

Queer Solidarity with Palestinians

Navigating Identities in the Context of Conflicting Solidarities

Eva de Jong



Master's Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in

Political Science (MSc): Gender Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in Politics

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. A. van der Vleuten

Nijmegen School of Management

Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

June 2024

Student ID: s1087201

Word count: 17700

Radboud Universiteit



Front page image:

Kurt Bauschardt - Edmonton, Canada - Queers Against Israeli Apartheid, CC BY-SA 2.0

Retrieved from: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=100047258>

All rights reserved.

ABSTRACT

This study examines how social movements navigate different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities. On October 7th, 2023, the violent conflict in Gaza reached another escalation. Many social movements united in a global solidarity movement to express their compassion with Palestinians, one of which is the LGBTQ+ movement. The rights of the LGBTQ+ community are, however, not well protected in Palestine, which has caused conflicts within this movement. By analyzing statements released by Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations in response to the violent conflict in Gaza, this study identifies four key frames employed by these organizations: the ‘human rights’, ‘injustice’, ‘identity’, and ‘solidarity’ frames. The comparative analysis of these frames shows two underlying mechanisms that depict how the organizations managed internal identity differences: *silencing the differences* and *focusing on intersectionality*. It concludes that social movements can navigate different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities by not incorporating these differences in their expressions as a collective, or by focusing on the inclusion of all identities within the collective. This significantly enhances the existing literature, which has thus far offered limited insights into the mechanisms through which social movements navigate different identities within their collective identity.

Keywords: social movements, collective identity, solidarity, LGBTQ+, Gaza

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>LIST OF TABLES</u>	<u>v</u>
<u>1. INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>1</u>
Solidarity, Pinkwashing, and Homonationalism	2
Problem Statement and Case Introduction	3
Methodology	5
Academic and Societal Relevance	5
Chapter Overview	6
<u>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</u>	<u>7</u>
Social Movement Theory	7
Identity Theory	10
Framing Theory	16
Conclusion and Limitations	18
<u>3. METHODOLOGY</u>	<u>21</u>
Approach	21
Data Collection	22
Methods of Analyzing Data	24
Discussion and Justification of Methodological Choices	25
<u>4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS</u>	<u>29</u>
Overview of Data Collected	29
Initial Coding and Thematic Analysis	29
Key Frames	32
Comparative Analysis	38
<u>5. CONCLUSION AND REFLECTION</u>	<u>41</u>
Summary	41
Answer to the Research Question	42
Reflection on Contribution	44
Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research	45
Concluding Remark	46
<u>6. BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	<u>47</u>
<u>7. APPENDICES</u>	<u>54</u>
Appendix A: Data inventory tables	54
Appendix B: Interview transcript (Dutch)	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Frame alignment processes (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 625)	18
Table 4.1: Occurrences of frames	31
Table 4.2: Key quotes of the human rights frame	32
Table 4.3: Key quotes of the injustice frame	34
Table 4.4: Key quotes of the identity frame	35
Table 4.5: Key quotes of the solidarity frame	36
Table 4.6: Sub-frames of the solidarity frame	37
Table A.1: Overview of data collected (chronologically)	54
Table A.2: Identity statements of Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations included in analysis	56

1. INTRODUCTION

On October 7th, 2023, yet another escalation of the tensions in Gaza occurred: Hamas, a Palestinian militant organization, invaded southern Israel, to which Israel responded by striking Gazan cities (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023). The recoil of Israel has escalated into the deaths of tens of thousands innocent civilians and led to the destruction of entire cities in its attempt to terminate Hamas – an operation that could continue until at least the end of 2024, as a senior Israeli official stated (Al Lawati & Ebrahim, 2024). The violent conflict in Gaza has led to increased international tensions and the United Nations is frequently debating on how to respond (Fassihi, 2024). Several studies have shown how the framing of this conflict varies per country and across media platforms (Segev & Miesch, 2011; Ezzina, 2021; Hashish, Ismail & Abusaada, 2023). The differences range from a focus on ‘neutral’ reporting, employed by influential news sources such as the BBC and CNN, to giving the Israeli narrative more space in their news coverage, and extending to strategically justifying Israeli acts under the excuse of the right to exist (Ezzina, 2021; Hashish, Ismail & Abusaada, 2023). The Palestinian perspective is less present in traditionally Western media and is generally depicted more by non-Western news outlets, such as the Arab network Al Jazeera (Aguilar, 2009; Sarwar, Malhi & Naz, 2023). An important finding in this regard has been the result of a critical discourse analysis of BBC coverage: Israeli media were found to strongly enforce their influence in Western media institutions in order to promote the Israeli narrative (Hashish, Ismail & Abusaada, 2023).

Academic literature on the topic of Israel, Palestine, and Gaza tends to employ stronger language than news media. A study conducted by sociologist Jamil Hilal (2015) emphasizes the difference between the ‘neutral reporting’ on Palestine and the actual settler-colonial history of Palestine, illustrated by the following quote:

Dominant international discourse describes Israel as a democratic state [...]. It is very rarely, if ever, seen as a settler-colonial state that imposes on Palestinians a system combining features of apartheid. (Hilal, 2015, p. 3)

The usage of the term ‘apartheid’ in combination with colonial history is mentioned in several other studies as well, which contrasts strongly with the more neutral terminology employed in mainly Western news media (Dugard & Reynolds, 2013; Peteet, 2016; Greenstein, 2019).

Moreover, several studies have discussed the potential of the Israel/Palestine situation being a genocide or ethnic cleansing (Polya, 2010; Rashed, Short & Docker, 2014; Nijim, 2023). However, the official international determination of labeling it a genocide has not been established yet, despite strong suggestions hereof made by both the International Court of Justice and the United Nations Special Rapporteur on human rights in the Palestinian territories (Mian & Brown, 2024; Edwards, 2024). The thesis at hand refers to the ongoing tensions and escalations in Israel, Gaza, the West Bank, and occupied Palestinian territories as ‘the violent conflict in Gaza’ as to stipulate the violent nature of the conflict but simultaneously refrain from judgement.

The ongoing debate on how to understand and label the violent conflict in Gaza, together with the escalation of October 7th, 2023, have had a strong mobilizing effect not only on traditional media and academic literature, but on social media as well. The events have shaken up the internet, as online debates have surged, and people have collectively called for ceasefire (Watkins, 2024). Moreover, pro-Palestine student protests have rapidly spread across Northern America and Europe, all largely calling for universities to divest from and cut ties with Israeli companies and institutions (Regan, 2024). Apart from students, solidarity with Palestine has come from many sources that have united in a global solidarity movement (Reinhart, 2024).

Solidarity, Pinkwashing, and Homonationalism

A perhaps surprising social movement that has joined the global solidarity movement is the queer movement, which calls for equal rights, acceptance, and societal inclusion of all sexual orientations and gender identities – better known as the LGBTQ+ movement¹. This movement has a rich history in expressing solidarity with Palestine, which after October 7th has shown another surge of engagement (Prager, 2024). This might come as a surprise to those familiar with the lack of protection of members of the LGBTQ+ community in Palestine. By law, dating back to the British colonial occupation, same-sex sexual activity is prohibited and there are no laws in place to protect any and all members of the LGBTQ+ community (Human Dignity Trust, n.d.). At the same time, this contrasts with the existing protection of the LGBTQ+ community in Israel. Israel has in the past three decades achieved major advantages in terms of LGBTQ+-rights, though this has been mostly advantageous for gay men whereas adequate protection of trans people is still lacking (Blus-Kadosh, Rogel, Blatt & Hartal, 2023). If

¹ “LGBTQ+” is an abbreviation for: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer. The ‘+’ signals all other sexual orientations and gender identities, such as intersex, agender, asexual, pansexual, and non-binary.

LGBTQ+ people are relatively better off in Israel and face criminal sentences in Palestinian territories, why would they express solidarity with Palestine? This question has surfaced since the earliest expressions of solidarity with Palestine made by the LGBTQ+ community and has recently even been ridiculed on social media into the comparison with “chickens for KFC” (Tamarkin, 2023; Bernstein, 2023).

A response to this question has been articulated by writer and activist Sarah Schulman in her influential New York Times opinion piece called “Israel and ‘Pinkwashing’” (2011). She argues that Israel’s pro-LGBTQ+ attitude in contrast to other countries in the region, such as Palestine, is mistakenly understood as an indicator of the safeguarding of human rights (Schulman, 2011). Israel creates an image of a safe space for LGBTQ+ people (mostly focusing on gay men) to distract from its violations of the human rights of Palestinians, Schulman argues (2011). Her column and later published book on this topic made the term for this process – ‘pinkwashing’ – a now widely understood concept. The employment of pro-LGBTQ+ discourse to justify islamophobia, xenophobia, and racism by politicians and states is linked to the concept of pinkwashing and has been known as ‘homonationalism’ (Puar, 2007).

Jasbir Puar, a Women and Gender Studies scholar who introduced the term homonationalism, argues that Israel is the “pioneer of homonationalism, being perfectly situated to encourage the normalization of some homosexual bodies in relation to an increasingly violent occupation of Palestine” (Puar, 2013, p. 338). The answer of LGBTQ+ people advocating for Palestine to the question of why they would support Palestine rather than Israel, has been that the apparent LGBTQ+-friendliness of Israel distracts from the ongoing violations of the human rights of Palestinians (Prager, 2024; Tamarkin, 2023). The internationally operating movements that consist of LGBTQ+ people expressing their solidarity with Palestine, such as Queers for Palestine and Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QuAIA), generally point to homonationalism as the core problem and stand by the Palestinian fight for self-determination (Atshan, 2020). This ties in with the overall sentiment of queer organizations within Palestine, such as alQaws and Aswat, which oppose Israeli pinkwashing practices as well as Palestinian taboos regarding non-normative expressions of gender and sexuality (Prager, 2024).

Problem Statement and Case Introduction

The LGBTQ+ movement includes more identities than just pro-Palestine activists, as it involves a multitude of individual identities coming together in a collective movement. Jewish LGBTQ+

people, Palestinian LGBTQ+ people, Israeli LGBTQ+ people, pro-Israel LGBTQ+ people: all are present in the global LGBTQ+ community. The collective identity of a social movement is widely understood to be discursively constructed out of many different identities (Maddison, 2004). How, then, do social movements manage potentially conflicting identities, such as in the context of the conflict in Gaza? Though solidarity with Palestine has a long history and is still very present within the LGBTQ+ movement, knowledge on how these potentially conflicting identities are managed within the movement is still lacking. This study seeks to examine how the LGBTQ+ movement navigates different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities with regard to the violent conflict in Gaza. This pertains to a core question that resides on a more abstract level, as understanding this specific case could contribute to a more general understanding of how social movements navigate different identities, especially in the context of potential conflicts of solidarity within the movement. That leads to the proposition of the following pressing question:

How do social movements navigate different identities that construct their collective identity in the context of conflicting solidarities?

To be able to create an in-depth understanding of how these different identities are navigated, this study explores relevant theories, such as social movement theory, identity theory, and framing theory. As the research question pertains to the dynamics within and behavior of social movements, this study elaborates on social movement theory in order to understand how social movements are constructed and how they handle the complex realities they aim to represent. In representing a certain cause or group, social movements actively construct a collective identity. Identity theory provides deeper insights into the foundational dynamics of this collective identity, of conflicting identities within a collective identity, and of ally identity, as the latter is related to expressions of solidarity. Lastly, framing theory offers insights into the strategic use of frames by social movements, which is necessary to grasp the ways in which social movements portray their collective identity while accounting for the different identities within.

The responses of the Dutch LGBTQ+ movement to the violent conflict in Gaza are together a suitable case of how a social movement navigates different individual identities within a collective identity in the context of conflicting solidarities. The LGBTQ+ movement, consisting of many movement organizations, has a long history in the Netherlands. Several decades of pioneering LGBTQ+ activism led to the legalization of marriage for same gender couples, being the first country to do so (Kollman, 2016). At the same time, the Netherlands

has a history of politically positioning itself as one of Israel's most loyal allies in its conflict with Palestine (Malcontent, 2022). The position of the LBGTQ+ movement, which (as previously mentioned) has a history of expressing solidarity with Palestine, in the Netherlands, a country with strong ties to Israel, is significant. The Dutch LBGTQ+ movement has to navigate potentially conflicting solidarities in their attempt to represent the LBGTQ+ community as a whole. Studying these conflicting solidarities can create a better understanding of how the Dutch LBGTQ+ movement navigates these different identities and can at the same time be used as a framework for understanding similar cases of different social movement or in different contexts. Furthermore, focusing on a single case allows for an in-depth analysis of the underlying mechanisms of this phenomenon, whereas multiple cases would result in a more shallow analysis and would therefore be less substantial in providing an in-depth understanding. Additionally, choosing a singular case is more time-efficient and allows for more clarity and focus in the analysis.

Methodology

To analyze how different identities are negotiated within the Dutch LBGTQ+ movement regarding the violent conflict in Gaza, this study focuses on the public solidarity statements made by organizations and collectives within this movement. Their solidarity statements contain different ways of interpreting the violent conflict in Gaza, and thus portray different definitions of the social and political reality of this conflict. These different representations can be understood as frames. Moreover, their statements also include frames that portray the collective identity of the movement organizations, generally understood as identity frames. When comparatively analyzed, these frames can provide insights into how different movement organizations make sense of social and political reality while at the same time navigating their own collective identity. This study thus employs a frame analysis of statements made by Dutch LBGTQ+ organizations in response to the violent conflict in Gaza, as well as an interview with a spokesperson of a key Dutch LBGTQ+ organization. The combination of these methods allows for the creation of a deeper understanding of how these organizations navigate the different individual identities within their collective identity.

Academic and Societal Relevance

In the Netherlands, LBGTQ+ movement organizations generally attempt to represent the entire LBGTQ+ community. Research on how these movement organizations manage internal

identity differences is still lacking. Especially concerning the topical solidarity expressions of Dutch LGBTQ+ movement organizations regarding the conflict in Gaza, no research has been conducted that dissects how different identities are managed in the expression of solidarity by these organizations. Moreover, this case study contributes to an underexplored area in social movement theory that concerns conflicting identities and solidarities. This study specifically adds to the general apprehension of the complexities of social movements' collective identities and their engagement with humanitarian conflicts. Additionally, the case presented in this study offers valuable data and insights that can be used by others studying similar phenomena in different social movements or in different countries.

Apart from the scientific contributions, this study also provides insights into the challenges the LGBTQ+ movement may face in their solidarity with other marginalized groups, which could inform movement strategies for building more cohesive and supportive networks. Moreover, the insights from this research can help social movements promote solidarity while simultaneously valuing their internal diversity. It offers knowledge on the importance of inclusivity and intersectionality that can lead to more informed approaches of expressing solidarity as a collective identity. Finally, this study brings attention to the often overlooked connections between LGBTQ+ activism and international humanitarian conflicts, which can increase general awareness and understanding of the global dimensions of social justice issues.

Chapter Overview

This study first offers a review of relevant literature in the domain of social movement theory, collective identity, and framing theory. In this chapter potential explanations of the research issue are explored, and important research gaps are highlighted. A chapter on the methodology follows, which includes the research approach, the data collection methods, and how frame analysis is operationalized to answer the research question. Then, the results of the frame analysis are discussed, the four discovered frames are explained, and a comparative analysis synthesizes the results into several conclusive outcomes. After this, a discussion of the results and of the research in general follows, and finally, the conclusion ties all findings together.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

To understand the underlying mechanisms of how social movements navigate different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities, this chapter sets out to identify the potential underlying processes and how these are embedded in the key theories involved in this study's subject. Social movement theory is the overarching theory that aims to explain the origins, mechanisms, and consequences of social movements. After the 1970s the theory split up into two paradigms: structuralism and social constructivism. The following chapter explores why the social-constructivist perspective is better equipped in explaining identity negotiations in social movements. Additionally, social movement theory provides key insights into the construction of social movements, which contributes to the overall understanding of this study's subject. Social movement theory does not, however, offer insights into the construction of a collective identity – something that is argued to be essential for a social movement.

Identity theory provides an understanding of collective identity that still lacks in definitions of social movements. Moreover, identity theory also offers an understanding of ally identity, which is intertwined with solidarity. After elaborating on identity theory, solidarity between movements is discussed, along the most important understandings hereof. Though ally identity – which covers how individuals identify as allies to a movement – has been studied thoroughly, the subject of allyship specifically from members of one movement with another movement still lacks in current literature.

Lastly, framing theory is explored for potential strategies of social movements to manage different identities. Collective identity theory does articulate the importance of framing in the creation of a collective identity, however, framing theory provides a more in-depth analysis of this identity construction. Furthermore, framing theory is essential to understanding social movements in general, since frames are operationalized by social movements for divergent purposes, which will be covered in the second last section of this chapter. The chapter concludes with an overview of the discussed theories and potential explanations of this study's subject, along with crucial research gaps that have been discovered.

Social Movement Theory

Background

The basis of social movement theory emerged within the social sciences at the end of the 19th century, but the theory only reached new developmental peaks shortly after the American and

European surge of protest movements in the 1960s (Van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2009). The rapid developments led to a bifurcation in social movement theory that moved beyond the classical approaches of up until the 1970s. The split consisted of two contesting paradigms: the more American *structural* paradigm and the relatively European *social-constructivist* paradigm; a split that had a general impact on the social sciences, not only on social movement theory. The theories on social movements that emerged from these paradigms are generally understood as new social movement theories (Buechler, 1995). The social-constructivist paradigm is best equipped in understanding how social movements navigate internal identity differences, because it emphasizes the fluid and negotiated nature of both individual and collective identities (Snow & Benford, 1988). This perspective recognizes that a collective identity is constructed through social interactions and collective processes (Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes, & Sasson, 1992). By focusing on the dynamic construction of meaning and the role of discourse, social constructivism provides tools to understand how social movements manage different, potentially conflicting, identities.

Definitions

What a social movement constitutes of has been topic of discussion among prominent social movement scholars, all focusing on different aspects of a social movement. To gain a holistic view of what a social movement may be sociologists David Snow and Sarah Soule, together with political scientist Hanspeter Kriesi, provide five axes on which generally all preceding definitions are based: “collective or joint action; change-oriented goals or claims; some extra- or non-institutional collective action; some degree of organization; and some degree of temporal continuity” (2004, p. 6). Though political activism is often associated with social movements, this definition does not include activism. Protests can be seen as a tool used by social movements but should according to some scholars not be essential to qualify as a social movement – this is argued to be a rather narrow view that does not represent the complexities of reality (Davidson, 2017).

The five dimensions proposed by Snow, Soule, and Kriesi are not essential to all social movements: most are based on at least three of them (Snow, Soule & Kriesi, 2004). The *collective or joint action* dimension describes all activity oriented towards a common goal by at least two individuals, pursued via both institutional and noninstitutional channels (Snow, Soule & Kriesi, 2004). The difference between social movements and interests groups, since they both contain the characteristic of collective action, is predominantly that interest groups tend to be located within the political arena and pursue their goals through institutionalized

channels, whereas social movements are understood not to be limited to those (Snow, Soule & Kriesi, 2004).

The second dimension of *change-oriented goals or claims* entails that even though social movements differ in the focus and level of change they pursue, their common characteristic is the focus on “promoting or resisting change with respect to some aspect of the world in which we live” (Snow, Soule & Kriesi, 2004, p. 8).

Thirdly, *some extra- or non-institutional collective action* involves that social movements often (but not always) use means of action that fall outside of institutionalized channels (Snow, Soule & Kriesi, 2004). For example, social movements somewhat regularly use (quasi)public places for purposes that they were not necessarily intended to be used for (Snow, Soule & Kriesi, 2004).

Fourth, the dimension of *some degree of organization* followed from the academic dispute on to what degree social movements are organized. An important distinction to now be made is between social movements and social movement organizations (SMOs). SMOs are understood to function as a mediator between a movement and both its supporters and society (Della Porta & Diani, 2020). They act as an organizing actor and provide the needed structures to pursue, for example, mobilization of resources, recruitment of members, and coordination of actions (Della Porta & Diani, 2020). Social movements represent the broader collective, characterized by the five pillars that are discussed, within which SMOs operate. The fourth pillar, thus, surpasses the dispute about on which level a social movement is organized and determines that all social movements include at least some form of organization, irrespective of the level thereof (Snow, Soule & Kriesi, 2004).

The final dimension of *some degree of temporal continuity* involves that social movements hardly ever make significant progress without “fairly persistent, almost nagging, collective action” (Snow, Soule & Kriesi, 2004, p. 11). Though scholars have argued that social movements can be episodic and can lack a routinely societal presence, it is understood that many social movements have a way of returning in so called ‘cycles of protest’ that emphasize their temporal continuity (Snow, Soule & Kriesi, 2004; Tarrow, 1998). A straightforward example of such a cycle of protests is the cyclically returning waves of feminism that signal the temporal continuity of the movement.

The understanding of social movements that is present in social movement theory, summed up in five distinct dimensions, signals the fluid and complex nature of social movements. A singular, straightforward definition of a social movement does not exist; social

movements are constructed out of diverse temporal and organizational factors and pursue their goals using diverse methods.

What is lacking in this understanding of social movements is how individual identities are at interplay with the collective identity of a movement. An understanding hereof is needed to provide an answer to the research question of this study that focuses precisely on the identity aspects of social movements. Identity theory may be able to provide an understanding of this aspect, especially in its comprehension of how collective identity is constructed. Moreover, the previously mentioned definition of a social movement along the five axes lacks an understanding of how identity interacts with the concept of a social movement. This could be due to the fact that identity is still emergent in social movement research, though the importance of studying identity in relation to social movements is rather clearly formulated in prominent research (Polletta & Jasper, 2001; Snow, 2001). Therefore, collective identity should be integrated in the general conception of a social movement. Understanding how collective identity is an integral element of social movements may create a more holistic view of social movements, and therefore may be able to better attribute to this research. The following section sets out to achieve this holistic understanding and subsequently delves into how identities are constructed and how they are at interplay with each other.

Identity Theory

When speaking of identity we are not referring to an autonomous object, nor a property of social actors; we mean, rather, the process by which social actors recognize themselves – and are recognized by other actors – as part of a broader collectivities, and develop emotional attachments to them. (Della Porta & Diani, 2020)

Collective identity

Collective identity is broadly understood to be a fluid construct: collective identity is rarely fixed (Polletta & Jasper, 2001). However, social movements often do need to create a fixed collective identity in order to achieve social and political mobilization and to create an overall societal presence of the movement (Evans & Gamman, 1995). This instrumentality of collective identity thus causes a paradox: collective identity is fluid, but for it to serve its purpose within a social movement it needs to be fixed. In another interpretation of this paradox, collective identities are understood to be entirely fictional or so-called ‘necessary fictions’ (Jasper &

McGarry, 2015). The argument here is that the complexity of cultural meanings can never be fully encompassed by a fixed collective identity – therefore it is fictional (Jasper & McGarry, 2015). These diverse interpretations signal the complex nature of collective identities: they are fluid, need to be fixed to achieve certain goals, and may therefore be entirely fictional. So, it can be reasoned that the collective identity of a social movement is the result of a complex and arguably iterative process.

Necessarily fictional or not, collective identity involves a multitude of interactions, both with external as well as with internal factors and actors (Polletta & Jasper, 2001). External actors can be allies, for example, relevant to this thesis' main objective of understanding how allyship and solidarity are related to collective identity. This aspect will be returned to later in this chapter. On the other hand, internal factors are, for example, individual identities – how does a multitude of individual identities constitute to a collective identity? The danger in this reasoning, however, is its tendency to reduce a collective identity to merely a gathering of individual identities – which is not necessarily the case. Moreover, the sharing of certain identity markers, such as class, ethnicity, or sexual orientation, does not fully encompass a collective identity: multiple scholars in this field argue that 'identity work' is needed to ultimately construct a collective identity (Snow & Anderson, 1987; Snow & McAdam, 2000; Polletta & Jasper, 2001; Jasper & McGarry, 2015).

Identity work

The complex construction of a collective identity described in the previous section is underlined by sociologists Rachel Einwohner, Jo Reger, and Daniel Meyers, which lead them to focus on the identity work necessary in the construction of a collective identity in their book *Identity Work in Social Movements* (2008). They argue that identity work is not only needed in the construction of a collective identity, but also in the maintenance and renegotiation of it (Einwohner, Reger & Meyers, 2008). Identity work involves the activities and challenges integral to the strategic usage of identity in social movements (Einwohner, Reger & Meyers, 2008). This characterization of identity work as a strategic process results from the necessity for social movements to manage both external presentation and reputation as well as internal dynamics of diverse identities (Einwohner, Reger & Meyers, 2008). Prior to analyzing the identity work needed to manage internal diversities, with the aim of elucidating aspects of this study's subject, the activities involved in identity work are first elaborated on.

The constructionist perspective on social movements involves understanding what identity work entails, as the concept of identity work is based on the assumption that a collective

identity is the result of interaction and negotiation by members of a collective (Snow & McAdam, 2000; Einwohner, Reger & Meyers, 2008). Identity work involves both addressing difference and sameness: one's opposition to a certain external group (or institution or society) and one's identification with the internal collective (Einwohner, Reger & Meyers, 2008). This shows how identity work is executed on the meso level – within the movement – but interacts with both the macro and micro level (societal and individual level respectively). Social movements often choose an oppositional stance, meaning that they strongly articulate how they are different from the hegemony or from those they oppose (Einwohner, Reger & Meyers, 2008). Social movements build their identities by distinguishing themselves from an 'other', often in order to gather support and solidify their collective identity (Tilly, Castañeda & Wood, 2020).

Though the sameness and difference expressed in identity work can seem rather dichotomous and have been argued to be so, Einwohner, Reger, and Meyers argue the importance of recognizing the intersectional identities involved in identity work, which require diverse acknowledgements of sameness and difference (2008). In connection to this study's subject, an example of this is how members of the LGBTQ+ movement have to do significant identity work in creating a collective identity that embraces all different intersecting identities within the movement. This movement requires thorough identity work, because the LGBTQ+ community is not a monolithic or homogenous group: it includes a variety of identities, that sometimes overlap or intersect with other identity markers. This makes it harder to differentiate between external identities and internal identities and to identify what identity markers are part of the collective identity, and therefore requires more identity work (Einwohner, Reger & Meyers, 2008).

Apart from creating boundaries through outlining sameness and difference, which is a rather discursive practice, identity work also involves symbolic and strategic practices. The work required for symbolic representations that represents a collective identity can also be categorized as identity work. Practices such as creating slogans and visuals are understood to be part of the way a collective communicates its identity and serve as important instruments in creating recognition among both internal members and the external public (Jasper, 2011). Moreover, strategic practices also influence the way a collective is perceived and involve identity work in the sense of strategic positioning, often employing certain frameworks to create a representation of their identity (Gamson & Meyer, 1996). These frameworks will be returned to in the section on framing theory.

Managing internal diversities

In the different interpretations of identity work, the way in which identity work involves the management of different internal individual identities is important to understanding this study's subject, namely: how do social movements manage different individual identities? The kind of identity work needed to manage different identities knows several forms. Most of them arise from a place of internal disagreement, which in the best case leads to conversations on the most fundamental question of the collective identity of a social movement: "Who are we?" (Taylor and Whittier, 1992). As mentioned earlier, the collective identity of a social movement is understood to be discursively constructed, by means of conversations on goals and motivations (Maddison, 2004). Literature on collective identity remains unclear on the relation and potential conflict between a collective identity and the internal individual identities, but some understandings of how social movements navigate the diversity of individual identities have been articulated.

One of the strategies identified as crucial to the cohesion of social movements has been creating a strong collective identity (Morris & Braine, 2001). One of the aspects of a strong collective identity is a clear vision of the goal of the movement (Polletta, 2002). This includes being clear and definitive about the movement's objective and keeping the goal (or goals) in sight at all times. Clarity about goals manages the effectiveness of the movement, and higher effectiveness generally corresponds with lower levels of internal conflict (Polletta, 2002). Moreover, as stated before, practices that express sameness and difference also benefit the solidification of the collective identity of a social movement.

In the articulation of a strong collective identity, the degrees of inclusion vary. Some social movements opt for strict boundaries as to whom is included in the collective, while others stress the importance of being inclusive rather than exclusive. This is related to the level of internal conflict as well, as both strategies have its merits with regard to resolving internal conflicting identities. For example in the feminist movement, particularly during the second wave of the 1960s and 1970s, different identities that intersected with womanhood came into conflict with one another. Especially regarding racial-ethnic differences within the broader feminist movement, conflicts about whose rights were being fought for arose. 'White feminism' signals the claim that the feminism of the West, mostly rising in the United States, prioritized feminism over anti-racism, and thus that the intersecting identity markers of women of color were overlooked or even disregarded. Though feminism was appealing to many racial-ethnic identities, it was expressed in different ways depending on the specific scene from which they emerged (Roth, 2004). Different ideas about how the feminist movement should handle these

internal differences and conflicts developed, of which two were clear opposites. One response was to focus on these different identities within the movement and take into account the intersections of identity markers. This has in the context of the feminist movement been described as ‘inclusive solidarity’ (Roth, 2004). By paying attention to the inclusion of all identities that identified with the feminist movement, an inclusive movement was able to rise from the internal conflicts that it had suffered (Roth, 2004). Other scholars have named this process ‘identity bridging’, depicted as the process of reconciling different identities and bringing those together under a broader collective identity (Della Porta & Diani, 2020).

On the other side it has been argued that “a collective identity that is inclusive of a wide range of attitudes tends to make the group more rather than less exclusive” (Friedman & McAdam, 1992, p. 164). Including people who engage in the actions of a social movement, but not necessarily identify with the social movement itself and in some way ‘tag along’, can cause internal conflict about the collective identity of the movement (Creasap, 2012). However, ‘tagging along’ is not nearly comparable to the engagement of ethnic-racial minorities in the global feminist movement, for example, especially since the feminist movement has emerged from various groups of people coming together and not one singular group of (white) people (Gines, 2011). The claim that including a large variety of identities within a singular social movement could invoke internal conflict rather than dissolve it is an interesting perspective. However, research on this is still lacking. Therefore, the inclusion-perspective offers more leverage in providing answers to the question of how social movements manage different identities. Intersectionality is one way of pursuing this inclusivity and, thus, an important approach to managing different identities within a movement.

A final strategy for managing potentially conflicting identities is the focus on a solid democratic foundation within a movement. In the creation of social movements, a strong collective imagination is understood to be crucial to its internal democracy (Blee, 2012). This ties in with the strategy to create a strong collective identity and at the same time stipulates the importance of democracy within a movement. Sociologist Francesca Polletta has argued that specifically a participatory democracy creates the space for dialogue to discuss internal differences and potential conflicts (2002). Having open conversations, and having the structures in place to do so, thus also contribute to the management of different identities. Apart from creating a strong collective identity, focusing on inclusion (or rather exclusion), and appreciating internal democracy, little research has been conducted that specifically dissects how diverse social movements internally manage different identities.

Ally identity and solidarity

This study focuses on different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities. In social movement theory, solidarity is often associated with ally identity. Being an ally to a social movement is different from being a member of a social movement. One of the most prominent differences is that allies generally do not have the life experiences that members of the movement do have – the experiences that made them join the movement, such as injustice and exclusion (Myers, 2008). Other than that, allies generally need to prove they support the movement and its members and at the same time can more easily disconnect from the movement than the members themselves, whose identities are generally more attached to the movement (Myers, 2008).

In this differentiation between allies and members of a social movement, the members are assumed to be the ‘beneficiaries’, whereas allies are assumed to not reap the benefits of the social movement (Myers, 2008). However, is this a true dichotomy? Can’t it be argued that in some instances, being an active ally in a social movement does improve one’s own situation as well, albeit indirectly? For example, allies of the LGBTQ+ movement fight for freedom along with the movement’s members to achieve a more liberal society that could benefit *their* general sense of freedom as well. In the case of the violent conflict in Gaza, aren’t allies of Palestinians also indirectly beneficiaries, as standing up against oppression somewhere could mean standing up against oppression everywhere? This nuance to ally identity is crucial to understanding the mechanisms underlying solidarity between social movements, though it has yet to be explored.

What differentiates the construction of an ally identity from a collective identity is still understood to be the lack of self-interest (Myers, 2008). Because of this, allies do not necessarily have to navigate their identity within a movement as a beneficiary activist does: creating boundaries (sameness vs. difference, as stated before) and internal negotiation generally are not part of ally identity construction (Taylor & Whittier, 1992). Even though the construction of the ally identity differs from the construction of a collective identity, allies do face a great deal of identity work. Daniel Myers in his work on ally identity claims that “as with any other social identity, the ally identity is constantly renegotiated, renewed, and revised as the activist either participates in movements or withdraws from them” (2008, p. 176). Moreover, allies often have to actively demonstrate their commitment to the movement, as they are not part of the collective identity (Myers, 2008).

Simultaneously, social movements frequently rely on allies in their effectiveness. Again, the LGBTQ+ movement is a good example hereof. Allies of the LGBTQ+ movement in being actively involved in the movement or as not causing obstructions to the proceedings

of the movement have shown their importance to the success of the movement (Myers, 2008; McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1988).

Most literature on ally identity focuses on individuals that identify as allies to a social movement. For this study, however, it is crucial to specifically examine how individuals *that belong to a social movement* identify as allies to another social movement. Research on this kind of allyship is still lacking, though one aspect of social movement theory does allude to a certain kind of allyship between movement members with other movements. Studies have shown that having a history of activism increases the probability for future activism (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1988). Three factors are identified as positive influences on joining a social movement after having been part of a different social movement: previous experience, identification with the role of activist, and ‘sunk social costs’² (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1988). This could be an explanation of why members of one social movement join in supporting another social movement, or – in the case of this study’s subject – express solidarity with another social movement. How social movements navigate different expressions of solidarity with other social movements is still in need of definitive research.

Framing Theory

Frames and identity

Several key scholars have observed that identities are context dependent and serve a practical purpose (Dugan, 2004; Bernstein, 1997; Goffman, 1974). The framing of collective identities, according to prominent sociologist Goffman (1974), influences the level of support movements receive from both aspiring members as well as from the public. This ties in with the previously mentioned notion that collective identities of social movements are often instrumental. ‘Framing’ is the process of creating meaning and signals an active choice in constructing and depicting reality (Gamson, Fireman & Rytina, 1982; Benford & Snow, 2000). Scholars have categorized three general categories of frames, that all serve a different purpose. *Diagnostic* frames identify the (social) problem(s) a social movement targets; *prognostic* frames determine the strategies that should resolve these problems; and *motivational* frames articulate different motivations for acting on these problems and suggested solutions (Caiani, 2023). These frames operate in addition to one another, often in a successive process (Caiani, 2023). Apart from the three key frames, *identity* frames are operationalized to identify the self of the social movement

² Sunk social costs in this context refers to the previous investment of “time, energy, relationships, as well as more tangible resources in pursuing activism” that reinforce continued participation in social movements (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1988, p. 709).

and *oppositional* frames are used to determine the antagonists in the previously identified (social) problems (Caiani, 2023).

The identity frame is especially relevant to this research, as identity frames articulate a collective identity that is the result of the previously mentioned identity work. Though definitions of social movements often lack the identity dimension, the importance of identity in the dynamics of social movements has been widely understood by social movement scholars. Sociologist Bill Gamson articulates this entanglement of identity in social movements: “Participation in social movements frequently involves enlargement of personal identity for participation and offers fulfillment and realization of the self” (1992, p. 56). However, the question of how these personal identities are then enlarged and negotiated within the context of the broader collective identity of a social movement has not been satisfactorily answered yet.

Frame resonance and frame alignment

In order to become or remain a successful social movement – that is, in short, achieving the goals were set out – social movements have to continuously frame and reframe. This continuous process involves examining *frame resonance* and actively engaging in *frame alignment*. The concept of frame resonance involves the examination of the effectiveness of frames (Benford & Snow, 2000). This is related to the degree of resonance with members and others, as well as to the mobilization potency a frame has (Benford & Snow, 2000). Two factors play an important role in frame resonance, described as “credibility of the proffered frame and its relative salience” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 619). Frame resonance is therefore an important indicator of the effectiveness of a frame.

Additionally, frame alignment processes are deliberate strategies employed by social movements to connect their interests with those of potential supporters and potential resource providers (Benford & Snow, 2000). Frame alignment processes take on many forms, which are categorized into: frame bridging, frame amplification, frame extension, and frame transformation (Benford & Snow, 2000). As described in Table 2.1, frame alignment processes are not necessarily related to the internal alignment of different identities. Moreover, some of these strategies are understood to cause internal conflict, rather than to provide internal unity. For example, frame extension is reported to increase internal friction with regard to ideological matters, as well as efficiency and territorial concerns (McCallion & Maines, 1999; Benford, 1993; Babb, 1996). This is related to the concept of *frame disputes*, which entails the “intramovement disagreements regarding diagnoses and prognoses” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 626). David Benford, a sociologist specialized in social movement research, uncovered that

frame disputes are a prevalent element in the dynamics of a social movement and influence the structure, internal relations, and the construction of the collective identity of a social movement (1993). A question that remains unanswered in social movement literature is how social movements manage these frame disputes.

Table 2.1: Frame alignment processes (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 625)

Frame alignment process	Definition by Benford and Snow
Frame bridging	The linking of two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem
Frame amplification	The idealization, embellishment, clarification, or invigoration of existing values or beliefs
Frame extension	Depicting interests and frame(s) as extending beyond its primary interests to include issues and concerns that are presumed to be of importance to potential adherents
Frame transformation	Changing old understandings and meanings and/or generating new ones

Conclusion and Limitations

This chapter has explored the most important theories on the construction of social movements and collective identities, as well as the strategies and processes related to this construction. Theories within the realm of social constructivism have been identified as best equipped to understand the dynamic construction of meaning and the role of discourse within social movements. First, social movement theory provided an overview of social movement definitions along five axes. What stood out in this overview was the lack of attention to identity, which could be due to the fact that identity is still emergent in social movement research. The importance of identity to this field of study is not insignificant however, and this review included the argument that collective identity should be understood as an integral part of a social movement. Moreover, the subject of this research specifically focuses on the identity aspect of social movements. Therefore, the second section examined identity theory.

Within identity theory, a comprehension of collective identity in relation to social movements provided the insights that collective identity is not fixed and that the construction of it requires identity work. Addressing sameness and difference among identities is understood to be crucial in this practice, and at the same time recently called for attention to intersectionality, as this nuances the boundaries of a collective identity. Additionally, symbolic and strategic practices are employed by social movements to create and revise their collective

identities. This indicates the importance of frameworks as a strategic tool, which was elaborated on in the section on framing theory.

While social movement theory and the notion of collective identity offer crucial insights into the construction of a social movement, literature on the management of internal diversities is still rather narrow. Two strategies to manage internal diversities have been articulated: the construction of a strong collective identity and the establishment of a solid democratic foundation. More research is needed to understand exactly how these strategies result in a lower level of internal conflicts. Moreover, these strategies fail to address how individual identities are negotiated.

The final aspect of identity theory that is relevant to this research's subject is the notion of ally identity. The definition of ally identity proved to be rather narrow. It does not account for the ambiguity of this identity category: allies are conceptually separated from beneficiary activists, though it could be argued that allies to some extent do benefit from the movement and its achievements as well. Theory on ally identity further lacks an understanding of allyship between members of a movements with another social movement and predominantly focuses on allyship of individuals – not specifically within a movement – with other individuals or social movements. Academic literature is therefore unable to explain how social movements navigate conflicting solidarities.

Framing theory, lastly, provided the necessary understanding of frames as strategic tools for social movements. Identity frames are understood to be the most important articulators of a collective identity as a result of identity work. Additionally, frame resonance and frame alignment proved to be understood as important aspects that determine the effectiveness of a frame (see Table 2.1). Frame alignment processes were discovered to be more related to the causes of internal disputes, rather than to the resolution to such disputes. How social movements manage frame disputes therefore remains a question unanswered.

Returning to the research question central to this study: *How do social movements navigate different identities that construct their collective identity in the context of conflicting solidarities?* This literature review provides insights into how a collective identity is constructed. Moreover, it offers an understanding of ally identity, which is related to solidarity. The related strategies in creating a collective identity within and achieving success as a social movement were discussed as well. These strategies – most importantly creating a strong collective identity and establishing a solid democratic foundation – proved to be crucial to the management of internal conflicts. The literature review indicates, as an answer to the research question, that social movements employ strategies of creating a strong collective identity and

establishing a solid democratic foundation to navigate different identities within their collective identity. What remains unclear, however, is how these strategies are related to the context of conflicting solidarities. This study aims to create a more thorough understanding hereof. Framing strategies have proven to be pivotal in the articulation of a collective identity. Creating a better understanding of how frames are operationalized could offer insights into the underlying process of managing diverse identity, which is what this research sets out to achieve.

Based on this literature review, two expectations emerge as focal points for the forthcoming empirical analysis. First, social movements are understood to navigate potential internal conflicts by creating a strong collective identity. From this, it is expected that a social movement organization employs the strategy of creating a strong identity to manage internal differences. A second strategy social movements employ in the navigation of internal differences is the establishment of a firm democratic foundation. So, this could lead to the expectation that social movement organizations create a solid democratic foundation in order to manage internal differences. However, as this literature review has illustrated, research on the effect of a solid democratic base on the level of internal conflict is rather limited. More research is needed to assess whether it can in general be expected from social movements to have low levels of internal conflict as a result of a strong democratic foundation. Because of this generalizability issue, this expectation is dismissed, and the focus of this study will be on the first expectation, for it has a more substantive academic base. Moreover, focusing on the plausibility of one core expectation allows a deeper analysis hereof, which enhances the overall reliability of the research. The next chapter articulates what research methods fit best to investigate this phenomenon.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study aims to understand how social movements manage different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities, particularly in the responses of Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations to the conflict in Gaza. By analyzing the framing strategies and expressions of solidarity used by these organizations, this study seeks to elucidate how they coordinate their identity as LGBTQ+ advocacy groups with their engagement in broader social justice movements, principally regarding international conflicts with human rights violations such as the one in Gaza. The following chapter discusses the approach to this research problem and the accompanying data collection methods. It concludes with a discussion and justification of the chosen approach.

Approach

The goal of this study is to create an in-depth understanding of how a social movement manages different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities. In order to move beyond a description hereof and understand *how* a social movement manages these conflicting identities, a qualitative approach is most fitting, as it offers the depth needed to create an adequate understanding of the phenomenon. Furthermore, the subject of this study has not been studied extensively so far. A quantitative approach would be less able to capture any unexpected or unforeseen results than a qualitative approach. Choosing a qualitative research method allows for more freedom in the collection and interpretation of data and can result in a more detailed and thorough analysis. This freedom is achieved through the selection of rough data that has not yet been framed. The interpretation of this rough data is, in qualitative research, not constrained by predefined categories or quantitative measures and therefore creates more freedom in the interpretative analysis.

Frame analysis is chosen as the primary analytical tool because of its effectiveness in dissecting how social movements construct meaning and interpret events, which has been elaborated on in the previous theoretical chapter (Lindekilde, 2014; Benford & Snow, 2000; Caiani, 2023). This approach allows for the uncovering of underlying mechanisms and symbolic representation used by Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations in their responses to the conflict in Gaza. Furthermore, by employing frame analysis, a nuanced exploration of the framing strategies used to manage diverse identities within the LGBTQ+ movement can be achieved. Additionally, an interview with a key stakeholder complements the frame analysis by providing valuable insights into the motivations and decision-making processes behind their framing

choices. Through this interview, this study is able to better capture the nuanced perspectives and subjective interpretations within the social movements, which enriches the overall analysis.

Conversely, content analysis and discourse analysis are valuable qualitative approaches and could potentially explain a part of the issue addressed in this study. However, these approaches may not fully capture the complexities of collective identity and conflicting solidarities within Dutch LGBTQI+ organizations in response to the Gaza conflict. Content analysis focuses on the quantification and categorization of textual data as a means to analyze content and to identify patterns within this content (Krippendorff, 2004). Though this approach could offer insights into the presence of certain frames, it lacks the depth required to fully understand the underlying mechanisms and interpretations behind the textual data. Given the nuanced nature of collective identity and solidarity expression, content analysis is on its own not able to provide the in-depth understanding of the framing strategies of social movements this study sets out to achieve. Additionally, conducting a discourse analysis would result in the same limitations as content analysis. Though discourse analysis is able to provide important insights into the discursive construction of the data to be analyzed, it lacks the possibility to adequately go beyond linguistic qualities and offer a nuanced understanding of the underlying mechanisms of social movements' solidarity expressions (Antaki, Billig, Edwards & Potter, 2003; Lindekilde, 2014).

The use of frame analysis, supported by the interview of a key stakeholder, allows this study to overcome these limitations for it offers a holistic methodological approach to understanding the management of conflicting solidarities within a social movement. Where content and discourse analysis would result in a relatively shallow exploration of the mechanisms of navigating diverse identities, frame analysis focuses more on the strategic choices made by the framing agents (i.e., social movements) and is therefore better equipped in understanding the considerations underlying the strategic choices made by these agents.

Data Collection

The data for this study consists of publicly available documents, including official statements, social media posts, and organizational texts from Dutch LGBTQI+ organizations. All texts to some extent respond to the violent conflict in Gaza. Additionally, the interview with a representative of a key movement organization will provide deeper insights into their considerations of solidarity and their framing strategies.

The data is collected by a thorough online search for relevant documents, in which no selection is applied other than the previously mentioned requirements. Official statements first have a priority, for these are expected to be the most extensive and carefully considered documents about the violent conflict in Gaza that were made public by the social movements. A top-down approach in looking for these statements is most fitting: first the larger Dutch LGBTQI+ movement organizations are looked into for their statements, followed by the search for smaller movement organizations. This approach is chosen for its ability to retrieve as many statements as possible, ranging from large to small social movement organizations, since the aim of the study is to comprehensively understand Dutch LGBTQI+ social movements' statements. Analyzing statements from both large, medium, and small social movement organizations increases the degree of generalizability and reliability of this study.

The data consists of, among others, website statements, as websites are still important outlets for movement organizations and provide access to anyone with an internet connection. Moreover, in gathering the data, petition forms were also taken into account, as petition forms can be an important medium in expressing certain sentiments and are often utilized to respond to a (social) problem.

Additionally, statements on the social media of Dutch LGBTQI+ organizations are added to the body of data, for this is an important outlet for social movements in general (Kidd & McIntosh, 2016). Moreover, the focus of this study on the oppression of Palestinians increases the relevance of social media statements. Sociologists Hallward and Armstrong (2016) emphasize the relevance of social media activism in studying Palestinian resistance on the basis of three core explanations:

1. Many Palestinians no longer believe negotiations [...] will yield any positive outcome. Consequently, many have turned to other means – both violent and nonviolent – for pursuing goals of self-determination.
2. Social media activism is especially attractive to Palestinians given that Palestinians as a community are stateless and dispersed.
3. Palestinians have a long history of appealing to the international community for supporting their struggle for national determination, a strategy often referred to as “internationalizing” the conflict. Social media provides a natural venue for perpetuating this effort.

(Hallward & Armstrong, 2016, p. 227-228)

Since Palestinians have largely turned to social media, it could be expected that social movements supporting Palestinians also turn to social media to express their solidarity. The social media posts are used for their textual content as to be aligned with other types of content that is to be analyzed.

Since this case study is focused on Dutch organizations, some statements are in Dutch. Excerpts of these are carefully translated. Original statements are available through the links in Appendix A. Moreover, the interview with a key organization is in Dutch as well and its relevant parts are translated as well. The original interview can be found in Appendix B.

Methods of Analyzing Data

After gathering data, the study proceeds to identify the various frames used in the statements published by social movements that pertain to their collective identity. These frames are understood to be the result of the creation of meaning and depict a distinct interpretation of reality (Benford & Snow, 2000). By examining the data and looking for recurring themes, language usage, and arguments, frames are identified. The dominant frames utilized by the social movements in this study are the human rights frame, injustice frame, identity frame, and solidarity frame. What these entail will be discussed in the empirical chapter. Analyzing the different frames provides this study with the needed comprehension of possible underlying mechanisms and tendencies in the context of conflicting solidarities within social movements. Comparing and contrasting the different frames helps shape the understanding of the underlying mechanisms – e.g., motivations, deliberations – leading up to the statements. Based on this analysis, a conclusion about the underlying mechanisms of these statements can be drawn.

Moreover, the expectation formulated in the conclusion of the literature review can be affirmed or denied as a result of the forthcoming analysis. The core expectation is that social movement organizations employ the strategy of creating a strong identity to manage internal differences. The core requirement for a strong collective identity in this study is a clear description of the identity of a social movement organization expressed by the organization itself. The collective identities of the organizations will be assessed prior to the analysis in the following empirical chapter. From the frame analysis, an evaluation is made of how social movement organizations employ an identity frame to navigate the different identities within the movement. When it is evident that a social movement organization expresses a strong collective identity in an attempt to navigate different identities, the core expectation is considered affirmed. Conversely, when social movement organizations are found not to strategically

emphasize their strong collective identity to navigate different identities, the expectation is considered denied. In the case of too little evidence to conclusively assess the expectation derived from the literature review, the expectation is neither affirmed nor denied. Fortunately, this research design permits a broader range of results beyond merely affirming or negating the central expectation. The analysis will result in a section dedicated to potential new discoveries.

In conclusion, frame analysis is the primary analytical tool to systematically examine how social movements manage conflicting solidarities and construct their collective identity in response to a conflict and humanitarian crisis elsewhere. This approach enables this study to uncover underlying mechanisms of the statements made by these social movements, which aligns with this study's aim to create an in-depth understanding of how social movements manage differing identities. Supplementing the frame analysis with interviews strengthens the research by providing insights into the motivations and deliberations behind the framing choices. The combination of these methods increases the validity and depth of the analysis and study overall. Moreover, this method allows for a comprehensive evaluation of the central expectation retrieved from the literature review and can provide insights into current gaps in academic literature. Lastly, the chosen approach to data collection, including the collection of data from multiple sources, ensures a thorough investigation of Dutch LGBTQI+ organization's responses to the Gaza conflict, which also increases the validity and moreover strengthens the reliability of this research.

Discussion and Justification of Methodological Choices

While a qualitative approach is most fitting for exploring the complex phenomenon of conflicting solidarities within social movements, it is crucial to address the potential limitations of the selected methods. The most prominent limitation is that qualitative research involves subjective interpretation. This often results in the presence of biases in conducting the research. In this section, potential biases and the steps taken to mitigate these biases will be addressed. Subsequently, the limitations of both frame analysis and the integration of interviews will be discussed, concluding with a discussion of the approach to data collection.

Biases

First, there is a risk of confirmation bias in conducting interpretative analysis. Since a qualitative approach leaves more room for interpretive freedom, it could also leave room for an unconscious search for interpretations that confirm preconceived beliefs regarding LGBTQI+

movements' solidarities. To mitigate this bias, transparency about the data collection approach as well as a systematic approach to the frame analysis are incorporated in this research. Moreover, alternative explanations to the results will be discussed in the empirical chapter.

Second, the risk of cultural and identity bias ought to be addressed. Cultural and identity biases could result in certain assumptions about the norms and values of Dutch LGBTQ+ movements, which could potentially shape the analysis and consequently this study's conclusion. To diminish the potential influence these biases could have on the research, a thorough literature review is conducted in order to develop a nuanced understanding of the processes involved in social movements in relation to identity and solidarity.

Third, a selection bias could be of influence on this study because of its risk of over- or underrepresenting certain social movement organizations. However, since this research specifically focuses on public statements made by all kinds of Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations, the risk of a selection bias is made relatively small. Since this study focuses on publicly available documents, the retrievability is rather high. Most important in the collection of the data is a thorough search as to not leave out any statements. This diminishes the risk of selection bias as well.

Lastly, researcher positionality ought to be discussed. I have a background in philosophy and in gender studies. My knowledge of critical race theory and gender studies could create a bias that influences the way I interpret certain content created by social movements. Moreover, I am myself part of the LGBTQ+ community that expresses solidarity with Palestine. Therefore, my position in society and my personal beliefs are strongly tied to this study's subject. Lastly, I am an able-bodied white woman that was raised and lives in a prosperous country. This limits my ability to understand crucial intersections of minority identities, though my identity as a lesbian woman offers me some critical insights into the lives of minority groups. To assure my positionality as a researcher does not influence my research, I continuously reflect on my own position and focus on maintaining a reflexive approach. This ensures that I do not unconsciously include personal preconceptions in the research. Moreover, being transparent about my positionality supports a more nuanced and critical engagement with the findings and allows you, the reader, to understand the context in which this research is conducted.

Limitations and justification of chosen methods

Apart from these biases, the limitations of the chosen methods are to be discussed. Frame analysis strongly relies on interpretation, which provides a certain degree of freedom needed for this research, but also makes it susceptible to subjective interpretations that could lead to

inconsistencies (Benford & Snow, 2000). Therefore, the frames are carefully chosen and articulated, taking into account personal biases in order to reduce subjectivity.

Additionally, to prevent an oversimplification of the complex reality of the statements, possibly caused by reducing the statements to concrete frames, the frames are selected based on their coverage of the underlying complexities of the statements. Consequently, the frames in the analysis are less simplistic and better able to reflect the complex nature of the mechanisms underlying statements.

A third limitation of frame analysis is the limited scope of the research, since the focus lies solely on publicly available online statements. Though a thorough search for any and all publicly available documents, a chance exists that not all relevant data is included. Moreover, excluding other sources of solidarity expressions made by social movements, like protests or private group correspondence, could potentially overlook important factors that shape solidarity expressions and identity negotiations (Snow & Benford, 1988). However, solidarity statements that have been publicly published are rather sufficiently suited for the operationalization of frames, as it is more reasonable for social movements to strategize in their public announcements than in their private correspondence, for example.

The interview that supplements the frame analysis is slightly limited because of desirability bias, power dynamics, and limited generalizability. However, since the interview functions as an addition to the frame analysis, it solely provides the needed depth wherever this is lacking in the frame analysis. Therefore, these limitations are of less influence on the study's reliability.

Limitations and justification of data collection

In light of these limitations, the approach to data collection is reflected upon to further strengthen the research. First, incorporating several different data sources allows for triangulation of the results, which enhances this study's validity and reliability (Maxwell, 2013). The cross-referencing of these different types of data leads to the ability to minimize the impact of the aforementioned biases and limitations. Second, the data collection strategy adopted in this study results in an adequate representation of the diverse perspectives and considerations within the pool of Dutch LGBTQ+ movements. As stated before, the data was collected carefully and sought for extensively in order to be able to analyze a representative amount of data. By intentionally collecting data from different organizational sizes, focus areas, platforms, and geographical locations, this study is able to capture a broad range of solidarity expressions of Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations.

4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Through employing frame analysis this study aims to create an understanding of how Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations negotiate different identities and conflicting solidarities with regard to the conflict in Gaza. The collected data consists of fifteen public statements made by Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations with regard to the conflict in Gaza. In this chapter, the data is specified and contextualized, and the results of this analysis are provided and discussed. After the initial coding and the thematic analysis, four frames are identified to be most prominent in all statements: the ‘human rights’, ‘injustice’, ‘identity’, and ‘solidarity’ frames. After carefully examining the occurrences and contents of these frames, the comparative analysis in this chapter provides potentially significant findings.

Overview of Data Collected

The collected data consists of fifteen public statements made by LGBTQ+ movement organizations in the Netherlands. All organizations explicitly, but not necessarily exclusively, represent the Dutch LGBTQ+ community. Apart from being part of the Dutch LGBTQ+ social movements, the selection of organizations is heterogenous: large, medium, and small organizations are included. Moreover, both organizations that represent all members and those that represent specific intersections of minorities within the LGBTQ+ community (e.g., Black Pride focuses on LGBTQ+ BIPOC, or SEHAQ focuses on LGBTQ+ refugees) are included in the data.

The statements they have published and that are selected for this case study range from explicitly mentioning the violent conflict in Gaza to exclusively focusing on it. Important to note is that these statements are not general website texts or publicity texts but are published in response to or regarding the conflict in Gaza. Since this conflict has been ongoing for the past seven decades and social movement responses are time-dependent, this study focuses on the response statements of the past five years. A full overview of all collected data can be found in Appendix A.

Initial Coding and Thematic Analysis

The analysis of the statements started with open coding: certain (signaling) words, sentiments, and other themes were dissected from the data. This allowed for the capturing of the general

themes that are present in the data. It was an iterative process, in which codes and texts were continuously reexamined to crystallize the key themes of the texts.

After this initial coding, the main themes were analyzed as to identify which frames were being utilized by the organizations that published these statements. The most prominent themes found in the statements were ‘human rights’, ‘(in)justice’, ‘oppression’ (and ‘oppressive systems’), ‘violence’, ‘solidarity’, ‘collective identity’, and ‘identification’. These themes all included several codes that were categorized into these themes. For example, ‘oppressive systems’ is the theme that resulted from the combination of (among others) ‘colonialism’, ‘imperialism’, ‘capitalism’, ‘homonationalism/pinkwashing’, and ‘Apartheid’. The reason these codes were categorized into the category ‘oppressive systems’ was the context in which these systems were mentioned: all expressed some sort of systemic injustice, often directly specifying the injustice as oppression resulting from these systems.

In the transition of the main themes into understanding the underlying frameworks, existing literature on social movement framing was combined with the findings of the thematic analysis. As Robert Benford and David Snow describe in their paper on framing and social movements that the ‘injustice’ frame is widely employed by social movements (2000). The initial conceptualization of the ‘injustice’ frame by sociologists Gamson, Fireman, and Rytina (1982) articulates how social movements use this frame to articulate the unjustness of the actions of an authority. This conceptualization was later supported by several studies mentioned in Benford and Snow’s article (2000). The ‘injustice’ frame can also be found in the statements made by the social movements examined in this case study. Several themes present in the statements are understood to be part of the ‘injustice frame’. The initial themes of ‘oppression’, ‘oppressive systems’, ‘violence’, and ‘(in)justice’, all contain expressions of unjustness. Therefore, these themes are transitioned into the overarching ‘injustice’ frame found in the data – on to which will be deliberated in the next section.

The second frame retrieved from the thematic analysis is the ‘solidarity’ frame. Since the examined statements respond to the violent conflict in Gaza in which many people are in direct need of help, all statements included a strong sentiment of solidarity, and ‘solidarity’ was explicitly expressed in 73% of the statements (see Table 4.1). The ‘solidarity’ frame has been mentioned by sociologist and social movement scholar Donatella Della Porta in her analysis of how a fragmented group of heterogenous social movements converged toward solidarity during the Covid-19 pandemic (2022). Arguably, the current war in Gaza also creates a heterogenous group of social movements to express solidarity, of which the LGBTQ+ movement is one. In the thematic analysis, a clear overlap between the collective identity of this movement and their

expressions of solidarity was discovered, to which will be returned in the comparative analysis at the end of this chapter, as the remaining frames ought to be discussed as well to achieve a comprehensive understanding of such overlaps.

Table 4.1: Occurrences of frames

Frames	Occurrences* (total)	Texts in which present (%)
Human rights	13	47
Injustice	43	87
Identity	41	87
Solidarity	19	73

Note. n = 15

* Can be multiple times in one text

The remaining themes that resulted from the initial coding, ‘human rights’ and ‘identity’, fell rather neatly into existing frames expressed in social movement literature. The ‘human rights’ frame is associated with larger discourses found in expressions of social movements (Lindekilde, 2014). Moreover, the ‘human rights’ frame can be understood as a ‘master frame’, meaning that the frame overarches multiple social movements and manages the positionings of other social movements that utilize this frame (Snow, Vliegenthart & Ketelaars, 2018). The thematic analysis of this study found that most statements that utilize this frame almost exclusively express their solidarity through this frame. Compared to the other frames, the ‘human rights’ frame is less present in all texts (47%) as seen in Table 4.1. The frame overlaps to some degree with the ‘identity’ frame, especially in statements made by actors that identify as ‘human rights movements’. The ‘identity’ frame generally expresses the ‘self’ on whose behalf the statement is published, which emphasizes “awareness of similarity and shared fate” (Caiani, 2023, p. 197). The collective identity expressed in 87% of the data consists of the general identification with the LGBTQ+ community and/or movement and includes a variety of specifications that will be elaborated on in the following section.

The thematic analysis thus concluded with the categorization into four distinct, but overlapping, frames: ‘human rights’, ‘injustice’, ‘identity’, and ‘solidarity’.

Key Frames

This section contains the elaboration, illustration, and contextualization of the four frames found in the case study. The associated codes and themes, as well as the elements that indicate whether the frame is a diagnostic, prognostic, or motivational frame, are elaborated upon in the following paragraph.

The human rights frame

The ‘human rights’ frame can be understood as a master frame, encompassing any and all framing processes related to or stemming from the mentioning of human rights (Snow, Vliegthart & Ketelaars, 2018). The way human rights are defined by social movements in the data is varied and is expressed with both positive and negative language. On the positive side, human rights are understood as, for example, “the right of every individual to be themselves” and “justice and the protection of all people”. The negative formulation of human rights encompasses phrases as “freedom from oppression and exploitation” and “to exist without fear of harassment, violence, and discrimination”. The key quotes related to the human rights frame can be found in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Key quotes of the human rights frame

Organization	Quote
COC	“As human rights organization we stand for justice and the protection of all people”
Pride Walk	“Oppression and exploitation are violations of human rights, and so also of those of LGBTQI+ people”
Queer Network Amsterdam	“We stand for human rights and always in solidarity with oppressed and excluded groups – both in The Netherlands as well as elsewhere in the world”

Then, a plurality of expressions of whose human rights these statements concern can be dissected. Whose human rights are spoken of ranges from more general expressions, such as “everyone’s” or those of “oppressed and excluded groups”, to more narrow ones, such as LGBTQ+ people, LGBTQ+ Palestinians, Palestinians, and Israelis. Already notable is how LGBTQ+ Israelis are never mentioned, signaling an absence of identification with Israelis.

Lastly, the statements mention human rights often in the context of human right violations. This ties in with the injustice frame. In the comparative analysis, this overlap will be explored, along with what the implications of the ‘human rights’ frame are on the ‘identity’ and ‘solidarity’ framework.

The ‘human rights’ frame is used both as a diagnostic and a prognostic frame. On the one hand, expressions of human rights violations and the threatening of human rights of (LGBTQ+) people in Gaza are a diagnosis of the current state of affairs and the problem that is at hand. Two statements mention the lack of commitment to international law of both Israel and the international community, which problematizes the safeguarding of human rights. On the other hand, the protection of human rights that is vastly needed is expressed as well in the statements. In relation to this, a call for ceasefire is mentioned in several statements. These expressions signal the prognostic elements of the ‘human rights’ frame utilized by the LGBTQ+ movements. By explicitly mentioning which and whose human rights are at stake (diagnostic) and stating that these rights need safeguarding (prognostic), the ‘human rights’ frame fulfills two important factors of social movement framing.

The strategy employed by the organizations that use the ‘human rights’ frame as their main frame to solve any internal tensions seem to be to *not mention* any internal tensions or conflicting solidarity. By expressing solidarity with victims of human rights violations in general, these social movements refrain from addressing conflicting solidarities at all. This finding also resonates in the interview with a spokesperson of COC, one of the larger LGBTQ+ organizations in the Netherlands, see Appendix B for the full interview. In this interview, the spokesperson articulates that they specifically chose to express solidarity with all people. COC identifies as a human rights organization, because “LGBTI-rights do not exist, only human rights do”. What is regarded as most important to this social movement organization is that “human rights apply to everyone and that no distinction can be made”. In response to questions about potential conflicts within the organization, COC mentions that they had to deal with a great deal of “feelings, ideas, and views”. Why they chose for a politically neutral terminology that focused solely on the protection of human rights is due to their aim to not differentiate between human rights violations in one place versus in other places. COC is silent in their consideration of different identities within the social movement and the conflicting solidarities – silent both in their statements as in the interview.

The injustice frame

The ‘injustice’ frame is compared to the ‘human rights’ frame even more pluralistic in nature. Different statements include different notions of injustice, likely related to the differences between the social movement organizations. Table 4.3 includes key quotes that illustrate the ‘injustice’ frames.

Table 4.3: Key quotes of the injustice frame

Organization	Quote
Collective of multiple people (open letter)	“The right to exist without fear of harassment, violence, and discrimination is absent in the West Bank and occupied Palestinian territories”
COC	“The continued Israeli bombing and the lack of food, water, and medical care is at this moment the biggest danger to everyone in Gaza, including LGBTI+ persons”
Pride Walk	“Homonalism is equated to (extreme) right smear campaigns against Muslims, refugees, and migrants”
Stichting Art. 1	“Stand up and speak up against injustice against the Palestinian people and the occupation of their land”

The best distinction between different kinds of injustice can be made between systemic injustices and incidental injustices. The systemic injustices that are mentioned are, e.g., colonialism and capitalism. Colonialism, which in this analysis contains neo-colonialism as well, is problematized with regard to its oppressive functions: “settler colonial violence” and “Western imperialist greed and consumption” are mentioned as the injustices caused by colonialism. Capitalism contains a more extensive number of injustices, of which homonalism and pinkwashing are problematized most. Pinkwashing is once declared to be “rainbow capitalism” and is problematized because of its function in exploitation and oppression. Homonalism is even directly linked to violence when being described as “using pro-LGBTQ+ rhetoric to commit violence globally”. An initial frame following from the analysis is the ‘oppressive systems’ frame, which was derived from the mentioned examples. However, together with other forms of injustices mentioned, the ‘oppressive systems’ frame can be understood to be part of the larger ‘injustice’ framework that is present in many of the statements.

Apart from oppressive systems, an extensive number of more specific injustices are stated. Many of them are related to the situation of Palestinians: dispossession, ongoing bombing, harassment, hostages, family evacuations, torture, and a lack of food, water, and medical care are some examples. Moreover, violence was mentioned 29 times in a total of twelve of the fifteen statements. Important to mention here is that LGBTQ+ victims of violence are mentioned four of these 29 times, which signals a potential relation between violence against people in Gaza and violence against LGBTQ+ people. It also signals an overlap between the ‘injustice’ framework and the ‘identity’ framework. Moreover, human rights violations are

also part of the injustices mentioned in the statements, illustrating the overlap between the ‘human rights’ and the ‘injustice’ framework. These overlapping frames could potentially explain the combination of frames used by social movements.

Oppression through acts of violence is the other side of the ‘injustice’ framework. Thus, it can be said that the ‘injustice’ framework utilized in the analyzed statements is strongly linked with oppression through both incidental practices of oppression as well as systemic oppression. The ‘injustice’ frame is a diagnostic frame, for it clearly articulates a wide range of injustices happening in or in relation to Gaza.

The identity frame

The identity expressed in these statements is the collective identity of the LGBTQ+ community. This already is a community that encompasses a variety of individual identities, tied together by the shared identity of non-normative sexual orientations and gender identities. One explanation for this alliance is given by sociologists and social movement scholars Jasper and McGarry: “The LGBTQ movement attempts to address issues of sexual orientation as well as gender because, standing alone, the trans community can be ignored” (2015, p. 7). Several of these identity expressions can be found in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Key quotes of the identity frame

Organization	Quote
Collective of multiple people (open letter)	“As queer and trans people we of all people know solidarity from others is lifesaving”
COC	“As human rights organization we stand for the right to live for people everywhere on earth”
Pride Walk	“Mostly because we ARE LGBTQI+ Muslims, refugees, and migrants”
Papaya Kuir	“We are ALL Palestinians”
Black Pride	“As our ancestors have done before, we shall continue on until everyone is free, as our liberation is tied together”

The collective identity created and expressed by social movement organizations worldwide can be found in all of the statements analyzed. However, there are some differences to mention. The biggest LGBTQ+ organization of the Netherlands, COC, clearly states that they identify as a human rights organization. As mentioned previously, in their interview they articulate that they do not identify as a LGBTQ+-rights organization, for they identify as a human rights

organization that fights for the human rights of LGBTQ+ people – a subtle but significant difference. Other organizations focus on specific intersections within the LGBTQ+ movement, such as Amazigh³ queer diaspora (Marokkueerzawya), or on different subcategories within the LGBTQ+ movement, such as lesbian refugees and migrants (Papaya Kuir). Though these organizations might represent smaller fractions of the LGBTQ+ community, they all identify as being part of this collective identity and therefore represent this community. Moreover, some statements also include the mentioning of the history of the LGBTQ+ community and the shared experience of oppression and exclusion – the level of which is dependent on color, class, and gender, as mentioned in one of the statements. The emphasis on shared history strengthens the sense of shared identity. This can be recognized as an important strategy of managing diverse identities. The ‘identity’ frame does not comply with the categories diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational and can be seen as an additional frame (Caiani, 2023).

The solidarity frame

The expression of solidarity in the statements is rather simply formulated: “Free Palestine”, “Ceasefire now”, or “Against Apartheid” are often-used mottos, for example in the form of hashtags on social media. Other expressions of solidarity are presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Key quotes of the solidarity frame

Organization	Quote
Collective of multiple people (open letter)	“We must stand side-by-side with other persecuted groups fighting for equal rights”
Black Pride	“We are thinking about our siblings worldwide – also in the Western world – whose suffering increases as hatred and persecution grows”
Queer Choir Amsterdam	“We stand by the Palestinians and their fight for liberation, along with Sudan, Congo and all people brutally oppressed by Western colonial systems”
Papaya Kuir	“QUEERS AGAINST APARTHEID”
Queer Choir Amsterdam	“We stand in solidarity with the Palestinian cause for freedom”

With whom solidarity is expressed ranges from more politically neutral to very specific vocalizations of solidarity. Neutral articulations are focused on a general “all people” that are

³ Amazigh diaspora refers to Berber people living outside of the traditional territories of Berber people.

suffering or being oppressed, due to a number of actors or circumstances. The majority of solidarity expressions, however, explicitly mentions Palestinian people, Palestine itself or, in one statement, the “Palestinian struggle for life in dignity”. A significant aspect of these solidarity expressions is the difference in how Palestine and Israel are named. The ‘perpetrator’ in these expressions is ‘Israel’, and the victims with whom solidarity is expressed are ‘Palestinians’ or ‘the Palestinian people’ (see *emphasis* in Table 4.6). This is crucial to consider when discussing the solidarity expressions in this second category. As a third category, there are the solidarity expressions that overlap with the collective identity of the LGBTQ+ community, which use words as “our siblings worldwide” or “our community elsewhere”. This category offers some insights into how these organizations manage the potentially conflicting solidarities within the movement, to which will be returned in the following section. The three different kinds of expressions are categorized as three sub-frames of the ‘solidarity’ frame and define how solidarity is framed, as illustrated in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Sub-frames of the solidarity frame

Sub-frames	Organization	Expressions of solidarity
Politically neutral solidarity	COC	“We stand for justice and the protection of all people”
	Collective of multiple people (open letter)	“We must stand side-by-side with other persecuted groups fighting for equal rights”
	Queer Network Amsterdam	“We stand for human rights and always in solidarity with oppressed and excluded groups”
Solidarity with Palestine/Palestinians	Gender Program/ Studies	“Rise up against seven decades of <i>Israeli</i> colonial settler violence”
	Dance with Pride	“ <i>The Palestinian people</i> and their right to sovereignty and freedom”
Overlap identity/ solidarity	Black Pride	“Siblings worldwide”
	Pride Walk	“Our community elsewhere”

Note. Emphasis added by author.

The injustices that are mentioned in the statements are often accompanied by expressions of solidarity. This frames the victims of these injustices as people to be in solidarity with, and that solidarity is – to some degree – necessary in reaction to the violent conflict in Gaza. The ‘solidarity’ frame is therefore understood to be a motivational frame: it creates an atmosphere of willingness to act. One of the statements literally encourages others to “join [them] in issuing

statements condemning this ongoing Israeli state violence and taking collective action to express solidarity with the Palestinian struggle for life in dignity”.

Comparative Analysis

The four frames each have their distinct attributes and functions, but overlap to a certain extent as well. The ‘human rights’ frame overlaps with the ‘injustice’ frame when the statements mention human rights violations since these are understood to be a form of injustice. The ‘human rights’ frame overlaps with the ‘identity’ frame when a movement identifies as a human rights movement. Since the LBGTQ+ movement actively advocates the protection of human rights of this marginalized group, the overlap is rather reasonable. Lastly, the ‘human rights’ frame and the ‘solidarity’ frame overlap as well, because human rights are often mentioned as the reason the movement organizations are in solidarity with the people whose human rights are violated. This expression of solidarity does, however, entail that conflicting solidarities are not being addressed. Instead of finding a way to manage the different solidarities, the organizations that mainly operationalize the ‘human rights’ framework, and from this express their solidarity, mute the internal identity differences in their statements.

The ‘injustice’ and ‘identity’ frame overlap when injustice is mentioned with regard to the LBGTQ+ community. For instance, LBGTQ+ victims of violence or oppression in Gaza are mentioned in several statements. Moreover, the ‘identity’ frame includes considerations of how the LBGTQ+ community has historically been oppressed and excluded, of which the “level [was] dependent on color, class, and gender”. In this regard, solidarity is expressed as well, especially in one noteworthy sentence found in the statement by Queer Network Amsterdam:

Our pride is intersectional – we cannot separate the violence against and the exclusion of the LBGTQI+ community from (institutional) racism, homonationalism, sexism, Islamophobia and other forms of oppression and violence.

The notion intersectionality is found in multiple statements. The LBGTQ+ organizations express identifying as intersectional: the intersections of multiple axes of discrimination, exclusion, or oppression are stated to be represented within the LBGTQ+ movement. This articulated both in identity statements made by the movements part of this study, as well as in their solidarity statements. A full overview of all identity statements can be found in Appendix A, Table A.2. Furthermore, one of the statements published by a coalition of LBGTQ+

movement organizations includes an explicit identification with this intersectionality: “we ARE LGBTQ+ Muslims, refugees and migrants”. Besides this identification, a wish to be more intersectional and aware to intersectionality is expressed in two statements as well.

These findings signal an interesting pattern in the overlap of the frames: solidarity seems to be expressed through a process of identification, aided by the ‘injustice’ and ‘human rights’ frame. Intersectionality is the gateway leading to this overlap between identity and solidarity. On the one hand, intersectionality contains expressions of shared experiences of discrimination, exclusion, or oppression. On the other hand, several of the statements also explain that therefore, their “liberation is tied together”. One statement even goes the length to use the sentence “we are all Palestinians” – a phrase frequently heard in solidarity protests. This pattern aligns with the collective identity that the movement organizations expressed elsewhere. A full overview of all identity statements can be found in Appendix A, Table A.2. All of the movements that have expressed to value intersectionality express this identity in the solidarity statements as well. Specific indications of whom this might refer to is not given in the identity statements but does in some instances appear in the solidarity statements. For example, the statements mention, with regard to their collective identity, Palestinian victims of Israeli oppression and dispossession. The collective identity expressed in this regard is built on the premise that the LGBTQ+ community stands for all people suffering from oppression and whom are historically marginalized. This specific articulation of collective identity is a frame employed by some, not all, Dutch LGBTQ+ movement organizations that were analyzed. However, it does signal an important explanation of why Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations are in solidarity with people in Gaza, and more significantly: Palestinians. The shared experience of oppression, currently and/or historically, ties the identity of the Palestinians to the LGBTQ+ community.

This is one of two prominent findings of the analysis: the expression of solidarity is tied to the LGBTQ+ identity in several ways as to connect their identity to the victims of the violent conflict in Gaza. This signals an important mechanism of how LGBTQ+ organizations manage their internal identity differences. In contrast to muting these differences, related to the ‘human rights’ frame, this strategy is employed in an attempt to highlight intersectionality and through this foster a more inclusive social movement. The second significant finding is that the ‘human rights’ frame is in several instances tied to expressions of solidarity. This solidarity is articulated without addressing any different identities within the LGBTQ+ community. Instead of focusing on these differences as the intersectional strategy entails, the organizations express solidarity with all victims of human rights violations and mutes any internal identity differences.

5. CONCLUSION AND REFLECTION

This final chapter provides a conclusion to the research presented. The chapter begins with a concise summary that highlights the primary elements of each preceding chapter. The second section addresses the central research question, integrating the theoretical answer from the literature review (Chapter 2) and the empirical answer provided in the analysis and results chapter (Chapter 4), and offers a final answer to the research question. Following this analysis, the chapter reflects on the contributions of the research, discusses its limitations, and offers recommendations for future studies.

Summary

The global solidarity movement with Palestine has, to a certain extent, encompassed support from the LGBTQ+ movement. From the understanding that within the LGBTQ+ movement different identities and different identity intersections exist, and that these identities may include conflicting solidarities, the question was raised of how the LGBTQ+ movement navigates internal identity differences in the context of the violent conflict in Gaza. On a more abstract level, this question pertains to an understanding of how social movements in general navigate identities in the context of conflicting solidarities.

Research shows that social movements operationalize at least two strategies to manage internal identity differences and potential conflicts: creating a strong identity and establishing a solid democratic foundation – though the latter lacks definitive research on its mechanisms. Moreover, the likelihood of social movement participation increases through previous experience in social movements, which is linked to ally identity. This supports the assertion that a social movement can encompass different identities whose solidarities may differ as well. Finally, framing theory offers insight into the diverse strategies social movements employ to achieve success. The practice of identity framing showed to be of importance in creating a strong collective identity, expressed both externally as well as internally. How a social movement frames itself, therefore, is understood to provide insights into the management of internal identity differences in social movements.

Conducting a frame analysis of social movements' solidarity statements would provide essential insights into the underlying mechanisms of how social movements navigate different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities. Fifteen statements of Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations were initially openly coded and examined for its main themes. These codes and

themes led to the categorization of four core frames: the ‘human rights’, ‘injustice’, ‘identity’, and ‘solidarity’ frames. A comparative analysis of these themes would potentially result in a comprehension of the strategies LGBTQ+ organizations employ to manage internal differences. Chapter 4 elaborated on the results of the frame analysis and synthesized the results into two significant findings: some social movement organizations showed to silence the internal identity differences and others rather focused on intersectionality as a means to navigate different identities. The following section uses the findings of both the literature review and the empirical analysis to provide an answer to the research question.

Answer to the Research Question

The aim of this study was to create an in-depth understanding of how social movements navigate different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities. The research question was:

How do social movements navigate different identities that construct their collective identity in the context of conflicting solidarities?

The answer to the research question is threefold. There are several strategies social movements employ to navigate different identities that construct their collective identity in the context of conflicting solidarities. One of these strategies is creating a strong collective identity. Support has also been found for the argument that social movements focus on intersectionality and with this create an inclusive collective identity in order to navigate internal identity differences. Lastly, a new strategy has been found: social movements can also employ the strategy of silencing differences in their attempt to navigate internal differences.

The theoretical answer resulting from the literature review was twofold: social movements can create a strong collective identity or perhaps establish a solid democratic base to manage internal conflicts. The first strategy showed most potential in providing an explanation for the research subject. Creating a strong collective identity is strategy employed with varying degrees of inclusivity. Being inclusive in the formation of a collective identity is a historical practice that has been of significant impact on both the feminist movement and the LGBTQ+ movement. A focus on the intersecting identity markers, rather than one singular axis, was the strategy employed to create more inclusive movements and to lower the level of internal identity conflicts. Other scholars have argued that by including more different identity, the level of internal conflict would rise, and contend that a social movement should rather focus on

exclusivity in the creation of a strong collective identity. Although the literature consistently emphasizes the importance of creating a strong collective identity, the level of inclusivity involved remains a point of contention. An important strategy involved in creating and amplifying a strong collective identity is identity framing. This practice entails the strategic construction of a social movement's identity by highlighting certain attributes and values and downplaying other aspects.

The finding that creating a strong identity is commonly understood to be an important strategy in navigating internal differences led to the expectation that social movements do, in fact, operationalize this strategy. The expected outcome of the frame analysis of Chapter 4 therefore was that the social movement organizations would express their collective identity in the solidarity statements. This could subsequently be interpreted as a strategy employed by social movements to navigate internal differences in the context of conflicting solidarities.

The results from the frame analysis, supported by the interview with a large Dutch LGBTQ+ organization, are twofold as well. First, several of the studied social movement organizations employed the strategy to not include any acknowledgement of internal differences in their solidarity statements. The discovery of this 'silencing' strategy was a result from the overlap of the human rights frame with the solidarity frame. Second, other organizations did take an inclusive stance and focused on intersectionality in their solidarity statements. This was the result of another overlap between two frames: the identity frame and the solidarity frame. The collective identities expressed in identity statements by the organizations did not significantly differ from the collective identities they expressed in the solidarity statements. The organizations did, however, strongly express a collective identity in their solidarity statements.

The empirical results can be interpreted in the context of the existing literature on this issue. Based on the theoretical framework, it can be concluded that Dutch LGBTQ+ movements explicitly articulate a collective identity in their solidarity statements to address and manage internal differences. This affirms the expectation articulated in Chapter 2 and therefore strengthens the generally existing understanding in social movement theory and identity theory that the creation of a strong collective identity is employed to navigate internal differences. In addition to the confirmation of the usage of this strategy, the frame analysis also offered two different strategies: *silencing the differences* and *focusing on intersectionality*. The literature review discussed that several scholars understand creating an inclusive collective identity to be related to lower levels of internal conflict, while some others argue that inclusivity leads to more internal conflict. Several movements in this case study attend to the first collection of

literature and confirm that inclusivity, by means of intersectionality, is indeed a strategy employed by social movement organizations to manage internal differences. The other finding that several organizations have contrariwise silenced internal differences does not pertain to any findings in the literature review. It offers a novel insight into the strategies employed by social movements to navigate internal differences.

Reflection on Contribution

Given the findings discussed in this concluding chapter, it is necessary to consider this study's contribution to knowledge of how social movements navigate different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities. This study demonstrates that social movements employ several strategies to navigate internal diversities in the context of conflicting solidarities.

First, creating a strong collective identity has been found to be an important strategy of social movements. The literature has understood this strategy to be important and this was confirmed by the case study on Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations. Collective identity has not been widely understood to be an integral part of social movement definitions. This study shows that, as other social movement scholars have argued as well, identity is a crucial aspect of social movements – both collective identity, identity work, identity conflicts, and ally identity.

Second, this study adds to the body of work dedicated to understanding how inclusivity can be operationalized by social movements to manage internal diversities. The case study found that some social movement organizations unambiguously focus on intersectionality to express their solidarity with Palestine. Incorporating all identities and potentially conflicting solidarities in their solidarity expressions therefore adds to the understanding that social movements use a strategy of creating a strong inclusive collective identity to navigate internal identity differences.

Apart from these findings that strengthen two strategies present in existing literature, the third and last core finding rather enriches these theories by providing a novel insight into the research issue. The case study shows several instances of silencing internal differences by framing the collective of a Dutch LGBTQ+ organization to be concerned with all victims of human rights violations. This can be interpreted as another strategy to navigate these differences: muting them. The strategy of silencing internal differences is an addition to existing literature on how social movements navigate different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

The final section of this study addresses the research limitations and suggests recommendations for further research on how social movements navigate different identities in the context of conflicting solidarities. First, there are some methodological limitations that ought to be discussed. The sample size was rather small: a total of fifteen statements made by thirteen different organizations were analyzed. Due to time constraints and personalized algorithms on social media, it is possible that not all statements that fit the requirements of the data needed for this study were found. This could lead to a reduced validity of the study because it remains unknown if any and all suitable data was included in the analysis. Further research could conduct a more extensive search for data – perhaps in another country or of a different social movement – to assure a more definitive validity.

A second limitation of this research is the context – of this study and of the analyzed data. The Netherlands has, as mentioned in the Introduction, a complex history with Israel and Palestine. Since this study was conducted during a period of intense public and political debates on the escalating conflict, and included statements of only the past five years, it needs to be stated that this contextuality limits the relevance of the findings over time. A recommendation for future studies is to include data from a larger period of time to increase temporal validity. Another recommendation could be to address the contextuality more extensively, also in order to increase temporal validity.

A third and final limitation of the study at hand is the assumption that the studied social movements to a certain extent operationalized certain frames with intention. The assumption of intentionality can reduce the validity of the results because when a social movement does not intentionally employ a certain frame but is assumed to do so, conclusions on their internal strategies may not represent reality. Therefore, a recommendation for future studies is to conduct a mixed methods approach in which frame analysis is combined with in-depth interviews of spokespersons of the social movement organizations. Though this study has included one such interview, which has somewhat increased the validity, a representative range of interviews could increase the validity.

Apart from the recommendations that followed from these limitations, one other finding leads to suggestions for future research as well. As mentioned in the literature review, some research has been conducted on the establishment of a democratic foundation as a strategy to navigate internal differences and reduce internal conflicts. However, research on its underlying mechanisms is lacking. Conducting research on how a social movement's democratic base can be a tool in navigating internal differences can further strengthen the theory on this strategy.

Concluding Remark

This study has shown to be of assistance to existing literature on how social movements navigate identity differences in the context of conflicting solidarities. Three strategies are found to be employed by social movements to navigate identity differences in the context of conflicting solidarities. The identified navigation strategies include creating a strong collective identity, focusing on inclusivity in the construction of a collective identity by means of intersectionality, and silencing internal identity differences. Apart from its contribution to academic research, this study could be able to provide some insights for social movements and their members themselves as well. No one is the same in this world, identities will always differ. Social movements are an extraordinary vehicle to bring these different identities together to fight for the same cause and have proven to be pivotal in human history. Providing the needed tools to navigate the (potentially conflicting) different identities that come together in a social movement, especially in times of other pressing social issues that need support, can be of great assistance to social movements and its members. This study has aimed to contribute to these tools and has recommended future research to add to this as well. Providing a better understanding of social movements may increase such movements' potential for success, which could change and improve the world. As stated by the Black Pride movement: "As our ancestors have done before, we shall continue on until everyone is free. As our liberation is tied together." None of us are free until all of us are free.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aguiar, L. (2009). Framing a global crisis: An analysis of the coverage of the latest Israeli-Palestinian conflict by Al-Jazeera and CNN. *Estudos em comunicacao*, 6, 1-17.
- Al Lawati, A. & Ebrahim, N. (2024, June 1). What seven more months of war would mean for Palestinians, Israelis and the world. *CNN*.
<https://edition.cnn.com/2024/06/01/middleeast/what-seven-months-of-war-mean-for-israel-hamas-mime-intl/index.html>
- Antaki, C., Billig, M.G., Edwards, D. & Potter, J.A. (2003). Discourse Analysis Means Doing Analysis: A Critique of Six Analytic Shortcomings. *Discourse Analysis Online*, 1(3), 14-35. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/athenea.64>
- Atshan, S. (2020). *Queer Palestine and the Empire of Critique*. Stanford University Press.
- Babb, S. (1996). “A True American System of Finance”: Frame Resonance in the U.S. Labor Movement, 1866 to 1886. *American Sociological Review*, 61(6), 1033–1052.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2096307>
- Benford, R. D. (1993). Frame disputes within the nuclear disarmament movement. *Social Forces*, 71(3), 677-701. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2579890>
- Benford, R. D. & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology* (26), 611-639.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611>
- Bernstein, M. (1997). Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103, 531–65.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/231250>
- Bernstein, M. (2023, November 21). Queer Palestinians & The Power of Pinkwashing [Audio podcast episode]. In *A Bit Fruity*. <https://podcasts.apple.com/gb/podcast/a-bit-fruity-with-matt-bernstein/id1693739175?i=1000635528870>
- Blee, K. M. (2012). *Democracy in the Making: How Activist Groups Form*. Oxford University Press.
- Blus-Kadosh, I., Rogel, A., Blatt, R. & Hartal, G. (2023). Progress and Challenges of the LGBT+ Community in Israel. In P. R. Kumaraswamy (Ed.), *The Palgrave International Handbook of Israel* (pp. 1-16). Palgrave Macmillan.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-2717-0_101-1

- Buechler, S. M. (1995). New Social Movement Theories. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 36(3), 441-464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1995.tb00447.x>
- Caiani, M. (2023). Framing and Social Movements. *Discourse Studies*, 25(2), 195-209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456231154734>
- Creasap, K. A. (2012). Social Movement Scenes: Place-Based Politics and Everyday Resistance. *Sociology Compass*, 6(2), 182-191. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00441.x>
- Davidson, R. J. (2017). *Consensus social movements Strategic interaction in Dutch LGBTI politics* [Doctoral thesis, Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research]. <https://hdl.handle.net/11245.1/cc522a57-8c30-44fe-9633-ac132dc2491d>
- Della Porta, D. (2022). *Contentious Politics in Emergency Critical Junctures: Progressive Social Movements during the Pandemic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Della Porta, D. & Diani, M. (2020). *Social Movements: An Introduction* (3rd ed.). Blackwell.
- Dugan, K. B. (2005). *The Struggle Over Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Rights: Facing Off in Cincinnati*. Routledge.
- Dugard, J., & Reynolds, J. (2013). Apartheid, International Law, and the occupied Palestinian territory. *European Journal of International Law*, 24(3), 867-913. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/cht045>
- Edwards, C. (2024, January 26). Top UN court says Israel must take ‘all measures’ to prevent genocide in Gaza but stops short of calling for ceasefire. *CNN*. <https://edition.cnn.com/2024/01/26/middleeast/israel-genocide-case-icj-hague-ruling-south-africa-intl>
- Einwohner, R., Reger, J. & Meyers, D. (Eds.). (2008). *Identity Work in Social Movements* (Vol. 30). University of Minnesota Press.
- Evans, C. & Gamman, L. (1995). The Gaze Revisited, or Reviewing Queer Viewing. In P. Burston & C. Richardson (Eds.), *A Queer Romance: Lesbians, Gay Men and Popular Culture* (pp. 12-61). Routledge.
- Ezzina, R. (2021). Western Media’s Representation of Palestine. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, 25(1), 357-365. <http://ijpsat.ijsh-t-journals.org/>
- Fassihi, F. (2024, May 29). New Cease-Fire Proposal Circulates at U.N., Driven by Outrage Over Israel’s Strike on a Tent Camp. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/05/29/world/middleeast/algeria-gaza-ceasefire-proposal-un.html>

- Friedman, D., & McAdam, D. (1992). Collective identity and activism: Networks, choices, and the life of a social movement. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 156–173). Yale University Press.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992). The Social Psychology of Collective Action. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 53–76). Yale University Press.
- Gamson, W. A. & Meyer, D.S. (1996). Framing political opportunity. In D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy, & M.N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (pp. 275–290). Cambridge University Press.
- Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W. & Sasson, T. (1992). Media Images and the Social Construction of Reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, 373-393.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.18.080192.002105>
- Gamson, W. A., Fireman, B. & Rytina, S. (1982). *Encounters with Unjust Authority*. Dorsey.
- Gines, K. T. (2011). Black Feminism and Intersectional Analyses. *Philosophy Today*, 55, 275-284. <https://doi.org/10.5840/philtoday201155supplement68>
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. Harper Colophon Books.
- Greenstein, R. (2019). Colonialism, Apartheid and the Native Question: The Case of Israel/Palestine. In V. Satgar (Ed.), *Racism After Apartheid: Challenges for Marxism and Anti-Racism* (pp. 75–95). Wits University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.18772/22019033061.8>
- Hallward, M. C. & Armstrong, C. (2016). Tweeting resistance: the evolution of engagement frameworks. In L. E. Hancock, *Narratives of Identity in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* (Vol. 40), pp. 227-261. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/S0163-786X20160000040008>
- Hashish, Y., Ismail, A. & Abusaada, H. (2023). BBC Coverage of the Aggression on Gaza 2021: Critical Discourse Analysis of Arabic and English Versions. *Komunikator*, 15, 54-67. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jim.18508>
- Hilal, J. (2015). Rethinking Palestine: settler-colonialism, neo-liberalism and individualism in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. *Contemporary Arab Affairs*, 8(3), 351-362.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17550912.2015.1052226>
- Human Dignity Trust. (n.d.). *Palestine*. Retrieved May 30, 2024, from <https://www.humandignitytrust.org/country-profile/palestine/>

- Jasper, J. M. (2011). Emotions and social movements: Twenty years of theory and research. *Annual review of sociology*, 37, 285-303. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150015>
- Jasper, J. M. & McGarry, A. (2015). Introduction: The Identity Dilemma, Social Movements, and Contested Identity. In A. McGarry & J. M. Jasper (Eds.), *The Identity Dilemma: Social Movements and Collective Identity* (pp. 1-17). Temple University Press.
- Kidd, D. & McIntosh, K. (2016). Social Media and Social Movements. *Sociology Compass*, 109, 785-794. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12399>
- Kingsley, P. & Kershner, I. (2023, October 7). 'We Are at War,' Netanyahu Says After Hamas Attacks Israel. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/10/07/world/middleeast/israel-netanyahu-hamas-attack.html>
- Kollman, K. (2016). Pioneering marriage for same-sex couples in the Netherlands. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 24(1), 100–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2016.1147057>
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Lindekilde, L. (2014). Discourse and Frame Analysis: In-Depth Analysis of Qualitative Data in Social Movement Research. In: D. Della Porta (Ed.), *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*, 195-227. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198719571.003.0009>
- Maddison, S. (2004). Young Women in the Australian Women's Movement: Collective Identity and Discursive Politics. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 6, 234-256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461674042000211317>
- Malcontent, P. (2022). The Netherlands, the EU and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. *European Review of International Studies*, 9(2), 270-299. <https://doi.org/10.1163/21967415-09020005>
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. & Zald, M. N. (1988). Social Movements. In N.J. Smelser, *Handbook of Sociology*. Sage Publications.
- McCallion, M. J. & Maines, D. R. (1999). The liturgical social movement in the Vatican II Catholic Church. In L. Kriesberg, M. N. Dobkowski & I. Wallimann, *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* (Vol. 21), pp. 125-149. JAI Press.

- Mian, L. & Brown, B. (2024, March 27). 'Reasonable grounds' to believe Israel is committing genocide in Gaza, UN rights expert says. *CNN*. <https://edition.cnn.com/2024/03/27/middleeast/israel-committing-genocide-in-gaza-un-rights-expert-says-intl/index.html>
- Morris, A. D. & Braine, N. (2001). Social Movements and Oppositional Consciousness. In J. Mansbridge & A. D. Morris (Eds.), *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Social Protest* (pp. 20-37). University of Chicago Press.
- Myers, D. J. (2008). Ally Identity: The Politically Gay. In J. Reger, D. Myers & R. Einwohner (Eds.), *Identity Work in Social Movements* (pp. 167-187). University of Minnesota Press.
- Nijim, M. (2023). Genocide in Palestine: Gaza as a case study. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, (27)1, 165-200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2022.2065261>
- Peteet, J. (2016). The work of comparison: Israel/Palestine and apartheid. *Anthropological Quarterly*, (89)1, 247-281. <https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.2016.0015>
- Polletta, F. (2002). *Freedom Is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements*. University of Chicago Press.
- Polletta, F. & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective Identity and Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 283-305. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2678623>
- Polya, G. (2010). Ongoing Palestinian Genocide. In W. A. Cook (Ed.), *The Plight of the Palestinians*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230107922_3
- Prager, S. (2024, February 5). Queer people organizing in solidarity with Palestine continues to grow. *Prism Reports*. <https://prismreports.org/2024/02/05/queer-people-organizing-solidarity-palestine/>
- Puar, J. (2007). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1131fg5>
- Puar, J. (2013). Rethinking Homonationalism. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 45(2), 336–339. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43302999>
- Rashed, H., Short, D. & Docker, J. (2014). Nakba Memoricide: Genocide Studies and the Zionist/Israeli Genocide of Palestine. *Holy Land Studies*, (13)1, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.3366/hls.2014.0076>
- Regan, H. (2024, May 3). Where pro-Palestinian university protests are happening around the world. *CNN*. <https://edition.cnn.com/2024/05/03/world/pro-palestinian-university-protests-worldwide-intl-hnk/index.html>

- Reinhart, E. (2024, April 11). The solidarity of shared trauma: De-exceptionalising Gaza. *Al Jazeera*. <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2024/4/11/the-solidarity-of-shared-trauma-de-exceptionalising-gaza>
- Roth, B. (2004). *Separate Roads to Feminism: Black, Chicana, and White Feminist Movements in America's Second Wave*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sarwar, H., Malhi, A. T. & Naz, I. (2023). Representation of Israel and Palestine Issue in International Media: An Analysis of BBC and Al-Jazeera coverage in 2022. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 375-381. [http://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2023\(4-III\)34](http://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2023(4-III)34)
- Schulman, S. (2011, November 22). Israel and 'Pinkwashing'. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/23/opinion/pinkwashing-and-israels-use-of-gays-as-a-messaging-tool.html>
- Segev, E. & Miesch, R. (2011). A Systematic Procedure for Detecting News Biases: The Case of Israel in European News Sites. *International Journal of Communication*, (5)1, 1947-1966. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/995>
- Snow, D. (2001). Collective Identity and Expressive Forms. In N. J. Smelser & P. B. Baltes, *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, pp. 2212-2219. Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b0-08-043076-7/04094-8>
- Snow, D. A. & Anderson, L. (1987). "Identity Work among the Homeless: The Verbal Construction and Avowal of Personal Identities." *American Journal of Sociology*, 92,1336-1371.
- Snow, D. A. & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research* 1(1), 197-217.
- Snow, D. A. & McAdam, D. (2000). Identity Work Processes in the Context of Social Movements: Clarifying the Identity/Movement Nexus. In S. Stryker, T. J. Owens, and R. W. White (Eds.), *Self, Identity, and Social Movements* (pp. 41-67). University of Minnesota Press.
- Snow, D. A., Soule, S. A. & Kriesi H. (2004). In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 3-16). Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470999103>
- Snow, D. A., Vliegenthart, R. & Ketelaars, P. (2018). The Framing Perspective on Social Movements. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, H. Kriesi and H. J. McCammon, *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 392-410). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119168577.ch22>

- Tamarkin, S. (2023, November 22). Why Queer Solidarity With Palestine Is Not “Chickens for KFC”. *Them*. <https://www.them.us/story/lgbtq-solidarity-palestine-saed-atshan>
- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, V. & Whittier, N. E. (1992). Collective identity in social movement communities: Lesbian feminist mobilization. *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, 104, 109-21.
- Tilly, C., Castañeda, E. & Wood, L. J. (2020). *Social Movements, 1768-2018* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Van Stekelenburg, J. & Klandermans, B. (2009). Social Movement Theory: Past, Present and Prospects. In S. Ellis & I. van Kessel (Eds.), *Movers and Shakers: Social Movements in Africa* (pp. 17-43). Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004180130.i-260>
- Watkins, A. (2024, May 29). ‘All Eyes on Rafah’ Surges on Social Media After a Deadly Israeli Strike. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/05/29/world/middleeast/all-eyes-on-rafah.html>

7. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Data inventory tables

Table A.1: Overview of data collected (chronologically)

Author	Date	Title	Source	Word count	Link to source
Collective of multiple people (open letter)	<i>n.d.</i>	Brief aan het bestuur van Pride Amsterdam	Google Docs form; spread via social media	884	https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSc1SjYwsPAdivWK9JfFp0ubjljjYqtx9lnFj0DAmKQUmInBw/viewform?fbclid=PAAab_NHgasBZ9wAipZrNLcpo7nMdTaGoDe33mBcvbrYWFF1N_Waf7UA_thhI_aem_AcKp_kjbkHn1x8xA8X3PxJrVZrrkW7IJi3py49qKgI0i9ivIq56mv7GZxLcNAQkay0
SEHAQ	2019-02-21	<i>No title</i>	Facebook	425	https://www.facebook.com/sehaqNL/posts/984406131745116
Graduate Gender Programme and Netherlands Research School of Gender Studies	2021-05-14	Palestine Solidarity Statement	Facebook	494	https://www.facebook.com/uva.arcgs/posts/2895755790672024?_cft_%5b0%5d=AZWbfROpbQy3IUtPGd1_7Llr7wQ5A1R2d0Sal3BI3ee0fEr_07d1AjiBOKvDLXcPf2KubRKPoVC8I5MMWad1PZ8EdbJIGvUNCzAowDcStPPL1EJnXewRJAhyoKF_3p8WsuKdMljnojj6jKtzAfBlpQBh5goXs281m1kEvHkIDUckcC9Ho6nYzXgRDCzeQf8jUWZnbUvSx3t3rr3ij45z-Nop&_tn_=%2CO*F
Dance with Pride	2021-05-27	#MusiciansFor Palestine	Instagram	103	https://www.instagram.com/p/CPYS0QqFMdl/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRIODBiNWF1ZA==
We Reclaim Our Pride	2021-08-12	<i>No title</i>	Facebook	1124	https://www.facebook.com/events/302436481657466/?post_id=307523571148757&view=permalink&_cft_%5b0%5d=AZWt43r4iqGIY-rv-o9ICAhJZOBDXyMj1a4WZ1vsaYuR7r38JK8wxoTNBrTz82Er1Z3jkTQG4kcclNhgxZWho-97mUsk0F0ShElifYxIbnjcQ9d14TOzrZwRypvIAfmXa5l6rH78PR7t-yaV8AbK84RcaXpwKrmLajy4aFWM2XxNA&_tn_=%2CO%2CP-R
Pride Walk	2022-07-30	Pride Walk 2022 Manifest	Instagram	1385	https://www.instagram.com/p/CgoLU_7Ik-J/
Queer Network Amsterdam	2022-07-30	<i>No title</i>	Instagram	138	https://www.instagram.com/p/Cgnmbl_IUrm/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRIODBiNWF1ZA==

Marokkueerzawya	2023-10-26	<i>No title</i>	Instagram	10	https://www.instagram.com/p/Cy3SySOo-4I/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRIODBiNWFIZA==
Queer Choir Amsterdam	2023-11-02	<i>No title</i>	Instagram	54	https://www.instagram.com/p/CzJQG4UI-6L/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRIODBiNWFIZA==
Queer Choir Amsterdam	2023-11-02	Statement by Queer Choir Amsterdam at IDFA	Instagram	360	https://www.instagram.com/p/Czl5w-DIaBC/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRIODBiNWFIZA%3D%3D
Papaya Kuir	2023-11-07	<i>No title</i>	Instagram	22	https://www.instagram.com/p/CzWpymMojKI/
COC	2023-11-10	Staakt-het-vuren in Gaza!	Website of organization	319	https://coc.nl/nieuws-en-publicaties/staakt-het-vuren-in-gaza/#:~:text=COC
Stichting Art. 1	2023-11-13	<i>No title</i>	Instagram	25	https://www.instagram.com/p/Czk8jRpSoCy/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRIODBiNWFIZA==
Black Pride	2023-12-23	<i>No title</i>	Instagram	479	https://www.instagram.com/p/C1MTXzYIYOx/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link&igsh=MzRIODBiNWFIZA==
COC	2024-03-06	Kritiek op Booking.com	Website of organization	109	https://coc.nl/blog/2024/03/06/kritiek-op-booking-com/

Table A.2: Identity statements of Dutch LGBTQ+ organizations included in analysis

Organization	Identity statement
Collective of multiple people (open letter)	<i>Not an official organization, but a collective: no collective identity expressed elsewhere</i>
Black Pride	Black Pride NL is a grassroots organisation and social justice movement centering and celebrating the Black LGBTQIA+ community and those of color.
COC	The COC actively promotes a diverse and inclusive society. We connect the rainbow movements and defend emancipation, acceptance and equal rights for all lgbti+ people. [translated from Dutch]
Dance with Pride	A Proud Reunification of Dance Music and Queer Culture. A non-profit initiative supporting Project Queer Welfare, SEHAQ and Gladt e.V.
Graduate Gender Programme and Netherlands Research School of Gender Studies	<i>Not an official organization, but a collective: no collective identity expressed elsewhere</i>
Marokkueerzawya	Amazigh-Queer-Diaspora organisation based in Amsterdam "We Are Here To Connect, Critic And Build"
Papaya Kuir	We are a lesbo-transfeminist collective created by and for Latin American migrants and refugees residing in the Netherlands and the larger community interested in our struggle.
Pride Walk	<i>Not an official organization, but a collective: no collective identity expressed elsewhere</i>
Queer Choir Amsterdam	Queer Choir Amsterdam is an artistic initiative that premises the creation of a brave space to celebrate our unique identities and voices. Through our rehearsals and performances we express our ideas for the futures we desire and the narratives we want to share. The queer community often gathers and functions in spaces of celebration and night life all of which were greatly affected during the pandemic, this gave us an incentive to create our own safe space beyond these confines, one that is run by and for queer people.
Queer Network Amsterdam	Queer Network Amsterdam is a solidarity network of Amsterdam-based LGBTIQ+ organizations, grassroots initiatives and individuals. The core of the network is to visibly bring to the fore the stories of LGBTIQ+ black people, people of color and transgender people. [translated from Dutch]
SEHAQ	Sehaq is a leftist feminist refugee-led group that aims to create safe spaces for queer & trans refugees from the Middle East & North Africa in NL
Stichting Art. 1	Stichting Art. 1 is an Amsterdam-based foundation that is working on international collaborative projects in the field of human development, democratic participation and human rights through art. [translated from Dutch]
We Reclaim Our Pride	<i>Not an official organization, but a collective: no collective identity expressed elsewhere</i>

Appendix B: Interview transcript (Dutch)

Geïnterviewde: Vertegenwoordiger van COC Nederland (COC)

Interviewer: Eva de Jong (I)

Datum: 17 mei 2024 10:00 uur

Plaats: online (Skype)

[Introductie van onderzoeker en het onderzoek]

I: Ik heb natuurlijk jullie statements gelezen over de situatie met Booking.com en jullie contacten daar, en de algemene oproep voor een staakt-het-vuren. Allereerst de vraag: waarom hebben jullie dat online geplaatst?

COC: En met ‘dat’ bedoel je de oproep voor een staakt-het-vuren?

I: Eigenlijk beide statements: waarom jullie op deze twee verschillende manieren die solidariteit hebben uitgesproken.

COC: Het zijn eigenlijk twee verschillende statements denk ik. De ene die oproept tot een staakt-het-vuren hebben we gedaan omdat voor ons lhbt-rechten in de kern mensenrechten zijn en mensenrechten moeten overal ter wereld gerespecteerd worden. Je kan daar ook een onderscheid in maken tussen de ene mensenrechten wel en de andere mensenrechten niet. Dus vandaar dat wij ons hierbij hebben aangesloten – bij de bredere oproep van ngo’s, onder andere in Nederland, die oproepen tot een staakt het vuren. Dus wij sluiten ons bij die oproep aan. En dat hebben wij ook daarin verwoord als het goed is. Ik heb het nu voor me – daar staan ook een aantal andere organisaties in genoemd. We leggen ook uit dat het ons gaat om mensenrechten van alle mensen aan alle zijden van het conflict, ook in dit geval.

I: Dus jullie focussen jullie niet specifiek op een bepaalde categorie slachtoffers, zoals andere mensen misschien wel doen, maar op alle slachtoffers in dat opzicht?

COC: Ik weet niet zo goed hoe anderen dat doen maar wat ons betreft is het belangrijkste dat inderdaad mensenrechten voor iedereen gelden en dat je daar geen onderscheid in kan maken. De andere is: er bestaat niet zoiets als lhbt-rechten, er bestaat alleen zoiets als mensenrechten en die moeten voor iedereen gelden en dus ook voor lhbt-personen, maar ook voor anderen. En helaas is het zo dat die niet overal in de wereld gerespecteerd worden. Daar zetten wij ons voor in. En in dit geval hebben wij ons aangesloten bij de oproep voor een staakt-het-vuren.

I: Waren daar nog specifieke overwegingen of dilemma’s die daaraan ten grondslag lagen; die jullie intern misschien hadden over het al dan niet plaatsen van dit statement?

COC: Overwegingen of dilemma’s... Ik denk dat het iets is dat gewoon heel erg leeft in de maatschappij en dat betekent dat het ook heel erg leeft bij ons. Dus we hebben hier met collega’s veel over gesproken. Het gaat natuurlijk mensen aan het hart wat er gebeurt. We werken ook internationaal dus sommige mensen raakt het nog directer dan anderen. Maar we vonden het – wat ik al zei, het gaat om mensenrechten. Belangrijk voor ons was het om aan te sluiten bij de oproep van andere organisaties.

I: Duidelijk. En er waren niet per se onderlinge conflicten of pijnlijke punten in die gesprekken daarover? Dat kan ik me namelijk best voorstellen in zo'n situatie waarbij veel belangen meespelen.

COC: Ja, er wordt hier eigenlijk dagelijks denk ik wel over gesproken. Dus het is niet zo dat er een gesprek is geweest dat dan leidt tot een bericht op de website. Ik denk dat, zoals met andere onderwerpen die spelen in de wereld, spelen die [onderwerpen] hier ook gewoon bij de mensen die hier werken en hebben we het daarover. En evengoed over bijvoorbeeld het coalitieakkoord dat gister is gepresenteerd. Dat raakt ons ook natuurlijk allemaal, dus daar hebben we het ook over. Daarin zijn wij een best grote organisatie met een nog grotere achterban en een nog veel grotere community die we vertegenwoordigen, waarin allerlei verschillende gevoelens, ideeën en opvattingen spelen en dat kan allemaal, dat hoort daar ook in thuis.

I: Hebben jullie hierin dan een bepaalde politieke neutraliteit bewust gekozen of ziet u dat anders?

COC: Wat bedoel je daarmee?

I: Omdat u zegt: "er spelen veel verschillende belangen", en ik lees in jullie statement ook een bepaalde politieke neutraliteit over dat het in het algemeen over mensenrechten gaat en niet per se over pro of tegen een van beide landen is die hier in dit conflict meespeelt. Is dat een bewuste keuze?

COC: Het is in die zin een bewuste keuze dat wat de aanleiding voor ons om ons uit te spreken is het feit dat het gaat om schendingen van mensenrechten en niet daarbij het onderscheid te maken tussen schendingen van mensenrechten in één plek versus op een andere plek, of op één grond versus op een andere grond. En dat is dus omdat wij in de kern, wat ik al zei, een mensenrechtenorganisatie zijn. Mensenrechten die geschonden worden moeten overal benoemd worden en dus ook in dit geval. In dit geval was het natuurlijk ook zo dat er een oproep werd gedaan ook door andere partijen, waar wij ons graag bij wilden aansluiten omdat, wat wij ook zagen, die mensenrechten onderdeel zijn van dezelfde mensenrechten waar wij ook ons hard voor maken.

I: Dus jullie zien jullie zelf echt als een mensenrechtenorganisatie, in die zin?

COC: Absoluut, dat zijn wij.

I: Hebben jullie eerder gesproken over het uiten van solidariteit in een andere soort situatie? Dus bijvoorbeeld het conflict in Oekraïne of de burgeroorlog in Syrië; dat soort andere ook eventuele mensenrechten conflicten.

COC: Dat weet ik niet. Dat zou ik moeten opzoeken. Dat heb ik nu niet paraat.

I: Oke, dat is dan eventueel nog voor een later moment. Om er nog wat dieper op in te gaan: ik ben heel benieuwd hoe jullie als organisatie tegenover het feit staan dat Israël zich profileert als een pro-lhbt-land, daarin ook de banden met Nederland probeert sterk te houden en veel Nederlanders bijvoorbeeld ook uitnodigt voor hun Pride in Tel Aviv en daarmee probeert een bepaald beeld van zichzelf neer te zetten als heel progressief land. Het tegengeluid dat nu erg wordt gegeven is dat dat een soort dekmantel is – dat zijn niet mijn

woorden maar die kom ik veel tegen – voor de grote mensenrechtenschendingen die nu gaande zijn in Gaza. De tegenstelling daarin is dat queer personen zich misschien eerder solidair zouden voelen met Israël omdat ze die progressieve waarden vertegenwoordigen. Heeft u enige ideeën waarom in dit geval Nederlandse lhbt'ers juist zich solidair zouden voelen met Palestina in plaats van met Israël?

COC: Nee. Dat is lastig, want ik kan dat niet voor andere mensen natuurlijk zeggen. Ik weet dat het voor sommigen zo zou kunnen zijn. Maar andere mensen staan hier weer anders in en ik weet ook dat het kan verschillen. Nee, ik kan daar niet namens anderen – of namens de gemeenschap – spreken waarom zij bepaalde visies of opvattingen hebben over waarom dat gebeurt.

I: En hoe is dat voor u persoonlijk?

COC: Ik vind het heel lastig om daar een oordeel over te geven, omdat ik er te weinig in zit. Ik kan het vanaf hier heel moeilijk beoordelen – wat er precies gebeurt. Ik kan wel in algemene termen zeggen dat, en dan komen we denk ik terug op wat we net zeiden, dat in de kern het belangrijk is dat mensenrechten gerespecteerd worden en dus ook het promoten van mensenrechten nooit ten koste kan gaan van het schenden van mensenrechten ergens anders. Dat geldt in algemene termen zo en dat geldt hier ook zo.

I: Dan nog kort terugkomende op jullie statement over Booking.com. Daar waren jullie heel duidelijk in, met ook een focus op de mensenrechten die geschonden worden. Jullie zeggen daarin dat jullie jullie contacten gaan inzetten om dat bij Booking aan te kaarten. Hoe is dat gegaan en is dat gelukt?⁴

COC: We hebben al een tijdje een samenwerking met Booking.com. In dit geval is het natuurlijk heel erg verontrustend dat – en dat is ook waar de schrijvers van de open brief⁵ naar refereren – er accommodaties worden aangeboden in bezette Palestijnse gebieden. De schrijvers van de brief roepen in deze brief Pride Amsterdam op om hun samenwerking met Booking.com te heroverwegen. Wij voeren deze gesprekken al langer bij Booking.com en wij zijn ook in gesprek met Booking.com ook voordat we dit *posten*. Dus het is niet zo dat wij naderhand met Booking.com zijn gaan praten. En die gesprekken lopen nog steeds, dat zijn best wel ingewikkelde gesprekken natuurlijk, maar ook hier geldt voor ons dat het steunen van mensenrechten en het promoten van mensenrechten op één plek nooit ten kosten kan gaan van het schenden van mensenrechten ergens anders.

I: Is er al iets uit die gesprekken gekomen?

COC: Nee, die gesprekken lopen nog.

I: Oke, die gesprekken lopen nog. Heeft u verwachtingen daarbij? Hebben jullie een hoop – een doel voor ogen?

COC: Ja, ons doel is natuurlijk dat mensenrechten gerespecteerd worden overal. En als dat dus niet zo blijkt dan moeten we zorgen dat dat verandert en dan zullen wij alles doen wat wij

⁴ Inmiddels samenwerking en donatierelatie van COC met Booking.com verbroken, zie: <https://coc.nl/blog/2024/06/06/update-samenwerking-coc-x-booking-com/>

⁵ De open brief aan het bestuur van Amsterdam Pride over hun samenwerking met Booking.com.

kunnen doen om onze invloed daarop uit te oefenen. Maar dat moet blijken uit de gesprekken en wat daaruit komt.

I: Dan is dus eigenlijk het doel dat ze zich terugtrekken uit de bezette gebieden?

COC: Nou daarvoor moeten we nog echt de gesprekken met Booking.com voeren – over wat hun beleid is, hoe zij dat zien, waar dat schuurt of wel of niet in overeenstemming is met hoe wij ernaar kijken, en hoe we dat kunnen gaan oplossen. Daar kan ik nu eigenlijk nog niks over zeggen omdat ik daar nog met hen over in gesprek ben.

I: Duidelijk. Ik heb mijn belangrijkste vragen eigenlijk wel beantwoord gekregen op dit moment, dus hartstikke bedankt daarvoor. Ik heb ik het geprobeerd in te korten en dat is gelukt zo te zien, we zijn er heel snel doorheen. Heeft u verder nog vragen die ik kan beantwoorden?

COC: Nee, volgens mij is alles duidelijk. Ik zal het toestemmingsformulier invullen en dat stuur ik naar je terug.

I: Heel fijn. Mocht je nog iets willen toelichten – ik stelde die vraag over andere situaties waar jullie al dan niet op hebben gereageerd en eventuele discussies die daaraan voorafgingen – mocht je nog tijd vinden om daarover iets te willen zeggen, dan kunnen we nog een keer bellen of u kunt me daar ook over e-mailen. Daar ben ik namelijk ook heel benieuwd naar.

COC: Prima. Als wij ons eerder hebben uitgesproken over andere onderwerpen dan is het eigenlijk altijd in een nieuwsbericht, die vind je volgens mij tot in het oneindige terug op onze website. Daar vind je eigenlijk wel het meeste.

I: Oke, ja. Mocht je daar nog iets over willen toelichten, want het gaat voor mij natuurlijk over mogelijke discussies die daaraan ten grondslag hebben gelegen, dan hoor ik dat ook heel graag en dan zie ik dat wel verschijnen.

COC: Perfect.

I: Hartstikke bedankt in ieder geval voor uw tijd en voor uw bereidheid om het interview te doen. Dit gaat mijn onderzoek heel erg helpen. Dus nogmaals hartstikke bedankt en ik zie het formulier dan wel tegemoetkomen.

COC: Dankjewel. Stuur je ook het resultaat van het onderzoek nog op?

I: Ja, dat is goed.

[Afronding]