

質疑応答

【Question 1】

女性が武器を手にすることで力を得て家父長制度や家庭から解放されるということだが、ラディカルな運動や軍隊の中には、やはり家父長的な構造があると思われる。その中で女性たちは矛盾を感じていないのか？

Atreyee Sen: I want to start by Erica mentioning how these women go through extreme asceticism to show their involvement or commitment to their organization. And, how they have to spend hours displaying the fact that they could be a very involved and committed member of a very hardcore radical organization. I think that this is something which is interesting in terms of looking at international perspectives on women's participation in radical movements, a kind of extreme violence that the women subject themselves to in order to show their loyalty or commitment to the rhetoric.

Several scholars, for example, will argue that female suicide bombing is a very extreme example of that. Committing your body to be subjected to extreme violence or something that is more of a symbolic violence, this is a more dreaded form of violence. The fact that the women, the female bodies in particular, can be offered to an organization through the path of violence is something that is important. The question of victimhood and perpetrators is something that I found really, really fascinating in the context of Dr. Ogawa's presentation. And, I think again what Erica and I are trying to do in this project is that to step aside from this pattern of looking at women's participation in violence exclusively through the lens of either victimology or rhetoric of suffering.

All the agencies involving women in the context is something that women articulate themselves as emancipatory. What we have emphasized on these trends is: What are actually women's roles? How do women themselves see their engagement in those roles? How are they being represented by themselves? What are their own motivations? What are their memories once this violence is over? How do they see their actions? We are returning women's voices to a history of violence and conflict. But, it is always about women who are looking at themselves as victims or people representing women as victims.

What you raised was a very important question which is that people don't necessarily look at their own actions as victims or perpetrators: heroic or non-heroic. It is about how people represent them. The women belonging to the Indian National Army, for example, were really glorified by people. Their heroism was something that was celebrated and glorified by people. The women wrote a letter in blood to the head of the Indian National Army and said that, as women, they wanted to also make a contribution because at the beginning, they were banned from participating. But when women joined the Army, they were really celebrated. While it was accepted that men would do it, that men

would fight the colonizers, the fact that women chose all these different paths—whether it is Gandhi’s nonviolence movement or the Indian National Army— it was people who attributed heroism to them. And, I think, what is controversial about the way we are looking at radical movements now is that local people continue to attribute heroism to women who joined radical religious movements.

We look at it as terrorism. Women have joined up a terrorist group. But, somewhere, these women are being celebrated, they are considered to be heroes and nationalists. What we look in imperialism, women participating in the revolution, in Algeria, for example, where they were fighting the colonizers, was like a part of history. But, if you look at it from the perspective of women now taking part in the radical religious movements, they still think that they are fighting imperialism. They are fighting western imperialism or some sort of imperialism. I think that this is what makes this issue about victims and perpetrators look a bit complex.

There is limits of gender frameworks to understand women’s participation in radical movements. We have to constantly think about the fact that; Are they challenging patriarchy, are they not challenging patriarchy? Are they feminists, are they not feminists? Are they or aren’t they conscious of gender solidarities? But, if you look at it from the perspective of the women themselves, as I was working in the slum with these group of women, what they want is a brief reprieve. What they want is a temporary state of being where they could just go to work freely without the fear of being attacked or sexually abused in public space. They wouldn’t understand words like “patriarchy”; they are just illiterate, average, and everyday women. For them, if you tell them, “Okay here are some knives, and I am telling you that it is fine for you to use knives”, you are talking about the case of self-defense. What the women feel from their perspective is power. Power is a word they understand, but patriarchy is a word they don’t understand. It is complicated to look at it through the lens of scholars. We are saying, “yes they are re-enforcing patriarchy,” but, for the women themselves, they think they are challenging the men and getting more access to public space. I think that is where the academic paradox really is. Can we actually explore this from the perspective of the people who are joining these movements? There are obviously some benefits that they are getting out of it.

Erica Baffelli: I just wanted to add on what Atreyee was saying about the central idea of the body, the asceticism and this kind of glorification. Although my case study is in a very different context and I’m working on a relatively small group, something that I am starting to notice is the narrative about the body glorified through the ascetic practices, to take one’s body to the extreme, purified by the asceticism. Then, when women are re-elaborating their past and rejecting narratives about the body change, some of them start talking about violence and of denying their femininity through the ascetic practices. Or the bodies that were described as strong and purified are now seen as corrupted and sick. This idea of bringing their voices, their narratives is quite fundamental for our project.

And, this can be probably one of the key terms and elements we can use to look from a comparative perspective, tanking into consideration the different contexts.

【Question 2】

Professor Sen made a very compelling case on the way in which gender figures in the construction of these women's identities as freedom fighters, terrorists, or even women who defend themselves in public transportation. And, I wanted to ask whether gender is also part of the conversation, if and when these women are arrested or captured. Does it figure in the punishment decision as either an aggravating circumstance or extenuating circumstance or not at all?

Atreyee Sen: This question of gender that very much comes into being; but, I think, what is interesting is the fact that it comes into being, but not for Muslim or Christian or Buddhist women, or women from any other religious groups, because they are not given that privilege. It is only the women who are part of these radical religious movements who are going to get this privilege. It is a way in which you also tend to mobilize women who maybe Hindu women, but are not interested in party politics or religious radicalism. For example, if you ask these women how to spell "nationalism", they don't know, because they are that illiterate and poor—often like working as domestic laborers and maids in factories. They are not women who actually know about the ideology or nationalism, or anything like that. But, it is about these practical services of gender solidarity, which are offered to these women, which work for them. So, they remain committed to the party. Are they really concerned about the Hindu nation? I don't think they care. You know they are slum women, they don't give a damn, but when it comes to saying that if you join the party then we will give you knives and you can actually protect yourself on the street and the police will protect you as well, it is a fantastic deal for them. I am trying to say is the women are also strategic in the way that they engage with this kind of religious radicalism.

【Question 3】

There are three slides, about supporters, inbetweeners and critics of women participation, and among the supporters, there was this argument that the women once joined state and informal armies and organizations, their challenge its dominantly masculine practices. So, it is an argument often made that when an organization gets diversity, something will change and usually it is for the better. Can you elaborate a little bit on the gender side of this? I mean, it is not just diversity, but we are talking about women. How do the organizations change?

Atreyee Sen: I am going to give one example from my own work. The Shiv Sena, has been around

from the 1960s, and it has been a very prominent party. And, it was around for 25 years, when in 1985, they created their first women's wing. For 25 years, they hadn't even thought about diversity. They didn't even think that it was a party which was in any way made for women. But, accommodation of women in the Shiv Sena, over time, transformed a lot of its political agendas. The party incorporated the idea of women's rights; what can we do for the Hindu women? what can we do to protect everyday women on the street? It never had an agenda which was ever directed towards women. Even though it is as narrow and parochial as only offering good things to Hindu women, they still brought in women's agendas into question. For example, the party leader, when this whole thing about knife giving was becoming quite controversial in the press, was actually developing choices for women by saying that if you think that it makes you feel quite weird about carrying a knife in your purse, carry things which you associate with your kitchen. Carry chili powder in your purse, so you can actually throw into the eyes of the perpetrator. It gives you time to run. So, these are the ways in which the party increasingly sensitizes itself to the needs of its vote bank, it is a female vote bank, frankly. They need the women to remain in power.

If you look at some studies which are looking at women joining the US Army, for example, which is a State sponsored army and not a radical religious movement. A lot of scholars look at the US Army as a Christian fundamentalist organization. That it is a way in which they accommodate a load of Islamophobic people and deploy them to work or fight wars in Islamic nations. But stepping away from that, the incorporation of women in the US Army, for example, a lot of people have said, has reduced the amount of bullying that went on within the Army. People are hesitant to do hazing in front of or in the presence of other women. I am not saying that there is no sexual abuse in the army. There is quite a high rate of sexual abuse of women and rape in the army, as well. But, that was one of the arguments which was put forward that because of the diversity, it changed all the very strong masculine practices which had been there in the US Army for a long time.

Erica Baffelli: Going back to the question about punishment, I was thinking about a point that we haven't mentioned which came up in studies on Northern Ireland IRA members. Miranda Alison, for example, looks at IRA women combatants and says that in post-conflict situation female combatants were more stigmatized than men for being part of it. This is one of the other elements we are quite interested in looking at in this project. How these women are seen in the society in the post-conflict context and what are the differences between female and male combatants. Even if they haven't been in prison, they are being stigmatized for having chosen to be a part of these groups, for not having a family, for renouncing to motherhood in order to be part of radical movements and so on.

Atreyee Sen: Just to add a little bit to that is that historically, once women had an opportunity to be non-domestic in the context of violence, and in the post-conflict time, they found it really hard to get back to domesticity. It was like tasting the freedom that came with violence and conditions of

violence and conflict. You see it in the World War I and II, where the women went to fight. Men too went to fight in the trenches; and women had to take up the banks, post office, and as factory workers. When the men came back from work, women hated going back to domesticity and they fought to keep their jobs. The men were absolutely outraged by the fact that women became so organized in trying to retain their economic activities and freedom. This is something which keeps on coming back in the context of the post-conflict areas. That is why we have given a lot of emphasis on this idea of memory. Which is that, how do women remember the violence and relate it to what is going on with them now.

【Question 4】

I would like to know your opinion about the idea that some women act for or play for socially dominant ideology or perception which often tend to be masculine and I think this is a kind of issue of women members of the Aum cult, right? So, some women killed or hurt other women as an agent. What do you think about this kind of idea? You touched upon this I believe but I would like you to clarify on that again.

Atreyee Sen: It depends on to what extent women see themselves as culturalised or committed to the organization. If you are somebody who is very, very committed to a socially dominant masculinist radical religious movement, you would often see killing as not necessarily act of taking a life or you might not face any ethical challenges because you see it as defeating an enemy. But having said that, there is a lot counter literature which is emerging right now, which looks at women's participation in violence as sport that they are doing it because they enjoy it. And the question is that what is the psychosocial impact of that for other women or for the next generation? When I was working with this group, for example, the fact that often male children saw women carrying arms created a very confused masculinity in them. It does have a certain kind of psychological impact on the next generation.

Erica Baffelli: I think in Aum there is an interesting element that is the idea of being part of an elite. During interviews, some women said that it was easier to renounce to the beliefs and to renounce to the leader than to renounce the idea that they were a chosen elite and they were going to save the world. This idea of being “special”, which even women, if doing the ascetic practice properly, could reach higher spiritual levels, gave them authority in a sense. And then, at one point, the beating became part of it. Beating was acceptable because it was seen as helping the other person to reach liberation. Even before the killing started, the beating had already started, together with the idea of gaining power in the movement through extreme ascetic practices. I think this idea of “elite” is similar in other radical organizations and it’s a key element to understand what kind of violence (and toward whom) is accepted in the group.

【Question 5】

What happens to media images of women fighting? You probably know 20 years ago, there was a movie called *G.I. Jane* and more recently there has been popular movies of Mixed Martial Arts fighting. Some of these women, may look good for Hollywood, are quite violent. There must be a gap between what men think of women in the army and the women who were actually in the army and that you interviewed. Has there been any influence between each other and is there going to change? Is there anything more recent you want research about?

松尾:『GI ジェーン』のころの女性兵士のイメージはすごく特別な女性という感じだったが、最近観たロマンチックコメディ映画で、男性の奥さんがアフガンで戦死した兵士であるという設定があり、それが日常のモチーフとして出てきているのを見たときに、女性兵士の表象というものが、『GI ジェーン』の時代からは大きく変わって、女性兵士の存在がそれだけ日常化しているのではないかという印象を受けた。

小川:DV 被害者については、脆弱な女性というイメージがいまだに大きいと思う。1960年代70年代にアメリカで、battered women's movement が起こり、その後、フェミニズムの中で、「victimization-agency 議論」が展開された。アメリカのフェミニスト法理論の基礎を築いた研究者であり弁護士のキャサリン・マッキノン、DV 被害女性を裁判で弁護した際に、女性を脆弱な存在であると捉え裁判を闘った。けれども、女性を脆弱な「被害者」だと捉える視点は、女性を従属的な立場と不可分なものとして捉えることになるとして批判を受けるようになる。フェミニズムの議論では、被害者と表明することによる補償や支援は被害者の防御策として重要だという意見がある一方で、女性を惨めな被害者に還元することは、多くの女性の体験を反映していないという批判があった。エージェンシーの観点では、女性は無力で脆弱な存在ではなく、個人の考えに基づいて成長し行為を起こす能力をもつ存在であり、変化の主体となる可能性があると言われている。それゆえ、既存の秩序の中で生き延びてきた DV 被害者はエージェンシーであり能動的な存在といえる。このような議論があったので、アメリカでは、DV 被害女性のイメージが翻されている側面があるのではないかと思っている。

Atreyee Sen: I am going to say a couple of things. One of the key categories of representing women fighting, or women fighters, is of hyper-sexualization. That sort of fighting women's body carrying arms is sexualized. It is a very attractive, desirable, female body. There is a particular sort of return to the hyper sexualization of it. The second thing is that if you look at the media representations of women who are fighting—if they are fighting for the nation, a nation which is considered to be legitimate by the media itself, then it is still something which is glorified or something which is accepted. But, if it is a woman fighting for a cause, which the media considers to be illegitimate and unjustified, then the same woman is considered to be who I had put one slide, “the hybrid monster,” which is that she remains neither man nor woman, and she has no space within the sort of mainstream society.

Because you mentioned Lynndie England, I was thinking about that. This term “hybrid monster” was actually developed in the context of the Lynndie England controversy. When images of her

torturing prisoners in Abu Ghraib actually hit the media. Women in army are entering into this hyper competitive space, where they have to show that they are as good as men when it comes to displaying violence. Are we actually creating these hybrid monsters who are not sure whether they are women anymore and are aware of the fact that they can't be the same as men? One of the things about Abu Ghraib, which again, sort of in terms of its representational politics, became much gendered as there were a lot of women in Abu Ghraib. They were the women who were interrogators, torturers, soldiers, but somehow only the character of Lynndie England got attention. And, she was severely punished for it; she received a media trial, was chucked out of the army, never given another job, never returned to mainstream civil life. So it is like the media holds the trial as to who they think are the legitimate participants in any kind of violent organization.