Oppositional Identities: The Military Peace Movement's Challenge to Pro-Iraq War Frames

Lisa Leitz, *Hendrix College*

In the United States, rhetoric in support of the Iraq War often focuses on discourses of patriotism and supporting the troops. These discourses hold enormous sway over the American public because of the discursive legacies of the Vietnam War and the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. In response, members of the peace movement who are veterans, soldiers, and military families stress their military identities during activism. These individuals have organized as an important branch of the U.S. antiwar movement that challenges the pro-war framing of patriotism and troop support by strategically deploying "oppositional identities." The oppositional identity strategy involves highlighting the activism of individuals who many would assume would be part of the movement's opposition. In an effort to assert credibility and support their frames, activists assert this novel and seemingly contradictory identity through organizational affiliation, rhetoric, clothing, mannerisms, and symbols. Keywords: social movements; peace; Iraq War; identity; strategy.

Recent research has suggested that U.S. antiwar coalitions have highlighted veterans and military families' peace movement participation in order to cement the movement's claims to patriotism and troop support (see Coy, Woehrle, and Maney 2008; Heaney and Rojas 2006). In this article, I take a closer look at a subsection of the U.S. peace movement made up of military veterans and families who bolster the antiwar movement's attempts to influence the American public. During the Iraq War[1] that began in March 2003 nearly 20 antiwar organizations have claimed a connection to the U.S. military; these organizations, their members, and the unaffiliated veterans, soldiers, and military families who speak publicly against the war comprise what I term the contemporary *military peace movement* (MPM). This movement challenges pro-war rhetoric through a variety of protest campaigns that highlight activists' unique position as military insiders who critique the war.

By exploring MPM activism, I shed light on the deployment of what I call o*ppositional identities*. I refine social movement usage of "oppositional identities;" previously scholars have drawn on Jane Mansbridge and Aldon Morris's (see Mansbridge and Morris 2001; Morris 1992) discussion of oppositional consciousness and used this as another term for collective identities (e.g., Polletta 1999; Polletta and Jasper 2001; Rhomberg 2004; Sudbury 2001; Taylor and Whittier 1992).[2] However, I draw on the dual meaning of oppositional to suggest a new

---

1. I use "Iraq War" to designate the U.S. led war that began in 2003 and "Gulf War" to designate the U.S. led war against Iraq in 1990–91.

2. These social movement scholars defined oppositional identities as the collective identities that develop as groups come to understand the structural basis of their inequality and develop a positive and counterhegemonic understanding of their group identity. This definition shifts "oppositional consciousness" (Mansbridge and Morris 2001) into an identity.

definition for this term. I define oppositional identities as a type of collective identity that movements strategically deploy because they (1) lay claim to culturally significant symbols and ideas that their opposition's arguments utilize, and (2) are particularly useful for opposing policies or cultural knowledge. The oppositional identity strategy involves placing individuals, whom many would assume would be part of a movement's opposition, in highly visible positions within a movement. As I will describe in detail, the MPM's oppositional identity strategy claims culturally significant discourses invoked by war proponents, such as patriotism and troop support, for the peace movement. By highlighting military-affiliated activists, the MPM strategically uses oppositional identities to attain cultural resonance for the peace movement's claims. Military veterans and families use their firsthand experiences of the wars and their consequences to demonstrate their credibility when framing the Iraq War.

My development of oppositional identities shifts social movement theory's focus away from the importance of identity for the internal dynamics of social movements to understanding the role identity plays in movement attempts to influence the cultural discourse. I expand on Mary Bernstein's (1997) theory of identity deployment, which suggests that movement context and goals influence how movements strategically craft their public image. I demonstrate that the discursive context drives movements to publicly emphasize particular activists because they believe the deployment of these activist identities can disrupt the claims of the movement's opposition. While most social movement research continues to focus on large-scale tactics, oppositional identities reveal the importance of personalized political strategies wherein activists embody political protest throughout their everyday lives. Building on recent reviews of the literature on identity strategies, I outline five mechanisms used by activists to deploy oppositional identities: organizational affiliation, rhetoric, clothing, behavior, and symbolic association (Bernstein 2008; Bernstein and Olsen 2009).

I begin by reviewing social movement research that demonstrates the important linkages between discourses, frames, and identities. After a description of my methods, I turn to a case study of the involvement of military veterans and family members in the anti-Iraq War movement. I open with an exploration of two important discourses that the peace movement has had to respond to during the Iraq War. Then I illuminate the five ways in which MPM activists challenge and reframe pro-war rhetoric by deploying oppositional identities that claim patriotism and troop support for the antiwar movement. I end with a discussion of the controversial nature of oppositional identity strategies.

Discourse, Frames, and Identities in the U.S. Anti-Iraq War Movement

Recent social movement research highlights the importance of discourse in shaping the opportunities social movements face (Ferree 2003; Ferree et al. 2002; Gamson and Meyer 1996; Johnston and Klandermans 1995) and the frames that social movements produce (Snow and Benford 1988; Snow et al. 1986). I define discourses as culturally specific ways of talking about phenomenon that involve collective meanings associated with that phenomenon. Some ideas achieve greater traction and become dominant because of their use by and association with people who have a presumed authority and greater access to media and other forms of mass communication; these are hegemonic discourses (Gramsci 1971; Steinberg 1999).

Social movement organizations carefully articulate messages in order to contest and in some cases to support hegemonic discourse. Movement participants do so by creating frames,

---

Additionally, "oppositional identities" has referred to black expressions of nonmainstream (white) culture and how this rejection of dominant culture hinders the academic and occupational success of minorities (e.g., Fordham and Ogbu 1986). Although, I offer a different definition for this term as a social movement strategy, both the educational usage and my discussion demonstrate how individuals' ways of being, including clothing and mannerisms, challenge hegemonic understandings of people and their roles.

or interpretive schema, which focus people's attention on particular elements of the discourse in ways that support the movement's goals (Snow and Benford 1988; Snow et al. 1986). Movements and countermovements engage in "frame contests" (Meyer 1995) in which each side vies for control over interpretations of issues, information, and events. In order to win such contests, movements often use frames that can resonate with a broader culture (Benford and Snow 2000; Gamson 1992, 2004) and rarely radically depart from dominant discourses (Tarrow 1992). David A. Snow and Robert D. Benford (1988) theorize that the cultural resonance of frames in part depends on "narrative fidelity" or the fit of a frame with existing cultural myths, ideologies, and sentiment. By drawing on the dominant discourse, social movement participants use language and symbols that people are already familiar with and positively associate with to achieve cultural resonance thus "harnessing hegemony" to create alternative meanings (Ellingson 1995; Ferree 2003; Steinberg 1999; Woehrle, Coy, and Maney 2008). In other words, when social movements seek cultural resonance, they utilize elements of popular discourse to link their ideas with taken for granted beliefs. This increases the likelihood that their goals find broad acceptance among the general public.

Movement participants also strategically deploy identities to further movement goals (Bernstein 1997, 2008; Bernstein and Olsen 2009; Dugan 2008; Neuhouser 2008; Schroer 2008; Taylor and Whittier 1992; Whittier 2009, forthcoming). Although other scholars have discussed this as the framing of public identities (Haines 2006; Schwedler 2005), credentialing (Coy and Woehrle 1996), or the management of public identities (Kubal 1998), strategic identity deployment better describes the culturally and historically constrained choices movements make about who speaks and to which audiences. When movement actors deploy identity, they strategically display particular aspects of their identities in order to influence external audiences. Although some authors do not discuss this as a movement tactic, the strategic use of identity has been found in a wide array of movements including the gay and lesbian movements (Bernstein 1997; Cortese 2006; Dugan 2008; Kaminsky and Taylor 2008; Myers 2008; Rupp and Taylor 2003; Taylor and Raeburn 1995; Taylor and Whittier 1992), the breast cancer movement (Montini 1996), the animal rights movement (Einwohner 1999), the mothers' movement seeking justice for the Argentinean disappeared (Fisher 1989), poor Brazilian women's activism (Neuhouser 2008), Jewish resistance during World War II (Einwohner 2006, 2008), and white racialist movements (Schroer 2008). Similarly, movement scholars have found that movements have used celebrities to garner media attention and attract interest (Meyer and Gamson 1995).

Bernstein (1997) theorizes that activists either deploy their identities for education by looking or behaving in ways that are consistent with mainstream culture or they deploy their identities for critique by directly confronting the mainstream. In her research on the gay and lesbian rights movement, Bernstein (1997) found that contextual factors, such as the political context of the movement, influenced whether activists deployed identities to stress their similarities to the straight majority or to highlight differences from them. Expanding on this, Todd Schroer (2008) and Rachel L. Einwohner (2008) demonstrate that when activists face a hostile discursive climate they may in fact develop and deploy whole new identities, which allow the movement to be perceived as aligned with accepted identities and discourse. Others have found that movements solicit public attention and goodwill by deploying the identities of allies rather than movement beneficiaries (Cortese 2006; Myers 2008). In all of these cases, identity deployment is a tool for establishing the credibility of the frame articulators, which is also critical for frame resonance (Snow and Bedford 1988).

As the above examples suggest, movement identity strategies and the success of those choices are constrained by the discursive context. Movement context shapes which identities are in fact oppositional. While previous authors have not focused on *oppositional* identities as a strategy, other movements have used these identities to compete with the hegemonic or countermovement framing of their issues. For example, the animal rights movement has used scientists to critique the dominant scientific practice of animal testing (Jasper and Poulsen

1993), and the gay rights movement has highlighted the support of clergy to counter the religious right's portrayal of homosexuality as immoral (Crawford and Olson 2001). Recent research has also focused on the novelty of what I term oppositional identities such as Catholics within the pro-choice movement and feminists within the pro-life movement (Kretschmer 2009). Patricia L. Hipsher (2007) also focuses on those examples from the abortion debate to theorize about how "heretical social movement organizations" face difficulties in being seen as legitimate voices within that discourses. While there is significant struggle over the legitimacy of oppositional identities, in this article I demonstrate how oppositional identities can be important tools in discursive contests.

By emphasizing the involvement of those individuals whose embodied protest contradicts the arguments raised by their opponents, movement activists assert credibility and encourage cultural resonance. Movements deploy identities to support their use of frames; when they use mainstream frames to seek cultural resonance with the public, they may highlight oppositional or other identities that also appear mainstream while the deployment of more critical identities support frames that are intended to make a radical break with hegemonic discourse. Using the example of the MPM, I demonstrate the important role of identity strategies in achieving cultural resonance. When seeking cultural resonance, the U.S. peace movement highlights activists whose military ties provide them legitimacy in the debate surrounding the Iraq War. I will show how the deployment of a MPM identity enables the antiwar movement to claim to be patriotic and supportive of troops and provides legitimacy for the movement's framing of these discourses. However, while the oppositional identity strategy appeals to the public, I also reveal that this strategy remains controversial in both the general discourse, because the other side may counter the claims of oppositional identities, and within a movement, because this strategy often limits a movement's claims.

This article provides a useful way to integrate the, far too often separate, literatures on discourse, frames, and identity in social change. Additionally, I advance theorizing on the strategic use of identities by outlining a new type of identity deployment (oppositional) and by further specifying the mechanisms of identity deployment. Finally, by using the MPM as a case study, I also suggest that identity strategies are important in movement achievement of cultural resonance.

Data and Methods

In this article, I draw on nearly three years of fieldwork with the MPM to demonstrate the strategic role of MPM identities in the U.S. antiwar movement's attempts to achieve cultural resonance. I collected data on the four most prominent organizations of this movement: Veterans for Peace (VFP), Military Families Speak Out (MFSO), Iraq Veterans Against the War (IVAW), and Gold Star Families for Peace (GSFD)/Gold Star Families Speak Out (GSFSO) between March 2006 and January 2009 (see Appendix Table 1 for complete list of abbreviations). This data included ethnographic field notes from a variety of protest events and organizational meetings in every region of the United States, interviews with participants and leaders in the movement, and organizational and media materials on the movement and the Iraq War.

I use an extended case method analysis (Burawoy 1998) to explore the identity strategies of the MPM. I spent over 900 hours in the field as a participant observer at movement events. After writing notes during the events, I typed field notes on numerous movement activities including (but not limited to) protest demonstrations in Washington, DC and Los Angeles, the week-long march along the hurricane-ravaged Gulf Coast, the Camp Casey protests in Texas that catapulted Cindy Sheehan to fame, the VFP Conventions in Missouri and Minnesota, informational meetings held near military bases, and memorials to American soldiers in numerous cities in the United States. I frequently audio-recorded movement speeches, panels, and workshops, and I partially transcribed these into my notes. Through my participation at these

events I developed a purposive sampling frame to interview a wide range of movement participants to include a sample that was representative of the organizations in terms of gender, race, experiences with the military, and level of activism. Twenty-eight of these semistructured interviews were conducted in person, while the other two were conducted on the phone due to extenuating circumstances. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. Since MPM events frequently operate in numerous locations simultaneously, I also collected over 600 news stories on the movement and several thousand pages of press releases and other written materials.

For this article, I focused my analysis on my notes, interviews, and the other materials that describe the public speech and actions of MPM activists as well as discussions about strategy. These reveal the frames and tactics movement participants employ. I used inductive and deductive coding with cut, copy, and paste techniques that utilized word processing programs. In particular for this article, I coded for dominant frames or ways of describing circumstances, intentional choices made, and interactions between the MPM and the broader peace movement. As I came across discussions of strategy and information on public speeches and actions, I examined how activists described their military identity as well as what may have called attention to their distinctiveness from the wider peace movement. When I developed new codes for the ways the MPM identity was highlighted I searched for these patterns across all data.

The Discursive Context of the Iraq War

Discourses that stress patriotism and a need to "support the troops" were introduced in political speeches in the lead-up to the Iraq War and have been repeated in the media coverage as the war continues. These discourses are particularly important to the Iraq War discourse because the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York City and Washington, DC (hereafter 9/11) and the Vietnam War provide "discursive legacies," or the "well established, repetitive, restrictive, and culturally recognized ways of talking and writing about" events or objects (Coy et al. 2008:163). As I describe in the next sections, governmental elites and other Iraq War supporters defined patriotism to mean unquestioning loyalty to the policies of the government and defined "supporting the troops" as backing the mission of the Iraq War. In both the United States and Britain, such rhetoric had the effect of temporarily stifling antiwar criticism and movements that had existed in the lead up to the Iraq War (Meyer and Corrigall-Brown 2005; Ravi 2005).

Recently, scholars have paid attention to how memories of past events such as wars, revolutions, and protests shape the ongoing actions, identities, and discourses within a state (see Olick 2003). The ways that people remember and memorialize past wars shape how they make sense of present conflicts, and peace movement organizations must respond to this context. The Vietnam War and 9/11 provide powerful discursive legacies (Coy et al. 2008) that shape the frames and identities war proponents and opponents use strategically. These events are constantly recalled by American political elites, the media, and activists in discussions of the Iraq War. Proponents of the war readily use these discursive legacies to garner social and political support, and opponents of the war reframe the discourses in order to achieve cultural resonance.

Vietnam's Long Shadow over "Support the Troops"

The modern U.S. antiwar movement has had to wrestle with the perception that it was antitroop during the Vietnam era (Coles 1999; Coy et al. 2008). Although the factual basis of this collective memory has been questioned in recent scholarship (Beamish, Molotch, and Flacks 1995; Lembcke 1998), the perception that soldiers were mistreated by peace activists upon their return from Vietnam still holds incredible sway over the American popular imagination. A number of accounts by Vietnam veterans reflect the framing of Vietnam-era protesters as

antitroop (see Greene 1989), and this perception colors people's views of today's peace movement. Although Vietnam protestors' antitroop behavior is difficult to document at best, and is a myth at worst, the legacy of this framing filters into popular discussions of war and shapes the context surrounding the modern antiwar movement in the United States. For example, during my research I found several hundred mainstream media articles since 2001 in which authors characterize Vietnam War protests as antitroop, and they often compare and contrast this to Iraq War protests.

In post-Vietnam conflicts, Americans have actively sought to demonstrate their support of soldiers or returning veterans, and war advocates have actively sought to claim such actions for their cause. Pieces of yellow cloth tied to a number of surfaces, intended to portray troop support, dominated news coverage of the 1991 Gulf War (Jowett 1993). During the Iraq War thousands of Americans placed yellow magnetic decals on their cars, and "We Support Our Troops" signs were ubiquitous in businesses particularly in the U.S. Midwest and Southeast. Recent research suggests that these types of public troop support are positively associated with support for President George W. Bush, the Republican Party, and the Iraq War (Lilley et al. 2010). Media reports for both wars claimed that "this time" the soldiers would not be mistreated when they came home.

Hegemonic discourse framed troop support as support for the mission of the war. The rhetorical phrase "support the troops" is found on a variety of publicly available White House documents regarding the Iraq War, including budget requests that encouraged Congress to approve ad-hoc funding for the war. Pro-war elites and average citizens often claim that antiwar protestors do not support the troops. At the start of the Iraq War, conservative political pundits frequently claimed that those who were not in favor of the war were not supporting the troops (see Jehl 2003, for example). This rhetoric intensified during the 2004 U.S. Presidential election. For example, a widely distributed Bush-Cheney 2004 campaign advertisement characterized Sen. Kerry's vote against continued war funding as a vote "against funding our soldiers." Individuals participating in activism in favor of the war have also widely used the troop support rhetoric. Pro-war activists title their protests "support the troops" rallies. For example, in 2005 these events were aimed at countering antiwar protests outside President Bush's home in Texas. Pro-war speakers frequently rallied their crowd with sayings such as this quote from a 2004 Crawford protest, "What part of support the troops don't they get?" Additionally, pro-war rhetoric from activists and governmental elites claims that antiwar protestors are aiding the enemy or terrorists. This rhetoric is reflected in a tractor-trailer truck decal placed on trucks during the Iraq War which reads, "My USA supports our troops, wherever we go, whenever we go. No aid and comfort to the enemy, no way." This rhetoric is not unlike rhetoric that condemned Vietnam era antiwar protestors for working against the safety and interests of soldiers (Beamish et al. 1995).

Patrick G. Coy, Lynne M. Woehrle and Gregory M. Maney (2008) found that the discursive legacy of the Vietnam War contributed to the foregrounding of "support the troops" rhetoric in the Gulf War and the Iraq War, and peace movement organizations actively responded to this discourse. Peace activists attempted to disrupt the pro-war framing and redefine the meaning of the phrase. Similarly, during the Gulf War both traditional peace movement coalitions and a military family peace organization sought to distance themselves from negative characterizations of the Vietnam peace movement (Coles 1999). As I will discuss later, key to understanding this framing disruption and the insistence on the antiwar movement's support of the troops is the instrumental role of veterans and military families in reframing the social discourse of troop support in ways that encourage antiwar activism.

9/11 and Patriotism in the United States

Patriotism and nationalism are important for structuring war support (Nathanson 1993; Nussbaum 2002), and after 9/11 this discourse particularly resonated with Americans.

Following 9/11 there was a resurgence of popular patriotism, and many Americans rushed to demonstrate their love for and devotion to America in ways that were appreciably different from the past decade. For example, Americans reacted to 9/11 with widespread flag displays on their homes, businesses, cars, or clothing (Stitka 2005). Media outlets frequently displayed patriotic symbols and language (Denton 2004) including in sports (Falcous and Silk 2006) and advertising (Kinnick 2004), and public figures linked patriotism to consumerism (Altheide 2004). Some journalists even suggested patriotism influenced American media coverage of foreign affairs.[3] The rush to patriotism was so noticeable that a special edition of the journal *Peace Review* was devoted to the concept in 2003 (see Coy, Maney, and Woehrle 2003; Dreier and Flacks 2003; Haque 2003; Jensen 2003; Pareniti 2003).

As the Iraq War ramped up, hegemonic framing drew upon the memory of 9/11 to justify the war. Political elites promoted faulty causal links between the terrorist attacks and Saddam Hussein's government (Bamford 2004), harnessing patriotic fervor. President Bush and other members of his administration claimed those who publicly questioned that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction were unpatriotic, leading many news agencies to ignore war skeptics (Rutherford 2004). In the years following, war proponents have deployed patriotic symbols—not only flags and monuments but military bases, aircraft carriers, and military audiences—as backdrops to speeches on the war, thus tying the Iraq War to popular notions of patriotism and demonstrating the military's importance to this legacy. Similarly, there has been continued use of patriotic language and imagery when political elites and conservative pundits have defended the war. At times war proponents have gone so far as to suggest that calls for troop withdrawal are unpatriotic and seek to aid terrorists. For example, in 2005, House Speaker Dennis Hastert said that war critics, including distinguished military veterans, would ''prefer that the United States surrender to terrorists who would harm innocent Americans" (Babington 2005). Like Hastert, many conservative leaders claimed patriotism as a characteristic of only those in favor of the war (Artz and Kamalipour 2005).

Since 9/11, the peace movement has had to "harness and challenge hegemony" to respond effectively to the intensified patriotic pride and nationalism among Americans (Maney, Woehrle, and Coy 2005; Woehrle et al. 2008). The peace movement has made claims to American identity (Coy et al. 2003) and "American values" such as democracy (Woehrle et al. 2008) and civil liberties (Maney et al. 2005). They have also reconstructed what patriotism means using phrases such as "peace is patriotic" (Coy et al. 2003). Antiwar activists in the United States have also sought to link their dissent to American heroes whose patriotism is difficult to impugn. For example, numerous antiwar blogs, interviews, bumper stickers, t-shirts, and protest banners have erroneously attributed the quote "dissent is the highest form of patriotism" to Thomas Jefferson.[4] Many in the U.S. antiwar movement incorrectly attributed this quote to Jefferson likely in an attempt to call upon the patriotic imagery of a "founding father" in order to define opposition to the war as patriotic. Similarly, the involvement of military personnel and families in peace protests presents an embodied claim to patriotism on behalf of the antiwar movement, as I examine below.

Oppositional Identity Strategies

Activists with military connections are frequently given a prominent place in the U.S. peace movement because their visibility is perceived to be an important tool for framing strategies aimed at "transformation" (see Snow et al. 1986) of hegemonic meanings. These

3. Dan Rather suggested this in an interview on "BBC Newsnight" on May 5, 2002.
4. The Jefferson Library at Monticello has actively repudiated this quote (see Monticello n.d.). The original source of this phrase is unknown, although some attribute it to Howard Zinn from a July 2002 interview with Sharon Basco for TomPaine.com (see Basco 2002).

"troops" and their families lend credibility to the antiwar movement, and the military iden-
tity that activists deploy is a strategy aimed at reframing war opponents as patriotic and sup-
portive of the troops. The activists' use of identity resembles the everyday personal political
strategies (Taylor and Raeburn 1995) that gays and lesbians (Taylor and Whittier 1992) and
victims of child sexual abuse (Whittier forthcoming) use to challenge cultural understand-
ings by publicizing their identities and "coming out." As Bernstein and Kristine A. Olsen
(2009) have indicated, activists deploy identities that stake claims to the discourses invoked
by their opponents through the mechanisms of organizational affiliation, rhetoric, clothing,
behavior, and symbols. These mechanisms are important for the public presentation of op-
positional identity, and activists engage in this identity work both at movement events and
in their everyday lives.

Organizational Affiliation

Activists' affiliation with organizations, which declare their members to be veterans or
military family members, is a critical part of the deployment of oppositional identities. The
organizations provide a community and support the mobilization and maintenance of activ-
ists. More importantly for attaining cultural resonance, the existence of organizations devoted
to oppositional identities suggests that there is a significant presence of individuals with such
identities in a movement.

The military community's current activism comes out of established veterans' peace or-
ganizations as well as nearly a dozen new organizations created by veterans of current U.S.
conflicts and their families. Thousands of veterans, soldiers, and military family members have
formed organizations with titles and missions that highlight their military connections. The
most visible military antiwar organizations are those I describe in this research: VFP, MFSO,
IVAW, and GSFP/GSFSO. Each organization has a unique founding story, but all were tied to
military identities from the outset. Members of VFP, an organization of veterans of any conflict
and peacetime soldiers founded in 1985, began marching and organizing educational efforts
against the Iraq War in 2002. MFSO was founded in the fall of 2002 when cofounders Nancy
Lessin and Charley Richardson recognized the power of their voices as military parents after
receiving attention for carrying signs that read, "Don't send my son to war for oil." In July
2004, veterans from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan met at the annual convention of VFP and
formed their own organization, IVAW, just over a year after the war began. Finally, in January
of 2005, a handful of families of slain service members connected and formed GSFP, using the
military distinction "gold star" to distinguish themselves as families who had a loved one die
from war. Internal tensions led most members of GSFP to leave the organization in 2006 and
become a chapter of MFSO, entitled GSFSO. Each of these organizations, in its membership
and indeed even in its name, highlights both its claim for peace and its association with the
military. Their shared experience with the military brought the aforementioned organizations
together into what could be described as a coalition, but which I think is more accurately un-
derstood as a "culture of action" (Klawiter 2008). This term highlights how this segment of the
peace movement has cognitive, discursive, emotional, identity, and symbolic repertoires that
differ from other segments of the peace movement.

Antiwar coalitions in the United States have frequently sought endorsements for actions
from MPM organizations or used members of these organizations as the public face of cam-
paigns. For example, the largest antiwar coalition in the United States invited MPM organiza-
tions to be at the forefront of the national gathering for the second anniversary of the Iraq
War in March 2005 (see Heaney and Rojas 2006 for further discussion of this action). Coy
and colleagues (2008) suggest that after their research ended in March 2005, veterans and
military families were instrumental in crafting a discourse that suggested Iraq War proponents
had betrayed the troops. My research on the MPM picks up where this previous research ends.
I find that MPM organizations have been a critical aspect of the peace movement's attempt

to turn Americans away from supporting the Iraq War. Much of the media coverage of the MPM began in the summer of 2005, when tens of thousands of antiwar activists joined Gold Star mother Cindy Sheehan in protest outside President George W. Bush's Texas ranch. Cindy Sheehan had been the GSFP speaker at the VFP convention in Dallas, and when she traveled to Crawford, Texas she took a large segment of the VFP conventioneers with her. The numerous members of VFP, IVAW, MFSO, and GSFP who participated alongside Sheehan over the following weeks went on speaking tours and held prominent positions in local and national protests during the following years. In 2007, when United for Peace and Justice (UFPJ) sought to encourage newly elected Democratic lawmakers to cut funding for the war despite intense pro-war criticism that doing so demonstrated a lack of support for troops, the coalition turned to VFP, MFSO, GSFSO, and IVAW to spearhead the campaign.

MPM organizations continue to be featured on speakers' lists, at the front of marches, and in literature of the U.S. antiwar movement. During a March 2007 protest in Los Angeles, young men and women Vets led the procession wearing black t-shirts and carrying a sign, both of which simply declared these participants to be members of IVAW. After the protest I spoke with a 22-year old African American veteran who claims that, "We're the most important group here; that's why we're up front. People need to hear the truth from the troops." A mother whose son has served two deployments in Iraq and one in Afghanistan, described her on-stage speech, "They (the broader movement) will always ask us to be on the (speakers') list. They *need* us (her emphasis); we give them credibility." The presence of these organizations in antiwar movement campaigns is a strategy aimed at discrediting war proponents' critiques that the peace movement is unpatriotic and unsupportive of troops by highlighting groups of people representing oppositional identities.

Rhetorical Processes

Activists deploy their identities by carefully describing themselves in printed materials (Dugan 2008), online (Schroer 2008), and in various forms of speech (Bernstein 1997). The most prominent strategy I found in the MPM is the rhetorical demonstration of oppositional identities. Movement participants use rhetoric to make direct claims to the discourse of troop support based upon their own participation in or familial ties to the military. In fact, during a day of coordinated worldwide protests before the war even started, MFSO cofounder Nancy Lessin spoke from the main stage referring to the February 15, 2003 antiwar assembly in New York City as "the biggest pro-troop rally in the country." This description demonstrates how activists believe that antiwar activism is supportive of people in the military.

The MPM frequently works together and often displays all of the organizations' logos on banners declaring "Support the Troops: Bring Them Home Now." This message carries particular power because of the organizations' ties to the military. The activists seek to weaken the hegemonic frame that the current war policies are good for troops by describing how the war policies hurt them, their families, and friends. In speeches, signs, pamphlets, and Web pages, military and gold star family members assert their support for the troops by describing how they supported their families, and often whole groups of soldiers, with packages, body armor, and other supplies while at the same time participating in antiwar activism. For example, one military wife in Crawford, Texas, in 2006, described how her husband's unit lacked adequate water during the initial phases of the Iraq War and how she and other families mailed bottled water in attempts to support these Army soldiers. At a number of events military veteran activists have repeated the phrase "Support the troops? We are the troops!" when responding to criticism that the peace movement hurts service members' morale or aids the enemy. In speeches and in confrontations with bystanders, MPM activists describe specific aspects of the war to demonstrate their credibility on the topic. MPM activists' rhetoric explicitly draws attention to their experiences as service members or as family of service members to challenge the pro-war framing of troop support as support for the mission in Iraq.

MPM organizations spend a great deal of time and effort helping members to feel comfortable speaking in public. They hold conference calls on this topic and engaged in multiple meetings to encourage more members to "speak as veterans and military veterans" as former VFP national director, Michael T. McPhearson describes it. This is because as Nancy Lessin, cofounder of MFSO, describes below, they believe that it is important for MPM activists to describe their personal stories publicly about the war's effects. In her interview she said:

> When a nation is at war, it seems like the citizens want to support the troops . . . but when they hear military families or Iraq veterans or Gold Star families, you know, say my loved one's over there right now and I need your support, and here's what's happening and here's what I need you to do, it gives permission to communities to speak out against the war and not feel that they're unpatriotic and unsupportive of the troops. And it allows others in the broader community to get active in opposing the war.

Lessin's quote demonstrates how MPM leaders recognize the heightened discourse around troop support and patriotism and responds by using their identities to support a frame that defines these concepts to include peace. They strategically encourage their members to speak against the war from their personal military experiences because they believe these individuals will be perceived as credible sources, whose protest could spark wider discontent with the Iraq War.

The MPM is well situated to resist hegemonic framings of patriotism because service members' experiences in the military not only exhibit pride in one's country but also willingness to sacrifice for it. Veterans and military families describe their experiences with the military in speeches, online forums, and media interviews in order to claim patriotism and troop support for the antiwar movement. For example, in my interview with Michael Blake, who was a self-described "Army grunt" who served in Iraq, he said, "People say we're unpatriotic, but how can you be more patriotic than us? I mean, we were there. We saw how fucked up it is." Justifying his and others' activism, Blake describes how veterans answered their country's call to duty and demonstrated what many MPM activists called the "ultimate form of patriotism." During speeches and my interviews, activists claim that these patriotic experiences led them to protest the war. Military family organizations make similar claims by highlighting how they performed their patriotic duty by giving things up, such as time with their loved ones, for the needs of the country. Gold Star families claim that the very life of their loved one was given in service to their country, and some describe their family members' death as this mother of an Army soldier who died in Iraq in 2004: "With a knock on the door, my world as I knew it ended." In an open letter published on multiple Web sites, one brother of a soldier who died in Iraq in 2004 described how his nephew was growing up without his father; he wrote, "Above all, (his brother) was a patriot." This letter was intended to question the war's worth by highlighting the human costs.

As I suggest earlier, the antiwar movement in the United States has often claimed that protest is patriotic, and this rhetorical strategy is particularly present in MPM participant speeches, media comments, and public materials. For example, in July 2006 Cindy Sheehan described the ongoing protests at U.S. President George W. Bush's Crawford ranch to the crowd gathered there in the following way, "While others are celebrating July 4th with barbeques, we'll be showing our patriotism by putting our bodies on the line to bring our troops home." Similarly, Theresa Dawson, a military mom from Ohio, often enacts a caricature of herself when she attends protests and meetings with politicians. She calls herself the "Prissy Patriot" when she dresses in a pink suit and hands out a flag covered business card attached to a pin with two pink fluffy cotton balls on it. Through the card and in her discussions she asks members of Congress to "have the patriotic balls" to end the Iraq War. Assertions that link patriotism and antiwar activities are common in the broader peace movement, but MPM activists believe that when these claims are made by people who either participated in war or whose families have, the impact on the public is more significant because popular discursive

framing of the military recognizes and validates these speakers as patriots. As a Portland, Oregon VFP member asserted in a press release in 2004: "Veterans are the reality of war. We have served our country and our patriotism is above reproach." By deploying a military identity participants strategically emphasize their own patriotism.

The MPM has also adopted the discourse of troop support but reframe it using emotional rhetoric to suggest bringing troops home and caring for veterans is true support. For example, this rhetoric was present in speeches made from the main stage during the fourth anniversary of the war protest in Washington, DC. An MFSO mother of a wounded U.S. soldier serving on stop-loss orders[5] said, "The most supportive thing Congress can do now for my son, for the troops, and the people of Iraq is to stop funding this war." Echoing this framing, Garrett Reppnehagen, cofounder of IVAW, said, "I'm still serving my country. I am still serving my brothers and sisters and trying to get them home alive." In 2007, MFSO increased its use of this emotional rhetoric by framing Congressional budgets for the Iraq war as murder. MFSO engaged in a public campaign that included press conferences, postcards for legislators, and a host of protest activities using the slogan "Funding the War is Killing Our Troops." This campaign demonstrates how the MPM counters dominant framings of troop support and asserts that "bringing them home alive" is true support, using emotional appeals such as love and grief.

Members from all MPM organizations have sought to discredit the pro-war framing of popular yellow ribbons as troop support and to claim that true support requires continued care for war veterans and their families. Geoffrey Millard, a NY National Guard member who served in Iraq during 2005, stated in a speech March 2006:

> I want to start off by thanking my family, IVAW. Of all the "support the troops" ribbons, they don't do shit. But these people have supported me and I know I can count on them . . . For all of you who say "support the troops," where were you when I went to the Vets' Hospitals on Christmas? All I saw there was Veterans for Peace and IVAW.

This quote highlights a common MPM claim about the empty rhetoric of war supporters whose support only extends to approval of the mission of the Iraq War and not to the needs of military personnel and their families. In contrast, Millard points out that military activists demonstrate tangible troop support by caring for returning veterans. This rhetorical strategy uses personal stories to challenge hegemonic rhetoric that "support the troops" means "support the mission" and reframes war proponents as unsupportive of troops. Participants in the MPM use personal connections to the war to challenge Americans to redefine troop support as tangible care for veterans and reducing the loss of soldiers' lives. The use of these rhetorical strategies highlights the oppositional identities used by military affiliated activists to shift the meaning of patriotism and troop support in favor of antiwar activism.

Dressing the Part

Whether it's modern-day white racialists who eschew Ku Klux Klan robes (Schroer 2008), Polish Jews who donned Aryan attire (Einwohner 2008), or gay and lesbian activists who select conservative clothing for certain public events (Bernstein 1997), activists choose clothing strategically to declare particular identities. Activists in the MPM wear clothes that signify their intimate connections to the military, patriotism, and peace. Often their clothes feature organizational logos that declare the individuals to be antiwar activists *and* connected to the military. For example, the front of the main MFSO t-shirt has the words "Military Families Speak Out" encircling a peace sign with a yellow ribbon threaded though it. The words on the front allow the participant wearing it to declare his/her connection to the troops while the image uses symbols to connect support for the troops with peace. The words on the back of

5. Stop-loss orders require members of the U.S. "all-volunteer" military to remain in the armed forces beyond their contractually agreed-upon term.

the shirt, "Support our Troops: Bring Them Home Now," makes the direct connection between antiwar activism and troop support. Other organizational t-shirts can simply have the name of the organization, such as Veterans for Peace, which declare those wearing it to be troops and to be antiwar activists. During a meeting, a mother-in-law of an Iraq soldier described the logo clothing as an important part of what I term the oppositional identity strategy. She suggested giving all participants in a national MFSO forum t-shirts so "they could be walking billboards all weekend and at (their) home (town)."

Many of the veterans and some military family members wear military clothing, such as camouflage or dress uniforms, to antiwar functions. For example, veterans of previous wars who had been in the Army frequently wear elements of the green uniforms to protests or interviews with the media. Members who serve(d) in the military during the current wars in Afghanistan and Iraq often wear the khaki desert camouflage. The most common item is the field jacket to which MPM participants often attach Velcro patches issued by the military, which indicate elements of their service, and ones that they made, such as peace signs and running tallies of the service members who had died in Iraq. Occasionally, veteran activists wear their whole dress uniform or just their jacket from that uniform. Military dress uniforms are traditionally reserved for special occasions such as funerals, weddings, and ceremonies for important accomplishments, so the wearing of these uniforms not only deploys a military identity to claim patriotism and troop support, but it also suggests the importance of peace actions. Other items of clothing that are used to deploy military identities include hats that are also worn by veterans outside the peace movement indicating details about their service, such as time spent on particular Naval vessels, or membership in mainstream veterans organizations, such as Veterans of Foreign Wars. Like the camouflage jackets, these hats are often adorned with pins that communicate desire to end the war.

Although a few military family members, particularly spouses, wear the hats or jackets issued by the military to their loved ones, it is more common for them to show pictures of their loved ones in uniform. Most military families have these pictures on signs, and a few put their family member's uniformed picture on T-shirts that describe their military service or their death. For example, from 2006 to 2007, Carlos and Melida Arredondo set up what they called "Camp Alex" in cities from coast-to-coast to demonstrate the cost of the Iraq War and to promote opposition to the war. This display includes a tent and a coffin covered in pictures of and writings by their son Lance Corporal Alex Arredondo, who died in Iraq at age 20. Many of the pictures show Alex and other Marines in dress or camouflage uniforms, including a picture of Alex in his casket, thus deploying a military identity. Carlos's truck is a mobile Camp Alex; it is decorated with flags, pictures of Alex in uniform, a mock coffin, and two pairs of Alex's combat boots. The photos of Alex in dress uniform and the boots symbolize the troops, and the prominence of death and sorrow in the display are meant to ask in Carlos's words, "Why did he have to die? Was it worth it?" People engaging in oppositional identity strategies use military dress and symbols to demonstrate their connection to the "troops" and to advance the claim that patriotic, troop supporting people should protest the war.

Acting the Part

Activists also use behaviors and rituals such as impersonation (Einwohner 2006) and dance (Kaminsky and Taylor 2008) to deploy identity. Patriotism and a connection to the troops also emerge in the bodily movements and rituals prominent among military-affiliated antiwar activists. The members of these organizations often move in ways that suggest the military. For example, military activists often march, rather than walk, at demonstrations, and they carry U.S. flags to echo military marching formations.

VFP members lead cadence calls at antiwar marches, and MPM and other peace organizations produce the calls with them. VFP's cadences are military style call-and-response chants with antiwar lyrics substituted for traditional lines. In the military, troops often use elaborate

cadences while marching or running to stay in step and to tell stories about what they are doing and why. The cadences I documented at protests across the country maintain some of the basic calls of military cadences such as:

> Leader yells: "Sound off"
> Group responds: "1–2" {dashes indicate pauses}
> Leader yells: "Sound off"
> Group responds: "3–4"

However instead of the traditional final call of "Sound off" and response "1,2,3,4—1–2—3–4," the MPM response is "1,2,3,4— 1–2—No War!" MPM cadences twist some of the familiar elements of military cadences in order to demonstrate their identities as troops participating in antiwar activities. During a march in Slidell, Louisiana, a Vietnam veteran explains that he enjoys singing the cadences because they "show the public that *the military* is here protesting the war (his emphasis)."

While some military cadences are famous for their glorification of killing, their misogyny, or their description of the deprivation of military life (Burke 1989; Trnka 1995), MPM cadences tell stories that link participants' personal experiences of war with their opposition to foreign policy. For example, VFP uses a cadence to draw connections between Iraq and Vietnam with the lines, "Hey, Hey, Uncle Sam. We remember Vietnam. We don't want your Iraq War. Peace is what we're marching for." An alternate ending to the verse states that war means the death of soldiers and mothers crying. Another verse includes the lines, "They wave the flag when you attack. When you're home they turn their back." These lines demonstrate a counterhegemonic framing of Vietnam and troop support by suggesting that it is the policies of the state that are unsupportive of the troops, not the actions of peace activists. Cadence verses have also been created specifically for Iraq War veterans and for military families. Common among these peace movement cadences are declarations of military experience as well as an interpretive framing of troop support as an effort to "bring them home" rather than "stay the course."

IVAW also sponsors protests that look like warfare on the streets of cities such as Denver, Los Angeles, Washington, and New York City, through actions called "Operation First Casualty." IVAW members wear their camouflage uniforms and behave as if they are on patrols through Iraqi neighborhoods. Although they do not carry weapons, they do crouch, crawl, and move their hands as if holding and firing weapons. These tactics also involve forcefully "arresting" VFP, MFSO, and other peace movement members as if they were Iraqi civilians. IVAW quotes and literature about these protests describe this tactic as "bringing the war home." Tactics such as this are aimed at demonstrating MPM activists' intimate familiarity with war and to suggest their authority in their critique of the Iraq War.

Claiming Symbols

The MPM also claims patriotism and troop support by appealing to powerful symbols such as the flag and the U.S. Constitution. These symbols are prominently displayed and used by proponents of war, so by claiming these symbols for the peace movement this culture of action challenges dominant discourses. Although the broader peace movement uses some of these symbols to claim patriotism, activists within this MPM culture of action formalize this usage in ways uncommon in the movement at large.

MPM clothing often features the ultimate American patriotic symbol, the flag, featured prominently alongside symbols or words that indicate the wearer's antiwar position. The flag is commonly found on military uniforms and thus it is a staple part of the camouflage jackets often worn by veterans and occasionally their spouses and parents. Additionally, VFP members use their military know-how to construct harnesses to hold U.S. flags during antiwar protests and other events. The use of the flag is a clear disruption of hegemonic patriotic discourse, which claims the flag as the domain of patriotic, pro-war movements.

MPM activists strategically use another symbol of American patriotism, the U.S. Constitution and its related legal system, to encourage opposition to the war among a broad segment of the U.S. public. Rather than relying on international law, which most Americans are unlikely to understand or feel a connection with, the MPM substantiates their critique of the Iraq War by using frames that reference the legality and constitutionality of this particular conflict. VFP attempts to redefine patriotism as loyalty to the U.S. Constitution rather than to the commander-in-chief or current war policy. Speaking on the main stage of a massive DC protest in 2006, David Cline, the ailing, now deceased, VFP president, describes his belief that protesting the war is patriotic because the Iraq War is illegal and unconstitutional: "You know when we go in the military everyone has to take an oath to uphold the Constitution from all enemies foreign and domestic. And our enemy today is not foreign; it is domestic." Cline calls on a theme common in MPM literature, which asserts that the president and other pro-war politicians are the main threat to the U.S. Constitution. Similarly a 2007 VFP campaign entitled "Support and Defend the Constitution" involves veterans reading the soldier's oath in public forums and discussing the war's unconstitutionality with the media and politicians. Such actions are intended to display the participants' military connection while reframing patriotism as dissent against government leaders who, they assert, disregarded the U.S. Constitution.

Identity strategies involving symbols resemble shorthand. Symbols can trigger a variety of meanings and emotions in an audience, and activists often employ symbols strategically to suggest their connection to these ideas and feelings. Like women who've drawn on the symbolic importance of motherhood (see Fisher 1989; Neuhouser 2008), MPM activists try to build an association between themselves and the discursive significance of national symbols.

The MPM offers new ways to define patriotism and troop support to those influenced by these dominant discourses. In order to increase the cultural resonance of these frames, MPM participants deploy oppositional identities as veterans and military family members in the peace movement. As these examples of identity deployment through organizational affiliation, rhetoric, clothing, behavior, and symbols demonstrate, the MPM provides an embodied challenge to hegemonic frames that link patriotism and troop support to agreement with U.S. war policies. By identifying themselves as connected to the military and as antiwar activists, MPM activists deploy oppositional identities in order to claim patriotism and troop support as key elements of the antiwar movement. As I demonstrate, identity presentations are significant strategies for demonstrating the credibility of a group that is trying to frame a discourse.

Discussion: The Costs and Benefits of Oppositional Identity Strategies

By emphasizing their military connections, individuals in the MPM seek to harness and redefine dominant discourses on patriotism and troop support, and in turn encourage support for the antiwar movement from average Americans. By deploying oppositional identities activists disrupt hegemonic frames and increase the cultural resonance of movement frames. However, these claims are never uncontested, and there are a variety of costs associated with such a tactic for the movement and the individual activists.

Activists in the MPM believe that their insider position on the war allows them to be heard by people who may choose to otherwise ignore peace activism. In his interview, Vietnam veteran Lane Anderson suggests that oppositional identities are important because they allow this movement to reach the "unconverted" while most of the peace movement organizes "events for themselves." Anderson believes that "people of the military or associated in some way with the military" are the ones who can increase "public awareness of the cost of war" and raise "resistance to having our military abused." This interview reveals how MPM identities are based on both a belief that the war is bad for the U.S. military *and* that MPM activists should be the ones to point that out. Mike Hoffman, one of the founders

of IVAW, explains this in a 2004 interview with *Mother Jones*, which later was the basis of a cover story:

> [W]hen the average American hears a veteran—be it from this conflict, Vietnam, WWII, Korea, whatever, somebody who has seen combat and knows what it means—people listen, more than they do to anyone else, because this is somebody who has been on the ground, knows what the realities are, knows what these things mean (Goodman 2004).

Hoffman reveals that he believes that Americans respect the opinions of military people, and this renders their oppositional identities useful for achieving peace movement goals.

MPM activists frequently discuss how their oppositional identities can appeal to people outside the peace movement because they do not fit the stereotypes of traditional peace activists. Michael T. McPhearson, a Gulf War veteran and the father of an Iraq War veteran, described the importance of MFSO while speaking on a panel in Brooklyn, New York, October 16, 2004. McPhearson said, "We provide a bridge to a more conservative America who think [sic] peace means tie-dyed shirts and long hair. Members of MFSO come from every walk of life. Our faces represent the faces of everyday America." Not only are MPM activists respected because of their experiences, these experiences make them appear more similar to the "average American" than stereotypical peace activists. Similarly, during the Persian Gulf War in the 1990s, the leader of a military family peace organization claimed his organization could reach "ordinary" or "mainstream" America in ways that the "odd folk" in other peace movement organizations could not (Coles 1999). During both wars military families believed that this mainstream identity presentation helped inspire credibility and thus enhanced their antiwar framing.

All of the MPM organizations describe the educational value that their members provide. As individuals with experiences with the military and who oppose the war, they believe they have a unique and important perspective from which to critique the Iraq War. One of the purposes of MFSO described on their Web site and in handouts is "bringing our voices to the media to help bring the 'ground truth' and human face of this war to the public." The term "ground truth" appears on numerous VFP, IVAW, and MFSO documents, and it is also the title of a documentary about soldiers who went to Iraq and then developed a critique of the war. "Ground truth" represents a belief that the firsthand knowledge of military individuals is the real truth rather than what people hear about the war through the media and from government officials. One military wife described a common belief that this perspective is "sadly missing" from the Iraq War discourse. Although all of the organizations suggest that their outlooks on the war are important, on numerous occasions activists highlighted IVAW because it was seen as the "organization with the most credibility" as one retired Navy commander in VFP called it.

Activists use their oppositional identities in attempts to "educate" the public about the Iraq War. This instructive role is common among social movement organizations that are often "educational" organizations at least according to their nonprofit 501(c)(3) legal status. What makes the MPM different from other cultures of action within the peace movement is that tactics are often aimed at educating the public about the Iraq War by focusing on its consequences *for the military*. For example, activists have created "informational panels" for display alongside other tactics; these panels contain information on wounded soldiers, posttraumatic stress disorders related to the war, and service members who have spoken against the war. During rallies and marches MPM activists also frequently hand out flyers that describe military specific issues such as post-traumatic stress disorder and suicide, the rights of military service members and their spouses, and the difficulties military families face with the military at war. The importance of the MPM's role in educating the public is described by military spouse Tammara Rosenleaf as "the authority to speak to something that other peace groups don't have." Activists frequently describe their belief that information on these issues will be taken more seriously if it comes from people associated with the military.

While it is often difficult to measure social movements' impact on culture (Earl 2004), the antiwar movement's frames have achieved some cultural resonance. According to Pew

Research Center (2008) polls, immediately after the invasion in March 2003, 74 percent of Americans believed that the United States had made the correct decision to go to war in Iraq. By February of 2008, 54 percent believed this decision was wrong. The shift in opinion is most noticeable during 2005 and 2006 (see Pew 2008), and this coincides with the time when the MPM was most active. Recent CBS polls show further diminished support for the war in 2009, and in August of 2010 they show that approximately 59 percent of Americans did not believe that "America did the right thing in going to war in Iraq" (Montopoli 2010). A number of other newspaper articles and television stories describe polls and qualitative data that find the majority of Americans, including military families, are critical of the Iraq War (Fiore 2007; Zaroya 2007). This change of opinion demonstrates that hegemonic rhetoric linking troop support and patriotism to the backing of government policy on Iraq has lost impact even among those with military ties who are traditionally conservative. It is unlikely that Americans wish to appear unpatriotic or unsupportive of troops, but vocal opposition to the war by prominent military veterans and families has undermined war proponents' control of the discourses of patriotism and troop support. Lexis Nexus and Google News searches using the names of the organizations and a few leading activists reveal that the mainstream media has produced over 5,000 articles, television stories, and radio interviews on the MPM between January 2003 and December 2010. This media coverage of military-affiliated individuals in the antiwar movement provides alternative framings of patriotism and troop support and demonstrates that pro-war elites have not been able to control the discourse on the Iraq War. MPM oppositional identities create room for people to be seen as patriotic and supportive of the troops while opposing the war. While there are a number of reasons for the diminished war support, the MPM appears to have achieved some of its desired cultural resonance.

Although MPM involvement may lessen the critiques that the peace movement is unpatriotic and unsupportive of troops, many individuals do not accept peace movement participants' legitimacy as veterans or military family members. It is as if these individuals' activism trumps their experiences as service members or military families. This is especially evident in the virulent criticisms of Cindy Sheehan, one of the founders of GSFP. Attempts to delegitimize MPM activists and organizations are also found in controversies that sprung up over a variety of parades across the United States organized on Veteran's Day, Armed Forces Day, and Memorial Day during the Iraq War. For example, in Long Beach, CA, MPM organizations were denied entry to the city's 2007 Veteran's Day parade. As one parade coordinator explains, "They do not fit the spirit of the parade. The spirit being one of gratitude for what the veterans have done. We do not want groups of a political nature, advocating the troops' withdrawal from Iraq" (Puente 2007). Organizations such as the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars were allowed to participate in spite of these organizations' public position supporting the Iraq War policy. These exclusions demonstrate how pro-war individuals and groups counter MPM claims to patriotism and troop support. Additionally, this demonstrates how most people ignore the political nature of pro-war veterans groups, and this highlights the general assumption that the military and veterans support current war policies.

However, most MPM activists positively perceived the local and national media coverage of their exclusion from parades; activists describe the media coverage of these legitimacy contests as an important "public forum" for their oppositional identity strategy. While that may be the case, in discussions of this research with civilians and veterans alike I have found that many individuals suggest MPM activists are not "real" or representative veterans or military families. This supports Hipsher's (2007) theory that those claiming "heretical," or oppositional, identities must engage in significant efforts to assert legitimacy. The five mechanisms I describe earlier are important for doing just that.

Although frames that harness hegemonic discourse on patriotism and troop support may resonate with a wide segment of Americans, this limits the peace movement's ability to adopt more radical critiques of militarism and nationalism. This framing strategy has not been uncontroversial in the antiwar movement, and various other organizations and individuals

bitterly critique patriotism and/or troop support as antithetical to peace. My field notes contain numerous complaints by pacifists and others about how the focus on the frames described here distracted the movement from "attacking the military industrial complex" and detracted from a broader "need for internationalism." For example, one peace activist described the MPM focus on the constitutionality of the war as "privileging the U.S. legal system" over broader ideals of morality and internationalism, and that such a focus perpetuated the racism and other biases of that system. Similarly, a number of activists expressed disagreement with placing veterans at the front of marches, saying that doing so promoted militarism. Although MPM activists often spoke about and agreed with these broader platforms, the organizations and activists in this movement were primarily used in the limited capacity that I outlined above, which focused on achieving cultural resonance with mainstream America. As Bernstein (1997) suggests this is a function of deploying identity for education, and as Myra Marx Ferree (2003) implies it is the result of using frames to achieve cultural resonance rather than radically challenging popular discourse. Oppositional identities, then, are important for appealing to the middle, but their use may alienate segments of a movement's base.

It is critical also to understand that activists who deploy oppositional identities may face personal costs for their activism. MPM activists face some unique and serious risks for their participation in peace activism. Veterans of the current wars have faced punishments including military imprisonment; loss of monetary, educational, or health benefits; forfeited or stymied careers; and even additional tours in war zones. Military family members have had to worry about some of those punishments being administered to their children or spouses, as well as ostracism from networks that provide psychological relief, important information, and physical support. Veterans of past wars currently face fewer barriers to their activism, though some have been ostracized from mainstream veterans' organizations and have had difficulty obtaining benefits because of their activism. Activists deploying oppositional identities in other movements may have less extreme costs, but it is conceivable that public activism that critiques one's profession or community will be costly. For example, scientists who speak in favor of creationism may have their credentials questioned, and clergy who support gay rights may face expulsion in some denominations. Both organizations and individuals engaging in oppositional identity strategies must carefully weigh the costs and benefits of such a strategy.

The media evidence I discuss above does not directly reveal whether or how the MPM caused changes in public opinion. Further research is necessary to understand how members of the public make sense of the frames offered by various constituencies. Social movement scholars need to further uncover the links between protest frames, media coverage, and public opinion changes. Similarly, research on this strategy's use within other movements may expand our understanding of the costs and benefits associated with a variety of movement strategies.

Conclusion

This research offers a window into a unique segment of the peace movement. While the Iraq War has generated numerous critics, few speak with the same authority or garner as much media attention as military veterans and family members. This is because the legacies of the Vietnam War and 9/11 have heightened discourses of patriotism and troop support during the Iraq War. The cultural significance of these discourses is reflected in the decisions by both war opponents and proponents to frame these discourses in ways that support their arguments. Iraq War supporters assert that the patriotism and troop support require backing the policies of war, but antiwar activists claim that protest is patriotic (see also Coy et al. 2003) and that the troops are being betrayed by the war (see also Coy et al. 2008). The antiwar movement has further countered war proponents' claims of exclusive accesses to discourses of patriotism and troop support by highlighting those who fulfilled their "patriotic duty" by either becoming troops or by being the family of troops. The visibility of military veterans and families in the

antiwar movement thus undermines hegemonic rhetoric that patriotism and troop support requires blanket support for Iraq War policies. This oppositional identity deployment deflects criticism that the antiwar movement is unpatriotic and unsupportive of troops, and supports the framing of the Iraq War as problematic for the military and the country.

Like all movements, the MPM does not operate in a vacuum. Rather, activists must consciously and intentionally engage with hegemonic discourse and countermovement frames and tactics. This article presents a dynamic understanding of context that suggests how to integrate theorizing on discourse, frames, and identities in social movements. Movement leaders and individual speakers take stock of discursive legacies and make choices about how to engage hegemonic discourse. This knowledge shapes how social movement actors frame their messages, and they also make choices about who should present that message. Thus, identity strategies are simultaneously shaped by and shaping discourse. As such, social movement scholars should pay attention to how the discursive context explains which identities movements deploy. Models that seek to understand movement success should consider the following (and likely other) elements of context: hegemonic discourse, historical legacies, current popular symbols, and movement rivals.

While social movement scholars have spent considerable time understanding how identity affects internal movement dynamics, such as mobilization, solidarity, and retention, the role of identities in tactics, strategies, and outcomes needs further exploration. Understanding identity deployment as a strategy goes beyond thinking of identity as shaping tactical choices (e.g., Coles 1999; Polletta and Jasper 2001) to examine how movements intentionally craft their embodied public image. This article builds upon earlier efforts to theorize about the mechanisms of identity deployment (Bernstein 2008; Bernstein and Olsen 2009) to demonstrate five distinct ways that movements can publicly declare their identity. These mechanisms establish the credibility of certain activists and thus are imperative to transform various meanings in the discourse. Also, I move beyond Bernstein's (1997) identity deployment categories: for education and for critique. While Kimberly B. Dugan (2008) demonstrates how movements may deploy both types of identity at the same time and Bernstein and Olsen (2009) suggest that there are other ways that identity can be strategically deployed, I offer a window into another specific way that identities may be deployed by movements. The oppositional identity category recognizes that certain identities provide activists with authority and creditability on an issue. By highlighting the activism of individuals, whom many would assume would be part of the movement's opposition, this strategy can disrupt their opposition's claims as well as dominant discourse.

The oppositional identity strategy emphasizes movement claims because it is rooted in the very bodies and core identities of movement activists. Understanding identity deployment as a movement strategy aids in understanding the role of individual speakers and actors in contests over policies and culture. While scholars rarely examine personalized political strategies (Taylor and Raeburn 1995), this article demonstrates the importance of the everyday deployment of identity through clothing, symbols, affiliation, rhetoric, and bodily movement. These processes can be used to highlight identities in both social movement settings, such as protest events, and in daily activities, such as work, school, or travel. Strategies whereby social movement actors can embody their protest have the added benefit of appearing mundane, unaffiliated with protest, perhaps even apolitical. This may make these personalized political strategies more acceptable to segments of the population who dislike traditional protest. Embodied protest also personalizes what could be otherwise impersonal government policies, and identity strategies use this personalization to heighten emotional appeals. Although not the main focus of this article, as other scholars have demonstrated, emotion is an intrinsic element of discursive contests (see Goodwin, Jasper, and Polletta 2001, 2004; Gould 2009; Flam and King 2005; Taylor 1996, 2000; Whittier 2001, 2009; Woehrle et al. 2008), and the oppositional identity strategy attempts to cultivate emotions such as patriotic pride, grief over troop deaths and injuries, and anger.

When movements seek cultural resonance for their messages they must turn to individuals who can capture attention in the swirling claims and counterclaims surrounding political or social issues. Oppositional identities appear contradictory—both war and peace—and thus their novelty helps to capture media attention. The importance of media coverage and novelty for movement growth and cultural as well as political attention cannot be overstated. However, the oppositional identity strategy's value lies in more than just novelty, because the deployment of these identities disrupts the claims made by the movement's opposition. Over the last seven years MPM organizations have been asked to lead marches and other demonstrations against the war in cities and towns across the United States. Although these organizations are small in numbers of members, they have played this distinctive role because their military connections allow the movement to harness dominant discourses and encourage support for the antiwar movement from average Americans. Thus, scholars should further explore the role of identity deployment in achieving cultural resonance for movement messages.

Appendix Table 1. *Abbreviations*

MPM: military peace movement
IVAW: Iraq Veterans Against the War
VFP: Veterans for Peace
MFSO: Military Families Speak Out
GSFP: Gold Star Families for Peace
GSFSO: Gold Star Families Speak Out
UFPJ: United for Peace and Justice
9/11: September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks

References

Altheide, David L. 2004. "Consuming Terrorism." *Symbolic Interaction.* 27:289–308.

Artz, Lee and Yahya R. Kamalipour, eds. 2005. *Bring 'Em On: Media and Politics in the Iraq War*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Babington, Charles. 2005. "Hawkish Democrat Joins Call for Pullout: GOP Assails Murtha's Demand to Leave Iraq." *Washington Post,* November 18, p. A01.

Bamford, James. 2004. *A Pretext for War: 9/11, Iraq, and the Abuse of America's Intelligence Agencies*. New York: Doubleday.

Basco, Sharon. 2002. "Dissent in Pursuit of Equality, Life, Liberty and Happiness: An Interview With Historian Howard Zinn." Retrieved January 10, 2011 (www.tompaine.com/Archive/scontent/5908.html).

Beamish, Thomas D., Harvey Molotch, and Richard Flacks. 1995. "Who Supports the Troops? Vietnam, the Gulf War, and the Making of Collective Memory." *Social Problems* 42:344–60.

Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611–39.

Bernstein, Mary. 1997. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103:531–65.

———. 2008. "The Analytic Dimensions of Identity: A Political Identity Framework." Pp. 277–301 in *Identity Work in Social Movement,* edited by J. Reger, D. J. Myers, and R. L. Einwohner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bernstein, Mary and Kristine A. Olsen. 2009. "Identity Deployment and Social Change: Understanding Identity as a Social Movement and Organizational Strategy." *Sociology Compass* 3:871–83.

Burawoy, Michael. 1998. "The Extended Case Method." *Sociological Theory* 16:4–33.

Burke, Carol. 1989. "Marching to Vietnam." *Journal of American Folklore* 102:424–41.

Coles, Roberta L. 1999. "Odd Folk and Ordinary People: Collective Identity Disparities between Peace Groups in the Persian Gulf Crisis." *Sociological Spectrum* 19:325–57.

Cortese, Daniel K. 2006. *Are We Thinking Straight?: The Politics of Straightness in a Lesbian and Gay Social Movement Organization*. New York: Routledge.

Coy, Patrick G., Gregory M. Maney, and Lynne M. Woehrle. 2003. "Contesting Patriotism by the Post-9/11 Peace Movement in the United States." *Peace Review* 15:463–70.

Coy, Patrick and Lynne M. Woehrle. 1996. "Constructing Identity and Oppositional Knowledge: The Framing Practices of Peace Movement Organizations during the Persian Gulf War." *Sociological Spectrum* 16:287–327.

Coy, Patrick G., Lynne M. Woehrle, and Gregory M. Maney. 2008. "Discursive Legacies: The U.S. Peace Movement and 'Support the Troops.'" *Social Problems* 55:161–89.

Crawford, Sue E. S. and Laura R. Olson. 2001. *Christian Clergy in American Politics.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Denton, Robert E., Jr. 2004. "Language, Symbols, and Media." *Society* 42:12–18.

Dreier, Peter and Dick Flacks 2003. "Patriotism and Progressivism." *Peace Review* 15:397–404.

Dugan, Kimberly B. 2008. "Just Like You: The Dimensions of Identity Presentations in an Antigay Contested Context." Pp. 21–46 in *Identity Work in Social Movement,* edited by J. Reger, D. J. Myers, and R. L. Einwohner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Earl, Jennifer. 2004. "Cultural Consequences of Social Movements." Pp. 508–30 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Einwohner, Rachel L. 1999. "Gender, Class, and Social Movement Outcomes: Identity and Effectiveness in Two Animal Rights Campaigns." *Gender and Society* 13:56–76.

———. 2006. "Identity Work and Collective Action in a Repressive Context: Jewish resistance on the 'Aryan Side' of the Warsaw Ghetto." *Social Problems* 53:38–56.

———. 2008. "Passing as Strategic Identity Work in the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising." Pp. 121–40 in *Identity Work in Social Movement,* edited by J. Reger, D. J. Myers, and R. L. Einwohner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ellingson, Stephen. 1995. "Understanding the Dialectic of Discourse and Collective Action: Public Debate and Rioting in Antebellum Cincinnati." *American Journal of Sociology* 101:100–44.

Falcous, Mark and Michael Silk 2006. "Global Regimes, Local Agendas: Sport, Resistance and the Mediation of Dissent." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 41:317–38.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 2003. "Resonance and Radicalism: Feminist Framing in the Abortion Debates of the United States and Germany." *American Journal of Sociology* 109:304–44.

Ferree, Myra Max, William Anthony Gamson, Jürgen Gerhards, and Dieter Rucht. 2002. *Shaping Abortion Discourse: Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*. New York: Cambride University Press.

Fiore, Faye. 2007. "Bush Loses Ground with Military Families." *Los Angeles Times*, December 7, p. A-1.

Fisher, Jo. 1989. *Mothers of the Disappeared.* Boston: South End Press.

Flam, Helena and Debra King, eds. 2005. *Emotions and Social Movements*. New York: Routledge.

Fordham, Signithia and John Ogbu. 1986. "Black Students' School Success: Coping with the 'Burden of Acting White'." *Urban Review* 18:176–206.

Gamson, William A. 1992. *Talking Politics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2004. "Bystanders, Public Opinion and the Media." Pp. 242–61 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Gamson, William A. and David Meyer. 1996. "Framing Political Opportunity." Pp. 275–90 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framing,* edited by D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, and M. N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goodman, David. 2004. "Breaking Ranks: An Interview with Mike Hoffman." *Mother Jones,* October 11. Retrieved January 10, 2001 (www.motherjones.com/politics/2004/10/breaking-ranks-interview-mike-hoffman).

Goodwin, Jeff, James Jasper, and Francesca Polletta, eds. 2001. *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2004. "Emotional Dimensions of Social Movements," Pp 413–32 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Gould, Debra. 2009. *Moving Politics: Emotion and ACT UP's Fight against AIDS.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from Prison Notebooks.* London, UK: New Left Books.

Greene, Bob. 1989. *Homecoming: When Soldiers Returned from Vietnam*. New York: Putnam.

Haines, Herbert H. 2006. "Dangerous Issues and Public Identities: The Negotiation of Controversy in Two Movement Organizations." *Sociological Inquiry* 76:231–63.

Haque, M. Shamsul. 2003. "Patriotism Versus Imperialism." *Peace Review* 15:451–56.

Heaney, Michael T. and Fabio Rojas. 2006. "The Place of Framing: Multiple Audiences and Antiwar Protests Near Fort Bragg." *Qualitative Sociology* 29:485–505.

Hipsher, Patricia L. 2007. "Heretical Social Movement Organizations and Their Framing Strategies." *Sociological Inquiry* 77:241–263.

Jasper, James M. and Jane Poulsen. 1993. "Fighting Back: Vulnerabilities, Blunders, and Countermobilization by the Targets in Three Animal Rights Campaigns." *Sociological Forum* 8:639–57.

Jehl, Douglas. 2003. "Across Country, Thousands Gather to Back U.S. Troops and Policy." *The New York Times*, March 24, p. B15.

Jensen, Robert. 2003. "Patriotisms a Bad Idea at a Dangerous Time." *Peace Review* 15:389–96.

Johnston, Hank and Bert Klandermans, eds. 1995. *Social Movements and Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Jowett, Garth S. 1993. "Toward a Propaganda Analysis of the Gulf War." Pp. 74–85 in *Desert Storm and the Mass Media*, edited by B. S. Greenberg and W. Gantz. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Kaminski, Elizabeth and Verta Taylor. 2008. "'We're Not Just Lip-Syncing Up Here': Music and Collective Identity in Drag Performances." Pp. 47–75 in *Identity Work in Social Movement*, edited by J. Reger, D. J. Myers, and R. L. Einwohner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kinnick, Katherine N. 2004. "Advertising Responses to Crisis." *Society* 42:32–36.

Klawiter, Maren. 2008. *The Biopolitics of Breast Cancer: Changing Cultures of Disease and Activism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kretschmer, Kelsey. 2009. "Contested Loyalties: Dissident Identity Organizations, Institutions, and Social Movements." *Sociological Perspectives* 52:433–54.

Kubal, Timothy J. 1998. "The Presentation of Political Self: Cultural Resonance and the Construction of Collective Action Frames." *Sociological Quarterly* 39:539–54.

Lembcke, Jerry. 1998. *The Spitting Image: Myth, Memory, and the Legacy of Vietnam*. New York: New York University Press.

Lilley, Terry G., Joel Best, Benigno E. Aguirre, and Kathleen S. Lowney. 2010. "Magnetic Imagery: War-Related Ribbons as Collective Display." *Sociological Inquiry* 80:313–21.

Maney. M. Gregory, Lynne M. Woehrle, and Patrick G. Coy. 2005. "Harnessing and Challenging Hegemony: The U.S. Peace Movement After 9/11." *Sociological Perspectives* 48:357–81.

Mansbridge, Jane and Aldon Morris, eds. 2001. *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Social Protest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meyer, David S. 1995. "Framing National Security: Elite Public Discourse on Nuclear Weapons during the Cold War." *Political Communication* 12:173–92.

Meyer, David S. and Catherine Corrigall-Brown. 2005. "Coalitions and Political Context: U.S. Movements against Wars in Iraq." *Mobilization* 10:327–44.

Meyer, David. S. and Joshua Gamson. 1995. "The Challenge of Cultural Elites: Celebrities and Social Movements." *Sociological Inquiry* 65:181–206.

Monticello. n.d. "Spurious Quotes." Retrieved January 10, 2011 (www.monticello.org/library/reference/spurious.html).

Montini, Theresa. 1996. "Gender and Emotion in the Advocacy for Breast Cancer Informed Consent Legislation." *Gender and Society* 10:9–23.

Montopoli, Brian. 2010. "Poll: Most Americans Say Iraq War Was a Mistake." *CBS News*. Retrieved January 3, 2010 (www.cbsnews.com/8301–503544_162–20014856–503544.html).

Morris, Aldon. 1992. "Political Consciousness and Collective Action." Pp. 351–73 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A. Morris and C. Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Myers, Daniel J. 2008. "Ally Identity: The Politically Gay." Pp. 167–87 in *Identity Work in Social Movement*, edited by J. Reger, D. J. Myers, and R. L. Einwohner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nathanson, Stephen. 1993. *Patriotism, Morality, and Peace*. New York: Rowan and Littlefield.

Neuhouser, Kevin. 2008. "I Am the Man and Woman in This House: Brazilian *Jeito* and the Strategic Framing of Motherhood in a Poor, Urban Community." Pp. 141–66 in *Identity Work in Social Movement*, edited by J. Reger, D. J. Myers, and R. L. Einwohner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2002. *For Love of Country?* Boston: Beacon.

Olick, Jeffrey K., ed. 2003. *States of Memory: Continuities, Conflicts, and Transformations in National Retrospection*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Pareniti, Michael 2003. "What Does It Mean to Love One's Country?" *Peace Review* 15:385–88.

Pew Research Center. 2008. "Public Attitudes Toward the War in Iraq: 2003–2008." Retrieved October 20, 2010 (http://pewresearch.org/pubs/770/iraq-war-five-year-anniversary).

Polletta Francesca. 1999. "'Free spaces' in Collective Action." *Theory & Society* 28:1–38.

Polletta, Francesca and James M. Jasper. 2001. "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:283–305.

Puente, Kelly. 2007. "Antiwar Vets Slam Parade Ban: Veterans Day Parade Organizers Say They Want L. B. Event to be Free from Politics." *Long Beach Press-Telegram*, November 7, p. A-1.

Ravi, Narasimhan. 2005. "Looking beyond Flawed Journalism: How National Interests, Patriotism, and Cultural Values Shaped the Coverage of the Iraq War." *The Harvard International Journal of Press/ Politics* 10:45–62.

Rhomberg, Chris. 2004. *No There There: Race, Class, and Political Community in Oakland.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rupp, Leila J. and Verta Taylor. 2003. *Drag Queens at the 801 Cabaret.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rutherford, Paul. 2004. *Weapons of Mass Persuasion: Marketing the War Against Iraq.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Schroer, Todd. 2008. "Technical Advances in Communication: The Example of White Racialist 'Love Groups' and 'White Civil Rights Organizations.'" Pp. 77–100 in *Identity Work in Social Movement,* edited by J. Reger, D. J. Myers, and R. L. Einwohner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Schwedler, Jillian. 2005. "Cop Rock: Protest, Identity, and Dancing Riot Police in Jordan." *Social Movement Studies* 4:155–75.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford, Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51:464–81.

Snow, David A. and Robert D. Benford. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance and Participant Mobilization." Pp. p.197–217 in *From Structure to Action: Social Movement Participation across Cultures*, edited by B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi, and S. Tarrow. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Steinberg, Marc W. 1999. "The Talk and Back Talk of Collective Action: A Dialogic Analysis of Repertoires of Discourse in Nineteenth-Century English Cotton Spinners." *American Journal of Sociology* 105:736–80.

Stitka, Linda J. 2005. "Patriotism or Nationalism? Understanding Post-September 11, 2001, Flag-Display Behavior." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 35:1995–2011.

Sudbury, Julia. 2001. "(Re)constructing Multiracial Blackness: Women's Activism, Difference and Collective Identity in Britain." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24:29–49.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1992. "Mentalities, Political Cultures and Collective Action Frames." Pp. 174–202 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Research*, edited by A. Morris and C. Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Taylor, Verta. 1996. *Rock-a-by Baby: Feminism, Self-Help, and Postpartum Depression.* New York: Routledge.

———. 2000. "Emotions and Identity in Women's Self-Help Movements." Pp. 271–99 in *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by S. Stryker, T. J. Owens, and R. W. White. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Taylor, Verta and Nancy Whittier. 1992. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." Pp. 104–29 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A. Morris and C. Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Taylor, Verta and Nicole C. Raeburn. 1995. "Identity Politics as High-Risk Activism: Career Consequences for Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Sociologists." *Social Problems* 42:252–73.

Trnka, Susanna. 1995. "Living a Life of Sex and Danger: Women, Warfare, and Sex in Military Folk Rhymes." *Western Folklore* 54:232–41.

Whittier, Nancy. 2001. "Emotional Strategies: The Collective Reconstruction and Display of Oppositional Emotions in the Movement against Child Sexual Abuse." Pp. 233–50 in *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*, edited by J. Goodwin, J. M. Jasper and F. Polletta. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2009. *The Politics of Child Sexual Abuse: Feminism, Social Movements, and the Therapeutic State*. New York: Oxford.

———. Forthcoming. "The Politics of Visibility: Coming Out and Individual and Collective Identity." In *Strategy in Action: Movements and Social Change*, edited by J. Goodwin, R. Kutz-Flamenbaum, G. Maney, and D. Rohlinger. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Woehrle, Lynne M., Patrick G. Coy, and Gregory M. Maney. 2008. *Contesting Patriotism: Culture, Power, and Strategy in the Peace Movement*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Zaroya, Gregg. 2007. "Military Family Members Share Public's Division on Iraq War, Bush." *USA Today*, December 12, p. A-1.