European Journal of Politics and Gender • vol XX • no XX • 1–25 • © Authors 2026
Online ISSN 2515-1096 • https://doi.org/10.1332/25151088Y2026D000000131
Accepted for publication 12 January 2026 • First published online 23 February 2026

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Sticky feeling politics: affective feminist resilience to anti-gender politics in the Spanish Parliament

Silvia Díaz Fernández, *silvia.diaz@cchs.csic.es*
Paloma Caravantes, *paloma.caravantes@cchs.csic.es*
Spanish National Research Council, Spain

Emanuela Lombardo, *emanuela.lombardo@sns.it*
Scuola Normale Superiore, Italy

The rise of anti-gender and far-right actors threatens feminist, anti-racist and LGBTQIA+ politics. While responses to these forces are being researched, the affective dynamics of parliamentary resistance remain underexplored. This article examines how affect shapes feminist resilience to anti-gender politics in Spain's National Parliament, foregrounding the affective dynamics of parliamentary debates, which are especially relevant to understand because anti-gender actors weaponise emotions against feminism. Building on Ahmed's 'sticky affects' and Bargetz's 'feeling politics', we propose the concept of 'sticky feeling politics' to explore how affective parliamentary dynamics shaped by anti-gender politics attach feelings to gendered and racialised bodies, and how feminist members of Parliament (MPs) feel, navigate and contest these. Drawing on 12 debates and 22 interviews with MPs, staff and allied organisations, we trace practices of embodied resilience, solidarity and political rationality. The article advances scholarship on the affective life of institutions, showing how feminist actors foster affective political resilience within hostile terrains.

Keywords affect theory • sticky feeling politics • feminist resilience • anti-gender politics • Spain • democracy

Key messages

- Politics is affective: anti-gender and far-right actors weaponise affect to attack progressive and feminist members of Parliament (MPs).
- This article theorises sticky feeling politics to explore affective feminist resilience in the Spanish Parliament.
- Feminist MPs reorient hostility into resilience, reshaping politics through emotion, care and solidarity.

To cite this article: Díaz Fernández, S., Caravantes, P. and Lombardo, E. (2026) Sticky feeling politics: affective feminist resilience to anti-gender politics in the Spanish Parliament, *European Journal of Politics and Gender*, Early View, DOI: 10.1332/25151088Y2026D000000131

Introduction

The rise of anti-gender and far-right actors, as evidenced in recent elections in the US or the European Union, threatens the advancement of feminist, anti-racist and LGBTQIA+ politics (Kantola and Lombardo, 2021; Ayoub and Stoeckl, 2024; Holvikivi et al, 2024; Lombardo, 2024). This article centres affect as a critical lens to examine feminist resilience in the Spanish National Parliament in response to this so-called 'anti-gender' politics. We understand anti-gender politics as the organised efforts to oppose gender, racial and sexual equality, often through the delegitimisation of feminist knowledge and institutions, as well as political violence against feminists, racialised and LGBTIQA+ people, and other marginalised groups (Dietze and Roth, 2020; Kriszan and Roggeband, 2021; Rawłuszko, 2021; Indelicato and Magalhães Lopes, 2024). We are attentive to the scholarly discrepancies and ideological positioning over the term 'anti-gender' (Roggeband et al, 2025; Wilén, 2025) and recognise that these mobilisations can be transversal, cutting across conventional left–right divides. We also understand them not as monolithic but as context dependent, with different ideological positions (Reinhardt et al, 2023; Sältenberg et al, 2024). Some place anti-gender actors along a 'far-right continuum' (Norocel, 2023), while others identify them within feminist politics, particularly in relation to anti-trans discourses (Hemmings, 2022; Gusmeroli, 2023; Platero, 2023).

In this article, we draw on Churcher et al (2023: 1) when they emphasise the role that institutions play in enabling and shaping 'entire ecologies of affect … that reflect and reproduce inequalities of power and privilege'. In this sense, we recognise affect as a productive force, heavily entangled with power relations, social organisation, agency and politics (Ahmed, 2004; Díaz Fernández, 2024). We contend that examining these affective dynamics is key, as political violence against feminist and progressive actors risks eroding democratic participation by pushing them out of the political arena (Hybridas, 2022). For instance, within the context of Spain, a feminist leader from a left-wing party resigned from her political duties with a heartfelt press note pointing to emotional exhaustion as a leading cause of her decision (Chouza, 2023). In the Belgian context, Coffé et al (2024) highlight how sexism in politics may become a barrier to women's representation, a situation that resonates in UK politics (Esposito and Breeze, 2022) and elsewhere (Hybridas, 2022; Håkansson, 2024).

Bearing this in mind, this article puts the affective into the map by looking at how it shapes parliamentary politics and feminist resilience practices. To do this, we put in dialogue Ahmed's (2004) phenomenological discussion of 'sticky affects' and Bargetz's (2014) conceptualisation of 'feeling politics' and propose the concept of 'sticky feeling politics' to capture the affective dynamics of parliamentary life. For Bargetz (2014), feeling politics highlights that political structures are organised not only discursively and institutionally but also affectively, that is, that they are lived, sensed and felt in

everyday life, shaping political subjectivity and agency too. For Ahmed (2004), sticky affects describe how emotions become unevenly distributed across social groups: they cling or attach differently depending on gender, race, class or other axes of difference. This stickiness helps explain why certain bodies or identities are repeatedly associated with fear, threat or anger in political discourse. Our contribution lies in bringing these two perspectives together to theorise 'sticky feeling politics', a framework for explaining how affect shapes gendering and racialising processes in parliamentary settings characterised by the interplay of anti-gender politics and feminist resilience practices. This approach illuminates how affective feminist discourses and practices navigate and (re)negotiate the affective dynamics structuring political interactions, enabling actors to contest anti-gender politics and enact feminist resilience through affective means.

Drawing on this, we contend that the Spanish Parliament is an affective institution in which the circulation of affect has become sticky in relation to the construction of exclusionary and increasingly antagonistic gendered and racialised dynamics shaped by the legacies of Francoist fascism and colonialism (Roggeband et al, 2025). Although affect has always been intertwined with politics and policy making (Slaby and Bens, 2019), affective trajectories have become heightened in the current anti-gender times (Hemmings, 2022). In Spain, this is reflected by the unfolding of emotional radicalisation against feminist agendas, primarily driven by Vox, the far-right party (Pichel-Vázquez and Enguix-Grau, 2021), and the Partido Popular ('Popular Party' [PP]), the mainstream right-wing party (Jaráiz Gulías et al, 2024). The significant presence of these parties, inextricably linked to the Spanish fascist past, has made the Spanish Parliament become suffused with sticky affect, becoming particularly stickier for those members of Parliament (MPs) with feminist and progressive agendas, as they face a hostile parliamentary context for feminist policy making (Kantola and Lombardo, 2024; Lombardo et al, 2025).

In this article, we argue that the stickiness of affect in the Spanish Parliament functions to structure political debates and resilience practices along the axes of gender and race through the generation of specific feeling politics (Bargetz, 2014; 2019). The overarching question of the article is: how does affect shape feminist resilience to anti-gender politics in the Spanish Parliament? We operationalise this through two specific research questions:

- How do feminist MPs negotiate and navigate the sticky feeling politics that are produced?
- What affective feminist resilience practices emerge in this context?

To address these questions, we draw on primary and secondary data collected during Spain's 2019–23 parliamentary term, which was characterised by a significant presence of Vox (14.8 per cent of seats) and the PP (25.4 per cent of seats). Our material includes parliamentary debates on topics central to feminist politics, such as reproductive rights, LGBTQ+ rights and sexual freedom, and 22 interviews conducted with progressive and feminist MPs, political staff and civil society organisations collaborating with the Parliament.

With this work, we build on key scholarship examining the affective life of institutions (Churcher et al, 2023) and the affective fabric of politics (Ahmed, 2004; Bargetz, 2014; 2019; Slaby and Bens, 2019; Hemmings, 2021;

Pichel-Vázquez and Enguix-Grau, 2021). The analytical framework of 'sticky feeling politics' makes visible dimensions of parliamentary politics overlooked in conventional accounts, especially how affect structures both antagonism and resistance within institutional arenas. We also contribute to work addressing feminist institutional responses to anti-gender politics in parliaments (Cullen, 2021; Caravantes et al, 2024; Kantola and Lombardo, 2024; Lombardo et al, 2025). While these contributions have significantly advanced our understanding of affect and feminist resilience in political life, the application of an affective lens to parliamentary contexts remains largely underexplored (for exceptions, see Kantola and Miller, 2021), a gap this article seeks to address.

Affect in politics and institutions

> The political is affective because it fundamentally deals with what matters to us, what we value, fear or desire, or what concerns us – us as a polity. Conversely, the affective is always political, since emotions are … modulated by shared or conflicting values. (Szanto and Slaby, 2020: 478)

The so-called 'turn to affect' has been gradually integrated into political studies (Hogget and Thompson, 2012). While affect has gathered attention in areas like social movements and feminism for some time (Bonu Rosenkranz, 2025), mainstream political studies have traditionally been rooted in assumptions of rationality, strategy and objective decision making, as seen in behaviourist approaches (Hogget and Thompson, 2012). According to Bargetz (2014; 2019), this has led to a liberal conceptualisation of politics as detached from feelings, ignoring the political significance of affect and the role of emotions in governing and regulating social order (Sauer and Penz, 2017).

In the opening quote to this section, Szanto and Slaby (2020) emphasise the interwoven relationship between politics and affect in their theorisation of political emotions. But what really is affect? And is it different from emotions? This question lies at the heart of the affective turn (Clough, 2008). As Seigworth and Gregg (2010) explain, affect resists a singular theoretical framework, instead giving rise to multiple interpretations, or shimmery worldings (Seigworth and Pedwell, 2023). Some scholars, such as Massumi (2002) and Gould (2009), conceptualise affect as a pre-cognitive intensity distinct from emotion, while others, such as Ahmed (2004; 2010), Wetherell (2012) and Bargetz (2014; 2019), argue that affect is inherently tied to context and thus closely linked to the emotional. In this article, we draw on the feminist tradition that sees affect and emotions as intertwined and heavily entangled with histories of power, discourse and ideology (Ahmed, 2004; Leys, 2011; Wetherell, 2012). In this sense, we understand affect as 'part of what emotions do' (Schmitz and Ahmed, 2014). We approach affect not as a pre-social or purely bodily intensity distinct from emotion but as something that is integral to what emotions, understood as social and cultural practices, *do* in the world. Rather than isolating affect as a force outside discourse and power, we are interested in how emotions operate affectively, how they circulate, attach to bodies and objects, and how they shape social boundaries and orientations. This means rejecting a rigid affect–emotion binary, understanding affect as always already entangled with

discourse, history and power, and focusing on the ways in which emotions organise collective life and subjectivity.

Drawing on affect literature, Szanto and Slaby (2020) explain emotions as inherently political: as embodied, repeatable patterns of interaction that both shape and challenge what matters politically. In view of this, emotions also have a normative dimension, imposing certain norms or affective attachment on specific ideas and perspectives that establish how we should feel about 'certain socio-cultural or political issues' (Szanto and Slaby, 2020: 489).

The normative dimensions of affect are palpable in institutions, which are embedded in and productive of affective relationships (Hochschild, 1983; Ahmed, 2012; 2019; Bargetz, 2019; Slaby and Bens, 2019). As Ahmed (2012) argues, institutions accrue affective value by (re)ordering the social in exclusionary ways, marking only certain bodies, ideas and political imaginaries as legitimate and belonging. Similarly, Churcher et al (2023: 1) contend that parliamentary institutions rely on exclusionary mechanisms that shape 'entire ecologies of affect', reinforcing hierarchies of power and privilege. These mechanisms work to preserve the institution's 'idealised self-image', primarily benefiting its founding members, elite white men, while differently positioning racialised and gendered individuals as 'invaders' of the parliamentary space (Puwar, 2004). Puwar (2004) reminds us that institutional spaces like parliaments are not empty containers but, rather, historically occupied by dominant, normative bodies. When racialised and gendered bodies enter these spaces, they are marked as 'space invaders' (Puwar, 2004) and made to be hyper-visible, over-scrutinised and 'affectively monitored' (Ahmed, 2021). Feminist analyses show how parliamentary affective dynamics exercise control over emotions following a logic of 'in_visibilisation' (Sauer, 2023) that legitimises disembodied reason as the appropriate form of political expression.

Ethnographic takes on feminist institutionalism have further examined the inner life of parliaments, with Miller (2021) showing how everyday practices, routines and performances in institutions reproduce emotionally coded gendered power while also revealing cracks and tensions where these power relations can be contested. Recent scholarship has also highlighted how emotions shape parliamentary life and institutional practices through affective pressures and strategies, focusing on the programmatic role of emotions in shaping legislators' world views and structuring policy discourses (Sanchez Salgado, 2024).

While parliaments are difficult to navigate for non-hegemonic actors, anti-gender politics have enhanced such hostility by polarising political deliberation regarding gender, migration and sexuality (Caravantes et al, 2024). Literature has started to explore the affective texturing of anti-gender politics in reactionary times (Pichel-Vázquez and Enguix Grau, 2021; Butler, 2024; Carbin et al, 2024; Holzberg, 2024; Obst, 2024; Moerking and Baspehlivan, 2025). Studies on feminist responses in counteracting anti-gender politics are also emerging (Cullen, 2021; Smrdelj and Kuhar, 2025), with attention on responses from social movements and civil society, as well as on feminist strategies developed in institutional settings (Krizsan and Roggeband, 2021; Campillo et al, 2025; Lavizzari et al, 2025; Lombardo et al, 2025).

However, research looking at the role of affect in how feminist or progressive actors negotiate the anti-gender political climate is scant (Sengul and McSwiney, 2024). This article addresses this gap by using affect as a critical lens to explore feminist resilience to anti-gender politics within the Spanish National Parliament. Building on

work exploring feminist resilience (Chiva and Gaweda, 2025), we understand it as a collective and relational practice embedded in a political project that seeks structural transformation towards an egalitarian society rather than as a moral imperative imposed on those already burdened by inequality. In our work, we identify feminist resilience practices, sometimes enacted by individual MPs but always linked to the collective where these are devised. Drawing on feminist critiques, we recognise how resilience is often mobilised within neoliberal frameworks to individualise responsibility, particularly for structurally marginalised groups. In doing so, it can obscure institutional failure and demand cheerful endurance rather than recognising the collective agency of resilient actors and enabling meaningful resistance or systemic change (Ahmed, 2010; Butler, 2016). In the following, we propose the concept of sticky feeling politics, building on Ahmed's (2004; 2010) theory of 'sticky affects' and Bargetz's (2014; 2019) notion of 'feeling politics'.

Sticky feeling politics

Sticky feeling politics describes how emotions like hate, fear and disgust circulate and stick to certain bodies, such as women and racialised and LGBTQIA+ people, thus unevenly distributing negative affects. In anti-gender politics, this stickiness not only marks and disciplines targeted groups but also shapes how they navigate, rework and contest these affective attachments. The concept builds on Ahmed's (2004; 2010) theorisation of 'sticky affects' and Bargetz's (2014; 2019) notion of 'feeling politics'. While affect and feeling are often used interchangeably, bringing both scholars in conversation requires attention to how each theorist defines and mobilises these terms. For Ahmed (2004), signs, objects and events are affective in that they leave an impression or press upon us. For this, she argues, some physical closeness to the object in question is needed. However, '[h]ow the object impresses (upon) us may depend on histories that remain alive insofar as they have already left their impressions' (Ahmed, 2004: 8). For example, the term 'witch' is shaped by past histories of sexism that linked certain women to socially and morally heinous behaviour (Federici, 2018). Therefore, being called a witch leaves a certain impression by echoing histories of domination, mass violence and stigmatisation under the imaginary of women as morally corrupt. In this regard, Ahmed (2004; 2010) argues that affect echoes the social, both past and present times, and also the individual, irreducible to either.

One of affect's defining features, Ahmed (2004) insists, is its capacity to move and circulate. Affect does not reside in subjects or objects but materialises in the movement between them. It travels across bodies and signs, accumulating force and sticking in uneven ways. It is through this circulation that affect becomes enmeshed in social hierarchies, actively shaping and (re)producing gender and power relations. This leads to the question: what is the relationship between affect and power? Ahmed (2004) talks about the stickiness of affect as the dimension where power clings or, in her words, sticks. Sticky affects bind meanings to particular bodies or signs, intensifying their resonance and shaping how they are read. Sticky affects work like Velcro, Ahmed (2010: 36) explains, 'picking up whatever comes near'. Yet, this stickiness is unevenly distributed: some bodies attract stronger impressions, making certain emotions, such as fear, hate or disgust, more likely to cling to them depending on their social positioning. In white-supremacist societies, for instance,

Black and brown bodies become saturated with such affects, which circulate and attach disproportionately to them, structuring racialised encounters and sustaining systems of domination (Ahmed, 2000). Stickiness is therefore tightly bound up with power, systems of structural discrimination and socio-political hierarchies and is continually reproduced in everyday life through the mundane practices and politics that structure our social interactions (Stewart, 2007; Berlant, 2011; Cvetkovich, 2012). In this sense, we note Ngai's (2005) work on ugly feelings, those considered ambivalent, passive or obstructed (for example, irritation and anxiety), which, though often overlooked, also actively shape political life by revealing points of tension, resistance and negotiation. By focusing on these mundane circulations, we move away from abstract and individualising narratives of affectivity and instead examine how power relations are inscribed in people's everyday practices and under-the-radar affective experiences (Moerking and Baspehlivan, 2025).

Affect is political, and, as Bargetz (2014) argues, it does things politically, constituting what she calls 'feeling politics'. Bargetz (2014) conceptualises feeling politics as the deeply embedded affective relations that not only constitute political identities but also negotiate power relations and delineate the contours of political recognition. In privileging feelings rather than emotions or affect in her theorisation, Bargetz (2014) reclaims the word, often dismissed in liberal and rationalist political traditions, as central to political life. Developed within her conceptualisation of a political grammar of feeling, Bargetz (2014) explains feeling politics as the production of feelings within specific power relations and social structures, highlighting how affect circulates and gains socio-political recognition. For Bargetz, feelings are not spontaneous or isolated phenomena; rather, they are the very imprints of political conditions. To feel, she posits, is to be in direct contact with particular historical legacies. Feelings themselves are reflective of and shaped by these political conditions, which are felt, perceived and ultimately recognised in affective terms.

Bargetz distinguishes between the 'politics of feeling', understood as the deliberate use of affect as a political tool by institutions or actors, and 'feeling politics', conceived as the perception and recognition of social and affective power structures experienced by individuals and their responses to these structures. In this work, we use 'feeling politics' because our focus lies on the affective dynamics circulating in parliamentary debates and the everyday practices of feminist resilience rather than on the strategic mobilisation of affect by political actors or institutions. For instance, consider how the political legacies of racism and colonialism are not solely abstract systems of domination but embodied through feelings of fear and suspicion (Abadía, 2022; Roggeband et al, 2025). These feelings translate into ordinary practices: they dictate whom one might avoid and trust and how one navigates social spaces. Such everyday practices are not random; they are modulated by the enduring influence of historical power structures and their modern articulations. Here, feeling politics provides a crucial lens to understand doing politics, accounting for the myriad ways in which politics goes beyond the institutional, as it becomes affectively inscribed in everyday life, practices and identities.

Bringing Ahmed's (2004; 2010) theorisation of 'sticky affects' and Bargetz's (2014; 2019) notion of 'feeling politics' together into the concept of 'sticky feeling politics' allows us to understand the affective political dynamics of anti-gender and feminist politics that characterise increasingly hostile parliamentary contexts, both the politics of 'sticking' particular feelings to specific gendered and racialised people, and the

politics of how progressive MPs feel and contest anti-gender emotional attacks through affective strategies.

Data and methods

In this article, we draw on empirical data gathered within the framework of a European Horizon-funded project studying anti-gender politics and feminist movement and institutional responses to this opposition. Our analysis centres on Spanish parliamentary politics during the 14th legislative term (2019–23). The Spanish executive in 2019–23 comprised a left-wing coalition government between the historic Spanish left, represented by the Partido Socialista Obrero Español ('Spanish Socialist Workers' Party' [PSOE]), with 34.3 per cent of the parliamentary seats, and the new left Unidas Podemos ('United We Can' [UP]), with 10 per cent of seats (Congreso, 2019). This term, we argue, represents a unique sociocultural conjuncture: the rise of feminist institutional politics and movements (Alabao, 2022), and the far-right anti-gender party Vox gaining 14.8 per cent of the seats, thus contributing to a climate of heightened polarisation around gender and feminist issues, particularly in the parliamentary arena (Lombardo et al, 2025). In this article, we pay specific attention to the anti-gender politics of Vox, as interviewees consistently identified it as the main antagonist in the parliamentary arena. While the PP was also discussed and we acknowledge its role in anti-gender parliamentary politics, we narrow our focus on Vox because it has been identified in relevant literature (Pichel-Vázquez and Enguix Grau, 2021; Obst, 2024; Pichel-Vázquez, 2024) as the principal actor leading the 'affective crusade against "gender ideology"' (Obst, 2024: 5).

The data collection followed a two-step process. First, we collected and analysed 12 parliamentary debates, gathered between March and July 2023. This was followed by the collection and analysis of in-depth interviews, conducted between September 2023 and January 2024. The debates were selected based on their focus on gender equality-related issues, leading us to concentrate on those surrounding three progressive laws passed since 2021: (1) Organic Law 10/2022 of 6 September 2022 on the comprehensive guarantee of sexual freedom; (2) Organic Law 4/2023 of 28 February 2022 for real and effective equality of transgender people and to guarantee the rights of LGBTI (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersexual) people; and (3) Organic Law 1/2023 of 28 February 2023, amending Organic Law 2/2010 of 3 March 2010, on sexual and reproductive health and voluntary termination of pregnancy.

The analysis of the debates allowed us to identify prominent feminist and progressive actors who played a crucial role in shaping and defending these legislative initiatives, and these individuals were subsequently invited to participate in in-depth interviews. Selection criteria included the repeated presence and significance of their contribution in debates, their recognised expertise or leadership within their political party, and their engagement with equality institutions in the Spanish Parliament. Our analysis concentrates on parliamentary instances of resistance, understood not only as events located within the physical space of the Madrid parliamentary building but also as practices involving institutional actors or organisations with institutional presence. While most examples reported by interviewees took place inside the precinct, some exceeded its spatial boundaries, for instance, meetings in nearby bars or other informal

settings, yet these remain parliamentary insofar as they are embedded in institutional logics and enacted by parliamentary personnel or affiliated actors.

We contacted the identified feminist and progressive actors via email and also employed snowball sampling, using referrals from initial participants to recruit additional interviewees. In total, we conducted 20 semi-structured interviews in the Spanish Parliament with 15 MPs, three parliamentary technical personnel and two representatives of civil society organisations (CSOs) with institutional presence (20 women and two men) (see Table 1). The questionnaire was structured around two key themes: the actors and modes of resistance to equality policies, and institutional responses to such opposition. All interviews were conducted by pairs of researchers and in the Spanish language, as none of the research team speaks any of the other co-official languages in Spain. While we recognise this as a limitation, since Spanish is the working language of the Parliament and the common language across MPs, it had a minor impact on our research, though future research could benefit from a multilingual approach.

All data were coded by the team using ATLAS.TI. Affect was not an initial focus of our research design but, rather, an analytical thread that emerged inductively from the fieldwork. During the data collection and subsequent analysis, it appeared to us that many of the parliamentary discussions and interview conversations were significantly shaped by emotions: exhaustion, frustration, anger and fear, though also some optimism and joyful determination. It became apparent that there was a specific affective dimension to Spanish politics and to our interviewees' sense-making. Having identified this, we decided to read the data through the lenses of affect theory as a means of, as Berlant (2008: 4) explains, 'tracking affective intensities politically without

Table 1: Background information on interviewees

Interview number	Date	Institutional role	Location of interview
Interview 1	18/09/2023	MP	Online
Interview 2	04/10/2023	MP	Face-to-face, Madrid
Interview 3	26/09/2023	MP	Online
Interview 4	20/09/2023	MP	Face-to-face, Madrid
Interview 5	11/10/2023	MP	Online
Interview 6	10/10/2023	MP	Online
Interview 7	05/10/2023	MP	Online
Interview 8	23/11/2023	Parliamentary technical personnel	Face-to-face, Madrid
Interview 9	25/10/2023	MP	Online
Interview 10	28/11/2023	MP	Face-to-face, Madrid
Interview 11	18/10/2023	MP	Online
Interview 12	24/100/20023	Parliamentary technical personnel	Face-to-face, Madrid
Interview 13	17/11/2023	MP	Online
Interview 14	29/11/2023	Parliamentary technical personnel	Face-to-face, Madrid
Interview 15	12/12/2023	MP	Face-to-face, Madrid
Interview 16	17/10/2023	MP	Face-to-face, Madrid
Interview 17	04/12/2023	MP	Online
Interview 18	07/02/2024	MP	Face-to-face, Madrid
Interview 19	11/07/2023	CSO	Online
Interview 20	18/07/2023	CSO	Online

presuming their status as dramatic or, indeed, as events'. As feminist researchers at different stages of our academic trajectories, we are attentive to questions of power and recognise that our own sensitivity to affect and our commitment to centring it as a constitutive force in politics have shaped both our reading of the material and the analytical framework we bring to this article. As cis white women, we are also aware that our standpoint situates us within specific relations of privilege and limitation, which inevitably shaped the entire research process, as our cisness, whiteness and academic status afforded us particular forms of access, credibility and comfort in contacting and securing interviews with feminist MPs. These same positionalities influenced how we were perceived in the interviewing process, how participants responded to us and the interpretive lenses through which we made sense of gendered and racialised dynamics. They also influenced which affective resonances we attended to most closely and how we theorised their political significance. Consequently, this work remains partial and open to future engagement.

Sticky feeling politics in the Spanish Parliament

As we have argued, anti-gender politics tends to reproduce its ideological arguments through affective means, or what Holzberg (2024) calls affective grammars, meaning the emotional dynamics that weave together anti-feminist, anti-queer, racist and anti-migrant sentiments, encapsulating them as conspiracy-like ideologies that portray Western civilisations in rapid decline. This is reflected in Vox's speeches during debates in the Spanish Parliament, particularly those regarding gender, sexuality or sexual reproductive health. In these instances, feminism is depicted as an 'evil' and 'sectarian force' (Toscano_Vox_DSCD_236)[1] whose aim is to simply destroy life (Toscano_VOX_DSCD_130).

At the core of this discursive strategy is a process of affective vilification, where feminism and queerness are not only opposed ideologically to their politics but also made sticky through repeated associations with decline and brokenness. We interpret this as a deliberate discursive strategy because it manifests as a patterned practice: hate, disgust and fear are consistently attached to feminist, queer and anti-racist actors in their parliamentary speech, thereby articulating their anti-gender ideology, while love, care and protection are repeatedly associated with Vox (Pichel-Vázquez and Enguix Grau, 2021; 2023). We see the repetition of these affective vilifying attributions in parliamentary settings as configuring specific 'sticky feeling politics', whereby affect does not merely express political divides; it produces them, establishing who is rendered threatening and who is rendered trustworthy (politically and institutionally), who feels love, and who is inscribed into a politics of destruction and disgust. These affective distributions are not neutral; they reproduce longer histories of vilification and delegitimation of feminist, queer and anti-racist struggles, while simultaneously legitimising the far right as the true defenders of social cohesion, the family and the nation. This configuration draws on pre-existing affective legacies rooted in Spain's fascist past, portraying feminist and queer politics as fringe, divisive and confrontational and right-wing conservative actors as the guardians of traditional values and the common sense of the average Spanish citizen.

The mobilisation of affect by anti-gender actors within the Spanish Parliament was both felt and affectively recognised by our interviewees and in the parliamentary

debates, where feelings of indignation rose across MPs: some accused Vox MPs of bringing shame to Spanish politics (Lastra_PSOE_DSCD_130), others portrayed them as 'delirious' (Pozueta_Bildu_DSCD_216), and some defiantly asserted that 'there is far too much feminism for rich white men to decide our future' (Vehí_CUP_DSCD_137). Throughout the interviews, a shared process of sense-making emerged around the affective circuits structuring the parliamentary context. Describing the atmosphere of the Spanish parliamentary arena, MPs affirmed that 'the experience is brutal' (Interview 3) with 'constant attacks targeting us' (Interview 8) that are aimed to 'blow everything up' (Interview 2).

This seems to signal the affective accumulation within this particular context, which is felt as 'really intense' and 'increasingly unmanageable' (Interview 1), indicating a potential disruption of the political debate through affective means, which, according to the second extract, is harder for women. This points to how the circulation of affect mobilised by Vox is not evenly distributed but tends to accumulate around those already marked by gendered power structures. A sticky affective trajectory unfolds that makes political participation more difficult, unsettling the usual 'good tone' of parliamentary work and being emotionally taxing for feminist actors. When considering the underlying reasons for this parliamentary hostility, another interviewee remarked:

> Extract 1
> When I hear the people from Vox, it's like they surround us a bit and are right above us [in the parliamentary chamber], and we hear many of the conversations and comments they make, and I am convinced that they feel they have every right to be the ones in charge. They feel like the victors of the Civil War, and they still carry that with them. That's what happens with the far right in Spain. (Interview 10)

This MP's interpretation recognises the sticky affective dimension of Vox's presence and practices in parliamentary settings, directly linking them to ideological narratives of dominance and the enduring historical legacy of the Spanish Civil War. By describing Vox MPs as the 'victors', she underlines their feeling of entitlement to power, evidencing how histories of domination are inscribed into everyday political practices. In this way, Vox's interventions do more than merely disrupt debates; they contribute to an affective ordering of the parliamentary space, one in which certain bodies accumulate a sticky affect that enhances their legitimacy, while others are burdened with affect that constrains their political participation and undermines their credibility.

Although already indicative of gendered dynamics, the stickiness of affect also operates through racial demarcations. In multiple interviews, MPs specifically pointed towards one specific MP who was at the receiving end of xenophobic and racist attacks by Vox politicians, with one of them asserting that 'whenever she went up and down the benches, she was relentlessly insulted … and yelled at' (Interview 7). In this case, the MP's political activity is affectively curtailed due to being yelled at, which was so constant that she 'could barely speak', leading the interviewee to perceive 'the feeling of desperation in her, of rage, of not being able to express herself' (Interview 7).

This parliamentary atmosphere is thus shaped by a loud yelling that mobilises affective silence, intimidating and effectively constraining the political participation

of marginalised subjects. The affective silencing sticks to this racialised MP due to past and present colonial trajectories that mark her, in Puwar's (2004) words, as a 'space invader'. The result is the emergence of a distinctive form of sticky feeling politics, an affective regulatory mechanism that continuously shapes both the political debate and the institutional space. This mechanism operates through the accumulation of sticky affect, rooted in long-standing racial and sexist histories of exclusion, which reaffirms the political legitimacy of certain bodies while marginalising those deemed out of place. The context of violence that far-right politics creates around feminist and racialised MPs goes beyond marking them as space invaders, also expelling them from the parliamentary arena through insults and constant hostile commentary.

Feminist resilience practices

How do feminist and progressive MPs navigate the sticky feeling politics shaping the previously described parliamentary atmosphere? What can feelings, in the words of Bargetz (2019), 'politically' do? To explore this, we account for what Churcher et al (2023: 2) call the 'many lives of institutions', referring to the multiplicity of affective modes of living and engaging within an institutional setting, focusing on how political actors both preserve and contest the power asymmetries therein. Building on the interviews and parliamentary debates analysed, we identify three feminist resilience practices: embodied resilience, solidarity-making practices and a return to political rationality.

Embodied resilience

When reflecting on the interaction with anti-gender actors' speech in parliamentary debates, MPs describe an embodied, affective struggle that both unsettles and shapes their responses:

> Extract 2
> Vox has a very provocative discourse; it moves you. When Vox speaks … I got nervous.… What used to happen to me is that I would really freeze up. What do I say to them? What do I say? The thing is, the answer is that I don't debate with fascists. It's like, what am I supposed to do? (Interview 2)

> Extract 3
> The experience is very intense, so sometimes you're left like you need to do what your body asks of you, responding forcefully and with strong words, then that's the best thing to do. (Interview 4)

Extract 2 shows the uncertainty of how to navigate parliamentary politics shaped by the affective tone of Vox interventions. The interviewee's refusal to engage with 'fascists' coexists with a momentary paralysis and the wonder about what she is 'supposed' to do. The intensity reflected in Extract 3 echoes Interviewee 7's words (see later) about Vox's political speech going directly 'to your stomach', evidencing that sticky feeling politics are inscribed upon the body's affective political registers. Across the

interviews, embodiment explicitly appears in other instances of feminist resilience practices, such as progressive politicians engaging in 'strategic hugs' (Interview 2) after Equality Commission debates, using physical and relational solidarity to counteract the isolating impact of Vox's attacks (Interview 2).

These gestures exemplify embodied resilience, as MPs deliberately perform self-containment and collective presence within parliamentary settings, disrupting the affective framings imposed through vilification. Despite instances like this, it is pertinent to note that intra-feminist tensions, partisan logics and differing attitudes towards embodied performative and accessibility-sensitive forms of solidarity, including variations in comfort of ability with physical gestures like hugging, might also shape these dynamics, meaning that emotional dispositions towards resistance are not uniform but uneven and, at times, contested. For instance, parliamentary debates on trans rights and sex work often showed the division of feminist politics and the rising tension between different feminist positionings. The 'strategic hug' might not be comfortably embraced equally by all feminist actors, however strategic it may be.

This political context is imbued with the dynamics of sticky feeling politics, rendering feminist and progressive MPs consistently unsettled and complicating their ability to negotiate the parliamentary space and debates effectively. Yet, feminist resilience finds its path, sometimes expressed through indignation and emotional exhaustion after being repeatedly targeted by far-right hate speech and feeling frustrated by insufficient institutional protections (Interview 7): 'I shouted at the president saying that "I'm fed up, president, and I've been listening to hate speech in this chamber for two years!".'

The collective dimension of feminist resilience also appears crucial. Several interviewees recalled a notable incident in the Spanish Parliament where, following a Vox intervention denying the existence of gender-based violence and their legislative proposal of 'intrafamilial violence', all feminist and progressive MPs took the floor one by one. They listed the names of every murdered woman since official records began, transforming the session into a collective act of memory and affective resistance that directly challenged Vox's denial. Thinking back on this, an MP said about the event:

> Extract 4
> It was all very emotional; that session was very emotional. There were a lot of feelings; you could feel it there because we were reading out the names of murdered women together, putting our bodies and souls into it. (Interview 11)

The political and symbolic significance of this act is twofold: first, it enacts a symbolic occupation of the parliamentary space within a context where, as discussed previously, feminist and progressive MPs are marked as 'invaders'; and, second, it signals the mobilisation of affects with feminist goals, that is, for them to stick to the space, to the debate and to those who deny gender-based violence. The MP claims that 'you could feel it there', referring to the affectively charged atmosphere they repurposed. Together, these narratives demonstrate that feminist resilience within parliamentary arenas is far more than rhetoric; it is affectively embodied, oscillating between moments of refusal, verbal counterattack, collective acts of memory and solidaristic embraces.

Solidarity-making practices

Across the interviews, feminist and progressive MPs mentioned different modalities of solidarity, care and accompaniment as strategies to weave support in these 'brutal' political times. During a parliamentary debate, one MP expressed her 'condolences' to the minister of equality for the relentless attacks she endured, declaring, 'we don't deserve this, and it's unacceptable!' (Vallugera_ERC_DSCD_216), thereby collectivising the attacks into a shared grievance and defence against the parliamentary hostility. Several interviewees described these as an almost organic process that emerged naturally:

> Extract 5
> So, it comes out automatically, even if you've already taken the floor, because the rest of the political forces end up automatically defending your intervention and taking a stand against that discourse without having agreed on it. There's no need to coordinate it. I think it just comes naturally, and any of us would do it, because it's not an attack on a political party, it's an attack on us simply for being women. (Interview 4)

Extract 5 highlights the affective political landscape that MPs must navigate in the Spanish Parliament, one saturated with emotions that stick to their bodies through insults and attacks 'simply for being women', a sentiment that is also shared by a male MP we interviewed (Interview 15). The affective recognition of this sticky, collective injury enables the act of solidarity, described as something that arises 'automatically' and 'naturally', without prior coordination. Feminists and some women MPs are moved by the gendered attacks to take a stand, regardless of political affiliation or ideological alignment. An affective alignment is woven through mutual support, where the shared experience of vulnerability becomes the ground for feminist resilience. The foregrounding collectivity of solidarity building is illustrated in another MP's speech:

> Extract 6
> I don't only speak out when they go after X, I also speak out when they go after the woman from Esquerra, or the one from Bildu, or UP [Unidas Podemos], or Irene Montero [Minister of Equality at the time of the interview, from the UP]. I've argued with Irene about many things, we've had lots of disagreements, but when they said that thing about getting on your knees [sexual reference about Montero], we were the first to say that that kind of thing cannot be tolerated.… it's a political loyalty, not a personal one, but a political one. (Interview 6)

The political loyalty described is affectively attuned and emerges from a shared emotional and political grammar of what is intolerable, reworking the sticky feeling politics to produce an affective institutional space of feminist loyalty and protection. The bodies are stuck together by a shared register of indignation and care that knits individual experiences into a political 'we'.

The collectivisation of feminist resilience also emerges through moments of informality in everyday situations that turn into possibilities of affective weaving:

> Extract 7
> The women MPs who work on equality had a relationship outside Parliament. We tried to smooth over some rough edges with a dinner, with a beer. It worked. This also has another side, you know? You're aware that women in the informal sphere of politics always, always lose. But by being in Madrid [location of the Spanish Parliament] – and most of us, not being from Madrid [MPs from different Spanish regions] – we reclaimed something we don't have at home, which is time. We didn't have to rush back. Therefore, we were able to set up an informal system like theirs [in reference to male MPs], one built around beer, coffee and dinner. And we did it. And it worked. (Interview 2)

The MP's sense-making underlines the affective dynamics that shape women MPs' navigation of the gendered fabric of informal political life, which has traditionally been male-dominated spaces, acting as a constraining factor for women's engagement and career progression in politics (Kantola, 2019). These informal gatherings act as spaces where the political and the personal are imbricated, deliberately so, as a practice of resistance. Mundane acts, such as having a 'beer, coffee and dinner', are reconfigured as moments of politically charged ordinary affects (Stewart, 2007). These affective alignments are crafted through the small, relational hum that shapes the circulation of affect and, thus, power. In reclaiming 'something we don't have at home', these MPs are producing, even if fleetingly and momentarily, an affective reordering of the sticky feeling politics that shape parliamentary politics, generating new alliances by smoothing 'some rough edges', interrupting the stickiness process that marks their othering in the institutional arena.

Forging these resilience practices in such a hostile parliamentary context is costly and requires 'constant support by fellow colleagues and parliamentary group', as well as being 'permanently active', which resulted in exhaustion and extreme tiredness (Interviews 1, 8). This came at a cost, as the following MP noted:

> Extract 8
> When we were making progress and ended up in the gutter, which sometimes happened, you abandon the fight. I mean, we also tried to be a bit strategic because, otherwise, you tear yourself apart. You fight the battles that can be fought, and if you see that you're fighting one but the soufflé doesn't rise, then you let it go. (Interview 1)

Extract 8 underscores the importance of self-protection and the affective negotiation of the stickiness at play: a refusal to become engulfed in the affective politics of the institution. By disengaging from participating and practising letting go, resilience is enacted, which opens up new potentialities of what affect can do by reconfiguring political agency affectively as a feminist negation to partake. The need to do politics differently was expressed in several interviews as the only means to 'defend a feminist democracy in the face of far-right groups' (Interview 8). In this sense, we argue, disengaging might create possibilities for affective reorientation: an invitation to shift tactics, to redistribute energy and to craft more sustainable modes of feminist resilience to resist and navigate the sticky feeling politics at play.

A return to political rationality?

A sense of being under constant attack was shared, with several MPs expressing concern about how the prevailing climate of 'political circus and headline-driven sensationalism' (Interview 17), along with the reproduction of 'a series of speeches and gestures that are absolutely unacceptable in a democracy' (Interview 13), was directly impacting political deliberation and undermining the proper functioning of democratic institutions, as reflected in the following MP's sense-making:

> Extract 9
> It hits you straight in the stomach. Therefore, one of the things we were very clear about as a group was that the stomach had no place in the chamber. Only this [pointing to head] was allowed in. Because if heart and stomach were allowed in, well, we'd spend the whole day in the bathroom. (Interview 7)

In this extract, the MP outlines a vivid struggle between affect ('heart' and 'stomach') and rationality ('head') in political spaces. She highlights the need to disallow the affective to function in the institutional setting, as she describes embodied reactions located in the stomach or heart as something that must actively be excluded from political practice. The need to leave the 'stomach' and 'heart' outside the chamber underlines how a normative understanding of politics is incompatible with emotions. The MP frames this idea through humour ('we'd spend the whole day in the bathroom'), showing resilience and laughing together to cope with the experience of an emotionally intense parliamentary context.

The work of emotional regulation is further favoured in another MP's sense-making, who argued that when facing Vox and anti-gender arguments:

> Extract 10
> A great deal of restraint is needed. A lot of restraint, rationality and a certain level of self-control among us, because it's true that there were moments when a member of Parliament let something slip. (Interview 10)

In other accounts, the unfolding of this return to political rationality is articulated through a defence of the parliamentary institution itself:

> But in my experience, I believe there ought to be a bit more intervention in the debate, above all to protect parliamentary proceedings from insults that are extremely sexist, from insults that are extremely discriminatory and from this constant pattern of attacks, which, in my view, have no place in an institution like the Spanish Parliament. (Interview 2)

In facing the political climate of violence enacted by anti-gender actors, encompassing sexist and discriminatory discourses, the MP seeks to re-establish a normative boundary of political deliberation that protects the institution of the Spanish Parliament. In the parliamentary debates, this is reflected in numerous occasions where feminist and progressive MPs asked to bring the discussion back to democracy and rights and not 'irrational confrontation' (Montero_Podemos_DSCD_130), arguing that they were losing the 'democratic frames' of parliamentary debates (Fernández_Podemos_DSCD_216). Although we recognise that a return to political

rationality is not unique to parliamentary politics, we argue that its articulation in this specific context functions as an affective strategy of resilience, one that seeks to restore legitimacy to the institution and feminist knowledge while countering the delegitimising tactics of the affective vilification spearheaded by Vox.

The defence of political rationality illustrates the gendered regulation of emotion within political settings. Traditionally, parliamentary spaces have been structured around masculinised ideals of rationality, self-control and unemotionality, thus equating politics with objectivity and order. The appeal to 'rationality' and 'self-control' points to the sticky feeling politics at play, structuring the political setting. Through the demand that affect is rigorously policed so as not to have moments of affective slippage, some MPs reinforce a regulatory logic of invisibilisation that privileges disembodied reason as the only legitimate form of political work. This is reflected in the recourse to data and reports by international and national institutions (trade unions, human rights organisations and the European Union) in MPs' argumentations (Berja_PSOE_DSCD_123), as well as drawing on expert voices to root their claims (Fernández_Podemos_DSCD_190). All interviewees deemed referring to leading feminist experts as fundamental for democracy. The emotional disciplining implied in the earlier extracts solidifies a dichotomised understanding of politics and affect that may reproduce gendered, racialised and class-oriented hierarchies, where certain bodies, those perceived as more emotional, irrational or vulnerable, are systematically marginalised from legitimate political action. This reproduces what Bargetz (2020) coined 'the sentimental contract', whereby emotional containment and rational distance sustain the liberal order. While affective regulation operates as a form of resilience for feminist MPs navigating hostile affective climates, it cannot be fully understood as a practice of feminist resilience. Rather than being collective, relational or directed towards structural transformation, this return to rationality risks reiterating the liberal logic of the sentimental contract, thus highlighting the tensions between surviving within and transforming the affective infrastructures of politics. A defence of political rationality and personal restraining works to render some politicians as sticky affective and, therefore, not suited for political practice.

Events of slippage function as moments of affective disruption that need policing and suppressing, thus as objects and conduits of emotional disciplinary control. Far from simply maintaining parliamentary decorum, this emotional injunction helps sustain patriarchal normative ways of doing politics by delegitimising modes of knowing and resistance that arise through embodied experience. We thus identify a tension between the affective investments in embodied resilience and solidarity making, on the one hand, and a retreat to political rationality as a formal shield, on the other. Although this claim for political rationality can function as a strategy of feminist resilience against anti-gender actors who weaponise specific emotions to disrupt parliamentary politics, it risks replicating the very sticky feeling politics that marginalise embodied voices, permitting full democratic participation only for those willing or able to conform to a sanitised affective regime.

Conclusions

In this article, we have presented an account of affective feminist resilience to anti-gender politics in the Spanish Parliament in order to provide new insights

through the analytical lens of affect within the context of parliamentary politics. We introduce our concept of sticky feeling politics to analyse the affective dynamics of anti-gender and feminist politics in Parliament, both how particular feelings (such as hate and fear) are made to 'stick' to specific categories of people (women and racialised and LGBTQIA+ subjects), and how MPs targeted by such affective attacks feel, rework and contest them through their own affective strategies. Our conceptualisation highlights that these affective distributions are not one-directional: while Vox mobilises stickiness to vilify and exclude, feminist and progressive MPs, through their resilience practices, rework these affective distributions into resources of solidarity and political imagination. Sticky feeling politics, therefore, emerge as dynamic, or in constant negotiation by all actors involved in parliamentary politics.

The contribution of sticky feeling politics to scholarly debates on gender and politics lies in three main areas. First, it brings an institutional focus to affect theory: whereas Ahmed and Bargetz develop their frameworks primarily in relation to sociocultural spheres, we show how affect operates concretely within parliamentary settings, shaping policy negotiation, legislative work and political participation. Second, it highlights the relational and contested nature of affect in institutional contexts: stickiness is not only exclusionary but also reshaped through feminist resilience, influencing political strategies and the balance between antagonism and solidarity. However, it is important to point out that, as our analysis also shows, feminist MPs can reject and contest certain sticky affects mobilised by far-right anti-gender actors while remaining entangled in others as a result of being embedded in liberal institutional logics, shaped by legacies of colonialism, patriarchy and neoliberalism (Roggeband et al, 2025) that generate specific sticky affects (Ahmed, 2004). Third, it offers a conceptual synthesis for understanding affective parliamentary dynamics: combining Ahmed's focus on the repeated attachment of affects like hate or disgust to certain bodies with Bargetz's attention to the negotiation of felt experiences by actors targeted by anti-gender politics, our framework captures how affective antagonisms and solidarities coexist, accumulate, linger and are constantly renegotiated in parliamentary politics, contributing to feminist-institutionalist debates on informal arenas, symbolic practices and performative acts.

Overall, our analysis underscores that institutions are not only arenas of policy and debate but also affective spaces where power is negotiated, challenged and endures, being felt and registered in the body as much as discursively argued. Consequently, this article foregrounds politics as an affective process, embodied, felt and constantly negotiated. We understand the Spanish Parliament as a deeply affective institution, shaped by lingering affective legacies of Francoism and colonialism. By tracing the contours of sticky feeling politics within this space, we offer a framework for grasping how power is not only exercised but also lived through affect and how feminist actors, in turn, forge affective political resilience from within increasingly hostile institutional terrains. This contribution lies in centring the affective not as background noise to parliamentary politics but as a constitutive force in feminist resilience and political practice, one that sustains presence, reclaims legitimacy and reimagines what politics can feel like and for whom.

In our analysis, we identify the affective dynamics of the parliamentary arena, particularly as Vox MPs attempt to shape the boundaries of political legitimacy through affective vilification. This strategy systematically mobilises affects like fear, outrage

and hate, making them stick to feminist, queer, racialised and anti-racist actors, thus rendering them as illegitimate political actors.

Our findings show that feminist and progressive MPs have made sense of this political arena and developed three main affective resilience practices: (1) embodied resilience; (2) solidarity-making practices; and (3) a return to political rationality. From emotional self-containment to collective acts of remembrance, embodied resilience disrupts far-right affective framings through gestures that are both personal and public, intimate, and disruptive. Solidarity practices that involve care networks, shared recognition and coordinated responses affectively reorganise the political infrastructure that contours mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion, reaffirming the collective belonging of feminist and progressive MPs. A return to political rationality, finally, names the ongoing negotiation between feeling and decorum, between the 'stomach' and the 'head', where feminist and progressive MPs seek to re-establish a normative boundary of political deliberation against the mobilisation of affect by far-right and anti-gender actors. Together, these practices illustrate how sticky feeling politics emerge, are reworked and are reoriented by feminist and progressive actors as they navigate a political climate of increasing polarisation and hostility.

A limitation of this article lies in its reliance on MPs' partisan narratives in the parliamentary debates and self-perceptions in the interviews, which are both inevitably shaped by the dynamics of a highly polarised political context. While these accounts provide invaluable insights into how actors themselves experience and negotiate affective dynamics, they also risk reproducing blind spots and silences, particularly around deeply ingrained gendered and racialised hierarchies that remain difficult to articulate explicitly in parliamentary discourse and by parliamentary actors. This paradox, where the very dynamics we seek to foreground are also those most often invisibilised, complicates the task of tracing affective power relations. Such challenges are not unique to this article but become especially acute in parliamentary arenas, where institutional roles, procedural norms and partisan logics heavily structure interaction. Our framework of sticky feeling politics should therefore be understood as a first step towards rendering these dynamics visible while recognising that further methodological and analytical work is needed to capture what remains unsaid or obscured in parliamentary practices.

Future research should further investigate how sticky feeling politics take shape across both institutional and grass-roots contexts, particularly in settings marked by varying degrees of gender-based polarisation. Additionally, a closer look at the temporalities and spatial qualities of affective feminist resilience could shed light on how affects accumulate, linger and transform over time, as well as how they are anchored in and shaped by specific institutional geographies, routines and architectures of power. Lastly, paying attention to the role of digital affective infrastructures would enable a better understanding of how politics has become a digitally mediated phenomenon and the ways in which affect circulates, intensifies and reconfigures political subjectivities and solidarities across both institutional and networked spaces.

Note

[1] References to parliamentary data follow this structure: surname of MP, Political Party, DSCD (Session Diary Parliamentary Congress - in Spanish: Diario de Sesiones Congreso de los Diputados), number of session.

ORCiD IDs
Silvia Díaz Fernández https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9118-8090
Paloma Caravantes https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5012-7515
Emanuela Lombardo https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7644-6891

Funding
This work received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation Programme under the CCINDLE project (Co-creating Inclusive Intersectional Democratic Spaces Across Europe) (Grant Agreement Number: 101061256). Views and opinions expressed are those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union, the European Research Executive Agency or the UKRI (United Kingdom Research and Innovation). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Acknowledgements
We wish to thank the European Commission for funding this research, Mieke Verloo as coordinator and all team members, with whom we have engaged in inspiring discussions and fruitful theoretical debates that helped us develop and advance our work. We would like to thank Esther Romero for her contribution to the data collection process, which greatly enriched our research. We also warmly thank the people we have interviewed in the framework of the project for generously sharing their time and knowledge with us. Thanks also to the participants of the ECPR (European Consortium for Political Research) Joint Sessions 2025, 'Gendering Democratic Resilience', chaired by Christina Chiva and Barbara Gaweda, for their helpful comments and insightful feedback on an earlier draft of this article. Finally, we would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback on earlier versions of this manuscript. Paloma Caravantes thanks the Comunidad de Madrid for funding under the César Nombela fellowship program (grant agreement number: Ref. 024-T1/PH-HUM-31224).

Contribution statement
SDF wrote the first and subsequent drafts of the manuscript, with detailed comments from PC and EL. Reviews of this manuscript were undertaken equally by SDF, PC and EL. SDF conceptualised the study in earlier versions, yet the theoretical work was carried out by SDF, PC and EL equally. EL designed the study and, together with SDF and PC, collected the data and interpreted it.

Research ethics statement
This work obtained ethical approval from Complutense University of Madrid (31 May 2022).

Author biographies
Silvia Díaz Fernández is a Ramón y Cajal fellow in the Institute of Public Goods and Policies at the Spanish National Research Council (RYC2024-048296-I). Her work explores affect theory, digital culture and far-right anti-gender movements. She is a researcher at the Horizon 2020-funded project 'Co-Creating Inclusive Intersectional Democratic Spaces Across Europe' (Ref: 101061256).
Paloma Caravantes is a César Nombela fellow in the Institute of Public Goods and Policies at the Spanish National Research Council (2024-T1/PH-HUM-31224). Her

work explores feminist institutional politics and democratisation, as well as intersectional and gender equality policies. She is a team member of the Horizon Europe CCINDLE project (GA: 101061256, 2022–26).

Emanuela Lombardo is Professor of Political Science at the Scuola Normale Superiore, Italy. Her lines of research are gender equality policies, feminism and democracy. She is the principal investigator of the Scuola Normale Superiore team and of a work package (with Johanna Kantola) in the Horizon Europe CCINDLE project (GA: 101061256, 2022–26).

Data availability statement

Due to the sensitivity of the data and the presence of potentially identifiable information, the data set generated and analysed during the study is not publicly available in order to comply with data protection requirements.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

Abadía, M.C. (2022) Cancerous silence and fascism: the Spanish politics of forgetting, in R. Dolphijn and R. Braidotti (eds) *Deleuze and Guattari and Fascism*, Edinburgh University Press, pp 234–51.

Ahmed, S. (2000) *Strange Encounters. Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*, Routledge.

Ahmed, S. (2004) *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, Routledge.

Ahmed, S. (2010) *The Promise of Happiness*, Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2012) *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Combined Academic Publishing.

Ahmed, S. (2019) Institutional habits: about bodies and orientations that don't fit, in W. Alloa, F. Chouraqui and R. Kaushik (eds) *Merleau-Ponty and Contemporary Philosophy*, SUNY Press, pp 197–217, doi: 10.1515/9781438476926-012

Ahmed, S. (2021) *Complaint!* Duke University Press.

Alabao, N. (2022) Por una democracia feminista (siempre por hacer), *Nueva Sociedad*, 298: 109–20, https://static.nuso.org/media/articles/downloads/5.TC_Alabao_298.pdf.

Ayoub, P.M. and Stoeckl, K. (2024) *The Global Fight Against LGBTI Rights: How Transnational Conservative Networks Target Sexual and Gender Minorities*, New York University Press.

Bargetz, B. (2014) Mapping affect: challenges of (un)timely politics, in M.L. Angerer, B. Bösel and M. Ott (eds) *The Timing of Affect: Epistemologies, Aesthetics, Politics, Diaphanes*, pp 289–302.

Bargetz, B. (2019) A political grammar of feelings: thinking the political through sensitivity and sentimentality, in T. Bedorf and S. Herrman (eds) *Political Phenomenology. Experience, Ontology, Episteme*, Routledge, pp 52–70.

Bargetz, B. (2020) The sentimental contract. Ambivalences of affective politics and publics, in A. Fleig and C. von Scheve (eds) *Public Spheres of Resonance: Constellations of Affect and Language*, Routledge, pp 63–81.

Berlant, L. (2008) Thinking about feeling historical, *Emotion, Space and Society*, 1(1): 4–9, doi: 10.1016/j.emospa.2008.08.006

Berlant, L. (2011) A properly political concept of love: three approaches in ten pages, *Cultural Anthropology*, 26: 683–91, doi: 10.1111/j.1548-1360.2011.01120.x

Bonu Rosenkranz, G. (2025) *Safer Spaces, Feminist Movements and Emotions. Affect into Action*, Routledge.

Butler, J. (2016) Rethinking vulnerability and resistance, in J. Butler, Z. Gambetti and L. Sabsay (eds) *Vulnerability in Resistance*, Duke University Press, pp 18–28.

Butler, J. (2024) *Who's Afraid of Gender?* Penguin Books.

Campillo, I., Romanos, E., Sábada, I. and Fernández-Vázquez, G. (2025) From confrontation to avoidance: feminist responses to anti-gender mobilization in Spain, in R. Smrdelj and R. Kuhar (eds) *Anti-Gender Mobilizations in Europe and the Feminist Response: Productive Resistance*, Palgrave MacMillan, pp 107–36.

Caravantes, P., Elizondo, A. and Lombardo, E. (2024) Gendering democracy: feminist parliamentary responses to opposition against gender equality, *Journal of Gender Studies*, 34(5): 749–63, doi: 10.1080/09589236.2024.2427200

Carbin, M., Carlsson, E. and Nilsson, B. (2024) Telling feminist stories in an affective atmosphere of anti-genderism: Swedish gender scholars reflect upon their position, *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 32(4): 321–33, doi: 10.1080/08038740.2024.2413987

Chiva, C. and Gaweda, B. (2025) Gendering Democratic Resilience: Towards a Comparative Framework, ECPR Joint Sessions, Charles University Prague, 20–23 May.

Chouza. P. (2023) La dimisión de la coordinadora de Podemos Asturias reaviva la tensión entre la dirección de Belarra y los críticos, El País, 25 September, https://elpais.com/espana/2023-09-25/la-dimision-de-la-coordinadora-de-podemos-asturias-reaviva-la-tension-entre-la-direccion-de-belarra-y-los-criticos.html (Accessed: 15 January 2026).

Churcher, M., Calkins, S., Böttger, J. and Slaby, J. (eds) (2023) *Affect, Power and Institutions. Routledge Studies in Affective Societies*, Routledge.

Clough, P.T. (2008) The affective turn: political economy, biomedia and bodies, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 25(1): 1–22, doi: 10.1177/0263276407085156

Coffé, H., Deswert, C., Devroe, R., Storme, E., Wauters, B., van Haute, E., et al (2024) Sexism in politics: a barrier to women's representation, The Loop, https://theloop.ecpr.eu/sexism-in-politics-a-barrier-to-womens-representation/ (Accessed: 17 June 2025).

Congreso (2019) Elecciones Generales de 10 de noviembre de 2019, https://app.congreso.es/consti/elecciones/generales/resultados.jsp?fecha=10/11/2019 (Accessed: 17 June 2025).

Cullen, P. (2021) From neglect to threat: feminist responses to right wing populism in the European Union, *European Politics and Society*, 22(4): 520–37, doi: 10.1080/23745118.2020.1801183

Cvetkovich, A. (2012) *Depression: A Public Feeling*, Duke University Press.

Díaz Fernández, S. (2024) On the productivity of affective laddish misogyny within the context of lad culture in UK University campuses, in G. Kaufman, S. Stambolis-Ruhstofer and B. Ralpph (eds) *Research Handbook on the Sociology of Gender*, Edward Elgar, pp 151–64.

Dietze, G. and Roth, J. (eds) (2020) *Right-Wing Populism and Gender. European Perspectives and Beyond*, Transcript-Verlag.

Esposito, E. and Breeze, R. (2022) Gender and politics in a digitalised world: investigating online hostility against UK female MPs, *Discourse & Society*, 33(3): 303–23, doi: 10.1177/09579265221076608

Federici, S. (2018) *Re-Enchanting the World: Feminism and the Politics of the Commons*, PM Press and Kairos.

Gould, D. (2009) *Moving Politics. Emotion and ACT UP Fighting Against Aids*, The University of Chicago Press.

Gusmeroli, P. (2023) Is gender-critical feminism feeding the neo-conservative anti-gender rhetoric? Snapshots from the Italian public debate, *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 28(3): 382–99, doi: 10.1080/10894160.2023.2184908

Håkansson, S. (2024) The gendered representational costs of violence against politicians, *Perspectives on Politics*, 22(1): 81–96, doi: 10.1017/s1537592723001913

Hemmings, C. (2021) Unnatural feelings: the affective life of 'anti-gender' mobilisations, *Radical Philosophy*, 209: 27–39.

Hemmings, C. (2022) 'But I thought we'd already won that argument!': 'anti-gender' mobilizations, affect, and temporality, *Feminist Studies*, 48(3): 594–615, doi: 10.1353/fem.2022.0042

Hochschild, A.R. (1983) *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feelings*, University of California Press.

Hogget, P. and Thompson, S. (2012) *Politics and the Emotions: The Affective Turn in Contemporary Political Studies*, Bloomsbury Publishing.

Holvikivi, A., Holzberg, B. and Ojeda Guemes, T. (2024) *Transnational Anti-Gender Politics: Feminist Solidarity in Times of Global Attacks*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Holzberg, B. (2024) The great replacement ideology as anti-gender politics: affect, white terror, and reproductive racism in Germany and beyond, in A. Holvikivi, B. Holzberg and T. Ojeda Guemes (eds) *Transnational Anti-Gender Politics: Feminist Solidarity in Times of Global Attacks*, Palgrave Macmillan, pp 183–202.

Hybridas (2022) *La violencia política por razón de género en España: una aproximación cualitativa*, Ministero de Igualdad, https://violenciagenero.igualdad.gob.es/wp-content/uploads/La_violencia_politica_por_razon_de_genero_HYBRIDAS_DGVG_DEF.pdf.

Indelicato, M.E. and Magalhães Lopes, M. (2024) Understanding populist far-right anti-immigration and anti-gender stances beyond the paradigm of gender as 'a symbolic glue': Giorgia Meloni's modern motherhood, neo-Catholicism, and reproductive racism, *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 31(1): 6–20, doi: 10.1177/13505068241230819

Jaráiz Gulías, E., Vicente Iglesias, G. and García-Maseda, M. (2024) Emociones y radicalización política. El paso del voto del PP a VOX, *Uru: Revista de Comunicación y Cultura*, 9: 133–52, doi: 10.32719/26312514.2024.9.9

Kantola, J. (2019) Women's organizations of political parties: formal possibilities, informal challenges and discursive controversies, *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 27(1): 4–21, doi: 10.1080/08038740.2018.1529703

Kantola, J. and Lombardo, E. (2021) Strategies of right populists in opposing gender equality in a polarized European parliament, *International Political Science Review*, 42(5): 565–79, doi: 10.1177/0192512120963953

Kantola, J. and Lombardo, E. (2024) Feminist institutional responses to anti-gender politics in parliamentary contexts, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 26(4): 833–57, doi: 10.1080/14616742.2024.2366478

Kantola, J. and Miller, C. (2021) Party politics and radical right populism in the European Parliament: analysing political groups as democratic actors, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 59(4): 782–801, doi: 10.1111/jcms.13181

Krizsan, A. and Roggeband, C. (2021) *Politicizing Gender and Democracy in the Context of the Istanbul Convention*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Lavizzari, A., Barone, A. and Bonu Rosenkranz, G. (2025) Contentious gender politics in Italy: feminist responses to anti-gender mobilizations, in R. Smrdelj and R. Kuhar (eds) *Anti-Gender Mobilizations in Europe and the Feminist Response: Productive Resistance*, Palgrave MacMillan, pp 25–52.

Leys, R. (2011) The turn to affect: a critique, *Critical Inquiry*, 37(3): 434–72, doi: 10.1086/659353

Lombardo, E. (2024) Anti-gender regimes, feminist politics, and the challenge of societal democratization, *Mobilization: An International Journal*, 29(4): 459–76, doi: 10.17813/1086-671X-29-4-469

Lombardo, E., Caravantes, P. and Díaz-Fernández, S. (2025) 'Stop torpedoing women's rights!': feminist institutional responses to anti-gender politics in Spain and Catalonia parliaments, *European Journal of Political Research*, 64(4): 1693–717, doi: 10.1111/1475-6765.70005

Massumi, B. (2002) *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*, Duke University Press.

Miller, C. (2021) *Gendering the Everyday in the UK House of Commons: Beneath the Spectacle*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Moerking, E. and Baspehlivan, U. (2025) Ordinary affects of global reactionary politics, *Critical Studies on Security*, 13(3): 402–6, doi: 10.1080/21624887.2025.2474782

Ngai, S. (2005) *Ugly Feelings*, Harvard University Press.

Norocel, O.C. (2023) Gendering the far-right continuum in Europe, in K. Kondor and M. Littler (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Far-Right Extremism in Europe*, Routledge, pp 288–99.

Obst, M. (2024) Not in the mood for gender and feminism. Exploring affect and expertise through Spanish anti-gender movements, *Women's Studies International Forum*, 104: art 102892. doi: 10.1016/j.wsif.2024.102892

Pichel-Vázquez, A. (2024) *Género ultra: Movilizaciones afectivas en la política de género de Vox*, PhD thesis, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC), http://hdl.handle.net/10609/150362 (Accessed: 17 June 2025).

Pichel-Vázquez, A. and Enguix Grau, B. (2021) Framing gender through affects: antifeminism and love in the Spanish Far Right (Vox), *South European Society and Politics*, 26(4): 465–87, doi: 10.1080/13608746.2022.2115185

Pichel-Vázquez, A. and Enguix-Grau, B. (2023) Ni oblit ni perdó: mobilitzacions afectives i regulació política de les emocions, *Quaderns de l'Institut Català d'Antropologia*, 39(2): 231–43.

Platero, L. (2023) Strange bedfellows: anti-trans feminists, VOX supporters and biologicist academics, *DiGeSt – Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*, 10(2): 125–30, doi: 10.21825/digest.89997

Puwar, N. (2004) *Space Invaders: Race, Gender and Bodies Out of Place*, Berg.

Rawłuszko, M. (2021) And if the opponents of gender ideology are right? Gender politics, Europeanization, and the democratic deficit, *Politics & Gender*, 17(2): 301–23, doi: 10.1017/s1743923x19000576

Reinhardt, S., Heft, A. and Pavan, E. (2023) Varieties of antigenderism: the politicization of gender issues across three European populist radical right parties, *Information, Communication and Society*, 27(7): 1273–94, doi: 10.1080/1369118x.2023.2246536

Roggeband, C., Rawłuszko, M., Meier, P., Díaz Fernández, S., Lombardo, E. and Caravantes, P. (2025) Anti-gender politics and European democracies' legacies of exclusion and violence, *Women's Studies International Forum*, 112: 103151, doi: 10.1016/j.wsif.2025.103151

Sältenberg, H., Díaz Fernández, S. and Caravantes, P. (2024) Two gender-equal nations? Anti-gender re-configurations of national belonging in Sweden and Spain, *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 33(1): 101–16, doi: 10.1080/08038740.2024.2370309

Sanchez Salgado, R. (2024) Parliamentary assemblies and emotions, in H. Flam (ed) *Research Handbook on the Sociology of Emotion: Institutions and Emotional Rule Regimes*, Edward Elgar Publishing, pp 400–14.

Sauer, B. (2023) The in_visibilization of emotions in politics. Ambivalences of an 'affective democracy', *Journal of Gender Studies*, 32(8): 819–31, doi: 10.1080/09589236.2023.2227116

Sauer, B. and Penz, O. (2017) Affective governmentality: a feminist perspective, in C. Hudson, M. Rönnblom and K. Teghtsoonian (eds) *Gender, Governance and Feminist Analysis: Missing in Action?* Routledge, pp 39–58.

Schmitz, S. and Ahmed, S. (2014) Affect/emotion: orientation matters. A conversation between Sigrid Schmitz and Sara Ahmed, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für GeschlechterStudie*, 20(2): 97–108, doi: 10.3224/fzg.v20i2.17137

Seigworth, G. and Gregg, P. (2010) An inventory of shimmers, in M. Gregg and G.J. Seigworth (eds) *The Affect Theory Reader*, Duke University Press, pp 1–26.

Seigworth, G.J. and Pedwell, C. (2023) *Affect Theory Reader 2. Worldings, Tensions, Futures*, Duke University Press.

Sengul, K. and McSwiney, J. (2024) 'Nazis aren't welcome here': selling democracy in the age of far-right extremism, *Media and Communication*, 12: 1–16, doi: 10.17645/mac.7853

Slaby, J. and Bens, J. (2019) Political affect, in J. Slaby and C. von Scheve (eds) *Affective Societies: Key Concepts*, Routledge, pp 340–52.

Smrdelj, R. and Kuhar, R. (eds) (2025) *Anti-Gender Mobilizations in Europe and the Feminist Response: Productive Resistance*, Palgrave MacMillan.

Stewart, K. (2007) *Ordinary Affects*, Duke University Press.

Szanto, T. and Slaby, J. (2020) Political emotions, in T. Szanto and H. Landweer (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Phenomenology of Emotions*, Routledge.

Wetherell, M. (2012) *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*, SAGE Publications Ltd.

Wilén, E.J. (2025) The 'anti-gender movement,' capitalism, and the left, *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews*, 54(3): 200–3, doi: 10.1177/00943061251330131d