Gender and the Subject of (Anti-)Nuclear Politics: Revisiting Women's Campaigning against the Bomb

Catherine Eschle, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow

In its early years, the field of gender and security studies was characterised by sustained engagement with large-scale women's anti-nuclear protests occurring in the US and UK during the Cold War.¹ Acknowledged as a formative influence by those feminist scholars “who marked out important pathways” within International Relations (IR) in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Sylvester 2001: 18) — with Cynthia Enloe, for example, writing that Greenham Common women's peace camp in Berkshire inspired her entry into feminist IR and her distinctive mode of academic scholarship (Enloe 2004: 174) — the protests were also celebrated for challenging the certainties of the IR discipline. As Christine Sylvester put it (1992: 167), “women, who supposedly have no agency of their own in international relations” were speaking and acting in ways that offered alternative understandings of both gender identity and security to the militarised malestream (see also Enloe 1989: 77-79; Sylvester 1994: 184-97; Tickner 1992: 60; Elshtain 1987: 240-1).² Simultaneously, these same writers warned of the tendency in anti-nuclear protest to define women in terms of their maternal capacity, associated with peaceability (and a transcendent moralism), while yoking men and masculinity to a predisposition for warmongering (and a strategic mindset). Such essentialist assumptions were criticised as limiting not only the agency of women, but also

¹ For the purposes of this article, I define gender and security studies narrowly, as part of the IR discipline. However, Laura Shepherd (2010a) has argued convincingly for a broader definition that encompasses a longstanding feminist effort to study conflict and security from a variety of disciplinary perspectives and from beyond the academy. On this view, the feminist-identified texts produced by Cold War anti-nuclear activists are an intrinsic part of gender and security studies rather than exterior to it.

² Carol Cohn's deconstruction of masculinity in the techno-strategic discourses of US Cold War nuclear elites (1987, 1989) was also widely cited by feminists carving out space within the discipline.

the possibilities for peace and the potential of feminist theory and practice (Elshtain 1987: chap. 7; Sylvester 1987; Tickner 1992: 59). In both positive and negative ways, then, Cold War women anti-nuclear campaigners were brought centre stage in the struggle to reframe gender and security in IR and beyond.

However, women's anti-nuclear activism, and indeed nuclear politics more generally,³ has faded from the purview of gender and security studies in recent years. This is problematic, in the first place because it means that feminist IR scholars have paid negligible attention to post-Cold War nuclear developments. While it could be argued this simply reflects the demobilisation of women's anti-nuclear campaigning in the US and UK with the end of the Cold War, and the corresponding decline of the threat posed by the nuclear arms race, feminist IR scholarship has long contested such a straightforward empiricist reading of what counts as worthy of research. In any case, nuclear weapons did not disappear in the 1990s and nor did campaigning against them, as we are reminded by an important but neglected body of feminist work on/aligned with critical responses to the 1997 Indian nuclear tests (e.g., Das 2007; Oza 2006; Chowdhry No date).⁴ The failure more generally in gender and security studies to engage with such developments serves to fix women's anti-nuclear campaigning in a particular form and to a particular moment, thereby aiding the naturalisation of nuclear weapons in the post-Cold War world.

³ The term nuclear politics is intended to encompass struggles over both nuclear weapons and nuclear energy: most peace movement activists see the two as fundamentally interconnected and as equally flawed methods of achieving human or energy security (in contradistinction to hegemonic articulations that seek to disentangle the two and, even if advocating nuclear disarmament, support peaceful uses of nuclear power). For reasons of time and space, and to foreground the discursive significance of the shift to a post-Cold War era, this article focuses on campaigning against nuclear weapons.

⁴ As the Indian critics make clear, the view that nuclear weapons were less politically pertinent at the end of the Cold War (and indeed the very epochal categorisations of "Cold War" and "post-Cold War") is ethnocentric, with pertinence adjudicated from the Anglo-American viewpoint dominant in IR.

An additional problem resulting from the decline of ongoing critical engagement with nuclear politics in gender and security studies is that the 1980s Cold War activism of such key initial influence now tends to be perceived in rather simplistic and even stereotyped ways. On the one hand, the rare mentions of nuclear politics in recent overviews of gender and security studies imply a rather idealised view, relying as they do on a truncated version of the narrative by Enloe, Sylvester et al. about Greenham women stepping into agency in IR, without critically re-examining the original texts or revisiting the evidence (Shepherd 2010a; b: 78-9; Sjoberg 2009: 197, n. 84; Blanchard 2003: 1294, 1302).⁵ The cumulative result is the romanticisation of the figure of the Cold War woman anti-nuclear campaigner, as a kind of feminist warrior who has now passed into the history books. On the other hand, in gender and security studies more generally, these same campaigners have been effectively demonised. With feminist IR scholars forced to confront misreadings of their own project as biologically determinist by the mainstream of IR (see Tickner 1999; Shepherd 2010a), and with the rising popularity in the field of anti-essentialist poststructuralist approaches, initial anxieties about women's peace politics have been strongly reinforced and attention has swung sharply in the opposite direction, toward investigations of the role of women as gender-destabilising agents of political violence. There is an implicit assumption here that the Cold War anti-nuclear activist is intrinsically pacific and gender-conservative, the nemesis of feminist IR rather than its lost hope. As Tina Managhan has indicated (2007), however, such assumptions can and should be scrutinised.

In line with Managhan, my starting point in this article is the proposition that an anti-essentialist, poststructuralist-influenced methodology, far from necessitating the avoidance of women's anti-nuclear activism, can illuminate it in fresh and interesting ways. Recent

⁵ The early analysis by Carol Cohn is also recirculated in these overviews, Cold War masculinism thereby counterpointed to Cold War feminism.

systematisations of this methodology in gender and security studies are set out in part one, along with the parameters of my empirical research. I then go on in part two to identify the “basic discourses” in circulation amongst women campaigners against nuclear weapons in the US and UK in the later Cold War period, each offering differently gendered constructions of the political subject mobilised in anti-nuclear struggle. In the third and final part of the paper I explore the ways in which these discourses are reproduced and reconfigured in the post-Cold War texts of Helen Caldicott, in the US, and Angie Zelter, in the UK. In so doing, I argue that there were multiple figures of the anti-nuclear campaigner circulating in Cold War women’s activism and that new subjectivities are emerging in contemporary writing in ways that reflect and reproduce the shift from a Cold War to a post-Cold War context and the differing political environments of the US and UK. I conclude that gender and security scholars ought therefore to revisit fixed, unitary assumptions about the identities of women anti-nuclear campaigners, as one element in a broader, critical re-engagement with the gendered dimensions of nuclear politics. I close by suggesting some future lines of enquiry for such an undertaking, with regard to the antecedents of women’s anti-nuclear activism, its geopolitical specificities and political effects.

A Poststructuralist Feminist Approach

The literature in IR combining poststructuralism and feminism is heterogeneous and rapidly expanding, but it is specifically the recent methodological recommendations with regard to gender and security studies developed separately by Lene Hansen and Laura Shepherd that I am interested in here. For these scholars, the substantive focus of poststructuralist-influenced feminist enquiry should be on the discursive construction of gendered subjects in global politics. Thus Hansen states, “[t]he relationship between identity and foreign policy is at the

center of poststructuralism's research agenda" (2006: 1), while for Shepherd it is her specifically feminist "curiosity about 'the concept, nature and practice of gender'" and the ways in which "gender configures boundaries of subjectivity" in IR, that drives her research (Shepherd 2008a: 3, citing Zalewski). To conceive of gendered selfhood as discursively constructed is to see it as "existing only insofar as it is continually rearticulated and uncontested by competing discourses" (Hansen 2006: 6). Defined as systems of meaning and representation, discourses are understood to "fix" self-understandings and interpretations of the world, and thus to reproduce power relations (Shepherd 2008a: 20-3), albeit always temporarily and in incomplete and contested ways. We are thus enjoined to enquire into "multiple and competing discourses about gender ... and security ... [which] articulate specific subjects, ascribe identities to these subjects and position them in relation to each other" (Shepherd 2010b: 76), thereby instantiating gendered relations of domination and resistance.

As both Shepherd and Hansen make clear, the "discursive ontology" (Hansen 2006: 17) underpinning their approach is radically anti-essentialist. In general terms, it involves a rejection of the analytical utility of distinguishing between non-discursive and discursive realms, and with this the possibility of enquiring into the material roots of textual representations, in favour of illuminating how material realities become interpreted as such (Hansen 2006: 21-3; Shepherd 2008a: 17-19). More specifically, it goes beyond the argument in earlier second-wave feminism that the biological fixities of sex are distinct from and non-determining of gendered identities and roles that are rather socially constructed and challengeable. A poststructuralist-influenced feminist approach necessitates rather a more thorough-going discursive constructionism in which the continual re-enactment of the gender norms circulating in discourse are seen to shape and give meaning to concrete bodily

differences. On this view, the chief task of the scholar bridging feminist and poststructuralist traditions should be to destabilise apparent certainties about both sex and gender rather than to make claims about or on behalf of gendered identities and thus reinforce power relations. In this light, my claim that Hansen and Shepherd's framework can help to illuminate anti-nuclear campaigning by *women* needs some justification.

There seem to me to be two issues here that need disentangling. The first has to do with *biological* essentialism, and whether women's anti-nuclear activism and the study of it necessarily replicates the view that there are characteristic male and female traits, which are pre-social or natural, and which determine immutable social and political outcomes. On this point, it should be recalled that the pioneering feminist IR writings mentioned above not only elaborated a critique of crass assumptions about the embodied subjectivities of women and men circulating in anti-nuclear discourses, but also lauded certain instantiations of anti-nuclear campaigning as destabilising of gender certainties, most notably at Greenham Common. Moreover, as Managhan's more recent study of campaigners at Greenham and elsewhere demonstrates (2007), even when biologically essentialist identities are mobilised, they may have subversive political results.⁶ Managhan concludes that the tactical effects of such identities should be subjected to careful empirical investigation by poststructuralist feminists, rather than assumed a priori to be problematic (2007: 646). By implication, their discursive construction merits critical scrutiny, rather than dismissal and avoidance.

A second and more serious issue arises, however, if we accept the premise that a focus on women's anti-nuclear campaigning necessarily rests on an essentialist approach to the gendered subject *in more general terms*, that is, it assumes fixed, stable entities called women

⁶ For a contrasting view, see Shepherd's brief but provocative comparison of the Greenham campers and the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo in Argentina (2010c).

who exist prior to, and are productive of, discourses and texts. Yet this premise too is contestable. Many poststructuralist feminists have argued on political grounds that it is possible to maintain a deconstructive analytical approach toward gender while simultaneously pursuing an empirical focus on women, in an effort to avoid “complicity with mainstream efforts to ‘write women out of IR’” (Managhan 2007: 644, citing Sylvester). In this vein, they have combined “elements of skepticism, particularly about the social formation of subjects, with elements of a standpoint feminism that has us acknowledging and interpreting what subjects say” (Sylvester 1994: 52). Others have sought to develop a more theoretically consistent justification for their focus on women as subjects. Alison Stone, for one, has reinterpreted Butler as implying that “women” have “a history, a genealogy, a ‘line of descent’” (2005: 5, citing Gatens; see also 2004: 15-23), with gender identities crystallising, however fleeting and unstable, in a layering process through which past constructions leave their traces on what follows: “All women thus become located within an ongoing chain of practice and reinterpretation, which brings them into complex filiations with one another” (Stone 2004: 19). As Shepherd concludes (2008a: 4), such a view “allows for research that investigates the ways in which ‘women’ as subjects and objects act, speak, write and represent themselves, are represented, written about, spoken about and acted on”⁷ — including, one assumes, within the context of anti-nuclear discourses, which have long been the site for the (self)-construction of feminised subjectivities within white, western, middle-class parameters and in oppositional relation to the masculinised nuclear state.

So how, more concretely, should such research be conducted? Hansen and Shepherd imply that *written texts* offer a particularly fruitful starting point, as sites in which discourses about gendered subjects are circulated and in which instances or practices of gendered

⁷ This is not Stone’s conclusion in her 2005 article, which is rather that Butler’s theory of politics requires an acknowledgement of pre-discursive material drives.

representation are embodied (Shepherd 2008a: 24-5). While neither author focuses entirely on the written word, also examining visual imagery and the body (Shepherd 2008a: 24; 2008b; Hansen 2000: 300-305; 2007),⁸ their stress on systems of representation and meaning-making nonetheless goes hand-in-hand with an emphasis on “the analytical centrality of language” (Shepherd 2008a: 3) as “articulated in written and spoken text” (Hansen 2006: 2). In the case of anti-nuclear politics, such an emphasis presents a useful empirical alternative to the mass mobilisations and embodied practices that so caught the attention of Enloe et al. and that continue to enjoy a nostalgic recirculation in the field, but that are no longer characteristic of anti-nuclear campaigning in the US and UK today.

For advice on text *selection*, Hansen is particularly helpful. Key to her schema is the poststructuralist emphasis on the “intertextuality” of discourse, that is, the precept that “texts build their arguments and authority through references to other texts”, often across the boundaries of particular genres and across space and time, shifting the contours and nodes of a discourse as they do so (Hansen 2006: 8, see also 55-72). She develops several models of intertextuality, the first focused on official discourse and documents, the second examining also wider foreign policy debates, and a third including either representations in popular culture, or the more “marginal political discourses” of social movements and academic commentary (2006: 59-64). All three models entail a preliminary focus on primary texts with the researcher then moving outward to secondary sources and conceptual histories, paying close attention to the rhetorical structures typical of the different genres examined (2006: 52-4, 65-72). The selection of texts for Hansen also depends on the temporal framing of a particular investigation (whether it examines a singular moment, historical development over

⁸ Poststructuralist-influenced feminist work treating the body as text or considering lived embodiment and bodily practices lies beyond the scope of this article, but it can yield very rich insights, including with regard to women’s anti-nuclear politics (Krasniewicz 1992; Managhan 2007).

time, or compares different time periods) and the number or type of “Selves” being studied, as well as on considerations of textual clarity, popularity, authority and availability (Hansen 2006: 73-87).⁹ Having thus identified a field of texts, the researcher should identify within them a handful of “basic discourses” that serve to structure political discussion and imaginative possibilities (2006: 51-2). Then “one might subsequently (re)turn to a detailed study of the articulations of identity and policy within particular texts ... and situate them inside the context of the larger political debate” (Hansen 2006: 52).

Shepherd focuses her methodological arguments more on techniques of textual *analysis*. She outlines two steps in this regard, the first focusing on the “rhetorical schemata” of a text and involving a search for the

linguistic structures that provide a sense of order in texts, thus constructing the meaning of the concepts ... In the identification of representational practices specific to gender, for example, I look for instances of gendered identities described “as” or “like”, statements about gendered identities that can be problematized, and emphasis on aspects of gender provided by placement within the text. (Shepherd 2008a: 30)¹⁰

The second step involves an analysis of “predication/subject positioning” (Shepherd 2008a: 26, 30-1), which requires unpacking both claims made about the gendered attributes of a person or thing by examining the associated adjectives and other descriptive words or qualifiers, and its position in relation to claims in the text about other persons or things. This chimes with Hansen’s claim that a deconstructive reading illuminates identity construction in terms of a “process of linking”, whereby a positive series of signifiers are connected to a

⁹ Hansen adds to this mix the “number of events”, which seems to me another way of thinking about the temporal dimension, involving as it does highlighting key moments and selecting texts around these.

¹⁰ Conversely, one could search for the ways in which objects or concepts are described “as” or “like” gendered identities. This is important because gender not only resides in the categories of “man” and “woman”, masculinity and femininity, but “also functions as a broader symbolic system: our ideas about gender permeate and shape our ideas about many other aspects of society beyond male-female relations—including politics, weapons, and warfare” (Cohn-Hill and Ruddick 2005: 2).

particular subject, and a “process of differentiation” whereby signs gain their meaning from explicit or implicit contrast with their opposite (2006: 19-21). As Hansen reminds us, the researcher should consider not only how discursive stability is achieved, but also “instabilities and slips” in the articulation of relationships between identities (2006: 42).¹¹

These methodological arguments underpin the discourse analysis of anti-nuclear women’s campaigning in the US and UK that I present in the rest of the article. In Hansen’s terms, this is a single Self enquiry, focusing on gendered constructions of the anti-nuclear activist. With regard to its temporal framing, it is the recent historical development of this Self which is under review, from the 1980s to the present. And with regard to its underlying model of intertextuality, my study examines the “marginal political discourses” of social movement activists, as well as academic commentary about them. In what follows, my reading of the material from and on activist circles in the UK and US in the 1980s, ranging from pamphlets to academic books to website documents, seeks to outline the “basic discourses” in circulation in this period, each mobilising rival conceptions of gendered subjectivity and thus of the anti-nuclear campaigner. Turning to the post-Cold War period, in which the discursive field is sparser with little secondary commentary, I focus on texts by two well-known campaigners that I suggest serve as sites of authoritative meaning-making among activists. A detailed deconstruction of the rhetorical structure and predicates in these texts is undertaken in order to expose continuities and shifts in the gendered constructions of the earlier period.

Revisiting Cold War Discourses

¹¹ Shepherd advocates these strategies within the context of a Derridean double reading (2008a: 28). This seems to me particularly suitable as a way of destabilising texts that have ossified interpretations with wide authority. It may be, however, less helpful in initial efforts to uncover and unpack marginal political discourses.

With the revival of the Cold War in the early 1980s and the accompanying resurgence of the peace movement around the world, and in the wake of the second wave of feminism, larger numbers of women than ever before mobilised against nuclear weapons. A new generation of all-women groups and women-led actions was launched: the US, for example, saw the emergence of WAND —Women’s Action for Nuclear Disarmament (Caldicott 1997: 296-9) — and “the Ribbon”, which involved 20,000 women and their male supporters wrapping embroidered cloth around the Pentagon (Pershing 1996). Moreover, many women did not confine themselves to ostensibly feminine or civil modes of political organising, instead advocating changes in gender relations and participating in the revived direct action wing of the movement (Wittner 2000; Gusterson 1996: 193-7, 213-4). It is in this context that “Women’s Pentagon Action” organised dramatic demonstrations and blockades, for example (Linton and Whitham 1989; Women’s Pentagon Action 1982), and that the women’s peace camp phenomenon arose. Women made their homes at Seneca Falls and Puget Sound in the US (Krasniewicz 1992; Paley 1989; Russell 1989a) and at various nuclear bases across Europe, with Greenham Common camp in the UK remaining the earliest, largest and most well-known example (Roseneil 1995, 2000; Hipperson 2005; Cook and Kirk 1983).

Several basic discourses about gender and nuclear weapons helped structure this wave of mobilisation. Such plurality has already been noted by academic commentators beyond IR: in the course of Hugh Gusterson’s ethnography of the Livermore nuclear weapons laboratory and protests against it (1996: 212-3), Sasha Roseneil’s (1995: 4-7) analysis of the camp at Greenham, and Helen Liddington’s (1991: 6-8) overview of the historical antecedents of British women’s peace mobilisation, three main narratives are identified, with each author naming and describing the three in varying terms. On my reading, however, six discourses can be distinguished, each giving rise to a different construction of the anti-nuclear activist.

These discourses can be labelled, respectively, maternalist, anti-violence, culturalist, materialist, cosmopolitan and cosmological in character.

To begin with, the *maternalist* discourse brought the figure of the “Mother-in-Action” to the fore as the key protagonist in anti-nuclear struggle (e.g., Caldicott 1986: 236). Speaking to and from the reproductive capacities of women, and insisting on the importance of the caring responsibilities and values traditionally associated with them (Ruddick 1989), this discourse implied that a nuclear-free world required the re-evaluation, re-imagining and spread of maternal values and practices over their masculine corollaries (Caldicott 1986: 241-2). It thus provided a positive justification for women-led or women-only organising, encouraging those who had previously been marginalised because of their association with caring responsibilities to make connections across the private and public realm and become a force for broader political change. The workings of this discourse can be seen in the repeated emphasis placed on motherhood in explanations given by individuals for their mobilisation (Pettit 2006: 24-6; Roseneil 2000: 46, 56-9); the decorative and symbolic use of photographs of and drawings by children at protest events (Pershing 1996: 128-9; Cook and Kirk 1983: 31); and in the revitalisation and re-working in activist circles of crafts associated with white, middle-class feminine domesticity such as embroidery (Pershing 1996; Krasniewicz 1992: 60-6).

One complementary discourse could be termed *anti-violence*, focused as it was on the problematic masculinity of the mainstream political subject and its connection to nuclear politics. Here, masculinity was constructed as either intrinsically pathological or as structurally corrupted: either way, nuclear weaponry was contextualised on a continuum of violence perpetrated by men and male-dominated institutions — from rape, through domestic

violence, to war (Russell 1989b; Held 1988). Within the terms of this discourse, the roots of violence were located in male sexuality, a drive to dominate women, non-whites and nature (Kokopeli and Lakey 1982: 233, 235-8; Easlea 1983), and/or to a larger system or structure of “patriarchy” (Zanotti 1982; Warnock 1982), each explanation bearing witness to the influence of radical feminist analyses (Roseneil 1995: 6-7; 2000: 34; Koen and Swaim 1980: 1). While primarily concerned to critique pro-nuclear male subjectivity, this discourse had the effect of elevating existing models of femininity and womanhood, providing as it did a negative justification for women-only organising against the bomb (Held 1988; Rosenbluth and Russell 1989: 302-5). The generalised figure of the “Woman” became by default the bearer of anti-nuclear struggle, a world without nuclear weapons requiring variously the feminisation of male psychology, the overthrow of male power and patriarchal structures by women, or even limitations on the numbers of men born into the world (Gearhart 1982).

The *culturalist* discourse, in contrast, had a distinctive emphasis on the cultural construction of hegemonic male *and female* subjects and the need for and possibility of challenging both. This discourse again positioned patriarchy as the structural context in which nuclear weaponry gained its symbolic resonance, but there was also some consideration here of the ways in which patriarchy overlapped with and was constituted by power relations such as heterosexism and racism (Smith 1989). This enabled the articulation of a more complex, intersectional critique of the ways in which dominant forms of masculinity underpinned and fed into Cold War nuclearism (see eg. Spretnak 1989; Hartsock 1989; Strange 1989). It also allowed for an avowedly feminist “queering” of dominant models of femininity (as embodied, for example, in maternal tropes and their association with middle-class, white, heterosexual respectability) and advocacy of alternatives (Snitow 1989; Roseneil 2000: chaps 7 and 10). Overall, the discourse hinged on the construction of the “Reflexive Activist”,

whose critical self-examination and insistence on the stratified, changeable character of gender, was positioned as central to the struggle for change. As Gusterson (1996: 212) indicates, culturalist arguments pointed ultimately to a vision of the post-nuclear world as “androgynous”, with gender difference no longer playing a politically meaningful role.

The fourth discourse was *materialist* in character, emphasising the impact of nuclear weapons and their cost. Widespread in the anti-nuclear movement (Roseneil 1995: 5), when circulating in and through women’s activism it was frequently typified by a preoccupation with the impact of nuclear weapons on female bodies and lives. The implications for the reproductive system of exposure to radiation was highlighted, for example (Koen and Swaim 1980), or the deleterious effects on health, education and welfare budgets of prioritising spending on weaponry (Omolade 1989; Beneria and Blank 1989). Gender figured here as differential embodiment and lived social roles more than as an identity or form of power. But gender was also interpolated in a more abstract way, in terms of a repeated emphasis on the impact and cost of nuclear weapons on human bodies, relationships and the natural world. The abstractions of nuclear rationality, as pursued by a technocratic, Western, masculine subject, were thus confronted by the concrete, embodied mode of reasoning historically associated with feminine (and also non-white, non-Western) subjectivity but here assumed to be more widely shared (Buirski 1983; Pettit 1983). In this way, the discourse constructed a feminised but potentially inclusive figure of the anti-nuclear activist we could call the “Empath”.

A very different tack was taken in the *cosmopolitan* discourse, which focused on women’s political exclusion from the defence and political establishments of the nuclear state.

Epitomised in British author Virginia Woolf’s anti-war rallying cry from an earlier age – “As a woman I have no country. As a woman I want no country. As a woman my country is the

whole world” – this discourse was rearticulated in the Cold War period by radical feminists who, assuming an undifferentiated commonality of experience of oppression among women worldwide, aspired to a global sisterhood rather than entry into male-dominated institutions.¹² The sense of sisterly connection can be seen, for example, in accounts of the international character of Greenham and the solidarity actions that took place around the world (Cook and Kirk 1983: 32, 62), as well as in critiques of the loyalties and symbols of mainstream patriotism in both the UK and US (e.g., Krasniewicz 1992: chap 8). In addition, security was re-envisioned within the parameters of this discourse in ways that made it more inclusive of women’s experiences and transborder relationships. Militarism and the supposed protection it offered was subjected to critical scrutiny (Wood 1983; Thompson 1983; Ruehl 1983); the counterproductive character of violence was documented (Cook and Kirk 1983); and empathetic connections were forged with the ostensibly threatening ‘Other’ (Porter 1983; Mooney 1983: 5, 14). In such ways, this discourse reconfigured community and the methods used to protect it, rather than gender. It effectively contrasted a compromised political subject in the form of the male citizen or politician with the “Sister”, an ethical activist subject who transcended geopolitical specificities.

Finally, the *cosmological* discourse mobilised gendered imagery within a conception of the universe and our role within it. In its ecological variant, this discourse drew on a self-conscious ecofeminism (Epstein 1991: 176-8; Alonso 1993: 246-7) and was manifested in claims about women’s connectedness to the natural world (Women's Pentagon Action 1982; Salamone 1982), in critiques of a dualistic masculine worldview involving separation from and mastery over nature (Strange 1989; Griffin 1989), and in the images of nature peppering women’s life stories, poetry and other texts (Pettit 2006: 24, 27; Linton and Whitham 1989:

¹² Which is why I think Liddington is incorrect to label this discourse “equal rights”.

186). In its spiritual variant (Epstein 1991: chap. 5), the discourse gave rise to widespread Goddess iconography (McAllister 1982: ix; Jones 1989: 201) and pagan/wiccan narratives and rituals (Krasniewicz 1992: 53-60; Epstein 1991: 183-92). The anti-nuclear activist was constituted here as a potent feminine figure, either “Earth Mother” or “Goddess”, and urged to exert her powers to usher in an alternative future for the planet.

Although it is helpful analytically to delineate these six basic discourses about gender and (anti-)nuclear politics in Cold War women’s activism, they and the identities they constructed should not be misunderstood as internally monolithic and sharply distinct from each other in their empirical instantiation. To begin with, the discourses were internally heterogeneous and conflictual. There were rival articulations of a cosmological framework, as I have shown, and also of maternalism, with women’s caring capacity rooted sometimes in biologically determinist accounts of their physiology and thereby seen as eternal (Caldicott 1986), sometimes in their socially constructed caring roles and thereby envisioned as changing and changeable (Ruddick 1989).¹³ Moreover, the boundaries between discourses were permeable. Thus cosmological visions resonated with maternalism in their reimagining of femininity while, to take another example, the anti-violence and culturalist discourses both pointed toward patriarchy as the structural context in which men and masculinity gained their power and women and femininity were subordinated and oppressed. Finally, even the most divergent discourses were not indelibly associated with antithetical political projects and political subjects, but rather offered overlapping and competing sources of meaning-making and identity-construction within the same action or text. This is illustrated very clearly by

¹³ Roseneil concludes that maternalism is “a discourse which has within it the seeds of its own transformation ... action[s] which have begun within a maternalist framework have become increasingly feminist as women stepped outside the very roles they were seeking to defend” (1995: 5). In this way, she differentiates maternalism from feminism while suggesting the boundaries between the two are unstable. I would argue rather that maternalism is internally diverse and fluid, having both biologically essentialist and socially constructionist interpretations within it, along with rival versions of feminism.

detailed ethnographies of the women's peace camps (Roseneil 1995, 2000; Krasniewicz 1992). As I will show in the next part of the paper, instability, porousness and simultaneity continue to characterise the six discourses as they are re-circulated in the post-Cold War period, along with some notable shifts in content and in the activist identities thereby produced.

Deconstructing Contemporary Campaigning Texts

The end of the Cold War has been widely interpreted as inaugurating a new context for nuclear politics (e.g., Freedman 2003: chaps 27 and 28). In the US and UK, mass mobilisation against nuclear weapons diminished and large-scale women's protests were no exception, reflecting also the fragmentation and institutionalisation of feminist organising already underway by this time in the two countries. Yet women-led campaigning did not disappear entirely: in the UK, for example, vestigial camps remained for some years at the Yellow Gate in Greenham (Fairhall 2006: 150-155), as well as continuing at other sites (Aldermaston Women's Peace Camp No date), while WAND in the US regrouped and reoriented, broadening its focus and making new alliances (Sheldon 2004). In both countries, female activists found alternative institutional homes for their continued research and lobbying and continued to produce campaigning texts. Helen Caldicott and Angie Zelter are two examples, prominent figures in anti-nuclear mobilisation in the US and UK respectively for several decades. Their writings continue to have substantial authority in the reduced movement fields in which they operate, functioning I suggest as key sites for the recirculation and reconfiguration in the post-Cold War age of the basic discourses about gender and nuclear weapons identified above.

Caldicott is an Australian doctor who initially became politicised around the issues of uranium mining and atmospheric nuclear testing in her home country and who, after moving to the US, became a high-profile campaigner against nuclear weapons during the Cold War. She founded several prominent organisations — reviving the then-moribund Physicians for Social Responsibility in 1977, for example, and establishing WAND in 1982 — and her book on the superpower nuclear standoff, *Missile Envy* (1986), was “among the most widely read in the movement” (Gusterson 1996: 210). In the immediate aftermath of the Cold War, Caldicott wrote an ecologically-themed text, *If You Love This Planet*, and then an autobiography reflecting on her campaigning past as well as personal life (1997). She has since founded a US-based think-tank and written books on the strengthening of the “military-industrial complex” under George Bush Jr., the attempted revival in this context of missile defence, and the perils of responding to an overreliance on oil by turning to nuclear power (2004, 2006; 2007). She has also republished *If You Love This Planet* and hosts a radio show of the same name. Much of her campaigning trades on her “MD” status, her texts positioned as “expert” or educative and shot through with scientific knowledge claims as well as emotionally-charged appeals to the US public. As Gusterson puts it, Caldicott’s style combines “the moral authority of a doctor with the passionate warmth of a mother and the charismatic energy of an Old Testament prophet” (Gusterson 1996, 210; see also Redekop 2010).

In more substantive terms, Caldicott’s post-Cold War writings on nuclear weapons are characterised by her longstanding materialist concern with the impact of the nuclear industry on the environment and on human bodies, female and male. This is repeatedly counterpointed to the abstractions of the male-dominated nuclear industry (e.g., 2004: chap 2). The cosmological discourse can also be glimpsed, specifically in its ecological version, in *If You*

Love This Planet. Here Caldicott invokes the metaphor of the Earth as a patient riddled with interconnected illnesses of which the nuclear industry is but one (2009a: xiii, 109-119), and urges women to administer planetary healing by taking up positions of power in legislatures worldwide (2009a: 241).

In addition, maternalist and anti-violence discourses remain in play. *Missile Envy* mobilised these in particularly stark, biologically-determinist forms, locating the Cold War nuclear mindset in male physiology and the death-seeking, violent sexuality to which it gave rise, and finding the solution in a female leadership rooted in the physiological capacity to give birth and nurture children (Caldicott 1986: 235-42). Some of these biologically essentialist tropes are recycled at points in Caldicott's post-Cold War output. In a reported speech (2003), for example, she argues that male violence as manifested in the war on Iraq is due to a "subconscious evolutionary imperative",¹⁴ and in an interview alludes to plans for a book on questions such as "Why do men always kill? ... Why do men rape women?" (Andersen 2007). Conversely, maternalism is invoked in extended, celebratory references to her own role as mother in the autobiography, along with an emphasis on the pleasures and powers of a particular kind of bourgeois, white, heterosexual femininity, while *If You Love this Planet* is infused with maternalist-inflected claims that "the only cure is love" (Caldicott 2009a: 235). The concluding emphasis in that book on female leadership to save the world from ecological crisis draws less on the Earth Mother or Goddess imagery of the cosmological discourse, more on the maternalist argument that women's reproductive capacities and caring roles make them "crucial to planetary survival" and uniquely suited to "steer the planet toward a safe future for our children" (Caldicott 2009a: 155, 241). In such ways, Caldicott's post-Cold War texts re-circulate a familiar, biologically-essentialist version of the Mother-in-Action.

¹⁴ Note that neither Caldicott nor the organisation to which she was ostensibly speaking, Code Pink, have posted an "official" version of this speech, and the accuracy of the reported version may be open to question.

On my reading, however, there are also some discursive ambiguities and shifts visible in these writings that merit our attention (Sharoni 1997: 285). Notably, Caldicott's major post-Cold War analysis of the sources of nuclear pathology, *The New Nuclear Danger*, when read in tandem with *If You Love this Planet*, destabilises the anti-violence discourse and with it the pathological pro-nuclear male who is the nemesis of the Mother-in-Action. Note the absence in these texts of the earlier emphasis on intrinsic male sexual drive and death-seeking psyche. In their place, Caldicott introduces a more institutional analysis: it is the lack of accountability within the US government, in tandem with the entrenched power of the military-industrial complex and corporate media, which ensures an environment in which those who are financially and emotionally invested in nuclear weapons go unchallenged, particularly since September 11th. See, for example, her critique of the politicisation by neoconservatives of the hitherto independent Defense Policy Board (Caldicott 2004: xxiii) and her characterisation of the invasion of Iraq in 2003 as a kind of "insider" business deal: "In this charmed circle of American capitalism, Lockheed Martin-, Boeing-, and Raytheon-manufactured munitions destroy Iraq; George Schultz's Bechtel Corporation and Dick Cheney's Haliburton rebuild Iraq; and Iraqi oil pays for it all" (Caldicott 2004: xxx).

Individual male psychology still receives some attention, as in the claim that technicians involved in nuclear tests may be "seeking an archetypal understanding of the experience of conceptions and delivery, otherwise unavailable to them" (Caldicott 2004: 16-17). The core problem, nonetheless, appears to lie in the institutions in which such men flourish, in their lack of accountability and the absence of counterbalancing forces. The implied solution, moreover, lies not in transforming or displacing men, but in institutional change — in dismantling the Pentagon, for example (Caldicott 2004: 186), in public media ownership (Caldicott 2009a: 233) and in the emergence of female *and also male* anti-nuclear leaders

with the capacity to transform the institutions they seek to enter (Caldicott 2009b, 2010). In this context, Caldicott praises Barack Obama for his “correct instincts” on the nuclear issue (2010), and his publicly loving demeanour toward his children. Other male anti-nuclear activists and friendly political leaders are similarly described (1997: 254, 322; 2009a: 72, 242). In such ways, a figure of the anti-nuclear activist as a “New Man” begins to emerge.

The maternalist discourse is also destabilised in these recent writings, perhaps because the autobiography form encourages Caldicott to reflect more extensively on the meaning of motherhood and her own relationship to it. To begin with, the autobiography intimates very clearly that mothering is problematic for both women and children in a sexist society. Early chapters unflinchingly document the “dark side” of Caldicott’s childhood relation with her own mother, for example (1997: 9-10, 22, 23, 41), and her terrors and inadequacies when a mother herself are freely discussed (1997: 71-6). In documenting her move to a full-time campaigner, moreover, Caldicott makes linkages to feminist texts like *The Female Eunuch* which critique dominant models of femininity and the nuclear family. “I was rebelling”, she states, in part against “relative powerlessness as a woman” within a “patriarchal” context (1997: 121), and she rages against the way she is trivialised because she is a woman with a feminine mode of presentation (1997: 137, 233). Finally, Caldicott indicates that in some instances her past invocations of motherhood, and indeed models of femininity more generally, were explicitly strategic in character (see Sharoni 1997: 288). Thus we read that Jaeger and pearls worked best for a conservative audience (Caldicott 1997: 156, 242) and that an emphasis on maternal qualities served to provoke women’s groups to action: “I had learned enough about public speaking to tailor my talk to the audience” (Caldicott 1997: 212). Taken together, these features of the autobiography go some way to subverting the

naturalisation of and uncritical praise for women's maternal qualities we find elsewhere in Caldicott's recent writings.

Indeed, I would go so far as to suggest that the Mother-of-Action figure is giving way in Caldicott's writings to that of the "Feminist Heroine", in counterpoint to the emergence of the New Man. I use the language of heroism here for two reasons. Firstly, Caldicott's focus is very much on the achievements of the individual female leader, not on collective endeavour. Praise may be heaped on women-led organisations (1997: 299-303), but it is the role and leadership capacities of specific women that come across most strongly, in the repeated attention to key campaigners, from actress Meryl Streep to Nuclear Freeze leader Randy Forsberg, and in the detailing of Caldicott's own achievements. In this, the texts under discussion mirror the individualism of mainstream American political culture and of the liberal feminism which has found a home within it. Second, Caldicott strongly emphasises the sacrifices that the leader must make in her personal life in order to pursue her political goals. Women may be empowered and inspired by their caring roles and responsibilities, but they are also continually constrained by them and forced, in an overtly feminist move, to jettison them in pursuit of the anti-nuclear cause. Overall, then, the Feminist Heroine is an admirable, but ultimately rather lonely figure.

There are instructive resonances and contrasts here with the texts of the second author under consideration. Angie Zelter founded the "Snowball" campaign in the UK in the late 1980s in which women and men courted arrest by cutting the wire around nuclear bases. Organiser of many actions since, it was her acquittal as part of the four-woman "Seeds of Hope" affinity group, which damaged a Hawk Jet bound for the Indonesian army in East Timor, that particularly grabbed media headlines (Zelter 1997a). Drawing in this on a US Christian

initiative to turn swords into ploughshares, Zelter subsequently worked with others to create the “Trident Ploughshares” framework for direct action against British nuclear weapons, most recently coordinating a year-long wave of blockades at Faslane naval base in Scotland (Faslane 365 2007). Connectedly, Zelter has produced three books, including an edited collection of the motivations of those taking part in Snowball, a memoir of the Trident Ploughshares initiative and the associated trials, and a collage of reflections on Faslane 365, in each winding her own reflections in and around the words of others. These texts, and other shorter pieces online, differ in their style, purpose and intended audience from Caldicott’s in that they are documents by and for a British activist milieu, intended both as a record of “part of the history of the peace movement in the UK” (Zelter 2008: xxiii) and as a source of practical advice and inspiration for those already involved or about to act.

There are nonetheless some substantive affinities here with Caldicott’s writings, and with Cold War discourses, in terms of the re-circulation of materialist, maternalist and cosmological tropes. The first can be glimpsed in Zelter’s mention of the costs of nuclear weaponry (Zelter and Bhardwaj 1990: chap. 4), her insistence on “ordinary language” when in court (Zelter 2001d), and her rejection of the capacity to “close off, to deny the implications of our actions on others” in our political reasoning (Zelter 2008: xviii).

Maternalism also leaves an imprint, albeit to a much more limited extent than in Caldicott’s texts and without an emphasis on biology. Direct action is characterised as “a practical act of love” (2001e: 56), for example, while, an account of an all-women effort to disable a nuclear submarine support barge in Loch Goil mentions opposition to “the exploitation of children” and describes how, after hanging their “beautifully painted” banners around the barge and dismantling the internal electrics, the women “left it clean and tidy (it felt a bit like housework)” (Zelter 2001a: 41-3). Finally, the ecological variant of the cosmological

discourse comes through clearly, not only in fleeting mentions of the beauty of the natural environment, contrasted to the destructive power of nuclear weapons (e.g., Zelter 2008: xxiii), but more strongly in underlying assumptions about “the interconnected life-web of which we are but one species. We perceive that our life support systems around the world are deteriorating and dying” (Zelter 1997a). The abolition of nuclear weapons is thus positioned as one element in the struggle “to solve the pressing social and environmental crises that threaten the whole web of life on our fragile planet” (2009b).

Overall, however, the identity constructions in Zelter’s texts have a quite distinct flavour from Caldicott’s, and this is due not only to their different style and intended audience, but also to the predominance of Cold War culturalist and cosmopolitan discourses within them, both absent from Caldicott’s writings. The culturalist analysis of patriarchal structures is reproduced, for example, in Zelter’s account of a meeting between the women arrested at Loch Goil and their legal representatives. Zelter berates the lawyers for “egotistical, patriarchal, power games, masquerading under cover of ‘professional rules’”; there is a “clash of cultures” at work here, we are told (2001b: 81). Correspondingly, Zelter’s vision of a post-nuclear future invokes the kind of androgynous utopia highlighted by Gusterson: “a gender-blind society where women and men are equally respected” (Zelter and McKenzie 2001). The cosmopolitan discourse can be seen in Zelter’s texts in the form of familiar claims about the exclusion of women from military decision-making: “the arms industry, war and human rights abuses are controlled by men with women and children as major victims ... It felt good to confront this with an all-female team” (Zelter 1997a). Continuing this theme, international solidarity is emphasised, along with the need for deep changes to British foreign policy in order to create “real security” (Zelter 2008: xix).

While much of this is familiar from Cold War texts, it seems to me that the twin discourses of culturalism and cosmopolitanism have been reframed here sufficiently to produce new identity constructions. Assuming neither the continuous, critical probing of gender norms by the Reflexive Activist nor the transcendental, ethical figure of The Sister, Zelter's writings instead point toward the "Global Citizen" as the bearer of contemporary anti-nuclear politics (e.g., 1997a; 2001d: 47). This undoubtedly reflects the rise of the trope of citizenship in political theory and practice in post-Cold War Britain. Citizenship is treated in these texts as multidimensional — not only political, but also ethical, social and cultural in character — and as multilevel, involving participation in a planetary as well as national community and the prioritisation of international law (e.g., Zelter 2001f,b). Finally, citizenship is depicted by Zelter as gender-neutral, to the extent that masculine pronouns or traits are not routinely affixed to it. Having said this, the sexed embodiment of citizens is not assumed to be entirely irrelevant. On the contrary: the post-gender world of androgyny remains, like the post-nuclear world order, an ideal rather than a reality for Zelter and in this context the Global Citizen is depicted as routinely embodied by women who both draw upon and challenge gender norms.

Exactly how this is done can be seen if we contrast the figure of the Global Citizen with that of the Feminist Heroine from Caldicott's texts. In place of an emphasis on individual female leadership within governing institutions, Zelter's global citizen gains her power within an activist group or network, her role being to call governing institutions to account via civil disobedience or direct action. See for example the emphasis on collectivity and confrontation in the description of the Seeds of Hope women's affinity group (Zelter 1997a). Yet notwithstanding the often onerous physical and emotional demands of the direct actions Zelter documents, the trope of heroism found in Caldicott's texts is here displaced by a resolute emphasis on the ordinariness of the women involved. Indeed, Zelter is openly critical

of the tendency to “hero-worship” (2001c: 253) and seeks to undercut it, as when describing her nervousness during the dismantling of the Loch Goil barge and the physical difficulties faced in the task of throwing equipment into the water (2001a: 40-1). Yet Zelter also pointedly reverses the gendered division of labour prevalent in British direct action circles, privileging as it does “20-year old men with their fast boats and equipment” (1997b), by repeatedly underlining the support roles of “kind” and empathetic men and, conversely, the pioneering and dynamic civil actions undertaken by women (e.g., Zelter 2009a, 2001a). In such ways, these texts normalise women’s collective and disruptive agency, bringing it centre stage in the ongoing struggle of global citizens to achieve nuclear disarmament.

To sum up this section, my reading of recent work by Caldicott and Zelter indicates some interesting shifts in the basic discourses of the Cold War period. What I described above as an institutional critique dominates Caldicott’s analysis of the nuclear complex in the US under Bush and Obama. Taken in tandem with her more critical, reflexive attitudes to motherhood, this has functioned to attenuate the biological essentialism of the anti-violence and maternalist discourses upon which she relied during the Cold War. These shifts produce new gendered subject positions for the anti-nuclear activist that I have labelled the New Man and the Feminist Heroine. Zelter’s texts, in contrast, are imbued with a culturalist discourse, which brings with it an emphasis on patriarchal structures and the constraints they impose on both women and men that is missing from Caldicott’s more psychological and institutional account. Zelter’s writing is also distinguished by the recirculation of a cosmopolitan narrative of longstanding in the British context, albeit here articulated with a distinctive post-Cold War emphasis on citizenship and the potentialities of international law, along with an effort to reconfigure the sexist stereotypes prevalent in British direct action circles, which together feed into a new oppositional figure in her texts, that of the Global Citizen. All told, these texts

rewrite the basic discourses of Cold War anti-nuclear activism in ways that are shaped by and help constitute the national and temporal specificities of the political fields in which they circulate, and that further expand the array of gendered activist identity constructions in women's anti-nuclear activism.

Conclusion

This article has responded to a curious lacuna in the field of gender and security studies in recent years with regard to nuclear politics in general and women's anti-nuclear campaigning in particular. Post-Cold War developments have been entirely sidestepped, and campaigners of the Cold War period effectively feature now only as a romanticised or demonised stereotype. Drawing on recent systematisations of poststructuralist-influenced feminist methodology in gender and security studies that point enquiry toward the discursive construction of gendered subjectivities, I have shown in this article that Cold War women's anti-nuclear activism in the US and UK produced and was produced by far more complex and varied discourses than has been thus far acknowledged in feminist IR. Specifically, I have identified six basic discourses in circulation in this particular political field, and with them several overlapping, unstable constructions of the anti-nuclear protagonist—ranging from the gender-specific Woman or Sister or to the potentially more gender inclusive Empath or Reflexive Activist, and from the Mother-in-Action grounded in specific maternal experiences to the more metaphorical imagery of the Earth Mother and Goddess. In addition, I have shown that basic discourses have continued to circulate *and to shift* in campaigning texts written since the end of the Cold War, with new constructions of the anti-nuclear subject emerging from the writings of Helen Caldicott and Angie Zelter, namely the New Man, the Feminist Heroine and Global Citizen. My reading indicates that the gendered subjectivities of

campaigners are being rearticulated today differently from their Cold War counterparts and in dissimilar ways in the specific geopolitical contexts of the US and UK.

All told, the methodological and empirical arguments put forward in this article imply that scholars of gender and security can and should revisit the simplified assumptions that have developed in the field about the identities of women anti-nuclear activists during the Cold War, as well as the consequent neglect of post-Cold War developments, paying far more attention than hitherto to the historical antecedents, geopolitical specificity and political effects of women's anti-nuclear campaigning and the discourses underpinning it. There is potential here for a fruitful research agenda for gender and security studies, as can be seen if we take each of these analytical elements in terms.

With regard to historical enquiry, my challenge in this article to the reification of Cold War women's anti-nuclear activism in gender and security studies has exposed a range of hitherto neglected campaigning discourses in the 1980s that would bear further scrutiny and alternative interpretations. Moreover, the question of the relation of these discourses to those crystallised earlier in the Cold War, and to longer-standing British and American peace movement traditions, and hegemonic narratives, remains open. As Hansen (2006: 79) puts it,

The analytical — and political — value of historical studies is that they provide detailed insights into the structures of present national and civilizational identities, hence show[ing] how deeply rooted particular aspects of current identities are ... [and] how previously important representations have been silenced and written out of the discourse of the present.

For example, perhaps the Cold War/post-Cold War disjuncture may not be as crucial in terms of the formation of gendered subjects as that between the pre-nuclear and nuclear age, or

perhaps long-term continuities in terms of the relation of selves to national security in both dominant and marginal discourses may be more significant than the radical discontinuities supposed in dominant interpretations of the end of superpower nuclear competition.

Turning to geopolitical sensitivity, I have only hinted here at the particularities of discursive formations in the UK and US. The intricacies of the interplay between national context and identity production in anti-nuclear discourses clearly merit more detailed enquiry. Do the subjectivities articulated in the writings of Caldicott and Zelter feed into a more widely found discourse in their respective fields of activism, or to put it differently, are new, country-specific basic discourses emerging? Moreover, it remains an open question as to whether Cold War anti-nuclear discourses were the site of the production of national differences to any great extent. In addition, my case study has replicated the pivotal Anglo-American focus of the IR discipline, and other discursive contexts are in urgent need of examination. Recall the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests and opposition to them mentioned at the outset of this article, which brings to mind points of comparison and contrast between the campaigning texts of Caldicott and Zelter and those of, for example, Arundhati Roy. Roy's writings on nuclear weapons have been described as cosmopolitan in character (Kapoor 2009), but an initial reading suggests she calls on this discourse in a very different way to Zelter, asserting painful, temporary exile from a country suffering new and inventive forms of colonisation and ultimately desiring more freedom for self-definition within and for that country (Roy 1999, 2003). Serious attention to such articulations of post-colonial subjectivities is likely to cast into relief the ethnocentric limitations of anti-nuclear discourses and identities in US and UK contexts, as well as of gender and security studies.

With regard finally to the political effects of the discourses generated by and about women's anti-nuclear activism, this article has sought to reinforce Managhan's point, mentioned earlier, that scholars of gender and security studies should not assume the political impact of gendered representations of the subject, but instead scrutinise that impact empirically. More concretely, my analysis hints that what could be called the internal political effects of identity constructions in anti-nuclear circles — in relation to activist motivation, self-understandings and self-representations — may be more diverse, unstable and open-ended than previously supposed. What remains to be investigated is the wider political effect of these constructions and in particular their interplay with dominant discourses about gender identities and/or nuclear weapons. To put this in Hansen's terms, a more fully intertextual study is required, one that would enquire not only into the framings developed within the texts that together constitute or represent the "marginal political discourse" of anti-nuclear activism, but also their relationship to official state discourse on nuclear weapons, wider foreign policy debates (such as media representations of weaponry and opposition to it) and/or popular cultural representations. Such an undertaking would allow a fuller understanding of the ramifications of women's anti-nuclear campaigning and the multiple identity constructions found therein, as well as of the gendered dynamics of nuclear politics more generally.

Taken together, the three lines of enquiry suggested are intended to prompt gender and security studies into re-engagement with women's anti-nuclear campaigning. After all, as I began by pointing out, such campaigning was foundational to our field. And as has become clear in the course of this article, it is still with us today, albeit changed in form and context, serving as a reminder that nuclear weapons and the gendered (in)securities they produce also remain with us. The abandonment of this area of enquiry is thus premature as well as unnecessary — particularly so given that there has been a flurry of IR publications on nuclear

politics in recent years, with increasing attention paid to the normative commitments and identity constructions of the nuclear state (e.g., Rublee 2009; Ritchie 2010). Re-engagement with the discourses of women anti-nuclear campaigners offers one route for gender and security scholars to contribute to this literature, and a necessary first step in the larger endeavour of revitalising critical attention to the complex, gendered dynamics of nuclear politics.

References

- ALDERMASTON WOMEN'S PEACE CAMP. (No date). 'Awpc History'. Available at: <http://www.aldermaston.net/camp/history>. (Accessed 9 October 2011).
- ALONSO, HARRIET HYMAN. (1993). *Peace as a Women's Issue: A History of the U.S. Movement for World Peace and Women's Rights*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- ANDERSEN, SHEA. (2007). 'Bust Wind Not Atoms: Helen Caldicott's Ongoing War on Nukes'. *Boise Weekly*. Available at: <http://www.boiseweekly.com/boise/bust-wind-not-atoms/Content?oid=934263>. (Accessed 9 December 2010).
- BENERIA, LOURDES & REBECCA BLANK. (1989). 'Women and the Economics of Military Spending'. In Harris, Adrienne & Ynestra King, *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*. pp.191-203. Boulder: Westview Press.
- BLANCHARD, ERIC M. (2003). 'Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28 (4), 1289-1312.
- BUIRSKI, JEANETTE. (1983). 'How I Learnt to Start Worrying and Hate the Bomb: The Effects of a Nuclear Bombardment'. In Thompson, Dorothy, *Over Our Dead Bodies: Women against the Bomb*. pp.15-28. London: Virago.
- CALDICOTT, HELEN. (1986). *Missile Envy: The Arms Race and Nuclear War*. Revised edition, Toronto, New York, London: Bantam Books.
- CALDICOTT, HELEN. (1997). *A Desperate Passion: An Autobiography*. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company.
- CALDICOTT, HELEN. (2003). 'Dr Helen Caldicott's Speech, Code Pink'. *Indymedia*. Available at: <http://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2003/03/57359.html>. (Accessed 9 December 2010).
- CALDICOTT, HELEN. (2004). *The New Nuclear Danger: George W. Bush's Military Industrial Complex*. New York: The New Press.
- CALDICOTT, HELEN. (2006). *Nuclear Power Is Not the Answer: To Global Warming or Anything Else*. New York: New Press.
- CALDICOTT, HELEN. (2009a). *If You Love This Planet: A Plan to Save the Earth*. Revised and updated, New York and London: WW Norton and Company.
- CALDICOTT, HELEN. (2009b). 'Uranium Export Is the First Step to War'. *The Age*. Available at: <http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/uranium-export-is-the-first-step-to-war-20090717-do5z.html?page=2>. (Accessed 9 December 2010).
- CALDICOTT, HELEN. (2010). 'How Did an Idealistic President Become a Champion of Nuclear Power and by Default, Weapons Proliferation?'. *Huffington Post*. Available at: <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/helen-caldicott/how-did-an-idealistic-pre b 446628.html>. (Accessed 9 December 2010).

- CALDICOTT, HELEN & CRAIG EISENDRATH. (2007). *War in Heaven: The Arms Race in Outer Space*. New York: New Press.
- CHOWDHRY, GEETA. (No date). 'Contesting Security? Postcoloniality, Nationalism and Nuclear Modernity in India'. Available at: http://ir.lib.nsysu.edu.tw:8080/bitstream/987654321/39869/1/geeta_Paper.pdf. (Accessed 12 November 2010).
- COHN, CAROL. (1987). 'Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12 (4), 687-718.
- COHN, CAROL. (1989). 'Emasculating America's Linguistic Deterrent'. In Harris, Adrienne & Ynestra King, *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*. pp.153-170. Boulder: Westview Press.
- COHN, CAROL, FELICITY HILL & SARA RUDDICK. (2005). 'The Relevance of Gender for Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction'. *Disarmament Diplomacy* [Online]. Available: <http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd80/80ccfhsr.htm> [Accessed 12 April 2010].
- COOK, ALICE & GWYN KIRK. (1983). *Greenham Women Everywhere: Dreams, Ideas and Actions from the Women's Peace Movement*. London: Pluto Press.
- DAS, RUNA. (2007). 'Broadening the Security Paradigm: Indian Women, Anti-Nuclear Activism, and Visions of a Sustainable Future', *Women's Studies International Forum* 30 (1), 1-15.
- EASLEA, BRIAN. (1983). *Fathering the Unthinkable: Masculinity, Scientists and the Nuclear Arms Race*. London: Pluto Press.
- ELSHTAIN, JEAN BETHKE. (1987). *Women and War*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- ENLOE, CYNTHIA. (1989). *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- ENLOE, CYNTHIA. (2004). *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- EPSTEIN, BARBARA. (1991). *Political Protest and Cultural Revolution: Nonviolent Direct Action in the 1970s and 80s*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- FAIRHALL, DAVID. (2006). *Common Ground: The Story of Greenham*. London: IB Tauris.
- FASLANE 365. (2007). 'Welcome to Faslane 365!'. Available at: <http://www.faslane365.org/>. (Accessed 20 February 2011).
- FREEDMAN, LAWRENCE. (2003). *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy*. 3rd edition, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- GEARHART, SALLY MILLER. (1982). 'The Future - If There Is One - Is Female'. In Mcallister, Pam, *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*. pp.266-284. Philadelphia: New Society Publisher.
- GRIFFIN, SUSAN. (1989). 'Ideologies of Madness'. In Russell, Diana E.H., *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. pp.75-83. New York and Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- GUSTERSON, HUGH. (1996). *Nuclear Rites: A Weapons Laboratory at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- HANSEN, LENE. (2000). 'The Little Mermaid's Silen Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School', *Millennium* 29 (2), 285-306.
- HANSEN, LENE. (2006). *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge.
- HANSEN, LENE. (2007). 'The Clash of Cartoons? The Clash of Civilizations? Visual Securitization and the Danish 2006 Cartoon Crisis'. Available at: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/security/news/awayday/hansen_danish_cartoons_and_visual_securitisation_isa_2007.pdf. (Accessed 17 August 2011).
- HARTSOCK, NANCY. (1989). 'Masculinity, Heroism, and the Making of War'. In Harris, Adrienne & Ynestra King, *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*. pp.133-152. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- HELD, JANE. (1988). 'The British Peace Movement: A Critical Examination of Attitudes to Male Violence within the British Peace Movement, as Expressed with Regard to the 'Molesworth Rapes'', *Women's Studies International Forum* 11 (3), 211-221.
- HIPPERSON, SARAH. (2005). *Greenham: Nonviolent Women V the Crown Prerogative*. London: Greenham Publications.
- JONES, LYNNE. (1989). 'On Common Ground: The Women's Peace Camp at Greenham Common'. In Russell, Diana E.H., *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. pp.198-215. Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press.
- KAPOOR, PRIYA. (2009). 'Of Moral Positions and Nuclear War: Novelist Arundhati Roy as Peace Activist'. *Global Media Journal* [Online], 8. Available: <http://lass.calumet.purdue.edu/cca/gmj/fa09/gmj-fa09-kapoor.htm> [Accessed 6 March 2010].
- KOEN, SUSAN & NINA SWAIM. (1980). *Aint Nowhere We Can Run: A Handbook for Women on the Nuclear Mentality*. Bradford: WAND.
- KOKOPELI, BRUCE & GEORGE LAKEY. (1982). 'More Power Than We Want: Masculine Sexuality and Violence'. In McAllister, Pam, *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*. pp.231-240. Philadelphia: New Society Publisher.
- KRASNIEWICZ, LOUISE. (1992). *Nuclear Summer: The Clash of Communities at the Seneca Women's Peace Encampment*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- LIDDINGTON, JILL. (1991). *The Road to Greenham Common: Feminism and Anti-Militarism in Britain since 1820*. American edition, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- LINTON, RHODA & MICHELE WHITHAM. (1989). 'With Mourning, Rage, Empowerment and Defiance: The 1981 Women's Pentagon Action'. In Russell, Diana E.H., *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. pp.163-187. New York and Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- MANAGHAN, TINA. (2007). 'Shifting the Gaze from Hysterical Mothers to 'Deadly Dads': Spectacle and the Anti-Nuclear Movement', *Review of International Studies* 33 (4), 637-654.
- MCALLISTER, PAM (ed.) (1982). *Reweaving the Web of Life*. United States: New Society Publishers.
- MOONEY, BEL. (1983). 'Beyond the Wasteland'. In Thompson, Dorothy, *Over Our Dead Bodies: Women against the Bomb*. pp.5-14. London: Virago.
- OMOLADE, BARBARA. (1989). 'We Speak for the Planet'. In Harris, Adrienne & Ynestra King, *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*. pp.171-189. Boulder: Westview Press.
- OZA, RUPA. (2006). *The Making of Neoliberal India: Nationalism, Gender and the Paradoxes of Globalization*. New York: Routledge.
- PALEY, GRACE. (1989). 'The Seneca Stories: Tales from the Women's Peace Encampment'. In Russell, Diana E.H., *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. pp.216-222. New York and Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- PERSHING, LINDA. (1996). *The Ribbon around the Pentagon: Peace by Piecemakers*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- PETTIT, ANN. (1983). 'Letter to My Neighbour: Nuclear War and the Countryside'. In Thompson, Dorothy, *Over Our Dead Bodies: Women against the Bomb*. pp.89-107. London: Virago.
- PETTIT, ANN. (2006). *Walking to Greenham: How the Peace-Camp Began and the Cold War Ended*. Dinas Powys: Honno Press.
- PORTER, CATHY. (1983). 'Building on the Positives: The USSR'. In Thompson, Dorothy, *Over Our Dead Bodies: Women against the Bomb*. pp.157-161. London: Virago.
- REDEKOP, BENJAMIN. (2010). 'Physicians to a Dying Planet: Helen Caldicott, Randall Forsberg and the Anti-Nuclear Weapons Movement of the Early 1980s', *The Leadership Quarterly* 21, 278-291.
- RITCHIE, NICK. (2010). 'Relinquishing Nuclear Weapons: Identities, Networks and the British Bomb', *International Affairs* 86 (2), 465-487.
- ROSENBLUTH, HELENE & DIANA E.H. RUSSELL. (1989). 'Feminist Visions in Action: Interview with Simone Wilkerson'. In Russell, Diana E.H., *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. pp.292-307. New York and Oxford: Pergamon Press.

- ROSENEIL, SASHA. (1995). *Disarming Patriarchy: Feminism and Political Action at Greenham*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- ROSENEIL, SASHA. (2000). *Common Women, Uncommon Practices: The Queer Feminisms of Greenham*. London: Cassell.
- ROY, ARUNDHATI. (1999). *The Cost of Living*. London: Flamingo.
- ROY, ARUNDHATI. (2003). *War Talk*. Cambridge: South End Press.
- RUBLEE, MARIA ROST. (2009). *Nonproliferation Norms: Why States Choose Nuclear Restraint*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- RUDDICK, SARA. (1989). 'Mothers and Men's Wars'. In Harris, Adrienne & Ynestra King, *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*. pp.75-92. Boulder: Westview Press.
- RUEHL, BERYL. (1983). 'The Balance of Terror: Deterrence and Peacekeeping'. In Thompson, Dorothy, *Over Our Dead Bodies: Women against the Bomb*. pp.32-48. London: Virago.
- RUSSELL, DIANA E.H. (1989a). 'The Puget Sound Women's Peace Camp: Interviews with Two Activists'. In Russell, Diana E.H., *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. pp.223-235. New York and Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- RUSSELL, DIANA E.H. (1989b). 'Sexism, Violence and the Nuclear Mentality'. In Russell, Diana E.H., *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. pp.63-74. New York and Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- SALAMONE, CONSTANTINA. (1982). 'The Prevalence of the Natural Law within Women: Women and Animal Rights'. In Mcallister, Pam, *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*. pp.364-375. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.
- SHARONI, SIMONA. (1997). 'Commentary: In Search of Counterhegemonic Discourses of Peace', *Peace & Change* 22 (3), 281-292.
- SHELDON, SAYRE. (2004). 'A Brief History'. WAND. Available at: <http://www.wand.org/about/brief-history-of-wand/a-brief-history-by-sayre-sheldon/>. (Accessed 9 October 2011).
- SHEPHERD, LAURA J. (2008a). *Gender, Violence and Security: Discourse as Practice*. London: Zed Books.
- SHEPHERD, LAURA J. (2008b). 'Visualising Violence: Legitimacy and Authority in the 'War on Terror'', *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 1 (2), 213-226.
- SHEPHERD, LAURA J. (2010a). 'Feminist Security Studies'. *International Studies Encyclopedia Online (ISA Compendium Project)*. Available at: http://www.isacompendium.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g978144436597_chunk_g97814443365978_ss1-10. (Accessed 10 November 2010).
- SHEPHERD, LAURA J. (2010b). 'Gendering Security'. In Burgess, J. Peter, *Handbook of New Security Studies*. pp.72-80. London: Routledge.
- SHEPHERD, LAURA J. (2010c). 'Sex or Gender? Bodies in World Politics and Why Gender Matters'. In Shepherd, Laura J., *Gender Matters in Global Politics*. pp.3-16. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- SJOBERG, LAURA. (2009). 'Introduction to Security Studies: Feminist Contributions', *Security Studies* 18 (2), 183-213.
- SMITH, BARBARA. (1989). 'Feminist Writers Confront the Nuclear Abyss'. In Russell, Diana E.H., *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. pp.93-103. New York and Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- SNITOW, ANN. (1989). 'A Gender Diary'. In Harris, Adrienne & Ynestra King, *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*. pp.35-74. Boulder: Westview Press.
- SPRETNAK, CHARLENE. (1989). 'Naming the Cultural Forces That Push Us toward War'. In Russell, Diana E.H., *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. pp.53-62. New York and Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- STONE, ALISON. (2004). 'Essentialism and Anti-Essentialism in Feminist Philosophy'. *Lancaster E-Prints*. Available at: http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/34/2/Microsoft_Word_-_E9130088.pdf. (Accessed 3 January 2011).
- STONE, ALISON. (2005). 'Towards a Genealogical Feminism: A Reading of Judith Butler's Political Thought', *Contemporary Political Thought* 4, 4-24.
- STRANGE, PENNY. (1989). 'It'll Make a Man of You: A Feminist View of the Arms Race'. In Russell, Diana E.H., *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. pp.104-126. New York and Oxford: Pergamon Press.

- SYLVESTER, CHRISTINE. (1987). 'Some Dangers in Merging Feminist and Peace Projects', *Alternatives* 12 (4), 493-509.
- SYLVESTER, CHRISTINE. (1992). 'Feminists and Realists View Autonomy and Obligation in International Relations'. In Peterson, V. Spike, *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. pp.155-177. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- SYLVESTER, CHRISTINE. (1994). *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SYLVESTER, CHRISTINE. (2001). *Feminist International Relations: An Unfinished Journey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- THOMPSON, DOROTHY. (1983). 'Defend Us against Defenders: Democracy and Security'. In Thompson, Dorothy, *Over Our Dead Bodies: Women against the Bomb*. pp.61-69. London: Virago.
- TICKNER, J. ANN. (1992). *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- TICKNER, J. ANN. (1999). 'Why Women Can't Run the World: International Politics According to Francis Fukuyama', *International Studies Review* 1 (3), 3-11.
- WARNOCK, DONNA. (1982). 'Patriarchy Is a Killer: What People Concerned About Peace and Justice Should Know'. In Mcallister, Pam, *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*. pp.20-29. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.
- WITTNER, LAWRENCE. (2000). 'Gender Roles and Nuclear Disarmament Activism, 1954-1965', *Gender & History* 12 (1), 197-222.
- WOMEN'S PENTAGON ACTION. (1982). 'Excerpts from the Unity Statement'. In Mcallister, Pam, *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*. pp.414-415. Philadelphia: New Society Publisher.
- WOOD, SUZANNE. (1983). 'The Illusion of Protection: Civil Defence'. In Thompson, Dorothy, *Over Our Dead Bodies: Women against the Bomb*. pp.49-60. London: Virago.
- ZANOTTI, BARBARA. (1982). 'Patriarchy: A State of War'. In Mcallister, Pam, *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*. pp.16-19. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (1997a). 'Civil Society and Global Responsibility: The Arms Trade and East Timor'. *Security, Community and Emancipation: An Introduction to Critical Security Studies*. Available at: <http://pegasus.phys.saga-u.ac.jp/peace/zelter.htm>. (Accessed 15 March 2010).
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (1997b). 'Trident Ploughshares 2000 [Seminar Presentation]'. *civilresistance.info*. Available at: <http://www.civilresistance.info/challenge/trident>. (Accessed 15 March 2010).
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (2001a). 'A Little Nuclear Crime Prevention up the Gail'. In Zelter, Angie, *Trident on Trial: The Case for People's Disarmament*. pp.39-46. Edinburgh: Luath Press.
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (2001b). 'The Lord Advocate's 4 Questions'. In Zelter, Angie, *Trident on Trial: The Case for People's Disarmament*. pp.79-83. Edinburgh: Luath Press.
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (2001c). 'Ourstory'. In Zelter, Angie, *Trident on Trial*. pp.252-292. Edinburgh: Luath Press.
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (2001d). 'People's Disarmament', *Disarmament Diplomacy* (58).
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (2001e). 'People's Disarmament'. In Zelter, Angie, *Trident on Trial: The Case for People's Disarmament*. pp.47-56. Edinburgh: Luath Press.
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (2001f). 'Setting the Legal Context'. In Zelter, Angie, *Trident on Trial: The Case for People's Disarmament*. pp.98-124. Edinburgh: Luath Press.
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (2008). 'Introduction'. In Zelter, Angie, *Faslane 365: A Year of Anti-Nuclear Blockades*. pp.xvii-xxiii. Edinburgh: Luath Press.
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (2009a). 'Angie Zelter at Aldermaston'. *Edinburgh Peace and Justice Resource Centre*. Available at: <http://peaceandjustice.org.uk/node/2422>. (Accessed 15 March 2010).
- ZELTER, ANGIE. (2009b). 'Trident Ploughshares Support for Decommissioners'. In Decommissioners, Edo, *If I Had a Hammer ... Decommissioning the War Machine*. pp.20-21. Wordpress.
- ZELTER, ANGIE & ARYA BHUSHAN BHARDWAJ (eds). (1990). *Snowball: The Story of a Non-Violent Civil Disobedience Campaign in Britain*. New Delhi: Gandhi-in-Action.

ZELTER, ANGIE & DAVID MCKENZIE. (2001). 'Mixing It'. *Peace News* [Online]. Available: <http://www.peacenews.info/issues/2443/zelter.html> [Accessed 6 March 2010].