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ABSTRACT

This thesis is rooted in an exploration of protest encampments as sites of subversive political potential. In particular, it offers a discussion of two camp sites in their specific historical and geographic contexts, and examines the elements of performance that contribute to their political and theatrical efficacy. First, I discuss the 1932 Bonus Army encampment in Washington, DC, in which unemployed First World War veterans rallied to demand financial assistance from the US government. This is compared to the 1980s Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp, and participants' efforts to contest the militarisation of public space. The analysis is framed in an understanding of women and veterans as potential embodiments of Giorgio Agamben's homo sacer figure; Further, queer camp aesthetics are identified as a possible means of countering the sovereign/homo sacer divide (in line with Agamben's call for a new ontology of potentiality) and the protest camps are evaluated in the context of this notion. The thesis applies theories of camp aesthetics alongside critical political philosophy to explore the successes and failures of both protest camps. It forms part of a broader research plan that aims to critically compare protest performance tactics within their political and legal contexts.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis offers a comparative analysis of the performances of two historic protest camps: The Bonus Expeditionary Forces' 1932 encampment in Washington, DC and the 1980's Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp in Berkshire, England. Aiming to contribute to the dramaturgy of protest advocated by Baz Kershaw, this study weaves together approaches of theatre historiography with theories drawn from political philosophy. It attempts to rigorously integrate Theatre and Performance Theory with knowledge drawn from the fields of Politics and International Relations, in order to raise questions about the practical role of protest performance in the shaping of global politics. In particular, the thesis is concerned with the ability of protest camping to create new avenues to political agency on the part of broader public audiences, through strategic deployment of specific aesthetic devices – particularly camp sensibilities, or queer camp aesthetics. Through a critical analysis of these aspects, this study will demonstrate that political power has historically been inscribed on the bodies of protesters in particular ways that impact the potential efficacy of political performance tactics. This first requires a view of protest camps as performances, which can take the form of ongoing social dramas, but which also contain moments of more explicitly theatrical actions. This work is broadly situated within a longer-term interdisciplinary Theatre-and-Politics project that will compare the impact of political protest camps in the United Kingdom and United States. The aim is to foster a body of work that possesses the merits of interpretive approaches alongside empirical principles and political philosophy.

Case Studies and Methodology

The Bonus Expeditionary Forces were a collective of American First World War veterans who journeyed to Washington, DC in 1932 to demand immediate payment of their post-dated war bonuses. Approximately 20,000\(^1\) unemployed veterans and their families gathered in the nation’s capital to campaign for the bonus payment, which had

---

\(^1\) Estimates of the number of Bonus Marchers vary widely. Dickson and Allen (2010) and Lisio (1994) agree on an estimate of 20,000. Waters (1933) placed the overall number around 30,000. Many popular contemporary accounts suggest a total number of more than 40,000 protesters, but this seems to include the veterans' families and a variety of other supporters (Mink and O’Connor 2004). However, it should be noted that the overall spectacle of the protest may have been characterised by a significantly larger number of protesters than the account of 20,000 veterans initially suggests.
been postponed until 1945 due to legislative disagreements over the federal budget (Dickson and Allen 2004, 1). With the Great Depression in full swing, they were supporting the calls of a few federal politicians who believed early payment of the bonus would ease their suffering and help stimulate the economy (Daniels 1971). For nearly eight weeks they camped in the city, around the Capitol building and on Anacostia Flats, in the environs of iconic Revolutionary War battlefields. Throughout their residence they maintained a military-like structure, divided into units with commanding officers who practised drill marches for discipline. When Congress rejected the bills that would have granted immediate payment of their bonuses, the veterans remained camped in Washington because they simply had nowhere else to go, nor the financial means to get there (Waters 1933). Ultimately, President Herbert Hoover ordered the US Army to evict the protesters, and this resulted in one of the most horrific uses of military force against civilians in American history. Using tanks, bayonets and tear gas the Bonus Army and their family members were forcibly evicted, resulting in the deaths of at least two protesters and one case of gas-induced blindness (Dickson and Allen 2004).

The Greenham Common Women’s Peace Camp is perhaps a more familiar scene to many, taking place much more recently and played out to a wide audience through televised news media. Sparked by NATO’s decision to site American Cruise Missiles at the Greenham Common Air Force Base, this protest became one of the most visible actions of Cold War campaigns for nuclear disarmament. It began in September 1981, when a few hundred women (and a small number of men and children) marched from Cardiff to Greenham Common to protest the imminent arrival of the 96 cruise missiles. After arriving, they spontaneously made the decision to stay, setting up a protest camp at the gates of the base. This peace camp was soon populated by more than 250 long-term residents, and a women-only policy was instituted (Liddington 1989). Weaving essentialist-feminist practices with creative protest tactics, the Greenham Common camp inspired several like-minded protests throughout Europe. Although the numbers of protesters varied over the course of the encampment, the site became notable for its creative and joyful engagements with the military base and law enforcement officials. Despite multiple attempts at evictions, the camp remained for 19 years, outliving the Air Force Base itself. The final protesters left the camp in 2000 (Fairhall 2006).

Both of these historical protest camps were distinctly theatrical, deliberately enacted in full view of the public and also conveyed to broader audiences through a variety of
media types. The Bonus Army undoubtedly had a more visible immediate presence, being located as it was in the centre of the nation's capital; however, it is likely that the majority of first-person witnesses to that protest were mainly politicians, journalists and a relatively small number of local residents. More importantly, the performance was played out to the nation through the medium of radio, which was a highly popular form of entertainment during the Depression. Radio hosts were the popular celebrities of this era, with millions of followers, and many were left-leaning agitators who inspired devout fans (Daniels 1971). The Greenham Common women, by contrast, had the advantage of a greater range of media through which to broadcast their actions. Protesters were highly conscious of the colour photographs and film clips that would capture their major actions and almost instantly influence worldwide public opinion of the events. Overall, both camps were enacted with the specific intent of creating a spectacle for politicians and the public that might impact debates over pressing political issues.

The Bonus Army and the Greenham Common camps were vastly different in their historical and political contexts, and also in the creative tactics that they employed to engage with politicians and the public. However, it is this contrast that will allow me to thoroughly explore the efficacy of their identity-based protest camping in a way that accounts for the influence of cultural and political contexts. By constructing a comparative analysis around two geographically and historically distinct protests, I will be able to construct a detailed comparison of marginalised political actors and their performances within and against the frames of political authority.

Methodologically, my analysis attempts to integrate the approaches of a theatre historian, interpreting performance events in their historical and cultural context, with theoretical insights gleaned from more social and political philosophers. I will be following Kershaw and Nicholson's suggestion that it is better to overtly frame an investigation of theatre history with one's own philosophical biases (2011). First, I am pursuing an exploration of political camping alongside queer camp aesthetics in order to elucidate the ways that political interactions are entwined with theatricality. Second, I am also seeking to bring political philosophy into the frame of interpretation in order to bring to light the subtle operations of power, vulnerability, violence and potentiality that are located beneath the surface of popular protests. I hope that by investigating these elements in historical protest performances, broader truths may be revealed about
the relationship between political power and theatricality as it is manifested in modern day events. Finally, my focus on political camping and queer camp is intended to test out my belief that historical performances have impacted and influenced more recent protests. This resonates with the ideas of theorists like Diana Taylor who suggest that traces of historical acts are transmitted throughout time in the embodied repertoire of performance traditions (Taylor 2003, 20). I will demonstrate that the political landscape is shaped by these traces of performance, and that documenting the links can help to clarify the environmental factors that create both political constraint and opportunity for protesters.

Research Context

Popular protest has been increasingly recognised for its degrees of influence and legitimacy in recent years; in the wake of both the Arab Spring and the global Occupy Movement, protest has been acknowledged for its revolutionary potential and its more general power to impact national political futures. The protests of the early War on Terror era undoubtedly possessed a power to capture the public imagination, and in some cases directly affected elite debates and subsequent legislation.² The Arab Spring uprisings against dictatorial regimes have prompted an increasing number of commentators to recognise the legitimacy of popular protest actors; furthermore, the Occupy Movement lent further credibility to such tactics through its social inclusiveness and, arguably, through the centrality of white middle class voices in its midst (Gessen and Taylor 2011). Indeed, this growing influence of protest was evidenced by Time magazine’s decision to grant its illustrious 2011 ‘Person of the Year’ title to an amorphous but inclusive person called ‘The Protester’ (Andersen 2011). This recognition was evident not only in media and popular culture, but also in the wide range of scholarly attentions given to the subject in the past few years (e.g., Bogad 2005, Brady 2012, Cockburn 2003, Hughes 2012, Spencer 2012).

However, questions remain regarding the power of protest to effect genuine political change. Perhaps more pressingly, questions also exist regarding scholars’ capacity to investigate the impact of protest with necessary levels of thoroughness and complexity. At the broadest level, disciplinary positions create vastly diverse notions of ‘efficacy’ and ‘impact’ that impart divergent value-judgments to protest outcomes. For example, a

² For details of individual politicians and debates directly impacted by protest performance, see Rowe 2013, pp. 5-6, 68, 134-140.
researcher may variously privilege markers of ideological change, sociological effects, or targeted electoral outcomes. They may also favour an analysis of the aesthetic and affective impact of protest. This results in a diverse range of analyses that combine to create a vibrant collage of potential protest efficacy and impact – but this can also create islands of research that foster relatively narrow epistemological approaches to such a vibrant and difficult-to-contain topic. As a scholar with roots in both the Arts and Social Sciences, this is an issue that is of great interest to me, and one that shapes my own approach to the study of protest. In light of this I believe it is useful to briefly outline the disciplinary contexts of Politics, Theatre and Performance Studies that provide the foundation to this study.

In studying protest, Politics scholars have tended to depict it within the broad frame of social movements, often addressing it through the overly-wide lens of Social Movement Theory, or as a fringe component of norm-creation in Constructivist International Relations. The emphasis in both of these schools is typically placed on the capacity of protest movements to attract new members, and to achieve a level of influence in the nexus of global political power structures (e.g., Finnemore and Sikkink 1998, Locher and Prugl 2001). Politics scholars, with a few exceptions (e.g., Cockburn 2006, Eschle and Maiguashca 2010) often tend to focus on those elements of protest performance that can be studied through an empirical framework, and this obscures the full vibrancy of its impact on both producers and audiences. Furthermore, Politics studies of protest almost exclusively concentrate on the impact of protest theatre on elite politicians, neglecting the potential role of the public in democratic processes (e.g., Seabrooke 2007, Sjostedt 2007). By contrast, Theatre scholars have sought to define and interpret the aesthetic and affective aspects of protest and elucidate its creative and immaterial impacts on witnesses and creators (e.g., Bell 2004, Cohen Cruz 1998, Kershaw 1992 and 1997). This approach counters the gaps in Political studies of protest, by accounting for the interactive elements of protest and the power of creative elements to achieve particular ends.

I want to suggest that both fields possess merits and oversights and would benefit from greater interdisciplinary engagement. Too often, scholars appear to seek refuge in targeted disciplinary traditions that occlude a more fully fleshed examination of political phenomena. It is my contention that interdisciplinary Theatre-and-Politics projects would provide insights to move the study of protest further than most existing
approaches. In other words, a framework that incorporates social scientific elements alongside the Theatre and Performance concerns for aesthetics, affect, and interpretive experience will potentially offer new insights regarding the means and ends of political protest. By synthesising theories of performance aesthetics and affect with theories of global political operations, we might be better placed to develop an understanding of political protest performance as a site of agency creation or ideological change.\(^3\) While this is not an entirely original suggestion, it seems that remarkably few studies of political protest have attempted to involve in-depth scholarship from both Theatre and Politics. While this is a long-term project that exceeds the scope of this thesis, I want to contextualise the following chapters as the opening gambit in a broader bid to inflate the study of protest – and indeed, political phenomena more generally – into an activity that moves across and among the Arts and Social Sciences. My long-term research aim is to expand this approach to the study of protest with an awareness of its theatrical and political legacy, through analyses of performed representations of historic protests in contemporary contexts. This would enable a better understanding of the theatrical inheritance of modern-day protest actions, based on the interpretive environment shaped by protest tactics of the past.

**Research Aims and Methodology**

To begin this exploration, this work will consider protest through a performance-oriented lens, with a social science filter applied. This means that I will be largely concerning myself with the creative and dramatic techniques of protest initiatives, and their potential impact on audiences. However, I want to situate this exploration within a sound understanding of the political and legal contexts that protest performance is staged within. This has the advantage of weighing up the potential impact of theatrical protest in the specific environment that it takes place within, including the cultural and political advantages and disadvantages that this entails. For example, distinct differences exist in the United States and United Kingdom regarding the complicated relationship of protest to notions of civic duty and citizenship. This impacts interpretations of protest due to the frames of legitimacy that surround political performances. At the same time, cultural traditions related to the perception of particular social roles can restrict the ability of those individuals to protest in a meaningful and legitimate manner.

---

\(^3\) For political theories regarding the mass public’s role in social change, see Seabrooke 2007, Sjostedt 2007.
In addition to contextualising protest performances within their respective frames of political power, we can also consider their enactment and legacy within the context of critical political philosophy. In this regard, I am locating my research within a view of efficacy that privileges the conditions for broad-minded audience interpretation over ideological persuasiveness. Put briefly, I am interested in the ways that protest performance can instantiate new modes of political awareness and engagement among the general public, outstripping the conditioned frames of thought that conventionally accompany political interactions. This requires an understanding of protest performers and audiences as subjects of political hierarchies that produce particular degrees of citizenship and non-citizenship, and attendant possibilities for political agency. On this point I turn to Giorgio Agamben's theories of the camp and operations of sovereign power. Jenny Hughes (2011) has demonstrated the applicability of Agamben's theories to War on Terror protest performances, and I extend this line of thinking below.

Agamben's conception of the Homo sacer figure and its role in upholding sovereign power is reliant on performance, as it functions primarily through the enactment of banishing for the benefit of citizen-audiences. Sovereign power is created and upheld through the performance of banishing/abandonment, and without public witnesses it would be stripped of its political impact. In the analysis to follow I conceptualise war veterans (as distinct from soldiers) as figures that reflect the sovereign power to banish or abandon, and domestic-political actors (embodied by the women of Greenham Common) as figures that serve an equivalent function in the face of the military arm of sovereign power. I will discuss in detail the way that certain theatrical devices might make incursions into these frames of regulated citizenship (and non-citizenship). In particular, Hughes has suggested a link between protest camping, queer camp aesthetics, and the state-instituted camp that provides a vital marker and source of sovereign power (Hughes 2011). I want to explicate this linkage by thoroughly examining the ways that queer camp performance in political encampments destabilises the sovereign power that Agamben imagines.

I have deliberately chosen the performances of the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common women as examples of this linkage. As I will demonstrate below, I believe that they contain traces of camp sensibilities, and that these traces have been passed down to more recent generations of protest groups comprised of veterans and women.
This assertion is drawn from recent research I've conducted among War on Terror protesters. In my field research from 2006-2012 I discovered that two of the most successful protest groups (in terms of public visibility, mediatised repetitions, citation by mainstream politicians, and reputation in the wider anti-war community) were groups that not only organised themselves as women and as soldiers, but that also deployed a high level of camp and carnivalesque performance tactics in their protest actions. My subsequent analysis of 'Code Pink' and 'Iraq Veterans Against the War' provided a full account of the women who paraded the halls of Congress in hot pink lingerie and feather boas, and the soldiers who conducted security raids on the streets of Manhattan and laid siege to the National Archives to 'protect and defend the Constitution of the United States' (Rowe 2013). The case for these groups embodying elements of camp aesthetics is suggested by their embrace of highly exaggerated character traits, parody, and overt theatricality. They are also not unique in this regard, as scholars such as Rachel Kutz-Flamenbaum have discussed similar tactics evident in groups like ‘Missile Dick Chicks’ and ‘Raging Grannies’ (2007). However, the prominence of camp sensibilities in War on Terror protest raises the question of whether these tactics were simply created spontaneously, or whether they were inspired by - and to some extent derived legitimacy from - earlier tactics by their protester forebears. In order to make the case for this latter assertion, I believe that a focus on earlier groups of protesting women and soldiers will uncover clues regarding the foundations of protest performance in the War on Terror period. This will also explicate the broader relationship between political power and protest performance that is of central concern to me.

While I am not suggesting that either the Bonus Army or Greenham Common should be broadly labeled as 'camp performance', I do contend that these protest camps contained elements of the kinds of performance that theorists have attributed to queer camp approaches. These include parody, irony, excess, frivolity, and theatricality, and my aim is to search out and explore their inclusion in the protest performances that took place within these camp sites. In the chapters below I will explore these aspects of the protests and suggest that they were potentially included in the repertoire of protest practice that continues to influence modern-day protest movements.
Chapter Structure

In Chapter One I expand on the epistemological and philosophical foundations of this study. I provide a concise literature review that details some of the most relevant performance theories and explores these in relation to the aims and intentions of this study. This begins with a review of the terminologies and concepts I will employ, and an explanation of my concept of protest efficacy. I also consider aspects of theatre historiography, and position my research within dramaturgical approaches to the study of political protest. I will also provide details of existing scholarly studies of the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common Women’s Peace Camp, and provide an overview of significant studies of protest in the War on Terror era. I then move into a discussion of Agamben’s theories of sovereign power and Homo sacer, in order to provide the background for a discussion of the ways that political encampments might impact the political phenomena he theorises. The chapter concludes with a discussion of queer camp performance and its applicability to a study of this nature.

Chapter Two begins my analysis with a discussion of the Bonus Expeditionary Forces. To further my exploration of political backdrops I first provide an account of the character of the Veteran in American cultural traditions, and discuss the restrictions and opportunities this created for members of the Bonus Army. I then discuss the protest in detail, highlighting the theatrical characterisation of veterans. I analyse several major actions that took place during the encampment, including the March to Washington, the Capitol Building Protest, and the Death March. I also examine the eviction of the Bonus Army campers and their families, and the responses this generated among the general public. In the final section I revisit theories of queer camp aesthetics and assess the extent to which the Bonus Army successfully deployed such tactics.

Chapter Three follows the same pattern with an exploration of the Greenham Common protest in the United Kingdom. Here I consider the cultural construction of women, with particular attention paid to the evolving notions of gender, war, and politics in the later Cold War era. I highlight the ways that the Greenham Common camp differed in its deployment of queer camp performance by performing essentialist feminisms and joyfulness. I specifically address the March to Greenham, the 'Embrace the Base' action, Trespassing, and Courtroom Dramas. My analysis of camp aesthetics in this protest
focuses on theories of feminist camp and its intersections with the concerns raised above regarding the logics of sovereign power.

In my conclusion I draw together the insights from my two analytical chapters to summarise key points regarding the role of theatricality in efforts to achieve political efficacy from positions of marginalisation. I review the ways in which my case studies may reveal broader truths regarding civil disobedience, protest camping and queer camp performance. Finally, I discuss some of the ways that future research might build on my suggestions of interdisciplinary Theatre-and-Politics frameworks, in order to address some of the outstanding queries that surface within the chapters below.
CHAPTER ONE: Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

This chapter will provide a discussion of key topics related to political protest encampments and the use of queer camp as a theatrical tactic to resist frames of sovereign power. Before embarking on an analysis of the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common protests, it is first necessary to elucidate some of the most important theoretical strands that underpin my own investigation.

In the first section below I contextualise my ontological and epistemological approaches within the broader fields of Drama, Theatre and Performance. This involves an explication of disciplinary terms including 'performance', 'theatricality', and 'performativity' and the ways that I understand my research to intersect with the competing usages of these words. Following this I explore approaches to Theatre History and the study of protest performances, with particular emphasis on Baz Kershaw's call for a dramaturgy of protest, and on notions of theatrical traces and ghosting. I also briefly outline the source materials I will use for my analysis of the Bonus Army and Greenham Common, and discuss some of the advantages and pitfalls of these. In the next part of this section I consider notions of protest theatre efficacy, and I outline my own assessment of this concept, drawing primarily on the work of Jacques Rancière.

This chapter then proceeds to focus on relevant studies of protest performance. This starts with an overview of existing studies of the Bonus Army and Greenham Common, which reveal key themes of their performance tactics. I then briefly discuss some of the most relevant studies of recent forms of political protest, in order to provide the necessary context for my exploration of the relevance of historical protests. I particularly emphasise theories related to civil disobedience and the vulnerability of protesters, which are both central elements in the performances of the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common Women, as well as key concerns for modern-day protesters.

In the final section of this chapter I outline the philosophical framework of my analysis, providing a brief overview of the work of Giorgio Agamben, especially his theories of the Sovereign Ban and Homo sacer. Agamben's concept of political abandonment is supplemented here with contributions from the work of Slavoj Žižek and other scholars who complicate our understanding of the domestic operations of sovereign power. I then discuss theories of protest camps and their capacity to impinge upon the ordinary
operations of sovereign power. Finally, I provide a detailed review of theories of queer camp performance, in order to underscore the applicability of these concepts to my case studies.

I. ONTOLOGICAL AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL CONCERNS

Terminologies of Theatre and Performance
To begin to situate this study within the broad fields of Drama, Theatre and Performance, it is helpful to first explore concepts of 'performance' that have influenced the field in recent years, and to articulate my own scholarly position in this regard. The word 'performance' has generated significant debate since the second half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, when innovative approaches to performance emerged and the discipline of Performance Studies was consolidated. Perhaps most notably, Richard Schechner and Victor Turner collaborated to frame performative social events as anthropological social dramas, an approach furthered by Dwight Conquergood. This vastly expanded the range of social phenomena that was considered the legitimate remit of Theatre and Performance scholars (Carlson 2008). However, this trend has complicated usages of words like 'performance' and 'theatre', and compelled scholars to define not only their terminology but their disciplinary positions. Stephen Bottoms suggests that the popularity of Performance Studies and notions of 'performance' have consequently created a dichotomy that marginalises staged theatre (2003). Ultimately, as Bottoms suggests, this may be rooted in the perception that performance, with its focus on broad social dramas, is about doing something whereas theatre is still frequently conceived of as comparatively innocuous.

At this point it is useful to explore the usage of 'theatricality' in more detail. This term is one that has attracted vastly different usages, and the divergences overlap significantly with those noted in the use of 'performance'. Uses of 'theatricality' are also coloured by the same prejudices, both cultural and intellectual, that haunt references to 'theatre' more generally. As Jonas Barish notes, references to theatre have historically been accompanied by notions of inferiority and frivolity, distinct from what is real and important (Barish 1985). Despite this, the definition of 'theatricality' is subject to various
interpretations. As Tracy C. Davis and Thomas Postlewait point out, theatricality can mean the following:

...it is a mode of representation or a style of behaviour characterized by histrionic actions, manners, and devices, and hence a practice; yet it is also an interpretive model for describing psychological identity, social ceremonies, communal festivities, and public spectacles, and hence a theoretical concept. It has even attained the status of both an aesthetic and a philosophical system. Thus, to some people, it is that which is quintessentially the theatre, while to others it is the theatre subsumed into the whole world (Davis and Postlewait 2003, 1).

These distinct definitions of 'theatricality' – the first implying overt artifice and display associated with staged theatre practice, the last hinting at the underlying artifice and display of human activity more broadly – bear a close resemblance to the deliberations over the word 'performance'. It is therefore helpful to consider the terms in conjunction with one another when defining my own position in relation to them.

For the purpose of this study, I employ the term 'performance' to refer broadly to social interactions that deliberately take place in full view of audiences, with the purpose of being watched by others. This reflects my overall sympathies with Performance Studies traditions, and the emphasis on analysing a broad range of social acts as performance; However, I do not wish to obscure the importance of theatricality, but rather to critically investigate performances with regard to specific tactics of artifice and display articulated by 'theatricality'. Furthermore, while assessments of the 'theatrical' nature of any given social performance would best be considered on a spectrum rather than as binary polarities, I believe that the innate artifice and display of contemporary politics requires a recognition of its theatricality as a defining feature. Political actors in the 20th century and beyond have responded to increasing mediatisation by becoming ever more responsive to the potential to influence audiences through overtly artificial performances. Therefore, my use of 'theatricality' gravitates toward the first definition described by Davis and Postlewait, despite the fact that the subject matter that I am addressing falls firmly into the territory of the latter definition.

Finally, it would be impossible to fully elucidate a performance approach without addressing the term 'performative', especially in the context of a study dealing with queer camp performance and performed social identities. As 'performance' becomes an
increasingly popular descriptive term to refer to dramatic and theatrical interactions, 'performative' has become an increasingly common term in the disciplinary lexicon (Bottoms 2003, 174). The usage of this word is complicated due to the popularity of Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* and her usage of 'performativity' to refer to the repetitious social construction of gender. Significantly, in this text she also referred to 'subversive repetition' and used drag as one example of this (1990). This problematically led to many scholars over-emphasizing the resistant potential of social performance, which Butler has attempted to correct in later works, particularly *Bodies That Matter* (1993). Butler has emphasised that her usage of 'performative' is derived largely from J.L. Austin's Speech Act theory and is distinct from theories of drama and performance. However, Theatre and Performance theorists frequently emphasise the capacity of various theatrical tactics to create subversive repetitions that are at least moderately capable of impacting social constructions (e.g., Diamond 1996, Reinelt 2002).

However much Butler herself disagrees with the thrust of this approach, she has not wholly dismissed it as incorrect. For example, in *Bodies That Matter* Butler discusses the shocking nature of the early ACT UP die-ins as an example of street theatre that has the power to subvert dominant constructions while avoiding recuperation. This view was also expressed in an interview in 1994:

> I think we need to pursue the moments of degrounding, when we're standing in two different places at once; or we don't know exactly where we're standing; or when we've produced an aesthetic practice that shakes the ground. That's where resistance to recuperation happens (Butler et al., 1994).

This statement would seem to support the endeavours of many scholars who seek to elucidate the aesthetic tactics that have such power to 'shake the ground'. For example, Erika Fischer-Lichte has demonstrated how the concept of performativity can be usefully extended, through her proposals for an 'aesthetics of the performative' which is built upon Austin, Butler and Max Hermann (Fischer-Lichte 2008). Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick explores the power of performatives and 'periperformatives' based on their spatial, historical and cultural contexts, and emphasises the role of the witnesses that are implied in the operation of performative utterances (2003). It therefore seems clear that performance disciplines possess ample insight that can supplement and enhance the notion of 'performativity' as it is used by Austin and Butler.
However, this disciplinary overlap on the topic can create confusion due to the widespread use of 'performative' as a general descriptive term. In answer to this conundrum, Diana Taylor suggests the following:

Although it may be too late to reclaim performative for the nondiscursive realm of performance, I suggest that we borrow a word from the contemporary Spanish usage of performance – *performatico* or *performatic* in English – to denote the adjectival form of the nondiscursive realm of performance. Why is this important? Because it is vital to signal the performatic, digital, and visual fields as separate from, through always embroiled with, the discursive one so privileged by Western logocentrism. The fact that we don’t have a word to signal that performatic space is a product of that same logocentrism rather than a confirmation that there’s no there there (2003, 6).

In order to further conversations between the Social Sciences (where speech act performativity dominates) and the Arts (with their potential to flesh out, nuance and complicate discursive performativity) I have followed Taylor's suggestion in the chapters below. I reserve 'performative' to refer to performances that to some degree instantiate what they display, and 'performatic' to refer to general performance-like conditions. I want to avoid notions of performativity that deliberately exclude associations with theatre and performance, but I feel that in order to deepen the conversation among theorists of multiple disciplines it is helpful to use terms in ways that can be readily understood by as wide an audience as possible.

**Approaches to Theatre History**

Next I want to touch briefly on theories that are relevant to my methodological approach to historical protest performances. First, I am contextualising this investigation as a strand of 'protest dramaturgy', like that advocated by Baz Kershaw. Kershaw suggests that a dramaturgy of protest can reveal the weaknesses of seemingly all-powerful political entities, and it can reveal new ways of bringing about socio-political change.

An investigation into popular protest as performance could open up useful new vistas on the changing nature of civil autonomy and desire in its articulations to political tradition, social movements and cultural histories. Moreover, as protest has become an especially significant feature of the international political map in the past fifty years, a study of its evolving dramatic principles and tendencies could indicate fresh sources of radicalism in the contemporary world (1999, 91).
Kershaw's emphasis has been on mapping the evolutionary changes to protest in the 20th century, and it is hoped that my attempts to contextualise historical protests within their legal and political frameworks will advance this agenda.

Furthermore, I hope to demonstrate the way that some theatrical tactics have been handed down from historical political performances to contemporary protesters. My contention is that the roots of modern-day protest performance strategies can be found in their historical predecessors, even where these tactics were not as obviously dominant as in their modern-day counterparts. This view of theatre history as something that lingers in the ephemeral memory of modern-day actors is given added nuance by Diana Taylor. She distinguishes between concretely recorded archival records that take the form of documents, texts, videos, or archaeological remains, and the embodied memories contained in performance gestures, movement, dance and singing (Taylor 2003, 18-20). Furthermore, the repertoires of performance memories have a significant influence on modern performances, but modern performances might also reveal something about the protests of the past:

As opposed to the supposedly stable objects in the archive, the actions that are the repertoire do not remain the same. The repertoire both keeps and transforms choreographies of meaning. [...] But even though the embodiment changes, the meaning might very well remain the same. The repertoire too, then, allows scholars to trace traditions and influences (Taylor 2003, 20).

Marvin Carlson agrees with this, in his recognition of theatre as an archive of cultural memory. However, he departs from Taylor by emphasising the way that each new performance is shaped by contemporary contexts:

Theatre, as a simulacrum of the cultural and historical process itself, seeking to depict the full range of human actions within their physical context, has always provided society with the most tangible records of its attempts to understand its own operations. It is the repository of cultural memory, but, like the memory of each individual, it is also subject to continual adjustment and modification as the memory is recalled in new circumstances and contexts (Carlson 2003, 2).

Furthermore, Carlson notes that this phenomenon can be employed to deliberately trigger certain associations on the part of audiences. He uses the term 'ghosting' to denote the process of presenting audiences with an entity that they have encountered before, which,
although presented in a new context, calls upon their previous interpretations of that entity in their interpretation of its present manifestation (2003, 7). This is important for the elements of political protest that remain similar throughout history; this is true not only of elements like marching, sign-bearing, and passive resistance, but also in less common but equally memorable elements that audiences remember from one generation to the next.

The theories discussed above point to a need to analyse the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common camps as historical performances that have lent their own traces, or ghosts, to modern-day protest. By viewing them as such we can contribute not only to a dramaturgy of earlier 20th century protest, but also draw from them to flesh out dramaturgies of protest related to War on Terror protests, the Occupy Movement, and emerging protest movements. This is an important starting point for explorations of protest efficacy, because it points up the performatic elements that have remained similar in historically distant but politically related climates.

As I have made clear in the previous chapter, my overall analysis is concerned with the existence of camp sensibilities in these two protests, and this idea was derived from the inherited repertoire that is evidenced by recent protests performances. However, I will also be relying on more concrete archival materials in order to further my analysis of specific theatrical tactics. Many of these are first-person accounts of the protests written by the protesters themselves, or those who visited and interacted with the sites. For the Bonus Army encampment I am relying heavily on the account of Walter W. Waters, the overall leader of the protest and the man responsible for negotiating with law enforcement. His autobiographical account was written in 1933, just one year after the conclusion of the Bonus march. For Greenham Common, I will be referring primarily to two first-person accounts, by Jane Liddington (1989) and Beth Junor (1995). Liddington's account, written in 1989, provides a broad depiction of the protest actions including the lead-up to the initial march and the early days of the camp. By contrast, Junor's account takes the form of a diary and focuses on the later years of the camp, from 1984-1995. I have also made use of published photographs and some video footage for both protests; although far less of these materials exist from the Bonus Army protests, the few that do remain show clear depictions of the protesters, the camps, and the vividness of the final eviction. I will also of course refer to several secondary sources written as
retrospective analyses, primarily by historians. These sources can be read alongside more recent records of protest by women and war veterans, and together this body of materials provides important clues about the performatic traces that have shaped the repertoire of protest in recent decades.

There is no doubt that each of these sources is limited by its partiality and potentially by its distance from the original performance event. However, my decision to use these materials as a basis of my analysis is prompted in part by Kershaw's avowal of the usefulness of mediatised sources for protest dramaturgy. According to him, source materials such as those crafted by the news media can provide a glimpse of which elements of a protest were considered 'newsworthy', and this signals the theatrical impact of the event (Kershaw 1999, 260). I would also suggest that the availability of internet-archived sources might indicate to some extent which aspects of protest are considered most significant by contemporary audiences, and this provides evidence for understanding the influence of historic protests in the present day.

**The Efficacy of Protest Performance**

Before going further it will be helpful to explore the notion of efficacy in protest performance. Efficacy is the subject of much controversy for theatre scholars, particularly with regard to political performance. In the first instance, a focus on efficacy sometimes seems to impose artificial distinctions between entertainment and social function, as can be found in Schechner's efficacy-entertainment braid (Schechner 1988). Additionally, as mentioned above, it runs the risk of placing an unintentional value on various modes of performance (Bottoms 2003). However, it is important to note that as a scholar aiming to blend Politics and Performance, efficacy is a central concern for me. Regardless of the chosen terminology, an investigation such as I am suggesting must privilege a concern with the socio-political outcomes of performance – though this may entail a broadening of what is considered political or efficacious in the academic field of Politics.

Secondly, efficacy is problematised with regard to the particular ways that practitioners and critics define it. Many suggest that political theatre should be assessed for efficacy on the basis of its potential to effect some kind of social change, or at least to persuade audiences to seriously consider the political viewpoints it broadcasts. This is of course a
challenging endeavour, and one that has attracted criticism for the inadequacies of associated empirical approaches. In response to this problem, Baz Kershaw posits the following:

But what if we reframe the question? What if we pay more attention to the conditions of performance that are most likely to produce an efficacious result? And what if we broaden the canvas for analysis beyond the individual show or production (but still including it) in order to consider theatrical movements in relation to local and national cultural change? (1993, 2).

These questions are at the heart of my own investigations into the Bonus Army and Greenham Common. It is my hope that by locating these performances within their specific political and cultural contexts I will be able to critically evaluate some of the elements that contributed to their political and social efficacy.

In addition to these points, I am also pursuing an investigation of efficacy that privileges the potential for performances to create greater openings for dialogue and debate – over and above any ideological goals. Throughout my own participant observation in antiwar performances over the past several years, I have come to realise the extent to which protest groups seek to foster open dialogue as a priority that precedes their ideological agenda. For activists from a wide range of organisations and backgrounds, the primary goal is to create an interpretive environment that is marked by greater freedom of thought and expanded possibilities for political and social interaction.4

This kind of efficacy can be better defined with reference to Jacques Rancière's notions of emancipated spectatorship and dissensus. The goal here is to instil in viewers the potential to contemplate subject matter in a way that is not limited by either their own pre-formed frames of reference or by the bias of performance producers. Rancière challenges notions of theatre that assume an ability on the part of producers to create 'active' or 'passive' spectators. He critiques both Brecht and Artaud for manipulating

---

4 This assertion is based on interviews and participant observation conducted with major protest organisations in six US cities, from 2007-2012. For details of their responses, see (Rowe 2013). The point is further supported by Baz Kershaw's dramaturgy of protest, in which he notes that more recent protest performance has placed an emphasis on audience interpretations, multiplicity and polyvocality, and frequently employs parodies, subversive citations, and non-linearity. It aims to show how resistance is possible, rather than seeking to achieve particular ideological or policy-related ends (1999, 105-106).
audiences in divergent ways, but failing to undo the underlying hierarchy between producers and audiences.

Although the former aims to privilege rational distancing and the latter sensual immersion, both practitioners – according to Rancière – erred in their assumptions about the audience's pre-existing capacity for critical and creative engagement. Drawing on his theory of the 'ignorant schoolmaster', Rancière suggests that theatre practitioners who attempt to spur audiences to action are wrongly assuming a binary opposition of passivity and activity, in which activity is superior. He further notes that spectators are already active because they bring their own prior perceptions and predispositions to bear on the performance. This idea of emancipated spectatorship requires an acknowledgement of the potential gap between performance producers' intentions and actual audience outcomes (Rancière 2009).

While this view underpins the philosophical approach of this study, I believe that some greater nuance is necessary when applying Rancière's theories specifically to performances of political protest. Political protest most often arises out of a desire to shape public responses in order to redress perceived lacks in social and political participation; this frequently leads to a definition of 'efficacy' that seems largely incompatible with true emancipation of spectators, as outlined above. However, drawing on my conclusions regarding modern-day protesters' desire to prioritise the creation of open-minded dialogue and debate, it is possible to examine the efficacy of political protest not for its ability to direct audience response, but for its capacity to influence to some degree the nature of spectatorship. Following Rancière's views, we can celebrate the aspects of political performance that most encourage true audience emancipation - including the acknowledgement of the pre-existing individual agency of audience members - by recognising and addressing social and political phenomena that constrain public ideas about what is possible and valid. That this in itself is reflective of particular ideological standpoints is inescapable, but the emphasis here is on identifying performatic tactics that encourage open-mindedness, nuanced consideration, and dialogic engagement among both actors and spectators, and a pathway through which to escape the foreclosing devices of dominant norms and discourses.

This approach is more thoroughly articulated through Rancière's theory of 'dissensus' (Rancière 2010). The concept originates from his definition of 'politics' as the process
whereby normally invisible and excluded aspects of society become visible and included. Rancière suggests that society is mostly regulated through an account of social subjects and their rightful relationship to one another. Through this ordering of what is valid and perceptible, political powers (which he refers to as ‘police’) delimit and regulate social categories and their political potential. Consensus comes about when such ordering and accounting-for pervades society to the point of invisibility, and laws and norms are treated as reality by the general public. Dissensus is therefore created through the counter-process of bringing to light that which is normally hidden from public perceptions (Rancière 2010).

Maurya Wickstrom refers to dissensus as a key theatrical tool for challenging dominant conceptions of humanitarianism and human rights. She notes that some actors can reveal the inadequacies and inconsistencies of political rules and norms through performances that create dissensus:

Rights are both the written, inscribed form of the rights and the rights of those who decide to both use their rights and to test and verify the written form of those rights. Political subjects in the making test the inscriptions that seem to protect equality, belonging, well-being and so on, insisting on their verification through scenes of dissensus. This doesn’t mean testing to see whether various inscriptions prove to be practically applicable, or to see whether they are ‘true’, or obeyed. It means opening assertions, predicates, inscriptions to dispute, disputes about the frames in which we see something as given. Thus, rights are what the political subject-in-the-making does not have, but which she shows that she does have. They are also rights she has that she shows she actually does not have (Wickstrom 2012, 23).

Rancière clarifies this concept with reference to the execution of Olympe de Gouges, who was executed at a time when women had not yet been granted suffrage. In the enactment of her death, she visibly demonstrated that women existed as political subjects because they could be subject to political punishment; yet at the same time, they were not political subjects because they were still denied the right to vote (Rancière 2004). The relevant point here is the potential for performance to make visible the contradictions of sovereign power through a theatrical embodiment and display of those contradictions. This is a point underscored in a different manner by Žižek, in his notion that true freedom occurs only at moments of rupture in the dominant symbolic order (1999). This is directly applicable to both the Bonus Army and the women of Greenham Common. Through performance, the denizens of both political encampments deliberately displayed their
rights, lack-of-rights, and reconfigured rights in order to create dissensus among members of the public and those in positions of power. It is this dissensus-creating potential that will provide a key benchmark of 'efficacy' in my analysis below.

Despite this broadened definition of efficacy, no discussion of political protest performance can be sufficiently rigorous without some attention paid to the voices that critique protest for its potential lack of efficacy. Many of the concerns regarding the potential efficacy of protest arise from the fear that such events may simply reinforce the hierarchical social structures that underpin the specific injustices they seek to redress. For example, Lawrence Bogad mentions that carnivalesque protests may simply reflect and reproduce hierarchy, a common suspicion levelled at Bakhtinian theories of carnival more generally (Bogad 2005, 207). The echoes of this worry can be found in some critiques of camp performance, by those who fear it simply reinforces gender stereotypes. I have already mentioned Judith Butler's hesitations on the matter of subversive repetition, and this point is underscored by Slavoj Žižek who asserts that relatively marginal performances of resistance are incapable of effecting genuine social change:

[...] this gargantuan symbolic matrix embodied in a vast set of ideological institutions, rituals and practices, is a much too deeply rooted and 'substantial' entity to be effectively undermined by the marginal gestures of performative displacement (1999, 264).

In her analysis of development-related political theatre, Wickstrom expresses similar concerns. Her study of performances that intersect with neoliberal 'human rights' projects reflects an awareness of the potential of theatre to uphold the power frames that marginalise periphery populations (Wickstrom 2012).

To my mind, the doubts raised above about political performance efficacy underscore the need for real complexity and specificity in analyses. While it is essential to understand the backdrop of power hierarchies that protest operates within, I believe that a more nuanced and practical view may highlight those facets of performance that contain the potential to subvert those hierarchies. For example, Dia Da Costa contends that although culture – and performance activism, as part of culture – exists within a web of capitalist interests and negotiations, it also exists in other ways and for other functions. She suggests that theorists should not dismiss theatre for its complicity in capitalist systems,
but rather acknowledge that performance exists and operates on multiple planes at once (2010, 629). This would involve recognising that performance functions differently for different people, and that we might deliberately conduct an analysis of its subversive or creative aspects in order to ascertain how and when those aspects are most successful.

Theorists have also taken issue with the rather purist viewpoints that foreground a need to completely negate existing frames of power. Taking a more pragmatic approach, both Bogad and Michael Balfour point out that the War on Terror was characterised by contests of narratives and counter-narratives (Balfour 2012, 34), and that this creates a rich ground for the creation and propagation of performances that make use of dominant symbolic idioms in subversive ways (Bogad 2005, 5). This point is further supported by discourse analyst Adam Hodges in his theory of 'nominative power', whereby references to subject identities by elite politicians shape those identity categories, but also create a powerful position for those subjects to speak from (Hodges 2007). Furthermore, Kershaw points out that modern capitalist societies rely largely on symbolic representations of power, and these representations are often more key to the success of the state than law and order itself (1997, 257). These views underscore the importance of symbolic representations and are equally applicable to the political contexts of the Bonus Army and Greenham Common. While they directly counter Žižek's interpretation of performative displacement, they place an emphasis on the advantages of using languages and sign systems that are familiar to audiences, in order to subsequently impact those audiences in unexpected, dissensus-creating ways.

II. THEORIES OF PROTEST PERFORMANCE

While I have already touched upon the documentary sources I will be using with regard to the Bonus Army and Greenham Common, it is useful to begin this section with a review of the theoretical treatments these protest performances have garnered in recent years. This will provide a detailed context for my own research, and underscore the originality of my theoretical contribution.

To start with, the Bonus Army has received surprisingly little attention in any discipline, despite the vividness of its denouement. Interestingly, the few scholars who do address this historic protest have tended to emphasise its role in the social construction of political agency. For example, Jennifer D. Keene uses the Bonus March as evidence that military
conscription during the First World War led to the creation of veterans as a distinct political class possessing a thorough understanding of the social contract (Keene 2001). In a similar vein, Stephen R. Ortiz asserts that the Bonus Expeditionary Forces contributed to the development of veterans as an active political force in American society, largely in reaction to the constraints placed upon them by federal policies (Ortiz 2006). Lucy G. Barber discusses the Bonus Army within the broader context of political marches on Washington, citing their 1894 inspirational forerunners, Coxey's Army (Barber 2004). All three of these scholars provide contextual details that underscore the significance of the Bonus Army with regard to the construction of sovereign power and citizenship – and they also hint at ways that the performatic acts of veterans as veterans hold the potential to undo dominant conceptions of these categories. At issue here is the way that political marginalisation might be countered through repertoric performances by those who are marginalised; when veterans become politically restricted by the processes and logics of sovereign authority, this can conversely reaffirm the collective identity that provides them with a means to creatively seek political agency.

In the case of the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp, scholarly inquiries have been largely pursued by feminist theorists. In particular, researchers have grappled with the apparent essentialist-feminist character of the camp, while also considering its transgressive potential with regard to audience impact. Several studies have revealed the way that particular performatic tactics have helped to break down perceived barriers between military and civilian spheres. Christine Sylvester has shown how the Greenham Common women called into question the boundaries between public and private spheres, and subsequently exploded notions about the locations where 'international relations' operates. By adorning the base's fence with tea sets and other home artefacts, protesters inserted views of human life and domesticity into the landscape of military power (1994). In a similar fashion, Margaret Laware asserts that Greenham Common participants challenged the existence of the military base through strategic feminist rhetoric that:

...exploits the past; …it is parasitic, it adapts, reframes, juxtaposes, associates, satirises, reverses, ridicules, and appropriates dominant discourse, using and misusing every means by which meanings are corrupted and contested (Laware 2004, 25).

5 Indeed, the Bonus Expeditionary Forces were not the first major march on Washington, nor the first group of veterans to attempt to camp out on the Mall to demand attention to their grievances. In 1894, at the peak of an earlier national economic depression, a group of unemployed Civil War veterans was led by Jacob Coxey. They demanded federal creation of jobs through public-works programmes such as road-building – a fascinating precursor to the federal policies that would be enacted during the Great Depression. For details see Schwantes 1985.
Importantly, Laware emphasises the fact that this anti-militaristic rhetoric was embodied, as protesters’ physical bodies were used in symbolic actions against the base. The combination of Sylvester's discussion of visual props alongside Laware's discussion of language suggests that the impact of Greenham Common was highly performatic and should be analysed as such. As playwright Lucy Kirkwood, author of Tricycle Theatre's Greenham Common play, Bloody Wimmin, notes:

So what they were attempting to do, what the fence-cutting and courtroom singing and making faces at armed soldiers and weaving webs into the perimeter fence, all those things that might appear frivolous and silly and laughable and maybe a bloody nuisance but certainly not getting the silly cows anywhere, what all this amounted to was an attempt to coin a new language. They sought to operate outside the Westminster boys' dens of leather and oak, and the established power residing therein (Kirkwood 2010).

What these observations make clear is, first, that sovereign power operates in unique ways when the military sphere is brought into the picture. I will expand on this below in my discussion of Agamben, but here it is sufficient to point out that scholars have noted the camp's potential to undermine sovereignty's own removal from the messy and amorphous sphere of 'the domestic', in both social and political senses of that word. Secondly, these accounts hint at the power of protest performance to enact new modes of language – both verbal and non-verbal – that have the potential to rework existing frames of power.

In light of my assertion that the Bonus Army and Greenham Common are important for understanding modern-day protest, it is helpful to briefly discuss the characteristics of recent protest performances and the critical approaches scholars have taken in studying them. The trends and tactics identified in these more recent protests will provide clues about the kinds of ghosts and traces we might seek in their historical predecessors.

Theatre scholarship has a long history of engagement with political drama, both as aesthetic reflections of political circumstances and as a tool for political change. Studies have clearly encompassed a broad range of theatrical tactics and subject matter. However, there is a sense among researchers that the post September 11th era initiated an important shift in the interpretive environment that political theatre takes place within, and the subsequent protest tactics that evolved. This has resulted in a number of
important studies that outline the function and potentialities of performance in the age of a global war on terrorism. (Hughes 2011, Spencer 2012) Political protest after 9/11 became theatricalised in an almost unprecedented manner. This was partly due to technological advances in internet communications and social media networks, but I have argued elsewhere that it was also a necessary response, particularly in the United States, to the increased social circumscription of subjectivity brought about by the elite response to 9/11 and the branding of dissent as disloyal or unpatriotic (Rowe 2013). By performing with overt theatricality, political protesters were able to 'disarm' audiences that were largely inclined to label political dissent as unpatriotic and wholly inappropriate in the post-9/11 environment.\(^6\)

Most importantly for the contextualisation of this study, a number of recent works have critically assessed the capacity of protest performance to undo the War on Terror frames of power. For example, Jenny Spencer has discussed the inadequacy of many theatrical responses to 9/11 and 7/7 that reproduce real-life stories. She questions their complicity within the existing political power structures upon which the War on Terror was propagated (2012). Jenny Hughes suggests the need for protests that undermine rather than reify the operations of sovereign power in the age of global terrorism (2011). It is also worth noting that a small number of Politics scholars have concerned themselves with performance and its capacity to resist dominant post 9/11 constructions of global relations. For example, Cynthia Weber has assessed Hollywood cinema's depictions of international relations and their tendency to reinforce War on Terror politics (2005). Others have attempted to grapple with drama theory to understand the social function of stories of terrorism and war (e.g., Bleiker and Chou 2009, Odysseos 2001, Sylvester 2003).

Theatre scholarship has provided a wealth of treatments of political protest, but for the purpose of this study I want to momentarily focus on civil disobedience and protester vulnerability. This is because, as stated earlier, I wish to explore the legal and political context that surrounds and informs the performances of the Bonus Army and Greenham Common. Civil disobedience, with its written and unwritten rules and its long heritage as a socially sanctioned form of protest, provides a medium that can be fully explored with
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\(^6\) The word 'disarm' here is deliberately chosen with full cognizance of its dual meanings: first, post-9/11 protesters aimed to charm audiences and divest them of any preconceived animosity; secondly, they aimed to strip them of the discursive and performatic weapons normally levied at antiwar actors – this was achieved through strategically scripted performances that intended to complicate notions of patriotism, citizenship, and sacrifice prior to any ideological aims. In interviews conducted with protest groups including Codepink, Veterans for Peace, and Iraq Veterans Against the War, 'disarm' was frequently used to describe their overriding agenda regarding audience impact.
regard to the frames of power and norms that both restrict and enable it. In the chapters to follow I will expand on the particular frames that civil disobedience operated within in each historical protest; in this section the focus is on a general philosophical overview of the tactic.

The very act of defining 'civil disobedience' is somewhat fraught with ideological dilemmas, due to controversies surrounding the shadowy borders of legitimate and illegitimate political disobedience. John Rawls asserted that legitimate civil disobedience must be public, non-violent, and accepting of legal and political consequences (1971). Joseph Raz provided a more open definition, requiring only that civil disobedience enact the public transgression of a law in order to petition for redress of an unjust law, rule, norm or policy (1979). However, Kimberly Brownlee notes that this definition too is incomplete, because in its focus on law-breaking and policy-changing it overlooks civil disobedience that may be targeted at non-governmental institutions (2012). Brownlee then goes on to define civil disobedience according to its conscientious intent, which is evidenced, she suggests, by communicative acts that render the disobedience both persuasive and overtly conscientious. While this account has its pitfalls (primarily in failing to account for the possibility of spontaneous moral epiphanies, like those claimed by many Conscientious Objectors), it does point out the way that judgments of legitimacy in civil disobedience are tightly entwined with performance. Brownlee's reference to communicative acts invites performance-oriented accounts of the theatricality of disobedience and the results of this on judgments of conscientiousness.

Also at issue with performances of civil disobedience is whether they can effectively challenge the structures of sovereign power since they inherently operate within those power structures themselves. For example, Hannah Arendt emphasised the collective nature of civil disobedience and its power to build a sense of a dissenting community, but she contextualised this as a necessary component of healthy democracies (1970). This raises troubling questions regarding how effective civil disobedience can be if participants are seeking to overturn core characteristics of Western liberal democracy – no matter how much movement-building momentum and ideological solidarity is produced, it may be the case that civil disobedience simply provides a voluble but already-accounted-for outlet for minority viewpoints.
We can also complicate understandings of civil disobedience performance by considering displays of vulnerability within such actions. Civil disobedience is generally at its most powerful when the vulnerability of the perpetrator is emphasised. While political disobedience can take many forms, including riots, uprisings and simple willful lawbreaking, it is my assertion that the performances of disobedience that prove most effective in generating potential social change are those that highlight the risks involved to the individuals committing such acts. I want to emphasise that this is not a distinction between non-violent and violent civil disobedience; for me, the important distinction between, for example, the student riots in the UK in 2011 and the protests of the Civil Rights era is not in the degree of violence embraced or rejected by civilian participants - rather, the more important distinction is the degree to which participants put themselves at bodily physical risk and appeared to be at the mercy of law enforcement. Indeed, we can find historical instances from around the globe in which violent disobedient acts are witnessed with an awareness of the risk they cause to perpetrators; one needs look no further than rock-throwing Palestinians or the more aggressive agitators of Tahrir Square. In other cases, non-violence can fall flat with public audiences when it appears that protesters are simply creating a public nuisance and hassling overstretched law enforcement.

Some theorists conclude that the tremendous affective impact of vulnerability leads to an imperative for activists to highlight this characteristic in their protest. For example, Brian Doherty discusses the methods that activists might use to 'manufacture' their own vulnerability (1999). While this is an important notion for producers of political protest, it is a concept worthy of further sophistication in order to understand its full applicability. It is first essential to recognise the dynamics of political interaction that create vulnerability for participants outside of their own willful actions. At issue here is the fact that many instances of civil disobedience originate spontaneously, without extensive opportunities for protesters to plan their methods of performance – and this was certainly the case with some of the actions in my two case study performances. Even in situations where this pre-planning does occur, the term 'manufactured vulnerability' places most emphasis on civil disobedience actions in which protesters deliberately and cynically cloak themselves in powerlessness for the purpose of visibility; the danger here is that this might overlook or underestimate the vulnerability that many political subjects experience in the face of sovereign power. For example, suffragettes highlighted their vulnerability
through performatic means, but that should not suggest that they were not already physically and socially vulnerable in the political context they lived in everyday. Likewise, participants in the American Civil Rights movement of the 20th century should not be regarded as subjects who needed to create vulnerability where it did not exist – instead they found creative ways to make that vulnerability visible in unexpected places.

Even in more recent times, as we have seen in reactions to Occupy disobedience, political subjects are innately vulnerable to sovereign power and its ability to level punishments ranging from eviction to imprisonment to pepper spray. What I am suggesting here is the importance of considering theatrical displays of vulnerability more so than the manufacturing of vulnerability. Of interest to this study is the way that some theatrical tactics can display imposed vulnerability in a manner that creates an attitude of dissensus for public audiences; this may include heightening the depiction of protesters' vulnerability, but the emphasis is on revealing the existing frames of power and risk rather than creating those frames anew. This again has the advantage of foregrounding the political and historical context of each protest and the ways that cultural forces of the time shaped the vulnerability experienced, and performed by, protesters. It also connects to the vulnerability that is imposed on some categories of political subjects by sovereign powers – as will be shown below in a fuller discussion of Agamben's theories, sovereign power functions on the basis of its ability to create vulnerability for some groups of subjects more than others.

This importance of vulnerability in political performance is further demonstrated by Judith Butler in her discussions of precariousness and dispossession (Butler 2004, 2013). Butler's work is particularly relevant here due to her extensive commentary on modern-day protests and the impact that displays of vulnerability might have on contemporary political interactions. Her discussions of vulnerability have been partly derived from her participation in the Occupy Movement, and as such they offer insights into the operations of vulnerability that we might look for in historical protests. For Butler, an apprehension of vulnerability can create a more positive or socially just relation with others. Butler asks:
Could the experience of a dislocation of First World safety not condition the insight into the radically inequitable ways that corporeal vulnerability is distributed globally? (2004, 30).

In other words, experiencing vulnerability can destabilise comfortable assumptions regarding personal and political security in modern-day, Western, liberal democratic societies. By coming to know a sense of loss or risk or hurt, individuals might be more inclined to take note of the unevenness of security and vulnerability on a much broader political scale. Furthermore, Butler suggests that displays of vulnerability – or precarity – are key elements of political protest that have a unique power derived from their characteristics of bodily risk:

Bodies on the street are precarious—they are exposed to police force, and sometimes endure physical suffering as a result. But those bodies are also obdurate and persisting, insisting on their continuing and collective "thereness"… (Butler in Puar 2012, 168).

However, it also seems likely that some displays of vulnerability might risk reproducing the hierarchies of political power that are already present in society; to use Butler's own terminology, I am suggesting that not all displays of vulnerability have the potential to 'shake the ground' in a way that truly dislocates existing norms of security and insecurity. In many cases, protesters may simply reinforce notions of powerful state forces and the futility of citizen protest. This reinforces the need to consider specific performances of vulnerability for their potential to create dissensus-based efficacy. It also suggests a need to understand what kinds of displays of vulnerability might be most effective in particular circumstances.

As an example, one of the most effective tactics for revealing vulnerability is often the strategy of non-response. Susan Leigh Foster describes how the Civil Rights lunch counter protesters undertook detailed training in order to be able to resist reacting to provocations, even when faced with the use of physical force against them (2003). This tactic has since become a constant within the broader repertoire of non-violent protest in general. It is certainly an illustrative example of displayed vulnerability, but it is worthwhile to consider how non-response differs from other forms of vulnerability (such as locking oneself to government buildings or using one's body to obstruct public property). Significantly, non-response is successful because it emphasises the
vulnerability of protesters while forcing those in positions of power to improvise their own response. When protesters simply refuse to act in the face of sovereign commands and threatened reprisals, they place the burden of acting on law enforcement. Thus, audience response is perhaps more acutely impacted by the actions of law enforcement than by the protesters themselves. This differs from other displays of vulnerability because of the degrees of political complicity that are imposed on law enforcement and onlookers. Whereas other performances of vulnerability too closely reflect the frames of power and struggle that many protesters wish to subvert, some enactments of non-response might offer a tactic to opt-out of the sovereign-citizen dichotomy, obliging both law enforcement and onlookers to consider hitherto unthought-of options.

This demonstrates the need to analyse not just the performance of vulnerability, but the theatricality with which it is performed and the way that multiple subjects become positioned as ‘actors’. In order to interrogate historical performances of vulnerability for their capacity to challenge dominant orderings of power and exclusion, it seems essential to consider the complexities of political protests as they are enacted in public spaces in improvised and interactive performances. By analysing apparently disparate historical examples alongside one another, it is hoped that some insights will be revealed regarding the complex interactions that occur when vulnerability becomes a deliberately performed characteristic. In the chapters that follow I will compare the Bonus Army and Greenham Common Women's performances of civil disobedience in detail. As I will demonstrate, each camp possessed a unique characterisation that impacted the protesters' effective uses of the tactic. In both sites the vulnerability of the actors became a key focus of public debates, and this warrants a thorough examination of the theatrical tactics used to depict this vulnerability.

III. PHILOSOPHIES OF POLITICAL CAMPING AND CAMP

In this final section I will expand on the philosophical framework that I am employing in my analysis, and the complementary performatic tactics that Greenham Common and the Bonus Army illustrate. Although there are several bodies of philosophical work that could provide an effective grounding for my exploration of political power and activist responses, I have chosen to couch my analysis in the theories of Giorgio Agamben.
There are several reasons for this: First, Agamben offers an account of power that details the interactive and co-constitutive roles of individuals on three sides of the citizenship-sovereign divide: above, below and without. This in my opinion is a central area of concern for political protest, because its efficacy depends on the active participation of both protesters and law enforcement figures, as well as the (relatively) passive observance of audience members. Second, Agamben's work has received a great deal of attention from scholars in both the Arts and Social Sciences and this makes it easier to bridge the concerns and insights of these two fields in the context of this study. Finally, due to the convenient homonymic nature of the English word 'camp', Agamben's notion of the philosophical political camp invites comparisons with physical protest camps as well as with queer camp aesthetics. This is a comparison already suggested by Jenny Hughes (2011), and I believe that the examples of Greenham Common and the Bonus Army provide apt illustrations for the unpacking of this linkage. As will be shown, the various referents of 'camp' not only share a common linguistic signifier; they also overlap in their social and political functions.

In this section I will first provide an account of Agamben's relevant concepts, with particular attention paid to his interpretation of the sovereign ban, bare life, and Homo sacer. I will also discuss ways that his ideas can be supplemented and sophisticated by contributions from a variety of social theorists. I will then proceed to discuss two key aspects of the Bonus Army and Greenham Common performances that offer performatic challenges to the political constraints he outlined: political encampment and aesthetic camp.

It would be impossible for a study of this length to provide a full account of Agamben's theories of the State of Exception and the operation of sovereign power in the present age. However, to summarise, his work starts from a consideration of Foucault's biopolitics, the regulation of all facets of human life (bios) as opposed to prior models of sovereign power that simply exerted control over existence and non-existence (zoe). Agamben quickly moves away from Foucault by suggesting a more complex relationship between biopower and sovereignty. In his view, sovereign powers create and regulate both bios and zoe subjects and rely on the production of these categories for their own existence. In this respect, Agamben develops the notion of Homo sacer to designate an individual – or group – that is the subject of abandonment and is placed outside the realm of the polis; this is not to suggest that they are no longer under the control of sovereign power or
sovereign law, but rather that they only exist as the embodiment of their exclusion. In Agamben’s theories, the Homo sacer is relegated to a status of bare life, or zoe, whereas those remaining within the polis are bios, or biopolitical subjects (Agamben 1995).

Agamben believes that modern Western civilisations are under a perpetual state of emergency or State of Exception, in which sovereign power has been invoked to suspend-yet-retain the law. However, although the State of Exception has the potential to produce bare life throughout the polis as a whole, in this study I propose to consider particular political subjectivities as especially representative of the Homo sacer-producing ban. This approach is supported by theorists who call into question the degree to which the State of Exception truly applies. For example, Ernesto Laclau feels that Agamben moves too quickly from a description of some extreme instances of policy-making (whether that be examples from Auschwitz or the American War on Terror policies regarding captured combatants) to an assumption of quasi-totalitarian governance. Allowing for the manifestation of the sovereign ban and the resulting relationships of bios and zoe within pluralistic democratic societies necessitates a view of Homo sacer that is less binary and more open to potential change (Laclau 2007, 18). Furthermore, as William E. Connolly notes,

Biocultural life exceeds any textbook logic because of the nonlogical character of its materiality. It is more messy, layered, and complex than any logical analysis can capture. The very illogicalness of its materiality ensures that it corresponds to no design, no simple causal pattern, no simple set of paradoxes (2007, 31).

Along similar lines, Žižek suggests that the figure of Homo sacer can be constituted by the different treatment experienced by individuals in varying circumstances. While they may possess certain rights or degrees of citizenship in one context, that position can be equally threatened in another. War veterans are a prime example of this, as they simultaneously have the potential to embody sovereign authority, and also to experience severe restrictions on their individual political agency:

The distinction between those who are included in the legal order and Homo sacer is not simply horizontal, a distinction between two groups of people, but more and more also the ‘vertical’ distinction between the two (superimposed) ways of how the same people can be treated (2002, 32).
Žižek suggests this applies to all citizens, but in the chapters below I will explore how it applies in a heightened fashion to two political characters.

In addition, both Laclau and Connolly suggest that sovereign power in contemporary democracies cannot operate without some regard to public sentiment (Laclau 2007; Connolly 2007). If totalitarianism is not in effect, then the demos is still operative to some degree, albeit potentially muted through a variety of means. Crucially, Connolly notes that public sentiment about political participation shapes the ethos in which sovereignty is deployed, and '[…] a change in ethos, which forms a critical component in the complexity of sovereignty, alters the course of sovereignty' (2007, 38). This brings us directly back to the need to identify performances that can undermine dominant frames of political power and political vulnerability, and their related conceptions of political participation, particularly in the context of excluded, or banned, subjectivities. In light of these observations, and referring back to the discussion above regarding political vulnerability, some subjects are undoubtedly more vulnerable to marginalisation and ‘abandonment’ than others, so it seems logical to analyse their political performances to ascertain their strategies for operating within a State of Exception.

For the purpose of this thesis I am most concerned with Agamben’s notion of the political camp as a site that legitimises and makes evident the operation of sovereign power. Importantly, Agamben conceives of the political camp as both a literal and a figurative site that reveals the operation of sovereign power when the State of Exception begins to become the rule. This occurs through the visible exclusion of Homo sacer to a realm where they might be eradicated without being granted legal subjectivity (i.e., they may be ‘killed but not sacrificed’) (1995). This harkens back to Rancière’s discussion of de Gouges and her simultaneous possession and non-possession of rights, and when considered in this light the political camp invites explorations of its dissensus-creating potential. With this in mind, I turn now to an exploration of the subversive potential of protest camp performances. In later chapters I will expand on the particular ways that the Bonus Army and Greenham Common women enacted displays of their own rights and vulnerability to sovereign power. However, both protests shared the tactic of physical camping and I want to briefly explore the ways that camping underscores notions of political vulnerability and potentially creates greater audience awareness of the possibility for political change. Here, I focus on some general theories that elucidate the impact of protest camps on audiences.
To begin with, several theorists have expounded on the ways that the physical geography of camp sites impacts audience response. Susan Leigh Foster describes their potential to create 'interference' by placing physical obstacles in the path of everyday citizens. She suggests that this overt physicality is particularly effective in the present age of online activism and dwindling community gatherings (2003). Michael Balfour agrees with this assessment in his discussion of the theatrical impact of Ultimate Holding Company's *This is Camp X-Ray*. Speaking of the installation's ability to demand viewers' consideration of the realities of the War on Terror, Balfour states:

> While such a request may be denied or accepted, it troubled us by intruding on the normalcy of our everyday life, even if we were only going to pick some thing up from the supermarket, or on our way home from work. It sets up a connection that is difficult to ignore (2012, 35).

Furthermore, many scholars have commented on the ways that protest camping challenges spatial boundaries and subsequently calls into question notions of who and what 'belong' in certain spaces. Sophie Nield suggests that one of the lasting impacts of theatrical protest relates to the ways that spaces are reinterpreted in its aftermath. According to her, protests can call into question the possibilities of what can and cannot occur in particular spaces, and this can have broader effects on political perspectives (2006, 54). Similarly, Christine Sylvester has discussed the way that camps like Greenham Common can destabilise the security-based domains that are set out and regulated by elite political forces. Specifically, enacted homelessness can reveal another sense of homelessness related to the some groups' lack of agency within debates on international security policies (Sylvester 1994).

One key to success for protest camps can be to strategically perform in ways that make these contradictions of security and homelessness visible to the general public. George McKay uses excerpts from participant Jane Lockwood's diary to describe how Greenham Common's crudely constructed shelters constituted a rich living space that rivaled the domestic sphere they had left behind. According to Lockwood, this underscored the inadequacies of the 'real world' and the need to transform it – and this was made evident both to protesters and, potentially, to the wider public (McKay 1998, 28).
Finally, I want to point out two potential pitfalls of protest camps, which in my view suggest the need to consider other levels of their theatricality in order to assess potential efficacy. First, Lawrence Bogad discusses the potential for camping to become a stale tactic, particularly as the method is repeated over time or throughout multiple locations (2005). This is particularly relevant with regard to the ongoing legacy of earlier protest camps like the Bonus Army and Greenham Common; while individual members of the Occupy Movement may possess varying degrees of awareness of these particular forerunners, there exists a widespread notion of encampment as a well-established and well-understood protest tactic. This can result in an overuse of camping that renders it less impactful – in the words of Saul Alinsky, 'a tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag' (1971, 128). Furthermore, Jenny Hughes echoes concerns regarding protesters' unintentional reinforcement of dominant frames of power, with particular insights for producers of protest camps. She discusses the way that some protest camps simply make visible the violent effects of sovereign power in a prolonged but unchanging contest. They become a performance of a competition for legitimacy, but the frames of power remain unchanged in a 'closed cycle of verification'. Most significantly, she suggests queer camp aesthetics as a means of undoing this inertia (Hughes 2011, 145).

Having established some of the ways that physical protest camps might challenge normative displays of sovereign power, we can now explore how queer camp aesthetics within these camps can provide even greater subversive potential. As noted in the account above, theatrical tactics that create dissensus can allow or even compel audiences to imagine new possibilities outside of the frames of sovereign power, and this is particularly important when considering common elements of protest performance like encampments and vulnerability. Because any given protest is marked by a dynamic and complex collage of theatrical tactics, it is helpful to narrow my investigation to one particular area. I feel that a focus on queer camp is relevant here, because it intersects with many of the concerns outlined above. Queer camp performance is linked with the development of Butler's theories of subversive repetition (Butler 1990, Lloyd 2007). In addition, some writings on camp resonate strongly with Rancière's discussions of the nature of politics and the need to disrupt consensus-generating processes. Particularly when queer camp is conceived as a performatic bid for the visibility of normally excluded subjectivities, it can be understood as concurrent with political dissensus (e.g., Meyer 1994, Robertson 1999,
Ross 1999). In other words, when protest is enacted with camp theatricality, it may be better suited to resisting the replication of dominant hierarchies of power and exclusion described by Agamben, and also better suited to creating audience dissensus that 'shakes the ground' of political norms.

It is my contention that degrees of camp aesthetics can be located in both the Bonus Army and Greenham Common encampments – and in my estimation these elements of queer camp were not simply influential in their historical contexts, but were also transmitted into the performatic repertoire that was imparted to future generations of women and veteran protesters. My argument is therefore that these two case studies contain aspects of the kind of queer performance that came to the fore in anti-War on Terror protests. As noted above, these elements should not be considered as definitive of these historic protests’ overall tone or content. However, they do demonstrate the earlier existence of camp aesthetics in particular historical and social contexts. We can then extrapolate from these examples in order to make the case for queer camp protest tactics being present in the toolboxes of activists long before the current post-9/11 context.

In order to facilitate such an exploration, it is useful to first explore the elements of theatricality that contribute to a general understanding of 'camp' (while recognising the impossibility and inadvisability of a fixed definition). Fabio Cleto excavates the origins of 'camp' to discover that the term was used as Victorian slang to refer to 'actions and gestures of exaggerated emphasis... used chiefly by persons of exceptional want of character' (Cleto 1999, 2). Historical value judgments aside, this reference to 'want of character' is perhaps more resonant with import than the dictionary author intended.

Camp functions as a performative strategy that can complicate socially-regulated identity categories, or 'characters'; this is an important tool for individuals who find themselves in identity-derived positions of social or political marginalisation. The ability to deliberately perform 'characters' with exaggeration or mimicry can provide a powerful destabilising critique against such power hierarchies (Cleto 1999, Robertson 1999).

One of the challenges in evaluating the camp qualities of performance arises from the difficulty of delineating its defining features. Sontag described camp as a sensibility characterised by a failed seriousness, a love of exaggeration and artifice, the privileging of style over content, and an awareness of the double sense in which acts can be interpreted (1999). Ester Newton described camp as an emphasis on surface matters.
over core content, its 'dramatic form', and its depiction of 'being as playing a role' (1999). Jack Babuscio highlighted its characteristic irony, aestheticism, theatricality, and humour (1999). Moreover, camp performances do not necessarily require deliberate embrace of these characteristics. Indeed as Sontag notes, unintentional camp offers an equally serious challenge to social norms (1999).

It is also important to recognise that camp can be an effective performance tactic for a diverse range of performers and social identities. Moe Meyer expresses the way that the subversive potential of camp lies in its linkage with queer attitudes of performance:

What 'queer' signals is an ontological challenge that displaces bourgeois notions of the Self as unique, abiding, and continuous while substituting instead a concept of the Self as performative, improvisational, discontinuous, and processually constituted by repetitive and stylized acts. [...] The queer label contains a critique of a more vast and comprehensive system of class-based practices of which sex/gender identity is only a part (1994, 2).

Esther Newton furthers this point:

Masculine-feminine juxtapositions are, of course, the most characteristic kind of camp, but any very incongruous contrast can be campy. For instance, juxtapositions of high and low status, youth and old age, profane and sacred functions or symbols, cheap and expensive articles are frequently used for camp purposes. Objects or people are often said to be campy, but the camp inheres not in the person or thing itself but in the tension between that person or thing and the context or association (1999, 103).

Cleto elucidates the ways that these juxtapositions operate. He notes that 'deliberate camp' derives its power from,

the very act of performance, intentionally, and paradoxically so, producing a failure of seriousness, acknowledging its 'essence' in the unnatural, in the inessential and the contingent... (1999, 24).

These observations underscore the radical potential of 'deliberate camp' to pose challenges to political norms. In other words, when protest campers (either intentionally or unintentionally) employ camp aesthetic tactics they might have the capacity to destabilise norms by revealing political contradictions, tensions and unnaturalness.
While interpretation of the characteristics and function of camp have varied tremendously among theorists, the core markers noted above are key to understanding the potential of queer political camp performance to subvert dominant hierarchies. This will be demonstrated in greater detail in the following chapters, but before continuing I want to point out some of the general ways that theories of camp aesthetics intersect with the implications of Agamben's camp and Homo sacer.

First, it is necessary to expand on my interpretation of both the veterans of the Bonus Army and the women of the Greenham Common Peace Camp as reflective of Homo sacer subjectivity. I am drawing on Žižek's notions here regarding the potential applicability of this category to a vast range of political subjects. For Žižek, we are all subject to potential exclusion at the hands of sovereign power, with its ability to deprive groups or individuals of their full humanity (2002). While at first glance it may seem a theoretical stretch to conceive of women and veterans as examples of the Homo sacer logic, I maintain that both embodied significant degrees of exclusion or 'abandonment' due to their unique political circumstances vis a vis the geopolitical surroundings they operated within. The specific extent to which they embodied Agamben's concept will be explored in more detail in the following chapters, in the context of the performances that both shaped and expressed their characters; here, I simply make the case for the ways that women and veterans have been excluded and deprived of full agency in the context of 20th century political protest.

Although soldiers are typically associated with sovereign power, being a powerful embodiment of that power and complicit in its actions both domestically and internationally, the figure of the war veteran requires a different interpretation. Particularly in the United States, military veterans are the subject of extensive curtailments to their pre-existing civilian rights, and this combines with the physical, psychological and financial impact of war experience to leave them in a position of extreme political marginalisation. For example, military regulations continue to apply to ex-soldiers even when they have not been on active duty for many years, and rules explicitly restrict these individuals from voicing political opinions.7 While some veterans may choose to continue their embodiment of sovereign power by upholding sovereign authority and emphasising their former sacrificial duty, those inclined to alternative

7 See the Uniform Code of Military Justice for details of these restrictions, including prohibitions against political speech after the completion of wartime service (US Government. Uniform Code Of Military Justice).
viewpoints are stripped of their political agency. This begins to bring veterans into the realm of Homo sacer, because they are designated as beings who are outside the normal laws of society. The rule of law regulates their social and political position, but they are not granted the same full rights as ordinary citizens. In this sense they possess a greater degree of vulnerability to sovereign power, which can be imposed upon them in the form of imprisonment, curtailment of salary and benefits, and alterations to their ‘honourable discharge’ status.

The Greenham Common women might also be considered reflective of the Homo sacer figure, but in a very different way. To start with, the category of ‘woman’ has historically provided a basis for political marginalisation rooted in social gender constructions and attendant notions of inequality. This does not simply furnish an abstract cultural basis for exclusion; it also produces concrete practical outcomes with regard to access to political institutions and degrees of influence therein. This inequality becomes even more apparent in the context of the military base, an area heavily dominated by constructions of masculinity and largely stripped of the symbols of reproductive life and humanity. The military base is a manifestation of sovereign power but it exists as a site of exception, being already closed-off and separated from the polis and representative of the sovereign power to suspend legal norms and the rights of citizens. It contributes significantly to the strict delineation of the domestic, political and military spheres, and citizens are therefore deprived of their full rights and humanity there. Furthermore, on the military base, life is stripped of its individuality and humanity and also denied its usual claim to most rights. The bare life that exists within the military sphere varies in important ways from the bare life of the polis, but this is largely outside the scope of the present study. What is important is that because of the unique legal characteristics of the military base as a zone of exception, the women who sought to exercise their full citizenship in its environs were limited in their political, cultural and legal legitimacy. In this way the Greenham Common women drew on two manifestations of political vulnerability, one derived from their gendered social status and another from the invisibility and powerlessness imposed on citizens within the military sphere.

Despite these positions of marginality, some theorists have revealed how Agamben’s conception of Homo sacer provides some space for potential resistance to sovereign

---

8 One particularly relevant study on the bare life of the military sphere is The Scripting of Private Jessica Lynch: Biopolitics, Gender, and the “Feminization” of the US Military (Pin-Fat and Stern, 2005)
power. Laclau notes that the sovereign ban that creates Homo sacer is complex in its deployment and repercussions. Those who are designated as Homo sacer can subsequently form their own self-governing collective group (2007, 14-15). As suggested above with reference to war veterans, this speaks to the possibility for banned subjects to create powerful performances that are rooted in their own sense of self-identity and their own sense of laws and norms. In a mediatised democratic environment, the counter-authority that develops as a result of the sovereign ban can be a starting point for powerful performances of resistance. As Laclau describes it,

Here we have actors who are entirely outside of the law of the city, who cannot be inscribed in any of the categories of the latter, but such an exteriority is the starting point for a new collective identification opposed to the law of the city (2007, 14).

Others have hinted at the theatrical underpinnings of sovereign authority and abandonment. William Connolly describes sovereign authority as 'sustained through the mystique of the sacred' (2007, 24). This is particularly apt to an exploration of camp aesthetics that attempt to blur the boundaries between the sacred and the profane, and make social masks apparent. Jenny Edkins' work underscores the potential relevance of queer camp practices, because she expresses concerns regarding the ability of identity-based social movements to counter sovereign frames:

Such politics rely on the drawing of lines or the making of distinctions similar to those drawn by sovereign power. As such, they form part of the same logic, a logic of sovereignty that separates this and that according to their supposedly distinct qualities. Sovereign power is happy to negotiate the boundaries of the distinctions that it makes; what it could not tolerate would be the refusal to make any distinctions of this sort (2007, 76).

Edkins notes that Agamben himself has called for a new 'ontology of potentiality' in the face of these challenges (2007, 76). As shown above, camp performances have the potential to destabilise the logics of sovereignty, not by inverting or supplanting them but by demonstrating the fundamental impossibility of such distinctions. As Andrew Ross states, the politics of camp rejects concrete solutions to the conundrums of identity politics, instead privileging artifice, spectacle, parody and theatricality as a means of refusing any easy answers (1999, 325). Maurya Wickstrom would also concur with the need for protesters to find strategic performance methods that can undermine fundamental
sovereign orderings. She cites Agamben’s contention that acts of play can resurrect the objects of the sacred – those things that have been removed from life and interaction and designated untouchable or unalterable – to the realm of 'the free use of man' (Wickstrom 2012, 186).

These points all resonate with the elements of queer camp performance outlined above. Put more explicitly, Jenny Hughes makes a direct connection between protest camping, queer camp performance, and the state of exception enacted in the political camps described by Agamben:

> Queer camp reproduces the stigmatising ways the queer body has been framed and destabilises those frames at the same time as materialising a protective, communicative space for queer bodies. Protest camps occupy the orderly fictions of those sites by forcing a display of the exceptional violence that is concealed there. Both queer camp and protest camps exhibit 'camp critical mimesis', queering a politics of exception by locating and parodying its 'camp' (Hughes 2011, 127).

In the chapters to follow I will provide specific examples of the ways that both the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common women enacted various degrees of queer camp performance that challenged the politics of exception and the logics of sovereign power.
CHAPTER TWO

THE BONUS ARMY:
War Veterans and Depression-Era Government-Sovereign Power

The 1932 protests of the Bonus Expeditionary Forces, or ‘The Bonus Army’ as they were popularly referred to, provided some of the most vivid political performances in 20th Century America. In addition to the actions of the protesters themselves, the responses of law enforcement and government officials created dramatic scenes of vulnerability, power and violence for audiences across the nation. Importantly, the protest was enacted against the backdrop of the nation’s capital, among buildings and monuments saturated with references to the American government and national identity. This provided a vivid illustration of the complexities of political protest in the face of sovereign power, especially when enacted by marginalised or excluded citizens.

The story of the Bonus Army begins in the aftermath of World War I, during a time of great economic prosperity and social progress. In 1924 the United States Congress approved a bonus to be paid to First World War veterans in gratitude for their service – a practice that had become commonplace starting in the 19th Century. The funds were scheduled to be disbursed in a single payment in 1945, but in the intervening years the hardships of the Great Depression convinced many that the delay in payment was unwise. By the early thirties thousands of veterans across the country were unemployed and many were homeless and hungry. Believing that the bonus money was rightfully theirs, a growing group of impoverished veterans began speaking up for immediate payment. One of the veterans’ largest supporters was Representative Wright Patman from Texas, who believed that the bonus payment, in addition to alleviating the poverty faced by veterans, might help to stimulate the American economy more generally. He introduced what became known as the ‘Patman Bonus Bill’ in April 1932, and this provided the impetus for what became one of the largest marches on Washington of the 20th Century.

Veterans formed local groups around the country and ultimately a plan was devised to petition federal lawmakers to support the bill, in person and en masse. They called themselves the Bonus Expeditionary Forces and 15,000 of them made their way across the country to converge on Washington and demand immediate payment of their
promised bonuses. Throughout the first half of the year, veterans across the country begged, borrowed and stole their way to Washington, primarily by stowing away in freight trains. They believed that a large scale march on the capital would force politicians to recognise the validity of their cause and vote in favour of Patman’s bill (Daniels 1971, Waters 1933).

They arrived in May, and for more than two months in the summer of 1932 the veterans and their families camped in the environs of the nation’s capital, including on the National Mall and at nearby Anacostia Flats. They maintained a mostly cooperative relationship with law enforcement figures, who attempted to offset the potential humanitarian disaster in their midst by assisting with provisions of food and shelter (Daniels 1971). By July, Congress was voting on a bill that would allow for immediate payment of the veterans’ bonuses. On July 17th the Bonus bill was defeated in the Senate, and tensions between the Bonus Army and authorities increased. Though disheartened, the Bonus Army members were determined to hold their positions, and they remained in the city until July 28th (Waters 1933). On this day the decision was taken to remove the campers, and it is this episode that is perhaps best remembered in contemporary accounts of the Bonus Army. I will provide more details below; for now it is sufficient to point out that President Herbert Hoover ordered the US Army to disperse the protesters. Faced with the Bonus Army’s initial resistance, the police and Army deployed tear gas, burned the campers’ tents and possessions, and when violence erupted two protesters were shot and killed (Dickson and Allen 2004).

In this chapter I will pursue an application of the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter One to the case of the Bonus Army protest. The chapter begins with a discussion of the social and political context of the performance. This includes a consideration of the geographical and spatial context of the event; the social construction of 'the Veteran' in the American imagination of the 1930s; and the particular circumstances of US First World War veterans that restricted their full political participation and brought their subjectivity in line with the logics of Homo sacer vulnerability. Following this the chapter details several key protest performances that occurred throughout the event. I begin by discussing the march of the protesters to Washington, and the self-characterisation of the major players. I then discuss the camp sites that were set up, the siege of the Capitol Building, and the 'Death March', before concluding this section with a discussion of the eviction of the Bonus Army. In the next section I shift the focus of my analysis to the
elements of queer camp that appeared within these actions, including degrees of parody, irony, and theatricality. The chapter concludes with an overall assessment of the successes and failures of the Bonus Army as a subversive protest performance, particularly with regard to its potential as a dissensus-creating resistance to sovereign power. As a result of these explorations I argue that veterans’ interactions with representations of sovereign power are beset by unique challenges derived from their past history as arms of that same authority. This leads to circumstances that require careful negotiation in order to avoid reinforcing the political structures that are complicit in the marginalisation of veterans. By closely analysing the ways that sovereign logics are inscribed on veterans’ bodies, it becomes possible to interrogate the efficacy of their particular uses of theatricality, including queer camp performances.

I. STAGING THE BONUS ARMY PROTEST:
Government-Sovereign Spaces, Exclusions, and the Veteran Body in Performance

Richard Schechner emphasises that it is not only the layout of the performance area itself that influences a production, but also what is contained in the area surrounding the playing site (Schechner 1988). For political protest, this often includes the buildings associated with the targets of activist campaigns. Performing a protest against the backdrop of the White House or at the gates of a military base brings those locations into the mise-en-scene and forces audiences to consider these sites and their occupants in juxtaposition with the demands of protesters. In the case of Washington, DC, the signifying power of geographic fixtures is given added intensity by the existence of the First Amendment, which formally allows citizens to petition the government for redress of grievances. The capital is not simply characterised by its various sites of sovereign power, but also by notions of the constitutionally-derived right to protest at those sites.

One of the Bonus Army’s defining features was its location at the very geographic centre of American state power. While the protest was made more spectacular by the cross-country pilgrimages of the marching protesters, it was their encampment in the US capital itself that brought the protest into direct confrontation with ideals of national identity, citizenship and sacrificial military service. Furthermore, as Michael Balfour discusses in relation to Camp X-Ray, the Bonus Army encampments intruded on the ordinary, everyday business of the capital and forced both citizens and politicians to navigate through and around the protest (Balfour 2012).
To fully comprehend the impact of the geographic environment on this protest, it is vital to understand that the capital itself was deliberately designed to convey a narrative that would evoke appropriate public sentiments about nation and state. Significantly, the story told by the spaces of the capital is itself performatic, as it relies on physically conveying bodies from one depiction of history and values to another, in an interactive, quasi-ritualistic frame (E. Turner 2008). The US capital in Washington DC was initially designed in 1791, with significant additions and revisions taking place throughout the 19th and early 20th century. By 1900, the McMillan Commission had formalised the purpose of the city's urban design as one that would illustrate American democratic ideals and its position as a major global power (Lewis 2008). From the late 1800s onwards, touristic pilgrimages to the capital have involved dutiful visits to the Capitol Building (the houses of Congress), the White House, and the monuments on the National Mall devoted to George Washington and Abraham Lincoln (Cocks 2001). This is a story that performs democracy, in the most performative of ways. The capital produces and reifies democratic citizenship as it displays enshrinations of American Liberal Democracy. Citizens paying homage to these sites confirm their membership in the nation, and simultaneously learn what values, norms and behaviours are appropriate to that membership.\(^9\)

In addition to the architectural layout of the National Mall and the surrounding areas, it is also important to note the unique legal features of the Capitol area more specifically. This area, stretching for approximately 200 blocks around the Capitol building, has been policed by its own special force of officers since 1828, and they are separated from the jurisdiction of the Washington DC Metropolitan police (Senate 2011). Even to this day, protesters in Washington must be cognisant of the lines drawn around the Capitol building which demarcate the area under the control of the Capitol police. There, the actions of protesters are subject to a lower threshold of tolerance, as the Capitol police are essentially a kind of equivalent Secret Service for members of Congress and their staff (Spochart 2011). However, the effect is not only the creation of a different sphere of legality that the protesters operate within; it also underscores the distinctions between sovereign authority and the citizenry at large – despite the purported function of the

\(^9\) Catherine Cocks provides a detailed account of the history of urban tourism in the United States. She notes that Washington, DC was the only urban site to figure prominently in American tourism traditions in the mid-nineteenth century. Significantly, she connects this to the early design of the capital and its role in nationalist ideals (Cocks 2001, 39).
Capitol building as a neoclassical reminder of democratic ideals, the placement of it under a legal zone of exception effectively prevents full democratic existence within it.

While many of the Bonus Army's most vivid actions occurred on the National Mall and around the Capitol building, the vast majority of them camped across the Potomac River in an area known as Anacostia Flats. This site is also saturated with the traces of historical events, and so the veterans' makeshift community there was overlaid on the performance space that was already marked by the ghostings of American history. Anacostia was one of the first areas explored by Captain John Smith in the 1600s, and it later became a key site in American Civil War battles. Significantly, the area was developed throughout the 19th century as a planned suburb for the poor and working classes, many of whom were employed in nearby shipyards (Halnon 1997). This has characterised Anacostia as a region populated by less privileged sectors of American society, in contrast to the illustrious edifices of state power that are visible just beyond the river.

It is also worth mentioning the proximity of Arlington National Cemetery to the Bonus Army protest. Although the veterans did not perform there, its existence was implicated in the protest by parodies that displayed alternative cemeteries (discussed below). Much has been written about Arlington's role in upholding the narrative of soldier-sacrifice (e.g. Ferguson and Turnbull 2005, Grant 2005, Harrison 2003). This is key to understanding the importance of protesters' references to Arlington, and the effect of its proximity to Anacostia Flats. The cemetery houses the remains of soldiers from the American Revolutionary War onwards, and it strictly portrays soldiers as arms of sovereign authority whose deaths are celebrated as honourable sacrifice rather than as killed individuals. This characterisation will be discussed in more detail below.

Having suggested some of the ways that the geographical landscape of Washington DC might have impacted the Bonus Army protest, it is now useful to consider the experiences and characterisations of veterans in the 1930s to explore their overlap with the notion of Homo sacer. In this section I begin with a discussion of the Veteran character in the national imagination, before considering some of the concrete practical issues faced by individuals recently returned from war service. This paves the way for an assessment of the Bonus Army veterans as figures of sovereign abandonment.
As mentioned in the previous chapter, it may at first seem incongruous to consider military veterans as Homo sacer-like; after all, these individuals physically enacted the objectives of sovereign power and were directly charged with upholding state policies and ideals through violent means. Indeed, most theorising of wartime biopolitics has tended to focus on the victims of war – those marginalised or displaced by the discursive and concrete practices of violence – and the characterisations of the enemy. Furthermore, while the trauma suffered by non-combatants might be explained away as 'collateral damage', the characterisation of enemy deaths is essential to upholding sovereign authority. Enemy combatants must be shown to have died in vain, in order for the characterisation of just violence to be sustained. Significantly, in order to achieve this characterisation of enemy deaths, the characterisation of 'our' soldiers' deaths must be couched in notions of honourable sacrifice. Ferguson and Turnbull describe this further:

Dead American soldiers are the constitutive opposite of homo sacer: they are the heroes, those who can be sacrificed but not killed. It is not homicide for the government to send them to their deaths in war; instead it is necessary sacrifice for the sovereign state (Ferguson and Turnbull 2005, 56).

The authors go on to suggest that those veterans who survive but return home embodying the brutality of warfare are typically ignored in the national narrative of patriotic sacrifice (2005, 56).

This underscores the way that vulnerability obtains its political power from the performative frames that it is portrayed within, rather than from its existence alone. However, in many historical anti-war performances, the lingering suffering of war veterans and the futile sacrifices they have made have been dramatically highlighted, in attempts to make visible what the normal orderings of society and politics exclude. This aligns directly with Laclau's notion of the alternative frames of authority that banned subjects can attain. To understand how this characterisation of veterans might prove efficacious for political protest, it is necessary to explore the way that the honourable sacrificial veteran character is constructed at a more basic level.
Characterisations of soldiers and war veterans in the United States have long been complicit in upholding sovereign authority and promoting current US Foreign Policy. The war dead and living veterans are both ritually honoured through performatic ceremonies that link support for current policies with appreciation for – and debt to – the sacrifice of these military actors. At the conclusion of the First World War, veterans marched down Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House, to celebrate the nation’s victory and receive honours for their sacrifice from the general public. The American Legion was founded in 1919, and this organisation furthered the traditional association of veterans with heroic sacrifice. Patriotic and conservative, it promoted a view of veterans as individuals who deserved political and social deference in honour of their past military service.

These conceptions of heroic soldiers were also captured in the ceremonial performances around war memorials. Although no monuments to the war dead existed on the National Mall prior to the 1980s, the notion of soldierly sacrifice was not lacking in American culture in the 1930s. As noted above, Arlington National Cemetery was a focal point for memorialisations of sacrificial soldiers, and the public dramatisation of sacrifice myths had reached a new height just one year before the Bonus March would occur. This stems from the fact that the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier had been erected at Arlington in 1921, containing the body of an unidentified fatality of the First World War. However, only the bottom part of the structure was initially constructed, and it was in 1931 that the monument proper was completed. A few months before veterans began hopping freight trains to travel to Washington, President Herbert Hoover read the following words at a formal dedication ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknowns:

The nation will linger today in its annual tribute of reverent memory of the glorious youth who gave their lives to defend our heritage of liberty and will pay a special homage in the dedication of the completed tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Its beauty is the symbol of our national pride in their heroism; our gratitude for their supreme devotion (Hoover 1932).

These words characterised the ritualistic performances that would take place at the tomb continuously since that time. Through the changing of the guard and the public memorial ceremonies held there, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier reinforces the notion of soldiers

---

10 For more details on the soldier-sacrifice narrative in American domestic and foreign politics see Ferguson and Turnbull 2005, Grant 2005.
as objects of sacrifice who possess no individual character, and retain few markers of lived citizenship.

However, it is important to point out that this state-driven characterisation of the Veteran was not the only one being popularised at the time. In the aftermath of the First World War we can also discern the roots of a characterisation of war veterans that would become much more familiar in the post-Vietnam years. Following World War One, the American public was widely questioning the country’s role as an imperialist power, seemingly disillusioned with the aftermath of the war and the general impression that it had been fought to make wealthy men wealthier. This impacted the construction of veterans in the popular imagination, evolving from a pure association with patriotic ideals into something closer akin to late-Vietnam era veterans or War on Terror veterans – in this interpretation, veterans could be read as figures who uphold the state agenda, but are simultaneously victims of US foreign policy equally as much as perpetrators. I will return to this point below but here I want to emphasise the contradictory markers of heroism and victimhood that the Veteran character contained, and the resulting necessity to attend to the cultural and political context that veterans were acting within.

In order to fully explore the extent to which First World War veterans were illustrative of Homo sacer exclusion, it is also important to review the practical ways in which their political agency was limited, and the ways in which they experienced degrees of the sovereign ban. The first and most obvious point in this regard is the manner in which many First World War veterans came to join the military in the first place. The war was a significant turning point with regard to the staffing of the US military. After an unsuccessful recruitment drive failed to produce sufficient willing volunteers, nearly 3 million men were drafted into the armed forces under the 1917 Selective Service Act (Chambers 1987). This comprised roughly 68% of the total number of First World War service members (Department of Veterans Affairs 2013). For individuals who were drafted, their citizenship and attendant rights were dramatically curtailed as they were forcibly placed into the sacrificial soldier camp.

The curtailment of political agency continued upon the veterans’ return home, albeit in less direct ways. Conventional wisdom suggests that most Americans were prosperous during the 1920s, as the country experienced an economic boom and new technologies
increased leisure time. However, this prosperity was only selectively experienced, and many citizens did not benefit from what would become known as the 'Roaring Twenties' – particularly the rural poor and ethnic minorities. For many veterans, the obstacles to economic prosperity were even greater. While the Depression that would strike the United States (and indeed the world) in the late 1920s is the one most remembered for the vast suffering it caused, for veterans an earlier economic depression had contributed to the circumstances they found themselves in during the early 1930s. Because of the 1920-1921 recession, when unemployment rates rose to 16%, many of the returning veterans were unable to find work in the aftermath of their military service, and they had therefore been without jobs for a longer period than most citizens (Patterson 1995).

In addition, veterans who had experienced the traumas of trench warfare were provided with overall inadequate assistance in re-assimilating into civilian life. For the United States, the mustering of soldiers for the First World War comprised the greatest mobilisation of overseas forces yet seen in that country’s history. Subsequently, the United States government was simply ill prepared to care for the hundreds of thousands of returning veterans, including many who suffered severe physical and psychological trauma thanks to the nature of WWI trench warfare, and in particular the use of poison gas. This lack of preparedness on the part of the government is partly what led to veterans' insistence on early payment of the delayed bonus payment; the laws concerning veterans' benefits were widely inconsistent, and ironically WWI veterans were treated less favourably than those who had served in previous conflicts, or who had served domestically (Linker 2011).

Veterans were also troubled by the fact that government authorities had been lax in recording service-related illnesses and injuries, which made it difficult to obtain later treatment or benefits. (Lisio 1994, 15) The rehabilitation programmes that were offered were strongly complicit in efforts to minimise the financial outlay for returning First World War soldiers. Historian Beth Linker connects the developing rehabilitation programmes after World War One with a desire to limit financial compensation for war casualties. In describing the range of materials produced as propaganda for the rehabilitation programmes, she notes:
First and foremost this literature aimed to convince disabled soldiers that rehabilitation was the best form of compensation for their injuries and that they should be grateful for the medical and vocational training that the US government offered them. Rehabilitation magazines, in other words, intended to persuade soldiers that it was unnecessary, unseemly, unpatriotic, and at worst, unmanly to receive military pensions as their forefathers had. [...] The second goal of rehabilitation propaganda was to convince family, friends, and the entire American public that disabled soldiers would benefit more from a program of hospital-based reconstruction than from returning home and receiving care and financial help from their local communities (Linker 2011, 122-123).

Clearly then, First World War veterans were marginalised politically and socially, first by the poor job market they faced upon return, and second by the inadequacies of state-provided physical and mental health care.

In a sense, millions of Americans in the Great Depression can be considered Homo sacer characters, especially when we view this concept through Žižek's context-dependent lens. Bound by the laws of the state, and promised security in exchange for the restrictions on their freedoms (including, at this time, prohibitions on the sale, manufacture, and consumption of alcohol), in actuality they were largely denied any sense of security as they were unable to provide food and shelter for themselves and their families. For veterans who had fought to secure this way of life, there existed a contradiction between their ostensible defence against tyranny and communism, and the obvious lack of security back at home. While they may not have been subject to communist insurrection, they were equally displaced from their homes and from any sense of an ability to pursue life, liberty, and happiness. All of these points combined to restrict not only the political agency of veterans but also their full experience of humanity. Through their demarcation as differentiated subjects outside of the normal realm of citizenship, veterans can be viewed as a social group that experienced elements of exclusion or political abandonment, and subsequently illustrated the existence and authority of sovereign power.

While the inadequacies of health care and employment opportunities might spur identity-based political organising, they can also lead to popular depictions of veterans as 'forgotten heroes' who are victims of state power (Lisio 1994, 1). This revised characterisation alone does not rescue veterans from the entrapments of sovereign logics, because they continue to function as collective evidence of sovereign authority to decide
who lives and dies, and what form that life and death may take. Even where veterans are considered victims of unjust sovereign authority, they remain faceless figures that have been collectively restricted from political participation. In other words, war veterans are also subject to sovereign power in other ways that complicate ideas of citizenship and exclusion. Specifically, they retain sovereign protection despite their degrees of exclusion, but they are constructed as almost exclusively symbolic figures, representative of nationalist ideals and patriotic imperatives. While this doesn't conform neatly to the notion of Homo sacer abandonment, it does locate veterans in a distinct category of exceptionality that limits their political agency and inscribes them with greater vulnerability than some other social categories. This is vital to consider when accounting for the impact of their protest performances on the national public.

II. PROTEST PERFORMANCES OF THE BONUS ARMY: Political Camping and Camp Aesthetics in 1930s America

The performances of the Bonus Army began with their procession to Washington, which seemed to develop quite spontaneously as veterans across the country discussed ways of supporting the Patman Bonus Bill. In late April a small advertisement was placed in a Portland, Oregon newspaper, stating the intentions of a local group of veterans to convene in Washington in early May (Daniels 1971, 76). This was the group led by Walter Waters, who would become the de facto Commander of the Bonus Army Forces. It was a statement to the press by Walters that seems to have sparked the widespread support for the Bonus Army action, and prompted thousands of veterans from around the country to take part. Interviewed upon the group's arrival in St. Louis, Waters stated their intention to remain in Washington until the Bonus Bill was passed (Daniels 1971, 80).

The subsequent march of veterans across the country was enacted gradually over several weeks as contingents from various states organised themselves and made their way to Washington. They attempted to live off the land as they progressed, but were often given assistance by local communities and charity organisations (Daniels 1971, Dickson and Allen 2004). It became a distinctly performance-like event, watched avidly by the American public. In newspapers and radio reports, it was given attention on par with stories about the Lindbergh kidnapping and the Great Depression in general (Daniels 1971, 81). When a contingent from California was mobilised in early July, the mayor gave them a celebratory motorcade parade and an official send-off that hailed their
forthcoming journey with all the trappings of a wartime send-off (Dickson and Allen 2004, 144). A group from Ohio was helped along the way by a sympathetic rail worker who gifted them with a shipping consignment ticket that permitted their transport as 'livestock – 55 veterans' (Daniels 1971, 96).

Many of those who set off to join the protest never arrived. The difficulties of the cross-country journey were considerable, particularly for those who departed after the initial Portland-led contingent had already arrived in Washington. Although Waters' group found it relatively easy to journey by train (Waters 1933), many others did not, and still others attempted to make the journey in run-down vehicles with no means to refuel them as necessary. This resulted in thousands of would-be Bonus Army troops ending their protest before it had really begun. For example, Dickson and Allen discuss a group from the West Coast which initially numbered over 2000, but after hundreds of their vehicles broke down or ran out of petrol, only 450 arrived in Washington. This lent the journey to Washington a sense of the epic, and it contributed to the nation's rallying behind the protesters as they attempted to overcome the obstacles to make it to the protest (Dickson and Allen 2004, 145).

When the Bonus Army arrived in Washington DC they had not made specific plans to accommodate themselves. The difficulties they faced in acquiring transportation to the city had consumed their early planning, so their settlement within the city was effected rather hastily (Waters 1933). Assisted at first by the Washington police, the campers were offered makeshift accommodation in unused derelict buildings, and additional areas for camping throughout the city. A significant number of the Bonus Army camped around Pennsylvania Avenue, within view of the White House and Capitol Building. Far more were based at Anacostia Flats, a rather poor area of land marked by muddy fields and swamp-like areas. This site was designated 'Camp Marks', and in a mirror of more recent Occupy encampments it took on the appearance of a self-contained city with named streets, a library, post office, and classrooms for children (Dickson and Allen 2004). Many of these facilities were provided by the local Salvation Army chapter, but the effect for spectators was a performance of a full-scale alternative civilisation (Lisio 1994, 92). Despite these efforts, however, the Bonus Army encampments were marked by the extreme poverty suffered by their inhabitants, and it quickly became evident that
they were another manifestation of the shanty town 'Hoovervilles' that were cropping up around the country.\textsuperscript{11}

One of the most striking aspects of the Bonus Army camps was the way that they mirrored traditional Army camps. This aspect of the protest stemmed on the one hand from the protesters' desire to emphasise their military backgrounds (discussed below), and on the other hand from local law enforcement's desire to maintain law and order within the camp sites. The task of maintaining this law and order was given in the first instance to General Pelham Glassford, the Chief of the Washington DC Police. Glassford was a war veteran himself, and to a large extent he sympathised with the Bonus Army veterans. At the same time, the leader of the first Bonus Army contingent, Walter Waters, sought to minimise any political disobedience by the protesters, in favour of a controlled and orderly display of their needs. These two men collaborated to establish a culture of obedience and orderliness among the campers (Waters 1933; Daniels 1971). Due to the vast numbers of veterans arriving from all over the country, often accompanied by their wives and children, and the scarcity of basic resources to house and feed them, circumstances seemed to necessitate a strong organisation that could manage what provisions were available and prevent potential conflict. It was also felt that the protesters needed to appoint designated spokesmen to negotiate with authorities, both to secure accommodation and food, and to present a unified position (Waters 1933).

Walter Waters says that he was reluctantly appointed “Commander” and he subsequently appointed a Billeting Officer, Supply Officer, and significantly, a number of individuals to serve as an Intelligence Service. This last role was deemed necessary in order to identify and isolate any suspected Communist sympathisers in the ranks of the BEF, and the individuals were appointed secretly without knowledge of each other's identities:

Primarily their duty was to inform me of any radicalism growing beneath the surface; they were to keep their eyes and ears open for Communists or any agitators trying to turn the BEF to their own uses (Waters 1933, 56).

\textsuperscript{11} 'Hoovervilles' was the name given to the shanty town cities constructed on various wasteland sites throughout the country. Often comprised of rough cardboard and scrap metal shacks erected on refuse dumps, they were symbolic of the Great Depression in the United States and the President's failure to effectively intervene to alleviate public suffering.
I will discuss the efforts to rout out Communism from the Bonus Army below, but for now it is simply important to note that the military structure of the Bonus camp reflected the US Armed Forces' own hierarchical ordering of power, as well as its strict definitions of who might be considered as “inside” and “outside”. The military camp structure was further reinforced by daily performances that reflected the rituals of the US Army. From the third day, Waters led the Bonus Army troops in marches and military drills, and these attracted hundreds of spectators who brought food and other vital supplies to the protesters (Dickson and Allen 2004).

As has already been suggested by the discussion of veterans' political agency above, the typical characterisation of this group delimits the range of political actions that they can effectively engage in. As a collective group, veterans are largely visible in the public consciousness as either sacrificial heroes who uphold sovereign power, or as victims of that sovereign power in all of its perceived injustice. To speak from either of these positions risks reproduction of the existing frames of authority and marginalisation, and so it is therefore key to consider the self-characterisations of the veterans and the way that they embodied ideas of military service and heroism.

It is somewhat difficult to speak of the identity or characterisation of the Bonus Army as a singular consolidated entity, due to the diversity within its ranks. The majority of the protesters came from General Infantry backgrounds, with a small number of mid-ranked soldiers and commissioned officers. They came from across the United States, although they were primarily from urban industrialized areas (Daniels 1971). Importantly, the camps also contained a significant number of Black American veterans, and there was no practice of segregation either formal or informal. Veterans lived and worked alongside one another regardless of race. Furthermore, a Bonus Army contingent from Texas was led by a woman, dubbed 'Joan of Arc in Overalls' (Folsom 1991, 312). Despite this diversity, the Bonus Army as a whole did emphasise particular traits throughout the weeks of their protest.

As was noted above, the Bonus Army veterans went to great lengths to emphasise their military backgrounds in the layout and day-to-day operations of the camps. However, this approach also extended to the characterisation of the individuals within those camps. For example, many of the Bonus Army campers dressed in remnants of their old uniforms, emphasising their status as veterans but also visibly reminding onlookers of
the now-tattered state of veterans' affairs in the United States. The leaders of the Bonus Army also deliberately portrayed themselves as heroic military figures, although both of the key leaders had served in non-combat roles. However, this was not the general trend of the Bonus Army, as 65% of them had indeed served overseas in the First World War, a higher proportion than in the general population of military veterans at that time (Daniels 1971, 84). In addition to consistently playing the part of ex-soldiers, the Bonus Army did everything it could to ensure that its membership was comprised only of genuine veterans and their families. They required all new participants to register and show proof of service prior to entering the camp sites.

The Bonus Army also steadfastly repeated its links to past conflicts and its connections to earlier generations of sacrificial soldiers. Marine Corps Major General Smedley D. Butler made this speech to the group in June:

I know who's made this country worth living in! It's just you fellers. Look, it makes me so damn mad that a whole lotta people speak of you as tramps. By God, they didn't speak of you as tramps in 1917 and 18, no. Take it from me, this is the greatest demonstration of Americanism we ever had – pure Americanism! (Butler 1932).

At another speech just prior to the eviction of the Bonus Army, Butler compared their situation to George Washington's forces at Valley Forge, urging them to perhaps fall back over the winter and return to defeat their political opponents the following year (Daniels 1971, 139).

While these characterisations were fundamental to the performatic content of the Bonus Army protests, in order to evaluate the efficacy of their theatricality it is helpful to focus on some of their more overtly orchestrated actions. The earlier weeks of the Bonus Army protest had been marked by an overall lack of confrontation with authority, and a stoically patient approach to the campaign for the Bonus Bill. The peak of activist actions took the form of lobbying Congressmen in their offices and marching in demonstrations along Pennsylvania Avenue. There were few incidents of genuine civil disobedience, aside from the overall trespass on federal property, which had already been condoned – and in some cases invited by – law enforcement authorities (Waters 1933). This is an example
of the kind of civil disobedience that follows a known pattern of protest, conforming to sanctioned forms of temporary disobedience that are contained within particular spatial and temporal frames. While these actions can contain moments of more subversive potential, for the most part they suffer from a reflection of dominant political frames.

Even when Congress finally put the Patman Bonus Bill to a vote in mid-June, the Bonus Army conducted itself in a strictly non-confrontational manner. The House of Representatives voted in favour of the Bonus Bill on June 15th. In their excitement at the forthcoming Senate vote, and the prospect that their bonus payments might soon be awarded, members of the Bonus Expeditionary Forces began to gather in the area of the Capitol, awaiting news. On June 17th when the Senate vote was underway, approximately 8,000 of the protesters gathered on the Capitol steps. The noise they made could often be heard by the Senators inside the building, where speeches were delivered – mostly explaining why the lawmakers intended to reject the bill. When the bill was ultimately defeated, the protesters, under Waters' guidance, simply returned to their tents and sustained their passive approach to political demonstration (Daniels 1971, 118-22). At this point it seems that the Bonus Army was intent on refraining from the kind of heightened theatricality that might be expected in conjunction with serious political agitation.

However, attitudes began to change in July as protesters became increasingly impatient and many felt the need for more direct action. At this time, Walter Waters' leadership was eclipsed by a new arrival from California, Royal W. Robertson. Robertson was younger and more charismatic than Waters, and – significantly – he was an out-of-work Hollywood actor (Dickson and Allen 2004). Rather than his group being subsumed into Camp Marks at Anacostia, Robertson insisted on billeting them in downtown Washington in close proximity to the Capitol (Daniels 1971, 129).

Under the influence of Robertson, the Bonus Army soon laid siege to the Capitol itself, something which had never before been ventured in American history. They informed authorities that they intended to occupy the Capitol grounds until Congress adjourned at the end of July, or the Bonus Bill was passed. The action began with a permitted march around the Capitol grounds on July 12, when they presented a petition in support of the Bonus payment. However, instead of dispersing as planned after the march, Robertson's group stayed at the Capitol and slept on its grounds. The Capitol police initially turned a
blind eye to this transgression, but it was an action that significantly escalated the
tensions between the Bonus Army and law enforcement. In part this was likely due to the
direct incursion of political protest into the domain of the Capitol, which, as noted above,
is demarcated as a site of exception characterised by altered rules and norms. By
performing across the boundary between government and public territory, the Bonus
Army threatened the existence of the ordered lines between sovereign and domestic
spheres.

In addition, Robertson's acting experience may have provided him with a beneficial sense
of theatricality, because this action appealed strongly to potential audiences. According
to Dickson and Allen, the siege of the Capitol attracted more than 10,000 car loads of
curious spectators in the first night alone (2004, 145). When Robertson was ordered to
keep his men from sleeping in the Capitol grounds, he inquired whether there was any
law prohibiting them from walking around the grounds throughout the night. Since the
answer to that query was 'no', the Bonus Army proceeded to hold an all-night march
around the Congressional building. General Glassford, under pressure to prevent this
occupation of the Capitol, devised a plan to passively keep the protesters off the Capitol
lawns, by simply turning on the sprinkler system throughout the night. The Bonus Army
petitioners would not be able to remain in the area without receiving a thorough soaking.
However, this simply added to the dramatic impact of the action, which newspapers the
next day named, 'The Death March'. The name was likely reflective of the pathetic vision
that the marchers presented, wearing rags and suffering visibly from the signs of hunger
and malnutrition. They were also exhausted, requiring frequent military-like orders from
Robertson to keep them on their feet and moving. The march continued into the next day,
when temperatures reached 36 degrees C. Several marchers collapsed and were quickly
ordered back in line. The action succeeded in attracting a great deal of public attention,
and indeed the crowds of spectators grew so large that police were forced to close the area
around the Capitol (Dickson and Allen 2004).

This is an illustrative example of the way that displays of vulnerability alter the potential
for civil disobedience to attract public attention, and more importantly to create a degree
of dissensus among spectators. Whereas the actions led by Walter Waters conformed to
the accepted rules of political protest in Washington, Robertson's more direct and creative
actions highlighted the risk faced by the protesting veterans. In doing so, the action may
have reminded audiences of their links to one another and to the protesters, in line with
Judith Butler’s beliefs about the power of vulnerability. By emphasising notions of shared humanity and attendant susceptibility to violence and bodily harm, the protesters no doubt increased their efficacy with regard to their ability to alert spectators to the paradoxes of sovereign protection and sovereign abandonment.

On the third day of the march, disgruntled officials decided to call out the Marines to protect the area from the Bonus Army marchers. However, this simply resulted in another vivid performance of unexpected behaviours as the Marines and the Bonus Army paid mutual respect to each other, and many identified old friends and comrades among the ‘other side’. In all, the march continued for four straight days, up until July 16th when Congress was scheduled to adjourn (Dickson and Allen 2004). While scenes of protesters gathering outside the Capitol building are now commonplace in American politics, this was certainly not the case in 1932. The actions of Royal Robertson and the men on the ‘Death March’ firmly established a tradition of occupying Capitol grounds. They also contained elements of queer camp aesthetics similar to those found in the current repertoire of American protest by veterans. These will be discussed in detail below.

The weeks leading up to the eviction of the Bonus Army from the nation’s capital were marked by steadily increasing tension between protesters and law enforcement. Following the June defeat of the Bonus Bill in the Senate, many protesters had relocated their camps to the vicinity of the Capitol building (Daniels 1971). Conditions within the camps were also deteriorating, and sanitation was becoming a major concern (Dickson and Allen 2004). By mid-July the Hoover Administration had become intent on evicting the marchers from Washington, but Bonus Army leaders expressed grave concerns about the participants’ homelessness and lack of transport. After several weeks of negotiation, the Washington DC police were ordered to clear the camp sites in the area of Pennsylvania Avenue and the Capitol (Waters 1933).

There are many differing accounts of the day, including those which emphasise the disobedience of the protesters as a key factor in the violence (e.g., Hoover in Waters 1933), and those that suggest that the veterans were simply innocent victims (e.g., Zinn 1980). Most of the evidence suggests that a relatively small number of the protesters behaved with some aggression, and it was in response to this that the United States Army deployed the full force of bayonets, tanks and tear gas. According to Lisio, whose
research on this particular topic is perhaps the most exhaustive, the conflict proper began when a small group of veterans carrying an American flag attempted to force their way through the lines of police officers gathered to effect the eviction. While the police had been ordered to refrain from using force, in the scuffle some of them panicked and two of the veterans were fatally shot (Lisio 1994, 94). The police informed President Hoover of their inability to maintain order, and requested support from Federal troops. Upon receiving this missive Hoover ordered Federal troops to mobilise against the wayward veterans, citing the need to protect government construction programmes scheduled for the area of the protest sites (Waters 1933, 125-36).

The next part of the story is made even more compelling by reading it through the long lens of 20th century politics and protest. The central actors that now enter the fray are familiar names: the figureheads of the US Army deployed that day in 1932 to forcibly evict veterans of the First World War from the US Capitol were General Douglas MacArthur, Major Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Major George Patton. These names are of course very recognisable as honoured military leaders and political figureheads of the later 20th century. Under this chain of command the army brought forth six tanks, mounted machine guns, infantry, and cavalry units to deploy against approximately 5,000 unarmed and undernourished veterans.

Although Walter Waters had been promised that the Bonus Army would be given a chance to form a procession and march away peacefully with their few possessions, the US forces began to systematically burn the Bonus Army's rows of tents and shacks (Waters 1933). It is generally accepted that the first fire was started by a protester, who acted out of defiance of the eviction order. However, this relatively minor disobedience was met by a scale of force almost unimaginable to many of the onlookers that day. General MacArthur ordered the entire downtown Washington camp site to be burned, and troops systematically proceeded from one shanty shack to another, torching each one and barely giving its occupants (including the wives and small children of the veterans) time to gather their few possessions and clear the area. Photographs from the day vividly show the acrid smoke rising from the shanties as terrified occupants scramble to leave, and the majestic dome of the Capitol building looms in the near distance (Lisio 1994, 95).

After torching the camps in the immediate vicinity of the Capitol, MacArthur, acting against the orders of President Hoover, led his troops across the river to Anacostia Flats
and ordered the entire area to be burned to the ground. This effectively displaced at least 15,000 Americans, who now had nowhere to go to be housed and fed. Importantly, all of this was watched by hundreds of private citizens, particularly in the Pennsylvania Avenue area, who observed the evictions and shouted ‘Shame, shame!’ at the army (Waters 1933, 125-36).

In the rout of the Bonus Army, spectators were treated to a performance by representatives of sovereign power. As the federal Army cleared the camps, the perception of protester vulnerability was no doubt heightened. Importantly, this awareness of true political vulnerability was established through the veterans' non-response. However, it differs in an important way from the theory of non-response discussed by Susan Leigh Foster, because in this instance the audience was aware that the protesters were not willfully enacting their impotence. Rather, they were placed in this role of powerlessness and risk by sovereign authorities, and this raises questions regarding the extent to which their actions could offer effective dissensus-generating challenges to the frames of political power. To begin to answer such queries it is necessary to focus more closely on the particular kinds of theatricality that surrounded the Bonus Army protest as a whole, which for the purpose of this study will be exemplified by the use of queer camp.

Having provided a concise synopsis of the performances of the Bonus Army, we can now examine the content of this protest with regard to its queer camp potential. While it would be impossible to suggest that the Bonus Army protest was a wholly camp performance, I want to examine it closely to discern which elements of the performances contained degrees of camp sensibilities. As I discussed in Chapter One, performances can convey camp sensibilities with a wide range of tactics and styles. Some acts are deliberately joyful and irreverent, whereas others invoke greater attempts at transfigured authenticity. Some performances deliberately intend to stage a camp politics, whereas others achieve it primarily from processes of audience interpretation. In this section I will discuss three key aspects that theorists have identified as characteristics of camp: parody, irony and frivolity. I believe these three elements were the most prominent aspects of queer camp in the Bonus Army protest, and ones that potentially shaped the repertoire of protest tactics for the 21st century.
Helen Shugart and Catherine Waggoner describe parody as one key characteristic of camp performance (2008). They chiefly note camp's tendency to send up dominant traits through subversive, stylised performances. This reveals the unnaturalness of essentialised identity constructions. Similarly, Moe Meyer refers to Linda Hutcheon to define camp parody as an extended repetition of multiple social conventions that depict critical difference for ideological ends (Meyer 1994, 8). Camp parody offers an alternative means of intelligibility to those marginalised by the dominant frames of signification:

Parody becomes the process whereby the marginalized and disenfranchised advance their own interests by entering alternative signifying codes into discourse by attaching them to existing structures of signification (Meyer 1994, 9).

Although many of the Bonus Army’s actions were enacted with an air of great seriousness and sincerity, elements of parody can be found throughout the protest as a whole. Some of this parody was accidental and some was deliberately staged, and it’s inclusion among the Bonus Army’s tactics rendered the protest more complex with regard to its theatricality and potential audience interpretations. Most obviously, the veterans’ own presence had the potential to be interpreted as a parody of the honourable self-sacrificing solders that were so common to dominant representations of the military. While I have discussed above the extent to which the Bonus Army leaders wanted to emphasise their military backgrounds in order to become more politically persuasive to the public, their focus on portrayals of ‘soldierliness’ potentially created another layer of characterisation, in which their actions could be read as a mockery or exaggeration of the ideal traits of the ‘original’.

In addition to their actual embodiment of idealised soldierly traits, the Bonus Army also went to some lengths to reinforce this characterisation in its publicity materials. Bonus Army troops published their own newspaper, entitled the BEF News, and the copies that remain reveal the extent to which the protesters repeatedly cited their military experience. For example, one article is subtitled, 'Scenes Recall Days of ’17, When Training Camps Were Alive With Young Americans'. Describing the scenes of the newly-instituted drill marches that were established to maintain order and discipline, the paper paints the following picture:
'Fall in!' barked the sergeants, as scores of recruits lounged about in groups, awaiting the command, and others hurried across the parade ground to join their companions. 'Right dress!', rang out the command. 'Front!' (Lisio 1967, 47)

While it is difficult to assess the extent to which such descriptions were sincere or parodic, theorists of camp have pointed out that it is not always a deliberate aesthetic (Sontag 1999). In this way, it is necessary to consider the way that the general public of 1932 might interpret the Bonus Army's self-characterisations, and I believe there is ample evidence to suggest the possibility of parodic readings. Particularly for an audience that was already predisposed to critique the soldier-sacrifice myth (as the American public was in the increasingly isolationist 1930s), characterisations of veterans as heroic soldiers were likely subject to sceptical interpretations and suspicions of exaggeration.

This may be especially true since the individuals portraying these idealised soldiers were frequently ill-suited physically to marches and military drills – they often struggled to stand up straight, to move in time with others, and to endure the long ordeals of the marches (Dickson and Allen 2004). In this sense, the role of spectatorship in parodic camp performance is highlighted – as Shugart and Waggoner note, aspects of reception and response are vital in determining whether camp parody exists or not (2008, 31). As audiences watched the Bonus Army veterans attempt to enact their former glorious, soldierly selves, a sense of parody must have been created through the incongruity of their performance with those more commonly enacted by active-duty soldiers. This is of course a very serious form of parody, and one that has the potential to evoke mixed emotions of pity, empathy, scepticism and derision in spectators. In this way it demonstrates Sontag’s assertion that camp can arise from quite serious performances.

The role of spectators would be paramount in interpreting these parodies in a camp context, but I believe that the parodic elements traced above also suggest the likelihood that the Bonus Army's theatricality has influenced more recent generations of protesting veterans.

As noted in the description of the camp sites, the veterans also created a parodic stage set that mirrored familiar and celebrated American military installations. Although the sites were typical of shanty towns and were marked by extreme poverty, this didn't prevent the protesters from creating elaborate replications of military bases. Their camps were typically constructed out of salvaged lumber and scrap metal, and each was named as an
individual 'fort' (for example, Fort Marks and Fort McHenry). The veterans also parodied Arlington National Cemetery, in an installation of a mocked-up cemetery surrounded by uniform white crosses and entitled, 'The Cemetary [sic] of our Enemies'. This provided a double-layered depiction of heroic soldiers, hinting at both the assumed mantle of heroism on the part of the protesters, and a characterisation of Arlington and its dominant notions of soldier-sacrifice as the 'enemy' of the Bonus Army (Lisio 1967, 48). These parodies of dominant military spaces were much more deliberate than those contained in the physical characterisations of the protesters as soldiers. This may have been at least partly due to the fact that they took place within the broad domain of the protesters' encampments, where the actions of individual protesters were less subject to the regulations imposed by Walter Waters, Pelham Glassford, and other leaders. In the camps the veterans themselves had plenty of free time to craft their own individual protests, and these frequently took the form of carefully painted protest signs, artistic installations, and subversive side-show performances. According to queer camp theories, these acts would have contained the potential to destabilise notions about the natural or rightful behaviour of veterans, and as a result, to destabilise other notions about natural or rightful political behaviour (Cleto 1999).

The performances of the Bonus Expeditionary Forces were also frequently ironic, and reflective of the kind of irony that is typically present in camp aesthetics. As Jack Babuscio describes it, 'camp is ironic insofar as an incongruous contrast can be drawn between an individual/thing and its context/association' (Babuscio 1999, 119). At issue here is the way that camp performances can display representations of entities that appear where, according to dominant sensibilities, they should not exist. While the most frequently theorised examples of this tend to be incongruities in masculine and feminine traits and bodies, other incongruous contrasts can contain the same subversive potential (Newton 1999).

Several aspects of the Bonus Army protests embraced such contrasts. In the first instance, the embodiment of political resistance by uniform-clad veterans is itself a stark incongruity. By locating non-violent direct action against the state on the bodies of unambiguous veterans, the performers of the Bonus Army protests disrupted expected norms about soldierly behaviour. In a society where veterans were strongly discouraged
– both culturally and politically – from critiquing government policies, the vivid enactment of protest in uniform for the stated aim of upholding American ideals surely created a dissonance for viewers.

The camp sites also provided an opportunity for the performance of ironic incongruities. As described at the beginning of this chapter, they were located on sites that were saturated with references to historical American events and values. Their subsequent construction from scrap materials, and the overt poverty and dereliction contained within these structures, offered a vivid contrast to the clean white lines of the houses of power and most national monuments in Washington. Furthermore, the voluntary construction of these camp sites offered a potential ironic alternative to dominant frameworks of power that establish camps as sites of the sovereign ban. In these self-instituted camps, protesters enacted an alternative state of exception in which state power could be critiqued, and indeed, the security of the state could be questioned or even rejected.

As several scholars have noted, the regulation of public space is an exemplary manifestation of sovereign power and biopolitics (e.g., Nield 2004, Pratt 2005). It is highly significant that the Bonus Marchers were initially given space by the government in order to house the incoming bevy of homeless citizens, and to ostensibly lessen the tragic spectacle of Hoover's economic legacy. Through this act, state control of government or public-owned sites was legitimated. By enforcing the state's control over public space, Hoover effectively displayed the government's authority to control who and what could be contained therein. This in itself was a performative act, and one that powerfully reinscribed notions of inside/outside and order/disorder. However, the protest camps were not solely controlled by Hoover or the chain of sovereign power that ended with Police Chief Glassford. In fact, the camp sites burgeoned well beyond the hopes and intentions of both federal and local authorities, and it was well recognised that the assistance provided by law enforcement was largely a practical necessity – the Bonus Army had made clear that they were coming, and that they had no intention of leaving, which meant that the subsequent actions of providing government buildings and areas for camping was very much a reaction and one that was requested by the protesters themselves (Waters 1933). Through this assertion of counter-authority, and the theatrical performance of that authority, the protesters began to achieve a redefinition of the space and its potential contents and usages.
All of these examples of irony in the Bonus Army actions hinge upon the appearance of characters or qualities in ways that are not normally admitted into the dominant social and political order. This not only resonates with the usage of irony in queer camp aesthetics, but also align with Rancière's concept of dissensus. While their inclusion may have been too marginal to create an overall tone of queer camp, it seems plausible that they were taken up by later generations of activists in a more overt way.

Finally, I want to consider the aspects of deliberate theatricality that appeared within the Bonus Army protests. Babuscio, drawing on Sontag, emphasises this element of camp as an appreciation of 'life-as-theatre, being versus role-playing' (1999, 123). To a great extent, political performance necessarily embraces theatricality and an awareness of being-as-playing-a-role. Even as early as the 1930s, radio broadcasts were heightening the theatrical nature of politics and the American public was becoming increasingly savvy about interpreting political discourse as theatre. Furthermore, protest performances potentially embrace theatricality to an even greater extent than other political acts, particularly when they enact possible alternative societies. It is therefore not surprising that performances that seek to change the dominant politics should embrace overt theatricality as a means to do so. Ben Shepard argues that direct action protest is innately playful, because it posits an alternative set of rules and norms that lie outside of political and social 'realities' (Shepard 2011). In this playfulness, elements of theatricality exist, because the alternative fictional worlds that are created are enacted for both the community of protesters and for public audiences. This would suggest that performances of protest and civil disobedience are inherently theatrical and playful, and in this section I want to highlight two of the Bonus Army actions that were most explicitly characteristic of these qualities.

First, as described above, the tone of the Bonus Army protests shifted significantly with the arrival of Royal Robertson and his group of California-based veterans. The change was not simply down to a change in leadership, but also in the progression to a much more theatrical style of protest. In place of orderly marches along traditional and well-defined routes, and the enactment of daily military drills, Robertson led his men in a dramatic protest that involved the vivid display of their own personal trauma. In addition, the Death March was planned as a theatrical performance, in that it intended to exhibit particular characterisations of the Bonus Army protesters to a very specific audience – primarily those who worked inside the offices of the Capitol building. In this sense it
embraced what Ester Newton refers to as role deviation and role manipulation, wherein the performers not only rejected dominant roles but made a show of performing alternative roles (Newton 1999). In some ways it was a great success, and it was instrumental in agitating the federal officials into action. While the eviction outcome was not what the protesters would have wished for, the Death March’s high degree of theatricality did attract much more public attention to the protesters' campaign (Dickson and Allen 2004).

Another example of an overtly theatrical performance was the ritual-like burials of members of the Bonus Army. These performances became very popular among the protest campers, and several of them enacted variations throughout the weeks of the encampment. In these scenes, a Bonus Army veteran would volunteer to be 'buried alive' by his comrades. The veterans were interred in a coffin-like structure that gave them room to sit up, and that had a stove pipe attached to allow air in. They were buried about four feet underground, and the public was typically charged 25 cents to view them (Dickson and Allen 2004, 144). This voluntary interment, alongside the encouraged voyeurism of the public, had the potential to draw attention to the more macabre elements of soldiers' deaths that are so often occluded in the sanitized and glorified rituals of public mourning. In ‘burying’ themselves alive, these veterans drew attention to what Agamben characterises as the ‘living dead’, a state of being that embodies identifiable traits of the non-living, though not actually deceased. He links this paradox to the same patterns of exclusion and subjectivity that Homo sacer is built upon (1995, 61). Perhaps even more importantly, these burials emphasised the existence of the Bonus Army protest as performance, and encouraged audiences to interpret the events with a cynical awareness of the artifice of all of those involved.

III. OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION

The successes and failures of the Bonus Army protest were many and varied. It was a complex action that involved individuals from around the country, many with varying goals and ideological positions. It also contained some difficult contradictions and inconsistencies in terms of the kinds of performances that were enacted. For the purpose of this analysis I will briefly outline some of the most notable outcomes of the Bonus Army, before discussing the extent to which they effectively enacted civil disobedience according to the concerns outlined in Chapter One.
To start with, it is essential to point out that the Bonus Army protesters were widely backed by the American public. Due in part to the popularity of left-leaning radio broadcasts, the public followed the events in Washington with avid sympathy for the marchers. In addition, citizens who were near enough to the protesters to offer practical help did so. They contributed vast amounts of food for the veterans and their families, and members of the public made financial donations even when they were suffering financial hardships themselves (Daniels 1971). Many historians cite the Bonus Army as a key factor in Hoover's defeat in the 1932 elections, as well as in the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the significant gain in Congressional seats by the Democratic Party (Dickson and Allen 2004, Lisio 1967). While the most conservative politicians continued to paint the Bonus Army as a Communist conspiracy, for most Americans they were representative of the popular need for federal aid to alleviate the sufferings of the Great Depression (Daniels 1971). However, there were still some detractors that critiqued the Bonus Army for their actions. In particular, the protest was questioned due to its limited focus on the financial needs of veterans. This was exemplified by an editorial in *The New Republic* when Congress eventually approved the immediate payment of the First World War bonus in 1936:

> Are the sufferings of unemployed veterans any more appealing to sympathy than…men…either too young or too old to have served, or […] unemployed women […] any more deserving than farmers and their families near starvation in the drought stricken areas? (Lisio 1967, 42).

This statement reveals the problems inherent to organising along strict identity-based lines, as this inevitably excludes others in the process.

Perhaps the Bonus Army's most obvious failure to destabilise the frames of sovereign power is in its outright reflection of dominant orderings of military and state power. The fervent desire of the protesters to be taken seriously as veterans compromised their ability to resist both hollow characterisations as sacrificial soldiers, and positions of victimhood experienced at the hands of the military arm of sovereign authority. In their belief that their status as veterans would earn them respect and political authority, the Bonus Army protesters most frequently embraced depictions of themselves that occluded their individuality or their existence as fully realised political citizens. While some of their
actions contained the potential to destabilise these frames of sovereign power, for the most part the protesters did not go far enough in their displays of the ironies and incongruities of dominant norms. For example, the ordering of the protest camps into military-like barracks, complete with mandatory drills and marches, instituted the very same frame of hierarchical authority that was evident in the US military. This hierarchy was of course the very source of the veterans' proximity to the position of Homo sacer, and it produced the needs that required them to petition the government for action in the first place. Despite this, the Bonus Army leaders saw fit to order their 'troops' to perform in whatever ways they deemed strategically necessary, even when this led to veterans collapsing from heat exhaustion or malnutrition.

Perhaps the most vivid example of the Bonus Army's failure to destabilise dominant political frames is in its policies relating to Communism. The Bonus marchers were accused of Communist sympathies from the very beginning of their march, and since the first major 'red scare' in the United States had occurred just a few years earlier, that was a charge that would be likely to tarnish their reputation around the country. Although leftist politics in general were highly popular during the Great Depression, and the Communist Party experienced a surge in support during this time, an outright subscription to Communism was still a route to political marginalisation; for protesters wishing to be recognised as legitimate political actors it was deemed necessary to disavow even the most tenuous links to Communism. As a result, the Bonus Army went to great lengths to ensure that there were no Communists in their ranks, to the point of assigning undercover 'spies' to monitor the protesters' behaviour (Waters 1933). This again reflected the ideology and structures of state power, and failed to offer an alternative approach.

Furthermore, one of the concrete outcomes of the Bonus Army was the eventual creation of the GI Bill in 1944. Although this occurred several years after the conclusion of the protest, the Bonus March has been cited as a motivating factor in its creation (Dickson and Allen 2004). This Bill created legislation that provides for a wide range of benefits to American veterans, including financial bonuses, job training, and funding for higher education. However, it provides a fascinating parallel to the inadequacies of the Bonus Army protest, as it actually serves to increase the number of lower-income military

---

12 The first 'red scare' in the United States is typically dated from 1919-1921.
recruits and creates a more enticing trap that leads individuals to willingly abandon themselves to a bare life existence in the excluded category of military personnel – existing only as embodiments of sovereign power, and prohibited from enacting full citizenship as individuals. While this was almost certainly not the intention of the creators of the GI Bill, it demonstrates the severe difficulties of organising politically on the basis of shared abandonment. In effect, the Bonus Army veterans – who grouped themselves together on the basis of uniquely absent rights and truncated citizenship – were the primary instigators of a political policy that would ensure the creation of millions more such men and women in the decades to come; and those men and women would be even less able to shake off the masks of sovereign power because of their extreme indebtedness and reliance on state-offered (and state-regulated) social and economic opportunities.

These issues are not simply significant as examples of the inadequacies of the Bonus Army performances; they are also indicative of the elements of the protest that limited opportunities for audiences to experience moments of dissensus and reflect differently on underlying frames of sovereignty and citizenship. By too closely mirroring the arrangements of power and marginalisation apparent in the 'original' manifestations of state power, the Bonus Army protesters minimised the subversive potential of their performances.

Despite these failures, it would be wrong to assume that the Bonus Army achieved nothing positive with regard to the potentialities of protest performance. Its biggest successes may have been the ways that it broadened the parameters of protest and contributed new and creative tactics to the repertoire of protest performance in the United States. In a broad sense, the Bonus Army protesters contributed significantly to ideas about what could or should be performed within the National Mall and throughout the US capital. Whereas it had earlier been associated almost exclusively with a glorified and sanitised version of American history and political ideals, in the aftermath of the Bonus March the capital became a site of pilgrimage not only for dutiful citizens, but also for those wishing to exercise their constitutional right to petition the government for redress of grievances. As Edith L.B. Turner notes, the National Mall now has the potential to operate as a dual depiction of its creators’ values on the one hand – embodied in the unchanging marble icons of Jefferson and Lincoln – and on the other hand an image of
open democratic space that contains the traces of past acts of political resistance and emancipation (E. Turner, 2008). While the later 20th century events of the Civil Rights Movement, Anti-Vietnam War Protests, and AIDS memorial ceremonies may be more well-known, it is undeniable that the Bonus Army protest was instrumental in effecting this multiplication of performances on the Mall.

In addition, the Bonus Army left its mark on protests by veterans throughout the 20th Century and beyond. Traces of its performance tactics and content can be found in a range of more recent protests. For example, in 1972 Vietnam Veterans Against the War staged a theatrical march through Valley Forge, enacting mock raids and torture of 'civilians' along the way (VVAW 1972). The prominence of theatricalised suffering and the use of celebrated historical sites in their protests would appear to be strongly linked with the performances of their Bonus Army forerunners. The actions of the Bonus Army can also be found in several War on Terror demonstrations. In a reflection of the subversive Arlington-like cemetery erected in Camp Marks, protesters in 2003 established 'Arlington West', a daily installation of uniform white crosses on the beaches of Santa Monica, California. This protest made use of the iconography of Arlington to vibrantly remind spectators of the number of lives lost in the War on Terror (Arlington West Project 2009).

Most significantly, the elements of camp sensibilities within the performances by the Bonus Army are now evident among current generations of anti-war veterans. In 2006, members of Iraq Veterans Against the War devised a guerilla theatre demonstration entitled 'Operation First Casualty'. In this performance, veterans in full combat dress stormed the streets of busy American cities and seized and detained innocent 'civilians' (IVAW 2007). In a similar performance in 2008, four members of that same organisation scaled the walls of the National Archives in Washington DC, where the US Constitution is housed. They defiantly took up a position between the lofty columns of the Archives building, and declared that they were upholding their military oath to 'protect and defend the Constitution of the United States' (Rowe 2013, 57). While these actions may seem starkly different from their Bonus Army counterparts, it is my suggestion that the characterisations displayed by IVAW were overtly and deliberately camp. By probing the actions of the Bonus Army and revealing the aspects of those performances that contained camp elements – moments of parody, irony, theatricality and so forth – we can better understand the evolution of protest tactics among war veterans.
Diana Taylor makes the following point about performance efficacy:

I would argue that its efficacy, whether as art or as politics, stems from the way performances tap into public fantasies and leave a trace, reproducing and at times altering cultural repertoires (Taylor 2003, 143).

This is key to understanding the impact of the Bonus Army, above and beyond its concrete effects for policy making. More significant than the eventual passage of the Bonus Bill or the creation of the GI Bill is the way that this protest operated within and upon the 'public fantasies' about soldiers and veterans, and in its most subversive aspects demonstrated that strategic camp repetitions of those fantasies might provide an effective means for destabilising the frames of sovereign power. The Bonus Army's legacy cannot therefore be fully understood without assessing it for this contribution to the repertoire of protest.
CHAPTER THREE

THE GREENHAM COMMON WOMEN'S PEACE CAMP:

Women and Cold War Military-Sovereign Power

The 1980s protest camps at the Greenham Common Air Force Base provided some of the most vivid examples of Cold War anti-militarisation activism. For nearly two decades from 1981-2000 the Greenham Common women joyfully and steadfastly resisted efforts to remove them from the area, all the while engaging in subversive acts that creatively confronted the philosophical underpinnings of Cold War security policies, as well as the material site of the military base itself. Throughout the years of their encampment, these activists didn't simply stage their protest against American Cruise Missiles – they also offered provocative challenges to the performances enacted by this representation of the military sphere and sovereign power.

The Greenham Common protests grew out of existing campaigns for nuclear disarmament and alternatives to Cold War militarism that had been present in the global political sphere since at least 1950 (Burkett 2012). Many of the women who would take an active role at Greenham had previously participated in anti-war and pacifist campaigns with groups like the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Many of them had also experienced frustration at the marginalisation of women within these campaigns, being oft times restricted to mundane activities like food preparation and sign decorating (Liddington 1989). When NATO announced its intentions to site 96 American Cruise missiles at Greenham Common, many citizens strenuously objected. Indeed, it was at this point in history that the membership of the CND increased exponentially, with more than 100,000 national members and thousands of active local chapters across the United Kingdom (Wittner 2009, 144). The Greenham Common missiles would be just one part of a larger plan to deploy more than 550 high powered missiles throughout Western Europe (Stead 2006). Since each missile was equivalent to four Hiroshima atomic bombs, the scale of fire-power on display was almost inconceivable (Junor 1995, x). In response to this news, a small band of protesters from Wales chose to march to Greenham Common, where they set up camp and drew the attention of peace protesters from around the country.

---

13 For a full history of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and related pacifist campaigns, see Hudson 2005.
The camp grew rapidly, and developed a unique character marked by deliberately colourful, creative and cheerful activism. It soon became a women-only protest camp, and it outlasted the Air Force base that it surrounded by several years. During this time the protesters engaged in a range of performances that both physically and metaphorically compromised the edifices of sovereignty and militarism. They cut holes in the base’s fence, trespassed onto military property, tied teddy bears and tea sets to the gates, and danced and sung through all kinds of hardships. In the rough makeshift shelters they constructed they cooked meals over unreliable camp fires and debated the fine details of foreign policy and political philosophy. They forged friendships and families, and in sum they developed a creative alternative society that offered a stark contrast to the politics-as-usual happening just beyond the steel and barbed wire fence. Although the women didn’t prevent the arrival of the American Cruise missiles, they did draw the attention of the world’s media, and achieved a few important victories in the courts. They maintained the peace camp through a multitude of harsh eviction attempts, and stayed to see the Cruise missiles leave the base. The last Greenham Common protesters didn’t depart the camp until the year 2000, long after the base had been decommissioned and returned to use as Common Land.

Although very different in its political and social context from the Bonus Army march, the Women’s Peace Camp at Greenham Common provides further examples of the heritage of camp sensibilities in protest camping. This chapter will follow a similar structure to Chapter Two, beginning with a discussion of the geographic, social and political context that the Greenham Common protest took place within. This will include a discussion of the status of women in 1980s Britain and the ways that this impacted their political agency. This provides important insights for analysing their subversive performatic potential within the frames of sovereign power and political vulnerability and abandonment. Furthermore, I explore how these processes of social and political marginalisation created distinct conditions for the performances of women’s bodies against the backdrop of the military base, with particular regard to the ways that the military base itself creates a unique performance of sovereign power. In the next section I discuss the development of the peace camp itself, first locating it within the evolution of the Greenham Common Air Force Base and then exploring the march to Greenham and the initial establishment of a permanent peace camp. Following this the chapter

---

14 The Greenham Common Peace Camp lasted from 1981 to 2000. The military base was transferred from the US Air Force to the RAF in 1992, and it was decommissioned in 1993 (West Berkshire District Council).
discusses a variety of protest actions that I believe demonstrate elements of camp sensibilities. This begins with an overview of the characterisation of women within the camp, before discussing in more detail the structure and governance of the camps, the 'Embrace the Base' action, trespasses, courtroom performances, and eviction attempts. The chapter then provides an evaluation of specific elements of camp aesthetics, including parody, irony, theatricality and playfulness. I conclude with a discussion of the successes and failures of the Greenham Common protest with regard to its potential to create dissensus and effectively challenge dominant frames of sovereign power. This will provide the necessary details to assess the extent to which camp theatricality at Greenham Common produced political performance efficacy.

I. STAGING GREENHAM COMMON:
Military-Sovereign Spaces, Exclusions, and the Female Body in Performance

As we have seen in the case of the Bonus Army, the geographical locations of protest are an important part of the way that protestors seek to influence audience interpretations. The surrounding environment of a political action is integral to its performatic significance, and this means that protests are informed by both historical uses of the performance space and by the current legalities and conventions imposed on users of those spaces. Like the protests of the Bonus Army, the performances at the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp were similarly informed by the ghosting of past events.

Greenham Common lies outside the town of Newbury in Berkshire. It was somewhat unique as a performance space due to its historical designation as Common Land, acquired by the Newbury District Council in 1939 for the stated intention of preserving it for the use of Newbury inhabitants. The land was subsequently requisitioned by the Air Ministry, and the base was established in 1941. It was used as a major base for the United States Air Force during the Second World War, when the community was happy to sacrifice the Common land for the sake of the war effort (Junor 1995, ix). Throughout the decades of the Cold War, the USAF constructed Europe's longest military runway at the base, and the Ministry of Defence purchased 77 acres of the property. In 1979, NATO announced its plan for the base to become home to 96 Cruise Missiles, which would entail the construction of underground silos and a major expansion of the base. The local Newbury community largely supported this development due to the attendant prospects of financial gain (Junor 1995, x). For many critics, the Cruise Missile decision was seen
as yet another escalation of the Cold War arms race (Junor 1995, Liddington 1989). Throughout all of the evolutions of the base, the legal rights of the Commoners with regard to this land were never completely dissolved – although the people lost access to it, their rights to it technically remained (Greenham and Crookham Commons Commission 2011). Indeed, in 1991 the fence around the base perimeter was declared illegal, on the basis that permission had not been sought to erect such a barrier on Common Land (Fairhall 2006). The resulting tension between Commoners’ rights and the demands of state policies would prove pivotal in the kinds of protest that were enacted by the Women’s Peace Camp.

In addition, the relationship of sovereign power with citizenship was further complicated at Greenham Common due to the American 'ownership' of the base. While the land legally belonged to the British, it was the United States Air Force that manned the base itself, and they provided the equipment and machinery that separated the denizens of the military sphere from the women who gathered outside to protest. The rules in place at the base required any civilian arrestees to be immediately handed over to local civilian police authorities, thus resulting in most arrests being conducted between local police and the protesters; however, on many occasions it was the military personnel who were the first point of contact for the civil disobedience of the protesters, and so the American Air Force members were directly involved in confrontations with the peace camp (Fairhall 2006, 94). The siting of an American power on British soil, and its targeting by primarily British citizens, created a different kind of encounter with sovereign power. In this sense spectators were treated to scenes of British women interacting not with the state forces that directly granted them citizenship and regulated their roles in society, but with a kind of super-sovereign power that enacted imperialist Cold War exceptionalism as self-legitimising practice. As I will demonstrate below, Greenham Common presented unique embodiments of the military, state, and domestic spheres and the performed interactions of the base personnel, law enforcement, and protesters manifested a complex negotiation of power and vulnerability.

15 The initial victory was secured by Greenham protesters Jean Hutchinson and Georgina Smith at Reading Crown Court, and the verdict was later upheld by the House of Lords, which declared that the Ministry of Defence’s bye-laws illegally impinged upon Commoners’ rights (Fairhall 2006, 112-114).

16 For more on the unique manifestations of Sovereign Power and bare life vis a vis imperialist military power, see Shenhav 2012.
Before continuing, it is also helpful to point out some key differences between traditions of protest in the United Kingdom and United States, in order to facilitate a valid comparison of these actions. Primarily, the notion of public protest as a 'positive' right has historically been absent in the UK. This is largely a result of differences in the legal and political systems between the United States and United Kingdom. In the latter rights have historically been based on a range of sources that include legal precedent, common law, treaties and historical documents, rather than a written constitution. However, protest in Britain is tied to notions of citizenship and patriotism that are not dissimilar to their American counterparts. Significantly, this stems from the vibrant history of direct action as a means to secure a variety of modes of political agency, particularly electoral reforms and the right to vote. Furthermore, theatricality can be detected in the underlying tactics of resistance from the Peterloo demonstration to the protests of the suffragettes, to Speakers’ Corner and beyond. Indeed, Sasha Roseneil links the Greenham Common protest directly to the performatic legacy of the Kinder Scout Trespass, and notes the similarity in both actions' efforts to resist the co-opting of Common land (Roseneil 1997). This seems to indicate that the heritage of theatrical protest movements underpins modern-day sentiments about the right to protest. This lends added weight to projects that seek to elucidate the dramaturgy of protest performances, because through such analyses we can begin to trace the means by which modern-day protesters derive a sense of legitimacy, and seek to portray this to audiences.

To some extent, the legal context of political protest changed in 1998 with the enactment of the UK Human Rights Act and the subsequent European Convention on Human Rights in 2000. Under these frameworks, British citizens obtained codified written rights to Freedom of Thought, Conscience and Religion; Freedom of Expression; and the Right to Peaceful Assembly. While these rights have of course been offset by the range of laws recently drafted in the name of anti-terrorism and security, the point remains that protesters in the present day are acting under written, positive laws that protect their actions to some degree, but also bring them squarely under the authority of sovereign frames. This is a slight but important difference from the circumstances in place at the height of the Greenham Common action.

17 I am using the term 'positive right' here in the tradition of political theory. The distinction between positive and negative rights relates to the nature of rights that permit or oblige actions as opposed to restricting or prohibiting actions.
The geographic and legal elements discussed above certainly shaped the kinds of protest that could effectively be enacted at Greenham Common. However, the actions – both in terms of their production and reception - were most strongly influenced by the social and political positions of the women who performed them. As in the case of war veterans, it is somewhat unusual to suggest that 'women' may function as a category for sovereign abandonment and Homo sacer-like identities. However, I will demonstrate below that a range of factors limited the political agency of women in 1980s Britain, and that their subsequent political acts took place within a frame of political exclusion that was created both by the proximity of the military base and by sovereign power more broadly.

To start with, a number of theorists have written about the ways that women are potentially reduced to bare life in modern Western democracies. For example, Anna Marie Smith discusses the welfare mother as a figure who is sexually and reproductively regulated through state policies (2010); Penelope Deutscher discusses the bare life problematic of women who are denied abortions (2008); Geraldine Pratt explores the states of exception that shape the lives of female economic migrants and sex workers (2005). Particularly relevant to this study are the observations of Cristina Masters, who explores the concept of *Femina Sacra* as a complement to Agamben’s *Homo sacer*:

Rendered as reproductive – as sexual objects – women are used in particular ways in the politics of war. *Femina sacra*, therefore, helps us to think through the specificity of how war operates on women’s bodies, without reducing women to dominant representations or massifying them as one among many. This is not to argue that women’s lives are necessarily more bare than men’s, but rather to critically think through how they are rendered bare in particular ways – ways worth paying special attention to (Masters 2009, 32).

There are several particular ways that the Greenham Common women were produced as excluded, restricted, bare life subjects prior to and during their protests. First, it is useful to reflect briefly on the gendering of politics in 1980s Britain. Most obviously, the leadership of Margaret Thatcher seems to offer an indication of expanded political opportunities for women. However, on closer inspection, and with the focus of analysis on gender over biology, Thatcher’s career reveals the extent to which femininity was largely considered unnatural in the realm of political action. For theorists like Francis Fukuyama, Thatcher provided an ideal example of masculinised politics inscribed upon and enacted by a female body. Indeed, Fukuyama praised Thatcher extensively for her
ability to apparently 'drag' male characteristics of tough-mindedness, aggression, competitiveness, and the willingness to use military force, all traits which he deemed necessary and suitable for late 20th and early 21st century global politics (Fukuyama 1998). Furthermore, Fukuyama expressed a widely-held view that – despite the few anomalies like Thatcher – women in general are ill-suited for political roles in global politics: 'in male-dominated societies, it is these kinds of unusual women who will rise to the top' (1998, 32).

In actual fact, the women of Greenham Common frequently spoke about their former experiences as marginalised political subjects, and the social forces that discouraged them from actively participating. The explicitness of women’s bare life experiences also becomes clear when considering the unique construction of some forms of 'rights' for women. For example, Ewa Ziarek interprets Homo sacer as a figure that can be the subject of violence that is not criminal – this provides another illustration of an individual that sovereign power has placed outside the protections of the law, yet remains subject to it (Ziarek 2010). In this sense, women (and many social minorities) may be seen to possess elements of the Homo sacer position, as violent crimes against them – including domestic abuse and harassment - are frequently downplayed or even decriminalised. This point also underscores the importance of vulnerability in political protest – if Agamben’s Homo sacer abandonment can be instituted through differently-regulated categories of vulnerability and bodily risk, then it makes sense to pay close attention to the ways that vulnerability is performed when protesters seek to challenge the logics of sovereign authority.

Women's bodies at Greenham Common were especially illustrative of the kind of bare life that Ziarek describes. Clearly, state power had labelled them as excluded from the ordinary realm of citizenry, suspending or mitigating some of their rights while continuing to insist upon their status as subjects of the law. Perhaps the strongest example of this comes from the words spoken to long-time peace camp resident Sarah Hipperson. She recalls that a local police officer blatantly told her that ‘there isn't anything anyone can do to you lot that I would consider criminal’ (Hipperson in Fairhall 2006, 95). This is of course a direct manifestation of Agamben's concept of an individual (or group of individuals) who is both subject to the law and placed outside of it. The protesters' punishment by law enforcement, coupled with their inability to claim themselves as legitimate subjects of legal protections – at least in the mind of some
figures of authority – underscores the extent to which they were operating as excluded, exceptional subjects.

Butler's performativity is directly implicated here, as these women discovered themselves to be confined by socially constructed gender roles that were difficult to escape from (Butler 1990, 1993). As I will demonstrate below, their performances at Greenham Common sometimes struggled to ‘shake the ground’ sufficiently to outstrip the social hierarchies of feminine/masculine, domestic/public and military/civilian. To fully understand the challenges of the subject position these women found themselves in, it is also important to consider the ways that gender constructions operate as powerful conveyors of other social categorisations, because of the seeming ‘naturalness’ of gender coding. These codes are connected to other hierarchical social orderings, and Veronique Pin Fat and Maria Stern suggest that they undermine the entire myth of military sacrifice (2005). In order for sacrifice to have meaning, it must be enacted for something else, and so the very existence of the military implies another sphere in need of protection – this is the domestic sphere, which is traditionally saturated with feminine gendering. In this way, the performance of gender to some extent upholds social constructions of the military and its attendant security imperatives. At the same time though, subversive gender performance may function as a means of destabilising the myth of military sacrifice that underpins many aspects of Western foreign policy.

In addition, I want to suggest that the case of Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp demonstrates the way that Homo sacer subjects can be produced not only by sovereign legislation or cultural practices, but by the sites in which they appear. My contention here is that civilian women in situ at military bases entered a sphere of exception where they existed neither as the wives and mothers that were apprehensible as British domestic citizens, nor as the manifestations of sovereign power contained within the base, nor as legitimate political actors. They performed at the borderlands between the military, political, and domestic spheres, and were faced with the constant traps of essentialised feminism on one side and the reproduction of violent and aggressive behaviour on the other. In this way, their attempts to achieve protest efficacy were heavily dependent on theatrical tactics that could 'deground' this complex of norms, to use Judith Butler's term (Butler et al. 1994).
II. GREENHAM COMMON PROTEST PERFORMANCES:
Protest Camping and Camp Aesthetics in Cold War Britain

The plan to march to Greenham was devised gradually in the wake of the news about
NATO's Western European missile plans. A small group of women in Wales had founded
an organisation called 'Women for Life on Earth', out of concerns about nuclear waste and
the nuclear arms race. These women included Ann Pettit and Helen John, and it was
these two who devised the initial plan for the march (Stead 2006). On August 27, 1981, a
group of thirty six women, accompanied by a small number of men and children, walked
120 miles from Cardiff to Newbury to demonstrate their objections to the Cruise Missile
installation. After walking for ten days they arrived at Greenham Common and sought to
present a letter to the base Commander that expressed their concerns. They also
requested a televised debate with the Secretary of State for Defence, but their request was
denied. In answer, four of the women chained themselves to the fence surrounding the
Greenham Common base (Junor 1995, x; Liddington 1989, 1).

According to Helen John, who was one of the women chained to the railings, the military
officers ordered them to leave, explaining that their men would be drinking that night and
the women would risk being raped if they remained. When the women laughed in
response, the commander became angry and in frustration he told them that they could
stay there for as long as they liked for all he cared (John, quoted in Russell 2006). The
women opted to do exactly that, and set up the roots of a camp that would remain for
almost two decades. They had celebrated the culmination of their march and their arrival
at the base with joyous somersaults and the waving of brightly coloured scarves and
ribbons, and these actions set the tone for the flourishing camp that would soon be
established (Stead 2006).

Ann Pettitt recalls that the idea for the march was inspired by a similar protest walk from
Paris to Copenhagen which she had read about previously (Liddington 1989, 224). This
in itself speaks to the potential of protest performance to create rippling effects of action
and interaction. Likewise, the act of protesters chaining themselves to the fence of the
base had not been part of the original plan. It arose spontaneously at one of the group's
overnight stops during a casual discussion of the suffragettes, and the image stuck in the
minds of some of the protesters (Liddington 1989, 230). In this way, Greenham Common
exemplifies Taylor's concept of the performatic repertoire, as it drew directly from historical protest practices to craft suitable theatrical responses to contemporary political issues.

As news spread of the Welsh group's encampment, protesters from around the country began to make their way to Greenham Common. The campers were supported by donations from like-minded groups, who offered tents, food, firewood and other vital supplies (Stead 2006). The camp sites themselves lacked physical comforts, although they didn't approach the level of poverty seen in the Bonus Army encampments. Most of the women lived in shelters called 'benders', constructed from bent tree branches and covered with scraps of plastic. These had the advantage of being easy to dismantle and relocate, something that became increasingly important as eviction attempts became more numerous. The site was often wet and muddy, but the women pulled together to make the camp as cheerful and homelike as possible. The Greenham Common camps were less likely to enact the kind of physical interference that Susan Leigh Foster theorises with regard to political encampments, simply due to their location away from the main thoroughfares used by the British public. However, they did operate in the fashion described by Michael Balfour, intruding starkly on public conceptions of the normalcy of the military base (Foster 2003; Balfour 2012).

One of the starkest contrasts between the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common camp was in the way that the sites were governed. While the BEF leaders felt that military-like discipline and hierarchy were required to maintain peace and order in the camps, the women of Greenham opted for a far different strategy. From the very earliest days of the camp, following the initial march and the decision to remain, the women embraced a collective and non-hierarchical approach to governing themselves. They had no assigned leaders or political structures, beyond a 'rule' that each woman would be allowed to fully express herself, in turn, during all discussions. This meant that many meetings stretched on for hours, as the protesters heard the views of every single woman present, in full. However difficult this might have been in practical terms, it created a fully democratic camp site, and one that reflected true consensus governance (Liddington 1989, 231). This is again reflective of Laclau's description of the potential for collective counter-authority to develop out of the exteriority of marginalised subjects (Laclau 2007).
The camp site also allowed for flourishing diversity within it, and this was facilitated by the several sub-camps that together comprised the protest site as a whole. According to Margaret Laware, the camp was made up of at least seven smaller camps positioned at the various gates to the base. In their efforts to avoid hierarchical divisions between the camps, the protesters gave them names associated with the colours of the rainbow, and each had its own particular characteristics (Laware 2004, 21). Yellow Gate, the first site established, became known for its linkages of militarism and racism, and the residents’ efforts to promote an anti-racist agenda. Green Gate was the second camp that was created, and it housed most of the women with children. Violet Gate was the most religious site, and the Red and Orange Gates housed the artists and musicians (Russell 2006).

Many of the former participants assert that the camp's ongoing cooperation and effective organisation is directly due to the acceptance of fluidity and multivocality that the participants privileged (Laware 2004, 23). This provides a stark contrast to the military-style organisation of the Bonus Army, but elicits its own potential for camp aesthetic qualities. Whereas the Bonus Army's opportunities for camp sensibilities arose from its parodic transference of dominant military camp sites, for Greenham Common the potential lay in the rejection of dominant styles of governance while being visibly located against (and in front of) them. This became an important feature of the overall performance of Greenham Common, because it provided an example of a workable political alternative – both to the law enforcement and the military personnel that came into daily contact with the site, but also to the 'spectators' among the general public who followed the protest in television and newspaper reports. Importantly, this was achieved by making visible something that was normally excluded and invisible – a disorderly and vibrant camp full of women located in perhaps the most tightly ordered and regulated of sites.

As a result of the characteristic fluidity and diversity noted above, it is difficult to sketch out a full picture of the characterisations on display at Greenham Common. However, in this section I want to draw out some of the prominent themes with regard to the portrayal of women at the camp site, in order to elucidate this as one component of a dramaturgy of women's protest in recent decades. To start with, the women at Greenham Common came from diverse backgrounds. In age they ranged from teenagers to octogenarians, and they included school teachers, midwives, magistrates, doctors, school girls, and people on
benefits (Russell 2006). With such a diverse cast of characters it is hardly surprising that there was no fixed identity or characterisation, or even a central ideology embraced by the protest as a whole. Perhaps the most obvious similarity shared by the campers was their biological sex, and it was this characteristic that would become one of the most controversial aspects of the camp. It also greatly shaped the kinds of performance that the protesters would engage in.

The decision to alter the peace camp from women-led to women-only occurred in February 1982. According to Liddington, tensions had increased over the winter months between the protesters and law enforcement at the base, as excuses were found to attempt to evict the activists. By the end of the first winter the activists were facing imminent forcible eviction, and the majority felt that excluding men from the camp would better ensure complete non-violence in response (Liddington 1989, 325-6). The decision was rooted in a fear that men would react with aggression during confrontations with law enforcement. Some of the women also felt that men weren't undertaking enough of the work duties at the camp sites, and others expressed a desire to create a specifically women's peace movement (Stead 2006; Liddington 1989). Although for the most part men were still allowed to visit and participate in actions during the day, this still created a sense of exclusion for the many men who wished to take part. More importantly, it also became a pivotal influence on the public's opinions of the camp – and this will be discussed more below. The Greenham Common peace camp is now often considered problematic in its linkage of masculinity with aggression and militarism and femininity with non-response and pacifism (Sylvester 1994). This will be discussed in more detail below, with regard to the intersections of essentialist feminism with queer camp aesthetics. Here, I focus on the resulting characterisations of the women and their political opponents.

The unique interactive issues that arise from women-only protest created opportunities for the protesters to deliberately perform hierarchical social norms and the inscription of sovereign power on individual human subjects. For example, a clear sexed-and-gendered binary was constructed between the female protesters and the mostly-male law enforcement. This became particularly true during the dramatic evictions and arrests, when potential physical confrontation was at its height. Spectators were treated on the one hand to images of female bodies – normally inscribed with weakness, domesticity, apoliticalness, and inactivity – very effectively blockading military vehicles or
dismantling so-called high-security apparatus; and on the other hand, they also watched as those very same female bodies were confronted by the presumed superior physical force of the male police officers. At the same time, the women's performance of passive, non-violent resistance compelled law enforcement to interact with them in a way that created dissensus not only for spectators, but for the law officers themselves. The actions of the Greenham Common women called into question their own assumptions about gender traits and the location/s of political agency and state power. As one protester puts it,

A policeman trying to pull two arms apart in a firmly linked human chain has to directly confront his own feelings about human contact, handling women not as sexual objects but as powerful beings (Hopkins and Harford 1984, 93).

In becoming a women-only protest group they effectively ensured that any display of state force used against them would be read by spectators in a gendered fashion. Because women's bodies are already inscribed with vulnerability as a 'natural' characteristic, civil disobedience performed by women locates the unexpected on the bodies of the law enforcement officials charged with removing or containing them.

Importantly, the protesters would often make use of these gendered codings of bodies in a subversive and humorous fashion. One prime example occurred during one of the many uses of fire by the protesters. The Greenham Common women frequently set small fires to aid their blockades of the base, requiring the base personnel or police officers to redirect their attentions to extinguishing the flames. In one action one of the peace women simply stepped on the hosepipe being aimed at the fire by the male authorities; this had the effect of reducing the spray of water to nothing more than a trickle, which Laware describes as appropriating the symbolic castration of men by women and transforming it in a way that presented a potential alternative world view (2004, 36).

It is also helpful to explore the women's own interpretations of gender and feminism, in order to more fully understand the gender relations they were partaking in and playing with. Jill Liddington outlines three general types of feminism encountered at the peace camp. First she discusses Maternal Feminism, the notion that women might be biologically predisposed to peaceful attitudes and a desire to protect life, due to their roles as mothers and nurturers (1989, 7). Secondly, Liddington notes the presence of Equal Rights Feminism in the camp. She critiques this kind of feminism for its failure to
address militarism in its entirety, focusing too much on demands for equality and not enough on calls for change (1989, 8). Finally, she describes the prevalence of Radical Feminism at Greenham Common, which she characterises as a kind of feminism that links patriarchy with militarism, and domestic violence by men with global violence by states (1989, 10). Liddington's categories are of course only generalisations, and many more types of feminism could ostensibly be located in the Greenham Common archive. However, her categories serve as a reminder of the diversity of protesters' views with regard to constructions of sex and gender.

However, it is also important not to focus on the sex-gender elements of the camp at the expense of the genuine day-to-day enactment of social relations that took place there. As noted above, women there performed an alternative way of doing politics, and the backdrop of the military base served as rich contrasting scenery. The ongoing performance of disobedience and alternative lifestyle cannot be reduced to a singular standpoint. Furthermore, it is important to consider the way that there was no singular identity imposed or even encouraged for Greenham. In fact the participants resisted aligning themselves with a particular strategy or body of tactics or political ideology, and the existence of the camp itself became the single unified 'strategy' of the protesters. This brief summary of the approaches to gender performance makes clear the way that the protesters were indeed performing social norms, in a very overt and deliberate fashion. What becomes essential then, is to consider the attitude of these various performances and the kinds of theatricality used within them.

At the end of 1981 the Greenham Common women began making plans for what would become perhaps their most memorable action at the base. Scheduled to coincide with the anniversary of NATO's decision to site the missiles there, the group conceived the action known as 'Embrace the Base'. The plan was to gather enough women at the site to completely surround the base. They calculated that 16,000 women would be needed to fully encircle the base's 9-mile perimeter, and in a bid to attract that many protesters they composed a chain letter which they hoped women would circulate to other women. Amidst the description of the event and the call to action was this bid:

Women are asked to bring personal things that represent the threat of nuclear war to us, and that represent our lives, our anger and our joy... we want to decorate the entire fence with personal things (Liddington 1989, 240-241).
The juxtaposition of personal items with the military sphere seems to have been an attempt to highlight and complicate the symbolic existence of the base. By deploying their own symbolic acts, the women demonstrated the ways that the military base might be differently enacted, through the inclusion of the lives that are constantly under threat from nuclear war. The placement of these symbols of childhood, families, and daily life laid a new skin on the base itself, and one which was undeniably human. This contrasted vividly with the sterile military base excepted from citizenship and the polis, and in so doing it challenged the 'natural' existence of the borders between the inhuman military and the human fleshiness of those outside of it. It also exemplified the way that a display of vulnerability - illustrated here by the drawings of children and the fragility of home artefacts - can insistently humanise the subjects of foreign policy.

While the organisers of the ‘Embrace the Base’ action were unsure about its potential success (Liddington 239), more than 30,000 women - double the number required - made their way to the peace camp on December 12, 1982 (Laware 2004, 21). They arrived in coaches, vans and cars from all parts of the country and around the world. The creativity and vibrancy of this action is best expressed Chris Mulvey, who travelled from Dublin to join in the protest:

> There it was in front of me: the fence, three times as tall as I and stretching further than my eye could see. I wanted to decorate it. I wanted to fill its holes with colour and with life, to transform it, so that when I looked again I would see Life and Beauty not threat and cold sterility. […]

> The tents were put up, the tea was made, the fence was decorated and transformed from a sterile ugliness into a dancing work of art. […] Sometime during that day we joined hands and began to sing. Hand in hand in hand, for nine miles we formed a living chain to lock in the horrors of war, to stand between them and our world and to say: we will meet your violence with a loving embrace, for it is the surest way of defusing it (Mulvey, in Harford and Hopkins 1984, 92).

Embrace the Base did more than blend the spheres of the domestic and the military and display the vulnerability of the protesters – it threatened the secure borders of the base itself, surrounding it in a show of force characterised by warmth, softness, affection and nurturing. In this action, the base itself became vulnerable and its existence within a state of exception was eroded. The action attracted global media attention, with television news programmes broadcasting aerial images of the military base literally
surrounded by hand-holding women. Embrace the Base brought the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp into the centre of public debates about Cold War militarism, and from then on it was established as a main character in the political dramas led by Thatcher, Reagan, Brezhnev and Gorbachev.

Despite the beauty and vibrancy of this event, it also highlighted another issue that is central to the performatic impact of Greenham Common. After the day and night of the successful action, when the fence had been covered with home artefacts and symbols of peace and humanity, the protesters awoke in a renewed atmosphere of tension. Chris Mulvey's account picks up the story again, shortly after the arrival of police:

A song began as more vans drew up and suddenly police were everywhere. Inside the fence and outside, more and more arrived. They began to remove the women. I watched as friends were dragged along the road and flung into the mud at the side of the banks. The clash between women and police began in earnest now. It terrified me. There was fear and violence in the air, shouts and cries, harsh orders and banshee wailing, a woman's scream and the thud of bodies flung on to the mud. Behind the fence a woman fell to the ground and two policemen rushed towards her. One, twisting his fingers into her hair, began to drag her through the gate. I saw his boot and heard the thud and suddenly I had to vomit (Mulvey in Harford and Hopkins 1984, 93).

This description is not atypical for Greenham Common. Throughout their residence at the Peace Camp, the women experienced all manner of risk and indignity. The camps themselves provided only the most basic of shelter from the elements. Sarah Hipperson remembers sleeping for two whole months with nothing but a bin liner to cover her. The protesters describe being spat upon by law enforcement, and having streams of urine sprayed on them from squeeze bottles. They were arrested regularly, then released, only to be arrested again a short time later (Russell 2006). Many spent time in prison, and while the unique forms of vulnerability they experienced there were not performed for the public, their subsequent pamphlet writings and protest songs poignantly conveyed the kinds of physical and psychological powerlessness they had experienced. As suggested in the quote above, when performing civil disobedience – particularly when obstructing roads and blockading the base – the women were often dragged along tarmac roads by police officers and thrown into ditches at the roadside (Stead 2006).
These descriptions illustrate a different kind of performed vulnerability to the one enacted by ‘Embrace the Base’, and one which is more closely aligned to the displays of vulnerability by the Bonus Army. Here, protesters’ vulnerability continues to be highlighted but with perhaps a lesser degree of disruption of the dominant ordering of sovereign power and citizenship. In incidents like the ones above, public audiences primarily witnessed a reflection of the ordinary frames of political disobedience and punishment, and this seems to lessen the dissensus-creating potential of the protest. This was a common challenge to the efficacy of the Greenham Common performances, which were regularly marked by attempts at direct action and civil disobedience that were conversely minimised by the Bonus Army.

Furthermore, the efficacy of performed vulnerability was also altered by the social roles the protesters were positioning themselves within. The vulnerability of the Bonus Army protesters was far less apparent, being largely incompatible with the markers of power, strength and resourcefulness that remain inscribed on the bodies of war veterans, so for those activists vulnerability only became starkly apparent in the face of extreme violence on the part of the government. However, the Greenham Common women strategically displayed their vulnerability from the earliest days of the camp, and their performances of non-response placed the police officers in the roles of protagonists. As a result, the emphasis for spectators was on the treatment of women by the police, and this may have set up an avenue to provoke audiences into rethinking the naturalness of police 'protection' and the benefits of 'law and order' itself. Clearly Greenham Common exemplifies the challenges of performing vulnerability in a way that can outstrip the orderings of power and citizenship in society. As in the case of the Bonus Army, these displays of vulnerability raise questions about the efficacy of such protests. This requires a more targeted exploration of the kinds of theatricality that were involved, and this will be further pursued below.

Beginning in January 1983, the Greenham Common women added another protest tactic to their repertoire: trespassing on the base itself. On New Year's Day 1983, forty four women scaled the base's fence and climbed atop the awaiting missile silos. There they joined hands and danced in a circle in the early dawn hours, initially remaining unnoticed by the police. Their dancing continued in a frenzied marathon until they were finally arrested hours later (Stead 2006). The action was marked by joyfulness and frivolity, but it represented an escalation of the protest tactics embraced by the women. The dancing
on the silos sparked a new wave of protest that focused on penetrating the boundary between the base and the peace camp, and it led Defence Secretary Michael Heseltine to warn the women that trespassing on the base would put them at risk of being shot (Associated Press 1983). Despite these threats, over the coming years the Greenham Common women repeatedly attempted to cut holes in the fence and physically transgress the borders between military base and peace camp. In an extension of the philosophies honed in the Embrace the Base action, some of the participants believed that trespassing on the base would demonstrate its 'insecurity' to the public, and make a mockery of its constructed image of untouchable, impenetrable force (Harford and Hopkins 1984, 154; Laware 2004, 30). Furthermore, these acts of sabotage forced military personnel to exert excessive efforts to secure the base from housewives, mothers, grandmothers, and young activists, eliciting a kind of camp performance by the soldiers themselves.

Furthermore, these trespassing operations were not solely symbolic. In October 1983 a large scale action was performed in which the protesters succeeded in cutting down four miles of the nine mile perimeter fence. This was achieved by tightly coordinated efforts that succeeded in keeping the protesters' plans a secret until they were already under way. The protesters cleverly planned the action to coincide with a scheduled Halloween celebration at the camps, and so the arrival of additional women didn't arouse the suspicions of the base authorities (Jones 1987, Liddington 1989). Furthermore, the women's Halloween costumes provided the perfect means to disguise the bolt cutters that they carried. As Liddington describes it, the protesters themselves were quite surprised by the ease with which they were able to cut the fence. They had previously practiced balancing on each others' shoulders in order to be able to reach the top of the fence, and it only required a few quick, deft snips with the bolt cutters to open entire portions. Because they had positioned themselves at sporadic intervals around the base, and often in less accessible areas, the military authorities lacked sufficient personnel to prevent all of the simultaneous acts of destruction. Ultimately 187 women were arrested for criminal damage, but not before the action attracted a great deal of media attention (Liddington 1989, 270). The fact that such a significant portion of the base's fence could be so rapidly eroded drew attention to its vulnerability, imposing a layer of characteristics not normally considered natural to the military sphere.

The arrests that resulted from the 'Bringing Down the Fence' action were certainly not a new occurrence for the Greenham Common women. Indeed, from their earliest actions
they had faced arrest and potential imprisonment, and some significant courtroom dramas were enacted as a result. As the years passed and the actions they undertook were increasingly illegal in a formal sense, the amount of time that Greenham Common protesters spent in courtrooms extended. While the stakes were high for the accused, many of whom spent weeks and months in prison, the interactions with the legal system provided a rich opportunity for camp courtroom theatricality.

Most of the Greenham Common court appearances were enacted at Newbury Magistrates Court, with a few more serious cases moved to the Crown Court. Here we find another example of the Greenham women embodying characteristics of Homo sacer, as they were simultaneously subject to laws yet denied equal recognition under the legal system. As David Fairhall reports, in court the women were often denied the opportunity to speak ‘the whole truth and nothing but the truth’ when they attempted to explain their anti-nuclear positions in defence of their actions. When such attempts were made by the accused, magistrates frequently cut them off, refusing to allow them to finish their statements and threatening them with charges of Contempt of Court (Fairhall 2006, 95). In addition, many were denied legal aid, so in fact they were disallowed from speaking in their own defence according to their own perspectives, and also denied an opportunity to hire someone ‘more qualified’ to speak for them. Most concretely, the magistrates prohibited women from giving Greenham Common Peace Camp as their residential address, thereby creating an impossible conundrum for women who genuinely lived at the site as their only home. This went hand in hand with efforts to deny the women the right to vote in local elections, on the basis of the supposed invalidity of their residential address (Webley and Samuels 2009, 43).

However, the most fascinating elements of the women's court appearances are the performance tactics that they embraced there. In court, the women sang songs, knitted scarves, wove woollen webs, and engaged in parodic repartees with officials (e.g., wrangling over the meaning of the phrase 'keeping the peace', swearing oaths to the Goddess rather than God) (Harford and Hopkins 1984; Liddington 1989). It was here that elements of camp sensibilities can most readily be detected in the Greenham women's activism. The separate environment of the courtroom provides a physically demarcated space that masks the power of the sovereign to ignore or suspend the law, yet it simultaneously provides the medium through which sovereignty enacts its authority. It is as if the courtrooms invited camp performance in order to effectively challenge their role.
as the masks of sovereign power. Most other kind of response would potentially have simply fallen into the sanctioned modes of behaviour expected within courtrooms, with the protesters taking either the role of the unjustly accused (fated to either become pardoned or condemned, but either way re-characterised and re-amalgamated into the logic of the polis) or the outright criminally guilty (and therefore already characterised as bare life or Homo sacer). By performing with parody, mockery and excess, as well as other behaviours considered altogether inappropriate to the setting, the women challenged the courtroom's function as a space that conceals and upholds sovereign power.

As discussed in Chapter Two, the eviction of the Bonus Army demonstrated the ways that forcible removals of protesters can create tense interactions with layered symbolic import for public audiences. For the Bonus Expeditionary Forces, the unexpected actions of their eviction altered the significance of the protest as a whole, and the ways that it would be remembered and embodied by later generations. Analysing the impact of the Greenham Common evictions is somewhat more difficult, largely due to the fact that these attempts were ongoing throughout the nineteen years of the camp's existence. A major part of Greenham Common's legacy in the dramaturgy of protest comes from the resilience of the campers and their determination to erect a liveable home space in the midst of vivid political insecurity. In the beginning the campers had attempted to stay in caravans, and when these were banned they tried living in tents. These too were prohibited so they took to living in their makeshift benders, and these rough shelters acquired all the comforts and attachments of any other home space. The evictions, which were always temporary, became a repetitive performance of destruction and rebuilding.

In the early years, attempts to evict the women from the vicinity of the base were largely unsuccessful. However, in 1983 the eviction attempts became much more frequent, and the women were forced to adapt. They learned to live with the constant threat of eviction, and became familiar with the violent threats the bailiffs would level at them in these situations:

'The bailiffs seemed to have no kind of restraint on how badly they were prepared to behave. A not uncommon alarm clock would be the point of a knife coming in through the plastic and slicing it off above your face' (Richardson, in Kidron 2007).
News footage supports this assessment, showing a bevy of men violently ripping apart the polythene shelters while women still slept inside. Several of the Greenham Common women have spoken of the anxiety that they felt as a result of the frequent evictions. They describe being unable to relax due to the fear that bailiffs could arrive at any moment and seize all of the campers' possessions and clear them from the site. Many of them built their benders on wheels, enabling them to simply roll their homes away temporarily when the site was cleared (Kidron 2007).

In 1984, in a bid to create starker legal boundaries and force the women into law-breaking acts, authorities hit upon the idea of widening the base's access road which circled the camp. This vastly reduced the amount of common land available to protesters to camp upon, and increased the likelihood of trespassing onto base property almost to the point of necessity (Junor 1995, 23-27). While this attempt was unsuccessful in its plan to oust the protesters, the cycle of eviction-and-return coincided with a decline in media interest in the women's peace camp (Fairhall 2006). This speaks strongly of the decline in the protesters' ability to effectively command the public's attention through genuine challenges to dominant norms. This may be at least partly due to the fact that the women's transgressions had taken on the form of a known pattern, with trespassing attempts, however creative, quickly quashed and followed by eviction attempts, however temporary. This effectively located the peace camp's actions within a known script, and quashed the previous elements of spontaneity and disruption that had given the protest its dissensus-generating potential.

The descriptions above only scratch the surface of the rich and diverse forms of activism that were engaged in at the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp. It would be impossible in a work of this length to fully analyse the depth of the peace women's performance tactics, but I have attempted to sketch a brief outline of exemplary actions for the sake of this study. In this section I will expand on some of the performatic devices touched upon in the paragraphs above; specifically I will address the ways that the Greenham Common Camp employed aspects of parody, irony, theatricality and playfulness, and contributed these to a repertoire of queer camp protest aesthetics. Following this I will provide a more detailed assessment of the thorny intersections of feminist camp with the feminist performance tactics that more generally characterised this protest.
If we consider camp parody as the subversive, stylised mockery of dominant traits, it is not difficult to locate examples of this characteristic among the performances at Greenham Common. On the surface, the protesters deliberately embodied stereotypical feminine traits and engaged in displays of dancing, singing, knitting, and nurturing (Russell 2006). To better understand the potential efficacy of these performance practices, particularly in terms of their ability to create dissensus for spectators, it is important to review some notions of feminist camp and the way that camp tactics can be usefully employed by female bodies. To start with, Pamela Robertson discusses the power of 'feminist masquerade', and concludes that it can more effectively parody not just the image of a natural 'original', but the idea that an original exists:

[…] the surprise and incongruity of female same-sex masquerade consists in the identity between she who masquerades and the role she plays – she plays at being what she is always already perceived to be (Robertson 1999, 274).

The women of Greenham Common, in their efforts to perform a brand of activism reflective of their women-only ethos, often portrayed exaggerations of characteristics encoded as naturally feminine. For the most part, they sincerely believed that women might be better suited to fostering international peace than men, and they were eager to prove that the roots of their politics lay in their experience as women. Because of this, they engaged in performance practices that highlighted stereotypical feminine behaviours – and regardless of their sincerity and intentions, the result for spectators occasionally offered, at least potentially, a parodic representation of those traits. This parodying of the culturally dominant markers of femininity became most apparent in the women's courtroom appearances, but it also existed in aspects of the day-to-day life of the peace camp and was regularly on display in televised news broadcasts.

In addition to the exaggerations of feminine stereotypes, Margaret Laware suggests that the protesters' performances attempted to effect alterations to these stereotypes. She lauds the Greenham Common women for their strategic re-working of existing tropes and rhetorics, and describes their process as:

[…] a symbolic re-inhabiting of women's own bodies, using those symbols associated with women's bodies to empower rather than to oppress [...] The act of re-appropriating those symbols associated with women's bodies is a way to resist the social constraints
placed on women's behavior and to reframe and reconfigure their embodied presences.

(Laware 2004, 25)

In this way, the women didn't simply re-enact femininity, they also re-scripted it. This is evident in actions like Embrace the Base and Bringing Down the Fence, when women made use of the symbols of feminine domesticity and passivity as a new form of weaponry against Cold War militarism. This resonates with theories of queer camp aesthetics such as those put forth by Meyer and Hutcheon, that emphasise the subversive potential of performed repetitions containing critical difference (Meyer 1994, 8).

The parodies of the Greenham Common camp also incorporated ironic elements in many instances. These moments of 'incongruous contrasts' were privileged by the organisers from the very start (Babuscio 1999, 119). From the moment the first protesters set off on their walking journey from Wales, their intention was to disturb and confuse 'normal' views of the military base by situating the concerns of motherhood and home-life in a place where they are more often rendered invisible (Sylvester 1994). Much of the ironic potential of the Greenham Common Peace Camp stemmed from the imposing presence of the Air Force base itself. This location provided a backdrop that heightened the sense of displacement when women performed home-life against it. According to Laware, the women's prolonged presence there subversively transgressed the boundaries of social roles. Referring to feminist theorists like Cynthia Enloe (1989), Laware contends that women in dominant discourses can only legitimately appear in the vicinity of military camps if they are acting as prostitutes or infiltrators. The impact of the protest performance was further heightened by the fact that the women deliberately left their comfortable homes and families to relocate 'home' at the very gates of the military sphere (Laware 2004, 26).

As I've described in the actions above, many of the Greenham Common performances attempted to highlight characteristics normally associated with 'women' and 'domesticity'. While this had the potential to constitute parodic performance, in some actions transgressive power was derived explicitly from the physical location of these signs of home-life. In these cases, camp sensibilities could be detected in the incongruous juxtaposition of home artefacts in the vicinity of the base. The 'Embrace the Base' action is perhaps the best example of this, and the images of a military base fence adorned with teddy bears, flowers, children's drawings and photographs certainly provided an
opportunity for dissensus among spectators. In addition to receiving a great deal of media attention, some individuals normally opposed to the Peace Camp actions found themselves reconsidering their own viewpoints in the face of this ironic statement of domesticity and familial ties. For example, RAF Policeman Peter Bryant had this reaction:

We used to call the women outside 'the smellies' [...] a lot of the lads saw that this was a really feminist, hippy sort of group [...] they were just mothers and grandmothers [...] to see them having passion about removing a nuclear deterrent was actually very, very moving [...] I was walking around the perimeter and [saw] all these teddy bears and clothing. I at that stage had a son who was two and a half or three years old. My views of the peace women actually did change and I was full of admiration (Bryant in Kidron 2007).

Another example of this type of activity is the frequent use of craft activism by the Greenham Common women. One of the actions that, according to Liddington, became symbolic of Greenham itself was the spinning of wool into webs which were then used in subversive ways. Pioneered by a group called Vermont Spinsters in the aftermath of the Three Mile Island disaster, the tactic used wool to literally weave gates shut and obstruct official machinery and tools (Liddington 1989, 215). As a performance tactic it embraces elements of idiosyncrasy and collage, but the woollen homespun webs were also a constant ironic presence on the Air Force base fence for nearly nineteen years.

In addition to locating the markers of domesticity where they didn't belong, these acts also brought attention to the insecurity of the military base. This is true in both practical and philosophical terms. In the first instance, the protesters used objects considered foreign to the military sphere to physically threaten the existence of the base itself; and the appearance of these objects – whether teddy bears, woollen webs, or the tents and women themselves – were not only significant for the way that they were out-of-place. They also added a layer of costuming to the military base that was wholly inappropriate to its constructed image of impenetrable exceptionalism.

In addition, the Peace Camp at Greenham Common was innately theatrical. As I mentioned in earlier chapters, political protest can always be considered theatrical in its efforts to display certain characteristics and attitudes to the public. In both the Bonus Army protests and the Greenham Common camp, activists behaved with real sincerity as
they carved out alternative communities in the face of violent state policies. Some of these efforts resulted in unintentional camp, when their actions were interpreted by the public in ways counter to their intentions. However, both protests also embraced deliberate theatricality as their alternative lifestyles were deliberately exhibited and performed for the public. In many ways the Greenham Common camp was more theatrical than the Bonus Army, in its frequent performance of actions designed to captivate audiences. This is partly due to differences in the media environment that allowed the 1980s protesters to conceive of actions that would play well to spectators of the televised events. However, there was also a distinct difference in the attitudes of theatricality between the two camps. For the Bonus Army, the foremost concern was to convey characteristics of discipline and military integrity, and most of their actions were conducted with utmost seriousness and dignity. Many of the centre-stage Bonus Army marches and protests verged on the maudlin, and there were few sources of genuine joyfulness in the midst of the hunger and poverty they experienced. Although concerted efforts were made to engage in joyful side shows, this was not the predominant attitude of their protests. The women at Greenham Common, by contrast, incorporated a sense of playfulness and joy in most of the actions they planned. This was partly a deliberate effort to contradict the deadly seriousness of Cold War politics and embrace an alternative way of acting politically. However, it also increased the potential for their actions to convey degrees of camp aesthetics, since playfulness is seen by some to be an essential component of camp (Shepard 2011). This playfulness contributed to the attraction of the protests for the media, and increased the audiences of the Greenham Common protests. According to Liddington, this joyful theatricality became a defining feature of the camp:

Greenham now occupied the central theatrical arena. This struggle was dramatically staged against a variety of backdrops: the High Court, Newbury Council Chamber and magistrates' court, Holloway. With the Greenham women now a media spectacle, links between feminism and anti-nuclear militarism became the subject of intense public debate (Liddington 1989, 252).

However, the theatricality of Greenham Common also became problematic to some extent, in the way that it sometimes eclipsed the serious message the protesters were attempting to convey. As Baz Kershaw notes, the media has a tendency to focus on those elements of protest that prove most vivid or attention-grabbing for public consumers of
media products. In this environment, reporters tended to focus strongly on what they called the 'carnival' aspects of the protests, highlighting the aesthetic elements over the political content. This was frustrating to many of the protesters, who wanted to convey a very serious message through their joyous performances (Harford and Hopkins 1984).

III. OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION

Any protest action that sustains itself for nineteen years must be considered to some degree successful – particularly when it is enacted in the tense security environment of a military base. However, Greenham Common's longevity also makes it difficult to assess the true nature of its impact. In many ways the responses to it over the years reflect changing sentiments about global politics in the aftermath of the Cold War. In this final section I want to illustrate the range of responses to the Greenham Common protests, and evaluate its overall potential with regard to resisting frames of sovereign power.

The Greenham Common protesters were certainly successful in gaining a great deal of support for their actions. Their initial march to the base and the first camps that were established attracted very little media attention. However, as they remained there over the first winter and devised creative actions like Embrace the Base, their popularity exploded and they were frequently joined by protesters from around the world. Many famous names visited the camps, including Yoko Ono, Neil Kinnock, Julie Christie, Michael Foot, Fiona Bruce, and Doi Takako (Stead 2006). They received donations and assistance from peace groups around the world, and became a figurehead for feminist anti-militarism (Sylvester 1994).

However, the Greenham Common women also attracted enemies, particularly among the local Newbury community. Many Newbury residents stood to gain financially from the existence of the American Air Force base, and still others supported Cold War militarisation as an essential path to national security. Women at the base occasionally reported being awoken with threats of being raped or 'gassed like animals' (Stead 2006). In another incident, Tory politician Michael Heseltine advised them that if they trespassed on the base they would be shot (Stead 2006). Overall these examples are illustrative of the ideological polarity that existed in 1980s global politics. However, the women were also criticised by fellow pacifists and anti-war sympathisers, due largely to their strict
enforcement of the 'women-only' rule. Many critics felt that it had the effect of marginalising men who opposed nuclear militarisation. As one impassioned Letter to the Editor stated,

The fact remains that at this very moment [...] there are young men in prison for refusing to handle the toys of war, and in the course of this century tens of thousands of men have suffered a similar fate; not a few have died for their refusal to bear arms. These men are indisputably part of the anti-militarist tradition – just as surely as women like Margaret Thatcher, or the women who presented conscientious objectors in World War I with white feathers, are not (Randall 1983, 10).

In addition, the women's strong embrace of a women-only position, however much it was not intended to suggest an essentialist linkage of femaleness with pacifism, was understandably interpreted as such by members of the public. This linkage became at least one of the more recognisable aspects of the group's statement, and it was one that was dangerously easy to topple. This was demonstrated in November, 1986 when the Pentagon and Ministry of Defence invited representatives from the media to enter the Greenham Common base to get a close-up understanding of its operations. When they entered, they were almost immediately met by 24-year old First Lieutenant Dawn Hewitt, an American woman who volunteered for assignment at Greenham Common and who was subsequently described by The Guardian as a “blonde bombshell” (Fairhall 2006, 116). This presence of a woman – not only on the Greenham Common base, but positioned in a role to justify the presence and purpose of the base and discuss her support of potential mass killing – was a powerful blow to the points the Greenham Common women wanted to make about femininity and peacefulness. While it can be analysed in a much more sophisticated fashion for the constructions of gender of the various players, the fact remains that the public generally interpreted this incident as a setback for the Greenham Common women's integrity. It is an incident that reveals the inadequacies of the protest camp with regard to creating public dissensus, because it evidences the peace women’s ongoing alignment with frames of power that can be easily re-appropriated by sovereign entities.

Despite the criticisms and the ongoing hardships they faced, the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp didn't waver. The Cruise Missiles did finally arrive at the base in November 1983, but the women simply changed their focus from preventing the installation to monitoring and obstructing the movement of base personnel at all times.
They eventually welcomed the INF Treaty in 1987, but felt the need to continue their presence to draw attention to the links between gendered violence and imperialist militarisation (Stead 2006). Protesters remained at the site until 2000. It is also important to note that Greenham Common has now been legally returned to the people of Newbury. Commoners’ rights have been re-established and cattle now graze on the land formerly occupied by the base (Russell 2006). In this sense, the Greenham Common protesters outlasted at least one manifestation of sovereign power, as they lived defiantly at Greenham Common until the military forces finally went away. However, deeper questions need to be asked to assess the extent to which these protests actually destabilised the frames of sovereignty and created political agency where it had not previously flourished.

Perhaps most obviously, the American Cruise missiles have now been replaced by Trident, a programme which collectively embodies almost twice the fire power that the Cruise missiles had (Stead 2006). This suggests that while the Greenham Common base may no longer be in existence, Cold War militarism has simply evolved into War on Terror militarism and the operations of imperialist sovereignty are simply played out in slightly different ways.

In addition, the aspects of essentialist feminism attached to Greenham Common are vital to consider in a balanced way in any assessment of its efficacy. As described above, the women-only aspects of the camp were primarily pursued to provide women a space for political participation that had not been available to them in dominant political circles. In addition, the women often felt that patriarchy was complicit in Cold War militarism, and so a feminist approach to protest might be more effective. Their intentions were not to exclude men, but rather to challenge social gender constructs in a way that could effectively destabilise other social and political constructions. It is as if, by carving out a space for an alternative exploration of social interaction, women at Greenham were experimenting with the possibilities of sex and gender in a way that did not permanently exclude men but was a means of demonstrating the fluidity and possibility inherent to all social categories more broadly. As noted above, many critics would suggest that the Greenham Common women simply inverted dominant patters of power and exclusion, and created new forms of excluded citizenship by literally banning some categories of people from their camps. However, this troubling aspect of Greenham Common can be offset by considering feminist conceptions of biopolitics. For example, many feminist
theorists would question and complicate the very notion of citizenship that Agamben's concepts are couched within. Theorists such as Luce Irigaray would suggest that the entire idea of citizenship should be expanded to accommodate feminist envisionings of the world. She and many others draw on the dramatic figure of Antigone to suggest that an individual's actions – although considered anarchic in mainstream political philosophy – are actually acts that serve to broaden the view of citizenship into a role that embraces a wider range of relationships, moralities and duties than those suggested by the traditional sovereign-citizen paradigm (Irigaray 1985). If this is true, then the landscape of citizenship and exclusion set up by Agamben might be sophisticated in a way that accommodates Greenham Common, not as just another site of exception but as a fluid, complex, and hyphenated illustration of political potentials. It is here that queer camp theorising becomes even more important, as it might allow for a more complex understanding of the aesthetic achievements of Greenham Common with regard to this alternative performance of resistance to sovereign power.

Finally, it is important to briefly point out the ways that the legacy of Greenham Common is evidenced in more recent protest movements. Over the course of the camp's long existence there developed a significant body of knowledge about protest tactics and impact, and this was disseminated by participants into a wide array of later political movements (Kidron 2007). In some ways Greenham Common also provided a conduit for protest creativity, by bringing together experienced protesters from diverse backgrounds and providing a space for ideas about political performance to transmit, flourish and grow. This is an important point to note with regard to protest dramaturgy, because it reveals the way that protest movements function not only as persuasive bids for political or social change, but simultaneously as sites that propagate future protest tactics.

Greenham Common's most obvious legacy can be detected in its links to more recent anti-war actions by women. Based on my own field research among women's anti-war organisations, it is clear that groups like Women in Black, Raging Grannies and Code Pink include members who gained some degree of activist experience around the military base at Greenham Common. While it may be challenged for its tendency to reflect rather than destabilise gender norms, the site did demonstrate the creative potential of women's peace projects, and highlighted some of the most successful ways of disturbing gender hierarchies alongside the social constructions of war.
Several War on Terror protests by women-only groups have exemplified queer camp theatricality, and there is significant overlap with the actions seen at Greenham Common. For example, the organisations Code Pink and the Granny Peace Brigade both depict characterisations of women that attempt to parody gender and other social norms – Code Pink by wearing hot pink lingerie into the halls of Congress, and the Granny Peace Brigade by dressing in straw hats, half-moon eyeglasses, flowery dresses and knitted shawls. In 2006, eighteen members of the Granny Peace Brigade were arrested and tried for obstructing the entryway to a US Marine recruitment office in New York City. In court, they explained that they were legitimately attempting to sign up for military service, and they performed humorous, ironic parodies of patriotism and sacrifice that were reflective of Greenham Common's earlier courtroom dramas. In 2009, Code Pink enacted a protest that involved knitting a giant 'tea cosy' to cover the fence in front of the White House. Activists from around the world sent hand-knitted pink-and-white squares which were then stitched together and draped over the White House fence in honour of Mother's Day (Abileah 2012).

In both of these examples, recent protesters have performed in ways that repeat the repertoric content derived from Greenham Common. Importantly though, they have also placed greater emphasis on the queer camp aesthetics contained within these performances, and in doing so their actions can be interpreted as having greater potential to subvert social norms. While the 'scripts' of these examples bear a marked similarity to actions conducted at Greenham, the attitudes of performance are much more overtly camp in nature. This demonstrates the way that historical protests can inform current ones through the record of the performatic archive, but it also underscores the way that the underlying theatricality of protest motifs can alter and bend across decades, as Marvin Carlson points out (2003). This also reinforces Baz Kershaw's contention that protest changes in response to changes in social and political circumstances (1999). In addition, the greater intensity of camp aesthetics in War on Terror protest might also point to the way that Agamben's notions of Homo sacer and the sovereign power to abandon or marginalise are far more relevant in recent years than was the case for their historical forerunners.
CONCLUSION

This thesis began by posing questions about the kinds of knowledge that might be revealed by analysing protest theatricality in the context of political philosophy. I have suggested that the combination of these disciplinary approaches might bring aspects of protest performance into focus that would otherwise remain obscured. In particular, I have sought to tease out the ways that theatricality operates when protesters' own bodies are already conspicuously inscribed with markers of sovereign power and subsequent degrees of vulnerability. By comparing two protest actions by women and veterans, I have attempted to demonstrate the traps and pitfalls that are inherent to protests organised on the basis of an excluded or marginalised political identity. By using Agamben’s concepts of sovereign exception and Homo sacer, I have been able to take stock of the ways that the political performances of marginalised identities are embroiled in the overarching logic of exception, abandonment and sovereign existence.

What this framework has consistently brought to light is not only the way that marginalised performances may be already-accounted-for (in line with Butler and Žižek’s reservations about subversive repetition), but also that these performances as marginalised figures, no matter how subversive, may contribute to the very constitution of sovereignty itself. This is because, as Agamben makes clear, sovereignty gains its definition and its legitimacy from the objects that it both protects and abandons. As a result, performing as and from either of these subject positions risks reinforcing sovereign power. To my mind, the most pressing concern that results from all of this regards the kinds of theatricality that are evident in each example of identity-based protest, and the extent to which these contain real potential to ‘shake the ground’, in order to prompt audiences to outthink the sovereign-abandonment frame. I have suggested that Rancière’s dissensus could be one indicator of the kind of interpretive environment required in these circumstances, if protest performers truly wish to alter the territories that sovereign logic institutes itself within. Furthermore, I have posited queer camp performance as one potentially efficacious tactic in this sense, and explored the extent to which traces of camp might be located in historical protests by analyzing them within their particular social and political contexts.
Chapter Summary

The Bonus Army and Greenham Common were both prolonged, multifaceted protest performances characterised by layers of political objectives. Because of this complexity I have focused on specific elements of these performances in order to elucidate their illustration of particular strands of political philosophy; specifically I have explored their use of camping as a protest tactic, and attempted to draw out the kinds of performances that were enacted from those camp sites. Furthermore, I have probed each protest for the ways that they might be connected to more modern uses of queer camp aesthetics in political performance. Ultimately I have sought to question the extent to which these elements of camp, and other aspects of these protests' theatricality, have intersected with the social construction of subject identities that function as manifestations of sovereignty and Homo sacer logics.

In Chapter One I provided an account of my theoretical framework, locating this research within recent debates in Theatre and Politics. Specifically, I framed the study with my particular definitions of terms like ‘theatricality’, ‘performance’ and ‘performativity’, and suggested that theatricality should be considered as a key element in the interrogation of performative norms. I also discussed some of the most relevant theories regarding protest performance, including issues related to the study of theatre history and protest dramaturgy. I explicated my concept of protest efficacy with reference to Jacques Rancière, and reviewed theories of civil disobedience and protester vulnerability. This was followed by an exploration of Giorgio Agamben’s theories of sovereign power and Homo sacer, which revealed the potential applicability of these concepts to certain categories of political protesters. Finally, I drew on an array of theories of queer camp performance to suggest that this kind of theatricality might have the potential to offer an effective challenge to sovereign power.

In Chapter Two I conducted a close analysis of the protests of the Bonus Expeditionary Forces, first exploring the influences of space and geography and their linkage to notions of citizens’ rights and responsibilities. I then examined dominant social constructions of the Veteran figure, noting the tension between the competing characterisations of heroism and victimhood. I also examined the ways that veterans face marginalisation and degrees of exclusion at the hands of sovereign power. The chapter proceeded with an account of some of the Bonus Army’s most memorable aspects, including the march to Washington, the nature of the protest camps, the Death March and the rout of the
Bonus Marchers by the US Army. I then critically evaluated these performances for moments of camp theatricality. I suggested that the more overtly theatrical actions were perhaps the most efficacious, but that these were limited by the overall desire to maintain order and obedience among the protesters. This potentially resulted in a reinforcement of government authority rather than a dissensus-creating subversion.

Chapter Three offered a critical exploration of the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp. I discussed the history of the Greenham Common geography, and the tension between traditional Commoner’s rights and the existence of the Air Force Base. I reviewed the ways that women faced degrees of marginalisation in 1980s Britain, and also pointed out the ways that the site of the base itself created intensified levels of exclusion and vulnerability for domestic political actors. I discussed the joyful and playful nature of the women-only camp sites, which offered a stark contrast to those of the Bonus Army. The analysis then focused on several illustrative actions by the Greenham Common women, including Embrace the Base and the Bringing Down the Fence Action. In my examination of camp theatrical elements I argued that the queer camp qualities of Greenham Common were largely derived from the protest’s placement against and in front of the symbols of military power. In evaluating the efficacy of these tactics, I suggested that feminist-inspired re-imaginings of citizenship and political authority might be appropriate when considering the impact of Greenham Common with regard to sovereign power.

To conclude this investigation I will summarise some of the key similarities and differences between the Bonus Army and Greenham Common. In doing so, I hope to point up the issues that have been raised in this analysis, and emphasise the lingering questions that remain to be addressed through further research. Specifically, I highlight issues relating to civil disobedience and protest camping; queer camp performance and protest efficacy; and dramaturgies of protest. To close, I point out the ways that future interdisciplinary Theatre-and-Politics studies might begin to seek answers to the conundrums of sovereignty, exceptionalism and exclusion.
Civil Disobedience and Protest Camping

Perhaps the most obvious point of analysis for these protests is their distinct enactments of civil disobedience – the specific ways that they contravened the written and unwritten rules of political participation and citizenship. Historically, particular frames of protest have been developed that negotiate and regulate the social crises brought about by perceived political injustice and subsequent recourses to political disobedience. These rules of non-violent direct action are often sanctified in the worldviews of political actors on all sides. While this provides a welcome avenue to legitimacy on the part of protesters, it can also set up a dangerous trap whereby the transgressive power of protest is subsumed by the existing social norms that regulate it; in other words, where protest is lauded as a marker of democratic freedom, enactments of culturally-familiar forms of civil disobedience can simply be hailed by disagreeing political leaders as evidence of the overall justness of their regimes. This can enervate protest and strip it of its true radical potential.

In the case of the Bonus Army, much of their civil disobedience was in some way condoned by authorities. Although their encampments in Washington were certainly not invited or officially permitted, law enforcement entities did accommodate the protesters in a bid to alleviate their hardships and ensure order and cleanliness in the capital. Most of the marches and demonstrations that took place were either formally allowed by the police, or comprised already-legal uses of the spaces they were enacted within. It was only with the arrival of Royal Robertson that a more confrontational, transgressive brand of civil disobedience occurred. By contrast, the Greenham Common women engaged in much more direct political disobedience from the very start of their protest. From the moment that the small group of women locked themselves to the gates of the Air Force base, the tone was set for outright transgression of the laws governing the site. The women made every possible effort to ensure that their law-breaking would remain non-violent, but they were committed to ongoing disobedience as a means of challenging the existence and authority of the military base. This resulted in frequent arrests and courtroom hearings, which added another layer to the performance of civil disobedience. Within the courtrooms that operate as masks for sovereign power, the protesters attempted to argue the justness of their cause, but were frequently imprisoned without a chance for a full hearing of their views. On one hand, this effectively enacted the tradition of political imprisonment for civil disobedience that stretches back to Henry
David Thoreau; but on the other hand, it also participated in the judicial system that reinforces sovereign authority.

In a similar vein, both the Bonus Army and Greenham Common enacted political vulnerability with varying degrees of success. While theorists like Brian Doherty, Susan Leigh Foster and Judith Butler all emphasise the role of vulnerability in protest performances, for the purposes of this study it is most useful to consider the forms of vulnerability that contribute to my definition of political efficacy (Butler 2006 and 2013, Doherty 1999, Foster 2003). Specifically, I am interested in uncovering the extent to which performed vulnerability is unexpected and incongruous, either in its intensity or in terms of the bodies and locations that illustrate it. According to this standard, the Bonus Army was initially less successful, with most of their actions condoned by authorities and their only risk stemming from their pre-existing poverty and homelessness. This changed when the US Army attacked their camp sites, and it was through the actions of the US government that they became not simply vulnerable subjects, but outright victims. While their victimhood in this unintentional performance contained little potential to destabilise dominant hierarchies of social and political power, the shocking and discomforting actions of the Army may have been sufficient to instigate new audience attitudes and modes of interpretation. Greenham Common provides a contrasting example, because their vulnerability was generally more apparent in the early months of the camp than in later years. This is largely because, as the camp went on year after year, the pattern of evictions and returns became familiar to audiences and lost its power to surprise or disturb. Still, the Greenham Common women did display vulnerability in unexpected ways, particularly by highlighting the risks that all citizens face when coming into physical contact with the military sphere.

As the chapters above have revealed, vulnerability operates in complex and surprising ways during protest actions, and I believe that analyses like this one can help sophisticate our understanding of the characteristic and its potential impact on spectators in particular contexts. Particularly by comparing the vulnerability of protesters in different time periods, and in starkly different geographic settings, we can begin to draw out some of the consistent similarities that impact protest across generations. For example, the Bonus Army and Greenham Common both reveal the way that militarisation of bodies and spaces has a profound impact on the dissensus-generating potential of displayed vulnerability. They also underscore the burden of interaction that is placed on law
enforcement through the voluntary vulnerability of non-violent civil disobedience. However, they also reveal the way that vulnerability is interpreted differently depending on the physical characteristics of the bodies that perform it, and the other characterisations already inscribed upon those bodies. As a result, when those bodies come into contact and conflict with sovereign power, the vulnerability they enact cannot easily be separated from other markers of political subjectivity. This reinforces the need to conduct detailed analyses of the theatricality of protest actions, in order to more fully understand their subversive potential.

Despite the apparent danger of inadvertently upholding dominant frames of power, civil disobedience – like all performance traditions – can be the subject of new and subversive incarnations. Both of these protests, while perhaps dominated by an adherence to accepted, known forms, did contain moments of creative, ground-breaking civil disobedience. They both pushed the boundaries of where civil disobedience could and should take place. They placed sometimes-damaged, always-vulnerable bodies into the pictures of sovereign power. They instituted creative, alternative communities and performed the paradoxes of engaged citizenship and disobedience in full view of public audiences.

Perhaps one of the most striking features of both protests was their performance of rights that individuals both have and do not have. Rancière seems to suggest that there is a unique kind of efficacy inherent to displays of such paradoxes – by testing entrenched notions of equality, belonging, and political well-being, and demonstrating the circumstances where these principles falter and fail, some political actors can open up the given world to dispute and debate (Rancière 2004, 23). This is an essential factor when evaluating the theatricality of civil disobedience. When veterans gathered in Washington in 1932, their primary achievement was to demonstrate the paradox of their predicament – specifically, they had been granted a bonus payment in recognition of their wartime service (a standard practice at the time) but they were not allowed to collect that payment until more than a decade later. Effectively, they were hailed as heroes but were left to starve while Congress engaged in endless budget debates. Furthermore, while they had fought to secure the nation a few years earlier, they now faced an extreme lack of security with regard to the day-to-day welfare of their families. The Greenham Common women also had some success in this regard, primarily in demonstrating the conflict
between Commoners’ rights and the suspension of those rights within the military site of exception. Their simultaneous possession of rights and lack of those rights was made most evident in the courtroom environment. When brought before the courts the peace women were not allowed to speak for themselves or declare the protest camp as their address, yet they were punished under the authoritative guise of a fair judicial hearing and sentenced to imprisonment for their residence at the base.

As I have demonstrated in the chapters above, an important aspect of civil disobedience is the space that it takes place within. Both the Bonus Army and Greenham Common opened up ideas about the legitimate spaces of protest. The BEF in particular was instrumental in redefining ideas about the role of protest in Washington DC. While it is now commonplace to cite the First Amendment while standing defiantly on the steps of the Capitol building or blockading a Senator’s office, this was not the case in 1932. Without the visionary acts of men like Walter Waters and Royal Robertson, American sensibilities about ‘petitioning the government for redress of grievances’ would look very, very different. Likewise, Greenham Common brought protest to the very gates of Cold War military power, and challenged the stark division between the deathly business of the base and the vibrant life of their camps. This was particularly important as a response to the globalised nature of warfare in the Cold War and beyond, as the behaviours of citizens were sharply regulated and linked with Us-and-Them security imperatives.

For Agamben, the physical camp manifests a geographic ordering of the state of exception; it constitutes a solid presence that illustrates the necessary ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ of the political order (Agamben 1995). While he referred to this ordering as a characteristic of states of exception, we might also consider the way that such spatial hierarchies are constitutive of sites of exception. As I have discussed in the chapters above, some spaces are strictly demarcated as locations that are exempt from the normal rules of society and politics, and in these sites sovereign power is increased and the rights of citizens are diminished. This means that the regulation of space is complicit in the broader project of sovereign power, and therefore the efforts of protest campers to challenge spatial regulations might impact the logics of exceptionalism and abandonment. While the regulation of political landscapes powerfully reinforces ideals of national belonging and obedience, it also provides an opportunity to perform creative subversions of these hallowed spaces. As we have seen, the Bonus Army challenged the
protected boundaries of the Capitol building, and Greenham Common did the same at the US Air Force base. In doing so they not only effected performatic challenges to the nature of these boundaries; they also vividly revealed the existence of these sites as zones of exception where sovereign power operates without regard to the lauded rules of the polis.

**Queer Camp Performance and Protest Efficacy**

Throughout this thesis I have privileged a definition of efficacy that is centred on the potential of protests to create new openings for audience interpretation that can outstrip the regulating frames of political norms. This is similar to what Judith Butler seeks when she calls for performances that ‘shake the ground’ (1994). As War on Terror protesters have discovered, it is not sufficient to simply change the political opinions of the public; more pressing is the need to chip away at the underpinning social constructions of power and vulnerability that create the subjects and objects of political violence more broadly. One way that this might happen is through the strategic performance of traits in ways that run counter to social and political expectations – in other words, through queer camp performance. This can be effected by highlighting characteristics that are considered alien to particular bodies, or by exaggerating or parodying characteristics that are considered natural to particular roles. Camp aesthetics can call social norms into question by revealing the possibility of fluidity, and the impossibility of fixed originals. This has the potential to disrupt political imperatives that arise from grand narratives of historical principles and contemporary obligations, and it offers complications and queries to the usual narrow interpretations of national values.

While neither of my case studies should be viewed as ‘queer camp performance’ overall, they do demonstrate the potential for both war veterans and women to incorporate camp elements in their protests through the use of parody, irony, theatricality and playfulness. Importantly, the appearance of camp sensibilities is derived from the tensions that emanate from these political performances – the incongruity of actions performed in certain spaces, or enacted by certain bodies, that conflict with audiences’ expectations. It is this particularly theatrical enactment of ‘critical difference’ that institutes a potential moment of dissensus, and which might agitate and disturb audiences sufficiently to generate an opening for the evolution of norms. However, my analysis in the above
chapters also raises an important area for further research, regarding the way that acts of protest camping can elicit particular modes of performance by government responders. In both the Bonus Army and Greenham Common examples, some of the most vivid performances involved government officials or law enforcement figures acting as protagonists. In some cases, the theatricality of their actions rose to levels that might have been interpreted as possessing camp qualities in their own right. For example, when General MacArthur laid siege to the Hooverville community of war veterans and their families, this exhibited a kind of hyper-militaristic Army that displayed traits of heroic bravado, violence and physical force in an unfamiliar and uncomfortable context. The male police officers who dragged Greenham Common women by their hair created a similar incongruity by overzealously protecting the armed forces while physically abusing domestic citizens.

In the chapters above I have frequently critiqued the protests of both the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common Women for their general lack of ground-shaking dissensus. In large part they are both protests that reinforced dominant frames of power, and illustrated the immense difficulty of impacting the ‘gargantuan symbolic matrix’ of dominant ideologies that Žižek describes (Žižek 1999, 264). Some of this lack of efficacy may be attributed to the fact that, to a significant extent, the degrees of camp sensibilities at both protest sites were only a small part of their overall theatricality and performatic style. Both protests largely lacked the focus on style over content that would accompany later examples of more definitively queer camp protests, and this often prevented participants from the reaching the level of audacity that might have effected true camp political aesthetics. For both the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common women, the content and persuasiveness of their political messages was key. Despite this, I have also attempted to demonstrate the particular aspects of each protest that contained traces of camp sensibilities, and that might have influenced later forms of protest practice. Because this thesis is located within a larger research agenda that aims to uncover truths about embodied political protest, these experiments with potentially efficacious theatrical tools are perhaps of greater concern than the protests’ overall efficacy.

**Protest Dramaturgy and Further Research**

I have positioned this study within the frame of inquiry suggested by Baz Kershaw’s dramaturgy of protest. With this in mind, I have aimed to explore the ways that the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common Women’s Peace camp existed as part of a
trajectory of protest traditions in their respective political and cultural environments. I have shown that both protests had roots in earlier political performances. In the case of the Bonus Army, this protest took place approximately forty years after the gathering of Coxey’s Army in the capital. While this earlier protest was shorter in duration and less confrontational, it is quite likely that it provided the inspiration for marching to Washington in the first place. From this seed, the Bonus Expeditionary Forces developed a much larger-scale protest action that drew on the precedent of direct, physical confrontations of Congress yet raised the stakes significantly. Similarly, Greenham Common was preceded by a range of protests that informed the nature of the peace women’s performances. In the first instance their decision to chain themselves to the fence of the Air Force base was explicitly inspired by the protests of the Suffragettes. Their actions may also be indebted to the forerunners of the Kinder Scout Trespass, particularly in their performed displays of the tensions between public rights of access and attempts at government enclosure and restriction. By physically placing themselves in areas that citizens were only recently barred from, the Greenham Common women continued a tradition of embodied challenges to limitations of public space. Both protests were also framed by the broader traditions of citizens’ rights of petition and appeal in their respective countries.

As Diana Taylor suggests, the repertoire both contains and alters the meanings that are attached to performances of the past; in this way, we might use comparisons of modern-day protests and their historical forerunners to detect those elements that evidence a common tradition of performance. By doing so, we can also explore what differences have been effected to the techniques and attitudes of performance. In the disjunctures that are discovered, we may locate the political and cultural peculiarities that influenced, or compelled, those evolutions of performance. To this end, a theoretical framework that takes serious account of both theatrical and political issues would be most suitable. I envision a theoretical framework that recognises political actions at all levels as fundamentally performatic; equally important is an understanding of the critical role that small-scale actors play in broader political phenomena, an approach advanced by scholars in Feminist International Relations, Postcolonial Political Theory and Critical Security Studies. My suggested research model involves a focus on interpretations of theatricality not simply as an end in themselves, but as a core part of studies that elucidate the complex emotive aspects of political interaction. This of course necessitates a greater
understanding of political theories and institutions, but it also involves a critical focus on attitudes of performance and potential audience affect.

I believe that this blend of disciplinary approaches might offer new insights that singular approaches are likely to miss. For example, a purely empirical account of the Bonus Army would tend to emphasise its impact on the elections of 1932, and the development of the GI Bill. A Politics approach would also centre more firmly on the institutional rules that govern protestor’s actions, including differences in the constitutional forms of each country, local ordinances, and economic and social factors that limit or encourage participation by certain demographics. These issues are vital to take into account in order to understand the forces that shape the production and interpretation of protest; however, on their own they offer little information about the ways that protest is played out among the general public. Accounts of this nature tend to hint at the influence of public opinion by protesters, but they fail to interrogate the extent to which these opinions were truly altered, and which creative elements of the protesters’ actions impacted the audience in desired or undesired ways. They largely obscure the role of emotion in the crafting of political norms and foreign policy, in favour of more easily-measured data sources like opinion polls, election outcomes, or the evidence contained in written documents. On the other hand, an interpretive or hermeneutical approach more familiar to Theatre Studies scholars could allow for an in-depth analysis of the emotive influence of protest on audiences. A Performance approach might explore the triangular tensions between protest producers’ intent, the frames of political power that acts are staged within, and the various strands of public opinion that result. Through close readings of protest as performance, we can begin to interpret its impact with serious, sustained regard to artifice and affect. We might also recognise the multiple levels of audiences that are potentially impacted by protests, and analyse them according to Theatre and Performance models.

Theatre and Performance projects that seek to incorporate elements of Political scholarship are already aided by existing efforts from their Politics counterparts. As Christine Sylvester recently articulated, there is an emerging body of scholarship among Politics and International Relations theorists that applies knowledge from the Arts and Humanities to a greater extent than ever before (Sylvester 2013). In the hermeneutic work encouraged by the likes of Iver Neumann, Daniel Nexon and others, interpretive approaches are considered valid and worthwhile methodologies for the study of even the most pressing matters of politics – including war and mass killing (Neumann 2011,
The common denominator of all of these works is the critical belief that a turn to non-scientific, traditionally 'cultural' products can offer otherwise overlooked information about the role of culture in the formulation of political norms. Importantly, these forays into hermeneutic modes of inquiry remain grounded in an overarching concern with the operations of political power on a global scale, and this can helpfully inform the investigations of Theatre and Performance theorists.

There can be little doubt that the analyses presented above have resulted in more questions than answers, and indeed this study was conceived as a foundation for further research projects. With regard to political issues, future studies might further evaluate these protests within their context of international relations, for example considering the protests of the Bonus Army against the backdrop of interwar global economies and Wilsonian democracy. One specific avenue to be explored is the way that the Bonus Army protest intersected with newly formalised notions of global rights. Likewise, we might consider Greenham Common for its interactions with Cold War realpolitik, and question what changes occur to protest when it is enacted within a constantly-changing map of allies and antagonists, under the threat of Mutually Assured Destruction. Greenham Common might also be considered as an alternative performance comparable with the proxy wars of this era, in which negotiations of dominance and allegiance were enacted as a means of political posturing against the Soviet Union.

Further investigations of the Bonus Army and Greenham Common are also needed in order to take account of the full range of documented audience responses. There is a wealth of materials available that could further our understanding of these protests and their efficacy within their particular political environments. These include a vast array of Letters to the Editor, photographs, video footage and interviews, all of which might aid in our understanding of the affective impact of the protests. Many of these sources reveal detailed and nuanced responses on the part of the public and politicians, and they could elucidate the effects of particular kinds of theatricality.

In addition, we might flesh out our understanding of the legacies of historical protest by analysing more recent representations of these events. By attending to the ways that past protests are depicted in modern day accounts, researchers could glean information about the elements that are considered most relevant to current social and political issues. To pursue this we might examine recent staged dramatic productions that take the Bonus
Army and Greenham Common as their key subjects. This would enable researchers to more thoroughly ascertain which elements of the original protests have resonated in a prolonged and impactful way. Although the Bonus March is a relatively unknown incident in American History, it has been rescued from complete obscurity by at least two recent community theatre productions. In April 2012, students at California State University collaborated with playwright Lee Cohn to create a performance about the Bonus Expeditionary Forces (Chandler 2012). In October of that year, Hofstra University staged a production of *The Bonus Army*, written by Isaac Rathbone and directed by Cindy Rosenthal (Bogard 2013). Both productions were followed by audience discussion sessions. The Greenham Common protest has also been portrayed in theatrical pieces in the UK, perhaps most notably in Lucy Kirkwood's *Bloody Wimmin*, produced by Tricycle Theatre July 2010 (Tricycle Theatre 2010). These pieces could provide essential information regarding the legacy of both protest actions. By interrogating modern-day audience responses to these historical forerunners, we might uncover the aspects of performance that influence opinions of modern-day protest camping, in their country-specific context. This would provide essential information for protest organisers who seek to craft truly subversive actions.

**Conclusion**

Diana Taylor suggests that performances bring to life the ghosts and traces of society that would otherwise remain obscured. They make visible the hidden structures that shape life for both individuals and collectives, and this visible enactment influences the ‘phantoms’ and ‘fantasies’ of the future (Taylor 2003, 143). If this is true, then the Bonus Army and Greenham Common must be credited for their contributions not only to a repertoire of protest, but also to a broader repertoire of politics that influences notions of who might act politically and what form those actions might take. In this sense I believe that the protests of the Bonus Army and the Greenham Common Women’s Peace Camp are relevant beyond the specific political projects of women and war veterans; they reveal something about the nature of vulnerability in the face of sovereign power, and the complexities of theatrical efficacy when faced with such difficult-to-destabilise paradigms. The knowledge gleaned from these examples is relevant to a wide array of protests that seek to challenge the logics of sovereignty, including the Occupy Movement, the Arab Spring, and recent anti-fracking encampments.
Ultimately, as William Connolly notes, the manifestations of biocultural life do not conform to any neat pattern or set of rules (Connolly 2007, 31). Cristina Masters further stresses the complexities of bare life and sovereign power, especially when they are inscribed on the bodies of marginalised political subjects (Masters 2009). By scrutinising these two historical protests in the context of biopolitics and bare life, I have not attempted to arrive at concrete, definitive assessments. Rather, I have sought to reveal some of the messy complexities that arise when protest is considered within these social and political frames, and uncover important but often obscured aspects of political performance. As the basis for future research into the interplay of power, vulnerability, violence and potentiality, this work has demonstrated the tangled complexities of the subject; however, it has also suggested the kinds of surprising or unexpected revelations that such investigations might uncover. By attending to similar tensions and paradoxes in other protest camp sites, it is my hope that we might derive greater insights that could aid protest producers in their efforts to effectively challenge the frames of sovereign power, exceptionalism and exclusion.
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