi (Eds.), *Sukupuoli ja väkivalta – lukemisen etiikkaa ja poliittikaan* (pp. 9–27). Helsinki, Finland: SKS – Finnish Literature Society.

Keen, S. (2011). Introduction: Narrative and the emotions. *Poetics Today*, 32(1), 1–53.
<https://doi.org/10.1215/03335372-1188176>

Kilby, J. (2013). Introduction to special issue: Theorizing violence. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 16(3), 261–272.

Krug, E. G., Mercy, J. A., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2002). The world report on violence and health. *The Lancet*, 360(9339), 1083–1088. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(02\)11133-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(02)11133-0)

Larry, R. (2011) *Violence and society*. London, UK: Sage.

Liljeström, M., & Paasonen, S. (2010). Introduction: Feeling differences. In M. Liljeström & S. Paasonen (Eds.), *Working with affect in feminist readings: Disturbing differences* (pp. 1–7). London, UK: Routledge.

Lindstedt Cronberg, M. (2009). *Med våldsam hand: Hustrumsshandel i 1800-talets Sverige. En studie av rättsliga, kyrkliga och politiska sammanhang*. Lund, Sweden: Lund University (Media-Tryck).

- McNay, L.(2004). Situated intersubjectivity. In B. Marshall & A. Witz (Eds.), Engendering the social. New York, NY: Open University Press.
- McNay, L. (2008). Against recognition. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Ngai, S. (2005). Ugly feelings. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nixon, R. (2011). Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Näre, S., & Ronkainen, S. (Eds.) (2007). Paljastettu intiimi - sukupuolistuneen väkivallan dynamiikka. Rovaniemi, Finland: Lapin yliopiston kustannus.
- Patil, V. (2013). From patriarchy to intersectionality: A transnational feminist assessment of how far we've really come. *Signs*, 38(4), 847–867.
- Pedwell, C., & Whitehead, A. (2012). Affecting feminism: Question of feeling in feminist theory. *Feminist Theory*, 13(2), 115–129.
- Pinker, S. (2012). The better angels of our nature: Why violence has declined. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Probyn, E. (2005). Blush: Faces of shame. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ray, L. (2011). Violence and society. London, UK: Sage.
- Rinne, J., Kajander, A., & Haanpää, R. (2020). Johdanto: Affektit ja tunteet kulttuurien tutkimuksessa. In J. Rinne, A. Kajander, & R. Haanpää (Eds.), *Affektit ja tunteet kulttuurien tutkimuksessa* (pp. 6–30). Helsinki, Finland: Ethnos.
- Roper, L. (1991). The holy household: Women and morals in Reformation Augsburg. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Sandmo, E. (1999). *Voldsamfunnets undergang*. Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Saresma, T. (2018a). Circulating the origin myth of Western civilization – the racial imagery of ‘men of the north’ as an imaginary heritage in white supremacist blogs. In D. Morse, Z. Réti, & M. Takács (Eds.), (Web)Sites of memory. Cultural heritage in the digital age (pp. 68–81). Debrecen, Hungary: University of Debrecen..
- Saresma, T. (2018b). Politics of fear and racialized rape: Intersectional reading of the Kempele rape case. In P. Hervik (Ed.), Racialization, racism and anti-racism in the Nordic countries (pp. 63–91). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saresma, T. (2018c). Gender populism – three cases of Finns Party actors’ traditionalist anti-feminism. In U. Kovala, E. Palonen, M. Ruotsalainen, & T. Saresma (Eds.), Populism on the loose (pp. 177–200). Jyväskylä, Finland: Nykykulttuuri. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-7401-5>

Schwerhoff, G. (2004). Social control of violence, violence as social control: The case of early modern Germany. In H. Roodenburg & P. Spierenburg (Eds.), *Social control in Europe. Volume 1: 1500–1800* (pp. 220–246). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Smith, L., Wetherell, M., & Campbell, G. (2018). *Emotion, affective practices, and the past in the present*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Strange, C., & Cribb, R. (2014). Historical perspectives on honour, violence and emotion. In C. Strange, R. Cribb, & C. E. Forth (Eds.), *Honour, violence and emotions in history* (pp. 1–22). London, UK: Bloomsbury Academic.

Walby, S. (2012). Violence and society: An introduction to an emerging field of sociology. *Current Sociology*, 60(7), 1–17.

Walby, S., & Towers, J. (2017). Measuring violence to end violence: Mainstreaming gender. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*, 1(1), 11–31.

<https://doi.org/10.1332/239868017x14913081639155>

Wetherell, M. (2012). *Affect and emotions: A new social understanding*. Croydon, UK: Sage.

Ylikangas, H., Johansen, J. C. V., Johansson, K., & Næss, H. E. (2000). Family, state, and patterns of criminality: Major tendencies in the work of the courts, 1550–1850. In E. Österberg & S. B. Sogner (Eds.), *People meet the law: Control and conflict-handling in the courts. The Nordic countries in the post-Reformation and pre-industrial period* (pp. 57–139). Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.

Åhäll, L. (2018). Affect as methodology: Feminism and the politics of emotion. *International Political Sociology*, 12, 36–52.