



基調講演

女性とラディカルな運動

ジェンダーと紛争についての新しい視点を探る

Gender and Radical Movement

Exploring New Perspectives on Gender and Conflict

アートリー・セン(コペンハーゲン大学准教授)

Atreyee Sen (University of Copenhagen)

I am interested in women and especially right wing activism. I am going to try and give you an overview of the current opinion, scholarship, and how it remains much divided, about the mobilization of women into radical religious movements across the world. What Erica and I are trying to suggest is that we are at a very critical juncture in the history of the world where large scale participation of women in religious armies, radical movements, and civil war is being noted by human rights

activists and scholars all over the world. And, whether this actually gives us new perspectives on gender and conflict, which is because, historically, gender studies emerge from woman victimologies. It was about looking at women suffering and being victims of war. So, what does it mean for gender studies, and for us to actually look at women who are participating in war, supporting men in war and picking up arms?

How do we actually represent women as prosecutors and perpetrators of violence? Women who torture and kill other women, women who are participating in war, killing and torturing other men. Dara Kay Cohen's work, for example, talks about how women in Sierra Leone organize rape and torture of other women as well. How do we actually understand that? With the growing number of religious wars and macro and micro level violence across the world, there is a time in history right now, when women are joining militaries, paramilitaries, armies, terrorist groups, formal, and informal militias, groups of people who are just self-styled freedom fighters, underground movements, secessionist movements (both at international and local levels), and also formal and informal street vigilantes.

What historians, anthropologists, sociologists are trying to see is that, again, we are living in a world where the idea of violence has completely changed. Where violence, violent conflict, intercommunity clashes, large scale, and small scale global wars has penetrated and infiltrated into every aspect of society. In this context when women in large numbers are joining these kinds of formal and informal armies, or joining this fight, what does it mean for academic scholarship?


Women as persecutors and perpetrators of violence

- Contemporary mobilisation of women in the context of war, violence and conflict
- Joining militaries, paramilitaries, armies, terrorist groups, militias, freedom fighters, underground movements, secessionist movements, separatist movements, formal or informal street vigilantes...
- Proliferation of civil wars, total wars, revolutions, everyday violence, intercommunity religious clashes, small wars...

I am going to talk a little bit about modes of recruitment. There are different ways in which women are getting recruited in these formal and informal armies. Some of it is voluntary and spontaneous. If you actually see religious leaders in action, they are often giving this kind of indoctrinating speeches which are very easily available over the internet. Women are joining these organizations after giving it a lot of thought. They are being seriously mobilized because they are considering their options and they are well-informed women who are joining these organizations because they really want to.

Modes of recruitment

- Voluntary
- Spontaneous
- Ideological
- Crisis in manpower
- Coerced
- Circumstances
- Birth and motherhood
- Informal and formal support
- The female body
- ETC...



= definition, conception and self-identification, often as activists, militants, freedom fighters, to goddesses, tigers, lions etc...

Because they feel that the cause is their own and they can identify with their cause. They feel a sense of commitment to that cause. The idea that they have been brainwashed is being increasingly dissipated. There are more women who are really engaging with radical religious rhetoric and joining these movements. The other side of the story is that often these women are being welcomed into these radical religious movements because of a crisis in manpower. Increasingly, the men are either killed in battle or it is that more and more international organizations, for example, find it easy to simply kill men. For example, if the US army were faced with a team of ISIS men, they would actually not hesitate to kill, but if they are faced with a team of women, and you know they have their guns trained in the direction of 500 women, they would hesitate to open fire. So, there is a particular crisis of manpower and that is one of the reasons why there is quite an acceptance of women joining these armies.

Women are also being coerced and under many circumstances they are being raped, tortured, and coerced into joining these movements. Sometimes it is a question of birth and motherhood, and again there is some literature which is emerging in the context of Palestine, for example, where children are just born in the context of violence. And, even if they are girl children, they are just joining Hamas because that is what you do when you are born in that violent situation. You have no other option. The question of motherhood also becomes important. If you have sons who just go and join a local terrorist outfit, then as a mother you want to support your children, you want to look after your children. So, you join these groups. But, what is really interesting, and this for me has been very interesting to watch in the context of right wing activism in India, is the role of informal support. You have these radical religious movements, and, actually the person who does their cooking, washing, and looking after them is the women.

Therefore, women are not necessary at the forefront of war. They are not really, like, picking up arms all the time and fighting. But, women show their sympathy and support. And, that becomes really important in the context of sustaining these movements. And, then, you have the importance of the female body. Tunisian women, for example, who are going into Syria marrying ISIS men, getting pregnant, coming back to the safety of their country to deliver the next generation of Jihadist. What they are doing is that they are offering their body. They are offering their body to the war. But,

having said that, what is important for us to know is that in this context, for example, these women do not see themselves as terrorists. When they are joining, they do not want to be named as terrorists. They want to be named as activists, militants, or freedom fighters, and then you have the range of affiliations to goddesses and they like to be called tigers or lions. So, you have, for example, the Black Widows, the Suicide Bombers Chechen, and you have the Black Tigers, who are the women suicide bombers in Sri Lanka. So, they don't identify with the idea of being called a terrorist. They think they are doing something more than that.

Now, what are the sites of mobilization? Where are these women found, the ones which join these organizations. You often find them in areas of vulnerability—that is, in poor areas, urban slums, in ghettos, and in areas of conflict. You often find them in schools, women madrasas, for example, are often targeted by radical movements. You find them in refugee camps, and in areas where women are either suffering grief or loss because some foreign entity has killed their children, and they are in a state of vulnerability. But, there are also lots of women foreign fighters who are joining these radical movements. Women who have been born in conditions of privilege, money, education and freedom, and the other women who want segregation, they want reeling; they want to join these movements. So, what is going on there? Are they doing it because they want a sense of community? Is there some kind of romanticism associated with radical religious movements? Denmark, for example, from where I am, has the highest rate of foreign fighters. And, they all are not necessarily Muslim. They have the highest rate of foreign fighters in Egypt and they aren't just local everyday dames who are very attracted to this idea of joining radical religious movements.

I think it is time that we took into consideration, in terms of academic scholarship, that we cannot only look at these women through the lens of victimhood—that, it is important for us to look at women through more agential engagement with war and violence. Public opinion, academic scholarship, including sort of media representation, is fairly divided when it comes to representing or understanding why or how these women are joining these movements. For example, you have now the 'right to fight feminists' who believe that women should have the freedom to join violent political organizations.



Whether it is like state-sponsored armies or not state-sponsored armies. Women should be equal to men when it comes to fighting. Why is fighting historically considered to be a masculinist domain? Why is it a man's world? And, it is important for women if they want equality to also be a part of this aspect of just everyday life, which is that, if you want to be part of a society where you

Sites of mobilisation

- Areas of vulnerability: Ghettos, conflict zones, schools, refugee camps, grief and loss etc...
- Areas of non-vulnerability: Women foreign fighters and the power of the rhetoric of violence

"almost all contemporary theoreticians take issue with the position that all women, or at least mothers, oppose war. There is simply too much historical evidence of women's support for, complicity in, and collaboration with the war efforts of men to make that statement defensible"

Mats Utas on 'Victimcy'

Supporters...

- 'Right to fight' feminists and the egalitarian militarists
- Quest for equality in all fields
- Join state and informal armies and organisations and challenge its dominantly masculinist practices



have armies, whether they are formal armies or informal armies, it is important for women to be a part of it. But, it is interesting because the feminists, for example, they argue that if you are part of these armies, if you are part of state armies or radical religious movements, the presence of women can change the nature of the movement. They can often soften the movement or take the movement in a direction which is away from mindless violence. Therefore, according to this point of view, it is important for women to join these movements not because women should be just fighting with men, but the presence of women changes the nature of any institution, and any movement. Any male-dominated movement—whether violent or non-violent— changes when it incorporates women.

Then, you have the “in-betweeners”. People who are sitting on the fence saying that women should have the freedom to join any kind of radical movement or formal or informal armies, but it is important to recognize the difference between the male and female bodies. The female body, for example, is vulnerable in the context of conflict. If a woman gets trapped, she will be raped, and if she is raped and she is pregnant, that causes problems. And, even if she is not raped, if she goes into war and she

has an affair with a local fighter, and she gets pregnant, a pregnant woman will not be able to fight. So, let's face it that there is a difference in biology between men and women, and it is important for us to take this into consideration that if women get pregnant then they should have the right to withdraw. Also, if women feel sexually vulnerable in a particular context, then they should have the right to withdraw from war. So, these are the in-betweeners, who said, yes let them participate, but they should have the freedom of choice to retreat.

And, finally, you have the absolute critics who think that it is outrageous that people should support women's engagement with war. Partly because, academics have historically believed that, if you don't highlight women's victimologies and women's suffering, then war will carry on forever. The role of women as peacemakers need to be taken into consideration. Historically, in many conditions of conflict between men, it is women who have intervened, and they have intervened very productively in

peace talks and, in informal ways, have brought peace within communities. So, if you glorify or accept the fact that women should be participating in radical religious movements, without just jumping in and saying that “this is really bad”, “they shouldn't be doing it”, then this takes away the importance of women's suffering—that women do suffer, that women are badly affected by war and conflict. So, the question that comes out of this kind of divided opinion is that who are the women who are at peace when at war? Why do women want to participate in war? How can war be sold to women as something which is beneficial for them or that which they can actually benefit from?

Inbetweeners...

- Limited participation of women in formal and informal armies
- Recognise 'the difference' between male and female bodies
- Not involve women in direct action
- Capture of women will involve sexual abuse
- Women must have the choice to withdraw from physical combat



Critics...

- Women's victimologies and suffering in conflict gets undermined
- Women's role as peacemakers need to be enhanced
- Not create a new space for women's sexual vulnerability and silencing
- Can we sell conflict as desirable to women?



"Women have always been the primary victims of war. Women lose their husbands, their fathers, their sons in combat."
- Hillary Clinton



That becomes the controversial question. What are the debates that emerge in response to that question? Most academics, for example, are trying to talk about the fact that war gives women a sense of agency and empowerment—the act of carrying arms, the act of freedom of mobility to walk around freely with guns. Some women have actually said that women just like wearing uniforms. They think that it makes them feel very cool about themselves. So, whatever it is, it is a sense in

which women's agency and empowerment often becomes tied to conditions of war because war challenges normative conducts, war challenges patriarchy. Women who are, for example, usually used to being cooks and cleaners for their husbands and their responsibility has always been to look after the home, and look after the children, and stay at home. In conditions of war, they feel that they have the mobility to actually carry a gun and get into war with their husbands. So, there is a way in which they can challenge patriarchy. They can step out of their homes. They don't necessarily have to remain limited within the confines of their homes.

Because the idea of home itself becomes complicated in the context of war—homes are broken, homes are torn apart. Women can be free. Women do not have to look after their homes anymore. But, one of the interesting things is that how do you militarize the bodies of women if women are cross-culturally taught to be honorable and respectable and their bodies are meant to be humble, to always show respect towards others? How do you militarize that body of a woman to be actually carrying guns? This is part of the training, which often becomes an important part of radical religious movements. Training is directed towards changing the movement and body of the women to make it far more aggressive. Another part of the controversial debate that arises is around what Erica mentioned, which is around female suicide bombing.

This idea of female suicide bombing is something that has really caught the attention of international policy makers because the fact that women could use their bodies as bombs and kill themselves and blast and destroy to rip apart their bodies and take the lives of people with them, is something that is so torturous for any kind of public imagination. And this has led to an interesting emergence of the politics of female martyrdom. Religious movements are now saying that women can also be martyrs.

Women who have given their bodies for the nation, who have sacrificed their beautiful bodies for the nation—that is something which is being increasingly glorified. But, the women themselves in the run up to the actual act of female suicide bombing, and again, there is some literature which is emerging on it, can use that act; the fact that they are going to make the ultimate sacrifice as people

Key controversial debates

- Women's agency, emancipation and empowerment
- Challenging normative codes of conduct
- Mobility, freedom and equality
- Women's voices being heard
- Power to kill and carry arms



Key controversial debates

- Suicide bombing, deaths of women warriors and the politics of female martyrdom
- Emasculation and gendered protectionism
- New cultural and political discourses to support it



know. It is not like the unpredictability of war, you are going as a soldier, you could come back alive if you are a soldier. But, with suicide bombing, you know you are going to die. That women use it as a powerful critic of local men. Saying that I am being forced to give my body to the nation because the men could not serve the nation. The men could not save women. So, it is me, I have to go forward and do it. So, it is a particular form of emasculation which is related to female suicide bombing. But, having said that, there are new cultural discourses—that are emerging within these radical movements—to support female suicide bombing. For example, there is the idea that it is less likely than a woman would be frisked because people would be unsuspicious of them. So, if you are a woman and you are standing in a crowd, people wouldn't look at you and think you are about to blast your body. But, what radical religious leaders are saying is that when women are willing to do that, they become the brides of God. So, women are celebrated as brides. They are dressed up, they are given spa treatments, they have make-up done, and they are considered to be beautiful. And, this kind of radical change in the celebration of women is something that is being incorporated now in radical religious movements. Earlier, it was all about celebrating the men. Now, it is about, let's accommodate different ways in which we can celebrate these women.

From now on I would like to give you a flavor of different kinds of ethnographies which are emerging especially in the context of anthropology, and I will begin with a little bit of my own. I work with a radical Hindu Nationalist Group in Mumbai and I especially look at women's involvement in this group.

One of the key debates which has emerged in the context of women's participation in radical religious movements, is that does it create solidarities between women? In my area of research, for example, it does create solidarities within women. Even though women join the movement, because they are Hindu nationalists and they are worried about the survival of the Hindu nation, they also coalesce around issues of rape and domestic violence and other kinds of sexual vulnerabilities. For example, the women who are part of this radical group, the Shiv Sena, which I worked with, they distribute local small pocket knives for women travelling on public transport. And, they say, if you are sexually harassed or you feel vulnerable towards rape, feel free to use the knife. And, the party will actually save you. The organization will save you. They will find a lawyer to protect you.

The Shiv Sena, the party, has also launched a smartphone application. If you download the smartphone application and you ever feel sexually vulnerable or feel like you are about to be raped, if you shake the phone hard enough, it starts ringing the local police station. So, you are a poor woman and you are a woman at work and you are travelling on the train, and usually sexual predators are predators who get on the train every day. They are always the same people. You know who they are. And, when you feel vulnerable, you just start shaking your phone and you are rescued immediately. So, these actually are solidarities which are built amongst women, in the context of

Women for women: rape, domestic violence, civic amenities

- Using radical Hindu movements to support women
- Offering small arms to protect poor women
- Delivering collective brute justice
- Spontaneous informal courts run by women
- Shaming rituals + violent beatings



right wing activism. So, superficially they are saying yes, this is about serving the Hindu nation, but on a very practical level, it is about women serving each other.

And then, there are also women who go against women when they join radical religious movements.

For example, in the context of the US, there are anthropologists and other scholars who are looking at Christian radical fundamentalists' women. Women who joined these Christian fundamentalist groups targeted women who are pro-abortion. They are burning down clinics when women are having abortions or terminating their pregnancies. They are attacking immigrant women, women who are coming in from Mexico and from other places, and seeking refuge in asylum. Mary Romero, for example, in her work, says that there is this idea that Christian radical fundamentalist American women are the perfect mothers. And, all these other women, the ones who are terminating their pregnancies or coming in from Mexico are unfit mothers. So, America should be a land for the fit mothers and fit mothers which come through their engagement with Christianity. Furthermore, you have another example from Kashmir, which is in the northern part of India.

It is a very violent and conflict stricken area, and there is this radical women's Islamic group called Dukhtaran-e-Millat, and they target women who are either prostitutes or women who are taking part in Valentine's Day—because it's a foreign import. "What is this idea of modernity?" "Why celebrate love?" "Your parents should be organizing an arranged marriage for you". "You should not have the freedom to love". So, these women go around, smearing the faces of that women with black ink and sort of ripping their clothes off in public and making them be revealed. This idea of keeping a society clean is also becoming part of these radical religious movements. Therefore, there is a problem with gender solidarities. When are women joining these movements showing solidarity towards other women or targeting and attacking them? What are the radical movements which generate solidarities and the ones which really don't?

In conclusion, when it comes to women in radical movements and looking at it from the perspective of conventional gender studies, can we actually look at it as a brand of soft feminism? If feminist trajectories have dominated gender studies for a long period of time, then a lot of the markers of women joining radical religious movements actually tick boxes which are related to traditional liberal feminism. For example, women joining these movements they seek to sustain women's aggression that women are united and they are aggressive and they are sort of fighting patriarchy. They increase the public presence of women, women move outside their homes, they no

Women against women: reproductive freedom, immigration

- Radical Christian women and fatal attacks on doctors, immigrant women, burning down of clinics
- Immigrants and pro-abortion activists as unfit mothers

Mothers Against Illegal Aliens (MAIA)
"MAIA shields itself with the armor of motherhood by appropriating traditional images of mothering to conceal its anti-immigrant activism targeting other mothers and their children. In order to attack other women and their children in the name of motherhood and family, MAIA constructs immigrant mothers as unfit mothers and their children as unfit for U.S. citizenship."

Guilty, the female anti-illegal immigrant vigilante who gunned down a nine-year-old girl and her father in Arizona
The leader of an anti-illegal immigrant vigilante group has been found guilty of gunning down a nine-year-old girl and her father in Arizona. The woman, who is a mother of two children, was found guilty of first-degree murder and capital murder. She is facing a life sentence in prison.

MARY ROMERO, "Go After the Women": Mothers Against Illegal Aliens' Campaign Against Mexican Immigrant Women and Their Children



Women against women: social and moral impurity

- Women's Muslim moral groups affiliated with militias
- Role in controlling women's social behaviour in terms of dress, veil and moral conduct
- Instigating moral orthodoxy and questions of respectability

On V-Day, Aasiya raids restaurants, gift-shops
A group of women, known as Aasiya, raided restaurants and gift shops on Valentine's Day. They were protesting against the celebration of Valentine's Day, which they considered a foreign import. They were also protesting against the moral impurity of the celebration. The women were seen in the streets, some wearing headscarves and some wearing face veils. They were holding signs and shouting slogans. The police were called to the scene and the women were eventually dispersed. The incident sparked a debate about the role of women in society and the importance of moral values.



longer are segregated and home-bound and they are out. And, carrying arms and engaging with radical movements increases their self-pride. They contest notions of submissive femininity in their body language, in their everyday behavior. All kinds of femininity, which is related to submission to men, are challenged by women's participation.

Women learn how to protect themselves. In conditions of war, it becomes important for them to protect their bodies, so that they know how to use arms or develop comeback techniques which are about protecting their bodies. And, one of the things which form a part of these movements is that they are not really overtly challenging patriarchy. They are supporting patriarchy. They are going along with it. They have temporary spaces which they are maneuvering to get some amount of freedom, but they are not saying that they want a world with no men. They are not saying that they want a world which is completely dominated by women. They want to still look at the broader ideology which comes with these movements. Parashar, who Erica mentioned before, talks about "creative conformity". And I thought this was an interesting thing to throw out there for discussion on whether you agree with it or not. Parashar argues creative conformity explains best the actions and lived experiences of these women—the women I was talking about all this while.

And she says, 'This "creative conformity" comprises actions that may not produce ends that appear "feminist" within a secular-liberal framework, not necessarily align with the intentions of the agent, but nonetheless influence gendered norms about moral life'. Which is, women still manage to challenge and transform conventional gender norms in mainstream society by participating in radical movements.

Great controversy! Women's collective violent action as 'soft feminism'?

- Seek to sustain women's aggression without gender solidarities
- Increase women's public presence, cultural and self-pride
- Contesting traditional notions of submissive femininity
- Women's mobilisation into self-protectionism during war
- Not overtly challenge men and patriarchal economies

... 'creative conformity' perhaps best explains the actions and lived experiences of these women. This 'creative conformity' 'comprises actions that may not produce ends that appear "feminist" within a secular-liberal framework, nor necessarily align with the intentions of the agent, but nonetheless influence gendered norms about the moral life.

(Swati Parashar, p 454)