

「特別寄稿」によせて

「過去の克服」とジェンダー・セクシュアリティ研究

李杏理

(シンポジウム企画者、CGS 研究所助手)

「特別寄稿」は、ICU ジェンダー研究センターが設立10周年を迎えた2013年に新設されたセクションです。ジェンダー・セクシュアリティ研究において見過ごされがちな問題、チャレンジングなテーマ、時宜にかなったトピックなどについて、独自の視点から果敢に研究・実践活動をされている第一人者の方々に、不定期にご寄稿いただいております。

5回目となる今回の「特別寄稿」は、2017年11月12日に本学で開催したシンポジウム「「過去の克服」とジェンダー・セクシュアリティ研究」でのご報告内容の要旨と、報告者の2名からご寄稿いただいた論文を掲載します。

永原陽子さん(京都大学文学研究科)は、「ジェンダーと史料から考える「植民地責任」：マウマウ訴訟とその後」というタイトルで、ケニアの反植民地闘士による英政府への償いの要求とそれに呼応した歴史家の役割、マウマウ裁判が提起した問題について話されました。以下にその要旨を紹介します。

マウマウとは、19世紀末からイギリスによるケニア植民地支配のなかで退去を強いられた土地の解放運動(主に「ギクユ人」)を指します。それらは、ラディカルな反植民地グループ(ケニア・アフリカ人同盟)による白人農場への襲撃で、1950年代に武力鎮圧がなされ、「テロリスト」という表象とも隣り合わせでした。

1963年のケニア独立は穏健派の主導によって実現されたため、マウマウは独立後も非合法とされ、語ることも自体がタブーでした。1990年代にはいってケニアの政治が民主化するとともにマウマウの復権を求める動きが高まり、非常事態宣言下での暴力被害に対して英政府の償いを求める声が沸き起こりました。これを受けた歴史研究者は、英植民地当局のマウマウに対する組織的な拷問、強制退去・収容、「スクリーニングセンター」、性的拷問、強制不妊手術等の被害を詳

細に調べ、著しました (Caroline Elkins, *Britain's Gulag* (2005); David Anderson, *Histories of the Hanged* (2005) など)。

2009年、拷問の被害者5名が英高等裁判所に提訴します。英政府の主張は、「原告の訴えは直接の加害者 (植民地政府や事業者) に向けられるべき」。「独立とともに、ケニア政治にかかわるすべての責任はケニア政府に移行した」というものでしたが、2011年の判決では、「政府が拷問を予防する手段を有していた」として英政府の当事者性が認められました。

さらに2012年の判決で「損害賠償請求権は時効により消滅している」という英政府の主張に対し、「(植民地支配と、独立後の国内政治のために) 2002年までマウマウは集まって交流すらできなかった」こと、さらに「性的虐待は、被害者の提訴の意思を抑えるような働きをする」という性的被害の特質を重視して、時効の適用が除外されました。

2013年6月「和解」が成立し、英政府は被害者5228名に対し、計1400万ポンド (一人当たり約50万円) を支払うことになります。英政府の立場はあくまで「自らに法的責任はない」というもので、「植民地統治下で拷問や虐待が行われ、それがケニアの独立を阻害したことを認め、深い遺憾の意を表明」するにとどまりました。

一連の議論の中でマウマウ側の暴力がクローズアップされることについて、永原さんはアフリカ人同士の暴力が起こるのも植民地主義のなかでトータルに見なければならぬとし、単にケニアの内部対立があったと指摘するにとどまらずに、この裁判から何を受け取るのかという問いを投げかけました。

それは第一に、司法の独立性です。裁判所は英政府の主張と大きく異なる判断を下し、外務省に関係文書搜索を命令しました。第二に、文書史学とオーラルヒストリーの連携です。既公開の文書以外はないと主張した外務省に対し、証言台に立った歴史家のアンダーソンは既公開の植民地文書の精査から、秘密文書の存在を類推し、公開を後押ししました。さらにエルキンスが聞き取り調査から暴力／性暴力の実態を解明したことで、研究のみならず判決文のなかで植民地暴力におけるジェンダー視点が重視され、賠償責任に時効はないとされたのです。

当事者による訴えを発端とし、そこに歴史・ジェンダー研究がコミットし、植民地暴力の重層性への理解が深まったプロセスとしてマウマウ訴訟は注目に値す

るといいます。

以下、ご寄稿くださった岩本裕子さん（浦和大学）は、「女性と言えば白人女性、黒人と言えば黒人男性」というアメリカ社会で黒人女性は埋もれた存在でありながら、歴史や生き様をどのように語り継ぎ、自ら表現してきたのか、文化・歴史上の重要人物を手がかりに考察します。

石井香江さん（同志社大学）は、ナチス政権下ドイツの女性間・異民族間の親密な関係の社会表象のあり方と議論の過程を整理し、その実像を理解するためには、「性愛」のみならず「絆」・「共同性」に着目する必要性があることを『エメーとジャガー』の事例を通して分析しています。

“Special Contribution” Column

Symposium ‘Overcoming Past Issues’ and Gender and Sexuality Studies

Coordinator: Haengri Lee

(Research Institute Assistant, CGS)

A special contribution section was added to this journal in 2013, the year that celebrated the 10th anniversary of the Center for Gender Studies (CGS). The section receives contributions on easily overlooked issues, challenging topics and other critical issues from leading scholars.

In this year’s installment of this section, we decided to publish two papers based on presentations given at the symposium “‘Overcoming Past Issues’ and Gender and Sexuality Studies” held at ICU on November 12th, 2017.

The first talk of this symposium was given by Ms. Yoko Nagahara of Kyoto University’s Graduate School of Letters and was titled “Thinking about ‘Colonial Responsibilities’ from the perspective of Gender Issues and Historical Sources – The Mau Mau Lawsuits and their Aftermath.” Ms. Nagahara spoke about several issues related to the Mau Mau Lawsuits such as compensation claims against the British government by anti-colonialism fighters in Kenya and the response of historians towards those claims. In the following I will summarize the main points of Ms. Nagahara’s talk.

The Mau Mau – or the Kenya African Union, as the organization called itself – was an anti-colonial liberation movement that comprised mostly of the Kikuyu people of Kenya. From the 1950’s on, they fought for the return of land that was taken by the British during the course of Kenya’s colonization as British protectorate, which began in 1895. The guerrilla warfare tactics and the attacks on white settlers and their farms led to them being labelled as “terrorists.” Even after Kenya’s independence was declared and a moderate government took over in 1963, the Mau Mau remained an illegal group and a

topic not to be spoken of.

In the 1990s then, during the course of Kenya's democratization, voices became louder that demanded rehabilitation of the Mau Mau, and compensation from the British government for the violence and damages brought upon them during the state of emergency, which the British declared in the 1950s in order to suppress the uprising. As a result of those claims, historians began researching and writing about this period, bringing to light the systematic torture, deportation and detention, the so-called "screening centers" or detention camps, sexual torture and forced sterilizations by the colonial government. (See, for instance, Caroline Elkin's *Britain's Gulag: The Brutal End of the Empire* [2005] or David Anderson's *Histories of the Hanged: The Dirty War in Kenya and the End of the Empire* [2005].)

In 2009, five Mau Mau victims of torture, in what was the first case of its kind, sued the British government for reparation. The government, however, took the stance "that claims have to be made against the actual perpetrators," that is, the government and businesses of colonial Kenya. In other words, the British government claimed that with the independence of Kenya, all legal responsibilities were transferred to the Kenyan government. Despite those claims, the UK High Court ruled in 2011 that "the British government did have means to prevent torture" and thus recognized its involvement.

Furthermore, in 2012 the court rejected the British government's claim that "too much time had elapsed for any claim for reparation," taking into consideration the psychological effects of sexual abuse, that is, the side effect of victims having difficulties to face and confront the perpetrator immediately. It also argued, that the limitations the Mau Mau's faced with regards to holding assemblies and interacting with fellow Mau Mau members after the uprising was a direct result of colonial reign and the domestic politics immediately after Kenya's declaration of independence.

Finally, in 2013, a settlement was reached in which the British government agreed to compensate a total of 5,228 victims, paying out approximately 2,600

pounds to each of the victims. The British government reiterated its view that it bears no legal responsibility, but recognized “that Kenyans were subjected to torture and other forms of ill-treatment at the hands of the colonial administration,” and expressed its “regrets that these abuses took place and that they marred Kenya’s progress to independence.”

Towards the end of her talk, Ms. Nagahara—with regards to the focus on violence inflicted by the Mau Mau’s in discussions about this issue—emphasized that violence occurring between people in Africa must not be thought of, for instance, as just a domestic issue of Kenya, but rather should be thought of in a broader context that includes the history of colonialism. She then went on to ask, what we might take away from this trial. According to Ms. Nagahara, there are at least two important lessons to be learned. Firstly, the importance of judicial independence. The UK High Court’s opinion greatly differed from that of the British government, as did its final ruling. The court also ordered the British Foreign Office to search for further documents related to the uprising. Secondly, the importance of close cooperation between historical research based on the analysis of documents and historical research based oral history. During the trial, the British Foreign Office argued that there do not exist any relevant documents besides those that have already been published. Yet, historian David Anderson, who testified on behalf of the Mau Mau team, suggested that there exist additional hidden documents relevant to the case, which led to their release and examination during the trials. And it was historian Caroline Elkins’ interviews with people who suffered (sexual) violence during the suppression of the Mau Mau uprising that added an emphasis on the gendered aspect of colonial violence, not only in research on the topic but also the courts ruling, in which the court rejected the British governments claim that “too much time had elapsed for any claim for reparation.” The trials, thus, can function as an example for the future, as they were a process, which started with the victims’ claims and through the commitment of scholars of history and gender studies deepened society’s

understanding of the multilayered workings of colonial violence.

Below you find papers by the other two speakers at our symposium. The first paper, written by Ms. Hiroko Iwamoto (Urawa University), takes a look at the ways black women in the United States, who – while finding themselves invisibilized by white supremacy and androcentrism – have found ways to express and hand down their histories and life experiences. The second paper by Kae Ishii (Doshisha University) discusses the ways intimate relationships between women and people of different ethnicities in Nazi Germany have been historicized and represented in the past. Through an analysis of the movie adaptation of Erika Fischer's *Aimée & Jaguar*, she shows that in order to understand these kind of relationships it is important to make use not only of the concept of "sexual love" but also that of "intimate bonds" and "cooperation."