Introduction

Observing Greenpeace through the Systems-theoretic Lens

> I think a lot of stuff that we do is not the things that we're campaigning about. It's about changing the world, the way people feel about their place in society, and what they can do, what they can achieve.
>
> When I was young I wanted to work for Greenpeace because they changed things. Gave people hope. Gave me hope. To think that I wasn't a nonexistent person who had to wait every five years to vote for candidates I didn't care about. Showed that you could have an influence as an individual or a group of individuals. I thought there was an organization that meant something, and allowed me to become more meaningful as a part of society, allowed me to say things I wouldn't be able to say otherwise.
>
> —John, Greenpeace Fundraising Director

Few protest campaigns by individual social movement organizations have been as deeply engrained in the global collective consciousness as the Greenpeace campaign against whaling, with its pictures of tiny inflatables going between the ready-to-fire harpoons and the fleeing whales. Greenpeace started to undertake direct actions against whaling ships in 1975. The protests of Greenpeace and many other organizations helped to raise enormous awareness of whaling around the globe and to mobilize international pressure on whaling nations to stop the practice. The argument can be made that the international protests were successful on many fronts. In 1986, a moratorium on commercial whaling decided by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) became effective. It is still in force at the time of writing. Iceland gave up commercial whaling from 1986 until 2006. In

Norway, too, there was no commercial whaling during the period 1988–1992. Japan only conducts whaling for purposes of 'scientific research'.

However, depending on the choice of perspective, it is also possible to make the reverse argument that the anti-whaling protests were unsuccessful in many respects (see Giugni 1998 on the difficulty of assessing the outcomes of protest). At the time of writing, Japan, Iceland and Norway were still allowing whaling or had allowed it to resume. Communication between the global anti-whaling and pro-whaling camps in general and between these two camps in the IWC in particular appears to be deadlocked (Kalland 2012; see also Dorsey 2013).

The Greenpeace campaign against whaling in Norway may be considered a prime example of unsuccessful anti-whaling protest. As I will explain, Greenpeace (and others campaigning against whaling) failed to convince Norwegians that whaling should be stopped, as the anti-whaling campaign was anathema to Norwegians on grounds of their culture and history. Indeed, in a reversal of Greenpeace's self-perception as environmental Davids fighting the Norwegian whale-butchering Goliaths, Greenpeace and the anti-whaling protest community were perceived by Norwegians as foreign oppressive Goliaths and sentimental hippies attempting to impose cultural imperialism on Norway, the environmental David. The anti-whaling protests provoked a committed and sustained counter-campaign by pro-whaling activists (see for example Kalland 2012), as well as general public resistance in Norway. The conflict between Greenpeace and other anti-whaling activists and their Norwegian opponents became known in Norway as the 'whale war' (Furuly 1993b; Johannessen and Bertinussen 1995; Jonassen 1993; Mathismoen 1992a).

In the late 1990s, Greenpeace attempted to redress this deadlocked situation through an in-depth analysis of and a concerted strategy change in its whale campaign in Norway. This book describes Greenpeace's public activities in the whale campaign in Norway from the campaign's beginnings in the late 1970s and the 1980s until 2006, and analyses the organization-internal dynamics behind the campaign. The book's particular focus is on the processes of organizational 'stuckness' of the early to mid-1990s and the processes of organizational reflection and strategy change of the late 1990s.

While the histories of Greenpeace and of whaling in Norway are interesting in and of themselves (see Dorsey 2013; Zelko 2013), the kind of research presented in this book is also important because it can increase our understanding of why and how social movement organizations succeed in achieving social change, or why and how they fail to do so. It can increase our understanding of the conditions and causes of the outcomes of protest. This is a subject we know too little about (Giugni 1998; Louis 2009). We do

know that while the social context of protest influences what protest can achieve, the specific activities of protesters also contribute to the success or failure of protest. What protesters do matters for what they can accomplish (Gamson 1975; Giugni 1999). In particular, it matters how they organize, make collective decisions, keep their collective action going. Hence, theorists and practitioners alike can learn about protest effectiveness from studying the internal dynamics of protest (McAdam et al. 1988; Banaszak 1996; see also Tilly 1999). And they can learn at least as much from analysing the organizing mistakes as from the success stories (see also Giugni 1999). Yet the mistakes of social movement organizations such as Greenpeace have rarely been the focus of movement analysts (Minkoff and McCarthy 2005).

Protesters' organizing and decisions – and their mistakes – are influenced by their values, their identities and their perceptions (Banaszak 1996; Van Zomeren et al. 2008). Thus, we need to understand these values, identities and perceptions in order to understand the success and failure of protest. In particular, we need to understand the 'blind spots' of protesters and protest organizations, their 'inability to hear or understand what others are saying' (Mansbridge 1986: 118, 191) that come with their values and identities. In-depth case studies of individual social movement organizations and campaigns are a good research strategy for this, as they can provide us with detailed, contextualized, 'thick' descriptions (Geertz 1973)[1] and interpretations of the organizational processes behind protest. They can inform us about the meaning protesters produce (see for example Yin 1994; Stake 1995; Tilly 2006).[2]

This book analyses Greenpeace's organizational dynamics in the history of its campaign against whaling in Norway. It seeks to understand the values, identities and perceptions, blind spots and inability to hear or understand what others were saying, that influenced these organizational dynamics. It also analyses Greenpeace's organization-internal reflection about all of these and Greenpeace's attempts to improve the situation in Norway. I hope that it will contribute towards an increased understanding of social movement organizations' effectiveness (or lack thereof) in achieving social change.

I witnessed part of Greenpeace's processes of organizational reflection and change myself, as I worked as a full-time volunteer for Greenpeace in Scandinavia from the summer of 1998 to the summer of 1999. Years later, during my Ph.D. trajectory and the process of writing this book, I conducted twenty-five semi-structured in-depth interviews about the Greenpeace whale campaign with twenty-two current and former employees of Greenpeace in Scandinavia, from activists to Executive Directors.[3] I also analysed internal and public Greenpeace materials, articles from newspapers in Norway and other countries, and different websites. I was thus able to develop a case

narrative and interpretation. (For a more detailed account of the research process and methodology, see Riese 2015.)

In this book, I hope to have faithfully represented, and done justice to, the differential perspectives of my informants. My interviewees are not quoted under their real names. I do not quote all individuals I interviewed, as not all of them gave me permission to do so. To improve readability, direct quotations from the interview transcripts have been shortened and edited for verbal tics, grammatical and syntactical errors, etc., that are acceptable in conversation but would have made them difficult to read.

I analyse Greenpeace's situation in Norway and Greenpeace's organization-internal processes from a systems-theoretic perspective. In particular, I use the systems-theoretic conceptual framework of 'double bind' to describe how Greenpeace manoeuvred itself into a situation in Norway where, whatever it did, it was always bound to lose – and how it later tried to get out of that situation. In addition to the double bind framework, I draw mainly on the theory of autopoietic social systems as developed by Niklas Luhmann (1927–1998), a German sociologist.

Application of this type of systems theory in the field of protest and social movement research has been limited (but see Ahlemeyer 1995; Luhmann 1997c). This is regrettable, since this theory has great explanatory power and solves various theoretical problems other theories have struggled with (see for example Bakken and Hernes 2003b). In particular, the theory is useful for explaining organizational processes and dynamics (see for example Luhmann 2006; Bakken and Hernes 2003a; Seidl and Becker 2005b). The contribution it can make to the study of protest is potentially great (Hellmann 1998, 2000; Ahlemeyer 1995).

The problem with the plan of using Luhmann's theory of autopoietic social systems to analyse the Greenpeace whale campaign in Norway is that, as Seidl and Becker (2005a: 10) put it, when starting to read Luhmann it takes one or two hundred pages before one understands anything. It is a highly abstract theory which draws on Luhmann's encyclopedic knowledge of the theorizing of thinkers such as Husserl, Parsons, Spencer-Brown, etc. – we might call it a theorists' theory. To begin to understand how the theory might help one to understand social realities, one must then proceed to read hundreds of pages more. (In German.) Consequently, there is a good chance that a reader who has never studied Luhmann before will find a comparatively short and condensed exposition of his theory gruelling and hard to understand. It should be noted that empirical application of Luhmann's theory has generally been limited so far, which is probably an indicator of how challenging an undertaking it is perceived to be (Becker and Seidl 2007;

Vos 2005; but see Nassehi and Nollmann 2004, who say that Luhmann's theory is actually very empirical).

Furthermore, it has to be said that Luhmann is not exactly uncontroversial, whether in his own field or in other disciplines. His theory provokes quite fierce reactions, both of approval and rejection, which is surely due in part to its abstractness and complexity, but also to its highly idiosyncratic character. One reason why its application in protest and social movement research has been limited may be that it is – in my view, wrongly – suspected to be in favour of (structural) conservatism and the status quo (see Hellmann 2000; Rucht and Roth 1992). Another may be that Luhmann comes across, in Nassehi and Nollmann's (2004) words, as an 'aloof ironist' (p. 16, my translation). This possibly makes him less appealing to social movement researchers than for example Bourdieu, who much more than Luhmann is seen, and saw himself, as a political intellectual and political fighter. (As an example of Luhmann being unappealing to social movement researchers, see Luhmann 1988.) The double bind framework is not uncontroversial either (see for example Olson 1972; Putnam 1986).

I do not wish the readership of this book to be limited to systems theory aficionados. In order to make the Greenpeace Norway case accessible to a diverse audience, I have chosen a limited number of systems-theoretic ideas to include and use in the main part of this book, and try to present these in as intuitive and accessible a fashion as possible. The interested reader will find some additional systems-theoretic explanations in the appendix. Choosing this strategy means that I cannot convey the complexity of the theory (let alone discuss its historical development, critical reception, etc.). I hope, however, that the ideas I do include, in the form I include them, will help readers, like they helped me, to understand the case of Greenpeace in Norway.

So which ideas are these? Niklas Luhmann was strongly influenced by the work of the biologists Maturana and Varela, who researched the functioning of the human nervous system (Hernes and Bakken 2003: 13f.). One of their main points is based on the following fact: it can be demonstrated that there is no unambiguous correlation between the wavelength of the colour of an object that we see and the activity pattern or state of the neural system. Meanwhile, a particular state of the neural system does correspond with the name we give a colour. Maturana's and Varela's message is that how we see an object is not determined by the characteristics of that object in itself. How we see an object – our experience – is determined by our own structure of cognition. The neural system is structurally determined (Maturana and Varela 1987: 26f., Ch. 7; Bakken 2000: 64ff.; Simon 2000a: Ch. 4).

This means that we should not think of cognition as an input-output model (as in, the environment gives an open system information). We should use a concept of operationally closed systems (Maturana and Varela 1987: Ch. 6, 176ff.; Bakken 2000: 74f.; Simon 2000a: 79). Maturana and Varela used the term autopoiesis (Greek: autos = self, poiein = to make) to describe living systems characterized by the ability to produce and reproduce the elements they consist of. An autopoietic system is operationally closed because the operations leading to the productions of new elements in the system are dependent on earlier operations of the system and are the basis for the following operations (Maturana and Varela 1987: 50ff.; Maturana 1999: 153f.; Baraldi, Corsi and Esposito 1997: 29f.; Luhmann 1997b: 65ff.). States of the nervous system trigger other states of the nervous system. These states cannot be produced outside of the system and then 'transferred' into the system. Neither can the system transfer its states into another system. If it is no longer possible for the nervous system to connect one state to another, the system will cease to exist (Maturana and Varela 1987: 186f.; Simon 2000a: 78ff.).

Luhmann generalizes the concept of autopoiesis and applies it to psychic and, most importantly, social systems (Luhmann 1997b: 66; Baraldi, Corsi and Esposito 1997: 29f.). In the Luhmannian framework, both psychic systems and social systems are understood to produce their own states, or elements, and connect one element to the next one, and then to the next one, and so forth. The elements of a psychic or social system cannot be produced outside of that particular system and then transferred into the system. Neither can a psychic or social system transfer its elements into another system. The elements of psychic systems are experiences; the elements of social systems, communications.

Information in social and psychic systems, then, is a system-internal quality. In the case of an autopoietic system, information cannot be in the system's environment and then be transferred into the system as an 'input' to which the system is open. For example, a psychic system cannot 'give' information to another psychic system. Neither can it 'give' information to a social system. Instead, information depends on the system in which it is processed. It is produced in the system. In the tradition of Bateson, systems theory scholars say that information is 'a difference which makes a difference' (Luhmann 1995b: 40; Bateson 1983b: 582). If something makes a difference in a system, it is information for that system. On the other hand, if something does not make a difference in a system, then it is not information for that system (Luhmann 1990: 45). For example, when you hear people talk in a language you do not understand, their talk is simply white noise for you and

not information. It does not make a difference to you what noises they make, because you don't understand any of the noises anyway.

While psychic and social systems are operationally closed, they are cognitively open. External stimuli can serve as perturbations to a psychic or social system, which are then processed by the cognitive structure of the system. The metaphor of a kaleidoscope is apt here (Simon 2000a): an external stimulus (a shake, an impact) can induce the kaleidoscope to rearrange its internal colourful structures. But this rearranging takes place under the terms of the kaleidoscope, it is done by the kaleidoscope itself. If one tried to directly arrange the coloured bits and pieces inside the kaleidoscope, one would in effect destroy it. An autopoietic system can and does realize and process perturbations from outside, but on its own terms.

This means that psychic and social systems can and do influence each other, but in the sense of mutual perturbation, not in a sense of mutual determination. If we take Luhmann's theory as a working basis, we become sceptical of our everyday notion that individuals may 'steer' or even 'force' social systems to operate in a certain way (as in, the boss is at the wheel of the company). Social systems possess autonomy; they possess *eigen*-dynamics which cannot be determined by psychic systems. (Neither can social systems control psychic systems.) A member of an organization may have ideas on how to improve the work of the organization, and she may try to make the organization adopt those ideas. But if the organization doesn't buy them, doesn't get them, doesn't adopt them on its own terms, then her efforts will be futile. Greenpeace in Norway illustrates this neatly: Norwegian Greenpeacers did see, and did try to make their organization see, that Greenpeace's campaigning in Norway was counterproductive. But for a long time, they could not get their organization to understand this.

In a unique way, Luhmann's theory acknowledges research findings which make it clear that it is impossible to explain social events by referring to mental states of actors. The social situation is decisive for how individuals 'act' or, indeed, for what constitutes an 'action' or an 'actor,' or for what an 'action' means (see for example Ellemers 2012 or Ellemers and de Gilder 2012; Luhmann makes this point in Luhmann 1995b: 165f.). Interestingly, Luhmann's theory was eagerly taken up by family therapists (Simon 2000b). Family therapists know that the thoughts and needs of individuals often, mysteriously, fail to be communicated in the social system that is the family. They also know that dysfunctional patterns in families often seem to emerge against the will or 'behind the backs' of the family members. The longer one looks at a particular family, the more impossible it becomes to pinpoint who started a particular pattern, or who is causing a particular problem. Thus, in a unique way, Luhmann's theory frees us from having to attribute

responsibility for social events to individuals and their supposed motives (although Luhmann is clear that such processes of attribution are very much a part of our lives). It frees us from having to play the blame game.

My interpretation of Greenpeace's problems in Norway revolves to a considerable degree around the problem of internal 'representation' of the environment in operationally closed systems. Because social systems cannot receive direct informational input from their environment, they can never know what their environment 'is really like' (Luhmann 1995b: 34f.). (This idea is by no means exclusive to Luhmann. See for example Burr 2003: Ch. 5.) Instead, in the process of (system-internal) cognition, the social system, on the basis of the external perturbations it processes, produces an internal under-complex reconstruction of what is outside of it. The reconstruction must be under-complex, because the system is less complex than the environment. If the reconstruction were complete – if there were a point-to-point correspondence between system and environment – the system would have to be as complex as its environment, and then it would be pointless to speak of a system. (Luhmann does not even accept the term representation instead of reconstruction, for even this would be too hopeful; Luhmann 1984: 47ff.; Luhmann 2006: 314; Luhmann 1997b: 124.)

It is intuitively understandable that it is decisive just which differences make a difference for the system, what exactly is information for the system (and what is merely white noise). What if the system misses crucial points about its environment? What if its internal reconstruction of its environment is under-complex in a bad way, such that it does not include things that are important for the continued reproduction – in other words, existence – of the system (Luhmann 1984: 47ff.)? What makes such situations particularly dangerous and difficult is the fact that a social system can miss a point *and* fail to understand that it has missed a point. In other words, a social system can miss environmental perturbations that indicate it is not picking up important environmental perturbations. (The analogous argument applies to psychic systems.) As we shall see, this is exactly what happened to Greenpeace in Norway.

The fact that this resulted in a notable lack of success for Greenpeace in Norway for a long time did not really make the organization reconsider its strategy (at least not in a comprehensive fashion). It is often taken for granted that if a social system does not reach its goals, the social system will reflect on why not, and change its strategy. Not so, says Luhmann: purpose is not a sufficient guide for action or reflection. Building on March and Simon (1958: 165), Luhmann says that purposes, such as stopping whaling, are not motives which allow one to understand and explain organizations' operations, although organizations may use a purpose as a justification for certain

decision chains.[4] The main 'purpose' or 'goal', the first priority, of an autopoietic system such as an organization is to continue operating, maintaining its own autopoiesis (Luhmann 2006: 165, 183–185, 256f.). What Greenpeace did in Norway did serve the function of enabling Greenpeace's own autopoiesis. It meant that Greenpeace could continue operating, and it mobilized support for Greenpeace in many countries (although not in Norway). So the fact that it did not reach its goal did not suffice to make the social system Greenpeace change.

It should be noted again at this point that Luhmann does not explain social autopoiesis in terms of motives or thoughts of individual actors (psychic systems). The fact that the main 'purpose' of an organization is to reproduce itself is not explained for example by the wish of its members not to lose their jobs in the organization. Instead it is seen as being similar to a human body (also an autopoietic system) continuously renewing its cells and so on, i.e. continuing its own autopoiesis, without any particular 'motive' or 'goal' except continued existence. It will be seen that this applies to Greenpeace in Norway, as well. That Greenpeace did not win the whale campaign mattered enormously to all Greenpeacers, both Norwegian and international. They would have liked to win the whale campaign all along. Also, most of them would have been able to find a good job with a different organization (and many eventually did). Greenpeacers' individual motives and interests are not a sufficient explanation for the social system Greenpeace's inability to change its whale campaign strategy.

According to Luhmann, reflection happens when, instead of unquestioningly continuing to reproduce itself, the system observes itself as a contingent unity in an environment. Something is called contingent when, to put it very simply, it could be otherwise. Contingent is 'neither necessary nor impossible' (Luhmann 1984: 152; Luhmann 1995b: 106). When observing itself as a contingent unity in an environment, the system is, potentially, able to compare this unity with alternatives. It is, potentially, able to realize whether it has failed to pick up on important environmental perturbations, and to choose to operate differently in the future so as to take these into account.

It must be emphasized that reflection is a special achievement, not something we can expect to happen all the time (Luhmann 1984: 601f., 617ff.; Baraldi, Corsi and Esposito 1997: 154f.). For an autopoietic system, whose main 'goal' is to maintain its own autopoiesis, the next step is typically more important than the future, because without the next step it will not reach the future (Luhmann 1990: 38; Luhmann 2006: 53). So it mostly just goes on reproducing without reflecting on its reproduction. Strictly speaking, social systems don't need reflection – as long as their operations work well

enough for them to survive (Vos 2005: 375). And when their operations no longer work well enough for them to survive, it is often too late for reflection anyway.

If and when a system reflects, uncertainty is increased. Reflection makes life harder for a social system, because it produces awareness that the system's structure is contingent, that the system could communicate differently, that it might have failed to process important environmental perturbations. The analogous argument applies on the level of the psychic system: an individual who consciously thinks about every step she takes and wonders whether she should have taken a different step will find it hard to walk. In this sense, it is healthy that social systems (and psychic systems) do not reflect all the time.

In reflection processes of social systems, such as Greenpeace's, emotions play an important role.[5] This is because emotions can be signals indicating the viability of a social system, its 'fit' with the environment.[6] Emotions may signal that the structure of the social system is viable in the environment, in other words, that the social system is doing well and should continue like this. In other cases, emotions may signal that the social system is threatened in some way (cf. Ciompi 2004). They may then trigger contradiction in the social system.[7] Luhmann speaks of the immune function of contradiction. Contradiction can help the social system to protect itself with the help of changes 'against rigidifying into repeated, but no longer environmentally adequate, patterns of behavior' (Luhmann 1995b: 371f.).[8]

A social system which wants to reflect on its own structure – an organization undergoing planned change, or a family in a therapeutic setting – must take into account the emotions the system's members experience. Emotions signify 'reasons' why the current structure is adequate in the environment. But they also signify potential dangers, 'reasons' why the structure is no longer sustainable. A social system which is able to communicate about its members' emotions, and to create an awareness of them, may succeed at reflecting on potential gaps between its actual structure and the structure that would be necessary. In consequence, it may be able to change purposefully for the better. On the other hand, a social system can waste a lot of time and resources talking about the 'factual' side of problems if it doesn't pay attention to the 'underlying' emotions (Günther 2004). Family therapists and organizational consultants have of course long known this (see for example Kahn 2003; Stein 2001; Vince and Broussine 1996; Watzlawick 1978). This book thus proceeds from the assumption that in order to behave 'rationally,' an organization must be 'emotional' (see also Carr 2001).[9] Further systems-theoretic concepts will be explained in subsequent chapters.

The book is structured as follows. In Chapter 1, I account for the early history of Greenpeace and provide a short introduction to Norwegian history

and culture. The dynamics of the 'whale war' between Greenpeace and Norwegians can only be understood against the background of these histories. When Greenpeace protested against whaling in Norway, Greenpeace's organizational self-description clashed with the dominant Norwegian self-description. Because both Greenpeacers and Norwegians were strongly emotionally attached to their respective self-descriptions, the confrontations between the two groups became highly emotionally charged.

Chapter 2 offers a short overview of the history of Greenpeace Sweden and Greenpeace Denmark before the two organizations merged with Greenpeace Finland and Greenpeace Norway to form Greenpeace Nordic. Greenpeace in Sweden, before the merger into Greenpeace Nordic, was the organization which first adopted the approach that came to be known as 'ultimate campaigning' or '*Phyllis Cormack* campaigning'. This approach was then brought to bear on Greenpeace's anti-whaling campaign in Norway in 1998–1999. Greenpeace in Denmark engaged in serious conflict with the umbrella organization Greenpeace International (based in Amsterdam) over a campaign in 1996. This experience became relevant when Greenpeace Nordic had to convince Greenpeace International of its new strategy for the Norwegian anti-whaling campaign in 1998–1999.

In Chapter 3, I describe the history of Greenpeace's anti-whaling campaign in Norway from 1988, the year Greenpeace opened its Norwegian office, until the merger into Greenpeace Nordic. This history was characterized by what I call 'loops of chaotic communication': the 'David against Goliath' chaos communication loop, the external 'campaigning against each other' chaos communication loop, and the internal 'campaigning against each other' chaos communication loop. These loops were unproductive, but unfortunately also self-reproducing and self-reinforcing, patterns of communication that Greenpeace was unable to get out of. I explain that Greenpeace Norway got caught in a pathogenic organizational double bind, a situation where it was 'damned whatever it did'. This organizational dynamics was due, to a considerable extent, to the fact that the organization was emotionally attached to its self-descriptions.

Chapter 4 first describes the process of merging the Greenpeace offices in Finland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark that took place between 1997 and 1999, and the resulting regional organization. I then account for Greenpeace's organizational reflection about the campaign against Norwegian whaling and about the related organizational self-descriptions, a reflection that led to a strategy change in the campaign in 1999. In particular, I describe how two Greenpeacers I will call Nils and John acted as change agents and put their organization in a therapeutic organizational double bind. Therapeutic organizational double bind is a method of intervention which is

employed in order to enable an organization to resolve the pathogenic organizational double bind it is caught in.

Chapter 5 explains how, after Nils and John left Greenpeace Nordic in 2000, the organization relapsed into the pathogenic organizational double bind that characterized the campaign against Norwegian whaling. I conclude with some reflections about reflection in protest organizations. The appendix offers some additional systems-theoretic explanations.

Notes

1. Geertz indicates that he borrowed the notion of 'thick description' from Gilbert Ryle.
2. Ideally, we should compare systematically across cases, movements and time (Benford 1997; Minkoff and McCarthy 2005); but of course an in-depth understanding of individual cases is a prerequisite for this.
3. The interviews took place in 2005 and 2006. Interviews with Swedes were done in Swedish, and translated into English by me. All other interviews were conducted in English.
4. Luhmann (2006: 165) quotes March's idea that organizations are systems that search for purposes (see March and Olsen 1976).
5. The theoretical ideas on emotions included here were earlier published in Riese, J. 2011. 'Functions, Communication, and Perception of Emotions in Luhmannian Theory: Emotions as Reflection Resources of Social Systems', *Soziale Systeme. Zeitschrift für soziologische Theorie* 17(1): 53–72. Republished with permission.
6. Luhmann regards emotions strictly as a psychic phenomenon (Luhmann 1984: 370ff.; cf. Baecker 2004: 10). A social system cannot have emotions (cf. Simon 2004). However, because humans are social animals who find it difficult to live and survive in social isolation, in other words, who depend on 'their' social systems for their own autopoiesis, human psychic systems will develop emotional reactions concerning the perceived degree of viability of the social system.
7. This argumentation is compatible with Ciompi's (2004) *Affektlogik*: Ciompi says that emotional energies can organize a social system in a certain way, until increasing emotional tensions provoke an abrupt bifurcation, a switch to a different pattern when it is no longer possible to cope with a situation in 'the usual way'.
8. Emotions can become relevant or processable in the social sphere in two ways. Firstly, communication can communicate about emotions; emotions can become information in communication. This holds true both for verbal and nonverbal communication. Secondly, emotions can 'show' themselves without being communicated about; we can 'sense' them in others (cf. Simon 2004). Emotions can become information in another's psychic system as a result of perception without any communication having happened. Following Weinbach (2004a, 2004b), I suggest using the – originally Bourdieusian – term 'habitus' to denote this pathway for emotions to become relevant in the social sphere (see Bourdieu 1990, 2001). It is reasonable to think that the perception of emotion via habitus is 'fuller', closer to

the 'real' emotion, than 'mere' communication about an emotion. Seeing an emotion in others might induce us to empathize, mirror the feeling, relate to it. Perception of emotions also has an advantage over communication of emotions with respect to speed and immediacy.

9. Goodwin, Jasper and Polletta note in their aptly titled contribution 'The Return of the Repressed' (2000) that much of the social movement literature is characterized by a 'cognitive bent' (see also Benford 1997). Emotions are often equated with irrationality; it is assumed that emotions and rationality are incompatible (Aminzade and McAdam 2002). The social movement literature shares its 'cognitive bent', which it is beginning to redress, with Luhmann's work. This book's systems-theoretic framework seeks to adequately appreciate the role of emotions. The fact that it uses the habitus concept to do so relates it to contributions such as Haluza-DeLay (2008) and Medvetz (2006), which employ the concept to analyse social movements. Crossley (2003) in particular notes the usefulness of Bourdieu's theory of practice for analysing social movements, and for analysing reflexivity in social movements.