Dismantling Enemy Images: Women-led Anti-War Movements Against State Narratives: A Study on Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp and Women of Liberia Mass Action for Peace

Erdoğan, Rüya Aysu

Dismantling Enemy Images:
Women-led Anti-War Movements Against State Narratives

A Study on Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp and
Women of Liberia Mass Action for Peace

Universiteit
Leiden

M.A. International Relations

Thesis

Rüya Aysu Erdoğan
r.a.erdogan@umail.leidenuniv.nl
2136295
Supervisor: Dr Andrew Gawthorpe

Word count: 14980

Table of Contents

Introduction

"We can best help you to prevent war not by repeating your words and following your methods but by finding new words and creating new methods" (Virginia Woolf)

"As a woman I have no country", Virginia Woolf said in her work, *Three Guineas*. The affiliation of women's movements and resistance against war has been long put into words. The dismantling of oppressive systems and cycles of violence subjugating women have been described as inherently linked to the resistance against armed conflict as part of this system. This thesis aims to uncover the underlying social and psychological underpinnings of this resistance, stressing the power of discourse and language in shaping war making as well as peace making. The reasons why conflict occur have long been contemplated by scholars from various disciplines, while this attention has not been reflected on to why conflict is resisted by certain groups. This thesis aims to do so by providing an intertextual analysis of pro-war discourses from state leaders and anti-war discourses from protestors who have mobilized against said leader. Pro-war discourses can be operationalized as political discourse that justifies war or armament. This justification is often done by the construction of enemy images by the speech act of leaders, which aims to generate popular support for the advancement of war or militaristic policies.

This thesis delves into two phenomena: first, the construction of these enemy images by the discourse of leaders, and second, the deconstruction of these discourses by women-led anti-war movement groups. In doing so, it will focus on two distinct states and peace movements. First, the anti-nuclear movement of Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp (1982-1983) is analyzed in relation to Margaret Thatcher's enmifying discourse, as the prime minister of the United Kingdom (UK) at the time. Second, the women's peace movement in Liberia against the Second Liberian Civil War (2000-2003), titled Women of Liberia Mass Action for Peace (WLMAP), is discussed together with Charles Taylor's enmifying discourse, as the president of Liberia at the time. The occurrence of a women-led peace movement in two so vastly different contexts, 20 years apart, is noteworthy, and this thesis attempts to provide a general conclusion on women-led peace movements based on an exploration of these two cases.

Research Puzzle

The social psychology academia suggests that the utilization of the in-group out-group divide is vital for the leaders' enmification processes. Presenting the in-group with good qualities and the out-group as the enemy, leaders make use of stereotypes already prevalent in the population to further enhance this bipolar divide and generate support for war. Thus, it is easy to assume that the population will be naturally inclined to support the war based on their in-group self-esteem. Anti-war movements present a challenge to this assumption, which is puzzling. The movements, originally belonging to the in-group, not only oppose the war, but they also actively resist it. This thesis shows that this is not due to the absence of an in-group out-group divide within the protestors. On the contrary, the protestors view themselves as the in-group based on common characteristics, such as gender, political orientation, race or class, and the state and the leaders as the out-group. Resistance towards war comes from the enmification of the leader who wages war, relating to a wider pattern of non-conformity and disobedience. Then, it should be questioned why this is the case. Why do the protestors not feel a connection to the leaders' in-group out-group divide? This, as this thesis showed, is rooted in their lack of identification with the in-group the leader creates. For women, their marginalization makes it unlikely to identify with the state or the leader.

Relevance

Socially, this research is relevant due to its aim to better understand how armed conflict can be prevented, now more than ever. The current political situation and contemporary manifestations of conflict require an in-depth understanding of how enemies are created and how these enemy images are resisted. By drawing on social psychology approaches, I hope to show that war in not inevitable but a construct of human psychology, rooted in the creation of enemy images. To understand how war can be prevented or ended, we need to understand how societies react to enemy images, and through which mechanisms they deconstruct them. Academically, this thesis addresses the wide gap in existing literature on anti-war movements, compared to studies of armed conflict and social movements in general. It also hopes to divert more attention to psychological underpinnings of conflict and a focus on individuals, e.g. leaders, and personalized and emotional discourses, e.g. songs by protestors, to address the newly developing interdisciplinary field of political psychology. Bridging the understudied

subject of anti-war movements and newly growing field of women in peacebuilding, this thesis aims to provide an intriguing finding based on the interlinking of official discourses of power and unofficial discourses of resistance. I choose to engage with women-led peace movements only, contributing to feminist scholarship by analyzing the dismantling of war justifying discourses by women, and to international relations scholarship by exploring connections between war justifying leaders and war resisting protestors.

Research Question and Plan

The research question for this thesis is: How do women-led peace movements dismantle discourses of war from their state leaders? The research aims to answer the research question in the following way. First, I provide a literature review containing the basic academic and theoretical frameworks this thesis will draw on. Second, I define the methodology of the thesis, mainly based on the work of Van Dijk (1997) and followed up with Baumgarten and Ullrich (2016). Upon laying out this basis, the thesis then attempts to understand how the women in the UK and Liberia, respectively, dismantle enemy images. Each chapter includes the discourse from the top and the bottom. I begin with an analysis of how the leaders construct the enemy images through the "us" versus "them" divide. Later, the discourses from the protestors are discussed, finding that neither of the groups engage with the enemy images of the leaders directly. Instead, they establish their identity as women as a marginalized in-group, posing themselves against the out-group of the state. The thesis then concludes by elaborating on this observation and providing avenues for further research.

Literature Review

In the discussion of the existing literature, as well as in the analysis, this thesis will be concerned with two phenomena: first, the creation of, and second, the reaction to enemy images. The following chapter will first establish the theoretical framework on the creation of enemy images by referring to constructivist arguments and social psychological concepts. Then, it will discuss the reaction of the public to these images, and thus more generally, the attitudes towards war. Building on this, the exploration will go one step further to highlight the phenomenon of mobilizing against war as a reaction of dissent, and then look specifically into

who reacts and mobilizes. This is where women will come in, as agents of peacemaking through protesting war.

I. Psychology in IR

Peace Psychology

The discipline of IR is increasingly moving away from traditional, state-centric approaches. While turning away from states as the primary units of analysis, the discipline of IR moves closer towards critical approaches that highlight the importance and relevance of studying individuals. When studying individuals, it is simply not possible to refrain from thinking about psychology, which is why scholars are increasingly showing interest in psychological aspects of international politics. Many discuss why social psychological approaches in research can contribute to a better understanding of peace and conflict studies (Bleiker and Hutchison 2008, Aminzade et al. 2001, Cohrs and Boehnke 2008, Hakvoort and Oppenheimer 1998). Based on this, Bleiker and Hutchison argue for increased interdisciplinary and reliance on humanities-oriented methods for the future of IR (Bleiker and Hutchison 2008: 134), which is what this thesis attempts to do by incorporating social psychology concepts with a discourse analysis on power and resistance.

Enemy Images and Enmification

Aiming to contribute to the gap in social psychological approaches in IR, this thesis will utilize basic psychological concepts to understand the formulation of pro-war and anti-war discourses. When discussing pro-war discourses, this research will be mainly concerned with the justification of war by state leaders. This justification has to rely on the construction of an enemy image, which then influences the public to see the war as legitimate. Thus, an enemy is a prerequisite for armed conflict (Oppenheimer 2006: 269). As Jahr defines it, an enemy image is “a set of negative stereotypes that stigmatizes a group of people as fundamentally evil, in contrast to one’s own side, which is seen as good” (Jahr 2010). Building on the Social Identity Theory of Tajfel and Turner (1979), the process of making the enemy image, so-called enmification, comes through the construction of an in-group and an out-group to create an “us” versus “them” divide (ibid). This bipolar divide is often created based on real or imagined race

and ethnicity, class, gender, religion, culture, and so on (ibid). Both Jahr and Oppenheimer highlight, however, that these images cannot be arbitrarily created, but instead need to be based on stereotypes and political concerns already existing within the community. These enemy images allow the in-groups to protect their own self-images and practice self-aggrandizement (Fabick 2004).

The analysis of the creation of enemy images concerns a closer look at leaders, and specifically state leaders, as they use the idea of a common enemy as a method of reinforcing power and values, social control, and diverting attention from problems which may result in a loss in popularity (Zamperini et al. 2012: 322). Enemy images allow for the rulers to implement measures that "bypass institutionalized ways of policy making" (Jahr 2010). Therefore, it is easy to see why state leaders would make use of these images. The role of the ruling elite, in this sense, is to diffuse these enemy images in order to gain support for a decision of armament or war. While enemy images and justifications of war are heavily studied subjects by many noteworthy academics, there has been less attention paid to how the public responds to this phenomenon. To contribute to this understudied aspect, this thesis aims to understand public dissent and resistance against war, for which it is crucial to investigate how these enemy images can be deconstructed. This can only be done through analyzing enemy images, "that engages us in experiential learning about our own hidden biases and assumptions about our enemies, and that increases our awareness of and resistance to the harmful effects of enemy images" (Fabick 2004).

Attitudes Towards War

This section will provide an overview of the existing literature on attitudes towards war from the discipline of political psychology. Looking at existing literature on attitudes towards war, it is evident that the research on public opinion on war is heavily quantitative and follow a positivistic paradigm. They seek to work with large datasets to find generalized conclusions pointing to the role of emotions, moral disengagement, right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation (Stitka et al 2006, Cohrs et al 2005, McAlister 2006, McFarland 2005, Ziv 2019). These studies are extremely helpful in identifying general trends and getting an overview of the psychological underpinnings of war attitudes, but they often fail to identify the process in-depth and at times, lack clear chains of causation. This gap in existing literature

points to the need for a more in-depth understanding of anti-war thought formulation, which this thesis aims to do through qualitative and humanities-based methods. Employing a qualitative and in-depth analysis in this thesis allows for a clearer understanding of how leaders carry out the enmification through discourse and how resistance against war intersects with this process, which is lacking from quantitative studies.

Interestingly, when it comes to the explanations of why anti-war attitudes occur, many do not refer to the deconstruction of enemy images. Zamperini et al. (2012) provides a general framework for how enemy images are deconstructed, detailing the psychological processes related to identity formation. They mention four factors leading to de-enmification: empathy and trust building, education and role taking, increasing contact between the groups, and redefining the boundaries of the in-group and the out-group (ibid.). While this work is of great significance for this thesis, for providing the only comprehensive account of the de-construction of enemy images, it does not go into detail to highlight how exactly this process takes place. This thesis, therefore, will build on the existing academic framework on enemy images and Zamperini's work to explain the discursive processes of de-enmification in social movements. For this, an overview of social movement theory is needed.

II. Social Movements

Social Movement Theory from a Social Psychology Perspective

Anti-war movements go one step further from anti-war attitudes, as they require the active mobilization of people against the state leaders. In order to understand this mobilization process, it is first necessary to outline social movement theory. Van Stekelenburg and Klandermans' investigation of why people protest from a social psychology perspective constitutes a very comprehensive account of social movement theory. First, they go into the classical explanation that people protest to explain grievances. They discuss relative deprivation theory and social justice theory from psychological perspectives (idem: 888). The discussion, however, revolves around a case of people protesting when they feel their rights have been violated or their situation is lesser than that of the other group, which does not always apply to anti-war movements. This will be discussed further in the following section.

Second, Van Stekelenburg and Klandermans discuss the efficacy theory. Efficacy is defined as "the individual's expectation that it is possible to alter conditions or policies through protest" (Van Stekelenburg and Klandermans 2013: 889). Related to efficacy, they present cynicism, which is described as the opposite of efficacy and lack of trust in the government. As they claim, "the more effective an individual believes protest participation is, the more likely she or he is to participate" (ibid.). Third, they look into social identity theory, arguing that "the more people identify with a group the more they are inclined to protest on behalf of that group" (idem: 890). The social identity theory on social movements, also based on the in-group and out-group divide, will be relevant when discussing women-led movements specifically in the following section.

Anti-War and Peace Movements

Within the extensive scholarship on social movements, anti-war movements are severely under-researched. This is evident even in the lack of conceptualization of what an anti-war movement is. For the purposes of this paper, the terms anti-war movement, protest, and peace movement will refer to the same concept: resistance against a decision of war through social mobilization. The decision to wage war, or not, is often perceived to come from the top. Foreign policy decisions rarely include the general public. This thesis argues that it is crucial to divert more attention to the topic of anti-war movements as an example of the public interacting with a decision of war, and perhaps influencing it.

Over the past decades, academia has looked at anti-war movements from the perspective of effectiveness (Lieberfeld 2008) or analyzed the social dynamics or cultural change throughout protests (Cockburn 2007, Fridman 2015, Korac 2016). The question of why anti-war movements occur remains widely unanswered, as well as the processes that generate this resistance. This thesis will observe the way anti-war protestors react to enemy images and present that the process of mobilization against war is rooted in discursive de-enmification.

The interaction of protestors with the political elite also remains overlooked. While constructing the enemy with a clear divide between the in-group and the out-group, leaders also need to interact with the public dissenters who blur the lines between the in-group and the out-group by mobilizing against the in-group. This thesis thus observes the way anti-war

protestors react to leaders' discourse, exploring how the leaders perceive anti-war movements and vice versa and drawing a crucial but overlooked link between the leaders and the public dissenters.

Another question that received lesser attention from anti-war movement scholars is the question of who protests? The anti-war movement scholarship is cumulated around the Vietnam War, the Iraq War closely following. Both movements occurred in the United States (US), making the discussion very much US-based. This thesis, therefore, works with movements outside of the US and sheds light onto peace movements from the Global South with its focus on Liberia, interlinking it with the UK to reach conclusive findings. Furthermore, a specific focus given to women's movements wishes to address this gap regarding the question of "who", highlighting what it is that makes women protest war.

III. Women in Antimilitarism and Peace Movements

Building on the question of who mobilizes against war, this section will look into gender-based approaches to war and peace. The very idea of anti-militarism has been interlinked with the development of feminist thought. As Rossdale states, "The most developed accounts of the everyday and banal politics of militarism have tended to emerge from feminist and queer politics" (2019: 65). Feminist scholars have studied militarism extensively to point to the links between patriarchy and war making. This also brought with it the formation of thought against militarism and war, often in combination with feminist struggle. The traditionally antimilitarist stance of women has been subject to criticism by some feminists, due to its basis on essentialist ideas about women's pacifism and problem-solving capabilities (Kirby and Shepherd 2016). The essentialist connection of militarism and masculinity is as significant as that of antimilitarism and femininity, with many studies looking into the role of masculinity in militaristic attitudes (Cockburn 2015, Sunbuloglu 2013, Duriesmith 2014).

As many feminist scholars argue, peacebuilding cannot be thought of as separately from women's issues (O'Reilly et al. 2015, Marshall 2000, Gbowee 2019). Despite the lack of extensive academic research on the issue, women-led peace movements are relatively common especially in the post-Cold War era (Tripp 2018). According to some, this has pragmatic

reasons. Women who are consistently excluded from formal conflict resolution and peacemaking efforts find themselves involved in or leading grassroots movements against war (Marshall 2000). Women's peace movements share three characteristics: a grassroots focus due to exclusion from formal negotiations, commitment to bridging differences, and the use of international and regional pressures (Tripp 2018: 1).

Despite the increasing attention given to women's peace movements, especially with the implementation of the Women, Peace and Security agenda of the United Nations (UN), women's activities against war remain widely understudied, as also pointed out by Tripp (2018: 5). For several decades, women's movements have largely intersected with anti-war and peace movements (Cockburn 2012). Focusing on women-led peace movements will not only provide a valuable understanding of attitudes against war, it will also highlight the ways in which women specifically interact with the enemy images created by leaders. This thesis therefore aims to contribute to feminist theory by bridging together the leaders and protestors, exploring the women's resistance based on their identity as women.

IV. Conclusion

While scholars have addressed how social identity theory plays into the construction of enemy images, how it leads to social mobilization, and how boundaries of the in-group and out-group may be reconstructed to dismantle the enemy images (Zamperini et al. 2012), a comprehensive account of these phenomena is lacking. An implementation of these concepts to women's movements is also absent. This thesis aims to address this gap by pointing to anti-war movements, and more specifically, women-led anti-war movements, as explanatory of all these processes. Based on this framework of social and peace psychology, what this thesis finds goes beyond the redefining of boundaries of the in-group and out-group. This thesis looks specifically into how the in-group and out-groups are constructed, both by the leader and the protestors, and finds that resistance against enemy images does not only blur the boundaries but constructs alternative in-group and out-groups entirely. Women have a crucial role in this process, due to their marginalized identity complicating their identification with the in-group.

Methodology

Critical Discourse Analysis

In order to investigate the enmification and de-enmification processes in detail, this thesis will employ a method of critical discourse analysis. Van Dijk defines critical-political discourse analysis (CPDA) as concerned with the reproduction of political power and domination through discourse, as well "various forms of resistance or counter-power against such forms of discursive dominance" (Van Dijk 1997: 11). He stresses the importance of looking into structures and patterns of text and talk, as well as modes of exclusion that relate to a macro-level of social structures, hierarchies and power.

The in-group versus out-group divide previously mentioned as part of the social psychology discipline as a primary component of enemy images finds its equivalent in Van Dijk's method as "us" versus "them". The self-aggrandizement of the in-group versus the enmification of the out-group is explained in Van Dijk's terminology in the following way: "we may thus generally expect the structures and strategies of dominant talk to focus on various forms of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation" (Van Dijk 1993: 264). War, in this regard, includes extreme cases of positive self-representation and negative other presentation, which I previously discussed as in-group self-aggrandizement and out-group enmification.

This thesis, by incorporating the discourse of protestors, builds on Van Dijk's methodology. Van Dijk states that CPDA prefers to focus on the elites' discursive strategies but points out the importance of an analysis of strategies of resistance and challenge to be included in a broader theory of power (idem: 250). Therefore, while Van Dijk's CPDA is crucial to better understand the top-down diffusion of discourse, an academic basis is also necessary for the analysis of bottom-up reactions to said discourse. Baumgarten and Ullrich (2016) study the linking of the elite and social movement levels of discourses and address that (1) social movements are not merely observers but also products of discourse, (2) social movements contribute to the discourse by promoting ideas not normally present in the mainstream discourse through their resistance or by creating new ideas, (3) social movements develop their

own internal discourses to express their identity and who is included and left out, (4) government discourses shape the mobilization potential of social movements.

Building on these works, this thesis combines two levels of discourse: from the top and from the bottom, official and nonofficial, the elite and social movements. While looking at the construction of "us" versus "them" in the discourse at both levels, the thesis goes one step further to understand the construction of discourse within the protestors to express their identity. This is crucial due to the focus of this study on women and women-led mobilization. The categorical identity of the protestors group, therefore, is relevant for the creation of their discourse. The construction of their identities as war resisters goes hand in hand with the construction of their womanhood, which is a phenomenon not observed at the state level discourse on war.

Case Selection

The research question will be answered through a qualitative research based on two cases. The case selection exemplifies a most different case analysis (Gerring and Seawright 2008). Gerring and Seawright argue against an entirely random case selection due to the insignificance of the results this would create, and instead, propose various criteria based on which the cases can be selected. The most different case selection requires the identification of cases where all plausible independent variables differ except for one, as well as the dependent variable, meaning that the cases are similar in two respects: "the causal variable of interest (X1) and the outcome (Y)" (idem: 306). This allows for a more generalizable conclusion, as the cases have very differing features leading to the same outcome.

This thesis chooses to analyze the UK and the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp from the years 1983-1984, when it was most active, and Liberia and the Women of Liberia Mass Action for Peace, from the years 2000-2003 until the achieved end of the civil war. The two cases appear to be vastly different: the UK and Liberia had different regimes, different political situations, different geopolitical positions, and different economic levels at the time frames being analyzed. More specifically, gender is constructed differently in the two cases due to the cultural context. Nevertheless, a women-led peace movement occurred in both. This commonality is interesting to delve into. Drawing on these two vastly different cases allows

for a more generalizable finding about women-led peace movements, which is what this thesis aims to present.

Research Plan

Applying this methodological basis, this thesis will seek to answer the general question of how women-led peace movements dismantle enemy images created by the leaders. For each case, the first analysis section will answer the question of how state leaders enmify "the Other", centering Margaret Thatcher and Charles Taylor. Second, the processes through which the protestors engage with this enmifying discourse will be investigated respectively. How the Greenham Common women react (or not) to the discourse of Thatcher in their own, resistance discourse, and how the Liberian women respond to Taylor's enmifying discourse, will be highlighted. As van Dijk posits, it is equally important what is not said and what is said. The women's lack of identification with the enemy image the leaders create, and therefore the absence of their discussion of the leaders' enemy, is significant to investigate.

For the analysis, a number of specific tools of CPDA was used. Van Dijk initially suggests the positioning of discourse in the realm of politics (1997: 20), characterizing the domains of politics. This was already done by the initial process of research in the selection of cases on the basis of women-led peace movements. The social, cultural and political contexts of the two cases were researched and will be briefly described in the analysis. Second, Van Dijk lays out the specifics of political discourse and the criteria which makes the "official" discourse while Baumgarten and Ullrich (2016) suggest an attention driven to unofficial discourses from social movements. Thus, a large variety of primary sources which represent the two levels were selected for both cases.

The tools of CPDA were first utilized to highlight the main themes and patterns in the discourse which point to power and resistance and the polarity of "us" versus "them". Further, the construction of the enemy by the leaders was analyzed through the lens of CPDA to show the attributed characteristics of the "them" that legitimize war. Moving onto the social movement discourse required a more in-depth understanding of the construction of an internal identity for the protestors as well as their creation of discourses which resist the official discourse, based on Baumgarten and Ullrich's (2016) methodology. Thus, the discourse from the protestors was

analyzed with a heavier focus on their identity and construction of the "us" as well as the various ways in which they resist the state discourse.

The sources analyzed include a combination of official state discourse and unofficial forms of discourse such as songs written in daily language. For the first case, eleven speeches from Margaret Thatcher touching upon the Soviets and Greenham Common from the years 1983-1984, and thirteen songs in a songbook for Greenham Common sung at the camp in the years 1982-1983 are analyzed. For the second case, seven written down speeches, one recording and additional sources from Charles Taylor from the years 2000-2003 and the memoir of Leymah Gbowee, the organizer of the social movement, is analyzed. Due to the lack of media coverage of the women's peace movement and the apparent focus of Western media on male protestors and opinions in Liberia, Gbowee's memoir was the only source including the voices of the women who protested. The 246-page long memoir was investigated with a strict focus on songs, speeches, statements, slogans, and dialogues, and very few accounts of Gbowee's explanation of personal experiences. This was done in order to avoid a too personal account of the protests and a singular discourse from the leader of the movement, which would prevent a broader understanding of the discourse.

Analysis

Case I: The UK government and Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp

After a NATO decision to store US nuclear missiles in the military base in Greenham, UK, a group of women mobilized to set a peace camp at the base. The numbers of the protestors rapidly grew, becoming "one of the world's first and biggest female-only demonstrations" (Nannar 2021). Despite being an exemplary case of anti-nuclear resistance, displaying a strong interconnection of feminist and anti-war activism and a transnational movement going beyond borders, the peace camps of the early 1980s have not received much attention from the academia, outside of a limited number of strictly feminist analyses. This section thus first incorporates the discourse from the top that creates the enemy image of the Soviets. And second, the discourse from the bottom is analyzed by focusing on the constitution of the in-group and the out-group and interaction with enemy images. A combination of the CPDA and Baumgarten and Ullrich's methods shows that while the leader blurs the boundaries of the "us" and the "them" by implying a connection between the enemy and the protestors, the protestors

enmify the leader and create a strong identity of womanhood which they present as the new "us", not directly engaging with the enemy image created by the leader.

Discourse from the Leader

First, it should be identified how the enemy image is created by the "top" to justify armament. For this purpose, Margaret Thatcher's discourse was analyzed with a specific focus on her comments on nuclear weapons, threats of the Cold War, and the Greenham Common protests. Using the CPDA method and identifying the themes, it was found that Thatcher's discourse was based on the following components: nuclear deterrence, anti-communism, and conceptualization of peace. In this section, these components are laid out in detail with examples from her speeches to display her construction of the "us" versus "them" in van Dijk's methodology.

The CPDA method shows that Thatcher refers to nuclear deterrence heavily in her discourse, based on a theory of a balance of power, based on which she justifies the enmification of the "them". She highlights balance and equality with regards to the government's nuclear policies, justifying nuclear armament. As she claims, "The principle is a balance in order to deter" (Thatcher 1983b). The modernized armament of the Soviet Union is presented as the justifier of NATO armament, as she claims the Soviets left Europe vulnerable. She emphasizes her belief in deterrence by saying: "They are a great protection" (Thatcher 1983a), "They have in fact deterred" (ibid.), "deterrence works" (ibid.). Thatcher stresses on the concept of balance, even providing numbers to prove the imbalance and one-sided disadvantage: "…ours will be deployed, I think 572, unless the Soviet Union take down theirs of which there are more, about 660 facing Europe, but they've got more over the other side of the Soviet Union" (ibid.). In her words, "One-sided weakness makes war more likely" (ibid.), justifying nuclear armament on this basis. She combines her defense of deterrence with her criticism of "unilaterals" who stand against nuclear armament, using a vague notion of "them" to refer to her critics.

This exploration with the tools of CPDA shows that Thatcher's strong defense of deterrence is closely linked to her conceptualization of peace, and through this, she poses herself and her government as peaceful while portraying the "them" as lacking this quality. She argues that one-sided weakness would "be more likely to put peace, freedom and justice at risk than to

keep it" (Thatcher 1983a), often coupling peace, freedom, and justice together. Thatcher's conceptualization of peace differs from that of the protestors, describing it as not the absence of war but the guarantee of democratic values, in line with a general Cold War rhetoric, as she claims: "peace with freedom and justice" (Thatcher 1983a). She refers to the in-group as "we" by stating: "We in this country do not want peace at any price. We want peace to retain freedom and justice, which is a part of our way of life" (Thatcher 1983c). As she sums up her definition of peace and disarmament, "I am the true disarmer. I keep peace and freedom and justice with it" (ibid.), strongly referring to herself and using self-glorification to increase her legitimacy among the in-group.

The CPDA method also asks for the investigation of how the "them", therefore the out-group or the enemy, is constructed through discourse, thus it should be discussed how Thatcher constructs the "Russians" and what qualities she attributes to them. She describes the Soviets as a "potential aggressor" (Thatcher 1983a, 1983i) and "an evil aggressor who aims to destroy my religion and all the values which I treasure" (Thatcher 1983g), justifying her government's decisions as self-defense through this perception of an aggression. They are described as a threat to peace and security: "You're much more likely to get them all down that way and then the world would be a safer place" (ibid.), "I think they want to make us vulnerable" (ibid.), not only for the UK but for the entire world, making it difficult to argue against the enmification of Russians.

Moreover, the enemy is described as firm (ibid.) and nonnegotiating, further enhancing the "us" versus "them" divide explained by the CPDA method: "'no negotiations unless you agree not to deploy any.' Typical Russian position" (ibid.), "That depends on the Russians…" (ibid.). This allows for the shifting of the blame from Thatcher's government to the Soviets, as Thatcher uses a discourse that justifies her actions based on the toughness, firmness, and perhaps evilness of the enemy. She often refers to this when she faces criticism in the House of Commons, saying: "If the right hon. Gentleman is against deployment of the SS20s, why does he not protest and ask for them to be taken down?"(Thatcher 1983f). This shifting of the blame is further legitimized by Thatcher's anti-communism and strong defense of democratic values. As she states: "Part of those democratic systems is, of course, the ability to demonstrate and to express one's views outside the House. I look forward to the time when demonstrations about nuclear weapons can take place as easily in Moscow as here" (Thatcher 1983b), she presents her government as open to criticism by further enmifying the Soviets. Thus, the "us"

versus “them” divide created by Thatcher is evident, portraying the in-group as peaceful, democratic and open to criticism, while the out-group is aggressive, authoritarian and uncompromising, which allows her to portray her hands as tied. As the CPDA method also requires attention given to what is not said, it is important to note Thatcher’s refrainment from directly answering the questions regarding the concerns on nuclear missiles, and instead, further emphasizing the “us” versus “them” divide.

Lastly, Thatcher’s interaction and addressing of the protestors at Greenham should be discussed in light of the CPDA method, looking into her discursive justification of her actions and construction of control over the dissenters. In all instances when she refers to the Greenham protestors, the reference is followed by the wrongdoings of the Soviet Union, as another example of shifting the blame from her government to the “enemy”. She states: “I do wish people who brought pressure on Greenham Common and everywhere else would understand there’s no public opinion in the Soviet Union” (Thatcher 1983a), thus, her enmifying of the Soviets reaches beyond the House of Commons and is also utilized against the protestors. She posits a strong division between her stance and that of the protestors. She claims: “I don’t understand the unilateralists. If they hated nuclear weapons as much as I do, and wanted them down as much as I do, they’d want them down in the world as a whole and they’d want them down in the Soviet Union” (ibid.). This further strengthens the “us” versus “them” divide, not only with the Russians as the enemy but also with the protestors as disagreeing with the self-aggrandizement of the in-group.

The CPDA method shows that this is accompanied by her association of the protestors with the Soviets, making claims of Soviet involvement in Greenham, through which she blurs the distinction between a group within the “us”, which challenges her power, and the “them” which she gathers support against. She also accuses the enemy of cooperating with the protestors to reach its goals (Thatcher 1983c). She claims that she does not “doubt the sincerity and indeed the idealism of many of these people”, however, this positive expression towards the protestors is followed by her comment: “The real aims of some of them is another matter” (Thatcher 1983g), insinuating an alternate motive in some of the protestors. Later in 1983, she discusses the violent rampage at the camp between the protestors and the police by taking a strong defense of the police (Thatcher 1983j) and then, the opposition against the protestors at Greenham “I am very much aware of the distress caused locally by the continued presence of those people” (Thatcher 1984). Through this, she justifies her position by pointing to those who

support her claims with a strong emphasis on "we" and "us" and presenting the protestors as causing harm, distress and intimidation rather than voicing legitimate concerns.

Thus, Thatcher's discourse on nuclear weapons and the enemy image of the Soviet Union contains a repetitive distinction of the "us" with positive traits and the "them" with negative traits, as van Dijk suggests, often juxtaposing her government against the Soviet Union to enhance its image. The division of the in-group and out-group is mainly constructed with her government, the British people, and at times, Europe, on one side, and the Soviets on the other. However, this division becomes less straightforward with Thatcher's address and discussion of the Greenham protestors. While belonging to the in-group of the British people, Thatcher couples the protestors together with the "enemy" and at times insinuates links between the two, in hopes to reduce criticism and move the protestors from the in-group to the out-group. She also further gratifies the British people who support her claims and makes arguments to lower the legitimacy of the protestors.

Discourses from Greenham Common women

In this section, the varying discourses of the Greenham Common women from the early years of the camp are analyzed through a songbook. Using the CDPA method, the following themes were highlighted in the women's discourse: strong emphasis on the in-group as sisterhood, femininity relating to maternal feminist ideas, strength and fighting relating to radical feminist ideas, strong emphasis on the out-group including the state, political elite, military, police, and men, and masculinity. In order to understand why the protestors did not identify with the in-group created by the state and resisted the enemy images, it should be analyzed what they did identify with. First, it should be highlighted how the protestors defined themselves and how their identity as a group was formulated separately to that of the state. Second, there is a discussion of how they respond to Thatcher's discourse, pointing out that there is no direct engagement of the protestors with the Soviet enemy image. Rather, they draw on ideas related to nuclear disarmament and put the blame on the state. And lastly, I will discuss how the protestors create an alternate enemy which is the state, an out-group they pose themselves against to further enhance their social identity as the in-group, thus creating another "us" versus "them" divide.

"We are women"

Title of the fourth song in the songbook, the expression of "we are women" is prevalent in the discourse in varying ways, and it is relevant to discuss this expression not only based on the construction of the "us" in Van Dijk's methodology, but also to comment on the internal discourses created by the movement as Baumgarten and Ullrich states. The conceptualization of women is plural, incorporating various feminist identities in its definition. The plural identities of womanhood in Greenham have been highlighted by several scholars (Eschle 2013, Moors 2014, Titcombe 2018, Murray 2006). Eschle highlights six feminist narratives at the camp (2013: 716-717), while Murray more broadly identifies maternal and radical feminisms, arguing that there was a shift from the former to the latter over the years (2006: 85). The CPDA analysis was conducted based on these frameworks, and on broader thematic terms, the most significantly expressed narratives were found to be the maternal and radical feminist identities. It should be noted that, as other scholars have also strongly claimed, these identities largely intersect with each other and should not be viewed as monolithic. Thus, this section shows how the women constructed the plural "us" as the in-group.

Baumgarten and Ullrich's methodology draws attention to an investigation of the internal discourse of the protestors, and the Greenham case displays a strong focus on a feminist identity based on maternalism as a crucial component of the women's discourse. The maternal identity describes the link of peace with femininity, motherhood and traditional "beliefs that women were nurturing and protective" (Murray 2006: 86), based on an essentialist understanding of feminism. Many of the metaphors used in the songs, such as "the flowers to grow" (Songbook 2010c), "embracing the base" (Songbook 2010e), "go to sleep", "you're safe" and "peace camp lullaby" (Songbook 2010m), display this nurturing, feminine, and motherly identity the women have taken on. Focusing on growth, protection and affection. This mother role is also expressed in a way to emasculate the men, often describing them with childlike features. Men and children are interlinked: "To the children, to the men" (Songbook 2010f) and war is described as a "game" children play with the weapons as their "toys": "Take those toys away from the boys" (Songbook 2010h). Therefore, the maternal discourse is not solely an expression of identity, it also provides alternative understandings of the world that challenges the mainstream discourse (Baumgarten and Ullrich 2016), which is based on nuclear proliferation. Moreover, the

maternal identity enhances the divide between the protestors and the state, as they portray themselves as feminine and nurturing and the state and military as childish and immature. This "us" versus "them" division is in line with essentialist roles given to women and men.

Baumgarten and Ullrich's method of analysis, combined with CPDA, shows that the internal discourses of the women go beyond a maternal feminist identity and encompass a radical feminist identity which shows an interesting division between the women and the state, despite the women defining themselves with characteristics in common with the state. The radical feminist identity breaks away from the traditional and essentialist assumptions of women as feminine, nurturing and peaceful and bases its narrative on gender differences. Radical feminists favored women-only activism, as also reflected in Greenham (Murray 2006: 82). This relates to a wider concept of sisterhood, believing that power comes through unity. As a feature of second wave feminism manifested in the previous decade (1970s), the sisterhood rests on the idea that togetherness brings power. This is expressed by words like: "For together we are strong" (Songbook 2010g), which is an idea also often observed in the discourses of the political elite (Van Dijk 1997). Thus, this identity is often described in expressions of strength or power. These expressions are made with similes: "She is like a mountain" (Songbook 2010b), frequent use of the word "strong": "we are women / We are strong" (Songbook 2010d), and descriptions of physical strength: "Break the nuclear chain" (Songbook 2010g). Employing a similar language to that of the political elite, the women create an "us" versus "them" divide not based on differing characteristics, but on marginalization and subjugation. The women defend that resistance against the state's power comes through sisterly unity, uncovering an identity of womanhood that has made them lack identification with the state's discourse for being women. Thus, unification becomes a strategy of resistance, as discovered through Baumgarten and Ullrich's method, while the "us" versus "them" divide is clearly established based on gender, as discovered through CPDA.

It is evident that the construction of "we" by the women in Greenham encompasses many feminist identities, often overlapping, despite conflicts within the feminisms, using the CPDA and Baumgarten and Ullrich methods. The discourse of the Greenham women also touches upon the phenomenon of the reclaiming of the commons as part of feminist struggle. The identity of the women is described in relation to their act of "sitting" or occupying the space. This is reflected in sentences like: "We'll blockade their bases" (Songbook 2010l), "we'll stay here" (ibid.), "Here we claim the common land" (Songbook 2010f). While constituting a

resistance tactic, occupying the commons serves to deconstruct the mainstream system of the state, resisting its power through a physical act also expressed discursively.

The CPDA method shows that a crucial component of the construction of "us" is anti-war, anti-nuclear and pro-peace ideas voiced by the women. The women at Greenham express their resistance against violence, war, and nuclear armament as part of their identity. Their resistance against militarism and nuclearization is rooted in the othering of these ideologies as "male" and masculine. As Eschle states, the figure of the 'Woman' became the bearer of antinuclear struggle, "a world without nuclear weapons requiring variously the feminization of male psychology…" (Eschle 2013: 717). Similarly, Titcombe explains that the deconstruction of militarism through feminist analysis pointed to parallels between the normalization of nuclear weapons and 'normal' identities for men and women (Titcombe 2018: 22). The women use a discourse that clearly voices their purpose and stance "for peace" (Songbook 2010e) and emphasize their identification with peace, creating a contrast with Thatcher, who also claims to identify with peace, but one based on deterrence.

The CPDA method points out that aside from wording their resistance against war, the women also address the consequences the nuclear war has, specifically on them as women, for which they hold the state as responsible. This not only constructs a negatively defined "them" which the women blame and thus, enmify, as the CPDA method shows. It also challenges the state discourse by shifting the blame back to Thatcher's government, as the Baumgarten and Ullrich method shows. As evident in sentences like: "We have life to lose" (Songbook 2010h.), "These bombs make us victims, it's us who will die" (Songbook 2010l), they voice their grievances by pointing to how they will get affected disproportionately for being women. Interestingly, they use metaphors that signify violence, such as "breaking" and "take the fence down" (Songbook 2010l) and "we're fighting" (Songbook 2010a), but these references to violence are presented as part of the resistance as a heroic identity for the women. This heroic identity allows for the self-aggrandizement of the in-group and creating a stronger sense of "us", while blaming the state for making them victims.

"They'll destroy us"

The CPDA method shows that while the identity of women as the in-group encompasses many feminist identities, their conceptualization of the out-group holds negative qualities often associated with men and the state. The division of "us" versus "them" is made significantly clear in the song "Which Side Are You On". The women say: "are you on the other side from me" (Songbook 2010j), expressing the antagonisms between themselves and those at the other side. Later they question, "Are you on the side that don't like life, are you on the side of racial strife, are you on the side that beats your wife" (ibid)., and through this, they identify three characteristics of the out-group: being pro-war and thus against life, being pro-racial strife signaling to traditionally far right-wing identities, and physical violence towards women. The description of violence against women relates to the contextualization of nuclear weapons on a "continuum of violence perpetrated by men and male-dominated institutions" (Eschle 2013: 716). Similarly, the women ask: "Are you on the side who loves to hunt / are you on the side of the National Front / are you on the side who calls me cunt" (Songbook 2010j), describing first a traditionally masculine identity which is violent towards all species, then the far right-wing party National Front, and the use of the word "cunt" to signify the marginalization of women by this out-group identity on the basis of male power and patriarchal structures. This song contains a very clear enmification of the out-group, which although not named explicitly, groups together the state, men, and right-wing ideologies.

Following the CPDA's focus on what is absent in the discourse, this song, like many others, does not clearly name the out-group it is referring to. The enemy is defined in general terms and mainly based on its pro-violence stance, which the women pose themselves against as peaceful and anti-violence. It should be noted that the protestors do not explicitly address Thatcher. Thatcher's identity as a woman creates a complicated relationship, as the women stand against another woman despite their emphasis on sisterhood. However, as the CPDA and Baumgarten and Ullrich methods show, Thatcher is grouped together with the state, which they perceive as "male". The protestors also position Thatcher herself as part of the men-led oppressive system. The state is more explicitly addressed in some of the songs, made up of a few entities mentioned by the women: the government, the political elite, the military, and the police. The enemy is mentioned as "government bigs" (Songbook 2010l), the Ministry of Defense (MOD), the military, and the police (Songbook 2010h). The women describe the "them" as violent and destructive, with sentences like: "You got enough bombs to kill us all

ten times" (Songbook 2010h) and "They'll destroy us to save us but they won't count the cost" (Songbook 2010l), pointing to the danger the out-group poses to the women. Further, they place themselves at the opposite side of this violence as the victims and those suffering the consequences, which is in line with a discourse of out-group enmification.

Moreover, the CPDA and Baumgarten and Ullrich methods point to the use of pronouns in the women's discourse as strategic, challenging the mainstream discourse. While positive words such as peace, strength and unity are mostly described with "our" or "my" pronouns, negative words with connotations of violence, oppression and nuclear armament are described as "their" without explicitly referring to the government, or "your" in an accusatory way. The women's use of the "your" pronoun signifies a direct addressing of the out-group, and thus, the leaders. This explicit addressing of the other group is not present in the leaders' discourse. The use of the "their" pronoun, however, is more common: "We'll blockade their bases, sit silent and strong", "We don't want their missiles and we don't want their wars" (Songbook 2010l). With these sentences, the women amplify the division between the two sides, describing the "base", "missiles", and "wars" as not belonging to the women. "Their war" is juxtaposed against "our peace", creating an effective division between pro-war and anti-war identities and directly challenging the discourse from the leader.

The CPDA method also allows an observation of the women's discourse expressing a strong distrust against the out-group, describing them as lying and not keeping promises to further enhance the enmification of the state. As can be seen from the lines: "ain't trusting their lies" (Songbook 2010l), "This isn't the way they said it would be" (Songbook 2010i), "They promised that the bomb was only keeping us free" (ibid.), a prominent quality of the out-group is its untrustworthiness. This connects to Van Stekelenburg and Klandermans' (2013) social movement theory, where they discuss lack of trust in the government as a feature of cynicism which makes protests less likely to occur. The lack of trust for the Greenham women generated the opposite effect, being included as part of their motivation to mobilize by enhancing their enmification of the state.

What this analysis finds with the methods of CDPA and Baumgarten and Ullrich is that the Greenham women do not directly engage with the enemy images created by Thatcher. The enemy image of the Soviets is largely absent from the discourse of the camp. Instead, they mention broader ideas to explain their anti-nuclear and anti-war activism which are linked to

the construction of their many identities of womanhood. This is coupled by the out-grouping of the state. The divide between "us" and "them" and thus the in-group and the out-group is strongly expressed in the discourse. While not addressing Thatcher specifically, the protestors refer to the political elite, military and the government's defense policies to further frame their agitation. The discourse from the camp has a similar quality to that of the leader: while refraining from directly addressing the "enemy", it seeks to increase in-group aggrandizement and idealized self-image to mobilize against the out-group. Thus, the dismantling of the enemy images created by Thatcher comes not from a direct exploration of the enemy, but through the creation of another enemy the women pose themselves against.

Case II: The Liberian government and WLMAP

The Liberian Civil War was brought to an end largely due to the consistent efforts of the WLMAP. Led by Leymah Gbowee, thousands of women mobilized and set up a camp to stop Charles Taylor's convoy and later circled the hotel in Ghana where peace negotiations were being made, ensuring that the parties reach an agreement. As the CPDA method also stresses the importance of the social and historical context while identifying the themes, it should be noted that as the first African republic, gaining its independence in 1847, Liberia has been characterized as patriarchal, patrimonial and patrilineal (Theobald 2012: 35). Liberia has ranked low in gender equality ratings for many years, especially in the time frame being analyzed. This is to show that the social, historical and economic context of the protests in Liberia largely differs from the UK case. The Liberian women protest against an active civil war with tremendous consequences on them, do not have the access to democratic institutions like in the UK, and face a different situation regarding gender roles and gender equality. This context is crucial to keep in mind while investigating this case.

Discourse from the Leader

President Charles Taylor was held responsible for the war and later found guilty of war crimes after stepping down as a result of the peace process. While the civil war also concerns the other side, the Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) armed group, this thesis is concerned with the state discourse, especially as that is what the protestors pose themselves against. Also for the purposes of the CPDA method, it is crucial to analyze the discourse of the

political elite to better understand their formulations of power. With the CPDA method, the themes of Taylor's discourse were highlighted as: humanitarian justifications, terrorism, and external forces, which this section details based on the construction of the enemy image.

Using the CPDA method, it can be seen that Taylor has a strong focus on creating the "us" versus "them" divide, starting with the construction of "us". Taylor builds the legitimacy of his actions, and therefore the positive traits of the in-group, by heavily focusing on the humanitarian catastrophe in Liberia in his discourse (Taylor 2002b). He claims that "our citizens are suffering" (ibid.) by making a clear distinction of "our" people and those causing the suffering. To specify, he mentions the "horrors being perpetrated against the people of Liberia" (ibid.), once again emphasizing the "people of Liberia" he defines as the in-group. Similarly, he stresses the need to defend this in-group (ibid.), his reference to patrimony also displaying the gendered nature of the state, and thus the in-group. He defines the enemy as "evil forces lurking in our midst" (ibid.) who must be defeated, for which "We must never flinch, we must never weary, we must never despair" (ibid.). His strong focus on the word "we" clearly emphasizes the "us" versus "them" divide signalled by van Dijk. His discourse based on humanitarian concerns starts by defining the "we" as peaceful, "War and conflict are not our friends" (Taylor 2002a), then declaring: "Our Nation is at War!" (Taylor 2002b), which he justifies based on these humanitarian concerns.

Taylor's justifications are based on self and in-group glorification, which becomes evident using the CPDA method. This justification is naturally based on Taylor presenting himself as humanitarian and as the saviour of the people, by waging war against those who cause harm upon the in-group. As he states: "As your President and Commander-in-Chief, it is my constitutional duty and moral responsibility to ensure the safety and security of all persons residing within the territorial confines of this nation" (Taylor 2002b), using a legal as well as political basis for why he is waging war. Taylor presents himself with overwhelmingly positive qualities. He also constructs an image of himself as well-calculated and says "If I were not here, there would be bodies all over the city" (Taylor 2003a), presenting himself as self-righteous and a humanitarian who the people of Liberia should feel gratitude towards. As he states: " I do not stop out of fear of the fight. I stop now out of love for you, (…) What is important is that you live and there is peace" (ibid.), he uses the emotions of fear and love to reinforce his positive image as the savior and the importance he claims to put on "peace". Thus,

Taylor's discourse directed to exert power over the Liberian population is based on self and in-group glorification.

Based on this, the CPDA method also asks for a discussion of how Taylor constructs the "them", and thus, the enemy. Initially, themes in the discourse highlighted with CPDA point to the LURD as the main enemy. Taylor defines LURD with many different terms, such as "evil forces" (Taylor 2002b), "armed bandits" (ibid.), "overly ambitious Liberians bent on gaining power through anarchy, rather than democracy" (2002a), "detractors" (ibid.), a "rebel incursion" (ibid.), and their tactics as "horrible" and "barbaric" (Taylor 2002b). More importantly, the label of "terrorist" is attributed to the out-group repeatedly in Taylor's discourse (ibid.). This terminology allows Taylor to present the enemy as apolitical, justifying his actions by ruling out an alternative. The terrorist discourse gains observable importance over time, as Taylor also conceptualizes himself in his first speech in 2002: "We have often referred to them as dissidents. But are they really dissidents? They cannot be referred to as freedom fighters, for who are they trying to free? They are not even rebels, neither are they insurgents. They are plain and simple terrorists — Terrorists without a cause" (Taylor 2002a), once again expressing an apolitical definition. Taylor establishes power by making use of norms set by the international community after 9/11. He claims that the Liberian civil war is a "terrorist war", "against us" (Taylor 2002a) making it very clear that the "us" is the victim being attacked and the "them" is the perpetrator.

Using CPDA, it is identified that upon clarifying the definition of the enemy through his discourse, Taylor presents the enemy as uncompromising, resilient, unstoppable and therefore, impossible to face without armed state violence. "They've launched thousands of rockets in Monrovia, killed thousands of people" (Taylor 2003c), "They have killed innocent civilians, burned villages and raped women and young girls" (Taylor 2002b), referring back to the humanitarianism theme by pointing out the atrocities of the enemy, while also posing them as undemocratic and waging war against the Republic. He says: "the terrorists have regrouped and regrouped again" (Taylor 2002b) and "a larger force and a more deadly arsenal leaving behind unimaginable horrors (ibid.) to justify armed action against such a group with unstoppable resilience and persistence. Further, he mentions the difficulty in convincing these uncompromising groups by stating: "we have to convince the parties…" (Taylor 2000), and "…our gesture has been met with cold shoulders by a powerful minority in self-imposed exile…" (Taylor 2002a). This allows Taylor to present himself as open to negotiation, but the

enemy as uncompromising and non-negotiating, similarly to the Soviet enemy image of Thatcher, meaning he does not have another choice of action.

The CPDA method also allows an understanding of how the other enemy images and out-groups Taylor defines, going beyond the description of the LURD. Taylor talks about outside forces as supporting or aiding LURD: “who are backed by powerful external forces” (Taylor 2002b), “being threatened by outside forces” (ibid.), including them in the enemy image. As Taylor summarizes: “Liberia is bleeding. It's being raped by foreigners” (Taylor 2003b), with Liberia personified to further enhance the image of the country as pure and the use of “rape” to establish moral superiority over the “foreigners” as the enemy. He specifically names the Guinean Government as supporting the enemy: “the Guinean Government that supports this war” (Taylor 2002a). The foreigners, Guineans and Sierra Leoneans are described as “savage” and purely evil (Taylor 2003b). The civil war is described as a “proxy war” (ibid.), with “Our young men and women who have been influenced to fight this terrorist war against us”, further creating the distinction with the Liberians who fight against them by posing them as influenced by external powers, and therefore, not purely “Liberian”. In this way, Taylor pushes the Liberians fighting in LURD out of the in-group of the Liberian people.

Moreover, the CPDA method showed that Taylor refers to the Western powers as alternative out-groups, presenting them as additional factors pushing the Liberian government to a certain plan of action. The US is described in friendly terms, due to Liberia’s diplomatic and historical connections, while also being accused of starting the war to take the blame off his decisions: "This is an American war”, "[The United States] caused this war... but we appreciate their presence” (Taylor 2003b). Taylor also discusses the UN as a Western, external actor working to the detriment of Liberia. He claims that the sanctions and arms embargo imposed on Liberia are “unjust” (Taylor 2002a) with “absolutely no basis” (ibid.), “without providing concrete evidence of any wrongdoing on the part of my government” (ibid.). While posing his government as good and innocent, Taylor also puts the blame on the West who have ruined the economy, and it is due to the UN arms embargo that Taylor “cannot defend you adequately” (Taylor 2003a), as another example of shifting the blame to justify his actions.

In Taylor’s recorded speeches, a direct mention of the protesting women is absent. Van Dijk’s CPDA states that what is absent from the discourse is equally important as what is there. For this reason, it should be contemplated why Taylor did not include the women in the out-group,

as Thatcher did with the Greenham women. While this is not recorded officially in Taylor's own words, Gbowee paraphrases him saying that "he was willing to engage in peace talks, but if our movement was truly fair we should demand the same of the rebels" (Gbowee 2011: 140-141). This concept of fairness very much resembles Thatcher's discourse on the Soviet Union, asking the resisters to turn their eyes to the enemy instead. Taylor's recorded speeches do not address the protestors at all, but repeatedly refers to the Liberian people. The people are referred to by Taylor in overwhelmingly positive remarks, as would be expected from the construction of the in-group: "the Liberian people continue to be resilient and patient" (Taylor 2002a), "the people of Liberia, the most powerful nations on earth", (ibid.). He only refers to women as victims of war rather than protestors, meaning that the women represent "the people" to him, not a radical dissident group. Unlike the Greenham case, the women of Liberia are still considered as part of the in-group in Taylor's official discourse and included in the "we", despite their resistance. As will be explained in the following section, this is mostly in line with the women's own identification.

Discourses from the Liberian women

As mentioned earlier, the context of the Liberian women's peace movement differs greatly from Greenham Common. It is important to clarify that the feminisms of the Liberian women differ from the Greenham women. For this reason, this section begins by laying out the context specific gender roles and marginalization of women in Liberia. Traditionally, the women of Liberia are expected to have the main responsibilities of farming, domestic work and childcare (Theobald 2012: 35). The traditional gender roles based on the control of labor and marriage also played a role in the outbreak of the conflict, which amounted to domestic slavery according to some (Fuest 2008: 205).

The civil war had tremendous effects on women. Women were disproportionately affected by the violence, as commonly observed in conflicts around the world. The violence extended to "rape and other forms of sexual violence, torture, abduction, slavery and forced marriage or forced recruitment" (Theobald 2012: 46). Gallo-Cruz and Remsberg mention that this violence was "commonly anchored in deeper social-structural issues" (2021: 90). At the same time, the outbreak of conflict pushed women out of their traditionally designated gender roles, due to the absence of men (Theobald 2012: 47). Moreover, many women played active roles in the

conflict (ibid.). Thus, when the WLMAP came into being in 2002, it brought together women from very diverse backgrounds: less and more educated, lower and higher classed, young and old, and Christian and Muslim.

The discourse of the protestors in Leymah Gbowee's memoir appears mostly united and homogenous, the general message being "We want peace, no more war" (Gbowee 2011: 140). However, this is not to mean that it did not encompass different feminist identities. As the Greenham case, the manifestation of womanhood was closely linked to the peace movement, but the feminisms expressed in the protest contextually differed from the Greenham case. Taking the Greenham exploration as a basis, this section identifies the feminist narratives in the Liberian movement regarding the identity of women as protestors, showing how the movement creates its own discourses to express identity and the mechanisms of resistance (Baumgarten and Ullrich: 2016), while keeping in mind the Liberian cultural context and difference in the construction of gender. Through the discourse analysis, I conclude that as with the Greenham case, the women of Liberia construct a strong identity as an in-group based on their resistance against war, which they pose against the out-group of Taylor's state. Their dismantling of the enemy images comes from the construction of another in-group and out-group.

"We, the Liberian women"

Using the CPDA and Baumgarten and Ullrich's methods, it can be seen that the women create a united identity of "us", and what unites the identities of the protestors is their description as "Liberian women". Unlike the Greenham case, there is a strong connection between the Liberian nation and the women protesting. This is evident in the main slogan of the protest, which is: "The women of Liberia want peace now!" (Gbowee 2011: 134), often repeated by Gbowee. Liberia and women are often coupled together to strengthen the identification between the two, e.g. "the women of Liberia" (idem: 140-141), "the Liberian women" (idem: 156). To go further, the grouping of the two words also indicates the protestors' belief that they represent the common people of Liberia: the civilians and those affected by conflict. Gbowee refers to the people of Liberia in several instances, presenting a strong identification with it. This is also emphasized with a focus on the word "ordinary", to further enhance the view that the women represent the people of Liberia: "they are ordinary mothers, grandmothers, aunts,

sisters" (idem: 124-125), "ordinary women" (idem: 117), and "ordinary people" (idem: 162-163). Thus, the women's resistance against Taylor's discourse also includes their self-grouping with the in-group of the common people.

Looking into the internal discourse of the protestors as Baumgarten and Ullrich suggests, the Liberian women's narrative is heavily reliant on an essentialist understanding of women as life givers, which they juxtapose against the leaders and warlords, and as natural peacemakers. This maternal feminist narrative is also due to their identities as mothers being very prevalent in their discourse. The following excerpt is exemplary of the women's identity as mothers:

> "'I'm nobody... a mother. A children-mother.'
> 'What are the things you do as a mother? Do you work to make money for your children?' 'Yessss ...' 'Then you are also a provider.' A smile. 'Yes. I am a provider.'
> 'Do you work in your church?' 'Yes...'
> 'So you are also a leader. Do you help to solve problems in the church? In your community?'
> 'Yes, I do.' 'Aaah. So you are a peacemaker.' 'I am! I am a peacemaker!'" (idem: 117)

The formation of women's identity as peacemakers is clearly identified here. The maternal identity is also expressed by the frequent mention of children, such as: "our children will ask us, 'Mama, what was your role during the crisis?'" (idem: 140-141), "WE ARE TIRED OF OUR CHILDREN BEING KILLED!" (idem: 127), "Our children are dying" (idem: 140). Therefore, a crucial component of the women's identities is their children and perceived responsibility to protect their children, causing a disconnect with Taylor's legitimacy as his rule prolongs the suffering of children. This divide can be observed through the CPDA method.

Baumgarten and Ullrich's methodology also requires an exploration of the discursive resistance strategies employed by social movements. The women also use the importance of motherhood in the Liberian society as a resistance tactic. The life-giving role of women is strategically used against the men: "Men are born through women's vaginas, and it's as if by exposing ourselves, we say, 'We now take back the life we gave you'" (idem: 160-161). Through this, the women also present themselves as "human" and claim to be the conscience of the men, using their identity as mothers, as one of the protestors directed to the men: "'You are our children!' (…)

‘We've born you!’" (idem: 143). Gbowee also directly puts this in words by stating: “’We are their conscience,’ (…) ‘We are calling on them to do the right thing.’” (idem: 155). The women build their identities strongly on the perception of being human, having conscience and obtaining naturally peaceful traits, differing from the men and establishing moral superiority over them to resist the oppression.

The internal discourse identified through Baumgarten and Ullrich’s method shows that the significance of motherhood is also tied to the strong role of religion in the women’s identities. As an interreligious movement, the Liberian women bridge together Christian and Muslim women in Liberia to achieve unity, bringing together different in-groups. The integration of Muslim women into the movement is explained in Gbowee’s storytelling of the church congregation, when a woman named Asatu said: "I'm the only Muslim in the church." (idem: 124-125). The interreligious quality of the movement was vocalized and made clear in the women’s slogans and songs (idem: 140). As the acts of praying and preaching are also mentioned regularly, religion represents both the maternal understanding of women as moral and with conscience, and a strong expression of unity within the women that overrides differences. This resistance strategy allows women to display an exemplary form of unification between groups that have fundamental differences, which conflicts with Taylor’s enmification and “us” versus “them” divide.

The women also resist Taylor’s discourse by presenting themselves with qualities that go against his attributions of the in-group and the out-group, and based on Baumgarten and Ullrich, by creating thinking that is antagonistic to the mainstream discourse. As mentioned earlier, the properties of Western feminism do not necessarily fit into the cultural context of Liberian women. It is, however, possible to see expressions of ideas that are often linked to radical feminism, such as unity, sisterhood, strength, and going beyond traditionally assumed gender roles. Sisterhood is expressed through the women’s frequent calls to come together: “We need to come together” (idem: 134), “let's put our voices together...” (idem: 124-125). Linked to this, the women’s identity as activists is also mentioned (idem: 113-114) as a newly discovered role that goes beyond what is traditionally expected of them. This new activity for the Liberian women is framed as a form of “feeling their own strength” (idem: 113-114). The expression of strength is extended to having a voice, as opposed to silence: “In the past, we were silent” (idem: 135). Gbowee often uses the word “voice” in ways to express strength: “my voice strong” (idem: 140-141), “YOU HAVE A VOICE IN THE PEACE PROCESS!” (idem:

127). The women speaking up and showing strength goes against Taylor's establishment of power with a discourse that portrays women only as victims.

Furthermore, Baumgarten and Ullrich's methodology shows that leaders' official discourses shape the protestors' relations with themselves and their identities. Based on this, the women's suffering is expressed as a crucial part of their identity as protestors, for which Taylor is held responsible. The narrative that women are disproportionately affected by the conflict is very prevalent in the discourse, which shows both the identification of women with suffering and their self-definition as victims of violence, as well as the grievances that they voice against the government. This relates to a general understanding that grievances lead to protest in social movement theory (Van Stekelenburg and Klandermans 2013). The words "we are tired" are expressed very frequently in the women's songs and slogans, and Gbowee elaborates on it in her speech: "we are tired of war. We are tired of running. We are tired of begging for bulgur wheat. We are tired of our children being raped" (idem: 140-141). The suffering of women, therefore, comes up as a strong component of the protestors' identity, also enabling their opposition to the government which causes said suffering. While doing this, the women also identify war with suffering, challenging the discourse of war expressed by Taylor.

"Taylor had destroyed the country"

The CPDA and Baumgarten and Ullrich methods showed so far that the women define themselves as mothers, peacemakers and activists who go against traditional gender roles, as moral, religious, united, and emotional. These qualities are juxtaposed against that of the leaders and fighters. The out-group, therefore, is defined as violent, monstrous, morally inferior, and unaffected by misery. The out-group encompasses many: President Charles Taylor, his "boys" (idem: 90-91), the government, military, security guards and police, as well as the rebel groups at times. While the women, in their protest discourse, claimed to be "condemning violence committed by all sides" (idem: 134), the receiving end of the women's discourse is often Taylor: "We gave Taylor three days to respond to our demands" (idem: 135). Taylor is presented as unbothered and unaffected by the women's struggle, refusing to acknowledge or respond to them (idem: 142). Gbowee defines him in the following way: "Charles Taylor sat on an upholstered couch, in a dull olive military-style suit. He wore dark glasses, but I could feel him observing me. I realized I had come too far to hate this man. It

was almost as if I just needed to see him, see the human being who had caused so much death and pain" (idem: 140-141). While making associations with the elite (upholstered couch) and the military (military-style suit), he is also described as non-responsive and difficult to read due to his dark glasses. The women hold him responsible for the death and pain in the war, using the word "hate" to further enmify the President.

Based on the CDPA method, the women's resistance against Taylor is evident, posing Taylor as the enemy. This is further enhanced by the description of Taylor as destructive: "Taylor had destroyed the country" (idem: 70), and even as a monster: "Yes, he was a monster, but perhaps if he got what he wanted, he would become human again" (ibid.). While portraying the leader as monstrous, the women establish their moral superiority based on being "human" and as the rebuilders of the country that Taylor destroyed. This monstrous description is directly linked to the out-group's identity as "killers": "BUTCHERS AND MURDERERS OF THE LIBERIAN PEOPLE-STOP!" (idem: 160-161), further enmifying the out-group and creating a disconnect between Taylor and the Liberian people.

The government is mentioned more explicitly as the receiving side of the women's demands, the CDPA and Baumgarten and Ullrich methods show. Gbowee addresses the only female government official in the room when voicing their demands to the government, using a formal and respectful language (idem: 141). The CPDA method also draws attention to the type of language being used and how the audiences are addressed. It is noteworthy to point out the women's formal and respectful language, showing that their resistance in this particular discourse remains within the boundaries of what is acceptable for Taylor as the leader. Moreover, the President's guards are included in the out-group and described as violent and aggressive (idem: 135). Thus, the enmification extended beyond solely Charles Taylor and encompassed the whole state: "Every institution that I'd been taught was there to protect the people had proved evil and corrupt" (idem: 161-162), being defined as evil and corrupt. The state is described as greedy and selfish with no regard for the lives of the Liberian people, which the women claim to represent: "You are all using the people of Liberia for your own selfish gains!" (idem: 138).

When looking at the enmification of the state, the CPDA also shows that the women attempt to reverse the power dynamic in their discourse by using the out-group's masculine identity. While the women strongly pose themselves against the male leaders and fighters, the men are

described as lacking masculinity for waging war. This is first voiced by the general at the peace talks: "'If you were a real man, (…) you wouldn't be killing your people. But because you are not a real man, that is why these women will treat you like boys'" (idem: 162-163). This belief is also voiced by the women, portraying the men as children and therefore themselves as morally and intellectually superior: "'You are our children!' Grace rebuked the young men. 'We've born you!'" (idem: 143). In one of the songs they sing, the women talk about "assholes" running away (idem: 218-219), symbolizing their defeat by the women's movement, once again emasculating the men and portraying them as weak and cowardly. As Mariama, one of the activists, states: "men have failed!" (idem: 134). The taking back of the commons by the Greenham women is mirrored in Liberia as taking back the country.

Therefore, the women of Liberia dismantle the enemy images created by Taylor not by engaging with the images and proposing alternative perceptions, but by employing a united and simple discourse based on their suffering for which they hold Taylor and the men responsible. The combination of the CPDA method and Baumgarten and Ullrich's methodology shows that the women resist the leader's discourse by creating another "us" versus "them" divide, posing themselves against the leader and the state. This is caused by their lack of identification with said leader, due to their grievances as women and marginalization in both their daily lives and during war. The women make this evident by emphasizing their suffering in their discourse through strong slogans and emotional expressions. The "us" versus "them" divide in Taylor's discourse does not resonate with the protestors, because they lack a sense of belonging in the "us" due to their identities as women and cycles of violence they experience by the state. This leads to the creation of an alternative "us" versus "them", bonding over their shared experience as women of different religions and enmifying the state and the men.

Conclusion and Avenues for Further Research

Based on a framework combining social psychology, women, and peace movements and using the methods of CDPA and Baumgarten and Ullrich, this thesis found that the deconstruction of the enemy images created by state leaders comes through the construction of the state as the enemy. This general finding directly relates to the identity of the protestors as women, as this identity led a disconnect from the state which they perceive as oppressive and marginalizing.

Through this lack of identification and belonging with the in-group the leader represents, the women create another in-group based on their womanhood, and another out-group including the state, the leader, and the men. The leaders' discourse, on the other hand, was based on an emphasis of the aggression of the out-group to create enemy images and the shifting of the blame from their governments to the out-group. While Thatcher pushed the protestors towards the out-group by affiliating them with the enemy, Taylor refused to discuss them at all and instead, focused on a more aggressive enmification.

In two cases with vast contextual differences, women-led peace movements are observed with the construction of these alternative in-group and out-groups, leading the women to stand against the war legitimized by the out-group. This process is plays out in different ways in the two cases, due to the said contextual differences. In the Greenham Common case, the women feel disconnected from the state and create a marginal identity, encompassing maternal and radical understandings of feminism, and present themselves as a separate entity. In Liberia, the women do feel disconnected from Taylor's state, but they feel they represent the "people" of Liberia as the ordinary women, mothers, and wives. And thus, the Liberian women create the division based on grievances and generalize their suffering to the whole country, while the women in Greenham Common mostly present an identity outside of the state, also displayed in their women-only activism.

As Virginia Woolf said: "We can best help you to prevent war not by joining your society but by remaining outside your society…".

This thesis was limited due to difficulties in reaching resources from both understudied cases. Women's anti-war initiatives overall prove to be difficult to access, and not as well recorded as anti-war movements in general. Another limitation I faced was the absence of studies on gender and resistance in Liberia from the perspective of Liberians. Except for Gbowee's work and few additional activists, the academic work on the Liberian peace movement remains extremely limited, lacking detail and depth, and dominated by Western authors. Further research on this matter would be advised to follow obtrusive methods of data collection and further examine the Liberian perspectives in order to give voice to the women on the ground.

This thesis hopes to serve as a starting ground for further research on enemy images, peace movements, and resistance against war. Building on the framework of this thesis, which

presents an often uncommon intertextual analysis of the state and protestors, further research could come to more robust findings going beyond the practical limitations of this thesis. At a time when anti-war attitudes and deconstruction of enemy images are very much needed, it is of utmost importance to direct the focus of the academia to the human and psychological underpinnings of why and how people resist war, as a prerequisite for building peace.

Bibliography

Aminzade, Ronald R., Goldstone, J.A, McAdam, D., Perry, E. J., Sewell, W.H. Tarrow, S. and Tilley, C. (2001). *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baumgarten, B., and Peter Ullrich. (2016). "Discourse, Power, and Governmentality. Social Movement Research with and beyond Foucault", in J. Roose and H. Dietz (eds), *Social Theory and Social Movements*, Springer Fachmedien, Wiesbaden: 13–38.

Baumgarten, B., and Peter Ullrich. (2016). "Discourse, Power, and Governmentality. Social Movement Research with and beyond Foucault", in J. Roose and H. Dietz (eds), *Social Theory and Social Movements*, Springer Fachmedien, Wiesbaden: 13–38.

Bleiker, R., and Emma Hutchison. (2008). "Fear No More: Emotions and World Politics", *Review of International Studies,* 34(1): 115–35.

Burgin, S. (2012). "Understanding Antiwar Activism as a Gendering Activity: A Look at the U.S.'s Anti-Vietnam War Movement", *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 13(6): 18-30.

Cockburn, A. (2007). "Whatever Happened to the Anti-War Movement?", New Left Review, 46: 29-38.

Cockburn, C. (2012). *Antimilitarism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cohrs, J. C., and Klaus Boehnke. (2008). "Social Psychology and Peace: An Introductory Overview", *Social Psychology*, 39(1): 4–11.

Cohrs, J. C., Barbara Moschner, Jürgen Maes, and Sven Kielmann. (2005). "Personal Values and Attitudes Toward War", *Peace And Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology,* 11(3): 293–312

Duriesmith, D. (2014) "Is Manhood a Causal Factor in the Shifting Nature of War?", *International Feminist Journal of Politics,* 16:2, 236-254.

Eschle, C. (2013). "Gender and the Subject of (Anti)Nuclear Politics: Revisiting Women's Campaigning against the Bomb", *International Studies Quarterly,* 57(4): 713–24.

Fabick, S. (Ed.) and Psychologists for Social Responsibility. "Enemy Images: A Resource Manual on Reducing Enmity". Accessed from: www.psysr.org. Consulted on 27/04/2022.

Fridman, O. (2014). "Alternative calendars and memory work in Serbia: Anti-war activism after Milošević", *Memory Studies*, 8(2): 212-226.

Fuest, V. (2008). "'This Is the Time to Get in Front': Changing Roles and Opportunities for Women in Liberia", *African Affairs*, 107(427): 201–24.

Gallo-Cruz, S., and Renée Remsberg. (2021). "Peacebuilding, Liberian Women, and the Invisible Hand of Conflict in the Postwar Era", *Women and Peacebuilding*, 5(2): 77-105.

Gbowee, L. (2019). "When Women Stand Together as One: The Power of Women's Grassroots Peace Movements", *Journal of International Affairs*, 72(2): 13–18.

Hakvoort, I., and Louis Oppenheimer. (1998). "Understanding Peace and War: A Review of Developmental Psychology Research", *Developmental Review*, 18(3): 353–89.

Jahr, Christoph. (2016). "Enemy Images", in N. Young (ed), *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*. Oxford University Press, accessed from: https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195334685.001.0001/acref-9780195334685-e-222.

Kirby, Paul and Laura J. Shepherd (2016) The futures past of the Women, Peace and Security agenda. in International Affairs 92: 2 (2016) 373–392.

Korac, M. (2016). "Is there a right time for gender-just peace? Feminist anti-war organising revisited", *Gender and Education*, 28(3): 431-444.

Lieberfeld, D. (2008). "What Makes an Effective Antiwar Movement?", *International Journal of Peace Studies,* 13(1): 1-14.

Marshall, D. R. (2000). "Women in War and Peace Grassroots Peacebuilding", *Peaceworks* 34: 1-32.

McAlister, A. L., Albert Bandura, and Steven V. Owen. (2006). "Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement in Support of Military Force: The Impact of Sept. 11", *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 25(2): 141-165.

McFarland, S. (2005). "On the Eve of War: Authoritarianism, Social Dominance, and American Students' Attitudes Toward Attacking Iraq", 31(3): 360-367.

Murray, Suellen. "'Make Pies Not War': Protests by the Women's Peace Movement of the Mid 1980s", *Australian Historical Studies,* 37(127): 81–94.

O'Reilly, M., Andrea Ó Súilleabháin, and Thania Paffenholz. (2015). *Reimagining Peacemaking: Women's Roles in Peace Processes,* New York: International Peace Institute.

Oppenheimer, L. (2006). "The Development of Enemy Images: A Theoretical Contribution", *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 12(3): 269–292.

Rossdale, C. (2019). *Resisting Militarism.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Seawright, J., and John Gerring. (2008). "Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options", *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(2): 294–308.

Skitka, L., Christopher Bauman, Nicholas Aramovich, and G. Scott Morgan. (2006). "Confrontational and Preventative Policy Responses to Terrorism: Anger Wants a Fight and Fear Wants 'Them' to Go Away", *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 28(4): 375–84.

Sunbuloglu, N. Y. (2013). *Erkek Millet Asker Millet.* Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 33-37). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Theobald, A. (2012) The Role of Women in Making and Building Peace in Liberia. Dallas: Ibidem Verlag.

Titcombe, E. E. (2018). "An Exploration of the Narratives From Wales, Emerging From the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camps 1981-2000", PhD thesis, University of the West of England, Bristol.

Tripp, A. M. (2017). "Women's Organizations and Peace Initiatives", in F. N. Aoláin, N. Cahn, D. F. Haynes, and N. Valji, *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Conflict,* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199300983.013.34.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis", *Discourse & Society*, 4(2): 249–83.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). "What Is Political Discourse Analysis?", *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 11(1): 11–52.

Van Stekelenburg, J. and Klandermans, B. (2013). "The social psychology of protest", *Current Sociology Review,* 61(5-6): 886-905.

Zamperini, A., Andrighetto, L. and Menegatto, M. (2012). "The Deconstruction of Enemy Images for a Nonkilling Society", in Joám Evans Pim (ed.) *Nonkilling Psychology*, Center for Global Nonkilling, accessed from: https://nonkilling.org/center/book-review/nonkilling-psychology/.

Ziv, N. (2019). "Pro-peace or anti-war: The effect of emotions primed by protest songs on emotions toward in-group and out-group in conflict", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 49: 778-795.

Appendix

Margaret Thatcher Foundation Speech Archive
TV Interview for London Weekend Television Weekend World - 1983 Jan 16 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105087
House of Commons PQs - 1983 Feb 1 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105246
House of Commons PQs - 1983 Feb 3 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105248
Interview for Sunday Telegraph - 1983 Feb 16 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105113
House of Commons PQs - 1983 Mar 3 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105265
House of Commons PQs - 1983 Mar 31 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105288
Speech to the Scottish Conservative Party Conference - 1983 May 13 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105314
House of Commons PQs - 1983 Nov 3 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105464
House of Commons PQs - 1983 Nov 15 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105474
House of Commons PQs - 1983 Dec 13 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105494
House of Commons PQs - 1984 Feb 21 https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/105625
yourgreenham.co.uk
Songbook (2010). https://womensliberationmusicarchive.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/yourgreenham_song_book.pdf Consulted on 25/05/2022.

AP Archive: Charles Taylor

Liberia: President Charles Taylor Press Conference – 2000 May 19 http://www.aparchive.com/metadata/youtube/c0452522de87782b5c5ffa79c424cd7c
GNS LIBERIA WRAP 2 – 2003 Aug 17 http://www.aparchive.com/metadata/youtube/028d3d6e36b5c0af181aae3df962f299
LIBERIA TAYLOR – 2003 Jul 28 http://www.aparchive.com/metadata/youtube/efff510564c13072f8df73cab8ab3c3e
LIBERIA PRESIDENT - 2003 Jul 18 http://www.aparchive.com/metadata/Liberia-President/6d97fb02dfd8b46a773c3611cc13da7d?query=charles+taylor&current=27&orderBy=Relevance&hits=253&referrer=search&search=%2fsearch%2ffilter%3fquery%3dcharles%2520taylor%26from%3d21%26orderBy%3dRelevance%26allFilters%3dCharles%2520Taylor%253APeople%26ptype%3dIncludedProducts%26_%3d1655873972742&allFilters=Charles+Taylor%3aPeople&productType=IncludedProducts&page=21&b=13da7d
LIBERIA TAYLOR – 2003 Jul 7 http://www.aparchive.com/metadata/Liberia-Taylor/b1fdf63165081eb1a1b5a722f112b181?query=charles+taylor&current=54&orderBy=Relevance&hits=253&referrer=search&search=%2fsearch%2ffilter%3fquery%3dcharles%2520taylor%26from%3d41%26orderBy%3dRelevance%26allFilters%3dCharles%2520Taylor%253APeople%26ptype%3dIncludedProducts%26_%3d1655873972743&allFilters=Charles+Taylor%3aPeople&productType=IncludedProducts&page=41&b=12b181
BBC News. (2003). “Taylor's farewell speech”. Accessed from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/3140211.stm. Consulted on 18/06/2022.
Dunn, D.E. (2011). The Annual Messages of the Presidents of Liberia 1848-2010.
Annual Message to the Legislature – 2002 Jan 28 https://www.asclibrary.nl/docs/340812982-22.pdf
Special Message to the Legislature – 2002 Feb 14 https://www.asclibrary.nl/docs/340812982-22.pdf
Memoir
Gbowee, L. (2011). *Mighty Be Our Powers*. New York: Perseus Books Group.