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ABSTRACT

Domestic violence is a widely documented type of gender violence and an epidemic social problem that affects millions of women, gravely violating their human rights. Globally, movements opposing domestic violence have been catalysts in shifting what had historically been considered as a non-issue or private phenomenon into a social problem. The change, however, has occurred unevenly over time and space, accompanied by a variety of social, legal, and even linguistic issues.

This dissertation investigates the social construction of domestic violence in Japan—including key language choices—before and since the pivotal, awareness-raising 1995 UN Conference on Women in Beijing. Struggling to find an effective Japanese term for the problem, the influential Domestic Violence Study and Research Group chose to adopt the English name, domesutikku baiorensu (domestic violence), while official government usage deploys a Japanese phrase burdened with competing meanings. The first law criminalizing and aiming to prevent domestic violence passed in 2001.

The dissertation explores the emergence of domestic violence as a Japanese social problem from the 1980s until about 2008 utilizing two primary datasets: 1) newspaper articles in Asahi Shimbun published between 1985 and 2008 (as a rough baseline of general public information and awareness); and 2) narratives from semi-structured interviews with 25 activist advocates addressing domestic violence before and after 1995. The two datasets together raise a series of issues: the framing of domestic violence as women’s problem; the victimhood trap; the emphasis on intervention, sheltering and dedomiciling; the failure to address abusers (neglecting prevention); hierarchy troubles
within the domestic violence movement; near absence of male advocates; and the multiple complications associated with linguistically branding the issue as foreign.

This study concludes with recommendations in the area of prevention, men’s involvement in both prevention and intervention, hierarchy trouble within the domestic violence movement, and the language dilemma in naming a social problem.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Domestic violence has been gaining recognition as a factor that threatens women’s health and well-being, owing to its severe, recurring, long-term effects on their physical and mental state of health (Peckover, 2002; Ramsey et al., 2002). As data on domestic violence is increasingly collected and made available from more countries, it further illuminates and strongly confirms the reality that domestic violence is in fact a global phenomenon seen and experienced in all countries from different corners of the world (World Health Organization, 2005). Its impact is grave, long lasting and often perpetuated in generations, and debilitating in numerous ways for its victims (United Nations, 2006; World Health Organization, 2005, 2010).

Domestic violence has been particularly well studied and documented in Western countries, such as the United States. A staggering number of incidents has been reported there: the moderate estimate ranges between eight to 15 million each year (Flitcraft, 1997), and it is reported that approximately one-fourth of American women will experience intimate violence sometime in their life course (Campbell, 2002; Lehman, 1996; Yates, 1996). Domestic violence is one of the most common forms of injuries that American women experience (Campbell, 2002). With such a prevalence rate, the American Medical Association has officially recognized domestic violence as a public health problem, and it is considered epidemic in the society (Bintliff, 1996: Lehman, 1996; Marwick, 1998; Winett, 1998). In fact, world organizations such as the United Nations (UN) and the World Health Organization (WHO) grapple with the issue as a
public health problem and accordingly recommend ways to address and eliminate it (United Nations, 2006; World Health Organization, 2005, 2010)

While some scholars suggest that domestic violence occurs regardless of age, social class and status, ethnic group and its culture, sexual orientation, or the level of ability and capability of the bodily function (Hall and Lynch, 1998), women-of-color scholars have demonstrated that not only gender but also other social locations, such as race, class, sexual orientation, and others impact how violence is experienced (Crenshaw, 1995; Das Dasgupta, 1998; Lee et al., 2002; Sokoloff and Pratt, 2005; Yllö, 2005). While a punch is a punch, it is experienced quite differently, depending upon, for example, national or legal status of the victim, or sexual orientation. Social locations would influence knowledge and accessibility to resources, or how a victim may be treated by advocates at various points of seeking help.

In the early 2000’s, the WHO conducted an illuminating multi-national study about the universality of domestic violence. The study investigated its prevalence and characteristics in various countries, such as Bangladesh, Brazil, Namibia, Thailand, Samoa, and five others. The study found that domestic violence is pervasive, and while it varies, the rate of having experienced physical and sexual violence was between 15% and 71% but mostly between 29% and 62% with particularly high rates reported in rural areas. The prevalence rate of physical violence was between 13% and 61%, while the prevalence rate of sexual violence fell between 6% and 59%. The patterns of physical and sexual violence indicate that they are not isolated incidents, and that they tend to repeat. Physical injuries from violence seemed relatively common, often minor with cuts and bruises; however, nearly 20% of women suffered more serious injuries, for example to
their eyes and ears, and some lost consciousness (World Health Organization, 2005). These results in light of numerous studies from well-documented countries indicate that domestic violence is a serious problem that is seen and experienced globally.

Although domestic violence has been well documented in the Western countries and increasingly in other parts of the world, this attention is a rather recent development. The climate surrounding domestic violence globally has changed greatly over the years and continues to change: from a non-issue or a private family matter that was normalized in marriage to a social problem and a crime. The shift took decades of hard and continuing work. One of the early influences that contributed in advocating women’s rights and equality has been the United Nations. Since the establishment of the Commission on the Status of Women in 1946, it has overseen the women’s situation in terms of education, politics, economics, societal status, health, and more. Violence against women has been one of the issues that the Commission takes seriously and addresses. Through its annual meeting focusing on specific themes, it formulates policy recommendations that are specific and action driven for multi-level implementation on scales that are global, national, and local (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2010). And beginning with the United Nations’ conference in Mexico City in the year of 1975, many worldwide conferences of the United Nations have addressed women’s basic human rights (Babior, 1996). In the 1990s, a series of catalytic events, including the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna and the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, both in 1993, firmly and concretely raised gender equality issues that impact women and girls. Shortly thereafter in 1995, the United Nations held its Fourth World Conference on Women, shining light on violence against
women as a pressing issue (World Health Organization, 2005). Among the topics that were raised at these conferences was domestic violence, which began to be considered as a serious social problem that threatens women’s and young women’s health and wellbeing (Babior, 1996; World Health Organization, 2005). It is no longer a private problem that occurs behind the closed door in the name of family, nor is home a safe harbor without violence for women. Not only has the normalized violence perpetuated in the privacy of home become a social problem but it also is now widely criminalized (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Doerner and Lab, 1998; Kainou et al., 1998; Loseke, 1992, 1997; Richie, 2005; Schechter, 1982; United Nations, 2006; Yoshihama, 1998, 1999; World Health Organization, 2005).

In Japan, the level of awareness of domestic violence as a social problem, not simply as a fight or bickering between spouses, has been rising since the early 1990s (Hada et al., 1998; Kusayanagi, 1999a, 1999b; Nihon DV, 1999; Nishinihonshinbun, 1999). Before domestic violence gained recognition as a social problem, several steps occurred, including the opening of an emergency shelter in the metropolitan area of Tokyo in the 1980s and other organizing efforts by feminists addressing other types of violence against women, such as prostitution, sex tours, rape, and more (Yoshihama, 2002a).

Among notable influences were the aspects of being part of the global and civil society and meeting its expectations as a member country. Japan ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (the Convention) in 1985, joining the global community (with the exception of the United States) with efforts to eliminate gender inequality for women and girls. One of the areas addressed in the
Convention is domestic violence as part of violence against women and girls. Japan’s fourth periodic report about its compliance made very little mention of domestic violence except to say that the penal codes apply to violence that occurs in families (United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, 1998). Four years later in the fifth periodic report, Japan reported much more progress, mentioning statistics on domestic-violence-related crimes, the newly established law for the prevention of spousal violence and the protection of victims, measures and actions taken by the government offices, governmental services provided to victims, legal measures in processing protection order, and more (United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, 2002).

Through recent research studies conducted in Japan, the reality that women have been suffering, the physical and emotional pain that they have been tolerating, and the harm that exists in the home, has increasingly been brought to the public’s attention (Hada et al., 1998; Kusayanagi, 1999a, 1999b; Nihon DV, 1999; Nishinihonshinbun, 1999). However, there are other aspects of domestic violence as a social problem that have been overlooked: how domestic violence has become a social problem in Japan and what are some of the implications of having created a social problem called domesutikku baiorensu. This chapter will provide theoretical perspectives used for this dissertation research and explain how they are appropriate for this study.

**Different Lenses, Different Causes**

Depending upon the philosophical orientations one subscribes to, there are three dominant perspectives—psychological, sociological, and feminist—for defining domestic violence. Psychological perspectives focus on factors that lie within individual
psychology and attribute domestic violence to this cause. Personality disorders, such as abusive or borderline personality, or psychopathy, are said to cause domestic violence because such disorders produce dysfunctions in relationships, which lead to abuse and violence primarily in intimate relationships. Some studies have found an extremely high incidence of personality disorders among assaultive populations, up to 80 to 90%, as compared to 15 to 20% in the general population (Dutton and Bodnarchuk, 2005). While psychological factors may explain some aspects of abusers, they do not explain why the majority of men are non-violent, provided that only eight to 12% of men are habitual abusers.

Sociological perspectives take into consideration various aspects of the context in which abuse and violence takes place. Individual characteristics based on biology and psychology are important for sociologists. However, particularly important and influential factors, when examining the nature and characteristics of domestic violence, are social and family structures, environment, cultural influences and more. Researchers who subscribe to sociological perspectives in examining domestic violence consider it extremely difficult to establish causation of such violence because of its complexity. Also, something seemingly easily derived, such as definitions of domestic violence, can matter greatly and dictate how to examine violence or what kinds of results may be derived (Dobash and Dobash, 1998; Loseke, 2005). Sociological thinking and perspectives allow the examination of domestic violence in complex ways and challenge social structure and its influence, such as ideas, practices, traditions, and arrangements, on violence.

Feminist perspectives take into consideration the social and environmental contexts in which abuse and violence occur, as sociological perspectives do (Dobash and
Dobash, 1998; Loske and Kurz, 2005; Loseke et al., 2005). But feminist perspectives place at the core the fundamental values of challenging gender inequality. Feminists believe that historically men have oppressed women by using male privilege and power in various ways, often times not so obviously and often through institutions (DeVault, 1996). This institutionalized male domination that permeates social structures and is perpetuated in society is patriarchy (Lerner, 1986). And the goal and determination of feminists is to work against patriarchy that has a long and continuing history of male dominance and to improve women’s status (DeVault, 1996).

It is my conviction that, when examining domestic violence, it is critical to front and center gender inequality. In short, gender and power are central to the feminist analysis that I use in this dissertation. This perspective includes paying close attention to the gendered contexts of social life and of the positions in the society where abuse and violence occur, noting how the meanings of abuse and violence differ with gendered lenses, and observing how the consequences of violence differ as well. Violence and abuse do not occur in a vacuum. Masculine gender and power together give rise to and perpetuate gender inequality that displaces women, makes them vulnerable, as well as upholding male dominance while subordinating women. Giving close attention to underlying formative influences of history, culture, political atmosphere, and other social and individual structures is necessary, and doing so with gender as the core is critical. Historically, for example, men’s violence has been tolerated, normalized, and perpetuated, while women are frowned upon when they use violence or act in ways that do not fit socially expected and accepted gendered behaviors (Dobash and Dobash, 1998; Loske and Kurz, 2005; Loseke et al., 2005; Yick, 2001; Sokoloff and Pratt, 2005; Yllö, 2005).
Besides anger, when motives of using violence are contextualized, significantly more men use violence for controlling and intimidating women, while significantly more women use it for self-defense. And the consequences of violence are gendered as well, with men’s domestic violence resulting in 40% of women in ER, while men are rarely, less than 5%, injured by women’s domestic violence (Loske and Kurz, 2005).

The examination of domestic violence through the lens of psychodynamic or psychosocial perspectives, only treats abuse as symptomatic and does not examine the underlying forces of power, privilege, and gendered social structures. When the focus remains on individuals and incidents, rather than structural and contextual aspects of abuse, the severity and types of abuse gain much attention but how or why such incidents occur is omitted. Worse yet, the focus on incidents and individuals contributes to harboring the kind of atmosphere in which victim-blaming can easily occur and in which it is expected and normalized that women should leave such relationships—instead of questioning why men batter women (Tierney, 1982). Therefore, examining domestic violence from the feminist perspective is meaningful and necessary.

**Theoretical Perspectives**

Defining a social phenomenon, such as domestic violence, is like a work of art, carefully and meticulously conducted and informed by ideologies that artists subscribe to. Answers to what domestic violence is and how it happens are not as easily stated as the question may sound. Hacking precisely describes:

> It does not help so much to say that if you count different things you will get different answers, for what you count depends upon your theory about you are counting (Hacking, 1999, pp145).
The social constructionist perspective is particularly important and helpful in explaining how social problems are created and what kinds of intended and unintended consequences are spawned as byproducts of problematizing phenomena. It helps to lay out how social problems are constructed, under what conditions phenomena obtain particular labels and become social problems, and what kinds of consequences, intended or unintended, may arise (Hacking, 1999). Combining this aspect with the gendered nature of domestic violence and my philosophical orientation regarding gender violence, I deem it important and appropriate to use social constructionist and feminist perspectives as frameworks for this dissertation research.

**The Social Constructionist Perspective**

Social problems do not get created in a random manner, nor are these creations accidental; rather, the process is deliberate (Blumer, 1971; Hacking, 1999; Loseke, 1999; Yoshihama, 2002a). This creation is also dynamic, as it reflects values of an invested group and meanings that are attached to social problems are negotiated (Blumer, 1971; Loseke, 1999; Yoshihama, 2002a). Thus, the construction of a social problem is a value-laden activity that is subjective and political (Bergen, 1995; Loseke, 1992, 1999; Mehrotra, 1999). As Du Bois explains, naming plays a significant role in this process:

In science as in society, the power of naming is at least two-fold: Naming defines the quality and value of that which is named—and it also denies reality and value to that which is never named, never uttered. That which has no name, that for which we have no words or concepts, is rendered mute and invisible: powerless to inform or transform our consciousness of our experience, our understanding, our vision; powerless to claim its own existence (Du Bois, 1981; quoted in Kelly, 1988).

People create “kinds” of activities and issues, kinds that are relevant, that are based upon habits or purposes. Kinds help us bring order, organization in society, and
make sense of things around us. With named kinds of things and behaviors, people can give meanings and moral values to phenomena. Kinds are not only created, but also molded. They may go through transformation and be reshaped over time, so long as they meet some conditions to be socially constructed (Hacking, 1999; Loseke, 1999). Not all problems will become a social problem: problems that meet certain kinds-making activities and processes and successfully compete against other social problem competitions will become a social problem (Loseke, 1999). One of the conditions in which kinds are constructed is that somebody, individuals or collective groups, initiate this kinds-making process (Hacking, 1999; Lamb, 1999; Loseke, 1999; Mehrotra, 1999; Tierney, 1982).

When kinds-making takes place to construct a social problem, it requires kinds-makers, expert individuals or collectives (Hacking, 1999; Lamb, 1999; Loseke, 1999; Mehrotra, 1999; Tierney, 1982), who show concrete and factual evidence that points to the commonness, as well as seriousness, of a problem. As an audience or a people needs convincing that the problem holds threats and risks that cannot be ignored, it requires kinds-makers to present convincing facts that detail the reality of the problem. It has to be proven beyond simply beliefs or imagination in some people’s heads. Requiring factual evidence to undergird the identification of a social problem also means that the problem needs to be a common occurrence, where people can agree upon and give consensus that it happens, and it happens commonly and often, and that it creates social difficulties. At the same time, this process of constructing a social problem lends authority and credibility to kinds-makers, as well as their assessment of a phenomenon. Therefore, professional expertise and experiences and facts presented by kinds-makers are important
and necessary in convincing people of the seriousness of a problem. Factual evidence that kinds-makers as experts present speaks volume and gives legitimacy when convincing people (Hacking, 1999; Lamb, 1999; Loseke, 1999; Mehrotra, 1999; Tierney, 1982).

However, claiming that something is a problem that requires change or solutions is not enough (Hacking, 1999; Lamb, 1999; Loseke, 1999; Mehrotra, 1999; Tierney, 1982): once denial is overcome or awareness of a particular kind of circumstance or behavior is gained among the public, people then also need to recognize that it is in fact a problem, and that the problem entails perceived high threats or risks. To lead this part of the kinds-making processes, kinds-makers need to be knowledgeable and credible professionals and experts, such as lawyers, policy makers, social welfare workers, academicians, and professionals in medicine. Such people’s expertise in and of itself suggests that a problem is worth paying attention to, and therefore, worth dealing with and solving. Information presented by experts holds convincing and appealing power to publics. Expertise among professionals is necessary, not only for kinds-making processes, but also for formulating resources and solutions to deal with the claims. Although kinds need to be serious enough to become a social problem, it cannot appear unsolvable or unworthy of solving (Hacking, 1999; Lamb, 1999; Loseke, 1999; Mehrotra, 1999; Tierney, 1982).

Another aspect of kinds-making processes that helps convince audiences there is a serious problem, and that something needs to be done, is that there should be victims and villains (Loseke, 1999). Victims are innocent people who are troubled, who need and deserve help. They are perceived as helpless in the audience’s eye. Villains, on the other hand, are trouble-makers who take advantage of or exploit victims in some way for their
own benefit. Kinds-makers need to make their case and present it to their audience in such a way, that people will be convinced that there is indeed a social problem, and something needs to be done to help victims, punish villains, and change the course of the problem (Loseke, 1999).

Another aspect of the process of constructing a social problem is that kinds-makers need to be able to reasonably agree upon criteria that define a problem. Kinds-makers may disagree on details of criteria, but they need to be able to fundamentally define and describe what the problem is. This typification or definitions and criteria will allow people to set a parameter and a frame around the issue and understand what it is, how it happens, and why it is a problem (Hacking, 1999; Lamb, 1999; Loseke, 1999; Mehrotra, 1999; Tierney, 1982).

**Feminist Perspectives**

Men have historically dominated women in the privacy of their home, in communities, and on a broader societal level through social structures and institutions. Feminists challenge gender inequality created by men, male dominance and power (DeVault, 1996). As subtle and not readily visible as it may be, the institutionalized male domination and power called patriarchy is ubiquitous in the fabric of society (Lerner, 1986). To stand up and work against patriarchy and address male power and dominance that create gender inequality is what feminists strive for (DeVault, 1996).

In the process of working against patriarchy, it became apparent that not only gender, but also the intersectionality of gender, race, class, and other identities are critical and necessary elements in examining and challenging oppressions, as oppressions and marginalization impact individuals differently depending upon their social location.
(Collins, 2000; Crenshaw, 1995; Das Dasgupta, 1998; Rich, 1986). As have the means to end oppressions, feminists come in different types and vary greatly. There are different emphases they hold in their feminist movement and activism (DeVault, 1996; Hesse-Biber et al., 2003). These differences reflect women’s lives, experiences, and social locations and how these aspects of women are shaped by differences, not only by gender, but also class, race, nationality, sexuality, and other identities (Hesse-Biber et al., 2003).

What makes diverse feminists unite in their movement despite their differences is the sense of responsibility, accountability, and commitments for the betterment of women’s lives (DeVault, 1996; Hesse-Biber et al., 2003). The driving force addressing issues that surround women, whether women’s rights, equality, or violence against women, is the women’s struggles against patriarchy.

Feminist understanding of domestic violence is rooted in social action, activism, and movements that raised awareness and empowered women (Yllö, 2005). And feminist analysis of domestic violence holds gender and power as central, paying particular and close attention to mechanisms that create gender inequality and oppress and subordinate women (Yick, 2001; Sokoloff and Pratt, 2005; Yllö, 2005). There are researchers who hold individual’s psychological state responsible for domestic violence (Dutton and Bodnarchuk, 2005), or others who hold alcohol and other drugs as causal factors of domestic violence (Flanzer, 2005). Feminist scholars and researchers, however, argue that violence must be placed in gendered contexts of our social life and social positions because violence occurs differently in terms of contexts, meanings, and consequences.

Hence, feminist perspectives of violence promote an analysis that brings in contexts,
meanings, and consequences of violence (Loseke and Kurz, 2005; Sokoloff and Pratt, 2005).

Some feminist approaches in addressing violence, however, lacked diversity, inconsequently treating women as a homogeneous group and disregarding differences among them. Such differences stem from the social location of women, as well as cultural differences and structural inequality, and these differences impact women differently and produce differing experiences of violence (Crenshaw, 1995; Das Dasgupta, 1998; Sokoloff and Pratt, 2005; Yllö, 2005). Ignoring diversity resulted in the unintended neglect of the needs of poor women and women of color in particular, consequentially overrepresenting these women as victims. Standardized ways to address domestic violence did not effectively help these women, further marginalizing them. However, more recent analyses of domestic violence have focused not only on gender and power, but also on the intersection of gender, race, class, nationality, and sexuality (Crenshaw, 1995; Das Dasgupta, 1998; Sokoloff and Pratt, 2005; Yllö, 2005).

**Theoretical Considerations for the Dissertation Research**

It took me many years to even figure out that something was wrong…. I mean, I knew that something was wrong, but I didn’t have a name [for it]. I didn’t know what it was, and I couldn’t figure it out, and I couldn’t talk about it with anybody…. (Radhika, a mother of two who was in an abusive marriage for 18 years, quoted in Mehrotra, 1999).

Problems in society are socially constructed. The ways in which they are defined and constructed reflect the dynamics of the process: the construction of a social problem may reflect the values of a certain group rather than society as a collective body, or a social problem may represent a negotiated meaning of a collection of groups (Blumer, 1971; Yoshihama, 2002a). In short, the construction of a social problem is a value-laden
activity that is subjective and political (Bergen, 1995; Loseke, 1992; Mehrota, 1999).

Although a meaning is ascribed to a phenomenon, the meaning is fluid and changes from individual to individual, from society to society, or from time to time (Kelly, 1988; Mehrota, 1999; Richardson, 1994).

Feminists attempt to bring out women’s voices in constituting a problem and its name. This stems from the notion that male perspectives have been dominant in society, defining realities for all and putting women in an inferior, vulnerable, and voiceless position (Bograd, 1988). In analyzing how domestic violence is socially constructed in Japan, it is helpful to use an example of the social construction of wife abuse as it developed in the United States and the United Kingdom and was then applied to domestic violence in Japan.

Wife abuse in the United States did not first occur in the 1970s (Bograd, 1988; Kelly, 1988; Loseke, 1987, 1992); rather, this was the beginning of recognizing wife abuse as a social issue. Prior to the 1970s, wife abuse had been considered as a private or family problem. It then made a shift in its conceptualization and was turned into a social problem (Bograd, 1988; Loseke, 1987, 1992). Such a shift in the conceptualization and definition of a social problem is attributed to “claims-making” activities. A result of the claims-making activities was labels, such as “wife abuse” and “battered woman”. Once the labels existed, social services such as shelters could be created (Loseke, 1987, 1992).

**Historical Context of Wife Abuse in the West**

Considering that the emergence of shelters did not appear until the early 1970s, wife abuse in the United States is a social issue that has come to be addressed in the recent past (Bograd, 1988; Yllö, 1988) and is now “part of contemporary family life”
(Bograd, 1988). Previously, women did not have a voice regarding this issue, and wife abuse was a hidden phenomenon, private in nature. Owing to the feminist movements, the phenomenon gained its name and attention from various professionals, such as physicians, law enforcement officers, judges, social workers, and researchers (Bograd, 1988). Early in the movement, activists and researchers based their arguments in individualistic terms, more as psychological and mental problems than as public and social problem. “Private troubles as public issues” and “personal is political” later arrived and criticized the individualistic way of approaching and treating wife abuse. Until the 1982 publication of Rape in Marriage by Diana Russel, which was the first thorough survey on rape, “marital rape was legally nonexistent and virtually absent in all of the work on family violence, sexuality, and rape” (Yllö, 1988). Owing to circumstances such as this, some researchers and feminist activists were concerned about the stereotypical notion and images of marital rape as non-existent and a non-issue, or worse yet, justifiable (Yllö, 1988).

Wife abuse in England first came into the public light in the 1972, while a small group of women collaborated to carry out the principles that underlay the women’s movement. A year earlier, this group started to operate a women’s center in a house in London, which quickly led them to realize that a 24 hour shelter for women as a refuge from abuse was a grave need, not just a center that was open only during business hours. In a few months, this realization was turned into Women’s Aid groups that were established throughout England, and these groups were the catalyst to mobilize authorities and media to bring in funds and start a campaign for the support of battered women. By 1975, there was a movement among some of the groups to form a national
organization, and the vast majority of the groups joined in creating the National Women’s Aid Federation, which was founded on democratic and feminist beliefs (Dobash and Dobash, 1988).

**Definition of Wife Abuse**

…the social problem called ‘wife abuse’ continues to exist only as long as social members use that label to categorize particular experiences, the ‘battered woman’ continues to exist only as long as individual women are incorporated into that category (Loseke, 1992, p41).

One of the names that define violence against women is “wife abuse”. This term contextualizes some particulars about this specific type of violence—who and what types of acts are involved. “Wife” denotes that violence occurs in a familial context and against women. The term also defines the victims and perpetrators. “Abuse” indicates the types of behaviors that produce maltreatment of wives (Loseke, 1987, 1992). And it is considered that the violence inflicted upon women is intended, rather than accidental. However, it should also be noted that the usage of the term “wife” is not only limited to women that are married, and terms such as “wife abuse and women abuse”, and “battered wife and battered women” are employed interchangeably. Given this interchangeability of the terms, women, regardless of their marital status, are considered as victims. Also implied is that other types of social status, such as race or class, does not limit wife abuse experiences to certain populations, whether women in particular ethnic minority groups or women in lower class: wife abuse occurs regardless of color, social status, or other social categories that people carry. On the flip side of the coin, men as abusers also come from various social status groups and all walks of life. Another implied notion is that women are victims in the sense that they did not play any part in precipitating violence, nor were they as violent as men (Loseke, 1992).
**Wife Abuse: Consequences of Its Definition**

Wife abuse has two realities. First, like any social problem, it has been officially and socially constituted as a reality encompassing specified acts and actors. This public reality is official, formal, typified, and objective. Second, and also like any social problem, wife abuse is an individual experience so there is an unofficial reality, one that is personal, experiential, and subjective (Loseke, 1987).

To label a condition as a social problem is to take a moral stand: The condition is intolerable and it is the public’s responsibility to do something about it. Likewise, to claim a woman deserves public sympathy is to take a moral stand toward her. To be viable, social problems claims of any type must convince the public that such moral stances and public interventions are justified (Loseke, 1992, p42).

While labeling can provide a new means of representation, it can also be a double-edged sword and may become a source of various unintended consequences: giving a phenomenon a name may undermine the experiences of individuals, or it may present experiences as highly homogeneous, and not recognize important differences among them (Loseke, 1992; Mehrota, 1999). Or, a name may exclude some experiences because the term is too narrowly defined (Loseke, 1987, 1992; Mehrota, 1999).

Wife abuse is defined broadly and is considered to include all types of abuse; however, there are certain features that are expected in order to “officially” qualify— extreme violence, recurring incidents, physical injuries, severe psychological damages, and the intension of abusers to inflict harm (Loseke, 1987, 1992). These features were established in part as an attempt to deconstruct the long established assumptions that wife abuse was not serious or a danger to women, and to undercut the idea of blaming women for their own victimization (Loseke, 1992).

This official definition consequently dictates “the process of claims-making.” While the official definitions of abuse are concentrated around these extreme features of
abuse, the actual lived experiences of abuse may differ, not only from one another, but also from the official definitions or socially constructed labels of abuse. Consequently, women who experience the types of abuse that do not fit the official definitions may not perceive their experiences as abuse, owing to this gap, which in return may cause delays in recognizing and dealing with abuse (Loseke, 1987, 1992).

The official definitions of abuse as severe, recurrent, and detrimental to physical and psychological state, leads to the notion that women who are experiencing abuse should leave such a relationship. Leaving is perceived as the only reasonable course of action that abused women should take, and it is the only way out of the abusive relationship. This perception stems from the shared understanding that abusers have only a slim chance in altering their behaviors. The consequence of leaving as the best solution to an abusive relationship is also reflected in policies and social services: service provisions are developed to assist women in leaving an abusive relationship, terminating a relationship, or staying away permanently. Shelters are put in place, so that women do not have to return to their abusers. One of the purposes that shelters serve, along with the provision of short term and long term safety and security, is to provide assistance in independent living (Loseke, 1992). Consequently, those who want only to stop the abuse but do not necessarily want to leave a relationship may feel as if they are not doing what they are expected to do, that they are being labeled negatively, as being unreasonable, not protective of their children, or self-destructive.

There are some parallels in rape and sexual assault victimization. In order to avoid relying on respondents’ knowledge of rape and to overcome some methodological limitations in capturing incidence and prevalence data on rape, feminist empirical
research framed questions based on the specific behaviors. Rather than asking in an ambivalent way, such as “have you ever been raped?”, which assumes the respondents’ understanding of rape as the same as researchers’, feminist empirical researchers asked, for example, whether or not the victims had unwanted sexual intercourse which was coerced upon them by threats or force. In employing more behaviorally specific questions, women are able to answer difficult-to-disclose questions on rape (Gavey, 1999; Kelly, 1988). However, employing behavioral questions poses its own limitation. Answering behavioral questions and marking off various types of experience that women have had does not imply that they were aware of what had happened to them. Their definition of rape may vary from the researchers’ definition, or they may not apply the labels of rape or sexual harassment to their own experiences. Therefore, while underreporting of rape may be lessened to some extent by using behavior-oriented questions, the actual number of people who identify an incident as rape or sexual harassment without understanding may be higher than that of self-identified or acknowledged victims (Gavey, 1999).

Labeling can have some negative consequences on the victims of rape or sexual harassment (Gavey, 1999). Without a name, abused women will have a difficult time defining their experience as abuse, or they will not know how to make sense of it. If they are unable to associate their experience to the name and conceptualize their experience as sexual abuse, having a name for their experience does not necessarily relieve them from the ambiguity. And this ambiguity and difficulty is exacerbated by the nature of sexual abuse and the ambiguity of the definition of it. Some of the commonly seen coping strategies with abused women are “forgetting” and “minimizing” their experience. While these strategies may help women live through abuse and survive, they may hinder the
ability of women to recognize abuse as abuse, which may further obscure their experience and the definition of abuse (Kelly, 1988). The notions that surround rape and rape victims may further perpetuate the images of victims, usually women, as vulnerable, weak, defenseless, or powerless, while perpetrators, usually men, are portrayed as violent, sexual, or having uncontrollable sexual desires. Being labeled as a rape or sexual assault victim may in fact influence women to feel as if they need to fit these images of a victim in order to have their experiences validated (Gavey, 1999). This dismissal of individual experiences may possibly produce further consequences (Loseke, 1987, 1992).

**Naming of Domestic Violence in Japan and Potential Consequences**

…itwife abuse cannot be examined out of its particular sociohistorical context, which shapes its dynamics, its social acceptability, and its meaning (Bograd, 1988).

Similarly in the case of Japan, as this dissertation will argue, the naming of domestic violence may potentially hinder or complicate the process of addressing and dealing with the issue. It is no exaggeration to say that in Japan, the term domestic violence did not exist prior to the recent domestic violence movement (Kainou et al., 1998). In the case of Japan, the delay in addressing domestic violence could be attributed partly to the lack of means, such as legal remedy or social services: the underlying notion of domestic violence as a private matter was enforced and reinforced by the lack of necessary means to address domestic violence (Yoshihama, 2002a). Now, I will argue, it is plausible that the name domestic violence itself might also be delaying the process of consciousness-raising and addressing the issue.
The term domestic violence has been widely used in the United Kingdom and the United States since the 1960s women’s liberation movement (Suzuki and Goto, 1999). When the notion of domestic violence was brought into Japan, two terms emerged: one was the imported English term, domesutikku baiorensu (domestic violence), and the other was the equivalent of family violence in Japanese, kateinai bōryoku. The more widely used term is the English one. While this seems like a simple borrowing, it may influence the ways in which people perceive domestic violence.

The Japanese language has three distinct types of writing. One is Kanji, which employs Chinese characters and each character has meanings attached to it. Another is Hiragana, which, as Watanabe et al. (1993) and Hayashi and Ikegami (1980) state, originates in Kanji but has been simplified over time. It has 46 letters and is used to write phonetically. The third type is Katakana, which is also a form of simplified Kanji and has 46 letters, as does Hiragana. In present days, Katakana is primarily used for a number of specific purposes, such as to write phonetically the names of places and people of foreign origin, to write foreign language terms, to write names of animals and plants, and to emphasize words and phrases. For example, the names of the presidents of the United States are phonetically written in Katakana, as well as an object such as tēburu or table in English. Another example is that while “turtle” in Japanese, kame, has a Kanji, it is also written in Katakana, which indicates that it is an animal. Or, in a written sentence, where a word, Japanese or English, requires some emphasis, it can be written in Katakana to draw special attention. Most of all, Katakana brands terms that are foreign.
In Japan, a term for domestic violence was coined as *domesutikku baiorensu* also abbreviated to *dī bui* (DV) in original English and written in *Katakana*, which denotes its origin as foreign. Suzuki and Goto (1999) explain that some activists in Japan advocated employing the English term instead of a translated Japanese term, owing to the meaning of intimacy that the English word “domestic” has, and they perceived it critical to maintain such meaning of the term. Kainou et al. (1998) further explain that the English term domestic violence, which is the product of both the women’s liberation and battered women’s movements, not only means that it is the violence in an intimate relationship, but also denotes the struggles against the existence of the social structure that perpetuates the oppression of women. Schechter (1982) further illustrates how in the U.S. the transition from “battered women” into “spouse abuse” lost the historical and conceptual meanings that underlay the term battered women, such as male domination, oppression of women, and women’s plight for gaining awareness about abuse. With these essential meanings and the history that comes with the term (Kainou et al., 1998), the absence of the equivalent term in Japanese language that represented the original meanings of English term encouraged activists in Japan to use the English term written in *Katakana*.

But this *Katakana* term *domesutikku baiorensu* or *dī bui* can be speculated as a bearer of some unintended consequences, a language dilemma. Because the term is in English and is written in the form of lettering that represents something foreign to Japan, people may believe domestic violence is something foreign that does not exist in Japan. Furthermore, in terms of raising awareness among people, the notion that *domesutikku baiorensu* is something foreign may suggest to people that domestic violence is not something they need to address or be concerned with. Whenever this notion of “other
people's problem” feeds into the individual’s notion and perceptions of domestic violence, there are further implications regarding policy and organizations. In addressing the issue of domestic violence, there need to be concerted efforts of various players, such as social services, legal professionals, criminal justice system, educators, various communities, and others. The perceived concept of domestic violence as a foreign issue could easily come to impede the process of addressing the issue properly, efficiently, and effectively.

Suzuki and Ishikawa (1999) pose a question if the term *domesutikku baiorensu* would help women relate their domestic violence experience to the social issue that the term is supposed to describe. During the feminism and women’s movements in the 1960s in the U.S., women themselves named their own experience of abuse and attached to the name the significant meaning of women’s oppression by men’s power and control and the social structure that encouraged it. However, in Japan, the significance of the term is not easily recognized owing in part to the borrowed foreign word. Feminists place importance and significance on having their own voice. But in the case of Japan, scholars and activists named the phenomenon for women by borrowing an English term. As has been suggested above and will be seen more clearly in the chapters that follow, the consequences of a foreign brand may be greater than it seems.

*Kateinai Bōryoku—Violence within Family: Confusion Abounds*

But the language dilemma does not end here. Not only can *domesutikku baiorensu* be misleading, but the Japanese alternative can also be confusing. The partially equivalent translation of the words *domestic violence* is *kateinai bōryoku*, meaning violence within family. But *Kateinai bōryoku* usually designates other types of violence
that can occur in a family, such as child abuse, sibling abuse, violence against parents, and elder abuse (Kainou et al., 1998; Kusayanagi, 1999a; Nihon DV, 1999). In fact, *kateinai bōryoku* has been widely used specifically to address violence against parents by children and young adults (Kainou et al., 1998; Kusayanagi, 1999a; Nihon DV, 1999; Suzuki and Ishikawa, 1999). Since the 1980s, the number of incidents involving children inflicting violence on their parents has increased (Kainou et al., 1998; Kusayanagi, 1999a; Nihon DV, 1999), which means that when people hear *kateinai bōryoku*, images of violent children are highly likely to be conjured up in people’s minds and not intimate violence between couples, spouses, and former partners alike.

**Indications from Previous Research**

The study I conducted in 2002 on Japanese female university students in Hawai‘i helps to illustrate some potential consequences of the language dilemma. The project explored how the participants conceptualized domestic violence, as well as the nature and the characteristics of domestic violence incidents in the interracial context of intimate relationships between Japanese female students at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) and American men. The study consisted of a self-administered survey and face-to-face semi-structured interviews. The unmarked survey was directly sent to all the 289 Japanese female students attending UHM at the time of study, and the response rate was 40.5%, with 117 responses returned. Of the 117 survey respondents, eight—five women who self-identified as non-abused and three who self-identified as abused—volunteered to participate in an interview. While there are various ways to define domestic violence, the definition used in the study for the purpose of coding is encompassing, including physical, psychological, sexual, economic, and social abuse (Arai, 2002).
Conceptualization of *Domesutikku Baiorensu*: Familial Physical Abuse

Domestic violence is “violence that occurs only within family” according to more than half of the respondents (53.2%; 58 out of 114), not something that could happen in intimate relationships outside of marriage (Arai, 2002). Of the respondents who considered domestic violence as necessarily familial, the majority (75.6%, 33 out of 58; 30.3% of all the respondents) had a perception that it was physical, excluding all other types of abuse. Typically, respondents described domestic violence as “*kateinai bōryoku*, and it is violence from husband against wife or children, or from children against parents,” and the acts of violence were illustrated as “hit, kick” or “to raise hand (and slap)” a family member (Arai, 2002). Respondents who considered that domestic violence occurred only within intimate relationships accounted for 17.4%, and those who indicated both familial and intimate contexts totaled 11.9%. Respondents who did not specify a relational context amounted to 16.5% (Arai, 2002).

As far as the types of violence are concerned, 47.7% of all respondents described domestic violence as only physical. In the narratives, respondents typically described acts of physical abuse as hitting, kicking, or slapping. Respondents who considered domestic violence as more than physical abuse amounted to 51.3%. Among them, the vast majority described domestic violence as physical and psychological abuse, and almost all of them indicated psychological abuse as verbal. Some mentioned sexual violence, but economic and social abuse was rarely mentioned (Arai, 2002).

*Domestic Violence: Confusions*

The ambiguity of the term and the unclear understandings of domestic violence became clear through the narratives that some of the participants provided. More than a
handful of the participants started their narratives with “(Is domestic violence) kateinai bōryoku?” indicating their insufficient understanding of the term. Some respondents revealed their struggles in defining domestic violence and understanding how it is more encompassing than simply physical abuse. One woman considered domestic violence as “Within family, husband uses violence against wife [or vise versa]. It is unclear whether or not verbal abuse is included. Also, it might be that violence between parents and children might be included…” Another woman, who considered herself as a non-abused participant, described an argument with her ex-boyfriend. Although her experience clearly involved elements of domestic violence, she did not consider herself having experienced it in the relationship. She wrote:

I have not had dī bui, but when I argued with a boyfriend of three years and seven months, who was a Filipino-American [immigrant], (he) pretended to shoot my head with a rifle. Although he wanted to get married to me, in the end we broke up because of this incident. Until recently [sometimes] he did ‘stalker’-like things to me, and it was bothersome (Arai, 2002).

Even though it may have been only in pretence, the act of bringing out a rifle and pointing it at the woman indicates coercion or intimidation that the man was imposing on her. In fact, the relationship was terminated because of it. Although this incident was enough to bring about a break-up, the woman did not perceive it as domestic violence. Furthermore, when this same man was doing annoying “stalker-like things”, she still did not associate her experiences with domestic violence or stalking. Even though she used the wording, “stalker-like”, to illustrate the ex-boyfriend’s behavior, it did not trigger her thinking that what she had experienced could have possibly been considered as domestic violence. While her disclosing and sharing of these experiences may suggest some very preliminary and tentative recognition or realization that her experiences could be
considered as domestic violence, her denial or unawareness indicates the difficulty of associating her own experiences with the name.

**Domesutikku Baiorensu: Misconception**

“It seems that in Japanese, *kateinai bōryoku*, but in English it seems that it is more encompassing…”, one woman wrote in her narrative. The English term seemed to have contributed to the confusion among some respondents. And the word “violence” has proved to be a cause of not only confusions but also misconception among some participants. It tends to conjure up in people’s mind physical violence that inflicts severe pain and injuries on a body, leaving other types of non-physical abuse out of the definition. Owing to this notion, many of the study respondents revealed their inadequate understanding of the name and of the issue of domestic violence. One woman, despite over ten years of residence in the U.S. and numerous years of higher education, displayed the ambiguity of the term domestic violence. Although psychological abuse was included in the definition, she wrote, “because of the word violence, I picture abuse as physical and sexual.” Another woman was clearly confused with the English name and wrote:

> I do not know about it (*domesutikku baiorensu*) so well, but I heard about it a little from an intern social worker… I do not understand it well, as I vaguely grasped the meaning. I have read this book, and it was about a little girl, who was abused by her father and uncle. So, I thought that *domesutikku baiorensu* was something like that.

As mentioned above, 53.2% of the study participants considered domestic violence as violence that occurred only within family. Of them, 75.6% considered it as only physical violence within a familial context. Many women used the term *kateinai bōryoku* and specifically described domestic violence as “violence from children against parents (Arai, 2002).”
Lessons Learned and Lessons Considered for Dissertation Research

Although this previous research was an exploratory study and not generalizable, the attempt suggests the need for further exploration, not only because the conceptualization of domestic violence has not been thoroughly examined in the Japanese social context, but also because it touches on a potentially critical aspect of naming and framing a social problem, in this case domestic violence. Considering that these women have had educational experience in the U.S., where domestic violence has been much more aggressively treated and for much longer than in Japan, and also their greater familiarity with the English language than average Japanese women, these data can be interpreted to suggest that the term *domesutikku baiorensu* presents difficulties among Japanese people. Therefore, it is speculated that for most Japanese to internalize the term *domesutikku baiorensu* and fully understand what it means will likely take a long time.

The process of naming and framing a social problem can be influenced and shaped by social conditions that surround the issue. And even with careful examinations, there may be some unintended consequences that are not foreseeable. When Japanese feminists were working to start addressing the issue of domestic violence, they looked toward the West as a model for naming and framing. While employing an English-*Katakana* term *domesutikku baiorensu* was well intended, its ambiguity is difficult to overlook. People may use the term without having a grasp of what it means, or they may have a misconception of what it is. Moreover, this language dilemma can be an obstacle for Japanese women in relating their experiences of domestic violence to the term or for people in general to gain a sense that domestic violence is a serious social problem that requires resources to address it. *Domesutikku baiorensu* written in *Katakana* brands...
domestic violence as foreign to Japan, imported from English speaking countries, somebody else’s problems, and not theirs; or, something that only non-traditional families subscribing to Western values and life style would experience. Yet the translated Japanese term also adds confusion since the widely used meaning of kateinai bōryoku is primarily associated with violence toward parents by children.

Considering the dilemma of problems created by the English term and different problems created by the usual Japanese term, it can be speculated that consciousness-raising among Japanese and in Japanese society regarding domestic violence may be more challenging than it could have been. Although various activists and feminists carefully and purposefully determined to employ English-Katakana domesutikku baiorensu, the toll in unintended consequences may be steep. In this dissertation research, the naming of domesutikku baiorensu as well as other aspects of the social construction of domestic violence in Japan are explored.

**Outlining the Dissertation**

To set out an investigation into documenting and analyzing how domestic violence is socially constructed in Japan, this dissertation is structured and organized as follows. It is critical to begin by contextualizing domestic violence in Japan. Chapter 2 provides historical background to domestic violence there and sketches developments in addressing the issue as a social problem. The importance and details of research methods are documented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 contains preliminary findings and analysis from the archival newspaper data and from the interviews with foremothers and forefathers of the domestic violence movement in Japan. The preliminary findings and analysis from these materials illuminate and contextualize the main research findings of the dissertation.
study, which are presented in Chapter 5. This chapter contains in-depth analysis of the interview data and particularly highlights aspects of the processes by which domestic violence became a social problem in Japan, as well as some unintended consequences. Finally in conclusion, Chapter 6 offers a summary of the dissertation research, strengths and limitations, and some future considerations for domestic violence research in the social construction field and also directions to effectively address domestic violence in Japan.

It is anticipated that, by using Japan as a case, this research will contribute to further developing a social constructionist perspective with respect to borrowing a foreign name and concept to address a social problem in a different country. It will also help document the history constructing domestic violence as a social problem in Japan through the eyes and voices of foremothers and forefathers of the movement. Simultaneously, this study is deemed to bring to the forefront how domestic violence is being addressed in Japan and what future directions Japan needs to take to effectively address the issue and move toward the eradication of acts that gravely violate human rights and negatively impact so many lives.
Chapter 2

Contextualizing *Domestikku Baiorensu*—Domestic Violence—in Japan

During the last handful of decades, domestic violence has gained significant recognition around the world as a social problem that greatly and negatively impacts women’s health and well-being. Its grave negative consequences cause ailments physically and psychologically that can be prolonged, especially given the recurring nature of domestic violence (Babior, 1996; Peckover, 2002; Ramsey et al., 2002). What had been considered a non-issue or a private matter is now not only a social problem but also in many places a crime (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Doerner and Lab, 1998; Kainou et al., 1998; Loseke, 1992, 1997; Richie, 2005; Schechter, 1982; Yoshihama, 1998, 1999).

Changes in the global social climate can be attributed in part to world organizations such as the United Nations (UN) and their efforts in raising awareness, promoting the issue, and educating peoples globally. Their message is that domestic violence is not acceptable and that as members of the global community, governments are expected to address the issue within their nations and make improvements in women’s and girls’ lives to free them from violence. Since the UN’s conference held in Mexico City in 1975, there have been other worldwide conferences that gather representatives of many nations to address violence against women (Babior, 1996; Peckover, 2002).

Japan is no exception in endeavoring to remedy domestic violence. Its efforts, however, to increase awareness and to address the issue as a social problem and as a crime that threatens women’s and girls’ health and human rights did not occur until recent years. In contrast to other developed countries, this delayed reaction to addressing domestic violence becomes clearer: While the Violence Against Women’s Act (VAWA)
was enacted in 1994 in the United States (U.S.) (U.S. Department of Justice, 1996a, 1996b, 1997), in Japan the domestic violence prevention law did not pass until 2001, over a decade ago (Asahi Shimbun, 2007; Chan-Tiberghien, 2004). This chapter will lay out information to contextualize domestic violence in Japan.

**Defining Domesutikku Baiorensu**

Through the last couple decades of addressing domestic violence, the definition of the problem has not been uniform. According to the UN (Watts and Zimmerman, 2002), domestic violence is defined as “any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women.” While this is a broad definition, it does indicate that domestic violence is imbedded in the gendered context of society, victimizes women, and includes physical and psychological violence or threats of such violence. Peckover (2002) clarifies that domestic violence does occur to men and within same-sex relationships, but the evidence shows that men cause the overwhelming majority of incidents against women.

Among researchers and scholars, domestic violence has been defined in various ways. As Gelles (1985) states, domestic violence was termed wife abuse early in the inquiry of these sorts of incidents. It primarily focused on physical violence that was inflicted on women by their husbands or intimate partners. Since the recognition of domestic violence as a social problem, many researchers have made attempts to include other forms, such as sexual and psychological abuse. However, owing to the difficulties and dilemmas that stem from methodologies surrounding domestic violence, many researchers tend to focus on physical violence and the severity of this violence rather than
trying to incorporate other forms of violence that are less obvious and more challenging to measure.

Not only do researchers and scholars differ in defining domestic violence, but also the public has varying understandings of what constitutes domestic violence. As many researchers point out, depending upon education and knowledge, culture, perceived social expectation, and other factors, people perceive domestic violence differently, and the differences in perception between ethnic groups and minorities have increasingly been documented (Das Dasgupta, 1998; Lin and Tan, 1994; Rasche, 1988; Yoshihama, 2000a; Zorza, 2001). For instance, in my study with Japanese international students at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa in 2002 (Arai, 2002), the majority of the students defined domestic violence as physical violence that occurred within a family. This definition is much narrower than the definition of domestic violence that encompasses physical, psychological, sexual, economic, and social abuse between partners (usually men attacking women) in the context of marital, common law, and dating relationships.

Domestic violence as defined by the Japanese government is slightly different again. According to the Gender Equality Bureau (GEB) of the Cabinet Office (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/dv/02.html), domestic violence is defined in three types: physical violence, which includes acts of slapping, kicking, pulling hair, as well as using objects to inflict harm; psychological violence, which includes yelling, putting down, threatening to harm or harm children, as well as withholding finances; and sexual violence that includes forcing sex or sexual acts against the victim’s will, forcing abortion, denying birth control, as well as showing pornographic materials against the victim’s will. Typically amongst activists and advocates and outside of the government domain,
domestic violence is defined as physical, psychological, sexual, economic, or social abuse of a domestic partner (Kainou, 1998; Yoshihama, 1998, 1999, 2005), psychological violence clearly separated from economic or social abuse. In the GEB definition of domestic violence, psychological violence is characterized broadly and includes aspects of economic and social violence.

In specifying the characteristics of domestic violence, the GEB explains why it is difficult for victims to leave abusive relationships (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/dv/04.html). According to the bureau, victims may blame themselves for the violence, may think that things will be better, feel they cannot leave because of the financial difficulties that would ensue, and may be fearful for their lives and/or that of children if they leave. They also elaborate not only on the physical injuries that result from the violence but also on the psychological damage sustained by victims and their children, who witness the violence. This type of psychological damage can be long-lasting and may impact other areas of the lives of victims and their children, who may learn to use violence as a solution to problems. As for the abusers, the GEB explains that characteristics such as age, education, type of employment, and income, do not determine who becomes abusive and who does not, though drug and alcohol usage may be correlated to domestic abuse and violence. While there may be various reasons why abusers resort to violence, the GEB states that the underlying cause “is said to be” sexism.

The GEB statement is vague and does not specifically take a stand, relying instead on phrases such as “it is said” or “some believe.” It is thus unclear whether they believe sexism is the underlying cause of domestic violence, whether they believe alcohol and
drugs are related to causing domestic violence, or whether they believe something entirely different is at the root of the problem.

**Domestic Violence in the Context of Violence against Women and Girls: Japan in a Global Picture**

Violence against women and girls is a social and public health problem that is documented in many corners of the world. One global entity that has been actively addressing the issue is the UN. Since its 1993 declaration on the elimination of violence against women (http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/48/a48r104.htm), the UN has been actively and globally engaged, working with countries in different parts of the world to address the issue. Out of the continued efforts and concerns for the welfare of women and girls, the UN waged its most recent campaign called “UNiTE to End Violence against Women” in 2008 (http://www.un.org/en/women/endviolence/pdf/factsheets/about_unite.pdf; http://www.un.org/en/women/endviolence/pdf/pressmaterials/unite_the_situation_en.pdf).

It is my conviction, and a conviction on which this dissertation is based, that violence against women and girls is a global phenomenon that touches people of all walks of life regardless of race, color, creed, age, wealth, or nationality and that domestic violence originates in gender discrimination rooted in historically unbalanced power dynamics between women and men, in another word, patriarchy. Therefore, the UN campaign was initiated to assist governments and societies in different parts of the world with their efforts to intervene and eliminate violence against women through resources, programs, assisting with developing infrastructure, and increasing consciousness and awareness nationally.
What does the violence against women and girls look like throughout the world?

As it turns out, it is no small matter, given data that indicate “up to 70% of women globally experience violence in their lifetime (http://www.un.org/en/women/endviolence/pdf/pressmaterials/unite_the_situation_en.pdf).” There are different forms of violence against women and girls, such as sexual violence, sexual violence in conflict, female genital mutilation, dowry murder, trafficking, and more. And among them all, the most commonly experienced form of violence is physical violence inflicted by intimate partners (http://www.un.org/en/women/endviolence/pdf/pressmaterials/unite_the_situation_en.pdf). The most recent announcement made by the World Health Organization on June 20, 2013, confirms this point: domestic violence is the most commonly experienced violence among violence against women, which affects 30% of women globally (http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2013/violence_against_women_20130620/en/index.html). While different countries have different prevalence rates, some data indicate that half of the female homicide victims are murdered by their intimate partner (http://www.un.org/en/women/endviolence/pdf/pressmaterials/unite_the_situation_en.pdf).

In terms of domestic violence, based on the Violence against Women Prevalence Surveys by Country compiled by the United Nations Women in March, 2011 (http://www.endvawnow.org/uploads/browser/files/vaw_prevalence_matrix_15april_2011.pdf), nearly 13% of Japanese women experience physical violence by their intimate partner in their lifetime, and Chinese and Korean women experience similar physical violence rate in their life time (15.4% and 14% respectively). Among Western
countersparts, 23% of German women experience physical violence by their intimate partners in their lifetime. Women in the United States experience slightly less than Germany, which is nearly 22%, and about 12% of women in Italy. In terms of lifetime physical and/or sexual violence, Japanese women seem to fare much better compared to the Western counterparts with a prevalence rate of 15.4%, while women in the United Kingdom, Germany, and United States experience higher rates of physical and/or sexual violence in their lifetime (28.4%, 25%, and 24.8% respectively). This comparison, however, requires a careful approach: it is difficult to determine whether the prevalence rate itself is lower or the low reporting rate is contributing to the lower prevalence rate.

Clearly violence against women and girls is a phenomenon that many women throughout the world experience. While some acts or practices of violence against women may be cultural in form—some may fall victim to dowry murder, not a practice readily seen in all parts of the world—many women globally, regardless of their socio-cultural status, experience domestic violence. Japanese women are not exempt from these violations, specifically domestic violence as illustrated in the following section.

**Documenting Domesutikku Baiorensu**

Since the first domestic violence research study that the Japanese government conducted through what is now known as the Cabinet Office in 1999, there have been numerous research studies done on the issue of domestic violence. Some years have seen multiple studies conducted by the government, with at least one study conducted nearly every year until today. In addition, more than 50 individual studies have been completed by prefectures since as early as 1997 (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/index.html). With these nationwide large scale and smaller regional studies combined, the Japanese
government seems enthusiastic about investigating aspects of domestic violence to better address the issue and serve victims and their family members.

According to the studies conducted by GEB, the vast majority of the victims of domestic violence who seek counseling are women, who make up nearly 99.4% of the total (Gender Equality Bureau, 2008). It is also documented that one out of four of victimized Japanese women have reported being physically abused, while one out of 10 women have been repeatedly abused by their spouse. In comparison to women, men’s victimization is much less: nearly 12% of male participants reported physical violence, while only two percent have experienced repeated violence (Gender Equality Bureau, 2008; http://www.gender.go.jp/whitepaper/h22/gaiyou/html/honpen/b1_s00.html).

Women’s lives were three times more likely to have been threatened by their domestic partners than were men’s: one in 22 as opposed to one in 62 respectively. Nearly eight percent of women (7.6%) reported that they had been forced to have sex\(^1\), and approximately three out of four (76.8%) knew the perpetrator of the sexual violence with 61.9% having known the perpetrator very well (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h23danjokan-gaiyo.pdf).

Among those who were in dating relationships outside of legal and common law marriages, women sustained physical assaults nearly three times more than men (8.7% and 2.9% respectively). Approximately 14% of women, nearly three times that of their male counterparts (5.2%), endured physical, psychological, or sexual violence from their dating partner. Both women and men in their 20s and 30s were the most vulnerable age groups (Gender Equality Bureau, 2008; http://www.gender.go.jp/e-

\(^1\) No data on men are available, as this question was posed only to women.
In terms of having felt threatened with their life, approximately one out of 30 women has been threatened, while one out of 100 (0.8%) men has been similarly threatened (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h23danjokan-gaiyo.pdf).

**Domesutikku Baiorensu as Crime**

Some crimes are more difficult to account for than others. Murders, for example, are easier to account for as long as dead bodies are discovered. Domestic violence, however, is notorious for underreporting, as studies in industrialized nations have revealed time and time again. They illuminate people’s complicated reactions to decisions of reporting or non-reporting domestic violence victimization. Sherman et al. (1992) conducted a groundbreaking study, revealing two to eight million incidents in the U.S. are reported annually to the police, while an estimation of one to 18 million cases are unreported. This wide range is a clear indication of how challenging it is to grasp more accurate rates of domestic violence.

With respect to reporting of crime, Felson et al. (1999) explain that many studies have shown that relational distance—whether victims and offenders are strangers, know each other, are related or intimately involved—is a strong predictor in victim’s reporting behavior. As repeatedly revealed in research studies, the widely accepted finding has been that the victims of domestic violence are reluctant to report their victimization. One study finds that reported stranger violence is 43.3%, while only 36.4% of the intimate violence has been reported to the police.

Despite the recognition or knowledge of the laws through which people can address conflicts, not everyone reports their victimization. Zeisel (1982) states that
certain crimes, especially domestic violence, do not reach the police, owing to the fact that people privately “take care of it” (91). Or in some cases, they choose non-reporting to try to avoid negative consequences. Felson et al. (1999) and Karman (1990) explain that if victims are economically dependent upon offenders, they might hesitate to report for fear of losing that financial support, or victims may choose not to report for fear of reprisals. In other words (Skogan, 1976; 1984), victims may base whether to report upon a cost-benefit analysis even in domestic violence cases.

Moreover, the reasons for non-reporting could vary from perceiving the event as a private matter to a trivial thing (Karman, 1990). Or, victims may hesitate in cases where offenders calm down quickly, and that victims might lose the will to call the police, or might be afraid that the police would not believe domestic violence occurred from rather calm offenders in their presence (Shupe et al., 1987). Regardless of the reasons for non-reporting, when the incidents of non-reported domestic violence amount to roughly half of the total number of crimes or possibly more, it may not be an exaggeration to say that what we know about true rates of domestic violence may not necessarily be represented by all domestic violence cases.

Capturing an accurate picture of domestic violence victimization in Japan is a challenging task: according to the latest study done and compiled by the GEB in 2012 (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h11.pdf), nearly 41% of physical violence victims did not confide in anyone or any place despite experiencing life threatening violence or requiring medical attention. In terms of sexual violence, only one out of ten victims reported their incidence to police (Asahi Shimbun, April 02, 2000).
One way to overcome un- or under-reporting is to look at murder cases, in which discovered dead bodies are unmistakably counted and details of murders are officially documented. According to the 2010 Gender Equality Bureau’s White Paper (http://www.gender.go.jp/whitepaper/h22/gaiyou/html/honpen/b1_s06.html), there were 2,516 cases of murders, assaults, and physical violence combined among intimately involved people in 2009. The vast majority, 92.4%, of the victims of these violent crimes that occurred in intimate relationships were female. While 65.1% of murder victims as a result of domestic violence were women, the overwhelming majority of the assaults and physical violence victims as a result of domestic violence were women (94.5% and 93.6% respectively). Undoubtedly, women are victimized in their intimate relationships: they are murdered twice as often and suffer physical violence more than 90 times that of their male counterparts. These stark differences between women and men are alarming and should be taken seriously. At the same time, this clearly illustrates why domestic violence is considered as a type of gender violence.

According to the latest Police White Paper (National Police Agency, 2012), between 2007 and 2011, there has been a steady increase in reported2 domestic violence cases in Japan. In 2007, five years after the domestic violence prevention law (DVP law) was implemented, there were nearly 21,000 cases reported. The following two years saw several thousand increases each year with slightly over 28,000 cases reported in 2009. The 2010 saw a greater increase, with nearly 34,000 cases reported. However, in 2011 there was an increase of only 500 cases over the previous year’s 34,329 reported cases.

---
2 Reported cases means that victimization was reported, accepted, and accounted for in public services. Types of reporting includes talking to a counselor or someone alike in a public service, requesting assistance, requesting protection, submitting victimization report, submitting a lawsuit paper, and arrests.
These numbers, however, need to be situated in the context of the well-documented reluctance among domestic violence victims to report their incidences (Felson et al., 1999; Karman, 1990; Shupe et al., 1987; Skogan, 1976, 1984; Zeisel, 1982), and one should realize that the numbers represent only part of the reality that victims of domestic violence face and experience.

The 2010 White Paper on Crime produced by the Ministry of Justice reports the violations of the DVP law, beginning from 2001, the year that the DVP law was implemented, through 2009. In 2002, the first year after the implementation of the DVP law, there were slightly under 50 violation cases. In the following seven years, the violation cases increased slowly over time. The only and slight decline was observed in 2006; otherwise, the increase trend has been gradual but steady. There were 90 violation cases in 2009, which was an 11.1% increase from the previous year. It has only been 10 years since the implementation of the DVP law, and during the first nine years that the data were collected, the violation cases nearly doubled. However, more time is needed to determine trends.

Given that domestic violence was criminalized only in 2001, Japan has seen quite a few changes in addressing domestic violence. The police, instead of dismissing domestic violence as “marital quarrels,” are now supposed, according to the latest Police White Paper (National Police Agency, 2012), to respond to domestic violence cases promptly and to investigate them respectfully, paying attention to the victims’ wishes, as well as addressing offenders and giving them guidance accordingly. Treating victims’ safety as central, police now have different types of collaboration efforts established between them and other agencies that serve domestic violence victims. Collaboration
between police and courts has been implemented to protect victims and ensure their safety: when courts issue protective orders, police act swiftly, implementing emergency plans and contacts, as well as communicating to offenders the legal circumstances they are in and the ramifications of breaking the court order, and giving guidance to respectfully follow the order.

**Reacting to Domesutikku Baiorensu**

Women and men react to violence differently. In the 2012 study report prepared by the GEB (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h23danjokan-gaiyo.pdf), approximately two-thirds of all female participants (62.3%) consulted with someone or somewhere regarding violence victimization perpetrated by their intimate partners, while only one-third of all male participants (31.4%) did so about their intimate partner violence. The comparison between 2005, 2008, and 2012 studies show little change for women: consistently around 60% of all women have gone to someone or someplace to talk about the violence. However, when it comes to consulting about sexual violence in intimate relationships, the rate is nearly half that of physical and psychological violence: 28.2% of women consulted about their sexual victimization in 2012, which was down from 31.7% in 2008, and further down from 35.1% in 2005. For men, however, the consulting rate after sexual victimization has changed drastically from one study to another: there were 17.1% of all men in 2005, and it nearly tripled by 2008 study with 47.1%. However, the rate dropped in the 2012 study and 31.4% of all men consulted with someone or somewhere about their victimization. Over the eight years, it appears that women’s consulting rate about violence has stabilized; however, it is difficult to assess how consulting rates for women’s sexual victimization and men’s domestic violence will
behave in the future, given the downward trend or drastic changes from one study to another.

Another aspect of trends observed in different reports is that in cases of domestic violence, women are more likely to want to, or try to, separate from their abuser. Men, on the other hand, do not think or behave in the same way (Gender Equality Bureau, 2008; http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h23danjokan-gaiyo.pdf). While the largest number of women, 43.2%, wanted or attempted to separate from the abuser but failed, only 21.4% of men, less than half of women, behaved the same. The second largest category for women, was not wanting to separate, which amounted to 38.5%. For men, the same category was the largest, and 60% of men did not want to separate. Among those who reported that they wanted to separate but failed, the number one reason for the unsuccessful separation for women was financial insecurity, which amounted to nearly 30%. For men, the same reason ranked sixth with only 7%. Instead, the number one reason among men for being unable to separate from the spouse after violence was because they worried what people might think, which accounted for nearly one out of four (Gender Equality Bureau, 2008).

Responses to Domesutikku Baiorensu

Since the enactment of the DVP law, there are different types of resources available to the public to address domestic violence in their lives. One place where evidence of services and resources clearly exists is shelters. According to scholars, there were 22 domestic violence shelters in Japan in 1998, a few years before the DVP law was enacted (Hada et al., 1998; Kusayanagi, 1999a, 1999b; Nihon DV Bōshi Jōhō Center, 1999, 2005; Nishinihonshinbun Bunkabu “X-Kazoku” Shuzaihan, 1999). Following the
DVP law of 2001, there are currently 210 government-operated Spousal Violence Counseling and Support Centers (SV Centers) established throughout Japan. According to the GEB, since 2002, the first year that SV Centers were established and began their operation, there were 35,943 clients, and the numbers have been steadily increasing. In 2011, the reported number of clients more than doubled that of the initial year at 82,099 clients. During the first 10 years, the annual increases were somewhere between about 3,000 up to 8,000, with the first year between 2002 and 2003 showing the largest jump. The vast majority of the clients were female, accounting for more than 99% each year. The most utilized service at these SV Centers was phone counseling, which saw between 66.6 and 69.9% of all who utilized these Centers over 10 years. In contrast, people who actually visited these centers were between 27.6 and 30.7%. (Gender Equality Bureau, 2008; http://www.gender.go.jp/dv/soudan.html; http://www.gender.go.jp/3-vaw/data/dv_dataH2407.pdf).

As far as police involvement, the numbers have seen generally gradual increases over the last 10 years as well. Cases brought to police in the forms of consultations, assistance, and rescue requests, and acceptance of victimization reports, steadily increased each year between 2002 and 2001 with the exception of a 1,500 case decline in 2003. During this period, the number of reported cases to police more than doubled with 14,140 and 34,329 cases respectively. 2011 saw the smallest increase with only 477 cases more from the previous year (Gender Equality Bureau, 2008; http://www.gender.go.jp/3-vaw/data/dv_dataH2407.pdf).

---

3 The first year that the data are available is 2001; however, the data collection period is between October 13 and December 31, hence the exclusion of the data. During this short period, there were 3,608 cases reported to police.
The least changes observed over the last 10 years have concerned the number of victims who used the Women’s Consulting Offices (WCO) in Japan. According to Yoshihama (1998), the Prostitution Prevention Law of 1956 mandated all prefectures to operate one WCO to prevent at risk women from turning to prostitution. These offices are equipped with facilities for a temporary stay and are open to victims of domestic violence needing a place to stay (http://www.gender.go.jp/3-vaw/data/dv_dataH2407.pdf; Yoshihama, 1998). Officially victims of domestic violence have been accepted into the WCO throughout Japan since the DVP law of 2001; the first year saw visits by 2,680 such women, followed by 3,974 in 2002. Since then, the numbers of domestic violence victims using the WCO have stabilized around 4,500 for the last eight years. Given that the domestic violence reported to the SV Centers and police has been steadily rising and more than doubled in the last 10 years (http://www.gender.go.jp/3-vaw/data/dv_dataH2407.pdf), the stabilized numbers of WCO use since 2003 seems unlikely and goes against the trends seen in other areas of service provision.

**Awareness of Domesutikku Baiorensu**

It has been over 10 years since the DVP law was enacted. How do people perceive domestic violence? The 2011 governmental study (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h23danjokan-4.pdf) reveals most people perceive physical violence as domestic violence and do so easily; however, people do not perceive psychological abuse as domestic violence. The majority of people considered acts such as hitting someone with objects that can injure, threatening someone with a knife, kicking someone, forcing someone to have sex against her will, constitute spousal violence no matter what the circumstances. Combined with the number of people who considered
circumstances as the deciding factor in determining whether acts qualified as domestic violence, the overwhelming majority of people considered these acts as domestic violence. Approximately half the people considered acts, such as forcing women to watch porn against their will and threatening to punch them with a fist as violence regardless of circumstances. On the other hand, people felt uncertain about acts that were psychological in nature, such as verbally putting down, ignoring at all costs for a long term, and monitoring and restricting friends and phone calls. People who did not consider each of these acts as spousal violence accounted for more than 10% of participants. The differences between women and men were minute, and both women and men perceived physical violence as clearly violence; however, they had less understanding of psychological violence as domestic violence.

According to the most recent GEB research report released in April, 2012 (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h23danjokan-4.pdf), the majority of the participants, 76.1%, indicated that they knew about the DVP law in one way or another. However, only 11.9% of those who were aware of the law knew its details. On the other hand, those who did not know anything about the law or its details accounted for nearly a quarter of the participants with 22.5%. Both women and men reported similarly about their awareness or understanding of the law. In fact, there is hardly any difference or shift between 2005, 2008, and 2013 studies: over eight years, those who are aware of the DVP law but have little understanding of the law account for approximately 65%, while participants who are not only aware but also knowledgeable of the content of the law account for about 12%. People who know nothing about the law account for about 23%.
The majority of the participants, 65.7%, indicated that they did not know where to go for help if they experienced domestic violence. Only one-third of the participants, 32.7%, knew where to go or call. Those who answered that they knew places for service increased since the 2005 and 2008 studies. Women know about the services slightly better than men, but the differences between them are minute. One-third of the female participants indicated that they know of services, and that holds true for all age groups; however, for male participants, the number increased for older age groups, with only 18.2% of participants in their 20s, while the largest response was found among those in the 60s or older group, 36.1% (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h23danjokan-4.pdf).

What would be necessary to prevent spousal violence? Sixty-eight percent of all participants in the 2012 GEB report thought increasing consulting offices and services that people can use for an early intervention would be helpful. Other categories that the majority of the participants perceived as helpful and necessary were: at home anti-violence education for children by parents (63.4%), high school and colleges anti-violence education for students (59.6%), and harsher punishment for perpetrators (57.5%). Around 40% of the people thought raising awareness through media (43.5%), controlling and restricting information that condones or exacerbates violence (42.3%), and educating perpetrators so that they will not use violence (42.2%) would be necessary to curb spousal violence. About one-third (35.9%) considered raising awareness and providing workshops to police, medical professions, and others as necessary. One out of four perceived workshops and events in communities as important (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h23danjokan-4.pdf).
When the government takes action to raise awareness among citizens regarding domestic violence or to provide services for victims and abusers, they need to do a better job announcing events and services: 57.7% of the survey participants indicated that they did not know of any governmental awareness raising efforts using posters, pamphlets, or the Internet. Only 37.2% people had seen a government advertisement on domestic violence, a strong indicator that they need to do something differently and more effectively to better reach the wider population (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h23danjokan-4.pdf).

**Circumstances Surrounding Domesutikku Baiorensu: Resources for Victims Pre-Domestic Violence Prevention Law Times**

The term, *domesutikku baiorensu*, first appeared in the Asahi Shimbun in 1995 (see Chapter 4 for details). And the DVP law was passed and enacted only in 2001 (Pado Women’s Office, 2002, 2003). However, this does not mean that domestic violence did not exist long before. This timeline merely indicates that the awareness of domestic violence and consideration of it as a social problem occurred recently. According to available records, domestic violence has long existed. For example, since the mid-1970s the number one reason, 37.6%, for petitioning for divorce among women has been spousal violence, and in more recent years, it has been number two. This clearly shines light on the fact that domestic violence did and has existed in Japan regardless of the relatively recent years of naming the problem and enacting the regulating law (Inoue and Ehara, 2005).

Social movement scholars have used resources, such as materials, labor, and funding, to determine the future of social movements, whether they successfully flourish or eventually and overtime diminish (McAdam et al., 1996; McCarthy and Zald, 1977;
Mueller 1994). One approach to explore how domestic violence has been handled in Japan is to examine the resources available for victims of domestic violence. It is possible to paint a better picture of the environment that surrounds the issue of domestic violence prior to the DVP law.

The first privately operated shelter that specifically served women and their children fleeing from violence opened in Tokyo in 1986, and by the early 1990s, several more private shelters opened to assist victims of domestic violence (Yoshihama, 1998). This is in stark contrast to the U.S., where the first domestic violence shelters was established in 1967 in Maine (Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse, 2008; U.S. Department of Justice, 2013). Japan’s first shelter seems to have come with much delay. At first glance, it appears there was no Japanese refuge available for abused women in need of safe places until 1986. However, with a closer look, it becomes apparent that there were ways in which women could seek safety and refuge from abuse and violence that marked their intimate relationships. These places were not called “abused women’s shelters,” nor were they built specifically for helping abused women. However, there existed some not so apparent resources.

In 12th century Japan, there were “shelters” that women could depend on when fleeing from an abusive marriage, desiring moments of peace from violence, or seeking divorce from such a relationship: Buddhist temples (Yoshihama, 1998). Over the intervening centuries, these Buddhist temples did not specialize in providing safety to abused women in need; however, as religious institutions, they provided refuge and solace to women who needed a break or to flee from abuse and violence.
In 1977, the first public emergency shelter was established in Tokyo (Yoshihama, 1998), providing assistance especially to women and children. Although this public emergency shelter allowed abused women to flee from abusive relationships without sending children to another facility, structural limitations existed in fully accommodating the needs of abused women because the shelter was operating under the prostitution prevention law of 1956. The same predicament ensued with the WCO because the purpose of these centers was to rehabilitate prostitutes and save women at risk, so as to keep them off the streets and away from prostitution. Hence, one of the services provided to prostitutes and women at risk was a safe place to stay. Battered women fleeing from abuse did use these facilities to stay safe although they were ill-equipped to provide services, such as counseling, for abused women.

This long held practice of making ends meet by relying on existing resources, even when they were not suitable for victims of domestic violence, came to an end with the enactment of the DVP law in 2001. According to the GEB of the Cabinet Office (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/book/images/pdf/stoptheviolence.pdf), Spousal Violence Counseling and Support Centers (SV Centers) were established in all 52 prefectures to provide support and services to victims of domestic violence. SV Centers provide counseling, information and education, referrals to other appropriate services that WCO did not offer, temporary safety and protection, and more. In April, 2008, it was documented that there were 180 SV Centers or facilities that function as SV Centers throughout Japan. With these specialized offices created and established to assist victims of domestic violence, women and their family members no longer had to bend over
backwards just to feel safer, nor did they have to seek refuge from violence at WCO among at-risk women and rehabilitating prostitutes.

Using the WCO for abused women raises a few conceptual questions: 1) did the Japanese government perceive battered women as at risk of becoming prostitutes? and 2) was having been abused considered as a risk or contributing factor to turn to prostitution according to the government? The answers are unclear. However, based upon the roles of resources and how they can be an indication of rising or declining of social movements (McAdam et al., 1996; McCarthy and Zald, 1977; Mueller 1994), it is possible to discern a few points. The fact is that there was no place dedicated for victims of domestic violence until the first private shelter was built in 1986. The only way that the government accommodated abused women until the DVP law of 2001 was by sending them to the WCO. Abused women were housed literally behind bars at these facilities although women in abusive relationships were not necessarily at risk of turning tricks. Drawing from the lack of specific resources for victims of domestic violence, the government did not perceive battered women as a group of people to assist or prioritize to do so.

Circumstances Surrounding Domesutikku Baiorensu: Contextualizing Background to Domestic Violence Prevention Law

Contrasting with a country such as the United States, at first glance Japan appears to have had a significantly delayed reaction to domestic violence: the first state to criminalize acts of wife-beating was Maryland in 1882 (Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse, 2008), and the US enacted the VAWA in 1994 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1996a, 1996b, 1997). While the implementation of a law criminalizing domestic violence occurred much later in Japan, in 2001, it does not mean that no efforts to address
domestic violence existed before that (Hada et al., 1998; Kusayanagi, 1999a, 1999b; Nihon DV Bōshi Jōhō Center, 1999; Nishinihonshinbun Bunkabu “X-Kazoku” Shuzaihan, 1999; Yoshihama, 1998, 1999, 2002b). In fact, contributing efforts in criminalizing domestic violence existed long before the law was actualized.

In the 1970s, as part of the women’s liberation movement, there were active women’s and feminist groups that challenged sexism, bringing to the forefront issues that had been neglected by society, such as violence against women and businessmen’s sex trips to Southeast Asian countries. Efforts at consciousness-raising and addressing sexism continued into the 1980s. The first rape crisis center opened in Tokyo in 1983. In the public sphere in the form of media, there were numerous novels and documentaries contesting rape, gender violence, and sexism. There were anti-porn and anti-beauty pageant movements developing. At the same time, there occurred heinous sex crimes and murders of young girls and women that shook the country. The late 1980s was the time when groups of women engaged in serious conversations and activities, poured their efforts into raising awareness and bringing societal attention to sexism as a major culprit in violence against women and in condoning and minimizing attitudes toward sexism and sexual violence. At last in 1989, sexual harassment was labeled and recognized as a social problem in society (Kainou et al., 1998).

In the 1990s, many of the issues closely or remotely related to violence against women began receiving attention, along with concrete ways to address those issues in society. Child abuse, the forced prostitution of the hostages of World War II, and sexual harassment at schools and workplaces were among the issues that were actively debated and problematized (Kaihou et al., 1998). As seen in Table 1 below, the 1990s were also
the time when issues regarding women’s status, health, and rights were put on the table, gained public attention, and were discussed to make positive changes both in and outside of Japan (Chan-Tiberghien, 2004).

A more concrete contributing factor that led to a successful DVP law implementation was the Basic Law for a Gender-Equal Society of 1999.

Table 1. Occurrences Associated with Women’s Status and Rights In and Outside Japan in 1990s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Domestic Violence Study and Research Group (DVSRS) was formed in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The United Nation’s World Conference on Human Rights was held in Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The International Conference on Population and Development was held in Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The US enacted Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>The United Nation’s 4th World Conference on Women was held in Beijing, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>In “Vision of Gender Equality,” Japanese government addresses importance of women’s human rights and considers achieving it a goal for the society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>National Shelter Network was formed in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto states gender equality should be one of the foundations for society, and it requires reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The Equal Employment Opportunity Law was amended to mandate sexual harassment prevention in the workplace in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Violence Against Women in War-Net Japan was formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Campus Sexual Harassment Network was formed in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>The Lawyers Network Against Violence Against Women was formed in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Birth control pills were legalized after 38 years since the government first formed a panel in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>The first Basic Law on Gender Equality was enacted, requiring implementation of measures for gender equality on the Japanese national and local levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The Anti-Stalking Law was enacted in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The Law to Promote Human Rights Education was enacted, requiring national and local levels to implement measures for human rights education in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The Domestic Violence Prevention Law (DVP law) was passed in Japan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Chan-Tiberghien, 2004)

Since the enactment of this law (http://www.gender.go.jp/english_contents/category/pub/whitepaper/pdf/ewp2009.pdf), the Japanese government has implemented strategies and enforced them to move toward
shared equality between genders. The targeted areas to address, promote, and enforce gender equality are: 1) human rights, 2) international cooperation, 3) work-life balance, 4) expansion of women’s role in policy planning and participation, and 5) social systems and practices, and by engaging three tiers of social structures, the national government, local governments, and the public, the Japanese government attempted to reach the goals it set for becoming a gender equal society.

To achieve this goal, eliminating all forms of violence against women is a serious and critical aspect to address. The 2009 White Paper on Gender Equality (http://www.gender.go.jp/english_contents/category/pub/whitepaper/pdf/ewp2009.pdf) reports the ten-year progress since the Basic Law for a Gender-Equal Society was established since 1999. It highlights some changes that have been implemented. One is the DV Counseling Navigation Dial Hotline, established in 2009, to connect victims to their nearby domestic violence services for further assistance. The purpose of this hotline is to swiftly guide victims without information of where to go or what to do (http://www.gender.go.jp/whitepaper/h22/gaiyou/html/honpen/b2_s08.html). Also, a collaborative system has been established between the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, the WCO, and private shelters to provide safety, protection, and support to victims by increasing funding for services and extending the existing support (http://www.gender.go.jp/english_contents/category/pub/whitepaper/pdf/ewp2009.pdf).

Although some steps happened decades before the DVP law was implemented and are not directly related to the domestic violence issue, they are related to overall women’s status. Given this timeline of the political opportunities related to women, the
enactment of the DVP law can be considered as a culmination of global and national occurrences regarding the status, health, and rights of women.

**Circumstances Surrounding Domesutikku Baiorensu: Contextualizing Japan Post-Domestic Violence Prevention Law**

Implementing a law that regulates and punishes acts of domestic violence was a milestone, sending signals to society that domestic violence is not only a crime but also a social problem requiring government intervention. Once the DVP Law was passed on April 6, 2001, and enacted on October 13 the same year, swift implementation took place at the governmental level (Pado Women’s Office, 2002, 2003). Plans for the first years were mountainous and far reaching to different levels of the government. Within the GEB of the Cabinet Office, new posts were created to oversee efforts on different levels. Various offices were dedicated to address the issue. Research groups were formed to oversee all aspects of studies on the issue. Also, the GEB was to ensure that services like spouse violence consulting and support centers would be swiftly established at the city, county, and prefecture level.

The Ministry of Health, Labor, and Wellness oversaw the efforts and progress by addressing domestic violence through the abuse prevention office; by implementing better and more thorough services at the WCO in prefectures; by educating the head of the WCO and other places through workshops on the newly implemented DVP law and on how to provide services appropriately, etc.; by improving the hardly existing psychological treatment for victims and their family members; and by collaborating with privately run shelters and providing them with funding for providing safety, shelter, treatment, and services (Pado Women’s Office, 2002, 2003).
The Tokyo Metropolitan Police Department indicated that they were going to place more female officers on duty. Because victims of domestic violence have a wide range of needs and because the vast majority of them are female, having more female officers was deemed important and helpful in creating a supportive environment for victims. At the same time, collaboration with other victim service programs and agencies was highly encouraged to better and swiftly serve victims (Pado Women’s Office, 2002, 2003).

At the prefectural level there were differences between what they were going to implement and how much or how soon. However, in general, prefectures began addressing domestic violence in areas that would make immediate impact, such as conducting research to get accurate information on the issue for developing services and programs, creating telephone hotlines, establishing shelters for temporary stays, forming committees to oversee implemented programs and assessing what is necessary to improve services, and establishing collaborative network with health services and others to provide broader support (Pado Women’s Office, 2002, 2003).

**Domestic Violence Study and Research Group**

Among the numerous precipitating factors in bringing the realization to society that domestic violence is a social problem and a crime and that it requires changes in attitudes and beliefs, the most important and deserving of mention is a feminist grassroots group called “Otto (Koibito) kara no Bōryoku Chōsa Kenkyūkai (Domestic Violence Study and Research Group, DVSRG).” Founded on the strong desire to eliminate violence against women (Kainou et al., 1998), this group was formed by various female professionals who were activists, scholars, social workers, writers, lawyers, and
researchers. It is an understatement to say that the DVSRG has shaped the domestic violence movement, as well as making domestic violence visible by conducting research and raising awareness among the public (Kainou et al., 1998; Yoshihama, 1998, 2002b).

The DVSRG set out to investigate by conducting research on some of the important aspects of domestic violence in Japan that no one has researched before: 1. How domestic violence affects women physically and psychologically; 2. How domestic violence is perceived socially; and 3. What needs to be done to create appropriate resource providers (Kainou et al., 1998). Uncovering the reality of domestic violence through research helped society recognize domestic violence as a social problem that needed to be addressed. Moreover, research projects provided the opportunity for victims to gain their voice and be heard by society. By defining domestic violence, uncovering people’s perception of it, revealing the reality in Japan, and addressing issues and problems to develop much needed programs, the research projects of the DVSRG became a leading tool for social change in Japan (Kainou et al., 1998).

The first domestic violence research conducted in Japan was carried out by the DVSRG in 1992 soon after the group was formed. Recruitment of study participants was conducted for four months through mass media and by distributing fliers. Individuals, professionals, various women’s groups and organizations, social and community services, and educational institutions assisted in the distribution. Although this first domestic violence study did not employ random sampling and was not representative of the population, the study shed light on what goes on behind the closed doors and it also became a catalyst to increase awareness and understanding of domestic violence among the people. Many domestic violence conferences held throughout Japan followed the first
research study (Kainou et al., 1998) and numerous regional studies conducted in communities unveiled domestic violence there (Hada et al., 1998; Kusayanagi, 1999a, 1999b; Nihon DV Bōshi Jōhō Center, 1999; Nishinihonshinbun Bunkabu “X-Kazoku” Shuzaihan, 1999).

The DVSRG was a leading organization that had ideas, resources, knowledge, and expertise to conduct the first domestic violence research in Japan. Moreover, they were also able to pull together individuals and other agencies that shared the same passion and goals in assisting the first research study. At the same time, the DVSRG was able to present research findings at the 1995 World Conference on Women (Kainou et al., 1998), which also became a mobilizing force politically. By presenting results at a world conference and illustrating how poor the governmental responses to domestic violence were at the time, the DVSRG was able to appeal to the UN about Japan’s grave need to better address the problem. By utilizing these mobilized resources, combined with the ability to seize political opportunities, the DVSRG invigorated the domestic violence movement in Japan. As Table 1 illustrates, after the 4th World Conference of 1995, there were more than a few occasions that addressed gender equality, whether statements of the prime minister on the importance of gender equality or by having passed laws to ensure gender equality in various areas of society.

**Naming Domesutikku Baiorensu**

In English speaking countries, such as the US, different terms are used almost interchangeably to discuss violence against women in the intimate context: domestic violence, wife abuse (Loske, 1992), and more recently intimate partner violence (IPV)
There seems to be a similar phenomenon surrounding names in Japan as well.

According to the Gender Equality Bureau (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/dv/01.html), the Japanese Government Cabinet Office intentionally uses the term, violence by spouse (haigūsha karano bōryoku; 配偶者からの暴力), and they use only this term in their official capacity. While the terms, domesutikku baiorensu (domestic violence) or the abbreviation dī bui (DV), have been primarily used to mean violence against past and present intimate partners regardless of the marital status, the GEB claims that there is no clear definition of the term, domestic violence, and some people even use the term to be more inclusive and also mean family violence, such as violence between parents and children. Therefore, to avoid misconception or confusion, the Cabinet Office chooses the term, violence by spouse. This indicates that the Japanese government and its bureaus and various offices choose to use the term that connotes violence by marital partners, while others such as non-governmental agencies and media use domesutikku baiorensu or dī bui.

While the term the Japanese government officially uses avoids confusion with parent-child violence, it also raises a different problem, namely limiting the relational aspect of violence only to spouses. While the GEB explains that women are not the only victims (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/dv/01.html) and “spousal violence” is not limited only to legally married couples but is also meant to include common law or divorced couples (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/law/index2.html), unless people are already aware of such governmental contextualization surrounding the “spousal violence” term, they are likely to assume that the relationship is limited to legally married couples,
given the notion that the term conjures up in people. This is, needless to say, potentially hindering the raising of awareness and consciousness among the people regarding domestic violence. Moreover, the contextualization provided by the GEB does not cover or even mention dating violence experienced by people who are in intimate relationships outside of marriage.

**Summary**

Violence against women and girls has been documented and battled against for decades and in all corners of the world. Domestic violence, as one of many forms that constitute violence against women, has also long existed worldwide, though it was not always considered as a social problem. In fact, the view of domestic violence as a human rights infringement is a fairly recent notion and understanding that did not “just” or accidentally happen. The case of Japan is that it took decades and a series of precipitating events to change the notion, belief, and attitude about what had been considered as marital quarrels and private matters to something that is unacceptable and a violation of human rights.

Once it was realized that violence against wives and intimate partners was wrong and not to be trivialized as a marital quarrel, much has happened and taken place in the different fabrics of Japanese society. Researchers, individually or governmentally, took on the tasks of conducting scientific studies, uncovering the silenced and trivialized reality of domestic violence. There were statistically informed facts that clearly pointed not only to the presence of abuse and violence but the pervasiveness of it. There were anecdotes that were difficult to ignore or brush aside not only because they were horrific but also they were so numerous. There were pressures to address the issue coming from
within and outside of Japan. With the momentum to problematize the issue came the DVP law of 2001, a particularly significant development and accomplishment for Japan, given that the law legitimized and enabled the systemic changes, implementing necessary means as intervention and prevention measures that included various types of social services, medical services, education, and more.

Needs of victims are being identified, and efforts to meet those needs are paid for. Education is considered important and critical not only for intervention but also for prevention. Treatments are implemented for victims, indirect victims such as children and family members, and for perpetrators. While many necessary steps are being made for addressing the social problem, this dissertation addresses further fundamental challenges, ranging from names to services to visions for the future, regarding *domesutikku baiorensu*. The following chapter will detail research methods of the dissertation study, what types of data were collected, and how those data are analyzed and interpreted to show how *domesutikku baiorensu* has been socially constructed in Japan.
Chapter 3
Methodology

The research design and tools of data collection and analysis one selects ought to be chosen on the basis that they are the most appropriate to answering a given research question [ideally rooted in one or more theories] (Chafetz, 2004)

Developing theories and explaining why and how social phenomena occur are what the social sciences aim to achieve. To achieve these goals, there are various methodologies to acquire empirical, falsifiable, and testable/re-testable knowledge. And in order to accomplish all this, research methodologies need not be something that a researcher prefers (Chafetz, 2004). Rather, methodologies need to be suitable based upon research questions and theories about the subject (Chafetz, 2004; Yllö, 1983).

In obtaining accurate information in the area of violence against women, methodological factors and research designs are critical (Elsberg et al., 2001). The commonly employed research methodologies in the field of domestic violence have been survey research for quantitative methodology and in-depth interviews for qualitative methodology, often times, one or the other. However, using just one methodology, whether quantitative or qualitative, is limiting (Yllö, 1983). A mixed methodology, combining qualitative and quantitative methodologies, and working in interdisciplinary ways, may help alleviate biases (DeVault, 1996; Yllö, 1983). At the same time, researchers need to be mindful of the fact that all methodologies come with strengths and weaknesses, and therefore, findings need to be carefully examined, as they are influenced by the methodology and theory behind them (Yllö, 1983).
Situating Self as a Researcher

Feminist researchers consider “feminist objectivity” critical. It treats knowledge as “partial, situated, subjective, power imbued, and relational (Hesse-Biber et al., 2003)”. Feminist researchers acknowledge that no one can conduct research completely free of values or biases, and that researchers inevitably bring in their own biases, values, and life influences (DeVault, 1996; Hesse-Biber et al., 2003; Yllö, 1988). Feminist researchers consider that their own positions as researchers and as subjects of knowledge inquiry are as critical to the research as are the participants who are the object of the knowledge. Connecting experiences and knowledge is a critical concern for feminist methodologists (DeVault, 1996; Hesse-Biber et al., 2003). Thus, feminist objectivity is not only applied to research participants, but also to researchers, research questions, and research methods. On the other hand, research need not be “subjective” in the sense that all assertions are merely matters of opinion and that there is no such thing as scientific truth. Rather, there are controls on inquiry, including an existing “reality,” tests of evidence and the tribunal of critical discussion and argument. Given that we cannot achieve a God’s view of the world, a situated objectivity is both possible and sufficient.

This means that as a feminist who conducts research in the field of domestic violence, it is critical and necessary to situate myself properly in the context of this dissertation project. My research interest in the social construction and the conceptualization of domestic violence originates in my own experience. Because the experience was life-changing and greatly influenced me as a person and ultimately as a researcher, I will here contextualize the fundamentals that drive me as a domestic violence activist and researcher.
It goes back to the marriage I had in Japan as a young woman. It lasted only for a handful of years but left a tremendous impact on me. In 1992 in Japan, I married an American man, whom I had met in Iowa when I was a college student. Practically being disowned by my parents because they did not approve the marriage, we were poor and struggling with our finances, but still had fun in our modest ways and had a group of older friends who took us as a young couple under their wings, and supported and guided us.

One day within the first few months into marriage, for a reason that I cannot exactly remember but had something to do with the kinds of pastries we had or did not have at home, we got into an argument, which developed into a fight. What ended the fight was a hard slap on my face. Without any expectation of anything like that to happen, I was stunned. But perhaps more stunned was he, who slapped me. He broke down in tears, apologizing profusely. Growing up, I never saw my parents argue, not even once. Nor were they harsh to me. The most that I got was an occasional verbal scolding from my mother. Once, she slapped me when she found out that I had been stealing candy and snacks from the neighboring super market. However, there was nothing that indicated abuse or violence at home in my growing up. So, a slap as a result of a petty argument was difficult to come to terms with.

At another time, the husband came to my workplace. He was unhappy with something that I can no longer remember, and he started to grumble about it. As we went back and forth talking about it, it turned into a bigger argument. A friend of mine, who was from the United States, was listening to what started as a conversation but now turned into an argument. Then, she pulled me aside and told me to come into her place
next door. There, she explained to me that when we talk about something, we need to stick with one current matter without bringing in other things that are unrelated. She also told me that he was not supposed to talk to me the way he did, putting me down, cutting me off, and giving me intimidating looks. I listened to her, but what she said to me that night made little sense to me until years later.

After the first slap that happened a little way into marriage, some remarkably violent incidents took place. About six months into marriage, an argument turned into a physical altercation. In a small apartment, I tried to stay away from him. When he got hold of me, he grabbed my hand and twisted my arm up so hard, I screamed as I doubled over. I thought that he was going to break my arm. When I was able to escape his arm lock, I ran to the phone and started to call a friend for help. By the time the friend answered, he grabbed the phone and started to beat me with it on my head. All I could do was to yell out loudly, “he is going to kill me!” In that moment, a thought that he actually might came across my mind in a flash. This screaming phone call prompted an intervention meeting among the older friends who were looking over us like parental figures. When a few of them and both of us sat down together, they talked to us about how to be married, how to compromise, and their other two-cents on marriage and marital relationships in general. No one talked about the violence that erupted and got my arm almost broken. This void felt so strange and uncomfortable, and left me feeling invalidated and invisible, and alone.

My marriage only lasted a handful of years, long enough to bring a son into this world. Toward the end, there were quite a few rough patches. One morning, my son and I were having breakfast. My husband was sleeping nearby, having taken the first morning
train home after an all-night outing. When he woke up, we kept on eating. I ignored him because I was angry at his behavior. He had been out of work for a while, but instead of looking for work and taking things seriously, he was often out all night, hanging out with friends and getting drunk. Then, something completely unexpected happened: he came to the table, where we were eating, looked straight into my eyes, and slapped my face. It happened so unexpectedly that I did not know what was happening. I turned to him, and without wasting time, he slapped across my face again. All of a sudden, fear struck me. His ice cold facial expression was filled with fierce anger. I quickly got up, grabbed my son to leave. To where, I was not thinking. All I was thinking was getting out of there. I could barely put shoes on with the child in arms and getting beaten on the head. I was relieved that he did not follow us.

Not that the marriage was filled with physical altercations or violence, but there were a few interactions with the police. In one case my husband was rampaging to the point that the apartment was literally upside down: a head high book case was knocked over and books were all over on the floor; the kitchen and bedroom floors were covered with items from the shelves and cupboards; there was a rice cooker on the street because he threw it out of the kitchen window. It was a mess, and I really needed intervention. When I reached the police and told them what was going on and how I needed someone to come, they told me that it was a private matter, and that the police could not help. As soon as I called them however, my husband left the apartment, and, although the police said that they could not help, two officers on bikes came by after fifteen minutes or so and knocked on the door. When they entered the apartment, one officer mumbled, “Wow, it will take a long time to tidy up the place.”
In another case I was hurrying down the street with my son in a stroller, half running and half fast-walking, heading toward the train station. I wanted to get away from the apartment, away from my husband, escaping to a friend’s place and seeking help. It was like a scene in a suspense film. I would look back to see if he was chasing us, not see him and feel a little relieved. Suddenly I saw him coming out of a side street, blocking my way and grabbing my arm to stop me from leaving. Pushing and yelling at him to stay away, I did not care whether people on the street were staring at us. All I could think about was getting to my friend’s house safely. He kept chasing us, popping into the street from side streets. By the time we got to the train station, he was following, chasing, and physically blocking us from reaching the station. When I realized that it was going to be very hard to get to the station or catch a train, I decided to seek help from a police box, directly across the street from the station. I entered the police box and asked for assistance. As soon as the police officers found out that I was running away from my husband, they told me they could do nothing because it was a marital quarrel between a husband and a wife. They just stood there, looking at us and looking at my husband pacing right outside of the glass door and windows and paying attention to what was going on inside the police box. I stood inside the police box hopelessly. The police were no help to me. I went out, still wanting to take a train to my friend’s, but the ex-husband blocked and grabbed at us to stop us from going any further. When I attempted to take a taxi, he pushed us away from the open-door and even got into the taxi before we could. Amidst all the back and forth, my son and I eventually slipped into a cab, closed the door on him, and headed to the friend’s house for a refuge. The police officers stood inside the police box, observing the whole time.
The following few years were filled with heartaches and tears and the struggle, with the help of friends and family, to get a divorce. Although divorce is a legal means to dissolve marriages in Japan, it took time for us to finalize it, requiring serious considerations for the best interest of the child and his future because of the complicated circumstances our mixed raced child would have faced in his life. The end of this marriage was a legal divorce, and the custody of the child rested with the father of the child.

Some time after divorce, with more support and help, I found a way back to college in Wisconsin. I had dropped out of college in Iowa when I was 21 years old. This time around unlike the first time, I was dedicated to learn what college education had to offer. My major was Sociology, and Social Psychology was one of the courses I took during the first semester. One day in class, the teacher was going over the cycle of violence, how violence can be passed on in family from generation to generation. It felt like a thick fog lifted, and all of a sudden I could see what was in front of me. Based upon what I knew about my ex-husband and his upbringing that involved child abuse, his behavior toward me during marriage made some sense to me. I went to see the teacher in his office after class, asking for more details about why people who supposedly love you still use violence and hurt you. I was shaking like a leaf with this newfound realization and information: people who grow up in an abusive environment may replicate abuse because it is their learned behavior that is “normal” to them.

A semester or two later, when I was looking into an internship option as part of my sociology education, my advisor mentioned a domestic violence shelter in town. As he explained what kind of place it was and what they did, something dawned on me, a
revelation. I was a domestic violence victim. Surprised, yes, I was. But it was much more complex than that. I was not sure what to think except that it felt like I finally saw the light at the end of the dark, long tunnel. Nobody had ever told me about domestic violence. My friends who intervened and helped me and my ex-husband get along never commented on violence. Nothing. And for the first time years later, not only did I find out that there is a phenomenon called domestic violence, but also the fact that what I experienced in marriage was domestic violence.

The urge to find out more was strong, and the curiosity and desire moved me. I jumped at the opportunity to do an internship at a domestic violence shelter. This life-changing experience provided me much needed information and knowledge about domestic violence, and the hands-on work at the shelter enabled me to learn in great detail about the phenomenon and about how social services work to help victims and support survivors. Now I truly began to understand. What the American friend had said to me years before finally made sense. Violence did not only come in a form of physical violence, but it could come in forms of psychological or financial abuse. Once this clicked in me, the vivid memories of incredibly mean looks, silent treatments that tormented me into doing things that I did not want to do but did only because I was afraid of him getting angry had different meanings. Those moments of being scared and fearful of him were no longer something that was annoying; now they were framed as abuse.

A semester long internship came to an end quickly, and I continued to be part of the shelter as a volunteer. Eventually the volunteer work turned into a full time advocate position. It was no longer fascination or on a journey of self-discovery that was driving me to work in the domestic violence field. Rather, it was the desire to do something about
domestic violence, a desire to help victims and support survivors. I wanted to do something about this problem that I had realized very quickly was wide, deep, and ubiquitous.

Over the course of years, from the first slap to the time I left work at the domestic violence shelter to begin my graduate education, my perceptions and attitudes toward domestic violence had been changed drastically. For someone who knew nothing about domestic violence, who did not even know what it was called to begin with, simply discovering the name of the problem was a revelation. Discovering the fact that I was a victim of domestic violence in a way provided relief. It may seem or sound like a cliché, but I had felt invalidated, invisible, and so incredibly alone because no one, even when friends knew what kind of violence unfolded in our relationship, said a word. No one acknowledged this part of my plight. People went on with their lives and at times intervened into ours as if there was no violence in our relationship. This perplexing behavior in light of the phenomenon called domestic violence became even more puzzling and confusing, and questions regarding domestic violence grew larger and deeper in some ways: why did everyone keep silent about it to me? Why did I not know about domestic violence? If it occurs as frequently as it does in the United States, does it not happen in Japan as well? While I found some answers to my own unnamed and silenced experience, there were many further questions that brewed in my mind and heart. I wanted to know more, and decided to look into graduate education for more information and answers.
Background to the Dissertation Research

Looking for answers and making inquiries into domestic violence among Japanese Americans brought me graduate school at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM). Though I happily immersed myself in my coursework, some peculiar and rather disturbing scenes and stories gradually came into my awareness and “tweaked” me. The reputation that Japanese women, students and tourists alike, had in the local scene was less than pretty: they were known for their easy lay and fat wallet. However, more disturbing was that there were men who specifically looked for Japanese women to take advantage of or even prey upon. More than a few times, I had been approached by men, and their opening line was identical, “Are you Japanese?” in Japanese most of the times. These encounters did not happen in bars or clubs, where one may expect casual encounters and interactions, but in seemingly innocuous places and under normal circumstances, like a public park or a coffee shop, when I was grading student papers. These and other encounters combined with what I heard and saw got me concerned and upset, and at the same time, influenced my academic interests greatly. I no longer was interested in looking into domestic violence among Japanese Americans; rather, I wanted to investigate domestic violence among Japanese women who dated or were married to American men. I wanted to do something about these seemingly disturbing situations that Japanese women were putting themselves in.

For my master’s thesis research, I set out to find out characteristics and prevalence of domestic violence among Japanese international students at the UHM, who were or had been in an intimate relationship with an American man. Through the assistance of the International Student Services on campus, I was able to mail surveys
directly to 289 female Japanese students, who were going to school at the time of the study. The participation rate for the survey was 40.5%, and of those who participated in the survey study, eight interviewees were recruited for a face-to-face interview. When constructing the survey questionnaire, one of the things that I made sure of including was the questions related to the conceptualization of domestic violence. Partly stemming from my own experience and partly for the concerns for Japanese students, I wanted to find out how much Japanese female students were aware of and understood domestic violence. Therefore, I asked survey participants to define in their own words and native language what domestic violence was to them. Also, when recruiting interview participants, I did not limit my recruitment only to the self-disclosed victims, but also included everyone with or without victimization experience. This was to ensure that I was capturing the conceptualization of domestic violence widely but primarily with the educated assumption that not all would have clear understanding of what domestic violence was, and that some may think that their relationship was abuse-free but in fact abusive. Casting a wider net deemed important to better capture how Japanese students conceptualized domestic violence.

Some intriguing findings came out of the thesis research. The participants had heard the imported English term, *domesutikku baiorensu* (*domestic violence, ドメスティック・バイオレンス*), before, but as expected, the majority of the participants understood it to be primarily physical. Moreover, the majority of them indicated that they understood domestic violence to be the English equivalent of the Japanese term, *family violence* (*kateinai bōryoku, 家庭内暴力*). The historical and contextual background to the family violence term in Japan is that violence inflicted by children and young adults upon their
parents has been primarily addressed under this term. Therefore, many participants had misconceptions originating from the meanings behind the Japanese family violence term. Some participants were unsure how to define domestic violence and ended their sentences with question marks, displaying uncertainty and ambiguity of their understanding. Even when students defined domestic violence in their own words, some were unable to connect their own abusive incidents or the abusive nature of their relationship to domestic violence. The complexity of conceptualizing domestic violence for the participants became clear, including that the term’s not being in their mother tongue could hinder clear understanding; that the Japanese context related to family violence influenced the participants’ conceptualization of domestic violence; and that, even with a clear definition, it was difficult for some participants to apply the concept to their own situations and to acknowledge that their abusive experience.

Having reflected on and compared against my own experience, I was relieved to find out that all participants had heard about domestic violence, and that they had some, however limited or misconstrued, knowledge of it. However, it raised more and further questions: why had Japan imported the English term to name the problem; owing to the English term, how well would people understand what domestic violence is. The use of English was particularly peculiar to me. People who command and can comprehend in English may not have problems with it, but it is questionable that general public command of the language was enough to understand domestic violence. And without understanding what it is, would it be possible to address this social problem and how would that work? These ponderings led me to the dissertation research that I present here.
Purpose of Research and Research Questions

The purpose of my dissertation is to shed light on the social construction of domestic violence in Japan, and it is twofold: first, to document how domestic violence has been constructed in Japan by examining reporting of domestic violence in a major newspaper, Asahi Shimbun, in Japan between 1985 and 2008. Secondly, I will investigate in-depth insight into the domestic violence movement in Japan by conducting face-to-face semi-structured interviews with key informants who were active in the movement from early on. Finally, I will analyze and discuss the consequences and potential unintended consequences of the social construction of domestic violence in Japan.

The main research questions are: 1) how was domestic violence constructed between 1985 and 2008 in Japan; 2) was there any change in the concept of domestic violence between 1985 and 2008, and if so, what kind of changes occurred; and 3) what are some of the consequences of having named domestic violence in Japanese-English domesutikku baiorensu? Below, the two data sets used for this study are described in detail.

Ethical Considerations for the Dissertation Research

The World Health Organization has published general guidelines and recommendations for ethically, methodologically, and responsibly conducting research in the area of domestic violence (2001). Given the sensitive and at times dangerous nature of issues investigated in the area of domestic violence, researchers have the responsibility to hold the sensitivity toward, safety, and confidentiality of participants with the utmost importance. Equally, the safety of researchers needs to be a priority.
To ensure research projects are sound ethically and methodologically, the Committee on Human Studies (CHS) at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) oversees all the research projects, including those conducted for academic exercises. Prior to undertaking the dissertation research, this research project was declared as exempt by the CHS at the UHM. Documentation required by the CHS included the proposal for the study, a detailed methodology for study, data collection, data processes and handling of the data and for the protection and safety of the research subjects. All research instruments for the study were also required for submission and approval. This research project was granted Exempt Status by the CHS within a month of submitting the application materials (see Appendix I through IV for research instruments submitted to and approved by CHS).

**Asahi Shimbun**

**Sample**

Archival research was conducted by using a Japanese daily newspaper, *Asahi Shimbun*. Based on the 2012 print circulation data (http://adv.yomiuri.co.jp/yomiuri/busu/busu01a.html), *Asahi Shimbun* has the second largest print circulation in Japan with approximately 10.5 million, following the top print circulation of approximately 13 million of Yomiuri Shimbun. According to the on-line journal, Japan Media Review (http://www.ojr.org/japan/media/1049955101.php), *Asahi Shimbun* has more than one million on-line subscribers, while Yomiuri Shimbun fares only 300,000. *Asahi Shimbun* has morning and evening papers, and has sections that are published nation-wide, as well as sections that are particular and specific to regions and only published in regional papers. The period used for this study was from January 1,
1985 through December 31, 2008, and there were 2,117 cases under the “domestic violence” term, 1,742 under the “family violence” term, and 50 under the “date DV” term during the study period.

**Sampling**

The *Asahi Shimbun* online archival data bank is available through the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa library; therefore, an online keyword search was performed within the *Asahi Shimbun* archive by using the terms “domestic violence” “family violence,” and “Date DV” for the duration of January 1, 1985 through December 31, 2008. As Kainou et al. (1998) and Chan-Tiberghien (2004) illustrate, the 1995 World Conference on Women held in Beijing, China, was a key event regarding domestic violence in Japan. To go back 10 years from that key event was deemed appropriate for the archival data collection.

**Research Instrument**

Microsoft Access© was used to create a databank to collect, keep, and analyze information from the *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper. To allow in-depth analysis within the key terms, articles were stored in three subsets, one under the domestic violence term, another under family violence, and also under date DV term. A data collection form was created in Access to collect the extensive amount of information. For all articles collected under these three terms, the same data collection form was used to maintain consistency.

---

4 The terms, ドメスティック・バイオレンス and ドメスティックバイオレンス were used. These two terms that mean the same but slightly differently spelled were used to make sure that all the articles that the key word, “domestic violence” appeared were collected.

5 The term, *Kateinai Böryoku*, 家庭内暴力, was used. This literally means “violence within family.”

6 The term, “Dēto Dibui, Date DV,” is a Japanese equivalent of “dating violence” or “teen violence” used in the United States.
and to preserve the ability to cross-examine between the terms. Each article was given a unique identifier and entered into the Access database in the chronological order. Some information was collected in a binary “yes/no” format, multiple answers, or narratives. All the information is stored in the original language, Japanese.

There were various types of basic information collected for each article, such as publication date, edition of newspaper, region in which articles were published, and section of newspaper articles appeared in. Also, various types of information were collected in binary “yes” or “no” format: whether domestic violence was the main feature of articles; cases with information on causation of domestic violence; victims and/or abusers depicted; cases depicting actual domestic violence instances; cases mentioning resource information; cases announcing any type of event or workshops; cases detailing anything about men and men’s program; abbreviation of “DV” used in any way; the term, “date DV,” appearing in cases; domestic violence framed as “family violence”; multiple terms used interchangeably; domestic violence framed as women’s human rights, social, or crime issues; cases expressing the need for change in legal, social welfare, shelter, and policy; interviews of victims, abusers, or professionals featured.

Also, relevant texts were collected from each article and stored. Texts collected were: the entire article; definition of domestic violence; quotations of victims, abusers, and/or professionals; causes of domestic violence; how victims and/or abusers are depicted; statistical information related to domestic violence; details of domestic violence cases depicted; and illustration of foreign programs and situations surrounding domestic violence.
**Data Collection**

By utilizing the *Asahi Shimbun* online databank and its keyword search engine, all the articles that contained the terms, “domestic violence,” “family violence,” and “date DV” were extracted. Each and every article that contained one of these key words was considered a case. Once identified, all the articles were downloaded into Microsoft Word© to save the data digitally, as well as to print and keep a hard copy, for analysis. A data bank was created by using Microsoft Access© to collect and store data (Refer to Appendix for details) and also for systematic analyses.

**Data Analysis**

Microsoft Access© served multiple purposes for this study: to store collected data and to allow analysis of it. Because Access allows users to create their own data collection forms to collect and store data in any way of their choosing, it was appropriate to use for this study.

Data that were collected under the three terms, “domestic violence,” “family violence,” and “date DV” were input into the same collection form, so that the information was consistent and cross-term analysis was possible. Numerous items (Refer to Appendix for items collected on the data collection form) were collected from each newspaper article, and multiple entries were collected on items as necessary.

Because Microsoft Access© has the capacity to run and conduct statistical analysis on data stored in the program, data were analyzed within each of the three subsets to determine trends and changes over time. Also, trends and changes were compared and contrasted across the three terms to examine any differences among them.
Data Interpretation

Once the articles from the newspaper were entered into the Microsoft Access©
database, systematic statistical calculations, such as totals and averages, were run to
examine trends during the study period within each variable. Then some of the variables
were grouped together for meaningful comparative analyses with totals and averages
within each subset, which were grouped by the three terms; at the same time, some
variables were compared and contrasted against the same variables in other subsets. This
allowed in-depth analyses of data within each subset and across the subsets.

Semi-structured Face-to-Face Interviews

Sample\(^7\)

Twenty-five interviewees working in the field of domestic violence participated in
the study; 23 were female. The longest work experience was more than five decades,
while the shortest was more than one decade. The interviewees’ age ranged from early
40’s to 80’s, and they resided in Japan at the time of interviews. Three interviewees had
extended time living in a Western country and gained professional knowledge there
related to domestic violence, and three interviewees had traveled abroad specifically for a
conference or training on domestic violence. Six of the interviewees went to Beijing,
China, to attend the United Nation Women’s Conference, which focused in part on
violence against women. Professions of the interviewees ranged from a long-time house-
wife activist, self-employed business owner, therapists, educators and scholars, to
domestic violence counselors, feminist therapists, lawyers, and directors of domestic
violence organizations. Three interviewees specifically worked with abusers, one

\(^7\) Refer to a table in appendix for more detailed characteristics of interviewees.
Interviewee worked with both victims and abusers, and the rest of the 21 interviewees worked with victims only. Two interviewees were members of the Domestic Violence Study and Research Group (DVSRG), which played a catalytic role in building the domestic violence movement in Japan (see Chapters 2 and 4). Three activist interviewees had a very close tie to DVSRG and worked closely with it in building the movement. All but one participant remained anonymous. Ms. Mikiko Katayama chose to participate in the interview with her identity disclosed to be responsible as a journalist. Therefore, all the participants except for Ms. Katayama were given a pseudonym to protect their identity. Out of the 25 participants, three self-disclosed their own domestic violence victimization experience. And one participant had experienced several potential child abuse instances, having been verbally abusive to one’s own child. Besides these four participants, no others disclosed any abuse victimization, being abused or being abusive.

Sampling

To select and decide on interview participants, the data collected for this study from the Asahi Shimbun were used, and 25 volunteer interviewees participated in the semi-structured interviews. The criteria for selecting participants were: 1) people who had been active addressing domestic violence before the term, domesutikku baiorensu, first appeared in the newspaper (which is 1995; refer to a later subsection on Asahi Shimbun data overview); 2) people who had demonstrated significant leadership and/or contributions to the domestic violence field in Japan, such as starting an organization or assuming a leadership role for larger collectives; and 3) addressing domestic violence needed not be the sole service of professional or volunteer work; however, it needed to be specifically addressed as an issue.
29 potential interview candidates met the above selection criteria. Contact information for these people was gathered by using search engines on the Internet if it was not supplied in newspaper articles. Each person was contacted by phone, email, or fax to solicit her/his participation in the study. All but four selected persons agreed to participate in the interview. The reasons for declining to participate in the interview were: too busy to participate and referred another person as replacement; unreachable owning to the dismantling of the organization; no response to solicitation; and being out of town the entire time interviews were conducted and therefore unavailable. There was one candidate, who had recommended another person as a replacement; however, the replacement had already been approached to participate in the study. No one replaced the four who did not participate.

**Research Instrument**

Upon meeting with participants for an interview, each participant was given two types of consent forms: to participate in an interview and to audio-record the interview. Each participant read and signed the forms, and once the forms were signed, the interview process began. When interviewees requested to pause or stop the recording device for disclosing confidential information, or the interview was interrupted by a phone call or someone, the recording process was either paused or stopped, and resumed at a later time. Once the interview was completed and the digital recording device was stopped, each interviewee was given a small gift bag of Hawaiian products as a token of appreciation. All the interviews were downloaded onto a computer for keeping data and conducting analysis.
The same interview guide (Refer to Appendix) was used for all the interview participants: 1) brief description of their role in the field of domestic violence; 2) how they became part of domestic violence work; 3) how they developed partnerships during the time when there was no name to call “domestic violence;” 4) goals and aspirations at the time they became involved with domestic violence and now regarding domestic violence; and 5) what their thoughts were on the term, “domestic violence,” if they have had any thoughts. For those who worked in the field of domestic violence as a larger part of what they do, they were asked to answer questions specific to their domestic violence work.

Data Collection

The interviews used for this project were conducted in the summer of 2009 in Japan. The researcher went to the key informant’s office or their choice of location and conducted the interview alone with the key informant. Before starting the interview, the two types of consent forms were explained verbally to each key informant, at which point, each informant was asked to read the two forms carefully, asked for clarification, questions and to address concerns if any, and to sign the forms if they understood the conditions and terms that the interview entailed. Once questions and concerns were addressed and the two consent forms were signed, the interview began with the digital-recording device on the table. The entire interview lasted approximately an hour, some of them longer. The interview, as well as the consent forms, were all in Japanese. All the 25 key informants agreed both to participate in the interview and to be recorded.

Once the interviews were done, all the digitally recorded interviews were downloaded from the recorder onto the researcher’s computer; then they were played on
a digital record on the computer to transcribe the interview. The transcription was recorded verbatim into the Microsoft Word© program in Japanese.

**Data Analysis**

Various steps were taken to analyze the interview data: 1) the downloaded interviews were transcribed verbatim; 2) the transcriptions of interview data were coded line-by-line. The codes were created based on particular attention paid to content, context, and subtle and not so subtle expressions of the interviewees. Each code represented what the interviewee said and or expressed by reading transcript line-by-line very closely and paying great attention to the words, how the words were phrased, and what they actually talked about in the context of the interview and tone of voice or emphasis that accompanied these words; and 3) then, the axial coding was conducted based on the line-by-line coding. This coding process deals with line-by-line coding in larger, meaningful sections, such as by paragraph or themes that exist within paragraphs. Axial codes describe themes that are derived from line-by-line coding based on the verbatim transcription. In this manner, there were several dozen axial codes derived from the interviews. These steps were repeated for each interview.

**Data Interpretation**

The derived axial codes were grouped together in a meaningful fashion, where some axial codes were combined together or some became parts of other axial codes to illustrate a broader theme. In this process of merging, consolidating, and making more dense and meaningful themes, many axial codes were eliminated, as either too thin to stand alone meaningfully or not mergeable with other codes in ways that made themes stronger. The larger themes that emerged out of this process were compared and
contrasted between interviews, and the common themes that rested upon the research inquiry questions were selected to fulfill the purpose of this study.

Summary

To investigate and answer questions that rest upon the social construction of domestic violence in Japan, two data sets are prepared for this dissertation research. The Asahi Shimbun archive is built upon the three key terms, domesutikku baiorensu, kateinaibōryoku, and dēto dībui. During the study period of 1985 and 2008, these key terms yield 2,117, 1,742, and 50 articles respectively. The narratives of the 25 foremothers and fathers of the Japanese domestic violence movement are collected through a personal face-to-face interview with each informer in the summer of 2009. These two primary datasets are constructed specifically to answer the research questions that are set forth for this dissertation study. The main research questions are: 1) how was domestic violence constructed between 1985 and 2008 in Japan; 2) was there any change in the concept of domestic violence between 1985 and 2008, and if so, what kind of changes occurred; and 3) what are some of the consequences of having named domestic violence in Japanese-English domesutikku baiorensu? In the following Chapters 4 and 5, collected data and their analysis and interpretation will be presented.
Chapter 4

Emerging Themes from the Data

What do the collected data show about how a major Japanese newspaper has contributed to public awareness of domestic violence? And what observations did activists against domestic violence in Japan contribute to understanding how domestic violence is perceived and addressed there? In-depth analysis of the collected data offers important though perhaps preliminary answers.

Asahi Shimbun

Based on the Domestic Violence term, there were 2,117 articles identified in Asahi Shimbun during the study period. Although the data collection starts in 1985, there were no articles found until 1995 under domesutikku baioirensu (See Graph 1).

Graph 1: Number of Articles Found under Domesutikku Baiorensu

![Graph showing number of articles found under Domesutikku Baiorensu](image)

The great majority (92.5%; 1,959 out of 2,117) of the articles appeared in morning papers, and the overwhelming majority of the articles (75.73%; 1,602 out of 2,117) were identified under “domestic violence (ドメスティック・バイオレンス).” Only four articles had both “domestic violence (ドメスティック・バイオレンス and ドメスティックバイオレンス)” appeared in them.

---

8 The great majority (92.5%; 1,959 out of 2,117) of the articles appeared in morning papers, and the overwhelming majority of the articles (75.73%; 1,602 out of 2,117) were identified under “domestic violence (ドメスティック・バイオレンス).” Only four articles had both “domestic violence (ドメスティック・バイオレンス and ドメスティックバイオレンス)” appeared in them.
During the first several years after the first article appeared in 1995, the increase of article numbers was minimal. However, beginning in 1998, the number of articles multiplied in each following year until 2001 and peaked in 2002 with 318 articles. Starting in 2003, the number of articles gradually declined over time: during 2005, articles went down to the upper 100s and down to the mid 100s in 2006, and article numbers seemed to have stabilized at around the mid-100s by the late 2000s (See Graph 1). The frequency of the entire articles that featured the domestic violence term are illustrated by the line graph in Graph 1; the majority of articles had domestic violence as a main subject.

**Table 1. Occurrences Associated with Women’s Status and Rights In and Outside Japan in 1990s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Domestic Violence Study and Research Group (DVSRG) was formed in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The United Nation’s World Conference on Human Rights was held in Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The International Conference on Population and Development was held in Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The US enacted Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>The United Nation’s 4th World Conference on Women was held in Beijing, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>In “Vision of Gender Equality,” Japanese government addresses importance of women’s human rights and considers achieving it a goal for the society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>National Shelter Network was formed in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto states gender equality should be one of the foundations for society, and it requires reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The Equal Employment Opportunity Law was amended to mandate sexual harassment prevention in the workplace in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Violence Against Women in War-Net Japan was formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Campus Sexual Harassment Network was formed in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>The Lawyers Network Against Violence Against Women was formed in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Birth control pills were legalized after 38 years since the government first formed a panel in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>The first Basic Law on Gender Equality was enacted, requiring implementation of measures for gender equality on the Japanese national and local levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The Anti-Stalking Law was enacted in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The Law to Promote Human Rights Education was enacted, requiring national and local levels to implement measures for human rights education in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The Domestic Violence Prevention Law (DVP law) was passed in Japan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Chan-Tiberghien, 2004)
The rise and fall of the number of domestic violence articles featured in *Asahi Shimbun* paralleled the time that the domestic violence prevention law (DVP law) was being considered and discussed, passed, and finally in October, 2001, enacted (Refer to Table 1 and Graph 1). Creating and passing the DVP law was framed as a priority among many important issues regarding domestic violence. Toward enacting the law, articles discussed what measures should be included in the law to protect victims. After the enactment of the law in late 2001, articles reported cases where the law was applied, illustrating how abusers were taken into the police custody. The reports also discussed what amendments should be considered to better protect victims and their children and to help victims become independent. Although the number of cases started to gradually decline after peaking in 2002, the ways in which article numbers dropped seemed to coincide with the 2004 and 2007 domestic violence law amendments. By 2005, the number of articles was reduced to nearly half of the peak of 2002.

Political opportunities theory suggests that there are events in society that may accelerate or hinder the process of social movements (Caniglia and Carmin, 2005; Jenkins and Perrow, 1977; McAdam, 1982; McAdam, et al., 1996; Mueller, 1994). The passing and enactment of the DVP law of 2001 seems to have materialized at an understandable time. As illustrated in Table 1 (Chan-Tiberghien, 2004), events in and outside of Japan since 1992 promoted gender equality and allowed domestic violence to be discussed as a type of gender violence that needs much attention, such as enacting gender equality related laws and promoting women’s health by giving women self-determination of using birth control pills. First and foremost, the creation of the Domestic Violence Study and Research Group (DVSRG) was critical to the domestic violence
movement: it brought the issue of domestic violence from the private sphere into the public realm by conducting research, gathering data, and presenting findings at the 4th World Conference on Women in Beijing, as well as to the Japanese government, to bring attention to the problem.

Similarly the first appearance of the domestic violence term in Japanese in 1995 and the proliferation of articles in the following years coincide with the world event of the same year, the 4th World Conference on Women (See Table 1). This conference drew thousands of Japanese women and feminists, and upon their return to Japan, they began organizing, working toward eliminating violence against women, and addressing this issue within their own communities. As Table 1 shows, following the conference, various networks and groups addressing violence against women sprouted, advocating for victims of various types of violence against women, addressing sexual harassment at workplace and on campus, and dealing with stalking. These and other activities and events culminated in the form of the enactment of DVP law of 2001. The 4th World Conference on Women and Japanese women who participated in it were a significant force in creating the atmosphere and environment to start addressing domestic violence in Japan.

According to the number of articles found under the term, domesutikku baiorensu, it appears as if domestic violence incidence rose dramatically in the short period of time starting in 1995 (See Graph 1). However, this appearance is deceiving and does not illustrate the existence of domestic violence before 1995. In fact, what this number illustrates is when the term, domesutikku baiorensu, began appearing in Asahi Shimbun and how it was adopted to address domestic violence overtime. What the DVSRG revealed in their 1992 study was the severity and widespread nature of domestic violence
among people they studied (Kainou et al., 1998). Hence domestic violence is a newly “recognized” social problem, not a new social problem.

This raises the question whether domestic violence was addressed at all in the newspaper before the adoption of *domesutikku baiorensu*. Did it have a name? And if domestic violence was reported in the newspaper, how much reporting did it have? Based on the article search with the key word, “family violence (*kateinai bōryoku*, 家庭内暴力),” it becomes clear that domestic violence did exist before 1995, and that it was addressed under this term.

**Graph 2: Articles under Kateinai Bōryoku**

![Graph showing articles under family violence](image)

Note: 1) FV as DV includes family violence used to describe or discuss domestic violence, and ambivalent family violence as domestic violence; 2) DV Term and Abbrev. were the articles that had family violence term together with “domestic violence” and/or “DV;” 3) Various Abuses includes child abuse, elder abuse, and abuse toward persons with disability; and 4) Undetermined includes articles that context of family violence was not determined from the content.

Graph 2 shows all the articles collected under “family violence.” It sheds light on how “family violence” has multiple meanings in *Asahi Shimbun*: it covered adolescents
and adult children using violence against parents, other abuses—such as elder abuse, child abuse, and abuse against individuals with disability—as well as reporting domestic violence without using the imported English term.

Graph 2 clearly illustrates that the vast majority of the family violence articles between 1985 and 2008 feature adolescents and adult children using violence against their parents. However, it is also clear that family violence as a term did address domestic violence in *Asahi Shimbun* during this period. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the number of domestic violence articles under “family violence” remained low. However, they increased dramatically starting in the period of 1994-1996, peaking during 2000-2002 and dramatically declining in the following years. Compared to the articles under *domesutikku baiorensu* in Graph 1, as well as shown by the article numbers that had both *domesutikku baiorensu* and “family violence” terms in addressing domestic violence in Graph 2 (yellow line), the increase in domestic violence article numbers began earlier with “family violence.” Again, the 4th World Conference on Women in 1995 coincides with the rise of domestic violence articles under “family violence.”

Interestingly, in the latter half of the study period, there were articles that had both “family violence” and *domesutikku baiorensu* terms in addressing domestic violence. As seen in Graph 2, the number of articles using both “family violence” and *domesutikku baiorensu* terms started to increase in 1999, peaked in 2002 and dropped thereafter. This particular pattern, however, is seen not only in domestic violence articles under “family violence,” but also articles that interchangeably use *domesutikku baiorensu* and “family violence,” as well as articles under *domesutikku baiorensu*. What this indicates is that the
term, *domesutikku baiorensu*, has not quite replaced the use of “family violence” in addressing domestic violence even after its inception more than a decade ago.

Also notably, the term, “family violence,” not only addresses issues of violent children and domestic violence, it also addresses other types of abuse. Although the number of articles that addressed elder abuse, child abuse, and abuse against persons with disability was significantly smaller than issues of violent children and domestic violence, it illustrates that the term, “family violence,” has multiple meanings. Moreover, significant numbers of articles were undetermined as to what specific issues they addressed, whether violent children, domestic violence, child abuse, or elder abuse, even after careful examination of the context of articles. This is problematic, as it requires readers to pay particular and close attention to the content of articles to decipher what exactly articles are addressing. Alternatively, readers may assume what the article is addressing without giving a careful thought or contextualizing the article. This aspect of ambiguity and difficulty in deciphering the nature of family violence articles continues as long as “family violence” is used to address multiple social issues.

Among the articles that were identified by the *domesutikku baiorensu* term, the majority were accompanied by the abbreviation, *dī bui* (dv) (See Graph 3). This was particularly convenient and accommodating in reporting: the first time the term, *domesutikku baiorensu*, appears in an article, it is annotated with an abbreviation in parentheses. Once the abbreviation is introduced in an article, instead of spelling out the term every time, the abbreviation is used in the rest of the article, which avoids redundancy and also saves space.
Among the articles identified by the domestic violence term, 135 articles (out of 2,117; 6.4%) framed domestic violence as family violence (家庭内暴力) (See Graph 3). Owing to the fact that domestic violence had been addressed under the family violence term before the adoption of the English name, it is understandable that this framing persisted even after the adoption of the domestic violence term.

**Graph 3: Use of “Dī Bui,” Family Violence Framing, and Dēto Dī Bui under Domesutikku Baiorensu**

Also notable is the emergence of the new term, dēto dī bui (date dv). Shown in Graph 3, the term, dēto dī bui, first appeared in 2002. For two years, there was only one article in each year, and the incline was extremely gradual. However by 2006, there were 9 articles that had the term, dēto dī bui. The emergence of the term seems to have come at an understandable time, and in fact was a necessary accommodation in addressing domestic violence widely and fully. This necessary accommodation is illustrated by the ways in which newspaper articles define and explain domestic violence. This is described below.
Framing Domesutikku Baiorensu

By closely examining how articles are presented and how the issue of domestic violence is discussed, it is possible to further illuminate how domesutikku baiorensu is constructed in Asahi Shimbun.

Emergence of Đế Đĩ Bui

According to Snow and Benford (1988, 1992), diagnostic framing explains the ways in which a social problem is defined. In Asahi Shimbun, domestic violence is commonly defined and explained in a manner that is brief and straight to the point, and it is done in several ways. One explanation is that “(domesutikku baiorensu) is violence inflicted by husbands, intimate partners, or other close men.” Similarly, “violence by husbands and intimate partners” is frequently used to explain domestic violence. Another common definition is “spousal violence,” in which cases newspaper articles describe domestic violence as “violence between spouses” in parentheses or vice versa. Also a common way to phrase domestic violence is “violence inflicted by husband.” These explanations are typically accompanied by expressions, such as domestic violence “victimization was difficult to oversee because it was treated as a problem within family (#169),” “until recently, (domesutikku baiorensu) tended to be concealed as a private matter between spouses (#199),” or domesutikku baiorensu “should not be recognized simply as a family problem, but rather a human rights issue (#95).” Although the expression of “violence between husband and wife” is almost always accompanied by brief descriptions of domestic violence, “violence by intimate partners” by itself without being coupled with other types of explanation is not present in these articles.
Given this contextualization of domestic violence as primarily a marital matter or something that adult intimate couples face, younger people who are single, such as teenagers and young adults, are left out of the definition. Even when explanations include intimate partners in the definition, the contexts in which domestic violence is illustrated in articles are frequently familial. This public framing of domestic violence necessitated the domestic violence movement to create another term to better address intimate violence that affects teens and young adults. Therefore, the appearance of dēto dī bui in articles, about seven years after the first appearance of domesutikku baiorensu term and a year after the DVP law was enacted, occurred at an understandable point in time of domestic violence movement.

**Framed by Sections: Society and Family**

The newspaper sections in which domestic violence articles appear should be an indicator of how Asahi Shimbun frames domestic violence, as well as how the articles are informed by the domestic violence movement. What are the frames that Asahi Shimbun uses, when addressing domestic violence? Out of 2,117 domestic violence articles using the term, nearly three-fourths (1,557; 73.5%) appeared in the sections of the newspaper published for various prefectures of Japan, and the article content included event announcements, hotline events, talks and workshops, fund raising for domestic violence organizations, and reports of domestic violence incidents or court rulings, as well as reports on domestic violence policies or social welfare services for victims, abusers, or involved children.

The remaining one-fourth (570 articles) appeared in the sections that were distributed nationwide. As illustrated in Graph 4, of the articles that were distributed
nationwide, slightly over one fourth (168 articles; 30.0%) appeared in the society section of paper. Another fourth (129 articles; 23.0%) appeared in the family section. The third largest category was the living section, which had 74 articles (13.2%).

**Graph 4: Nationwide Distribution of Domestic Violence Article Types**

Based upon the sections in which domestic violence articles appeared, domestic violence is perceived through several frames. Since the society section has the largest number of articles (30%), domestic violence is framed as a social matter and is addressed on the societal level. However, the second and the third largest sections, family (23.0%) and living (13.2%), indicate that domestic violence is framed as a women’s issue. The family and living sections feature articles that appeal and cater to female readers, and male readers are less likely to read articles in these sections. Considering the readerships of these sections and the nature of articles that are featured in these sections, domestic violence is framed as a social and women’s issue.
Four Core Frames: Social Problem, Women’s Rights, Human Rights, and Crime

Along with examining the framings by the newspaper sections, there were four ways that the body of newspaper articles framed domestic violence: domestic violence as a human rights issue, a women’s rights issue, a social problem, or a crime. Based on the 2,117 articles under *domesutikku baiorensu* term, these four frames appeared in 419 articles (19.8%): one hundred twenty-three articles (29.4%) treated domestic violence as a women’s rights issue; 109 articles (26.0%) framed it as a crime; 93 articles (22.2%) framed it as a social problem; 90 articles (21.5%) framed it as a human rights issue (See Graph 5). There were only two articles that framed domestic violence as a men’s problem, and another two articles as a public health issue, a tiny fraction of articles that framed domestic violence in these ways.

Graph 5: Domestic Violence Frames

As illustrated in Graph 5, the general pattern of increasing and decreasing of the four frames are similar to the rise and fall of the total number of domestic violence articles (Refer to Graph 1). Except for a few points in time, the use of the social problem
frame is slightly larger than others, when it appeared in 1998 and peaked in 2000.
Treating domestic violence as a social problem helps problematize the issue and creates a
sense of urgency in addressing the issue.

Also, the social problem, human rights, and women’s rights frames peaked in 2000, while the crime frame lagged by one year and peaked in 2001. This one year lag of the crime frame can be explained by the passing and enacting of the DVP law of 2001 (Refer to Table 1), as discussions surrounding the law essentially increased the number of articles framing domestic violence as a crime. At the same time, in comparison to the social problem, human rights, and crime frames, the women’s rights frame declined more gradually once it peaked in 2000, and it remained relatively stable at a higher number of articles than other frames until it plummeted in 2008. This persistence of the women’s rights frame suggests that domestic violence is framed mainly as a women’s rights issue, particularly in the latter years.

**Domesutikku Baiorensu: Not a Men’s Problem**

Domestic violence as a women’s issue can be much more clearly illustrated by examining how men and men related articles fare among the articles collected under the *domesutikku baiorensu* term. As illustrated by Graph 6, articles that addressed men, men’s programs, or events for men were minimal (115 out of 2,117; 5.4%) throughout the years. Once the percentage of articles rose into the teens, they remained at about the same level between 2000 and 2005. However in 2006, the articles dropped to only two percent and remained low at one-third of the highest in 2007 and 2008.

The small numbers of men related articles are an indication that the men’s domestic violence movement in Japan has been minimal or has had minimal influences
on the domestic violence movement at large. This minimal coverage of men in domestic violence articles suggests that the framework of domestic violence is primarily about women and a women’s issue, not about men or a men’s issue.

**Graph 6: Men Related Articles under Domesutikku Baiorensu**

Overall, domestic violence in *Asahi Shimbun* is framed in a several ways: as a family and marital matter, a social problem, human and women’s rights issue, crime, and women’s issue. Snow and Benford (1988, 1992) explain the processes in which framing of a problem may influence how well a problem may be accepted not only among participants of a social movement, but also among spectators. Shifting from a private frame of domestic violence to that of a social problem and human and women’s rights issue is more appealing to a broader audience and generates more support. The gender-neutral frame, such as posing domestic violence as a social problem or a crime, may be appealing to anyone, for women and men or young and old; therefore, they may have enabled the movement to reach bystanders broadly and widely.
Similarly, the world and international conferences enabled framing gender violence not simply as such, but also as a human and women’s rights issue. While the women’s rights frame may be more appealing to women and not so much to men, the human rights frame may capture more attention of the general public. Regardless, to frame domestic violence as something that threatens one’s rights alerts citizens and government and urges them to do something about it. Moreover, particularly in the light of a human rights frame, the government could not ignore the problem, particularly after the world and international conferences addressed violence against women: to ignore it would have tarnished Japan’s reputation worldwide and indicated inappropriate governance.

Summary

One outcome of problematizing domestic violence within these frames was the domestic violence law of 2001. As illustrated in Graph 6, the mentioning of men and addressing domestic violence from men’s perspective are a small fraction in Asahi Shim bun throughout the study period. Moreover, one-third of domestic violence articles appeared in sections of newspaper that are primarily read by female readers and not by males. These particular framings may discourage men’s involvement in domestic violence, or may undermine the serious and problematic behaviors of theirs. Men’s involvement and addressing men’s beliefs and behaviors on abuse and violence against their intimate partners are critical and essential to eliminate domestic violence. After all, as long as abuse and violence are condoned and framed as permissible among men, their abusive behaviors will not stop or be changed. Addressing women is only half the battle, as the vast majority of the domestic violence cases are caused by men’s abuse and
violence. Although women and girls are directly impacted by abuse and violence and it is absolutely necessary to address their safety first and foremost, not addressing men just as aggressively will be consequential and problematic in a long run.

**Semi-structured Face-to-Face Interviews**

Twenty-five key informants participated in this dissertation research. These activists had been working with the issue of domestic violence for many years before the term *domesutikkubaiorensu* first appeared in the *Asahi Shimbun* in 1995. Interviews with them add personal stories and new themes to the newspaper analysis.

*What Lies at the Core of Activists: Placing Sexism at the Core*

Activists, survivors and non-survivors alike, featured in this study are all long-time activists. While what constitutes "a long time" is subjective and can be questioned, in this particular case, all the activist participants had been involved in domestic violence work decades before the term, *domesutikkubaiorensu*, first appeared in the *Asahi Shimbun* in 1995. Without a name to specify the phenomenon or any framework to clearly define what it is, these activists had been working in the field, not clearly or specifically thinking that they were doing domestic violence work. They were helping women who had been battered and abused by their husband or boyfriend, or helping men who were battering or abusing their wife or girlfriend, because they found the grave need to do something about it and felt the strong desire to do so. These activists were foremothers and fathers of the domestic violence movement, who helped create the foundation of the movement. They worked in the particular fields—social work, finance, or law, where they were most comfortable, most passionate, or professionally trained. My informants included both women and men, and their ages range from 40's to 80's.
Their paths to domestic violence work varied greatly as did their backgrounds and the kind of activist work they did. Some are survivors of domestic violence, who are informed by their own experience. Some are in the legal field, assisting people through their legal battles. Some are in social services such as shelter work, providing immediate assistance when victims turn to them. Some are psychologists, who help victims and/or abusers individually, help them understand their circumstances and what they can do to make changes. For these interviewees, sexism plays a crucial part. Iwate uses examples from her young days at home more than a handful of decades ago to illustrate how sexism had impacted on her:

After all, there was sexism in my generation. My father was a university professor, but even then, in my family, there was I, my younger sister, and my younger brother. There was a clear difference between how (my parents) raised me and my younger brother. To my younger brother, they would say, “Go to a university!” And to me, they would be like, “Well, a junior college would do for you.”

Although my father might have appeared democratic being a sociology professor, he did not get it at all. So, since when I was a small girl, I strongly felt that men did not understand at all how women thought and felt…. it was like defying society and social structure to express such sentiments (Iwate, personal communication, July 2, 2009).

Many of the interviewees hold strong sentiments and attitudes toward and against sexism, and that is what lies at the core of their activism, fueling their activist fire and giving them strength to keep on going and to implement changes in society for the better.

Some of the challenges that women face stem from sexism in finance and employment. Fukushima, who was raised by her single mother, watched her mother struggle financially, earning money and raising Fukushima. And growing up, she was surrounded by single mothers and their children just like her. Having had a childhood like this, watching her mother and then experiencing her own financial struggles, it is
Fukushima’s passion to address women’s financial independence. She recalls one of the fundamental questions that drives her to this day:

Perhaps not so much these days but about 14, 15 years ago, women faced many walls, when it came to working. They needed a reason to work, for example, because children are old enough, or because husband lost his job. There was this atmosphere that women needed to explain why they needed to work. I questioned why women had to face such difficulties to work (Fukushima, personal communication, June 14, 2009).

Most activists have direct and personal experiences with sexism, and their personal experiences have informed them and made them aware of the injustices that some people in society experience solely based on sex. While sexism may be at the core for these individuals, there are other aspects of activists that are as important as sexism and that work hand in hand with sexism.

**Fueling Activism: Personal and Intimate Experiences**

While the interviewees work in different fields and in varying capacities, there are a few things that these women and men share in common. One is that "the personal is political": they have had something personal, personal experiences, moments, or encounters that left them with life changing impressions and led them into the domestic violence field. The most obvious and understandable influence is of the survivors' own experience of victimization. Fukushima definitively says that she would not have been involved in the domestic violence activism, had she not been a victim herself. She recalls:

I have this background, because of the difficulties with my father, my mother and I moved from place to place all over Japan. During that time, a step-father came into my life, and I was sexually molested by the step-father. And my mother was being abused by my step-father at that time. Because of this kind of family situation, I had this very strong desire to leave home as soon as I could. As soon as I graduated from high school, I got married to someone. I was 18 years old, I think. And this man was someone who got drunk and used violence..... It is nearly 30 years ago, and I had never heard of *dǐ buì* or what an abusive relationship would
mean. I had no idea what was happening to me, but I spent 7 years being married to the man, until all of a sudden he disappeared and left the house. Afterwards, it was extremely difficult to be independent. At that time, there was no place, where I could go, no information about what dī bui is, and I thought that I was the only person experiencing something like this. So, I felt that I needed to do something on my own, and resorted to physical day labor at times so as not to get hungry. I was all alone without any help in trying to restart life..... In my case, I had double-victimization, child abuse in my childhood, and violence by husband. And the negative consequences of experiencing violence by family were the hardest challenge I faced..... For me, I have experienced enormous challenges not only gaining employment, but also building relationships in society because of having experienced violence for many and long years..... So, I felt very strongly about creating a program that helps victims of violence by family become financially independent and return to society, because I felt that the biggest problem caused by the victimization of violence was the inability to feed myself, the inability to gain employment..... (ibid.).

At the core of these survivors is their own experience of abuse, intimately and strongly held, and shaping who they are as a person and who they are as survivors, who choose to work in the domestic violence field. Each life story of the survivor activists is invaluable and significant to her/his experience, and there are none that are the same. But every one of the survivor activists unequivocally expressed how their own experience of victimization eventually led them to working in the domestic violence field.

Katayama as a survivor and a journalist who works for a TV station in Kansai region consciously and carefully maintains the fine balance between the objectivity that journalists ought to have and her own experience of violence:

The very, very true story was that there existed dī bui in very personal proximity. It must have been around 1990 and thereafter. But at that time with the kind of recognition in Japan, of course, it was not received as dī bui. But still, I kept thinking that it was strange. And at the time in Japan, there was no place to take such a problem, or it was framed as marital quarrels, so no response by anyone or even by Police. So I kept wondering, “What is this? What is going on?” And right around then, I was talking with a journalist friend of mine who was living in the U.S. at the time, ..... when there was the OJ Simpson case, around 1995, she told me that there were ways to address (dī bui), or dī bui was treated as a social problem. I
felt the great gap (between U.S. and Japan). And at that time, the OJ Simpson case was not treated as that (in Japan), and I was amazed at the differences (of the broadcasting). In Japan, we get news and information about the U.S. the most (in comparison to other countries), but there was a stark difference. And that was how I got interested in looking into this matter..... It was I (who experienced victimization). But as a journalist, I thought that it would be more difficult (for viewers) to perceive it as a social problem, had I put forward the issue by saying “I experienced it.” So, not that I wanted to intentionally hide my experience, but I did not see any benefit by coming out, either, as I wanted to broadcast objectively. So, in broadcasting, I never mentioned it. But I really questioned such a thing existed in society (Katayama, personal communication, June 24, 2009).

However painful the experience of victimization might have been, without this particular and critical aspect of life experience, Katayama and other interviewees might not have been drawn into the domestic violence field, advocating for victims and survivors.

Similarly, one activist had life-changing moments because of his own abusive behaviors that he became aware of and that made him feel both ashamed and responsible.

He has been working with men through group work and men’s hotline, and describes the ways in which his own use of violence was the catalyst to his activism:

At the time (of participating in the student movement), I condoned violence. I considered that necessary violence was necessary. I was thinking, “Some violence should exist. There was violence in revolutions. Violence was at the forefront in the violent revolution, too.” But then, during the movement, I began feeling like, “there is something gravely wrong.” I began feeling very strongly how greatly and negatively violence affects people. And I had to go and participate in these acts often, and I began questioning. I could not be in the movement any longer because I became scared and basically ran out of the movement.....

After our child was born, I did not know very much how to raise and care for the child, and I have laid a hand on the child. Although I love the child so much....., in a moment when I became angry, I end up slapping my child. Such a (confused) state my heart was in. At that time, I had some strange perceptions that scolding and being angry were different. And at that time, I thought it was okay to scold vigorously, but not to get angry. I do not think like that anymore, but at the time, I thought that it was appropriate. So, then, all of a sudden, I slapped the child. And it was shocking to me and I did not know what to do..... And the relationship
with my partner. She scolds the child very hard, and I did not like it at all. So, I thought, “Why do you yell at the child like that? Why don’t you be gentler to the child? How violent is this person? I cannot believe that I am living with a person like this.” And even thought to the point of considering a breakup. I was all confused.

Around then, there was a customer who was involved with the women’s liberation movement….. She and her group went to the U.S. and brought back pamphlets on work that was being done about men’s violence against women in California. She goes, “I brought back these pamphlets as souvenirs. Would you like to read them? Are you interested in violence?” I was like, “Yes, yes. Yes, yes!!!” So, I accepted those and translated them…..

I and four other people began translating this book, and while translating, we read the book deeply and began to understand what violence is, what expressions of emotions are. And I began to apply these to my own life. And I used to think how violent my partner was, what a terrible woman she was. But I realized that my partner was good at expressing anger….. She was not slapping our child. She was only yelling. I was not yelling but slapping. And I could clearly understand the difference between the two. It dawned on me, what a terrible mistake I have been making. It was the first time that I realized…..

To express anger, there is no need to use violence. And violence is one way to express anger, but I could really understand how violence has terrible consequences, and it is a crime, and it is destructive to relationships, and it hurts the other person and at times yourself, too, and ends up hurting both. This experience was the start (Aichi, personal communication, June 19, 2009).

Such personal and significant moments were the catalysts of the interviewees’ activism regarding victims of violence or abusive behaviors. The chilling realization of ugly reality hit home, and hit home hard enough for them to change not only their behavior but also to want to help others change their abusive behaviors and help stop abuse. Whether the realization was brought upon them by their own acknowledgment or by others bringing it to their attention, these activists had their turning points in life that were personal.
For female activists, their particular social location as women held a significant place in their activism. As one interviewee says, “I must say, I happened to be born a woman, and I have been continuously feeling unreasonableness, just like other women have (Kōchi, personal communication, July 14, 2009).” Being a woman was another catalyst to activism, intimately informing them of the lower status of women in society and in the private sphere called home, showing them how women are disadvantaged in the workplace, at home, and in society and how women are treated differently than men from the moment they are born. The female activists unequivocally declared that years of experiencing sexism eventually fueled their desire to change the atmosphere and treatment surrounding women. A female lawyer recollects bitter feelings she had, when she was growing up and how those feelings followed into her career:

All in all, I was more privileged than other women in my generation because of my parents’ finances, their education, and so on. Even then, somehow, as one Japanese woman, I have experienced lots of discrimination. I could not understand it, and it was vexing to me ever since I was a child. And that must be what was at the core. “Why? Why do they say such a thing to me only because I am a woman?” I was seriously questioning since I was in grade school. And this “why” continues on into the career as a lawyer. Even after becoming a lawyer, a judge would look at me completely differently than at male lawyers, and society is the same, too. I have experienced a lot of stuff like that. Perhaps it may not exist now, but even before (getting anyone to) look at me, there were many times, when I was not respected as a lawyer. It is like (people) would not treat me as a lawyer. I have had many experiences, where obviously I was not treated as a lawyer. It is these experiences that urged me to do something about my discrimination experiences, or I think that I must have had bitter grudges about them. And I felt that there must have been commonality with discrimination that other Japanese women were experiencing. So, in this sense, I must appreciate the experiences of discrimination (laughs out loud). Since a small child, I had experienced many, many instances, and I held onto the thought and to myself, “someday, I will pay back for these grudges,” so that is how it turned out, organically (Tsukada, personal communication, July 27, 2009).
Most of the female interviewees, even as small children, questioned what they now know as sexism. At the time as children or young adults, they wondered why adults treated them differently from their counterparts, brothers. Seemingly simple things like doing chores at home, while male siblings were free from doing dishes or cleaning, were significant and influential to the female activists, not necessarily immediately but definitely at a later time as adults and activists.

Some female activists felt humiliated on being told that they did not need a university education because they were women and that they only needed to go to a community college at most and then to get married. Others were frustrated by and questioned the reality that, solely based on their gender, female graduates of colleges and universities were not hired by companies. Iwate, working in the disability movement in the 1970’s, was frustrated by the profound sexism that existed within her profession:

I felt that among male colleagues, they had no knowledge or idea as to how mothers of children with disability would feel or think. It is extremely challenging to raise a child with severe disability, but they say something like, “Because the way you raise your child is bad, the child is not improving.” Well, it is nearly 40 years ago, so there was, and still is even now, sex division of labor. So, when a child with disability is born, the mother solely takes care of the child with hardly any cooperation from the father. And I thought, that is wrong (ibid.).

Although it took time before the interviewees connected sexism to domestic violence, they had years of informative and critical experiences as women that played a significant role in their activism: their experiences helped them become more readily aware of sexism and gender discrimination that women face day to day. Sexism and the desire to fight against it lay at the core of their activism.
Early Experiences of Activism

For many of the interviewees, the domestic violence work that they have been doing in the past decades is not the first political and activist work in their lives. In fact, many had some prior involvement or at least interests in closely or remotely related fields, such as student movement, human rights, women's issues, and equal rights for workers.

I had been involved in the women’s movement (and) human rights movement since I was in my 20’s….. Because I have been living the life of being involved with the women’s movement, what has been at my core is ridding the world of gender injustices (Kōchi, ibid.).

Aichi (ibid.), Hanamaki (personal communication, July 1, 2009), Iwate (ibid.), and many others had joined the student movement at university or college and were enthusiastically, emotionally, and physically invested into and consumed by it, making it their priority at the time and placing education second or even further down the list of importance in their life.

These budding activists then moved on to something else by the time they left school. Some became involved in women's issues, others in worker's rights. Some went into the field of social welfare, helping those who were underserved. Hanamaki (ibid.), for example, had already been involved with some women’s movements and was interested in the issue of prostitution. Even when the interviewee’s engagements were not directly related to or traditionally considered as activism, they bore an activist in them: some went into direct service, helping people solve their problems through counseling. Katayama (ibid.) went into media, reporting news to public. Niigata (personal communication, June 22, 2009) did not hold a job but creatively and generously opened her home to women in need of safety and a safe place to stay. Most, however, entered the workforce without thinking that they wanted to make a difference in or to contribute to
society. They needed a job to sustain their life, and they liked some aspects of their job. For lawyer Tsukada (ibid.), all she cared about was having a good job that supported her independence. But the corporate world did not suit her very well, especially with its prevalent sexism affecting female clients and herself as well. In this kind of environment, female clients would be sent to her because male professionals did not want to work with them. Through these clients, Tsukada was introduced to sexual harassment and domestic violence cases. Eventually she left the corporate world and began working at a small firm, where she worked for many women who came with sexual harassment and domestic violence complaints.

Regardless of having a recognized idea of advocacy or activism early in their careers, they held attitudes that led them to activism later. At the core of who they are, they upheld a sense of justice. In addition, they had an ability to empathize with those who were in great need. Their activism is rooted in a strong sense of injustice, in empathy, and in the ability to envision change.

**Going against the Grain: Being Defiant**

In my interviews with them, many of the female activists detailed their long struggles against sexism. Though they did not always perceive their struggles as fights or hardships, they have long been questioning sexism and differentiated societal treatment of women. Several, such as Kōchi (ibid.), Tsukada (ibid.) quoted previously, recalled defying expected roles as a daughter and woman since childhood. Something as simple as wondering why they as a young girl have to do chores but their male siblings do not left a significant impression on these female activists, and they continued not only to wonder
but also to question numerous instances of differentiated treatment between themselves and their sibling counterparts, and resist their treatment in their own ways.

Marriage was a situation that many women found problematic and that evoked their defiance. As young women and good daughters, several interviewees, such as Iwate (ibid.), struggled to convince parents to send them to higher education. Tsukada (ibid.) and others strategically and purposefully chose careers that would allow them to sufficiently earn living to be independent. Without education or a career, they would not have had many other options but to marry and be supported by a husband. Freedom and independence were both invaluable aspects of life, and these women made sure that they secured them through their careers.

On the other hand, for someone like Fukushima (ibid.), marriage was a way not only to defy her family but also to escape from the violence that was prevalent at home. As long as she was still in high school, Fukushima, witnessing the violence that her mother endured from her stepfather and a victim of violence herself, had almost no options. As soon as she graduated, however, she married and left home. Although this marriage placed her in another violence-filled home, Fukushima’s act of leaving her family and getting married was defiant nonetheless: against her family by physically leaving, against her step-father by not taking violence from him any longer, against her mother for not protecting her, and perhaps even against society at large for not allowing her live a carefree life like a normal girl teenager.

Other interviewees who were survivors of domestic violence used different means to defy their abusers and resist the abuse and violence they were experiencing. Acts of defiance against abuse and abusers were difficult, tremendously risky and even dangerous
for these survivor activists: they were at the mercy of their abusers’ decisions whether their acts would elicit yet more abuse or violence. Niigata (ibid.), for example, had been tremendously risk-taking, persistent, and inventive in her decades-long endeavor to address domestic violence. It started as questioning sexism in her marital relationship as well as within her own community. Though for year after year she had no support from her family or community, Niigata was confident that there was a prevalence of domestic violence in her community. To address it and other aspects of sexism, she used her own resources to help women if they needed someone to confide in or a place to escape to.

Utilizing her own resources was an act of defiance against her husband, family, and in a larger sense the community, given that she had married into a well-known and respected family that has been established in the community for generation after generation. What Niigata started decades ago was against the code of how a good wife and daughter-in-law ought to behave, not to mention publically discussing sexism. She recalls:

I wanted to go (to a shelter) myself. I really wanted to go because I was truly facing enemies on all sides. So, I really wanted to go, but I looked and looked in the prefecture, looked for groups, but nothing that I wanted to use. There was nothing. And to have a place, where women can call easily and get assistance by phone, and some place, where people can casually go. There was no place that I could go although I really wanted to, so I created the place myself.

I could not say anything about what I was doing. It was the marital problems, and moreover, it started with my own experience. I do not like to say this, but because others do, I will say it now, but people say that Niigata is a very well-known name in the community. So, the daughter-in-law is unsuitable for the respected family, and people put such a label on me. (People say that) the stupid son who was born in the respected family. And I chose such a shameful, unrespectable son and chose to live my life that way. So, these have been a big problem, and I really could not say anything outside the family….. but I really could not say it. Really could not. I kept quiet. So, I said “this is my friend,” and had women stay at the house (Niigata, ibid.).
For survivors, whose life and actions were greatly influenced and even controlled by abusers, to do something, however small, of their own will and against their abuser despite the potentially negative consequences, was in fact an act of defiance and bravery.

Small though it might appear compared to street demonstrations or grand public gestures, even simply questioning gender roles or attaining a higher education degree was an act of defiance against expectations, social roles, and established societal standards. These defying acts were the key elements to these women that also defined them as activists and that created first steps toward a movement.

Many of the activists in their interviews implied that they "accidentally" became involved with the domestic violence movement. They did not set out with a clear and well defined will or desire to be activists or advocates in the domestic violence field. However, they had so much in them that led them there: strong and long-held sentiments against sexism, personal and intimate experiences that became foundations of their domestic violence work, and practice utilizing strategies and creativity to defy sexism. Without the various seeds of activism that propelled the interviewees into advocacy, there might not have been a flourishing career or activism in their life. In this sense, as accidental as these activists might have perceived their pathway to be into the activism in the domestic violence movement, there was hardly anything accidental about it.

Then and Now

All the interviewees have spent years of activism in the field of domestic violence long before the term *domesutikku baiorensu* first appeared in *Asahi Shimbun* in 1995. Their activism spans from the time there was no name to frame domestic violence or no services for victims and abusers to now with the existing DVP law and available services
for victims, abusers, and their family. Through the narratives, how domestic violence used to be and how it is now are clearly described.

**What Violence? Behind Closed Doors and Normalized Violence**

There are these impressions about family: it is something that is very good, warm, and good and something to love. And then, I come along and say that this is how my family used violence against me. There was much criticism. And (I was) called a liar (Fukushima, *ibid.*).

Simply put, from long ago victims did not have a voice, and they were invisible. So, the general public did not know anything about victims. And in such environment and you say that my husband is terrible (violent), you would be blamed for not doing a good job (Iwate, *ibid.*).

“There was no name, such as *dī bui*** was more than a commonly used phrase, when interviewees described the social context surrounding domestic violence when they began addressing the issue. Some started their advocacy in the early 1990’s. However, mostly because of the selection criteria that I chose, the vast majority of the interviewees began their domestic violence work in the 1980’s or even much earlier. Some had more than a few decades in their tenure. When the interviewees began their work, they did not have the currently used terms, *domesutikku baiorensu* or *dī bui*, to label the problem. So, without a name to frame domestic violence, how was it socially constructed?

If at all understood, domestic violence was gravely misunderstood in society, as Iwate describes here:

I was asked to go to a prison and visit with a woman, so I did. I was like, “Ha…….this is the person who murdered?” It was at the beginning of my career, but I got the impression that she was really far from a murderer. I felt that she was gravely misunderstood. After this, I visited her five or so times to hear her story. I asked her one time: “Your case is *dī bui*, and you are a victim of violence by husband and boyfriend. Do you know the term?” She says no. The husband was an alcoholic, and so I told her, and she acknowledged that she had heard that term before. But she simply thought that he had bad habits when drunk. She would say to her mother or neighbors, he gets drunk and becomes violent, he does not bring in
money, he throws things and breaks glass doors, so glass pieces are scattered throughout the house. With a small child crawling on the floor, she had to vacuum glass off the floor. The woman told me stories like this. No one told her that it was *dī bui*, and people told her that all was because of her lack of good wifely skills. So, she could not confide in anyone. So then, I wrote a professional report on it. The prosecutor side ripped her and me apart, indicating that if it was so terrible, she should have gotten divorced. I was like, because she could not, she ended up murdering him (*ibid.*).

A counselor by her professional training for decades, Iwate clearly remembers her client who had been imprisoned for murdering her husband. Without a name, awareness, or understanding, a woman had no idea what she had gone through in her marriage, nor did she know that her husband was abusive to her. Little did she know that he, not she, was responsible for his actions regardless of his alcoholism.

The interviewees unequivocally expressed and described the social atmosphere surrounding domestic violence at the time of starting the work as something that was a private matter that should not be discussed outside of homes. Matters that went on behind closed doors of the home were to remain there, especially when it came to matters between wife and husband. As Iwate’s account shows, it was out of the question to take private and personal matters to courts and other public places:

Every other month, we were having a seminar. The first time was on alcoholism and women. There was an alcoholism survivor among us, so she was in charge of that. And the second seminar was on *dī bui*. We sent announcements to newspapers, asking them to come and report on it. Those who came were all women reporters, so they were like, “Yes, we will write an article.” But when they return to the newspaper and report to their bosses, males, they would say, “Husband beating wife at home? How could we put an article like that (emphasis added by the interviewee) in a newspaper?” (*ibid.*).

Talking about things that happened between couples was greatly frowned upon and considered unacceptable and “taboo” (Tsukada, *ibid.*).
Another commonly described social atmosphere surrounding domestic violence was that it was “normal (Matsue, personal communication, July 28, 2009)” in marriages or even treated as “expression of love, so there were many people, who completely lacked knowledge” (Iwate, ibid.). When working in the government sector and promoting counseling for employees, Matsue was surprised and disappointed by attitudes of people who were highly educated, well regarded, and in good positions. He found their attitudes regarding domestic violence and their assumptions about men offensive and unacceptable. Male colleagues would say to him:

Men are sometimes like that (temperamental and explode at home after work); people like that (high positioned government officials) would say, “Do not get too excited about it.” I was very disappointed by this (ibid.).

Men’s use of violence against their wives was accepted and even condoned as masculine, not to mention that this kind of violence in marriages was considered ordinary.

Normalization of domestic violence was overwhelmingly evident in governmental institutions, and minimizing domestic violence as marital quarrels was standard practice. “There was no police response” (Katayama, ibid.), when calls for help were made. On those occasions when police responded, it was hardly a help for victims. The interview with Tsukada, who works on legal aspects of the domestic violence movement, shows interactions in which the police treated domestic violence cases as ordinary, non-problematic, marital quarrels, and not as abuse or crime.

Police did not respond (to dī bui cases) properly. What happened was, a wife calls police because of her husband’s violence. And the police come, but the husband talks them into leaving, so officers leave. After the police leave, conflict continued, and in the end, the wife stabs her husband. In this particular case, the husband did not die, so this was prosecuted as an attempted murder case. And this was clearly (dī bui). Had the police responded properly, when they were called in the first place, the stabbing incident would not have occurred. But (police) did nothing. They were
like, “ha, marital quarrels,” and left. This was very common (Tsukada, *ibid.*).

This minimizing and normalizing attitude toward domestic violence was detrimental not only to victims but also to others, when people including law enforcement paid no attention to or “did not treat it as crime at all (Tsukada, *ibid.*).”

In some cases, when people acknowledged the presence of domestic violence in intimate relationships, certain characteristics were attributed to the people involved. In other words, domestic violence did not happen to just anyone, but only to certain people. Tsukada described how violent husbands were perceived in the early 1990’s:

The existence of husband’s violence against his wife, the existence itself, nobody denied. But the husband who beats his wife was someone very unusual, someone blue collar, and someone without much education. Without any foundation, people understood *dì bui* to be something like that (*ibid.*).

Domestic violence was treated as a bi-product of certain environmental factors, such as poverty and lack of education. Therefore, it was treated as a special case, something that most people did not need to be concerned about, and which therefore could be ignored.

Some activists were directly impacted by these socially shared images of domestic violence as extreme, unusual, unique, and even unfortunate cases. Fukushima (*ibid.*) has been a writer and speaker since she began her activism publicly in the mid 1990’s. Since then, she has repeatedly experienced unfair, rude, or even discriminatory treatment by event organizers and media. Whether by a feminist group that had invited Fukushima to give a talk on her domestic violence experience or by various media sources in their interviews, Fukushima knew exactly how they were treating her: as a special case.
There are many, but one symbolic example is when event organizers say, “Thank you very much for your talk. But there is no one who does anything like that in our town.” It is like that (chuckles), you are special. Or, perhaps it is more like they want to believe that I am special. Also, there were quite a bit of reactions from mass media. Even then, it was like a special woman, only you experienced such tragedies. It was kind of like shining a spotlight on me, and I talk about this and that. Weekly magazines, too. Many came to report on me, but most treated me as special. Of course, there were positive responses, but even those people understood me as special. Regardless of good or bad, they all treated me as special. I take this as a sign of how few [other victims] there were who came out in public at that time……around 1995 (ibid.).

There were many instances of abusers and victims of domestic violence constructed and perceived as special cases. However, the same treatment by feminists was particularly insulting and greatly disappointing to Fukushima. After all, these were feminists, who were supposed to be informed and on her side. Instead, they treated her the same way others, men and non-feminist women, did.

Media can be a double-edged sword: it is an effective way to reach masses to disseminate information and educate the public, but passing information through gatekeepers may be challenging. People who are involved with the media, be it reporters, producers, editors, or owners, have discretion and power to control what is reported and how information is represented. As a TV reporter, Katayama (ibid.) paid particular attention to the content of news and how it was represented. With an objective perspective as a member of the media and informed by her own experience of abuse, Katayama had noticed the stark difference between the U.S. and Japan on broadcasting the O.J. Simpson case: in the U.S. media, the aspect of abuse and violence was broadcast openly, clearly, and heavily, while that representation was entirely absent in Japan.

Meanwhile, in a high-profile criminal case in Japan occurring at around the same time, aspects of domestic violence were absent from the extensive live broadcasting on TV and
the voluminous coverage in newspapers and other media sources. And when Fukushima interviewed to be a candidate for a nationally televised, well-known, highly regarded, and popular TV program, she was turned down because her subject matter “was not suitable for general public’s living room (Fukushima, *ibid.*).”

Since intimate matters between wife and husband were considered something that should not to be discussed or dealt with in public sphere, women did not have places where they could share their experiences or talk about domestic violence. Moreover, because domestic violence was normalized and trivialized in marriage, even when women brought it up among their friends, it was something that people brushed off or did not take seriously. These social environments created the atmosphere, in which women had to endure abuse and deal with it on their own and do so quietly.

**Invisibility and Blame**

Without a name to frame abuse within intimate relationships and at a time when most abuse was treated as and called marital quarrels, domestic violence was socially normalized, minimized or trivialized, and shameful to talk about outside of homes. The interviewees unequivocally described this as the situation when they began their work, some of them as early as the 1950s and as late as early 1990s.

Domestic violence was considered non-existent in Japan. When it does not exist, there is no victim. And where there is no victim, there is no citizen that deserves the right to social support. So, that is what it means by there is no governmental office or support (*Kōno, ibid.*).

These circumstances were among the culprits in creating a societal atmosphere in which victims of domestic violence became invisible. When domestic violence is normalized in intimate relationships, incidents of abuse and violence are a natural part of those relationships and do not call for any special attention, nor require any concern or action.
Overwhelmingly interviewees declared that for domestic violence victims “there was nowhere to go” to talk to someone or ask for help (Fukushima, *ibid.*; Katayama, *ibid.*; Kosaka, personal communication, July 14, 2009; Niigata, *ibid.*; Yahata, personal communication, July 14, 2009). Because a woman who took intimate matters between wife and husband outside of home would be considered a bad wife, mother, and daughter-in-law, she had no choice but to keep quiet and play the required role in public and at home.

In the countryside, there was this value; silence is women’s virtue and beauty. But I had no idea about this. Well, that is, my upbringing might have had something to do with it, but voicing opinion was normal for me. So, I said, “This (husband beating wife) is wrong, don’t you think? It is a community problem, so I am thinking of looking into this.” Then, women were like, “this is seriously problematic!” And they stopped me (Niigata, *ibid.*).

Not only did women stop Niigata, but also they collectively shunned and ostracized her for months and years for attempting to shine light on the husbands’ abuse and violence in the community that had traditionally been kept in the privacy of home.

Victims of domestic violence were relegated to invisible existence in society. In privacy of their homes, victims played a role of a faithful member of husband’s family, who would not ruin the family name or reputation. However, when the presence of abuse was acknowledged or accepted in marriage, the wife was to blame. The “quarrels” were constructed and understood as a result of her failure to fulfill wifely and daughter-in-law duties, failing to live up to the expectations of husbands and in-laws.’ Hanamaki questioned such attitudes toward victims, when she began working at a social welfare service office for women and children in the 1980s.

Once I began working, well, at the time there was no word, *dī bui*, one of the major tasks was to temporarily protect fleeing women and children and
keep them safe from their violent husbands. Despite the nature of the job, those who supported [the women] considered it [the violence] as a marital quarrel. (They would) think, “Sure, the husband may be at fault, but the victim must be at fault [too]. If she did nothing wrong, there would not have been such severe violence between a married couple.” (Hanamaki, ibid.).

Similarly, much ignorance or misunderstanding that existed in society was prevalent in professional fields. Tsukada, who witnessed this misrepresentation and misconception over and over again in court, said:

It seemed to me that all unanimously agreed that dī bui was a wife’s problem. It occurred because of the wife’s lousy treatment of her husband. If she had been catering to her husband better, something like that would not have happened. This was explained in most of the cases….. Because of the wife’s failure, things turn out like that. So, there was no understanding that the husband was responsible or the cause of the problem (Tsukada, ibid.).

Regardless of who was at fault, women were considered at fault and held responsible for making their husband upset, even when the husbands made mistakes or should have been held accountable for their actions. The house was a men’s castle. The head of the household should be able to relax, do what they would like to do, and be catered to. A husband’s abuse and violence was justified and defended by blaming the wife for her inability to respond adequately to her husband and in-laws.

Moreover, it was difficult for people to understand that responsible and capable adults would willingly stay in a relationship that was marked with abuse and violence (Katayama, ibid.). Judges and other professionals alike held women accountable for continuing to stay in the relationship and being mistreated and abused. Some judges even considered women masochistic because they did not flee from abuse and violence although they could. Misconception and misunderstanding of domestic violence and domestic violence victims were apparent and rampant. Even the professionals who were
supposed to provide services to women blamed women not only for the abuse but also for not escaping. There was no understanding of the role and dynamics of abuse and violence in domestic violence or of how women learn and manage to live with abuse over time for reasons such as survival, keeping a father figure in the life of children, desire to salvage the relationship, and believing and hoping that they can help change their man.

The experiences of women in this extended pre-1995 period were shaped by how domestic violence was constructed and treated as both non-existent and normalized. The consequences were immense: because domestic violence did not exist and did not exist as a problem, there existed no domestic violence victims. Or if violence was acknowledged, then women were to blame. What all this amounted to was that there were no rights for victims or services or support for victims. There existed no system to address domestic violence because it was not perceived as a problem. How domestic violence was socially constructed at the time influenced social reaction to domestic violence. How, then, do women fare in their home and society now in terms of abuse and violence that happens in their home?

**We Have Come a Long Way**

Compared to decades ago, when the interviewees began working on the issue of domestic violence, many things have changed and continue to change. One critical change occurs in morality. A moral shift, when a non-issue becomes an issue, is a critical step in constructing a social problem (Bergen, 1995; Loseke, 1992; Mehrota, 1999). Overwhelmingly, interviewees emphasized that they now have a name to call the problem, *domesutikku baiorensu* or *dī bui* (Refer to the below sub-section). Having a name creates many potentials and opportunities for necessary and desired social change:
not only is there a name, but with the name came a framework that constructs domestic violence as a social problem.

Iwate (ibid.), for example, had a difficult time coming to terms with a suicide death of one client she had worked with in the 1970s. This high school girl was seeing Iwate because of her eating disorder, among other psychological issues. However, those were merely the symptoms of the underlying cause: violence at home. Her father spent much time away from home because of work, but he would cut financial support to the family. When home, the father would verbally and physically abuse not only her mother but also the high school girl.

Now, it is clearly dī bui ..... That really was dī bui, physical violence and now so called moral harassment. It was severe and tactical psychological abuse toward the mother and her. She had a younger brother, but (the father was) never violent toward him. It was a case involving whacking the mother and daughter. Had it been now, it would have been like, “you are a child of dī bui, hurry, flee with your mother.” So, not having a framework results in not knowing how to support, and it also means not having support. She was 16 or 17 and sadly lost her life (ibid.).

While this may seem like an extreme case, other interviewees, including Akita (personal communication, July 17, 2009), Hamada (ibid.), Kōchi (ibid.), and Tsukada (ibid.), wished that they could have assisted or provided support to victims properly or better. They could not do so at the time only because they did not know what exactly they were dealing with, and they themselves were figuring out how to help these victims as they went along.

Not a single interviewee said that what Japan now has and does to address domestic violence is sufficient, and unanimously they strongly spoke of how much more needs to be done. However, compared to the times when they began, Japan has come a long way. Once domestic violence was problematized not simply as a private but also as
a social issue, it became a matter that needed to be addressed on a societal level. This meant treating domestic violence as a problem, hence, creating services to combat it, be it education (Kōchi, ibid.; Niigata, ibid.), welfare services (Hanamaki, ibid.; Iwate, ibid.), new laws criminalizing dī bui (Hamada, ibid.; Katayama, ibid.; Kōchi, ibid.; Tsukada, ibid.), or establishing governmental offices that specifically handle domestic violence issues (Akita, ibid.; Iwate, ibid.). Systemic changes such as these were critical and pivotal in the course of the domestic violence movement because what the activists were doing was finally acknowledged and given legitimacy, and a social understanding was created that domestic violence not only existed but also is a serious social problem requiring attention and strategies to combat it.

Among many aspects of changes that advanced domestic violence from “marital quarrels” to a social problem, all the interviewees identified the legal change as a key shift to the entire domestic violence movement. Having created and enacted the DVP law was an indication to society that domestic violence was a wrongful criminal act that is legally punishable. Criminalization of domestic violence brought further critical systemic changes, such as creating support and services specifically geared toward victims and family members, establishing governmental social services for domestic violence victims and family members to ensure their safety and well being, linking numerous governmental services to provide support thoroughly, implementing educational programs in school systems as well as in communities, and more. Even seemingly trivial changes, such as accommodating school transfers for children (Akita, ibid.; Kōchi, ibid.), or bringing social service workers to where victims are instead of sending victims to each individual social service office (Akita, ibid.; Kōchi, ibid.), were not possible before the
DVP law, though they were tremendously taxing to victims and to their affected family members.

**Having a Name**

“What? Aren’t you talking about Dī Bui Dī (DVD)? Huh? Dī bui???” was a commonly heard reaction, at times mixed in with cynicism (Hamada, *ibid.*; Hanamaki, *ibid.*; Kōchi, *ibid.*; Makiguchi, personal communication, July 25, 2009). Activists rarely get this type of reaction now, as the terms, *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui*, have been fairly well recognized and used in society. What does it mean to have a name for a social problem such as domestic violence? “To have a common language, to call it *dī bui*, is a very good thing,” Akita (*ibid.*) said firmly and with confidence, and others specifically positively endorsed the value of having a name. To the activist interviewees, the absence of a name when they began working in the area of now called domestic violence had been a problem. Niigata recalled how people used to frame the problem as “bad relationships between husband and wife (*ibid.*),” and Makiguchi described how people attributed violence to alcohol and assumed that addressing alcoholism would suffice to stop violence in homes (*ibid.*). As illustrated previously, having a name means that people can identify a social phenomenon as domestic violence. This common knowledge and sense of sharing knowledge is particularly important and catalytic not only for victims of domestic violence but also for those who advocate for them.

The majority of the interviewees, Akita was one, said they themselves did not gain an understanding of what exactly they were doing until after the spread of the *domesutikku baiorensu* term, the beginning of research on it, and the better awareness in the larger society (*ibid.*). Makiguchi, who had been involved with the shelter aspect of
domestic violence work, said, “Not only did I not know dī bui, but also I did not know the term, shelter, either (ibid.).” Niigata (ibid.), who opened her home to victims, remembers that she saw the term, dī bui, in 1999 for the first time in the newspaper and gained a realization for the first time that violence within marriage was called dī bui, and that what she had been doing for decades out of her own home was in fact a domestic violence work. And she also remembered that the term “violence” had not been used at all until this point: wife was slapped, dinner table was flipped over, and other descriptions, but no word of violence. Tsukada (ibid.), who had worked on case after case without the language or concepts of domestic violence, had felt frustration over cases for which she had not been able to provide the best possible assistance. Being introduced to the name, domesutikku baiorensu, and its concept, was an eye-opening experience for her. Many of the other activist interviewees also said they only truly understood that their work was domestic violence work with the name and the descriptions and concepts that came with it. Before that, they were simply doing what they could to address problems at hand and to be helpful to victims.

The vast majority of the activist interviewees was positive and saw the invaluable aspect of having a name for the social problem of domestic violence. Kōchi (ibid.), Kosaka (ibid.), and Tsukada (ibid.) were particularly outspoken and passionate proponents and advocates regarding this, emphasizing what it means to have a name for social problems, and what kind of roles naming and acquisition of a name play in legitimizing problems, raising awareness, and most of all, creating a common ground to share experience.
A name to a problem provides clarity for those directly and indirectly involved in it: in the case of domestic violence, victims and survivors know what exactly they experienced instead of feeling uncertain, alone, or not knowing what to do with their unnamed feelings. With a new perspective, people gain an understanding. They can do something about it if they choose to. And they gain a realization that they are not alone, and that there are others who have experienced what they have. For society at large, having a name is just as critical. It creates a turning point, in which a phenomenon, such as domestic violence, can be problematized, addressed, and defined. It helps build bases of information and knowledge and reframes the previously unnamed and insignificant phenomenon. As Kōchi explicitly puts it, “Changing a language and naming a problem is part of the struggles to change society (ibid.).”

**Paralleling to Seku-Hara—Sexual Harassment**

Nearly half the activist interviewees brought up seku-hara, or sexual harassment, when asked about the naming of domesutikku baiorensu and dī bui. There is a similar parallel between seku-hara and dī bui based on the fact that the both names originate in English and touch upon the issues of violence against women. As Aichi (ibid.) and Akita (ibid.) said, for most activist interviewees, because seku-hara had become a known word and phenomenon years before dī bui, they considered that seku-hara paved the way for dī bui to become familiar and potentially sped up the process and lessened the resistance for dī bui to be accepted into society. Anzai, who has been a counselor for decades, emphasized how long it took for seku-hara to be recognized and accepted into society. So, in comparison to that, she thinks that the struggles of dī bui have only begun (personal communication, June 28, 2009).
Hanamaki (ibid.) and Tsukada (ibid.), both with professional background in the area of sexual harassment, gave detailed accounts of how the term, seku-hara, came about. According to Hanamaki (ibid.), at the time when there was no name to describe sexual harassment, a catalytic case, the Nishifunabashi case, occurred in Osaka. A drunken man harassed a woman dancer at the subway platform, and in fighting off the man, she accidentally pushed him away and off the platform. As a result, the man fell and died. Tsukada (ibid.) recalls that an article came out in a men’s weekly magazine, detailing a sexual harassment account, and in it with sarcasm and cynicism mixed in, the abbreviation, seku-hara, was used. In this way, the term, sekusharu harasumento (sexual harassment) and seku-hara (abbreviation of sexual harassment), were introduced in Japan. And Hanamaki (ibid.) attributes the woman’s successful defense in the case to the ability to name the problem and to identify the nature of the crime. It was sensational and seku-hara won the best new word award that same year. In seku-hara’s case, as Tsukada (ibid.) puts it, the abbreviation has been widely used in Japan, much more so than the long English term, sekusharu harasumento, or even a Japanese term (性的嫌がらせ or seiteki iyagarase). Instead of long cumbersome English or Japanese terms, the short and catchy seku-hara gained much more popularity and has been used widely in society.

It is understandable how and why many of the interviewees brought up seku-hara not only as a gender violence precedent parallel to dī bui, but also to use as a measure of what might eventually happen to dī bui. As Akita (ibid.), Kōchi (ibid.), and Tsukada (ibid.) explicitly put it, having a common language and having a name to call a phenomenon is critical in raising awareness and gaining recognition for victims and others in society. A name is a starting point for addressing a social problem.
Giving a Name to a Problem: Thoughts and Efforts into Naming

When asked about the naming of the social problem, *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui*, Aichi (*ibid.*) and quite a few others said, “You will have to ask (members of) DVSRG about that.” Clearly, some of the interviewees were aware of how the naming came about, if not in close detail, and of Domestic Violence Study and Research Group (DVSRG) involvement. Some knew in detail the contributions that DVSRG made not only in naming the problem but also turning domestic violence into a social problem. The interviewees who directly or indirectly had ties to DVSRG explained the thoughts and struggles that went into naming the problem.

**Struggles and Accidents of Domestic Violence Study and Research Group**

Members of DVSRG had long and careful discussions on how to name the social problem appropriately. Five of the interviewees, Akita (*ibid.*), Hamada (*ibid.*), Hanamaki (*ibid.*), Kōchi (*ibid.*), and Makiguchi (*ibid.*), were strong proponents of the English language originated labels and believed that the terms could not have been anything else but *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui*. As Hamada puts it, “(the English names) are appropriate and right even after dozens of years passed (*ibid.*).” Among the five, a detailed picture of how the activists in DVSRG struggled and what kind of process naming took is painted.

DVSRG paid particular attention and consideration to words and the meanings they would have as names. The term family violence (*家庭内暴力, kateinai bōryoku*) existed prior to importing *domesutikku baiorensu*. However, as Akita details, it proves to be problematic for addressing domestic violence:
About 10 or so years ago, a teenager became isolated, locked himself in room, and used violence against parents, and parents became overwhelmed, and ended up murdering the teenage son by beating him with a bat. It happened in Kawasaki (Kanagawa prefecture). This case contributed to the use of (the word) family violence, being synonymous for children's violence against parents. So, for (domestic violence) supporters, victims, and also society, there needs to be a common language to address a problem or to name a problem. So, as a result, family violence was not appropriate (ibid.).

Using the family violence term was extremely problematic not only for Akita (ibid.) and others who felt strongly about the English names, but also for the vast majority of the activist interviewees. Using the family violence term was out of question because it would instantly connote violent children and young adults using physical violence toward their parents and would conjure up those images in people. Additionally, there are other types of violence that should fall under the family violence term, such as elder and child abuses. Grouping domestic violence under the family violence term would have added more confusion and misunderstanding to the already misleading term.

For several reasons, another option, “violence between married couples” (夫婦間暴力, fūfukan bōryoku)” was problematic for some of the activists, especially Hanamaki (ibid.) and Tsukada (ibid.). This name applies only to married couples and leaves out those who are in dating relationships or even common-law couples without legal marriage. It also leaves out the directionality of the violence, the reality that domestic violence is committed overwhelmingly by men against women, is lost. In the process, it neutralizes an important characteristic of this gender violence, treating violence just as equally between women and men.

With the terms, “family violence” and “violence between marital couples” being ill-equipped to define, describe, and address domestic violence, activists in DVSRG
began using the term, “violence by husbands and boyfriends (夫・恋人からの暴力, *otto, koibito kara no bōryoku*).” This term clearly set forth the directionality of the violence and the relationships where violence occurred. According to Hanamaki (*ibid.*), some activist members of DVSRG advocated for using a Japanese name, insisting the importance of using the native language, Japanese, to address their social problems. However, as Tsukada stated (*ibid.*), this particular Japanese term is not only a mouthful, but also awkward and cumbersome. After giving much thought to the names and without using inappropriate names, DVSRG ended up using “violence by husbands and boyfriends” and also *domesutikku baiorensu* as temporary measures. Tsukada was explicit about the situation DVSRG members were facing, and how the names were supposed to be temporary. The members of DVSRG deemed it crucial to start addressing publicly the problem and raising awareness with the time of the essence. They felt the utmost importance in addressing the problem was more urgent than contemplating on a name to find a perfect fit. Delaying the process of raising awareness was inconceivable to them (*ibid.*). However, the names that were intended to be temporary found their way into permanency. No replacement for “violence by husbands and boyfriends” or *domesutikku baiorensu* was introduced by DVSRG at a later time.

**Through the Lens of a Journalist**

As one of the first journalists to shine light on *domesutikku baiorensu*, Katayama shared this insightful story (*ibid.*). In and around 1997, she began considering producing a documentary on domestic violence, though at first there was hardly any interest from others at the TV station where she worked. With no one else suitable to do the reporting, the job landed on her so that Katayama ended up not just producing but also reporting in
the show (ibid.). In her profession as a journalist, she had a particular code of moral conduct to live by accompanied by strong feelings of obligation to fulfill her responsibilities. Furthermore, she knew the great power of the media and how much influence it could have on society. Therefore, she approached naming with much care and thought.

Broadcasting it for the first time, Katayama chose to use the term, “otto, koibito karano bōryoku (violence by husbands and boyfriends; 夫・恋人からの暴力)”. For other issues, she was well aware of new imported and recognized terms such as sutōkingu (stalking; ストーキング) and sekusharu harasumento (sexual harassment; セクシャルハラスメント). However, it was critical to Katayama that she use a different term to talk about domestic violence: she wanted to avoid a name that has been used before and was associated with other issues, and she wanted to frame domestic violence differently from other existing problems. This, to Katayama, was crucial in changing societal perceptions. Although she suspected that “violence by husbands and boyfriends” may be a difficult term for general public to understand, she used it consciously (ibid.).

Similarly, Katayama intentionally included not just husbands in her term. This was a time when the word for boyfriends was hardly ever used in news reporting (ibid.). Hence, for Katayama to intentionally and purposefully refer to boyfriends indicates her determination and commitment to raising awareness and doing the right thing instead of following tradition or what has been considered standard. This attitude and belief extended to using the term, dī bui, which already existed in Japanese though Katayama did not know it at first (ibid.). In researching for the program, she discovered researchers who were using dī bui in their work. Her decision to use the term in the documentary was
affirmed through meeting with victims and workers in shelters, investigating on people who had passed away, and interviewing medical professionals. Together with “violence by husbands and boyfriends,” Katayama used *dī bui* from the beginning.

Generally, Katayama does not think that it is a good idea to use English or foreign terms because clear understanding may be hindered. In the case of *dī bui*, she is very well aware that while the term has been well known and become easily recognized, the understanding of what *dī bui* is may not be up to par. However, she had contemplated on how to translate “domestic.” It should not denote marriage because violence does happen outside of marriage in intimate relationships, and leaving out boyfriends was out of question. Katayama struggled with naming because nothing fit well, especially the existing terms, such as “husband’s violence (*otto no bōryoku*, 夫の暴力)” or “family violence (*kateinai bōryoku*, 家庭内暴力).” Katayama found both of these highly problematic, “husband’s violence” for not being inclusive and “family violence” for connoting violent children and young adults using violence against parents. Avoiding these names and any confusion stemming from them seemed necessary to her even though she could conceive difficulties that people might also experience with the long foreign term, *domesutikkusu baiorensu*, or the abbreviation of it, *dī bui*, that had no significance to people (*ibid.*).

Katayama was aware of other terms being used elsewhere in the world: family violence, domestic violence, wife abuse, intimate partner violence—different terms at different times or places. She knew that during the world conference in Beijing in 1995, the Japanese interpreter used a translation of “family violence (*kateinai bōryoku*)” for domestic violence. When the O.J. Simpson case was broadcasted in Japan, it was the
“family violence” term used to describe the case. Katayama was not sold on this phrase, given the particular violence that it conjures up in people, images of metal baseball bats and violence against parents by children and young adults. She was convinced that it was better to use a new term, a new name without any existing perception or assumption. When she found out that the DVSRG was using domesutikku baiorensu and violence by husbands and boyfriends, it was reassuring to Katayama. Those names made sense to her even though she had to go against the standard practice of television media at the time by using a term that hinted at intimacy outside of marriage (ibid.).

Men’s Point of View

There were others, who were not part of DVSRG or mainstream efforts in naming domesutikku baiorensu but who had their own struggles with how to name and frame the issue of domestic violence. When Aichi (ibid.) and his fellow activists were organizing to start a men’s hotline service to address domestic violence, they had to put their heads together and seriously discuss how to name their service. At the time, they had no tool or language readily available to them to talk about domestic violence:

At first, there was nothing. There was no talk about that (domestic violence)…….. Not sure who started it, but some media in Tokyo started to write in newspapers. And dī būi started to be circulated and began spreading. So, for us, when we were to name it, it is called men’s problems hotline. So, for me, to address violence and I wanted to share knowledge on how to stop using violence after having read a book (in English). But other members were like, "Aichi-san. How are you going to translate that?" (People) would not understand domesutikku baiorensu, nor would (they) understand “family violence,” either. Because at that time, “family violence” meant a boy beating father or mother. So, to use “family violence,” people would not understand. So, then, I said, how about "a hotline for men who wants to quite violence." Then, (someone said) yakuza (Japanese mafia) would call us! (Bursts out laughing). There are a lot of people like that, and many joined (yakuza) without choice. We could not have dealt with stuff like that, so we were like, “What to do?” In the end, we settled with “men’s problems hotline.” ..... We began (the
hotline) in 1995, but at that time, we were not openly using “family violence,” or there was no dī bui word in public (Aichi, ibid.).

Aichi was in the end satisfied with the name that he and his fellow activists had elected to use for their hotline service. This decision, however, did not come easy, as detailed by Aichi and how he and his colleagues considered some names but decided against them because they were in the end not suitable.

Having a name to call and define domestic violence is nothing short of important or necessary: it is critical to its existence. Without a name, there is no common ground or understanding. All the activist interviewees who participated in this study had been involved in the domestic violence work long before the terms, domesutikku baiorensu and dī bui, were brought into the society. And their stories clearly pointed to the invisible social problem that they faced and worked against but did not know themselves how to call or frame it because it did not have a name. Naming a problem is no easy task for any problems. For these activists, they could relate their naming issue to what they had seen and heard with sexual harassment and what that social problem went through. But those who were involved with DVSRG had carried the weight of naming, thinking and discussing seriously how to name the problem for the society and years to come. And there were others, who went through a similar process individually, how to come up with appropriate terms to name the problem. One thing that these activists agree is that the names for domestic violence have gained recognition and become familiar to the public. Whether these interviewees agree or disagree with the naming of domesutikku baiorensu and dī bui as well as potential consequences of having such names will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.
Summary

Within the last several decades, the ways in which domestic violence was perceived and considered changed greatly: from non-existent or at least non-problematic “marital quarrels” to a social problem that is a crime. Gaining a name was a crucial step to this transformational process, as it brought significant changes, such as criminalizing domestic violence and creating the DVP law, as well as creating services for victims and their family. On the other hand, victims, who had been either blamed for abuse and violence or silenced, gained not only recognition but also access to services that could help them deal with abuse and violence in their lives. While this transformation occurred gradually and over many years, it was a significant and pivotal shift that triggered ripple effects in areas of the Japanese government and made fundamental changes in how the system handles domestic violence.

Domestic violence is indeed a serious social problem in Japan that is increasingly gaining recognition. In Asahi Shimbun, articles that featured domestic violence jumped and multiplied shortly before the DVP law was passed, and began declining immediately after the enactment of the law. Based on the ways in which domestic violence is constructed, detailed, and portrayed in these newspaper articles, domestic violence is primarily framed as a women’s problem although other frames, such as social problem, women’s rights, and crime exist too. What it is not is a men’s problem.

While reconceptualization of the notion and beliefs of marital quarrels as a social problem and as human rights violations may be similar in Japan to other parts of the world, the aspect of naming is an element of the social construction of domestic violence
that differs in Japan from other corners of the world. In the following chapter, aspects of naming and associated consequences are explored in more detail.
Chapter 5

Problematics of Domesutikku Baiorensu

Currently in Japan, domestic violence has a name, definitions, recognition, a law, and services designed to protect victims and their family members from abuse at home. Victims of domestic violence are no longer invisible nor blamed for abuse and violence. With the domestic violence prevention law (DVP law) in place since 2001, the Japanese government has been engaged in addressing domestic violence as a social problem. Today women who experience abuse and violence at the hands of husbands or boyfriends are recognized as victims. Abuse and violence that takes place in homes can be expressed as verbal or psychological, physical, or sexual. Repeated and prolonged belittling can have negative impacts leaving the victims with little self-esteem and unable to picture their life without the abuser. In addition, some victims experience economic abuse, having little to no control over money and no access to what they need and would like to purchase. Some victims are isolated from family, with the abusers strictly controlling where they can go, with whom, and when.

Understanding of domestic violence among observers may vary; however, an increasing number of people realize that it is a serious social problem that requires systematic and coordinated intervention to help victims, abusers, and their families to break the cycle that perpetuates abuse and violence.

According to the most recent nationwide prefectural and city and county survey on domestic violence services, all prefectures have an office that specifically addresses and handles domestic violence (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/pdf/2011houkoku_2.pdf). The services they provide range from referrals to
appropriate services, counseling, help securing safety for victims, the provision of
information and assistance in independent living, and more (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-
vaw/soudankikan/01.html).

When it comes to addressing abusers, prefectures, as well as cities and counties,
are not doing nearly as much as they do with victims’ services. According to the same
domestic violence services survey (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-
vaw/chousa/pdf/2011houkoku_2.pdf), only 40% of all the prefectures had a dedicated
office that works specifically with abusive men, though nearly 90% had a place where
men with domestic violence problems and/or other problems can be referred to find the
services and help they need. Aside from referrals, most prefectures (76.6%) reported
doing nothing directly to address abusers. Moreover, the activities of prefectures that
indicated they were doing something regarding abusive behaviors were all related to
research. Although all the prefectures have a dedicated office that handles domestic
violence, when it comes to addressing abuse and violence through abusers, only minimal
efforts are dedicated on both the prefectural and city and county levels.

For prevention activities that involve youth and young adults, the vast majority of
the prefectures (93.6%) said that they had awareness and educational activities for youth.
However, on the city, county, and town level, most relied upon the prefecture activities
and had nothing implemented (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-
vaw/chousa/pdf/2011houkoku_2.pdf). Clearly and understandably, much emphasis has
been placed on the victims and victim services to address abuse and violence
immediately, and there is much more that needs to be done. However, intervention
strategies through abusers lag behind, and prevention efforts lag even further.
Considering that passage of the DVP law in 2001 was a pivotal point, addressing domestic violence in Japan has only begun.

Given the established governmental and non-governmental services and the continuing efforts in developing intervention and prevention strategies, it may appear that advocates and activists need to continue improving the existing systems of interventions and preventions. Yet some consequences that have developed within and from the movement may influence future and further advancement in unexpected ways. In this chapter, various aspects of domestic violence in Japan are explored through the in-depth analysis of the narratives of activist interviewees who participated in this study. The subjects that emerge in this chapter are: 1) How domestic violence victims are perceived; 2) How activists are compartmentalized according to their roles; 3) What is missing in the narratives; and 4) the issues, once again, regarding the naming of domesutikku baiorensu and dibui.

What Victims in Japan Face

As described in Chapter 2, a series of national research studies has been conducted every three years since 1999. By reaching 5,000 purposive random samples of women and men over 20 years of age, the Japanese government has been collecting data on domestic violence, people’s awareness of the issue, and more. Based on these and other national studies, there is enough information gathered to conclude with confidence that in Japan the vast majority of the domestic violence victims are women. One out of four women is said to experience physical domestic violence in their lifetime, while one out of 10 women will experience repeated abuse. For men, the victimization portrayal is quite different, as one out of 10 men experience physical violence in their lifetime. In
terms of repeated physical violence, less than two-percent of men will experience it in their lifetime. Women’s lives are three times more likely to be threatened than men’s, and women in dating relationships are nearly three times more likely to experience physical, psychological, or sexual violence from their intimate partner than men in dating relationships. While these numbers and more are readily available from study results to describe characteristics and prevalence of domestic violence in Japan, there are other aspects of victims that are not available from these studies or their results. Based on the narratives of the activist interviewees in this study, domestic violence victims are recipients of sympathy and expected to leave their abusive intimate relationship.

**The Victimhood Trap: “Good,” Pitied, and Diminished**

Despite the existence of these statistics cited in the previous paragraph, domestic violence is often treated as if it did not exist, and its victims are invisible in society. This disservice contributes to their prolonged mental, emotional, and physical injuries. Family members who witness abuse and violence at home are negatively impacted and are at times directly abused as well. In the worst cases, the hidden domestic violence can literally lead to deaths, as pointed out in Chapter 2. On the other hand, blaming victims for abuse and violence that they did not cause or were not responsible for is not only unfair and unreasonable but wrong. It is equally wrong even if they made mistakes or did something wrong. That does not warrant or justify acts of abuse or violence. While invisibility of victims or blaming them masks the real problems of domestic violence, does it mean that it would be better to sympathize or even pity victims?

Some activist interviewees expressed concerns about how the status of victims has shifted from being invisible to being sympathized with or even pitied. The
recognition of domestic violence as a social problem is a necessary step toward addressing the issue; however, such sentiments lead to the perception of victims as helpless, and therefore, needing people to rescue them. The “poor” victim as a socially constructed category is problematic and may have unwanted, long term consequences.

As detailed in Chapter 1, social constructionists explain the process in which a problem is transformed and becomes a social problem; furthermore, the problem needs innocent victims, it vilifies problem makers, and it urgently demands strategies to address the problematized situation. Both the problem and the victims need to be compelling for people to want to do something about them.

Although highlighting an issue with compelling reasons, blameless victims, vilified problem makers, and a set of possible solutions is a necessary mechanism for creating social problems, this seems to be where the pitfall is: it is critical and necessary to make victims look worthy of receiving help. Social constructionists characterize “good” and “bad” victims, when explaining a transition from a non-issue to a social problem (Loseke, 1992, 1997; Mehrotra, 1999; Tierney, 1982). Not all victims appear worthy and deserving of help: if they do not look innocent or if it appears that they brought the problem on themselves, people will not perceive these “bad” victims as deserving help or see the issue as a problem that requires mending. On the other hand, when victims appear innocent and helpless, people are more likely to be compelled and convinced that these “good” victims deserve help.

Therefore in the past—though not necessarily with conscious intentions of utilizing social problem mechanics—activists in different parts of the world created the case for domestic violence by focusing on the severity of violence, primarily on physical
and sexual aspects, to get the attention of people and make them realize that it is a terrible problem that needs remedy (Mehrotra, 1999; Tierney, 1982). Advocates also emphasized the helpless characteristic of “good” victims: how victims had been stripped of their self-esteem because of the severe physical violence that was coupled with relentless belittling and strict control over time, and how victims had no way of getting out of their abusive relationships on their own. This presentation of “good” victims is accurate to some degree but not entirely. There are victims, especially in comparison to “good” victims, who seem aggressive or who fight back. They may appear as “bad” victims because they act out and do not appear as innocent or helpless, hence, not deserving assistance (Loske, 1992, 1997; Mehrotra, 1999; Tierney, 1982). However, to make the public aware of the problem of domestic violence and to make a compelling case of how victims of abuse and violence were treated and suffered at the hands of their intimate partners, it was logical and strategic to focus on the extreme, and obviously clearly wrong characteristics of abuse. And in the case of Japan, while having successfully transformed domestic violence into a social problem, victims now seem to have been labeled as a group of people to commiserate with and pity.

A few of the activists whom I interviewed made a point of discussing the images of victims and how those images may negatively impact not only the future of victims but also the domestic violence movement at large. I strongly argue that this issue must not be neglected. The concern raised here can be considered as an unintended consequence of the process of making domesutikku baiorensu a social problem. While emphasizing the powerless and helpless characteristics of victims is a logical, strategic, and necessary step toward making domestic violence a social problem, one price that victims may be paying
indefinitely is being labeled as helpless and lacking agency. Tsukada has difficulty explaining her feelings about the sympathized victims and how that sympathy or even pity may be harmful to them. However, her strong sentiments come through clearly:

There is only sympathy toward victims. That is something, I really want to say, it is wrong! (Emphasis added by interviewee) And because there was not even sympathy in the past (chuckles), and considering those times, in a way it is actually an advancement that (victims are) sympathized. But I feel that is wrong. (Victims) should not be sympathized, that is another type of discrimination. Of course, I feel that family courts have changed their attitudes. Compared to the times, when wives were at fault, it is better. But it has flipped the other way around, and they are pitied. (They are) treated as if they have no ability. That is not how it should be. Victims as independent human beings need to learn how to acknowledge their experiences of victimization, and how to help regain confidence that has been taken away from them, and participate in society once again. Not through pity, but by respecting them while working together with them. So, I cannot help but think that to say that there is an understanding among police and others, that understanding is coupled with pity……………… it is hard to explain, but sympathy is wrong (personal communication, July 27, 2009).

The concerns that Tsukada expressed also touch upon the transformation of victims to survivors. Nonaka wondered out loud, “Why can’t women regain energies and become survivors? Why are they remaining as victims? Why? (ibid.)” She has learned first-hand about various social services and their workings addressing domestic violence in the United States, and she is aware of the terms that exist to describe domestic violence victims, “victims,” “survivors,” and “thrivers” (ibid.). Indeed each individual needs to work with her own issue and regain confidence, ability to trust, and self-esteem, among other qualities that move them from victim status to survivor status and beyond. However, victims also need an environment that enables them to become survivors. Tsukada feels that she, other activists, and society at large need to develop ways to enable victims:

What I think is this. People who have experienced victimization, how people with victimization experiences can truly recover (from those
experiences) and be able to fully utilize their abilities, would mean what society as a whole, including people like me on the frontline, can do for them (ibid.).

It is worth noting the fact that someone like Fukushima (personal communication, June 14, 2009.), who has been involved with the domestic violence movement for decades, traveling throughout Japan and talking about her own experiences to raise awareness, uses the term, victim (higaisha, 被害者). She referred to herself as a victim not only when talking about her past, but also about her present self in the context of the domestic violence movement, her future goals, and more. Others like Katayama (personal communication, June 24, 2009), Niigata (personal communication, June 22, 2009), and Nonaka (ibid.), who have had their share of abuse in their intimate relationships, did use higaisha to talk about their past, however, not the present. Some of them referred to themselves as sabaibā, a survivor. There are differences between those who have experienced abuse and violence in the past and how they perceive and refer to themselves.

One may ask, what is the problem with being sympathetic to victims of domestic violence and how they may remain as victims for years to come? After all, they are being acknowledged as victims and are no longer invisible. Moreover, victims are receiving very much needed assistance and services that they had not previously received. The problem with sympathy, however, has to do with the conceptual framework of victims and with how such a framework may have unforeseeable consequences. When people express sympathy towards someone, these sentiments create a hierarchical order of relationships: by sympathizing, the sympathizer elevates her/himself higher than the sympathized. Unlike empathy, in which people put themselves in the other person’s shoes and attempt to feel and understand what she or he is experiencing on an equal level,
sympathy is hierarchical in a sense that one looks down on the other, pitying and feeling sorry for that person without being on an equal footing. There may also be a sense of relief from the sympathizer in that she or he is not experiencing what the sympathized is or has experienced. Sympathizing may also indicate that deep down, a sympathizer may undermine the respect that victims deserve. When these types of notions are imbedded in the general public, people may perceive victims as inferior beings because of their experience, and therefore, victims as a result may be perceived as someone who needs dole outs from society. Victims lose social status.

The sympathetic sentiments that lower victims’ status to less than normal and create an identity that solicits responses with sympathy and pity are not only the problem. As Nonaka and Tsukada point out, it is problematic that victims continue to consider themselves as victims. Individuals require an appropriate amount of time for them to work on their issues but then should move on. However, if they consider themselves only as victims and do not move beyond that, they may remain in this disempowering status indefinitely. Moreover, the lack of language to elevate victims to the status of survivor or even thriver contributes to the perpetual victimhood. Some activist interviewees used sabaihā, the importation of English term, survivor. Not having a Japanese term may pose long-term consequences that may hinder the empowerment of victims (refer to the section 5.4 in this chapter). Also, it is inherently problematic that victims move from their power-imbalanced intimate relationship to the victim/non-victim dichotomized power-imbalanced status in the society. These are more reasons why advocates do need to empathize with victims, and perceive and treat them as people whose rights have been violated, and work together with them to help restore their inner strengths and rights.
The Split Decision

Most activist interviewees discussed the kinds of work necessary to enable victims to become independent. For many activists, helping them become competent and stable is one of the ultimate accomplishments. Hotta, who has worked in both government and private sectors of domestic violence services, situates the issue of domestic violence in the context of poverty and how poverty makes domestic violence advocacy more challenging in terms of separating victims from abusers:

Instead of addressing dī bui solely on dī bui, the problems stemming from poverty are enormous and those are making dī bui work challenging. So then, people, who were born into poverty, grew up in poverty, and cannot be independent, how can we separate (them from abusers)? We cannot. They are unable to escape, and even if we did, they would most likely go back (to their abusers). So, how can we ensure their safety? They would not reach the point of separation or independence (personal communication, July 13, 2009).

For many activists, separating victims from abusers is a natural course of advocacy. Makiguchi talked about financial woes that domestic violence agencies in general experience. In her frustration about inadequate government response and aids, she expresses what government needs to do:

If dī bui is a crime, government needs to do some things better. Treat dī bui victims as crime victims and secure safety for them. Places to live, financial support until they become independent. Mothers and children, their hearts are shattered, so they need some treatment for their emotional healing. Living situation, financial support, and long-term counseling, even with emergency protective order or law, nothing long-term is implemented (personal communication, July 25, 2009).

A few activists considered victims’ independence in a broader and societal context. Hamada, for example, said that in order “to make sure that women are able to live as women, not as a wife or daughter, there are a lot of gaps that need to be filled to prevent discrimination or prejudice against them (personal communication, June 18, 2009).
Victims’ inability to become financially independent is a serious challenge to address; however, what is problematic here is the particular expectation about what victims ought to do—leave a relationship—when they come forward for social services. Leaving abusers is not the choice that all victims choose to make, at least not readily. Azuchi was particularly concerned that victims may not feel like coming forward and talking about their experience because of the imbedded expectation that they should leave their relationship.

I have wavered, but for a long time I have felt that the worst of the DVP law is that it is a law to break up people. When people use it, it directs people to break up. Of those who are married, one out of three or two out of three are victimized. One out of ten has multiple occurrences. One out of 20 feels that they might get killed. To take as an example of one out of 20, she might have felt (like she was going to get killed) once, but it is hardly ever that she has had nothing else besides that one time. There must have been violence in her life regularly. She must have had other incidents, but she remains married. That may be because for women it is impossible to be financially independent. Or, (they are) not empowered. And that may be, but it may also be like, they want to be with someone. Or, even though violence is not good, there are good times, too. Or, not necessarily love, but in other areas, convenience, and so on. So, there are overwhelmingly many who choose to remain married. We say to women, please come talk to us. But once they do, there is only break-up based on the law. It should not be like that. The DVP law needs to be workable even for those who choose not to separate. Otherwise, the vast majority of the women have nothing to do with it. If they tried to do something, there would only be the DVP law available. So, they may not do anything about it. So, there must be something effective that is good for those who choose to remain in relationships (personal communication, July 28, 2009).

Azuchi touches upon an important point: most victims do not leave their relationships, and they have various reasons why not.

In this context, advocates, activists, and others need to be mindful of how they interact with victims. If they are giving the impression, however subtle, that victims are supposed to leave their relationships and become independent, some of the abused may
feel they cannot come for services, or that those services are only for people who want to leave relationships. Some may just want to talk to someone but are not ready to leave or have not even given a thought to leaving. Thus, advocates and service providers need to give thought to the effects of their judgment of victims. Planting seeds of information and education is critical in raising awareness and consciousness. Visits by victims even just to talk create opportunities for service providers to provide information and education that victims may not utilize immediately, but perhaps later. If service providers appear, however, to be advocating only separation or breakups, some victims may never come forward and remain in abuse and violence without resources.

What does it mean to advocate for domestic violence victims? Who decides what is best for victims? Kawakita (2005b), discussing the recovery from domestic violence victimization, suggests that recovery means “one no longer receives violence, one is free from symptoms that were caused by violence, and one is free from second-hand victimization during the recovery process.” She goes on to explain that even in cases where victims choose not to leave abusers, if they were able to stop violence, that is a great outcome based on their self-determination. And if this newly developed situation leads them to mend relationships with abusers, or their mental health improves, then it could very well mean that they are on the road to recovery. She questions whether victims are truly recovering if others make decisions for victims and if they are doing what others tell them.

I strongly agree that supporting self-determination is a critical aspect of aiding domestic violence victims who have been disempowered by their abusers, often for an extended period. Even if advocates perceive that leaving is the best option for victims,
they cannot and should not push that agenda. When victims are subjected to such pressure, it is not so different from their intimate abusive relationships—they do what they are told to do with or without their own will. Moreover, leaving the relationship is not the only way to address domestic violence—unless the victims’ or family members’ lives were in danger. Whether advocates disagree with victims or believe that leaving is the only solution for abuse and violence, professionals in the field of domestic violence need a clear understanding that not everyone wants to leave, they need the capacity to communicate their concerns but without making victims feel that they must do what the advocates say, and they need to listen to and work with victims regardless of their will to leave. As Azuchi put it, victims come in all shapes and forms, and they have different reasons to want to keep their relationships. Always expecting victims to leave is unrealistic and not helpful. More importantly, activists and advocates should not replicate another power-imbalanced hierarchical relationship with victims, telling them what to do just as the abusers were doing. This dilemma bears further analysis from a feminist perspective.

**Hierarchy Trouble in the *Domesutikku Baiorensu* Movement**

Feminists and activists are concerned about and aim to change aspects of society that discriminate against and oppress women. Therefore, addressing sexism, gender discrimination and inequality, and patriarchy are critical to address and change to ensure equality for women and men. In this light, domestic violence is the epitome of what feminists and activists try to abolish. Domestic violence is a symptom of the power and control imbalance and patriarchy in family and society; domestic violence occurs when men abuse the power, control, and advantages that come with their gender and sex and
use these unearned privileges against women (Kawakita, 2005a; Hasegawa, 2005; Nakamura, A. 2005; Tomoda, 2005; Tsunoda, 2001). As narratives in Chapter 4 illustrated, the activists whom I interviewed are highly aware of what ills hierarchy spawns in relationships and society. As self-conscious as they may be regarding sexism and gender inequality and much as they tirelessly address them in their professions, they may be culpable of replicating hierarchy within the domestic violence field.

**The Survivor Strain, Even among Activists**

The dynamics between victims and non-victims and the hierarchical order that lowers victims’ status in relation to non-victims seem to affect not only the general public but also the people involved in the domestic violence movement, i.e. advocates and activists themselves. Some interviewees expressed concerns that an invisible division separated advocates who were domestic violence survivors from advocates without victimization experience and also created hierarchical order between them.

With or without victimization experience, the advocates and activists’ job is to advocate on behalf of victims to raise awareness, increase understanding about domestic violence in the society, create and secure services to assist victims, abusers, and family, help address domestic violence as a social problem, and implement intervention and prevention strategies, and more. Advocates and activists play many roles to victims: they are allies who can be a voice for victims when they are silenced and their voices are not heard; they are experts in the matter of domestic violence, who can influence the creation and implementation of laws, services, and government offices to assist victims; and, in settings where no one else understands the dynamics of domestic violence, advocates and activists do. However, this may be more an idealistic agenda than a reality, in part
because of the apparent divide that separates activists who are survivors of domestic violence from those without victimization experience.

According to Fukushima, there is an atmosphere within the domestic violence movement and among its advocates and activists that is negative to victims: “Even among people who do the dī bui advocacy there is a divide between those who have been victimized and who have not. I feel that, and I am sure that they feel that, too” (ibid.). And she brings up a well-known figure in the domestic violence field, saying that it was disappointing that this person gave her a cold shoulder. For Fukushima, “probably (she was) looking at me as a case—that is what it felt like. Yes, looking (at me) as a case, everyone is. I get bad feelings toward professionals” (ibid.). She partly attributes this divide and lack of support from non-victim to survivor advocates to how few survivors are working as advocates, and she wishes that non-victim advocates could be more supportive to survivor advocates and their work.

Fukushima had more than a few stories to share but used one to fully illustrate her point. About ten years ago, she heard about a feminist counseling training session focusing on listening to victims’ stories. An organization an airplane ride away was invited to the session and talked Fukushima into coming along with them; after all, Fukushima had first-hand experiences to share and they did not, and she lived near the training location. She hesitated a little about appearing without an invitation. Then, in talking with the invited group about how feminist counselors could have invited Fukushima but did not, she began to have strong feelings about it and decided to show up at the training. And when she arrived and the training organizer, whom she knew, saw her, the organizer obviously and immediately became defensive, explaining to Fukushima that
her proximity to the attendees was too close and saying some other things that did not
make sense but only angered her. She has been giving public talks and publishing with
full disclosure. Being recognized by the attendees did not make any difference to her, and
she would have come to their training free of charge. This interchange led Fukushima to
have a stronger conviction about domestic violence advocates and their beliefs and
attitudes toward victims:

People have biases against victims. And there are people who treat
(victims) as fragile objects, or people who completely ignore (victims), or
people who engage in victim-bashing, or people who say things like
“(you) need to do shelter work.” (Chuckles.) (*ibid.*).

Fukushima candidly and bravely shared her long-held strong sentiments with me. As a
survivor advocate, she has difficulty connecting with advocates without victimization
experience, and she has experienced this again and again over the course of decades of
domestic violence work.

The “lack of support” (*Fukushima, *ibid.*) for survivor advocates by advocates
without victimization experience may be tied to the previously noted social environment.
That is treating victims and survivors of domestic violence with sympathy, which in turn
lowers victims’ status and produces a hierarchical relationship between the victimized
and those without victimization. Moreover, sympathy and pity may have the effect of
leaving victims seemingly stuck in perpetual victimhood without the possibility to leave
that status. Both Nonaka, another survivor advocate, and Tsukada, who is without
victimization experience, expressed similar concerns. What Fukushima raises is another
layer to the victimization and victimhood, and how it affects the field of domestic
violence advocacy by failing to provide support for survivor advocates and by being
reluctant to learn from them.
As Fukushima carefully pointed out, her sentiments and experiences are “not based on any research study or cannot be validated” (*ibid.*). While this is true, I take seriously her numerous experiences of discrimination over decades of advocacy work. In fact, in one of my interviews, I witnessed a non-victim activist blatantly disparaging a survivor activist. The casual but clearly expressed disapproval caught my attention, as this survivor activist has been bravely putting her name and face out in the open, addressing violence against women for decades, and had begun doing so at a time when no other domestic violence victims were speaking out publicly about their experiences. It was difficult to discern on what basis the non-victimized advocate disapproved the survivor one, but despite the uncertainty, I suspect the negative comments were related to the victim and survivor status of this particular advocate.

I find it significant that this non-victim advocate expressed strong negative feelings toward a fellow activist, who has been advocating in the field for decades, to someone like me, a stranger who was conducting a study on domestic violence. Was the sentiment so strong that this non-victim advocate could not express it in a milder or more politically correct manner? Did this person consider any consequence of revealing unprofessionally expressed negative sentiments about an apparent ally? Certainly there are always disagreements among activists, and there are different philosophies that activists live by. They do not need to behave like or pretend that they are one happy family; however, personally attacking other allies and activists is disrespectful and only divides the efforts toward movement building. If the behavior is connected to the divide between the survivor and non-victim advocates, as Fukushima’s comments might suggest, it is disturbing, to say the least. And as noted in the previous section, advocates and
activists alike need to reflect and self-examine their biases toward victims and the perceived lower status they unconsciously give to them. Without grappling with this aspect of prejudice, people cannot provide advocacy that is respectful and sincere.

**Split Advocacy: Do You Stand with Victims or Abusers?**

In addition to the division between victim and non-victim advocates, there also tends to be a divide between those who advocate for victims and those for abusers. And this division appears just as problematic as the previous one. The vast majority of my activist interviewees strongly emphasized victims and victim support, while only the handful who work primarily with abusers emphasized the abusers and treatments for them. This difference is understandable, given their professional specialization. However, the division raised here is not a simplistic one drawn by who works with and for whom; rather, it runs deeper in a sense that it pits one against the other.

Nanase, a professional who has been working with abusers for years, presents a concrete example of animosity generated by misunderstanding and by misinterpreted good intentions:

One of the things that I am concerned about is that between women who are doing victim support and supporters who are doing abuser work, there needs to be better and more communication and information exchange. But that is not going well. And those who are victim advocates have prejudicial, negative perceptions and attitudes toward us. It is very unfortunate and disappointing. We needed a different approach, letting people know that we were taking abuser work seriously and taking it head-on. But at the time, we were too fixated on how we did not want to disclose content. Of course, we as the team wanted to create the framework of men for men's work. So, mixing with women was not acceptable, which would have been okay by itself. But because it was a men only setting, we probably needed to take extra steps—provide information, have discussions to ensure the quality of programs with women, and make other efforts. But because of the exclusivity, perhaps it caused misunderstanding. Of course, there are some real problems, and then there are misunderstandings. But stemming from them, there are
some (women) who are distant or skeptical about men's work. But this issue itself, I think, is very serious and important to address (personal communication, June 17, 2009).

Misunderstandings happen within the victim advocacy and abusers’ work amongst colleagues and allies, but professionals and activists whose goals are eliminating violence in intimate relationships need to work together. More serious and concerning here is the apparent lack of effective professional relationships between the groups of advocates for victims and those for abusers. To help victims, abusers, and their family members, professionals in the domestic violence field need to have constructive relationships, not hindering ones. Only collaborative and communicative relationships between those who work with victims and those who work with abusers will help both victims and abusers.

Victims’ advocates need to separate their professional behavior from their anger about the suffering of victims and not take those feelings out on professionals who work for and with abusers, as such work does not mean condoning the abuse and violence that the men inflict on their intimate partners. In fact, it should be quite the opposite, as activists who work with men aim to eliminate exactly this violence. Nanase points out some behaviors by victims’ advocates that are hindering the quality and professionalism of work against domestic violence.

Some (victims’ advocates) are calling people (who work with men) bad names. And when people talk all kinds of things, of course, that is problematic. … particularly when people are supporting abuser work, if victim advocates have some personal objection to abuser work, this may affect how they perceive abuser work and may turn into individual attacks. And the individual attacks may turn into something bigger, "the group that so and so is leading," or "the group that those people are part of." So, then it becomes a bigger problem (ibid.).

It becomes critical for victims’ advocates to view activities with and for abusers as the labors of allies, who are working with men who use abuse and violence. And open
communication and collaboration between the groups of professionals who advocate for victims and those who work with abusers become critical to break down the wall that separates the two groups.

Part of the problem is money. In describing what more needs to be done to address domestic violence, Mōri raised her voice passionately:

In terms of victim support, the DVP law is inadequate, needing to be renewed every three years. So, keep that and continue revising. And money. (Victim support needs) financial assurances. We keep asking for funding. (It is) the same with di bui and seku-hara, much money (goes) into abuser programs, so much money. But for victims of seku-hara, none. Abusers of seku-hara, one-oku. It really is necessary, but what about victims? They need to be supported. But if they think that they are doing something about it through abuser programs, then that is wrong (personal communication, June 16, 2009).

Frustration about the lack of financial support among victim advocates is legitimate and widely shared among the activist interviewees, as the vast majority of them described their own or their colleagues’ financial woes and how difficult it is to keep their work going with grave and debilitating financial hardships. However, it is unprofessional and unreasonable to criticize the amount of money that men’s programs are receiving. While victim supports are a must, and domestic violence activism cannot exist and further evolve without victim supports, it is just as necessary to address abusers. After all, abusers victimize women and violate their human rights by inflicting abuse and violence on their partners. Unless abusers stop their behaviors, victims continue to exist, and violence continues to negatively impact not only victims’ lives but also the lives of family and friends. Mōri’s criticism of the money that abuser programs receive shows much frustration but also a lack of understanding, compassion, support, and solidarity.

9 One-oku is roughly 100 million dollars.
toward the fellow activists working to eliminate and or at least alleviate domestic violence. Whether one approaches domestic violence by helping victims, working with children of victims, or through abusive men, the goal is the same: curbing abuse and violence in intimate relationships and ultimately eradicating this type of intimate violence. For people in the profession, to criticize fellow activists is counterproductive and hinders the progression of the domestic violence movement by further dividing between specializations and professions.

**The Westward Paradigm Push**

As shown in the previous chapters, in and around 1992 the members of DVSRG were fully aware of the historical background of the U.S. feminist and domestic violence movements and were influenced not only by historical aspects of the U.S. movements but also by strategies being deployed to address domestic violence (Kainou et al., 1998). When I interviewed them in 2009, many of the activist interviewees brought up the West time and time again, most notably the United States (U.S.), as a reference, in comparison to Japan, or to illustrate their experiences. This is no surprise given the highly influential presence of the U.S. among the interviewees of this study. Among the twenty-five, two were members of the DVSRG; six went to Beijing in 1995 to attend the United Nations (UN) women’s conference; four lived in the U.S. and obtained an education there; three traveled to the U.S. specifically for workshops or training on domestic violence and have done so multiple times; one had a mentor in Japan who was from the U.S.; four had a teacher or colleague who had traveled to or lived in the U.S. and gained information and knowledge through this colleague in domestic violence; and beyond these subsets, five
other interviewees brought up the U.S. in relation to Japan to illustrate their points. Some of their candid reflections on the influence of the U.S. were negative.

Some of the activist interviewees had been enthusiastic about learning what the U.S. had to offer and about applying the information and knowledge gained in the U.S. to their domestic violence work in Japan. Makiguchi (ibid.) had been greatly motivated and influenced at the UN Women’s Conference held in Beijing in 1995 where she first learned that there was domestic violence worldwide and that it was called *domesutikku baiorensu*. As soon as she returned back to Japan, she wanted to raise awareness about this social problem through the media and do more as well. A few years later, she experienced the renewed excitement and enthusiasm, when she went to the U.S. to learn about domestic violence shelters and their advocates. She was extremely impressed by how a particular shelter was imbedded into the community and how shelter-work was framed as building a safer community. This was a key and pivotal moment for Makiguchi, who later ran a shelter in Japan. Kōchi (personal communication, July 14, 2009), another activist interviewee, went to the U.S. immediately following the 1995 Beijing conference to study the laws and policies pertaining to domestic violence and to get hands-on experience at shelters and support groups. For her, it was an opportunity to learn “advanced strategies” and approaches to addressing domestic violence, and upon returning to Japan, she wanted to implement what she had learned immediately and widely. Indeed, she used a conference as a platform to disseminate her new knowledge and advocate for the DVP law.

The impressions, inspirations, and aspirations seen in Makiguchi, Kōchi, and others are understandable, especially in the mid and late 1990’s, when there was no name
for domestic violence, no law to protect victims, and no appropriate places to which
victims and their family could flee. Learning about domestic violence at the 1995 UN
conference or through colleagues who returned from the U.S., many activists
interviewees looked toward the U.S. for information, knowledge, and strategies. Even
among the interviewees, some activists said that Japan is “20, perhaps 10 years behind
the U.S. (Makiguchi, ibid.),” and questioned which directions Japan need to be headed in
relation to the U.S. Although understandable, this behavior is problematic in the sense
that looking elsewhere for ideas, knowledge, strategies and methods works only if the
findings are critically examined, assessed, and then properly adapted to the different
setting. What is available is not always what works, or works for all.

Some activist interviewees were explicit about how Japan and the U.S. are
different and argued that imitating what the U.S. does is not a good practice for Japan.
Niigata specifically pointed out in Japan’s social atmosphere divorce is much more
difficult in comparison to the U.S. (ibid.). Aichi (ibid.) and Azuchi (ibid.) discussed the
differences in the legal structures and how the U.S. has, for example, mandated programs
for abusers to attend. Given their legal professions, Kosaka (personal communication,
July 14, 2009) and Hamada (ibid.) pointed out how different the legal systems are
between the two countries. Hamada (ibid.) explained the loophole that abused women
would face, when they seek a divorce because major assets, such as life insurance,
property, and large items seem to be categorized under private information and even
wives do not have access to such information. Minor and trivial items, on the other hand,
that cannot be relied upon for financial survival are categorized as common assets and/or
the wife’s contribution. Lack of information about assets is exacerbated when
relationships are abusive and husbands have control over finances while wives have
access only to small allowances and no information on other assets. In the end, husbands
can systematically get and take everything at the time of divorce. Kosaka (ibid.)
discussed the criminal system, using the ways that arrests and sentencing of abusers are
different and how consequential that may be:

(Arrests) deliver a very good message, saying that (dī buī) is something
that violates human rights and individual’s respect. And what (victims)
experience may be universal, but the context in which they experience it is
not universal. A husband who is a professor, or a police, a doctor, would
be quite different than others. If they were arrested, it may be horrendous.
They may lose jobs, may suffer terrible consequences. Criminal courts are
really different. So, trying to do the same thing as the U.S. is difficult and
wrong, I think. And not all victims of dī buī think that it is a crime, and not
all want arrests. So, I think we need to treat this very carefully and
thoughtfully and conscientiously (ibid.).

The issue of context is critical, considering the effectiveness of what activists,
advocates, and governmental administrative offices implement and plan to implement,
especially when things are imported from abroad, where so many things are different, be
they history, culture, social structure, law, and more. Determining what to import and
what elements to alter in order to fit the new place appropriately requires a careful and
critical eye. Iwate reflected on the interaction she had with some Korean feminists and
advocates:

We invited (advocates) from a hotline (in Korea) and had conversations.
Very different from the U.S. or Europe is the Japanese patriarchy, similar
in Korea, too, Korea, China—extraordinarily strong. So, the fact that the
model we were looking at was the U.S. or Europe is very regrettable to me
now. And that was what the Koreans said too (ibid.).

It is difficult to assess from available publications, resources, and the activist
interviews for this study how much of critical assessment and discussions were
exchanged among the DVSRG members, lawmakers, and others who had a say and a
hand in implementing policy, strategies, services, and more. On a smaller level but just as critical, there were many activist interviewees who had their own practices of social services, such as a hotline, shelter, and support groups and who could implement whatever methods they saw fit; these might include practices from the U.S., given that so many interviewees had direct or indirect ties to materials or people from the U.S. Whether small or large, the implementation of foreign-origin ideas should be avoided unless it is first thoughtfully and carefully considered. Some things may work without adaptation, but given the particular social structure, legal system, social services, and other factors that play a role in domestic violence in Japan, it is safe to assume that many things will not be translatable and transferrable specific to Japan. Nonaka sums this up nicely:

I do not think that the U.S. or Canada is the best. But there are things that we can learn from them. There is a saying, “to ride on the shoulders of giants.” So, the U.S. and Canada are the giants in this case, and we can learn from them, and use their resources, digest them, and then do things that are appropriate for Japan. It is really hard to start from scratch, so instead of reinventing the wheel, use existing information wisely (ibid.).

It has been 18 years since the term, domesutikku baiorensu first appeared in Asahi Shimbun, and 12 years since the DVP law has been incorporated into the legal system. Several activist interviewees are concerned about or questioning the efficacy of what they have imported into Japan. It is not too late to re-examine their systems, to look at other countries, not just the West that is considered advanced, but other places as well, and to learn from them what has been working and what has not, and to use that information to make adaptations for addressing domestic violence in Japan effectively and culturally appropriately. As Japan rides on the shoulders of the West and others, its advocates need
to be thoroughly in tune with the needs of victims, abusers, and their family members in order to prevent abuse and violence in the specific context of Japan.

**Missing in Action**

Although there were no screening criteria for my activist interviewees that specified the type of domestic violence work they did (see Chapter 3 for details; refer to appendix for characteristics of interviewees), three of the twenty-five worked with men abusers, and one with both women victims and men abusers, and all the rest turned out to be victims’ advocates, ranging widely from counselors, shelter advocates, a medical doctor, a TV journalist, educators, to lawyers. Among the 21 victim advocates, the largest group of all interviewees, six of them provided direct support through shelters. Given these sample characteristics, it is reasonable that much of narratives revolve around providing support and services to victims. Yet this strong focus also raises concerns, especially when considering the future of domestic violence work and its effectiveness, as shelter work, for example, addresses only one small aspect of domestic violence as a whole.

*The Press of the Immediate*

For many activist interviewees, who see the lack of financial resources as one reason why women stay in their abusive relationships, women’s ability to gain psychological and physical independence is synonymous with financial independence. This is particularly obvious among immigrant women. Activists like Masuzoe know all too well how difficult it is for them to leave their abusive relationships owing to their foreign status in the country, limited language abilities, lack of work experiences, lack of knowledge of the community, and more. In general, these characteristics stemming from
their particular social locations make foreign women more unemployable than Japanese women, and hence confront them with more and exacerbated challenges when dealing with abuse and violence (personal communication, June 21, 2009). But Japanese women in abusive domestic situations typically also face financial difficulties. Rooted in her own experiences, Fukushima is a particularly strong advocate for connecting domestic violence with financial aspects of women’s lives and for increasing women’s employability and ability to self-employ. Yet she has experienced blatant disapproval of addressing domestic violence in this way:

Something like this happened one time at a talk (I gave) in an area that had particularly active women. Oh, it is already seven or eight years ago. I was asked, “Don’t you do shelter?” So, I replied, “No, I will not do shelter.” Then, I was criticized, told it was bad. (Chuckles) And I was told, “You should do shelter” among other things. And I was like, leave me alone. (Chuckles) It was a woman who was a member of a group that has been working on gender issues. Well, I think that there are many perspectives regarding a phenomenon called domesutikku baiorensu. So, I think that it is up to individuals how they get involved with it. Well, at the time, doing shelter work was the most common, and because it was considered most common, I received such a criticism, I think (ibid.).

Fukushima, a survivor who experienced abuse and violence first-hand for many years, gives objective considerations to the social atmosphere at the time and tries to make sense of criticism she received from another feminist activist at around the time when the DVP law was passed. As Chapter 4 illustrated, this was when the numbers of Asahi Shimbun articles on domestic violence multiplied, and the urgency to do something to help victims was immense. In this context, Fukushima’s sympathetic view is that the criticizing feminist, blinded by her own enthusiasm to help victims, could not perceive ways other than providing shelter as appropriate domestic violence work, especially coming from a survivor activist. This type of view is very limiting and even hindering to advancing
domestic violence work. While sheltering victims is often the first point of contact in terms of intervention, many other areas, such as mental and physical health, finances, employment, and much more, need to be coordinated to help victims. When it comes to children, another array of intervention strategies needs to be coordinated, especially with the education system. And abusers need their share of intervention and support to stop using abuse and violence in their relationships. These are only in the realm of intervention; implementing prevention strategies requires yet different approaches and tactics. As Fukushima said, there are many different perspectives and approaches in addressing domestic violence. Broadening the scope of strategies is critical, not limiting.

**The Missing Men: The Overlooked Abusers and Underused Male Advocates**

Another problem of invisibility in the narratives of the activist interviewees concerns the men who abuse. Although the vast majority of the interviewees were in the field of victim advocacy, they should be able to examine the entire field objectively as they, in answer to my questions, determine what the pressing issues are, what directions they need to take next, and what changes and improvements should advance the field as a whole, not concentrating exclusively on their own professional focus. Lack of attention to men’s and abusers’ work is a factor that slows down further development of the overall domestic violence work.

As one of the pioneers in the men’s work, Nanase, recalls how out of necessity he started this effort on his own:

> To solve gender problems, working with women was not enough. (You) cannot do it without working with men. But at the time, we did not think that any public services would work with men. So, to send out a message that it is necessary to address men and work with men, we created our own space (*ibid.*).
Although this was before the DVP law was enacted, Nanase believes and says that “in terms of men’s work, nothing has changed, really. There is no progress with that, I do not think” (ibid.). Aichi shares the same sentiments on the lack of men’s work and support for men’s work in general (ibid.). Much attention seems to have been paid to victims and victims work and not enough on abusers. This is problematic in light of stopping abuse and violence in intimate relationships, not to mention prevention work for men.

Aichi also raises the important aspect of diversity within the men’s work and how standardizing is not necessarily effective. One aspect of the diversity is the philosophical differences between the men’s support groups operated by women and by men:

Those places (men’s support groups operated by women) start with wanting men to admit their wrong doing. And that is different than what we do. Ending violence is the same goal, but not the ways things are done. And some men do well, and some do not. And without denying individuals, we want to accept who they are, understand their anger, but not express it through violence, and become a better person. When violence in the family ends, it would translate into no violence in the society. And we emphasize that it is necessary for them (to stop violence). And become good friends later once they stop violence, and build relationships. Other programs stress admitting you are wrong, and that is where they start. I very well understand why they start there. But there are people who just cannot start there. So, some came all the way from (Region) because they could not do those programs. And when they joined our group, they felt that they were listened to and were accepted as who they were. Good to have both. They do their thing, and those who really want to quit violence can shop around. And as long as they can quit violence, either way would be fine as long as it works for them. It seems it is difficult for those in (Region) to accept that kind of approach (ibid.).

The differences in approaches here stem from the differences in philosophies among the advocates: one is starting with the admission of wrongdoing, and the other, Aichi’s approach, of accepting abusers as who they are with or without admission of wrongdoing. I agree with Aichi’s argument that it is possible to employ different approaches in conducting men’s programs, as fitting all abusers into a single mold may not be suitable.
Allowing different types of men’s work may be more helpful in reaching out to as many abusers as possible, giving alternatives to those who cannot take part in a program only because they cannot fully admit from the start that they committed wrongdoing against their intimate partners. When these abusers are turned away and find no other assistance or opportunities to learn, then men’s group advocates have failed them, which means that it becomes critical to set aside differences between philosophies on men’s work and strive toward the goal of ending abuse and violence through working with men. It is important to co-exist and collaborate among the professionals of men’s work regardless of their philosophies and focus on the larger goals. Eventually, it should also be possible to evaluate outcomes of different programs to see if one approach seems clearly more successful than another.

Not only diversity and choices but also flexibility becomes important for men’s programs in Aichi’s point of view:

I wish that there were different places using different methods for men. When the government does it, methods would be fixed with some particulars, and that would not be good. So, it would have to be private and community organizations. Women are doing victims support. So, what about men? Doing nothing will not help or fix them. So, what has been happening now is punishing these men, sending them to jails and prisons for violations of the DVP law, having them pay fines or serve time. And while they are locked up, would they get treatment? No. And no such thing as fixing naturally without doing anything (men will not get better by doing nothing) (ibid.).

The concerns and frustration expressed here by Aichi are shared with Nanase, and they bring out important and critical aspects of men’s work and how it is lagging behind in comparison to women’s work. Owing to the lack of services or advocates, combined with the enforcement of the DVP law and arrests that come with it, men are getting arrested and imprisoned but not necessarily receiving treatments. Aichi expressed concerns about
how ineffective mandatory treatment of domestic violence abusers by way of arrests has been in the U.S., and how the recidivism rate in terms of using abuse and violence in intimate relationships has been persisting over the years without showing positive effect (ibid.). Clearly much more needs to be done for abusers, even with basic support services like hotlines, men’s group, and counseling. And more importantly, there needs to be done something before abuse and violence takes place in women’s lives.

Nagasaki, an interviewee who as a medical doctor has seen the results of sexual and domestic violence in her patients for decades, strongly feels that working with men is critical, “especially now that we have ways to respond to domesutikku bioresusu:”

Men's education. Men's education is lacking. Men's sexuality education. After all, men are saying stuff like “they (men) will know naturally” among themselves. But that is just not true. Men's sexuality education, and the most important is responsibility education about sexuality, how they would be responsible for their own behaviors. To teach those things. And manners, etiquette about these things. And then, sexual acts need to be accompanied by affection. So this kind of education is lacking. And this is not being done. So, men's sexuality education is lacking. For women, of course, they have opportunities to learn. And they may have time to go to cultural classes. But men do not do those things. But then, if they have conversations like this at work—no, they do not. Manners, etiquette. And also to be critical of themselves. It is lax. So, to educate something like this (ibid.).

Not just sexuality education but violence and anti-sexism education in general becomes critical as a means of intervention and especially for prevention. If one would like to eradicate abuse and violence, teaching moments need to happen before abuse and violence occur. While intervention is obviously necessary—people impacted by abuse and violence need help immediately—prevention must be emphasized at least as much as intervention. To raise awareness that abuse and violence against intimate partners constitutes a human rights violation, that using violence is an inappropriate way to treat
not only intimate partners but also everyone, and learning how to appropriately communicate with one another without resorting to abuse and violence becomes very important in educating women and men, young and old, but particularly for individuals from an early age.

*Prevention’s Forgotten Promise*

Through the narratives and illustrations of what the activist interviewees did, it is clear that they are caring people with generosity and great passion to address domestic violence: they spent their own moneys to run small projects, opened their homes to shelter victims, shed tears together with clients about the system that was unreasonable and inflexible, and more. Their beliefs and attitudes extend to the children who have witnessed abuse and violence, but, although some activist interviewees work directly with negatively impacted children alongside their abused and victimized mothers, much of the passion and drive seem to remain at the immediacy of abuse and violence: it stops there. Not many talk about prevention and the need of prevention even in the light of future considerations. This heavy focus on intervention and addressing the immediate impact of abuse and violence is almost debilitating with respect to the directions of the future domestic violence movement and strategies.

The activist interviewees who are part of or affiliated with shelter work are particularly concerned about the safety and welfare of children, and how abuse and violence negatively affects them. They regularly see and hear about these disturbing effects and observe them first-hand. Through a private study specific to her region, Kōchi discovered that five percent of children who come to shelters with their mothers have been sexually victimized (*ibid.*). Akita also mentioned seeing many cases of *dì bui*, in
which children as well as women were abused, including sexually (*ibid.*). They are echoed by Hamada (*ibid.*), Hotta (*ibid.*), Makiguchi (*ibid.*), and Nonaka (*ibid.*), who note that because exposing children to domestic violence is considered as child abuse, these children from abusive homes need immediate, extensive, and long-term treatment and assistance that should be coordinated by various professionals, such as social workers, mental health professionals, medical professionals, school officials, and more. However, attention rarely goes beyond such interventions. What about prevention?

Certainly, seeing and hearing about children negatively impacted by abuse and violence at home is heartbreaking to most people, particularly for knowledgeable and passionate advocates against domestic violence. It is nonetheless troubling to hear very little about prevention not only as part of the advocates’ future aspirations, but also in considerations of which directions the domestic violence movement should take next. Intervention is consuming and stressful, and involves ugly sides of human beings that people do not necessarily want to see or hear about. As a former domestic violence advocate in a shelter, I can attest to that and much more. However, it is also important for any kind of domestic violence advocate to realize and act on the fact that without addressing causes of this problem, abuse and violence will continue.

Though few, some activist interviewees are actively engaged in educating and raising awareness among younger generations with prevention in mind. They have realized that intervention alone is not good enough to address and eventually eliminate domestic violence. With her repeated begging and pleas, Niigata persuaded her prefecture office to take action: “Because I complained enough, the prefecture created guidelines for (high) school teachers, so (we are) moving forward slowly” (*ibid.*). Makiguchi also went
into high school classrooms with dī bui education and saw thousands of students in one year until the funding from the city dried up (ibid.). Nanase has undertaken men’s and masculinity education with children and men (ibid.). Though Katayama, as a professional in the broadcasting business, feels she has limitations in terms of directly providing services there, she has been active in other capacities in the Japan Domestic Violence Prevention and Information Center (ibid.).

In talking about future projections of the domestic violence movement, a handful of activist interviewees mentioned “not enough prevention” (Katayama, ibid.; Niigata, ibid.; Masuzoe, ibid.; Nanase, ibid.). Despite their small number, those activist interviewees who brought up the need to strengthen prevention have specific approaches and strategies in mind, which points to the seriousness of their concern. Niigata, who was successful in implementing a guideline in high schools, argues that “they need stuff like that in grade and junior high schools; otherwise, it would be too late” (ibid.) for educating and raising awareness among children and youth.

To convince people that they should take the prevention of domestic violence seriously, Masuzoe (ibid.) and Nanase (ibid.) believe it should be framed as a children’s human rights issue. In my view, this reframing of domestic violence as an issue of children’s human rights, with emphasis on children’s wellbeing, is not only a good tactic but the right approach. Katayama expressed the sentiment candidly and objectively:

Child abuse is easier to understand (for people). Among people I have talked with, the notions existed. (These are) adult women and their problems, and they chose their life, and why can’t they leave? So, compared to child abuse, it was more difficult to convey what dī bui is, and it was more difficult for people to understand (ibid.).
People would have an easier time becoming sympathetic and understanding toward children who are not only witnessing abuse and violence, but also receiving abuse and violence in the household. After all, children can be easily perceived as vulnerable and innocent. If people can be convinced that domestic violence is harmful to children and that abuse and violence at a young age can negatively impact their lives immediately and for years to come, efforts at prevention can be understood as an absolute necessity, and efforts, funding, and programs can be implemented within the society. Visions that emphasize intervention and prevention equally can be more effective and impactful and directed toward termination of violence.

By paying attention to the presence and the void in the narratives of the activist interviewees, it becomes clear how domestic violence is being treated and addressed in Japan. Japan has a reactive way of working with domestic violence with heavy emphasis and focus on victim intervention, namely sheltering. Programs for intervening with abusers or for preventing domestic violence overall are nearly absent. While understandable, the emphasis on victims and on the immediacy and urgency of addressing abuse and violence needs to be shared with the importance of prevention. After all, without prevention efforts, abuse and violence will not stop. This should be taken seriously not only among activists and advocates, but also and especially by the Japanese government. To show its seriousness and the commitment in addressing domestic violence, the government needs to reassess the importance of prevention. More importantly, this reassessment and reevaluation needs to come with real changes and actions, not simply rendering to rhetoric.
Honestly? Activists Reflect on the Foreign Brand

None of the activist interviewees participating this study knew the name, domesutikku baiorensu or dī bui, when they began their domestic violence work, be it a few decades ago or even longer. As detailed in Chapter 4, the interviewees unequivocally expressed their deep seated sentiments regarding having a name to call this phenomenon, domesutikku baiorensu: it is an extraordinarily good thing to have a name for this social problem and to be able to call it domesutikku baiorensu. Without a name, activists themselves did not know what exactly they were doing, nor were they able to concretely understand what they were fighting against. Moreover, the general public in Japan now recognizes key aspects of domestic violence. According to the 2011 study\textsuperscript{10} conducted by the Gender Equality Bureau (GEB) (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/images/pdf/h23danjokan-2.pdf), nearly 75\% of respondents indicated that they were familiar with the domestic violence prevention law (DVP law). There was hardly any difference in responses between females and males, and slightly over 11\% of females and males were not only familiar but also knew the content of the DVP law. Those who knew nothing about the law or its existence made up 22.5\% in total. In comparing against the previous research studies from 2005 and 2008, there have been little changes in the responses. Between different age groups, the older groups seemed to have slightly better knowledge. In terms of knowing where to seek help, about 33\% of respondents knew about services, a slight increase from the 2008 study.

\textsuperscript{10} Nationwide study of adults 20 years or older. First, regions were purposively selected, and then residents within those regions were randomly selected. Surveys were either picked up in a sealed envelope or mailed back. 5,000 surveys were distributed, and 3,293 collected with the return rate of 65.9\%. There were 1,754 females and 1,542 males. Questions on the domestic violence prevention law, violent behaviors within intimate relationships, experiences of violence, and more were asked.
While the general public may be increasing in their knowledge regarding domestic violence and its law and services, the activist interviewees still raised concerns in their narratives about how domestic violence is constructed in general and how the Japanese government defines domestic violence.

**Efforts of Domestic Violence Study and Research Group: Placing Japan in the Global Context**

As detailed in previous chapters, naming a social problem has benefits that are crucial. A name to a social problem provides a common language to talk about. It gives recognition among people and helps them gain an understanding of the problem. Moreover, a name helps people develop solutions to address the problem. In the case of Japan, the name they have to address domestic violence is *domestikku baiorensu* or *dī bui*, the imported English name and its abbreviation. There were reasons to import the English term, but was it a wise choice?

“You will have to ask (members of) the DVSRG about that,” Aichi said (personal communication, June 19, 2009) along with quite a few others, when they were asked about the naming of *domesutikkun baiorensu*. As detailed in Chapter 4, this naming did not come simply or easily: much thought and care went into it. According to Kainou et al. (1998), the feminists of DVSRG were well aware of the struggles around naming the problem in the United States, as well as the history behind them. The term, *domestic* denoted intimacy (Kainou et al., 1998; Loseke, 1987, 1992), which the DVSRG considered critical (Kainou et al., 1998). Also, the name *domestic violence* was the product of the women’s liberation and battered women’s movements. The name not only meant violence in intimate relationships, but also represented feminists’ struggles against
the social structure that perpetuated the oppression of women. What the Japanese feminists in DVSRG were also aware of was the shifts in meanings, when the name changed from *battered women* to *spouse abuse* in the U.S. In its transition to *spouse abuse*, the implications about male domination, oppression of women, and women’s plight for gaining awareness about abuse, were lost (Kainou et al., 1998). Because of these meanings that came with the English name, along with the symbolic representation of the history of women’s struggles against patriarchy in the U.S. and England, and because of the absence of the equivalence in Japanese language, the Japanese feminists of DVSRG made a conscious decision to use the English term, *domestic violence*, as a name for this social problem in Japan.

Matsue was the only activist interviewee who had never thought about the naming of *domesutikku baiorensu* or *dī bui*. Matsue was honest about his disregard and admitted that he never thought anything of it until he was asked in the interview. However, he was quick to reflect and consider that it might have been better had it been a Japanese name that men easily understood. Given that his involvement with domestic violence was through men, Matsue went on to say that a Japanese label that was relatable and struck men’s heart might have been beneficial especially for men (personal communication, July 28, 2009). The fact that Matsue did not question *domesutikku baiorensu* or *dī bui* until he was asked seems to indicate that he was comfortable with the terms. At the same time, the swiftness in answering with specific ideas for what would have been better names seems also to indicate some aspects of naming that he perceived as inappropriate.

A few activist interviewees had a somewhat neutral attitude and thoughts about using English terms to address domestic violence in Japan. Masuzoe thought, “to say *dī
bui was easier” and had “no resistance” (ibid.). And Nonaka “did not have much resistance or awkwardness in using English” (ibid.). Most interviewees, however, had some concrete thoughts about the imported English terms: positive or negative.

Hanamaki, one of the few strong proponents of the English term, domesutikku baiorensu, highlighted its positive impacts. Because the Japanese term, otto, koibito karano bōryoku (violence by husbands and boyfriends; 夫・恋人からの暴力), seemed too mundane and unlikely to induce curiosity or have an impact, DVSRG perceived domesutikku baiorensu as effective in raising curiosity and making impressions on people who hear and see the name. Moreover, members of the DVSRG were aware and knowledgeable of the history of the women’s movement in the U.S. (personal communication, July 1, 2009). Kōchi, another proponent, elaborated further on the significance of using an English term: English is an international language, a common language that women globally have to share and understand each other with. By choosing to name the problem domesutikku baiorensu, women in Japan now have a tool to share experiences of domestic violence with women globally (ibid.). With these reasons and intentions, DVSRG elected to use an English term, domesutikku baiorensu.

These intentions and expected responses that DVSRG sought were narrated by Yao, who was working as a domestic violence hotline operator and group facilitator at the time of the interview. She had experienced domestic violence in her marriage and even after divorce prior to getting involved in domestic violence work. Yao is also a strong proponent of using domesutikku baiorensu not only because the name provides recognition of one’s own experience, but also because it gives a sense of belonging and of a globally shared experience. Previously, Yao “had no idea that it (domesutikku
baiorensu) was a commonly shared problem, and we were connected with people in the U.S., Asia, and other parts of the world (personal communication, July 14, 2009).

What DVSRG intended and set out to do was reinforced by the fact that the pre-existing Japanese terms, such as family violence (kateinai bōryoku, 家庭内暴力) or violence between marital couples (fūfukan bōryoku, 夫婦間暴力), were deemed inadequate to address domestic violence properly (refer to Chapter 4). Strong supporters of DVSRG and its work, Hanamaki (ibid.) and Kōchi (ibid.), to name a few, were particularly adamant about using domesutikku baiorensu. But how are the terms domesutikku baiorensu and dī bui perceived and considered among the foremothers and forefathers of the domestic violence movement?

**But What about a Japanese Name?**

“Now dī bui has been familiarized, but I thought that it did not have to be English,” said Hotta (ibid.), who has professional experiences in both government and private sectors of domestic violence services. In fact, her sentiments were shared with the majority of the activist interviewees who participated in this study: the name of domestic violence should have been Japanese.

Fukushima, who survived years of sexual and domestic violence, strongly feels uncomfortable using domesutikku baiorensu and questions why the name could not have been Japanese since understanding would then have come easier to people. With domesutikku baiorensu, meaning is lost in translation, or people would not understand what is instantly and intuitively conveyed (ibid.). Niigata not only felt uncomfortable with the English name but felt that “there was something wrong at times because it is
hard for foreign terms to sink in” (ibid.). Hotta, a member of a shelter at the time, actively contested using English in their workplace:

I wanted to turn it (domesutikku baiorensu) into Japanese……it was directly imported in from the United States and used as it was. I mean, when you say it, (no one) understands it, and you have to explain every single time (ibid.).

Nanase, working with men, also expressed his strong sentiments regarding dī būi:

Felt strong about replacing (dī būi) with a Japanese term. Been feeling like that, but it has not been done. I think that it would be difficult to have a Japanese name, but then, there is this complicated name like “Gender Equality Bureau (Danjo Kyōdo Sankaku; 男女共同参画). It would be best to have something more natural (ibid.).

Though these activists and others very well understood that the Japanese equivalents to “family violence” or “marital violence” were problematic, they still felt strongly that a name for domestic violence should have been Japanese.

Using a new name with a clean slate appears to be the easiest way to identify a social problem without confusion. As Katayama puts it, “If you use and name a new name, without pre-existing perceptions or assumptions, people can accept the term” (ibid.). However, it is also possible to use existing terms to name a phenomenon. Hotta was well aware of this strategy and questioned why DVSRG did not declare like the feminists in the United States:

We could have declared, “This is the definition of the term. This term is normally used like this, but from here on and in this context, the term means this. We should have declared like that. But that did not happen (ibid.).

The declaration might have taken care of potential confusion that various existing terms might have caused; even risking confusion from multiple usages of existing terms, Hotta still felt that Japanese would have served better and more effectively.
Tsukada, although a strong supporter of DVSRG, expressed the most and deepest concerns regarding the term *domesutikku baiorensu*. Of course, she wholeheartedly feels that having a name for a problem and having a language to talk about it was an absolute necessity to address domestic violence. However, she questions the quality of the name and raises potential negative consequences from using English. As briefly explained in Chapter 4, according to Tsukada (*ibid.*), DVSRG had serious discussions about how best to name the social problem. “Family violence” was not appropriate because of the pre-existing meaning of violence against parents by children and young adults. “Violence between marital couples” was not deemed appropriate, either, because it limited the relationship only to marriages, and moreover, the directionality of violence was lost and neutralized. In these struggles, DVSRG specifically chose to name themselves as Domestic Violence Study and Research Group (otto·koibito karano bōryokuchōsa kenkyusho; 夫·恋人からの暴力調査研究所) in Japanese. In terms of naming the social problem, DVSRG decided to use *otto·koibito karano bōryoku* temporarily. They prioritized raising awareness of the issue and problematizing domestic violence as of utmost importance, and chose not to wait until they came up with a perfectly fitting name. Meanwhile, without a good name at hand, members of DVSRG were using the abbreviation of domestic violence, *dī bui*, among themselves for internal purposes and for convenience. Then, somehow, *dī bui* made it to the outside of DVSRG and into the public sphere. As if it caught on fire, it spread and gained more and more recognition than either the Japanese term or *domesutikku baiorensu*. The name that was intended to be temporary became permanent, and *dī bui*, which was only for the internal use gained its longevity in
the public sphere. After that, DVSRG never came up with a proper name to replace the provisional one.

Although Tsukada wholeheartedly shared the importance of urgently making the problem of domestic violence known and of raising awareness, in her viewpoint, DVSRG’s naming process was fatally flawed. Although Tsukada holds DVSRG responsible for failing to name the problem properly and squarely in Japanese, she also places it in the larger context of society, and points out that the ability to use Japanese language among its citizens has been deteriorating:

Problems.....we have the same problems (as English speaking countries) in Japan, and it is very critical how to make those aware, how to accurately capture those when they are brought into Japan. Well, our Japanese language abilities are deteriorating, and that is part of it. At the beginning of the Meiji era, a lot of Western philosophies came in. All those are concisely translated into Japanese. Like what we call, “freedom,” or “society,” all those. So in this sense, we have already lost the ability to translate. It is not just in this (domestic violence) field. Katakana is rampant. That illustrates the situation. It is very unfortunate, but it is the proof of how much our abilities to use Japanese have deteriorated. I do not think that it is a good thing. Of course not! (Exclamation added by interviewee) Because dī bui by itself, (you) cannot understand what it is (Tsukada, ibid.).

Realistically, names even if they were in Japanese, do not necessarily convey meanings fully or completely, and there may very well be a gap between what the names are supposed to mean and what the general public understands of them. This alone poses challenges when raising awareness and educating the public. Combined with names that originate in a foreign language, the challenges are multiplied. And Tsukada's resentment toward the terms and her uncertainty about whether a well thought-out Japanese name could have been established, are understandable. When the general public does not intuitively understand what the term is and what it means, it takes extra steps, time, and
efforts to educate them. And the fact that most of the interviewees have questioned *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dî bui* and wondered why there could not have been a Japanese term indicates that even among the domestic violence activists and professionals and even many years after the names appeared in the public domain, there were some shared negative sentiments about the naming of this particular social problem.

**Consequences of the Foreign Brand**

With or without association to DVSRG, a key group in choosing the terms *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dî bui*, the vast majority of the activist interviewees have given some thought about the name or have experienced instances that made them pause to think about the terms. Although the interviewees unanimously endorsed the importance of having a name to call the phenomenon, the majority had negative reflections on using words that originated in English. Their negative sentiments stem from exactly this, the foreign language.

Foreign words are common in Japan, part of people’s everyday life, and integral to the Japanese language system. Watanabe et al. (1993) and Hayashi and Ikegami (1980) note the three distinctive writing systems used for Japanese. One, *kanji*, uses pictorial characters that originated in China. Each character signifies a meaning and makes sense by itself or creates another meaning in combination with other characters. Another system, *hiragana*, which consists of 46 letters derived from simplified *kanji*, allows phonetic writing. Third is *katakana*, another type of simplified *kanji* that also consists of 46 letters. It is employed: 1) to write phonetically the names of foreign places or persons; 2) to write phonetically terms from foreign languages; 3) to write the names of animals and plants; 4) and lastly, to give emphasis to words and phrases. Accordingly, both
domesutykku baiorensu and dī bui, imported from the English language, are written phonetically in katakana, signifying that they were originally foreign. Despite the fact that katakana shows the regular incorporation of foreign terms into the Japanese language, some activists had serious concerns about the use of domesutykku baiorensu and dī bui. These are their reasons.

**Forfeiting the Intuitive Connection**

Many of the activist interviewees worried that because the names are in English and an abbreviation of an English term, the general public has no instant connection to them. In other words, the names are unrelatable. And when people cannot relate to the names, it poses problems for activists. Many of the interviewees have seen this failure to relate. Fukushima’s words sum it up. “I could not associate my experiences with the name, dī bui, because it was a foreign term” (personal communication, June 14, 2009).

“Do not use a foreign term! Not understandable!” is what a mayor said to Makiguchi, who has been managing a shelter for decades (Emphasis added by interviewee) (personal communication, July 25, 2009). Because of the mayor’s preference, Makiguchi opted to use a Japanese spousal abuse term for all the work she and her shelter organization did. Mōri, who has trained many professionals over the years, thinks that domesutykku baiorensu and dī bui are fairly well recognized, but explains why using foreign terms is nonetheless not a good idea:

I wanted to use names that are as easy (for people to understand) as possible to communicate. I think it was at a talk in 1992. After giving a talk on domesutykku baiorensu, a woman came to me. And she began talking about herself. So, I said to her, “Ah, that is domesutykku baiorensu, is it not?” And the woman said, “Oh, no, it is nothing fancy like that.” So, immediately I felt, this is no good. When I say, “it is XXX,” to people, a light bulb turns on. I wanted to use names that were like that. So at that
time, I repeatedly thought to myself that *domesutykkubaiorensu* is hard to understand (*ibid.*).

What concerns many of the activist interviewees is that people’s recognition of the names is not synonymous with understanding the names (details below). Anzai, who works directly with victims and abusers individually and in groups, has seen many clients being unable to relate to the names or having difficulties to do so, and despite the increasing familiarity of *domesutykkubaiorensu* and *dī bui*, she doubts that people’s ability to relate to the names has increased much over the years.

People may understand conceptually but cannot relate (the names) to their own behaviors. It is something that happens to other people. They do not truly understand. It is difficult to connect the dots. *Đī bui* is something different or special, but what they do—slamming a door shut, demanding sex (against one’s will)—is not *đī bui*. This, 10 or 20 years ago or now, is not much different. They may know the names but do not have an understanding of what it is. The ability to see what they do is *đī bui* hardly exists (personal communication, June 28, 2009).

Even after the term, *đī bui*, became available and gained familiarity, Anzai’s clients do not use it to describe or talk about their issue. And this to Anzai is an indication of how her clients, and by extension the broader general public, are having difficulty relating to *domesutykkubaiorensu* and *đī bui*.

So, I use the term, *đī bui*, and explain to clients that in Japan these days, sexual coercion is called *đī bui*. Then, for the first time, clients realize and say, "Oh, yes, it is." Clients hardly ever use the term, *đī bui*, on their own. Only the last few years, a few clients would ask, "Is it *đī bui*?" (*ibid.*).

The disconnect people have to the names, in Hotta’s eyes, reached the point that “if someone appears in front of them, they cannot match the phenomenon to the actual cases, to people” (personal communication, July 13, 2009). And Katayama contextualized it further, saying that unless they know someone in their life who had experienced domestic violence, people would have difficulty understanding it (personal communication, June
24, 2009). For many activist interviewees, the ability to relate to the names among clients and the general public alike was critically missing and therefore was problematic. After all, what good are names if they do not resonate with people?

The concerns of an inability to relate to domesutykku baiorensu and dī būi go hand-in-hand with concerns about the loss of instant and intuitive understanding that these activist interviewees expressed. Because domesutykku baiorensu and dī būi originate in English, unless one is fluent in the language, the meaning of the names is lost in translation. “You cannot smoothly get into katakana language. In terms of the language, the meaning of it alone, the content would be difficult to understand” (personal communication, June 17, 2009), Nanase said clearly and strongly. The advantage of having a Japanese name would have been that understanding among people would have come easier. With katakana English, meaning is lost, or people would not understand what it is instantly (Fukushima, personal communication, June 14, 2009).

Many activist interviewees expressed deep concerns because people are not able to relate to domesutykku baiorensu and dī būi or have no intuitive understanding of those terms because they originate in the English language. But that is not all. There is another aspect of the names that some activist interviewees have problems with.

**Foreign Name, Foreigners’ Problem**

For some activist interviewees, the difficulty regarding the use of a foreign language to address domestic violence rested at a deeper level, affecting people’s understanding or ability to relate to terms that are foreign. As explained earlier, one of the ways katakana is used is for phonetically writing terms, or names of places or persons’ that are foreign (Hayashi and Ikekami, 1980; Watanabe et al., 1993). Hence, for some
Japanese, using *katakana* to write *domesutikku baiorensu* denoted that it was foreign. This was problematic and raised eyebrows.

Anzai, who has been working as a counselor and exposed to people’s reactions first hand, reflected on the use of *katakana*: “It gives a sense that the name came from outside (of Japan), and perhaps that may lead people to think that it has nothing to do with them” (*ibid.*). Similarly, Azuchi concluded based upon her interactions with both women and men: “*Dī bui* and *domesutykku baiorensu*. English and *katakana*, and they have nothing to do with us. I think that it had impact like that (on people), reversal effect” (personal communication, July 28, 2009).

The concept of “nothing to do with us” was raised among different activist interviewees. It signifies their legitimate shared concerns, especially because they care about raising awareness among people and about working effectively. After all, *domesutykku baiorensu* and *dī bui* sound foreign. And they look foreign. There is nothing Japanese about these names. With the underlying notion that these names are foreign, people may think that *domesutykku baiorensu* and *dī bui* are things that happen abroad and thus that *domesutykku baiorensu* is someone else’s problem, not their own. This kind of attitude would be detrimental and counterproductive to the efforts of raising awareness and combating domestic violence. In short, besides the lack of intuitive understanding of the terms, their foreignness may hinder relatability.

The consequences of branding domestic violence as foreign by naming *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui* may be more negative than some activists would like to imagine, perhaps particularly DVSRG, the group responsible for the social problem’s
label. Some activist interviewees discussed the naming in the context of long-term development and used the case of *seku-hara* as an example.

*Sekusharu-harasamento* (sexual harassment) was shortened to *seku-hara*, and now it has sunk into society. But it took a long time. So, *domesutikku baiorensu* was shortened to *dī bui*, and it is still in the process (Anzai, *ibid.*).

Since the names are in English and do not allow people to intuitively or instantly associate with them, some activist interviewees have come to a realization that it will take a long time for people to understand what *domesutikku baiorensu* is. The preceding example of *sekusharu-harasamento* and *seku-hara* gives them some realistic but perhaps daunting ideas of a time consuming process for people to become familiar with and finally understand *domesutikku baiorensu*. With this in mind, activists and advocates alike need to be patient in educating and raising awareness among people. This appears to be an added, perhaps unnecessary, challenge to already challenging tasks: raising awareness, addressing preconceived notions and beliefs about intimate partner violence, and changing behaviors for better.

**The DV/DVD Muddle**

In comparison to 30 years ago, the awareness, even if superficially, is a great shift, from the time, when as a victim, Fukushima felt alone and had no idea that others went through experiences that were similar to hers (personal communication, June 14, 2009).

Now the names, *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui*, seem to have become known and are used in society, considering the fact that DVP law was implemented in 2001 and governmental offices, Gender Equality Bureau as one example, have been addressing domestic violence. However, when asked the level of familiarity with the names, *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui*, and the level of understanding of those names among
the general public, most activist interviewees made the point of separating the two: the
names of the social problem have been well known and people are familiar with the
names; however, when it comes to understanding of the issue and what the issue entails,
people do not understand very well what *domesutikku baiorensu* is.

There were a few activist interviewees who shared their experiences to illustrate
that public awareness is not yet sufficient. “There are some that would say, DVD. Even
now, there are people like that. When people request for talks, they would say, ‘Please do
DVD.’ Because I know what they mean, I just say, ‘Yes, of course.’” (Azuchi, personal
communication, July 28, 2009). Nanase, who educates young adults as one of the many
raising awareness activities that he carries out, showed some concerns regarding young
adults and their lack of understanding:

In college courses, when discussing *dēto dī bui*, there are some students in
class, who heard the term for the first time. And this has quite a bit of
weight (among students). But when we further talk about it, then there are
actually quite a few (who have experienced it). No abusers confess. But
victims do. Or, those who have experienced and overcome it talk about
‘back then’ (personal communication, June 17, 2009).

Unanimously, however, activist interviewees indicated that recognition of
*domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui* has improved among individuals and within society.
“The recognition of the name has been pretty good among people. And the government
has conducted research as well. So, the name recognition has been pretty spread,” said
Hamada (personal communication, June 18, 2009), or, as Niigata put it, “the name itself
has been familiarized” (personal communication, June 22, 2009). Some interviewees,
such as Yao, used hotline calls or walk-ins to gauge familiarity: “We receive quite a few
inquiries from family members, so that indicates that people are familiar with it (*dī bui*
these days” (personal communication, July 14, 2009). And others used guestimates to
illustrate the level of terminology recognition among people. Nonaka, among many others, thought about 30 to 40% of people knew the terms *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui* (personal communication, July 6, 2009). The only person who rated the recognition level much higher than about 40% was Niigata, who thought that about 80% of people have heard the terms, indicating “even grade school children have” (personal communication, June 22, 2009).

“This through TV, through comics, there is much more familiarity (with the names),” asserted Nonaka (personal communication, July 6, 2009). More than a handful of activist interviewees attributed the increasing public familiarity to the media, including, as Hotta noted, in TV dramas (personal communication, July 13, 2009). Katayama pointed out that *dī bui* had been declared the most popular word of the year in 2001 (personal communication, June 24, 2009). Given their wide distribution, the media can raise awareness and also reflect raised awareness both of the terminology and of how much *dī bui* has become a recognized issue. Recognition, however, is not the same as understanding.

Unanimously, activist interviewees indicated that the recognition of the terms, *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui*, has improved among people over the course of years, and familiarity with domestic violence has increased too. However, when asked about an understanding of domestic violence, activist interviewees unanimously answered that understanding is overwhelmingly poor. Niigata thought that around one percent of people understood well what domestic violence entailed (personal communication, June 22, 2009), while Makiguchi (personal communication, July 25, 2009), Azuchi (personal communication, July 28, 2009), and others estimated understanding at about or less than
10% of people. These very low ratings are a troublesome suggestion that public comprehension has remained at the level of superficial familiarity.

This superficiality is confirmed by how domestic violence is misunderstood and misconceived by men, women, and even professionals. Aichi, who had worked directly with men, has many anecdotes about the lack of understanding and misconceptions of domestic violence among clients:

Among men, they only think that it is not okay to hit (women). And that has been recognized. But then again, there are a lot of men who think it is perfectly acceptable to hit (women). There are many who think that, but at the same time they may be thinking while hitting women that they may be held responsible for dī bui. There is that possibility. And we receive calls from these men, who get outraged for being held responsible (for dī bui).

They have a sense that they may get blamed (for dī bui). They do not think that it is reasonable or even acceptable to get blamed like that. But because others around them say that it is not okay to hit even if they are furious, they at least know that they should not hit. Or, they happened to hit, and they want to quit, but they have no idea what to do. So they call us. Or, someone would tell them, “You are dī bui (abuser), so you make a call.” And they call us. So it is like that.

So, the familiarity has been spread, but in terms of psychological abuse, it is a task for now and the future (to educate men). A little awareness that "oh, that (psychological abuse) is unacceptable, too" is there, a little. But there’s a long way to go to include yelling, putting down, financially depriving of money—and these kinds of things are huge but not at all recognized. Physical abuse has been recognized, and that alone I think is a great accomplishment. But still, there is much to do (Aichi, ibid.).

Aichi’s perceptions of men and their misunderstanding of domestic violence are loudly echoed by Nanase, who has worked with men for decades (personal communication, June 17, 2009).

Misconceptions and misunderstanding are not just men’s problem; women and professionals have similar beliefs, assumptions, and confusions about domestic violence and its victims.
People vaguely know, but many think that (dī bui) is always physical. Even women would say perhaps this happens because women do or say things that deserve violence. Or, some would think that (dī bui) is caused by alcoholism and send people to AA and assume that violence would stop. There may have been a lot of past influences, but still it is the attitude and belief toward women.

Psychologists do not understand and say that the abuser just has a weird personality, or underdeveloped brains, genetics, or ADHD.

Pediatricians should ask about violence and abuse at home, but they do not because they lack understanding of dī bui and how it may impact children. Knowledge is present only among supporters and advocates. Those who have direct working relationships, like police, are starting to understand. But not others, (Makiguchi, personal communication, July 25, 2009)

Azuchi strongly believed that this kind of misunderstanding and misconception occurs because people did not understand the “psychology of domestic violence:”

There are quite a few people who would say, ‘if I get slapped even once, I would leave’. But it is not like that, so people who understand the psychology of it would be less than 10%. Even those who work in the dī bui related offices may not understand that much (personal communication, July 28, 2009).

Such misconceptions and misunderstandings identified by the activist interviewees are not something that should be underestimated or overlooked, as they may influence how people act and react to domestic violence as well as to its victims and abusers.

In summary, several issues challenge the philosophy behind the naming of domesutikku baiorensu that DVSG felt so strongly about. While the names are gaining familiarity, most people do not even come close to understanding what domesutikku baiorensu comprises. As many activist interviewees indicated, the lack of understanding among people requires constant explanation of what domesutikku baiorensu is. As several anecdotes suggest, it is likely that lack of understanding keeps some victims in the dark and without help. The lack of an intuitive understanding stemming from the imported
foreign names leaves those impacted by abuse and violence in the darkness longer, and activists and advocates are bound to spend more time and efforts in activities for raising awareness. DVSRG considered that English names might spark curiosity among people about *domesutikku baiorensu*; but, on the flip side, English may lead some people to dismiss *domesutikku baiorensu* as a foreign issue that does not pertain to or concern them.

For the DVSRG, the choice to use English, even if supposedly temporarily, rather than an inadequate or misleading Japanese term was meant to show that domestic violence is no small matter, rather a global problem. The decision to contextualize domestic violence on the global scale and to use *domesutikku baiorensu* as an international language to connect with women throughout the world may be ideal; however, it is probably more effective for activists and advocates, already aware of the global context, than for the general public. For them, building solidarity with women globally seems much less critical, perhaps even insignificant. This aspect of reasoning that went into naming *domesutikku baiorensu* does not outweigh the risks of misunderstanding or misconceptions among people, not to mention people potentially mis-framing *domesutikku baiorensu* as a foreign issue.

Tsukada thought it peculiar that the DVSRG did not go back to the temporary names and replace them with something official and more satisfactory (personal communication, July 27, 2009). As narratives illuminated, it is clear that the members of DVSRG, well aware that certain names would be inappropriate or dissatisfying, sought a name that would encompass all types of relationships as well as all types of violence and abuse. But perhaps, as Tsukada detailed, making an issue of domestic violence took precedence over naming (personal communication, July 27, 2009). This unfinished
business meant that the social movement took off with half-hearted names. Ironically, the group that considered naming so critical to building a social movement failed in the end to find effective terminology. This left the movement without an intuitively understandable label to which people could readily relate and which would facilitate awareness of the issue of domestic violence, educate people that it is wrong, and address the issue for change. Squarely situating Japanese people at the core—victims, survivors, abusers, family members, and the general public—and building a Japanese movement of domestic violence, a Japanese name that people could easily connect with and take an ownership of would have been essential. In my analysis, names that aided connecting with women globally or placing importance on the history of the U.S. domestic violence movement should have been considered secondary at most.

**Shikataganai: Cannot be Helped**

Nearly two decades after the first *Asahi Shimbun* article with *domesutikku baiorensu* in it came out in 1995, many activist interviewees showed their dissatisfaction with the naming of *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui* (Tsukada, Fukushima, Aichi, and Anzai, all *ibid.*). Nonetheless, most of them in the end said, “shikataganai,” meaning “it can’t be helped” or “nothing to do about it.” Aichi, for example, who held DVSRG responsible for their inability to name domestic violence in Japanese, said, “Shikataganai. They (DVSRG) never found any appropriate Japanese term” (*ibid.*). The sentiments of *shikataganai* were expressed in two ways: it is *shikataganai* because *domesutikku baiorensu* is what we had back then, and it is *shikataganai* because the name has been familiarized and that is what we have now. Therefore, it is too late to change.
The consequences were varied. “There was no suitable name. So, there was no choice but to go with it (dī bui),” said Kosaka, the long experienced lawyer (ibid.). Yet considering the “family violence term” problematic, she and her coworkers used the Japanese “violence by husbands and boyfriends” language together with domesutikku baiorensu and dī bui because those names were “so unknown” (ibid.). Niigata, who also felt hampered by the social context attached to the family violence term as well as by the feeling “there is something wrong” with the name domesutikku baiorensu (ibid.), nonetheless used the English name.

Mōri was inventive with naming domestic violence in her own way and used her own carefully chosen term through the late 1980’s until domesutikku baiorensu and dī bui became available and the DVP law was enacted. Although she had years of experience living in the U.S. and was very well aware of the domestic violence term in English, she crossed off domesutikku baiorensu, considering that there was no sense in using English. She chose a term that connoted intimacy and was inclusive of intimate relationships outside of marriage. Well aware of the use of domesutikku baiorensu and dī bui by DVSRG and other activists prior to the DVP law, Mōri continued using her own term up to 2001 before caving in to the increasingly recognized names in English. For her “it is too late to use” something rather than domesutikku baiorensu and dī bui, and that it is “shikataganai (ibid.)” because switching to something else at this point would be more confusing.

The shikataganai attitude toward the existing English name and its abbreviation, domesutikku baiorensu and dī bui, is of course understandable. Despite the discomfort and dissatisfaction with the terms, these activists have been working with them and
making them work for nearly two decades, helping them gain widespread currency. The road to recognition and understanding has just begun, Anzai (ibid.) and others said patiently, sometimes mentioning the precedent of sekut-hara.

The shikataganai sentiments also hint at reflective attitudes held by some activist interviewees: they do not have a strong or clearly recognized ownership to the domestic violence movement. Aichi, for example, both deferred to DVSRG about the naming of domestic violence and held them responsible for not naming domestic violence differently (ibid.). Without doubt, the accomplishments of DVSRG were critical and influential, and the activist interviewees were all well aware of the historical importance of the group. Those with no affiliation or working relations with DVSRG may give much credit to DVSRG and yet at the same time feel their own contributions or work are undervalued because they lack legitimacy due to their unaffiliated status with the recognized group to which the domestic violence movement is attributed. It is unfortunate if some of these foremothers and forefathers do not appreciate their own contributions to the domestic violence movement regardless of any direct involvement with DVSRG. At the same time, there is a fine line between the individual activists’ ownership of the movement and giving DVSRG more authority or credit than it deserves for building the domestic violence movement; shikataganai plays a role somewhere in-between.

Or, is it really shikataganai, can nothing be done about the names? While change would be confusing, so is the present situation as illustrated by the narratives, with people mixing up the existing “family violence” term with domesutikku baiorensu and not understanding the meaning of the English name, even muddling dī bui with DVD disks.
Undoubtedly some people would question why now do the established names have to be changed, or even be considered for a name change? Do not wake up a sleeping baby: it will all be fine as long as you keep at it. Or, will it? Clearly, many activist interviewees expressed their discomfort and dissatisfaction with *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui* nearly two decades after *Asahi Shimbun* first introduced *domesutikku baiorensu* in an article. Can those sentiments of victims, abusers, and family members be neatly wrapped up in *shikataganai* while waiting for their expiration date to arrive? Would things be all fine then? After the activists have been pushing forward as hard as they could to pass the law, to create services, to cultivate social atmosphere and understanding to treat domestic violence as a social problem, can their honest sentiments be heard somehow instead of making them feel as if they have to throw in the towel and say *shikataganai*? These long time activists and others have been working extremely hard to make a difference in the field of domestic violence, and it is “their” movement just as much as it is DVSRG’s. Cohesion in the movement will help it continue making further and better changes.

*Official Terminology: Japanese, but Not Quite Right*

Kōno, one of the strong proponents of using *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui*, referred to their wide currency in print:

The use of Katakana English has been established in talking about *dī bui*. There is now little use of Japanese marital and family violence terms in discussing *dī bui* in materials and resources that the Japanese government publishes and creates (*ibid.*).

Indeed, an abundance of publications have *domesutikku baiorensu* or *dī bui* in their titles, including *Domesutikku Baiorensu wo Norikoete* (Overcoming Domestic Violence) by Suzuki and Gotō (1999); *Dēto Dī Bui: Ai ka Bōryoku ka, Minuku Chikara ga Anata wo Sukuu* (Dating Violence: Love or Violence, Abilities to Distinguish will Save You) by
Endo (2007), and many more. As shown in Chapter 4, newspaper articles in *Asahi Shimbun* using the English terms have appeared since 1995 (although they declined after a peak in 2002). In addition to publications, the terms have appeared in television dramas and feature films, with titles such as *DV: Domesutikku Baiorensu* (Nakamura, T., 2005). Despite this abundance of products that use *domesutikku baiorensu*, Kōno’s description appears to be misinformed when it comes to the use of names within the Japanese government.

As briefly illustrated in Chapter 2, the Japanese government, its GEB, and other governmental bureaus across the board systematically use the term, *haigūsha karano bōryoku* (spousal violence or violence by spouse) (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/dv/01.html). Its website details why they choose to use this particular term:

*Domesutikku baiorensu* is a katakana form of English word, domestic violence. It is also abbreviated as “DV.”

There is no clear definition of what *domesutikku baiorensu* means. However, it is often used to mean generally that “it is a type of violence inflicted by a spouse, lover, or intimately involved person, in both present or past relationships.” However, depending on individuals, (the term) is also used inclusively to mean violence between parents and children. For the Cabinet Office, we will not officially use *domesutikku baiorensu* [dī bui] because of its potentiality of multiple meanings. Instead, we use *haigūsha bōryoku* (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/dv/01.html, retrieved on December 8, 2012).

This is consistent with the name of the DVP law in Japanese, *Haigusha kara no Bōryoku no Bōshi oyobi Higaisha no Hogo ni kansuru Hōritsu* (literally mean the Law of Prevention of Violence by Spouse and Protection of Victims). In fact, the first appearance of this spousal violence term in
Asahi Shimbun coincides with the passing of the DVP law, which was 2001. Based upon the Asahi Shimbun data, the haigūsha bōryoku term was never used prior to 2001, and it appears that the term was coined only to address domestic violence.

While the dedication of the term to address domestic violence in Japanese was an excellent attempt by the Japanese government, it is tainted by one of the problems that DVSRG tried so hard to avoid. Because the term “spousal” connotes marital relationships, it seems to exclude intimate relationships outside of legal marriage. The GEB statement tries to rectify that by stating specifically that their use of “spousal” is inclusive of intimate partner as well as former spouses or lovers. However, it is not obviously clear from the term “spousal violence.” Moreover, the notion of spouse is reinforced by the content of the DVP law: although common-law union is included under the protection this law offers, those who are in dating relationships are excluded (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/law/index2.html). If anyone is aware of the law, they may think of domestic violence only in the sense of marriage and common law unions, omitting other intimate relationships. This omission was the very reason why DVSRG decided against this particular term, but it has been used consistently in the Japanese government, for example in the numerous GEB spousal violence studies (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/chousa/index.html) as well as the Ministry of Justice study on spousal violence (http://www.moj.go.jp/housouken/housouken03_00009.html). These different terminologies used by the Japanese government and DVSRG and other activists should raise concerns with respect to potential misconception and

---

The spousal violence term was not part of the original study, hence, is not included in the Asahi Shimbun archival data in Chapter 4. The highest number was found in 2001, and in the following years, the numbers of articles with the spousal violence term steadily declined except for the times around the DVP law revisions in 2004 and 2007.
misunderstanding of domestic violence in Japan. The intentions and well-meaning behind 
domesutikku baiorensu that DVSRG and its members held close to their hearts were not 
honored.

**Official Stance: The Lost Cause?**

Some of the activist interviewees were very specific about bringing to the 
forefront the aspect of sexism and situating it at the core of the fight against domestic 
violence. For them and others, domestic violence is a type of gender violence and is 
caused by sexism. Hence, addressing sexism is extremely critical. In this view, sexism 
must be connected to the social structure of the society and to the ways that women are 
disadvantaged and faced with disadvantaged positions in the society. For Masuzoe, 
fighting domestic violence could not be separated from issues of women’s independence, 
patriarchy in the family, and how women get less respect as individuals within family, 
and more (ibid.). Kōno further identified the aspect of power and control, who holds 
power and control over whom, and strongly expressed that addressing sexism and how 
sexism spawns domestic violence and in a larger sense gender violence was extremely 
critical in domestic violence work (ibid.). As interviewees such as Hanamaki (ibid.) and 
Tsukada (ibid.) point out, women are faced with low wage issues. Many of them do not 
own property. Women are disadvantaged in and outside of their home. Without making 
connections between sexism and domestic violence, they argue, the job of addressing 
domestic violence is not complete, and domestic violence will not be eradicated. While 
directly addressing domestic violence is necessary and important, that is not nearly 
enough (Tsukada, ibid.). And these activist interviewees expressed strongly that
understanding of the sexism aspect of domestic violence was non-existent (Hanamaki, *ibid.*; Masuzoe, *ibid.*; Tsunoda, *ibid.*).

Situating sexism squarely at the core of domestic violence work is lacking in the Japanese government’s dealings with this social problem, a fact that in a subtle way shows the attitudes of the Japanese government toward domestic violence: they are “lukewarm” at best to identify sexism as at the core of the domestic violence issue. The GEB states: “With respect to the domestic violence prevention law, victims are not limited to women. However, victims of *haigūsha bōryoku* are often women” (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/dv/01.html). As explained in Chapter 2, the vast majority of the victims of domestic violence are women, nearly 99.4% of the total number of victims (Gender Equality Bureau, 2008). For the GEB to say that victims of domestic violence are “often women” is a grave understatement.

In the GEB explanation of what causes domestic violence, vagueness is paramount:

In terms of causes of violence, there is a social acceptance condoning the husband’s use of violence against his wife to some extent (*shikataganai*), or in many cases wives do not have income owing to the economic disparity between men and women. These are not simply individual problems, but rather are greatly influenced by and related to the social structure. As a precursor of men and women being equal partners and thriving in various fields, violence against women cannot exist. (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/dv/01.html, retrieved on December 8, 2012)

The GEB raises the symptoms of sexism: a social climate that condones violence against wives or the structural economic disparity between women and men. It even goes on to say that violence against women is a grave infringement upon women’s human rights. However, it stops at discussing symptoms and does not clearly and precisely explain
“why” domestic violence and other forms of violence against women occur. There is a social atmosphere that turns a blind eye to violence against wives because of the undercurrent of sexism. Yes, the GEB states that violence against women and domestic violence should not happen and are violations of human rights. However, the GEB also needs to take a strong and clear stand on “why” men commit horrible acts and the beliefs behind those acts and how sexism feeds those beliefs and acts. The same goes for a disadvantaged social structure for women and why such an unfair structure exists. Without raising the issue of sexism and structural sexism, the GEB and the Japanese government show less than committed attitudes toward addressing domestic violence and violence against women at a larger scale.

As illustrated in previous chapters, DVSRG and the activist interviewees in this study take a strong position against sexism, situating it at the core of domestic violence and gender violence alike and holding sexism as a cause of domestic violence. In contrast to this philosophy of the foremothers and forefathers of the domestic violence movements, the Japanese government does not come remotely close to what activists held strong and dear. Among the characteristics of domestic violence identified by the GEB, similar vague and noncommittal attitudes can be observed. In its list of the characteristics of domestic violence, the GEB specifies six reasons why victims cannot flee, mentions the impact of violence on victims and children, including an explanation of PTSD, and comments on typologies of abusers (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/dv/04.html). The language used to describe abusers reflects the lack of commitment:

Regarding perpetrators who use violence, there are no particular typologies, and it is said to have no relation to age, education, employment, or income. There are people that are nice, trusted socially, and whom others find it “unimaginable that he uses violence against his wife at
home”. Among perpetrators, there are people who only use violence in the intimate space called home, and others who are generally violent and use violence against total strangers by instigating instances. Also, there are people who apparently use violence in association with their alcohol or drug addiction or psychological disability. There are numerous reasons why perpetrators use violence, but it is said to have the background in the existing sexism in the society (http://www.gender.go.jp/e-vaw/dv/04.html, retrieved on December 8, 2012).

The GEB labored to illustrate that anyone has the potential to become a perpetrator, excluding factors like age, employment, and not limiting the probability to alcoholics and drug addicts, and others. However, in discussing the wider social context, they use the language, “it is said” to identify sexism as a main culprit in causing violence. Leaving peculiarly unclear “who” says this, the GEB, as an extension the Japanese government, never identifies the ultimate cause of domestic violence.

This touches upon a fundamental aspect in addressing domestic violence. First and foremost, without taking a stand on sexism or otherwise as a cause of domestic violence, how can the government expect to address domestic violence properly? Without clearly specifying causes of domestic violence, can the Japanese government say with confidence that they are addressing domestic violence to eradicate it? They cannot seem to take a stand on sexism as a culprit of domestic violence. If that is the case, what is the culprit in the eyes of the Japanese government? Having an ambivalent attitude that will not help address the issue is no small matter. While it is necessary to implement intervention broadly from law to services in education, social welfare, medical, and more, it is pragmatically important to implement prevention strategies that are based upon causes. If psychology were deemed to be a culprit, it is important to address individual psychology. If it were to do with alcohol and other drugs, there should be ways to address those substances head on. When the Japanese government is so ambivalent about the
cause of domestic violence, it is questionable how effectively they are implementing prevention and intervention strategies to combat domestic violence. Determining the cause of domestic violence and having a clear and strong stand on it is the fundamental task that the Japanese government needs to carry out.

Moreover, there is a big gap between the languages that DVSRG and activists use and the Japanese government. Although DVSRG poured care into naming the social problem, the government has elected to use a different term that was deemed inappropriate not only by DVSRG but also other activist interviewees. The different names used by activists and by the government must exacerbate confusions and misunderstanding that already exists. Can these be reconciled somehow? While paying respect to and placing the utmost importance on the public’s safety and quality of life, what would be the best solution to this naming issue? Effectiveness and pragmatics in raising awareness and addressing the social problem can possibly be enhanced if the government and activists collaborate in streamlining the name of the social problem. Some activists are willing to go with the flow in terms of *domesutikku baiorensu* because it is already in use and is too late to retract. But is it? And are they willing to ignore the parallel use of various names? And is that good for the general public?

**Summary**

Based on the anecdotes that the advocate interviewees shared, there emerged some potentially problematic aspects of the internal domestic violence movement and the work it has produced. When victims of domestic violence receive sympathy and not empathy, they are faced with yet another hierarchical relationship with domestic violence advocates and society at large. As long as sympathizers elevate themselves above the
objects of sympathy, a hierarchical relationship exists that does not help victims of
domestic violence in their empowerment process of regaining confidence, trust, and self-
esteem to heal themselves from within. This also negatively impacts victims in the larger
context of society, when they are perceived as someone to pity. Another related
conceptual problem is that domestic violence victims seem to be in a state of perpetual
victimhood. Some people use the term, sabai̇ba (survivor), to describe those who have
overcome their victimization and moved on. However, it appears that victims remain as
victims for a long time and do not seem to proceed with their lives. This situation may be
connected to the fact that victims are expected to leave their relationships and become
independent. This expectation seems unrealistic, as becoming ready to leave may take a
long time and not all victims choose to take this step. If advocates and social service
providers construct leaving relationships and becoming independent as signs of
overcoming domestic violence and becoming sabai̇ba, many victims will remain as
victims. These perceptions that are placed upon victims are problematic, not just for
victims themselves in their process and dealing with abuse and violence, but also to the
larger society and how it treats victims and what it expects of them.

Seemingly this problematic construction of domestic violence victims is present
within the field of domestic violence activism. One aspect that appears to draw a line
between groups of advocates is whether they have had their own victimization
experiences or not. This division may be associated with victimization and the negative
connotation it has, or it may stem from philosophical differences and what advocates
believe. Similarly, there is a division between the advocates for victims and for abusers,
such that work with abusers is sometimes misconceived and misunderstood as condoning
the abuse and violence they inflict upon their intimate partners. Regardless of the reasons for these divisions, this is troublesome for advocates and activists working in the domestic violence field and needs to be resolved for the sake of advancing the domestic violence movement and working effectively and in collaboration. Philosophical differences are inevitable even among the people who strive for the same goals; instead of letting those differences become obstacles and create dysfunctions, advocates and activists need to strive for the greater cause, even if it may mean temporarily setting aside one’s own beliefs or philosophies and working with one’s own biases.

Another aspect of the hierarchical construction of the domestic violence movement that surfaced from the narratives was the strong presence and influence of the West, especially the United States, in various aspects of the domestic violence movement, such as naming the problem, policies, laws, services and more. Learning from other places in terms of what works and what does not work is helpful; however, simply importing methods or programs from other places, be it the U.S. or any other country, to address domestic violence in Japan is likely to be ineffective, given the differences between Japan and other place of interest.

Granted that the vast majority of the activist interviewees were engaged in victim services and more so with the shelter work, much of the narratives revolved around services in the context of shelters. Since shelters are only one aspect of the larger victim services, this raises concerns that perhaps Japan needs more diversified services, addressing domestic violence and assisting victims by addressing employability, gaining job skills, working with mental health experts to gain and re-establish inner strengths, re-education program, and more. While advocates offer these services, it is my contention
that too much focus still rests upon shelter work. This also means that advocates need to do a much better job of creating space and services for abusers and men, helping them to change their behaviors and stop violence. As long as this aspect of domestic violence work is overlooked or undermined, Japan will not see much advancement with the issue of domestic violence.

More importantly, to seriously address domestic violence should mean how to prevent it from happening. Much of the narratives rested upon the aspect of intervention work, and sadly not much mention on prevention. It seems to be in the nature of their professions that advocates and activists are caught in the whirlwind of the interventions that are immediately in front of them, and have difficulty seeing beyond the immediacy of victimization. However, the ultimate task of domestic violence work should be to stop abuse and violence long before it happens in intimate relationships, not simply intervening after it breaks out. Attention to prevention shines light on the current status of the Japanese domestic violence work and brings to the forefront that so much more needs to be done.

Unanimously the activist interviewees agreed that having a name to frame domestic violence had been absolutely necessary and a critical step toward addressing domestic violence as a social problem. However, the decision of the DVSRG to use *domesutikku baiorensu* and *dī bui* remains controversial. Activist interviewees are still ambivalent about this English origin name because it suggests a foreign problem and is not intuitively understandable. Yet the price for the ill-fitting name may be greater than activists are willing to pay in the longer run, especially because in a case of domestic
violence, people’s welfare and even lives are on the line. Is it worth to take the risk of delayed reaction for many years to come?

Adding to the naming complexity, the Japanese government elected to use a Japanese term that is an equivalent of spousal violence, *haigūsha bōryoku*. Though modified by an effort to explain that the category does not exclude intimate relationships outside of legal marriages, the term itself connotes only marriages. Moreover, government offices and agencies seem to take a stand on the social problem of domestic violence that is vague at best and without conviction. Without clearly deciding how and why domestic violence happens, can the Japanese government address the social problem head on and eliminate abuse and violence from people’s lives? Evidence from study after study that they and other entities have conducted shows that domestic violence is real and touches many people, in some cases ending their lives. It is overdue but critical that the Japanese government addresses the issue fully and extensively from intervention to prevention, including identifying the role of sexism in producing and perpetuating domestic violence.
Chapter 6

Conclusion and Future Considerations

The process in which a non-issue is transformed into a social problem is complex, necessitating various steps and role-players to come to fruition. Indeed, not all problems become social problems. And sometimes, when a problem is being reconceptualized on a larger scale as a social problem, things do not go as smoothly or in the direction that activists and advocates foresee. The case of constructing domestic violence as a social problem in Japan is no different.

This final chapter summarizes the major research findings, discusses the strengths and limitations of this study, and offers future considerations not only for domestic violence research but also for directions to further address domestic violence in Japan.

Summary of Research Findings

This dissertation explores how domestic violence is socially constructed in Japan by examining two sets of data: an archival data set from the Asahi Shimbun newspaper, and 25 semi-structured face-to-face interviews with activists who have been addressing this issue long before the Domestic Violence Prevention Law (DVP law) was passed in 2001. All the activists were also involved before the term domesutikku baiorensu first appeared in Asahi Shimbun in 1995. The numbers of articles using domesutikku baiorensu multiplied between 1998 and 2001, peaked in 2002, and gradually declined thereafter. Newspaper articles in Asahi Shimbun reveal that although the term domesutikku baiorensu did not appear until 1995, the issue of domestic violence in Japan prior to this was addressed under a different name, namely family violence (kateinai börýoku). What this means is that domesutikku baiorensu is a newly “discovered” social
problem. The phenomenon has existed long before it gained a name or recognition as a social problem, and it was tolerated as a private matter or a non-issue.

The acquisition of the name *domesutikku baiorensu* merely indicated the beginning of the process of constructing a social problem. Although *Asahi Shimbun* primarily used the family violence term to describe violence perpetrated by children and young adults against parents, domestic violence continued to be addressed under the family violence term despite the increasing use of *domesutikku baiorensu* in the newspaper. There seems to be confusion stemming from these various names as domestic violence is addressed both as *domesutikku baiorensu* and as family violence, with the terms used interchangeably in some cases.

To add to these names in the early 2000’s a new term *dēto dī bui* (date dv, meaning dating violence) began appearing in newspaper articles to include young adults who are impacted by abuse and violence in their intimate relationships. Although *domesutikku baiorensu* is meant to be inclusive of intimate relationships that are outside of marriage, the notion of marital relationships speaks louder in *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper articles. Hence, it necessitated *dēto dī bui* to emerge to address the forgotten group of teenagers and young adults. However, even with the designated name, *dēto dī bui*, articles that address dating violence were few and far between, further indicating that domestic violence is primarily framed as an adults’ issue and between marital relationships. Also, there were four frames that emerged out of newspaper articles: *domesutikku baiorensu* is framed as a women’s rights issue, a human rights issue, a crime, and a social problem. What *domesutikku baiorensu* is not is also clear, based upon
the *Asahi Shimbun* as well as the narratives: it is not a men’s problem, as discussions related to or of men, men’s program or abusers were nearly absent.

While trends derived from the *Asahi Shimbun* can point to us how domestic violence has been constructed, the narratives of foremothers and forefathers of the Japanese domestic violence movement further illuminate some aspects of domestic violence that are not readily seen or heard in newspaper articles or in the public sphere. The narratives help deconstruct *domesutikku baiorensu* as a social problem and shine light on some of unseen, deeply rooted matters.

Victims of domestic violence in Japan face not only abuse and violence in their intimate relationships but also other challenges that stem from their victimhood. Victims are disempowered in their abusive relationships, and further disempowered once they are labeled as victims. This labeling constructs victims of domestic violence as without agency, powerless, helpless, and in need of others’ help. As social constructionists explain, these characteristics were necessary in making domestic violence victims appear worthy of receiving help; however, on the flip side of the coin is that victims are sympathized with and pitied, perhaps overly so, to the point that they are placed hierarchically lower than those without victimization. This continues to perpetuate their unequal and imbalanced status outside of their intimate relationships. Furthermore, domestic violence victims in Japan seem to be in a perpetual victimhood, stuck in that status with no name (beyond victim) to call themselves except *sabaibā*, another borrowed and imported English term, “survivor.”

Many of the narratives emphasize shelter work and frame the independence of victims as a success. The implication of this emphasis and framework is that victims are
expected to leave their intimate relationships even though not all the victims perceive leaving as a way to address the abuse and violence they suffer. This framework places victims in a vulnerable position: if they do not leave their relationships as expected, they are judged for not doing the right thing, and if they follow through what they are expected to do despite their will or desire, they are disempowered in a process that is parallel to their abusive relationships—doing as they are told. Neither sympathy nor unreasonable expectations is an effective way to support and empower victims of domestic violence.

Activists and advocates who fight against domestic violence despise the hierarchy that contributes to unequal relationships and the dysfunctions that spawn out of it. Nonetheless, some narratives indicate that there are divisions within the domestic violence professional fields that appear to be hindering the advancement of the cause. One division is between the survivor and non-victim advocates: this identity difference seems to produce friction and divisiveness. Another divisive wall occurs between professional advocates for victims and those for abusers, as if they are reflecting and enacting sentiments that victims and abusers hold against each other. Whether the division stems from having experienced victimization or not, or from the groups for whom advocates are working, these divisions negatively impact effectiveness, slowing down or cutting the flow of communication within the field. Divisions also hinder opportunities to cultivate collaborative working relationships across professions, ultimately delaying the advancement of the area of domestic violence.

It is critical to pay attention to the clearly voiced narratives of the study. However, it is just as important to pay attention to the void, as it speaks volumes silently. Nearly
absent in the narratives of the activist interviewees, as well as in the *Asahi Shimbun* archive, are a) the abusers of domestic violence, b) ideas or strategies to intervene, and c) any emphasis on prevention to stop abuse and violence altogether from happening. Much of the concerns and focus rest upon victims, victim advocacy especially shelter work, and how to assist victims to become free of abuse and violence by gaining independence, specifically by leaving abusive relationships. Children were mentioned in the context of intervention or in assertions that education is necessary for prevention; however, detailed and thoughtful ideas for domestic violence prevention were lacking in the narratives among the activist interviewees.

In the early 1990’s a group of feminist activists and scholars named themselves Domestic Violence Study and Research Group (DVSRG) and led the way to constructing domestic violence as a social problem. One of the things they spent much time and thought on was the name of the social problem. They deemed the Japanese family violence term *kateinai bōryoku* unacceptable because of the existing use and meaning of the term as youth and young adults perpetrating violence against their parents. At the same time, they were well informed of the history of the domestic violence movement in the United States (U.S.), which they perceived as important to incorporate into their movement and the naming of the problem. Moreover, the members of DVSRG felt strongly about being able to connect with women globally through the name. In the end, although some members of DVSRG felt that they needed a Japanese term to name the movement, they opted to use *domesutikku baiorensu* as a temporary measure, because to them the urgency of making the problem known to society outweighed the creation of an appropriate name for the social problem. *Domesutikku baiorensu* was introduced to
Japanese society, while the abbreviation, *dī bui*, somehow made its way in despite being intended only as a convenient internal name among the DVSRG members. Then the temporary name was never replaced by a permanent Japanese name.

The narratives point to the dissatisfying settlement of using *domesutikku baiorensu* among the activist advocates. Because of the lack of an instant and intuitive connection to *domesutikku baiorensu*, the sentiment that the name should have been Japanese was strongly felt. Moreover, because the name originates in English, it connotes that the issue is foreign and not native to Japan. While there were some positive reflections on the use of the English words, the activist interviewees felt rather strongly that although people have become quite familiar with the name they still do not understand it well. While the activist interviewees perceived the implications of the foreign branding as more negative than positive, in the end they expressed the sentiment of *shikataganai*, it cannot be helped, because *domesutikku baiorensu* is the name they have and nothing else. Similarly, the English name fits their strong preference and tendency to look toward the West, especially the U.S., as a model for finding strategies, methods, services, and more to address domestic violence.

What lies at the core of the domestic violence activists’ discussions in this study is the conviction that sexism and the hierarchy associated with sex and gender are at the heart of the domestic violence problem. They feel strongly about sexism and gender inequality and are able to see how the social structure feeds into and exacerbates the experiences of domestic violence because of the social hierarchy in Japan that places women in a lower bracket. The Japanese government, however, seems to have an ambivalent attitude, at best, toward the causes to which it attributes domestic violence.
The Gender Equality Bureau (GEB) of the Cabinet is the primary office that addresses domestic violence, but their problematic choice of the marital violence term, ふ婚暴力, to discuss and explain domestic violence shows ambiguous and uncommitted attitudes since it literally means marital violence and connotes the exclusion of intimate relationships outside of marriage, obscures the directionality of the violence, and neutralizes the gender aspect of domestic violence that plays out clearly in reality. Also, it is not the term that DVSRG uses or finds adequate. Moreover, between the efforts of DVSRG together with other domestic violence activists, on the one hand, and the GEB representing the Japanese government, on the other, there is a deep abyss in terms both of what they call the social problem and what they identify as its causes. The implications for the future may be troubling.

**Strengths and Limitations of Research**

Both my work with the Asahi Shimbun archive and the in-depth interviews I conducted with domestic violence activists and advocates plus the data derived from them offer extensive and invaluable information: the articles show trends and changes of theme over an extended period, and the narratives offer first-hand details on how the Japanese domestic violence movement came about, as well as who and what kind of people have been involved in building the momentum to gain public recognition of a social problem called 嫁暴力. Some survey studies conducted by the GEB focus on public awareness; however, this study features a distinctive, unique set of interviews with 25 activists, who have been involved with the domestic violence work in diverse ways, although primarily focusing on victim advocacy. The interviewees are relatively homogeneous with respect to their gender—all but three are female. Also, by
focusing on the foremothers and forefathers of the domestic violence movement, the newer and younger activists who are not part of the study would probably have contributed different types of information.

This study details the social construction of domestic violence by examining the experiences and perceptions of the foremothers and forefathers of the movement. While it details one side of the story, it does not have experiences or perceptions of the general public on domestic violence, nor of other non-activist victims. As shown in this study, the gap in the construction of domestic violence between the activists and the Japanese government, and the perceptions and understanding of the general public may differ from activists or from the government. This piece of information becomes critical, particularly when addressing intervention in domestic violence and prevention of it. Although the GEB has performed some investigation of the public’s perceptions and understanding of domestic violence, more studies are needed to assist in constructing strategies and methods to reach out for education and work with them to address the issue.

While this research study is greatly strengthened by its employment of both qualitative and quantitative data, its primary focus was on the narratives of the activist interviewees, with the archival data used to accentuate the voices of the interview participants. More thorough analysis of the archival data may derive different types of information.

With respect to practicality and usefulness, the study shows the potential for application in the real world besides a standard use for academics and their exercises. This year marks a decade after the DVP law was passed. It is a moment for people in the domestic violence field to perform some reassessment and reexamination, and this study
is an appropriate tool for that. It urges the Japanese government to take a firmer stand on domestic violence to better and properly address it with visions and strategies that take future generations into consideration. Advocates and service providers can use this study as a reminder of their good work and continue to further advance the movement and develop more effective strategies to eliminate domestic violence, particularly with respect to breaking down divisions within the movement, expanding strategies beyond immediate intervention work to prevention, and more. And in general, this study raises a question on the use of English words, in this particular context the naming of social problems. However, what this study reveals is applicable to other matters. Naming new phenomena in foreign terms is something to be carefully thought through, and weighing the implications and impacts should be one major critical part of this construction.

**Future Considerations**

This research study reveals the importance of using narratives and perspectives of domestic violence activists in examining how *domesutikku baiorensu* is socially constructed in Japan. There are various structures that future studies can employ to further examine aspects of the social construction of domestic violence in Japan. Interviewees can be diversified by including more male activists, more activists who do abuser work, and younger and newer activists who have begun their activism or advocacy work after the *domesutikku baiorensu* term was introduced to the society and after the issue was framed as a social problem. Also, perceptions and understandings of victims and abusers would add depth to and broaden the knowledge and understanding of the social construction of *domesutikku baiorensu*. Similarly, it would be helpful to conduct comparative studies of social construction of domestic violence between the general
public and those who have been involved with the movement to illuminate differences between the two. As social constructionist perspectives point to us (Hacking, 1999; Lamb, 1999; Loseke, 1999; Mehrotra, 1999; Tierney, 1982), it takes different types of role players to create a social problem. Incorporating different perspectives and experiences that those role players bring in constructing доместикку байоренсу would be enriching to the field of social construction. And it is particularly valuable to the Japanese domestic violence field in their continued endeavor to eliminate доместикку байоренсу.

This research study also reveals an aspect of activists and advocates in the domestic violence movement that seems counterproductive or even hindering to advancing the domestic violence movement and making strategies to better address the issue. Narratives point toward the compartmentalization of professionals, between victim and abuser advocates, between survivor and non-victim advocates, and between different types of professions. Breaking down the walls that separate these specializations would be likely to increase communication and create opportunities to collaborate across professions, including strategizing ways to effectively address domestic violence. Collaboration should also increase understanding of what and how others are doing their work in the field, and more. There may be good communication and support systems within a specialization, but it needs to go beyond that to progressively and effectively address domestic violence across the specializations.

Very importantly, the study shows that leaving relationships is constructed as a success for domestic violence victims. Aside from sheltering victims and helping them become independent, diversifying intervention strategies and methods, as well as finding ways of stopping abuse and violence, will be necessary to fully address domestic violence
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seems necessary and realistic. This is challenging for many activists and advocates, as
they perceive leaving as the only or the best way of addressing domestic violence for
victims. Campbell (2002) explains that women most commonly sustain injuries in
domestic violence incidents when they try to leave. To frame leaving relationships as the
only way to address abuse and violence for victims is extremely limiting and unrealistic,
given the frequency of injury incidents combined with the fact that not all victims
consider or desire leaving.

Reframing what counts as success for domestic violence victims would be a
critical first step for diversifying intervention strategies. Creating more options besides
leaving would be inclusive of those who are not thinking about leaving but still want
assistance, information, or guidance on how to work with an abusive partner. Otherwise,
there would be many victims who are left alone in the dark without information, support,
or resources because they feel that they have to be ready to leave in order to get
assistance from services. By creating more intervention options, it is likely that more
victims would reach out for help, information, and services. And the more victims that
services can reach, the better awareness they can raise about domestic violence. This kind
of inclusive outreach and education would be effective not only for immediate assistance
purposes but also planting seeds of knowledge for future sprouting.

Moreover, by expecting victims to leave their relationships regardless of victims’
intentions or will, advocates and activists may result in further disempowering victims by
depriving them of a critical opportunity of regaining agency, self-determination, and
making their own decisions for themselves. Or, the expectation of leaving may leave
victims feeling like a failure again if they did not follow what activists or advocates think
is best for victims. In the power-imbalanced and hierarchical abusive relationships, out of necessity and survival, victims of domestic violence do what abusers desire or expect. They lose their voice and replace their own desires by abusers’. As part of gaining back one’s own voice and relearning to advocate for oneself, what victims of domestic violence need is a safe and supportive environment in which they can make a sound decision based on self-determination. If victims choose not to leave their relationship, their decision needs to be honored and respected, especially by the domestic violence advocates to whom victims confide their problems. Victims need to be able to come to their decisions without feeling coerced or guilty about not doing what some authority figure expected them to do. To create this safe and empowering environment based upon self-determination, activists, advocates, and government alike need to reframe “success” for victims of domestic violence. And they need to break down the divisive walls between professions and types of advocacy to start conversations on expanding and diversifying strategies beyond shelters, since focusing too strongly on sheltering victims and aiding them to live independently is limiting.

Also, this study points to the disempowering effects of perceiving and treating victims with sympathy and pity. Moreover, there do not seem to be familiar Japanese words to talk about victims who have gone beyond victimization, regained a whole sense of self, and moved on. Although activists use sabaibā to describe survivors, that is another foreign term with which the public has no positive associations or connections, a situation that may prevent people from truly owning the term, in short, the same set of problems, this study demonstrates, that occurs with domesutikku baiorensu. As part of advocacy, activists and advocates, together with victims and survivors, must help
reconstruct the images of and the social construction framework of victims who receive empathy and help create a term that properly describe people who have overcome their victimization and no longer feel like victims or perceive themselves in that category. After being labeled as victims and treated with sympathy, it is debilitating to remain in that condition, and the lack of language or a construct to define those who have moved beyond their victimization is further disempowering. Changes in these aspects of the social construction of *domesutikku baiorensu* are crucial, especially for victims who are impacted directly, but also for others who develop negative or condescending perceptions of victims and behave accordingly.

There are some pragmatic yet potentially effective steps that activists, advocates, and the Japanese government should consider taking to reach a wider population and to better engage people; they involve reframing the issue. Both the *Asahi Shimbun* archive and the narratives of the activist interviewees’ pointed out that *domesutikku baiorensu* is overwhelmingly framed and treated as a women’s issue. This is necessary especially at the beginning of raising awareness and reaching people widely, considering the fact that the vast majority of the victims are women. They are facing imminent physical and psychological injuries, and interventions are deemed critical.

However, as people become familiar with *domesutikku baiorensu* and learn about the issue, the frame of *domesutikku baiorensu* as a women’s issue becomes increasingly problematic. Abusers are vilified to the point that even victim advocates have difficulty being sympathetic and realizing the grave needs of intervening abusers to prevent future violence. Moreover, this “women’s issue” frame places responsibility on women to do something about the issue: for women to solve the problem, for women to leave
relationships, and for women to be mindful and read yellow and red flags of domestic violence and stay away from potentially abusive men. Worse yet, this frame leaves men out of the equation, disengaging them from the problem and distancing them from learning about the real problem: men are inflicting harm on their intimate female partners. This fact needs to be communicated particularly to men, as they engage in abusive and violent behaviors toward intimate partners, and they need to stop behaving that way.

To better engage men, hold them accountable for their action, and educate them and future generations, this “women’s problem” needs to be reframed as “men’s problem.” Women created the domestic violence movement, but more men need to join the movement and start domestic violence work for men by men. The male interview participants of this dissertation research, for example, are role models who have been working with abusive men for decades. Japan needs more men like them who would jump into and carry on the effort among men. To appeal to men and engage more men in the movement, the reframing of domesutikku baiorenzu is essential.

While this reframing seems like a logical and effective strategy, it requires a careful and thoughtful approach so as not to cause any backlash from men. Calling men’s patriarchy-infused behaviors and holding them accountable may not settle well with some or perhaps many men and make them uncomfortable. In countries like the United States, men are leading a men’s movement against sexism, rape, and domestic violence, raising awareness, providing information, unlearning ingrained sexism, and changing the male and masculine culture locally and nationally (Einschlag, 2008; Hurt, 2008; Katz, 2008; Loewe, 2008; Mirande, 2008; Osayande, 2008). When the critique of sexism and
patriarchy comes from male activists, other men and young boys may feel less defensive and be more open to think about and discuss their masculinity, the ideas associated with being manly, and ways to redefine their male identity without using or resorting to abuse or violence. Men can and should create this type of safe place, where men can come together and educate each other for the betterment of not only women and girls but also for themselves.

In terms of directions and considerations that the Japanese government, as well as activists and advocates in the domestic violence field ought to take seriously, the first and foremost is a new emphasis on prevention. While addressing the imminent danger that victims and their family face is critical, truly imperative work is prevention and preventive strategies and methods. Prevention work is the only way to halt abuse and violence from occurring in the future. As became clear in my study, prevention will require a great deal of commitment, hard work, and leadership from the government and from activists. It will also require collaboration that includes both victims and abusers, along with the government, activists, and advocates. Involving all the players and arriving at the same table is critical in implementing programs and educating both boys and girls. Prevention education requires being thorough, starting from early years and lasting throughout children’s growing years. And continuing education is just as critical and necessary, involving adults both young and old. Implementing education should not be simplistic in the sense of creating programs in schools but also extend to other areas of people’s lives at home and in communities. One way to measure the seriousness of addressing domestic violence is to look at prevention efforts and strategies. After all, without ways to prevent abuse and violence and heavily relying on intervention, people
and their lives will continue to be negatively impacted. Abuse and violence will continue to occur in so many people’s lives. Japan needs to improve this area greatly and considerably if they are serious about addressing domestic violence.

To have effective prevention strategies planned and implemented, Japan needs to take a clearer, stronger and firmer stand on the contributing factors of domestic violence. Domestic violence is not a random act of a few men who have anger management problems. Domestic violence, like other types of gender violence, occurs because of sexism and oppression against women. In other words, patriarchy is the culprit. Without identifying causes, problems cannot be addressed fully or thoroughly, and eradication will not be possible. Prevention strategies in particular will be useless and ineffective if they are founded upon wrongly identified causes of domestic violence. Japan’s ambivalent stance on domestic violence is problematic because it does not allow clearly defined strategies to be employed. Seriousness in addressing domestic violence requires clear definitions of the problem and clear identification of the cause. The current situation is a rather half-hearted and cowardly response to domestic violence on the part of the Japanese government. Again, if it is seriously concerned about citizens’ wellbeing and future generations, it needs to tackle domestic violence fully and thoroughly by clearly defining the problem, identifying root causes, and instigating intervention and prevention strategies. Will Japan squarely identify the cause of domestic violence as patriarchy? It remains to be seen.

In patriarchal societies, where male dominance is prevalent and their influences permeate society, it is inevitable that social structures and systems are affected equally by patriarchal influences. This implies all the more efforts are necessary to address
patriarchy in stopping domestic violence. Also, recognizing the pervasiveness of patriarchy in stopping domestic violence. Also, recognizing the pervasiveness of patriarchy should create a pause or two about relying heavily on the governmental system, for examples, laws. While many advocates and activists want laws to address domestic violence abusers and protect victims and their family, laws are products of a patriarchal system. Even with creative and thoughtful efforts enacting laws to address domestic violence, the resulting statutes are enforced in the context of patriarchal society. Laws are necessary to ensure the safety of victims and their family but will not prevent abuse or violence from occurring.

One aspect that this research study emphasizes is the need for better solutions to the naming dilemma. The sentiments strongly shared among the activist interviewees are that while people are familiar with domesutikku baiorensu or dī bui, they do not fully understand what domesutikku baiorensu is and lack intuitive understanding of the name. Names that resonate with people are critical, especially in naming social problems. Using foreign terms and spending time on educating people about names, and what those names mean and entail is loss of valuable time and energy that could be more constructively applied to addressing the issue itself.

Related to this, activists and advocates, as well as the Japanese government, need to look for models, strategies, policies and more not only from the Western countries but also from others. However, before importing anything from elsewhere, they need to carefully assess the appropriateness of what they are about to import and modify accordingly to make things work effectively in the context of Japan. Global organizations, such as the United Nations and the World Health Organization have
extensive data from different parts of the world that can be used to Japan’s advantage in assessing and implementing programs.

This research study has uncovered the tip of the iceberg about *domesutikku baiorensu* and how it is constructed in Japan. Through the voices of activists who have been advocating in the field for decades, combined with the archival data from *Asahi Shimbun*, it shows that Japan thus far has been addressing domestic violence by developing and implementing intervention strategies. Now, a decade after the DVP law passed, it is high time to shift gears and start addressing domestic violence with future generations in mind, meaning through prevention. Though it is unmistakably no easy task, *domesutikku baiorensu* will never be fully addressed without prevention.
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   2540 Maile Way,
   Honolulu HI 96822
   Phone: 808-956-5007
Appendix II: Statement of Informed Consent for Participating in In-depth Interview in Japanese

参加同意書

研究題目 Deconstructing Domestic Violence: The Case of Japan

研究者氏名 荒井メイコ

住所 University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of Sociology,
2424 Maile Way, Saunders 247, Honolulu, HI 96822 U.S.A.

電話番号 (808) 956-7502

本プロジェクトは、社会運動のひとつであるドメスティック・バイオレンス（ＤＶ）運動が日本においてどのような人たちにより引き起こされ、どのような経緯で広まっていったかななどを理解することを主眼にしています。またドメスティック・バイオレンスという言葉が使われる以前の女性に対する暴力を取り巻く日本での状況にも目を向けるという目的もあります。

インタビューは一時間程度で、今回一回かぎりのご協力となります。再びこちらから追加インタビューご協力をお願いすることがありましたときは、参加の意思はその時点でご決意していただくもので、初回のものとはまったく別になります。初回参加されたからといって、二回目も参加しなくてはならないというものではありません。

この研究に参加することによって、第三者にあなたの身元が判明したり、あなたのプライバシーが脅かされたりすることはありません。インタビューの内容は厳重に管理され、論文中では決して身元が判明しないような形で発表されます。あなたが望まれる場合、インタビューはいつでも中断することができますし、そのことについてあなたが責任を負うことは一切ありません。このインタビューは全くのボランティアです。

この研究に参加して下さることにより、あなたは、日本におけるのＤＶ運動の経緯がどのようなものであるかを調査するお手伝いをして下さることになります。ご自身の経験を語って研究にご協力いただくことに対して、そして貴重な時間を割いて体験や意見を分かち合って下さることにたいして、ささやかながらお礼を用意しています。もしご希望であれば、プロジェクトが完了した時点での調査結果を、無料でご報告させて頂きます。

あなたの権利に対し何か質問がある場合、あなたの質問に対し、リサーチャーから満足のいく答えが得られなかった場合、あるいは何かコメントしたいことや、リサーチャーのあなたへの扱いに不満などがある場合、下記まで連絡してください。

Committee on Human Studies
University of Hawaii
2540 Maile Way, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 U.S.A.
Phone: (808) 956-5007

日付： ___________________________

サイン： __________________________
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Appendix III: Statement of Informed Consent for Audiotaping the In-depth Interview in English

Special Consent for Audio Taping of Interview

I give my consent to having this interview audio taped. I understand that the researcher will destroy these tapes as soon as they are transcribed (typed up), usually within 24 hours of the interview. I understand that the transcriptions will be destroyed at the conclusion of this research study.

I understand that no identifying information will be attached to the tapes. The tapes will be used for research purposes only and only by this researcher in connection with the present research project.

The information in this study will be used for doctoral dissertation and may be published as part of a larger report or a book. If information from the taped interview is published as part of a larger report or book, I understand that I will not be identified or described in ways that might lead others to identify me.

*I herewith consent to the audio taping of this interview, understanding that this consent does not waive any of my legal rights. Further, I understand that this consent is given in conjunction only with my consent to participate in the research project described in the attached consent form signed by me.*

Date: ______________________

If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact:

Committee on Human Studies
University of Hawaii
2540 Maile Way, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822.
Phone: (808) 956-5007
インタビュー録音同意書

私はインタビューを録音することを許可します。録音されたインタビューは、インタビュー終了後速やか（通常24時間以内）に書き起こされ、その後デジタル録音されたものは破棄されることを理解しています。書き起こされたインタビュー原稿は、分析が終了すると同時に処分されることを理解しています。

個人の身元が判明するような情報などは一切デジタル録音には添付されないと理解しています。このデジタル録音は、インタビューを行うリサーチャー本人だけが、本調査の研究目的のみに使用することとなります。

この研究で得た情報は博士課程論文に使用され、報告書や書籍等出版物の形で使用される可能性もあります。報告書や書籍等の出版物中にインタビューの内容が使用された場合、個人情報が漏洩されたり、私の身元が判明するような書き方がされたりしないことを理解しています。

ここにおいて、インタビューのデジタル録音に同意し、同意した事によってなんら私の法的権利は放棄はされない事を理解します。そして本同意書は、添付のインタビュー参加同意書に同意を表明したうえでのみ、提出されるものと理解しています。

あなたの権利に対し何か質問がある場合、あなたの質問に対し、リサーチャーから満足のいく答えが得られなかった場合、あるいは何かコメントしたいことや、リサーチャーのあなたの扱いに不満などがある場合、下記まで連絡してください。

Committee on Human Studies
University of Hawaii
2540 Maile Way, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Phone: (808) 956-5007

日付: __________________________________________

サイン: ________________________________________
### Appendix V: List of Items Collected on Asahi Shimbun Data Collection Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong>*</td>
<td>Morning or Evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong>*</td>
<td>Society, Family, Entertainment, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong>*</td>
<td>Region specific, such as Nagoya, Osaka, Seibu, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name Type</strong>*</td>
<td><em>domesutikk</em> baiorensu, <em>kateinai bōryoku</em>, <em>dēto dībuī</em> or combinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Violence Scale</strong>*</td>
<td>Use of <em>kateinai bōryoku</em> as clear or ambiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Use of Identical Article</strong>*</td>
<td>Check “yes” or “no” and enter other Article IDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Enter text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtitle</strong></td>
<td>Enter text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article Body</strong></td>
<td>Copy and paste entire article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quick Check</strong>*</td>
<td>Use of statistics; use of actual case; resource information; event information; on men; quotations of victims, abusers; quotations of professionals; DV as human rights, women’s issue, public health, social problem, crime men’s issue; discussion of social welfare; shelter; legal discussion; policy discussion; children in DV context; DV as family violence; dēto dī buī; child abuse; discussion of language; discussion of abroad;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Content Information***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Theme of Article****</td>
<td>Themes include abuser support, addiction, child abuse, sexual harassment, case workers, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes Needed*****</td>
<td>Topics includes abuser support, crime prevention, courts, police, law, elder abuse, education, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes Observed*****</td>
<td>Changes or improvement observed in areas, such as prevention, law, courts, education, shelter, collaboration, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description and Definition*****</td>
<td>Description and definition of domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events****</td>
<td>Name of events, types, organizers, purpose of events, prefecture, featured guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narratives*****</td>
<td>Cut and paste of quotations matched with organization, name of quoted person if applicable, role of person (victim, abuser, shelter advocate, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes*****</td>
<td>Copy and paste causes of domestic violence matched with organization if applicable, role of person (victim, abuser, shelter advocate, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depiction of Victims*****</td>
<td>Description of victims and how they are depicted; matched with organization if applicable, role of person role of person (victim, abuser, shelter advocate, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics*****</td>
<td>Statistics, name of study, study organization if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case*****</td>
<td>Texts on actual cases matched with role of a person or organization if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad****</td>
<td>Texts on description, discussion, or mention of abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Choose one of multiple choices.
** Check “yes” or “no” and all that applies.
*** All the information in this category is matched with identifiers, such as article ID, sequence order, and if applicable who made statements, and organizations.
**** Choose multiple answers from multiple choices.
***** Copy and paste texts as many segments as applies.
Appendix VI: Interview Guide in English

1. Please tell me about your career up to now.

2. How and when did you get involved with domestic violence? Please tell me about the pathways into your involvement.

3. At that time, did you have any goals or aspirations regarding your domestic violence advocacy?

4. At the time, when you began your domestic violence advocacy, how was the social atmosphere and systems that surrounded domestic violence?

5. At the time when there was no name such as dī bui in the society, how did you network and collaborated with others? And with whom?

6. In Japan now, how much do you think the term, dī bui, is familiarized and understood?

7. In Japan, we are using Katakana-English, dī bui. Have you thought of anything about that?

8. What are your personal goals with respect to domestic violence work?

9. What do you think are some of the future goals for the Japanese dī bui movement?
Appendix VII: Interview Guide in Japanese

1. 今日に至るご自身の主だった経歴をお教えください。

2. いつごろ、どのようにして DV に関わるようになったのか、そのきっかけや経緯をお教えください。

3. その当時、ご自身が持っておられた DV 活動に関する目標や課題は？

4. DV 活動を始められた当時の DV を取り巻く社会的状況や社会体制はどういうものだったのでしょうか？

5. DV 活動を始められた当時まだ DV という言葉も無い社会状況の中で、ネットワークやコラボレーションはどういう形でどのような方々を作ってこられたのでしょうか？

6. 日本において DV という言葉や意味がどれだけ浸透し理解されているとお考えですか？

7. カタカナ英語の DV という言葉が日本では使用されていますが、それについてはご自身でなにか思われたこと、考えられたことはあおりでしょうか？

8. 今現在の DV に関するご自身の目標や課題は？

9. 今後の日本の DV 運動においての課題は？
Appendix VIII: Table of Activist Interviewees Based on 20 Primary Interviewees

To ensure the anonymity that had been promised to the participants, a table with pseudonyms matching their characteristics was deemed inappropriate. This table is an attempt to provide a sense of who the interviewees of the dissertation research are. This table is constructed based upon the 20 primary interviewees out of the 25 total participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victimization Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Together with Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated from Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Advocacy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Profession</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence Shelter Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others(^{15})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\) Victimization here includes both having been abused and having abused; one abuser, four survivors.

\(^{13}\) The number is based upon those who have victimization experience. The relationship status indicates whether interviewees are together with or separated from the partner that victimization occurred.

\(^{14}\) This indicates a primary job that interviewees had regardless of whether it was related to domestic violence.

\(^{15}\) This category consists of journalist, medical doctor, self-employed, group facilitator, and trainer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Spent in Domestic Violence Field</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10s</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Domestic Violence Study and Research Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attended the United Nation’s Beijing Women’s Conference in 1995</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in Abroad</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lived and Trained(^{16})</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveled to Train(^{17})</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Influence(^{18})</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Islands of Advocacy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honshu (the main island)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other islands</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Advocacy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Areas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Areas</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{16}\) Interviewees had extensive living abroad experience and had domestic violence training abroad.

\(^{17}\) Interviewees traveled abroad specifically to train in the area of domestic violence.

\(^{18}\) Interviewees themselves did not travel abroad, but used materials on domestic violence from abroad that had been brought in by colleagues.
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