

論文

Responsibility for Citation

A Way to Understand Bystander Intervention in Sexual Violence through Judith Butler's Theory of Performativity

IGARASHI Mai¹

2023年度からはじまる「生命(いのち)の安全教育」には、バイスタンダー介入に関する教育が含まれる。しかし、文部科学省が提供する教材には、介入の前提となる、バイスタンダーとしての責任を認識する動機づけに関する言及がない。本稿は、性暴力の場に居合わせたひとがもつ責任について、ジュディス・バトラーのパフォーマティヴィティ概念からの説明を試みる。性暴力が発生する空間を、被害者を排除する力が働く場として理解すると、性暴力を目撃しながら無視する行為は、何もしない行為ではなく、その秩序を引用し強化する行為として位置づけることができる。バトラーが提示する言説を引用することに対する責任の議論を、性暴力が発生する空間の検討に応用すると、居合わせたひとは、その暴力の発生をゆるす秩序を引用することに対して責任をもつと理解できる。バイスタンダー介入教育は、当初、被害者の仲間として学生を呼びかけることで、従来の加害者として呼びかける方法と比べて、学生が受け入れやすいだろうとその可能性が期待されていた。しかし、加害性に目を向けないことは、性暴力の他者化につながる。性暴力の場に居合わせたひとに積極的に加害性を読み込む理解の仕方は、バイスタンダー介入の責任を効果的に認識することを可能にする。

Japan's Life Safety Education program includes bystander intervention education. However, the Life Safety Education program's material, which the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology prepared, does not refer to the motivation for recognizing one's responsibility as a bystander. This paper attempts to explain the responsibilities that bystanders have in the space of sexual violence from Judith Butler's theory of performativity. The public space in which sexual violence occurs can be understood as a place in which forces that exclude victims operate. Not only are harassment and victimization difficult to prosecute, but the process remains difficult for the victim, even after the harassment is reported to the police. In addition, harassment accusations are sometimes incorrectly deemed false. Such situations perpetuate the marginalization of women and those who are vulnerable to harassment. Ignoring sexual violence

while witnessing it is not tantamount to inactivity; however, this ignorance can be positioned as an entity that cites and reinforces an order that permits harassment. Butler presented the idea of the responsibility of citation regarding hate speech. Following this idea, the original act of sexual violence may have been committed by the perpetrator, but the bystander can be understood as being responsible for citing the order that permits this violence. Ignoring harassment is not truly an act of passivity, but rather an act that forgives the harassment and allows it to be repeated. Furthermore, the active intervention of bystanders does not simply prevent the repetition and reinforcement of the harmful order of the public space—it also opens the possibility of shifting this order. Bystanders are responsible for disrupting the order that enables sexual violence. The bystander intervention program was originally anticipated to be more effective at reducing violence than traditional victim/perpetrator-focused models, calling on people to be allies of victims. However, the othering of the perpetrator leads to a lack of questioning of one's own actions. The understanding that actively incorporates bystanders into perpetration offers effective ways to recognize one's responsibility for bystander intervention.

キーワード: バイスタンダー介入、性暴力、ジュディス・バトラー、パフォーマティビティ
Key words: bystander intervention, sexual violence, Judith Butler, performativity

1 Introduction

Starting in FY2023, Japan's Life Safety Education program will be implemented in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools in the country. This program aims to prevent children from becoming victims, perpetrators, and bystanders of sexual violence. In line with this, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) has released educational guidelines and materials tailored to each individual level of students' development. The PowerPoint presentations and video materials prepared for each developmental stage consist mainly of discussions regarding the role of bystanders in the prevention of "the second rape" and descriptions of what to do if one is present at the scene of sexual violence. Regarding the former, studies have examined how third parties regard victims and the kinds of words used to trivialize the victimization of sexual violence victims in trauma studies (Miyaji, 2007). Although the importance of the latter type of bystander intervention has been emphasized in recent years, there has been little research in Japan on bystanders who were present at the scene of sexual violence compared with, for example, bystander intervention in bullying scenarios.

In the educational material prepared for high school students, bystander intervention is addressed in the section "What if your friend is a victim of sexual violence?" The video resource uses the following example: "If your friend is in trouble on the train and is being harassed, you can ask your friend to come to you. By secretly telling a nearby adult, you can secure help for your friend or have the adult report the incident to station staff or the police." Harassment on the train is one of the types of sexual violence in Japan that lack bystander intervention. According to data from the Metropolitan Police Department, 45% of witnesses did nothing about harassment on the train (Close-up Gendai +, 2020). Furthermore, bystander intervention involves five steps: noticing the event, identifying the situation as appropriate for intervention, taking responsibility for intervention, deciding how to help, and acting to intervene (Burn, 2009, pp. 780–782). The Life Safety Education materials address four of these points but do not address responsibility to act, which describes how people could

recognize one's responsibility for bystander intervention. In response to the data showing that 45% of witnesses to harassment on the train did nothing, Nobuo Komiya, a professor of criminology at Rissho University, pointed out that there is a bystander effect at work—onlookers assume that someone else will do something about the harassment (Close-up Gendai +, 2020). Therefore, to better understand the concept of bystander intervention, we cannot ignore the issue of awareness of bystanders' responsibility to intervene.

This paper explores this responsibility using Judith Butler's concept of performativity. In *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly* (2015), Butler discusses the right to appear in public spaces. Sexual assault on the train is a threat to this right. By situating the bystander as a constitutive entity in a public space, this paper attempts to explain the responsibility of bystanders who were present at the scene of sexual violence to intervention in terms of the responsibility for the maintenance and transformation of order.

It has also been pointed out that the recognition of responsibility for bystander intervention is influenced by the relationship between bystanders and potential victims or perpetrators, on the one hand, and bystanders' ideas about the worthiness of the victim's being worthy of intervention, on the other hand (Burn, 2009, pp. 781–782). When there is a relationship between bystanders and potential victims, bystanders feel more responsible for intervening if the potential victim is, for example, a member of one of the bystander's ingroups. The victim's worthiness refers to whether the bystander thinks the victim is dressed “provocatively”; if both the victim and the perpetrator had consumed alcohol, then the rape is judged less severely, and the bystander's perception of their responsibility to intervene is reduced (Burn, 2009, pp. 781–782). In Japan, victims of sexual violence are often blamed for having or displaying certain characteristics (Maenosono, 2022, pp. 7–11). Both the cases of harassment on the train contained in the educational materials for high school students and the cases of sexual harassment at drinking parties in the materials for the “High School (Near Graduation)/University/General” level are cases in which the victims are acquaintances of bystanders. In the material for high school students, the victim is a friend. Given that many cases of sexual violence are committed by acquaintances, it is not unlikely that people will witness violence in which acquaintances are victims. At the same time, however, in the case of harassment on the train, for example, the victim may be a stranger (Saito, 2017, pp. 19-20), or the victim of harassment at a drinking party may be a coworker or classmate with whom one is not usually on good terms. The perspective of responsibility as a member of the public space presented in this study can be formulated on the basis of a kind of universal ethics, making it possible to explain such responsibility without depending on the victim's characteristics.

The following section, Chapter 2, outlines the behaviors that constitute bystander behavior. Chapter 3 then examines harassment events from the perspective of the right to appear in public spaces. Finally, Chapters 4 and 5 explain bystanders' responsibilities as agencies of citation and the repetition of the order of public space.

2 Distract, Delegate, Document, Delay, and Direct

In the MEXT's Life Safety Education program, the educational materials for the “High School (Near Graduation)/University/General” level include a section entitled “If You See a Person in Trouble.” When describing bystander intervention, in addition to calling out to the victim or asking another adult to call the police when one is at the scene of harassment as described above, the educational materials recommend the following: “Protect yourself first, and if possible, intervene in the situation (e.g., tell the person who is being forced to drink that it is time to leave, or tell the person who is trying to force another person to drink that you should ask for a soft drink next time)” (4). The materials also state, “If you cannot intervene on your own, get

help from others around you (e.g., ask a store employee for help or call the police)” (4). This chapter reviews the basic components of bystander intervention.

As a pioneer of bystander intervention programs, the Green Dot program proposed the 3 Ds (*Distract, Delegate, Direct*); later, in collaboration with the Green Dot, Hollaback! expanded them to the “5Ds” as follows: “The 5Ds are different methods—*Distract, Delegate, Document, Delay, and Direct*—that you can use to support someone who’s being harassed, emphasize that harassment is not okay, and demonstrate to people in your life that they have the power to make their community safer.” Japanese descriptions of bystander intervention are generally based on the definition developed Hollaback! and the Green Dot. The following briefly classifies specific examples of bystander intervention proposed in the material of the Life Safety Education program based on Hollaback!’s “5Ds” conceptualization of bystander intervention.

The first of the “5Ds” is *Distract*. Its “aim is simply to derail the incident of harassment by interrupting it.” The second is *Delegate*: “Delegation is asking a third party for help with intervening in the harassment.” The third is *Document*: “Documentation involves either recording or taking notes on an instance of harassment.” The fourth, *Delay*, is described as follows: “After the incident is over, check in with the person who was harassed.” The last is *Direct*—if you direct, “[a]ssess your safety first,” then “[s]peak up about the harassment. Be firm and clear.” Thus, bystander intervention includes not only immediate direct intervention but also following up after the incident.

The video materials for high school students address what to do if a friend is being harassed, which consists of *Distraction* (e.g., talking to the friend), *Delegation* (e.g., asking for help from nearby adults), and *Delay* (e.g., checking in with the friend). In addition, the “High School (Near Graduation)/College/General” public educational materials state that *Direction* can be used to confirm the victim’s safety and *Delegation* can be used to ask a nearby adult for help.

3 On the Matter of the Right to Appear in Public Spaces

“#ActiveBystander = 行動する傍観者,” released in 2020, portrays six common forms of sexual violence in Japan. These include upskirting—the act of taking a photograph under another person’s clothing without their permission—on escalators, men intentionally bumping into women on the street, cyclists groping a woman’s breasts, being persistently hit on in the street, slipping rape drugs into a date’s drink at bars, and bosses holding female employees’ shoulders and asking them private questions at company parties.

Being harassed on a train or bus, intentionally being bumped into on the street, persistently being propositioned, and being upskirted on escalators all exclude women from public areas, and harassment at company parties excludes women from the workplace. This chapter frames sexual violence in the public sphere as a matter of the right to access public spaces.

In *Wanderlust: A History of Walking* (2000), Rebecca Solnit describes how women are excluded from walking down the street:

[M]ost public places at most times have not been as welcoming and as safe for women. Legal measures, social mores subscribed to by both men and women, the threat implicit in sexual harassment, and rape itself have all limited women’s ability to walk where and when they wished. (Solnit, 2000, p. 234)

Women's presence in public spaces has become “with startling frequency an invasion of their private parts, sometimes literally, sometimes verbally” (Solnit, 2000, p. 234), and “women's walking is often construed as performance rather than transport” (Solnit, 2000, p. 234). It is assumed that “women's travel is invariably sexual or that their sexuality is transgressive when it travels” (Solnit, 2000, p. 234).

This sexualization of women's travel corresponds to the “cognitive distortion” of male perpetrators (Saito, 2017, p. 91). Perpetrators' perceptions, such as “women who wear revealing clothing want to be harassed,” “women who look at me must want to be groped,” and “since she walked toward me, it is okay to touch her” (Saito, 2017, p. 90), imply that “women walk not to see but to be seen, not for their experience but for that of a male audience, which means that they are asking for whatever attention they receive” (Solnit, 2000, p. 234). The possibility of such violence “in the more insulting and aggressive propositions, comments, leers, and intimidations that are part of ordinary life for women in public places” and “[f]ear of rape puts many women in their place—indoors” (Solnit, 2000, p. 240).

In *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly* (2015), Judith Butler asks who can safely appear in public spaces:

Gender norms have everything to do with how and in what way we can appear in public space, how and in what way the public and private are distinguished, and how that distinction is instrumentalized in the service of sexual politics. (Butler, 2015, p. 34)

Because “those who do not live their gender in an intelligible way are at heightened risk for harassment,” gender norms are directly linked to precarity, which “designate that politically induced condition in which certain population suffer from failing social and economic support more than others, and become differentially exposed to injury, violence, and death” (Butler, 2015, pp. 33–34). People who are targeted for harassment simply for walking down the street are not guaranteed the right to safe access to public spaces and are assigned a high degree of vulnerability.

By asking who will be criminalized on the basis of their public appearance, I mean, who will be treated as a criminal, and produced as a criminal [...]; who will fail to be protected by the law or, more specifically, the police, on the street, or on the job, or in the home—in legal codes or religious institution? Whose claims of injury will be refused, and who will be stigmatized and disenfranchised at the same time that they become the object of fascination and consume pleasure? (Butler, 2015, pp. 34–35)

Approximately 90% of harassment victims do not report their experiences to or consult with the police (Makino, 2019, p. 19; Saito, 2017, pp. 22–23). Furthermore, if victims report harassment to the police, they are asked to reconstruct the circumstances of their victimization during the interview process (Makino 39–41). Some victims are asked for personal information, such as the amount of their savings and employment status, because they are suspected of making false reports (Makino, 2019, pp. 41–42). In addition, even when a victim reports to the police, the situation is often treated as a “consultation matter” and not as a crime (Makino, 2019, p. 22). Furthermore, even if victims report violence or consult with the police, about 50% of perpetrators are merely given guidance (*shido*) or warnings (*keikoku*) and are not arrested (Makino, 2019, pp. 166–167). These circumstances suggest that victims are not adequately protected by the judicial system.

In 2000, after a series of acquittals in harassment cases, “false accusations of harassment” came into the spotlight (Makino, 2019, p. 161). False accusations of molestation are as much a criminal justice issue as other false accusations (Makino, 2019, pp. 184–185). However, there is a narrative that compares being a victim of molestation to being a victim of false accusations of molestation: in 1999, when a woman who suffered harassment on a train raised her voice, the train stopped for a while. It was later discovered that the suspected perpetrator was the wrong person (Makino, 2019, pp. 181–182). Regarding this incident, whether the suspected perpetrator was the wrong person or not, the fact remains that the woman was a victim—this should not change anything. However, in the media coverage of this incident, the victim was blamed in two ways: she allegedly invited the molester in and disrupted the situation by stopping the train (Makino, 2019, pp. 181–182). A distorted picture of false accusations of harassment is thus created: A woman’s accusation alone is enough to arrest 100% of those suspected of harassment, women making up false accusations of harassment to secure settlement money, and women seducing harassers (Makino, 2019, pp. 165–189). As for the last discourse, although the perpetrator molests the victim, he still claims to be falsely accused (Makino, 2019, p. 187). Sexual violence victims are not only legally protected enough, but in the distorted discourse concerning false accusations of molestation, molestation victims are supposed to be excessively protected by the judiciary and considered as a kind of “perpetrator” who exploits this unreal protection.

Butler also pointed out that the highly regulated field of appearance requires people to appear in a certain way (2015, p. 35). Several anti-harassment campaigns have urged women not to use crowded trains (e.g., Aichi Prefecture Railway Police Unit (2020)). Others advise women to wear less revealing clothing to protect themselves (Makino, 2019, pp. 29–31). These do not seek to change the space itself, but rather to relegate women to a different space. These “measures” merely maintain the order of the street.

In *Bodies That Matter* (1993), Butler describes the process by which one becomes a woman as follows: From birth, infants are named “girl” or “boy” according to the norms of biological sex, and the “it” named “girl” continues to be interpellated as “girl” in the future under the threat of punishment (Butler, 1993, pp. 7–8). If one who is interpellated as a “girl” refuses to conform to what is expected of a “girl,” one cannot “qualify and remain as a viable subject” (Butler, 1993, p. 176). Thus, it becomes extremely difficult for this subject to reject gender norm—the subject becomes either a girl or a boy. The norm that an “it” can always be categorized as a woman or man is then reinforced through repetition so that it appears fundamental (Butler, 1999). In other words, gender itself is made to seem as if it were fixed through the compelled citation of the norm and, at the same time, through its repetition. The very act of being harassed excludes victims from public spaces. In addition, victims are surrounded by challenging circumstances: the difficulty of reporting harassment, the unpleasant interrogations that occur when victims complain of harassment, the fact that the results often do not lead to criminal charges, the notion that harassment is equated with false accusations, and the idea that victims are somehow forced to take responsibility for criminal justice issues. These circumstances surrounding harassment victims can be interpreted as repeated and elaborate exclusion from public space to maintain order within this sphere.

Women and those who are vulnerable to harassment still use trains for transportation needs. The necessity to reproduce norms introduces the possibility of “undoing or redoing the norms in unexpected way” through repeated enactment (Butler, 2015, p. 32). Given the nature of these norms, one might think that the order of this public space might change as women and those vulnerable to harassment continue to ride trains out of necessity. However, this process is always fraught with danger. This expectation ultimately places the solution to this

violent situation entirely on the shoulders of those who are vulnerable to victimization. In the next chapter, we will discuss the responsibility of bystanders, focusing on their function in the public space.

4 Responsibility for Citation

It has been noted that bystanders who witness sexual violence but ignore the situation are also complicit in the violence. Shiori Ito states the following, based on a case in which a woman was forced to drink at a drinking party.

[L]et us say a woman is forced to drink at a drinking party.

If you can, you can talk directly to the perpetrators and ask them to stop. If you feel that your intervention might cause problems, or if you are afraid, you can ask the waiter or others around you for help, or you can deliberately knock over a glass to change the atmosphere. You can also follow up with the woman after the fact by giving her a ride home. If the situation becomes a major problem, you may call the police.

[...] Even bystanders can adequately deter sexual violence if they recognize danger signals and respond appropriately. On the other hand, if they are present in the situation but choose to ignore it, they could have deterred it but did nothing. They could be considered complicit in sexual violence.

The problem of sexual violence does not concern just the perpetrator or the victim. Recognizing that this is a problem for society as a whole is the first step to solving it. (Ito, 2018)

This passage emphasizes the responsibility of those who do not stop the perpetration of sexual violence. It is noteworthy that Ito uses this positive expression to say that ignoring sexual violence is the same as being complicit in the same violence.

The following is a typical scenario in which a man was triggered and began harassing a woman. On a crowded train, a man's hand accidentally touched the buttocks of a woman standing in front of him. He then intentionally pressed the back of his hand against the woman's buttocks, but he was not arrested or questioned by anyone. This experience gave him a certain feeling, and he began to repeat the act of molestation (Saito, 2017, pp. 61–62). This is a matter that concerns third parties, as they did not stop him—needless to say, it is difficult for the victim to protest in this kind of scenario. When third parties ignore the harassment, this action encourages future violence.

In addition, ignoring sexual violence not only allows it to continue but also creates new perpetrators. It has been noted that some people become molesters because they witnessed a molestation (Saito, 2017, pp. 63–64). After witnessing harassment and seeing that the perpetrator was not reported, these individuals decide to try it themselves (Saito, 2017, pp. 63–64).

Their “learning” begins when they start molesting others. First, when they see other people being molested, or when they accidentally touch a woman's body, they think, “I won't get caught! It's OK to do it!” Then, when molestation becomes a habit, they “learn by themselves” in terms of how to choose targets and situations so as not to get caught. (Saito, 2017, pp. 104–105)

This insight into the molester's thought process suggests that the molestation is not really an act of doing nothing, but rather an act that forgives the molestation and allows it to be repeated.

In the previous chapter, we presented a diagram that illustrates street harassment as a force that excludes women from public spaces. In light of this, we would like to consider the responsibility of bystanders. One factor in this concept is the idea of responsibility for citation. Butler explains the responsibility that comes with citing and repeating language in *Excitable Speech: A Politics of Performative* (1997). One possible means of dealing with hate speech is to regulate it. However, Butler repeatedly points out the following: “[I]t is not enough to find the appropriate context for this speech act in question, in order to know how best to judge its effect” (1997, pp. 3–4), “[to] decide the matter of what is threat or, indeed, what is a word that wounds, no simple inspection of words will suffice” (1997, p. 13). We are not free to create and use original words but to cite and repeat words that already exist.

The one who speaks is not the originator of such speech, for that subject is produced in language through a prior performative exercise of speech: interpellation. Moreover, the language the subject speaks is conventional and, to that degree, citational. (Butler, 1997, p. 39)

Butler criticizes censorship that prohibits the use of certain words as “[k]eeping such terms unsaid and unsayable can also work to lock them in place, preserving their power to injure, and arresting the possibility of reworking that might shift their context and purpose” (1997, p. 59). Thus, prohibiting the use of a word preserves it in its violent meaning.

Given the nature of language, Butler elaborates on the responsibility for citing language.

If hate speech is citational, does that mean that the one who uses it is not responsible for that usage? Can one say that someone else made up this speech that one simply finds oneself using and thereby absolve oneself of all responsibility? I would argue that the citationality of discourse can work to enhance and intensify our sense of responsibility for it. The one who utters hate speech is responsible for the manner in which such speech is repeated, for reinvigorating such speech, for reestablishing contexts of injury. The responsibility of the speaker does not consist of remaking language ex nihilo, but rather of negotiating the legacies of usage that constrain and enable that speaker's speech. (Butler, 1997, p. 27)

This paper extends the responsibility of citing language to the discussion of public space. It is the perpetrator who initiates the act of harassment. However, by leaving the sexual violence unattended when it is witnessed, the perpetrator is tacitly acknowledged and cites a certain order in the space where the perpetration takes place. This citation reinforces this order. In the absence of some bystander intervention, the escalation of harassment can be seen as a consequence of this abdication of citation responsibility.

In the “#ActiveBystander” video, after several sexual violence scenes are depicted, the message “Don't turn your eyes away. You help the sexual offenders take their way” is shown, along with examples of bystander intervention, including a man stepping closer to an upskirter (Distract); someone offering assistance to another person who has been bumped on the street by asking, “Are you okay?” and picking up a dropped package with the victim (Delay); and a person aiding someone who has been grouped by saying, “I saw it. Would you like to report to the police?” (Delay & Document). Other examples shown were saying, “It's nice to see you again”

pretending to be an acquaintance of a person who is relentlessly hit on (Distract); telling a bartender that a rape drug was slipped into a date's drink and asking him to turn down the drugged drink (Delegate); and telling a boss who is harassing an employee that, "That's sexual harassment" (Direct). In these interventions, victims do not have to deal with the damage alone, the perpetrators give up, the victim does not end up ingesting rape drugs, and the boss stops harassing their employee.

Of course, the results of the interventions do not always succeed as straightforwardly as in this video. However, in the Aichi Prefectural Railway Police Corps' "Handbook for Repelling Molestation and Voyeurism" (2021), it is noted that perpetrators stop 100% of the time when bystanders intervene. As discussed, ignoring the harassment is not really an act of inactivity but rather an act of forgiving the harassment and allowing it to be repeated. In addition to this, the active intervention of bystanders does not simply prevent the repetition and reinforcement of the harmful order of the public space—it also opens the possibility of shifting this order. In sum, bystanders are responsible for disrupting the order that makes sexual violence possible.

5 Conclusion: Actively Asking Bystanders to Take Responsibility

The Life Safety Education program includes bystander intervention education. However, the Life Safety Education's material, which the MEXT prepared, does not refer to the motivation for recognizing one's responsibility as a bystander. This paper attempted to explain the responsibilities that bystanders have in the space of sexual violence from the perspective of Judith Butler's theory of performativity. The public space in which sexual violence occurs can be understood as a place in which forces that exclude victims operate. Not only are harassment and victimization difficult to prosecute in Japan, but the process remains difficult for the victim, even after the harassment is reported to the police. In addition, harassment accusations are sometimes incorrectly deemed false. Such situations perpetuate the marginalization of women and those who are vulnerable to harassment. Ignoring sexual violence while witnessing it is not tantamount to inactivity, but this ignorance can be positioned as an entity that cites and reinforces an order that permits harassment. Butler presented the idea of the responsibility of citation regarding hate speech. Following this idea, the original violence of sexual violence may be the perpetrator, but the bystander can be understood as being responsible for citing the order that permits the violence. Ignoring harassment is not truly an act of passivity but rather an act that forgives the harassment and allows it to be repeated. Furthermore, the active intervention of bystanders does not simply prevent the repetition and reinforcement of the harmful order of the public space—it also opens the possibility of shifting this order. Bystanders are responsible for disrupting the order that makes sexual violence possible.

In practice, sometimes people cannot act as they expect, even if they understand their responsibilities. In particular, direct intervention presupposes ensuring the safety of both the bystander and the victim. Immediate direct intervention is difficult when the act of intervening is fraught with danger. However, as indicated in Chapter 2, there are various options for intervention. One can call the victim to their side or distract the perpetrator. Witnesses may follow up with the victim later, even if they cannot act at the moment of the assault. Due to the many ways to intervene while ensuring safety, it is clear that this is not simply a matter of safety, as many people do not take any action. It may also be the case that a witness who has suffered sexual violence in the past may experience flashbacks and be unable to act while witnessing another violent act. However, from the number of men who trivialize the damage of harassment and compare the victim of harassment and the

victim of false accusations, it is clear that not all people who refuse to act are incapable of doing so because of past trauma.

The 2013 Campus Sexual Violence Elimination (SaVE) Act of the United States requires each institution of higher education to participate in a Title IV initiative to provide college students with sexual violence prevention programs, including a component on bystander intervention (Kettrey, Marx, & Tanner-Smith, 2019, p. 8). Originally, by approaching young people (especially young men) “as allies in preventing violence against women, rather than as potential perpetrators of violence,” bystander intervention programs were “anticipated to be more effective at reducing violence against women than traditional victim/perpetrator-focused models, which may risk young men’s defensiveness or backlash” (Kettrey et al., p. 76). However, there is no evidence that these programs have any effect on reducing the perpetration of sexual assault. Thus, it was pointed out that “bystander program participants interpret program information from the perspective of potential allies rather than potential perpetrators” (Kettrey et al., p. 76).

Even in light of the sexual violence situation in Japan, the othering of the perpetrator ultimately leads to a lack of questioning of one’s own past and future words and actions, as well as the structures that enable one’s own privileged status (Maenosono, 2022, pp. 203–206). The understanding presented in this paper, which actively incorporates bystanders into perpetration, offers effective ways to recognize one’s responsibility for bystander intervention.

References

- Aichi Prefecture Railway Police Unit. (2020). Chikan/tosatsu gekitai handbook. Retrieved March 8, 2023, from the Aichi Prefectural Police Department website: <https://www.pref.aichi.jp/police/anzen/chikan/images/handbook-protected.pdf>
- Burn, M. S. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles, 60*, 779–792.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of performative*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion identity*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2015). *Notes toward a performative theory of assembly*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, and England: Harvard University Press.
- Close-up Gendai +. (January 23, 2020). *Deta ga ukibori ni! Shirarezaru chikan higai no jittai*. NHK.
- Hollaback!. The 5Ds of bystander intervention. Retrieved March 8, 2023, from the Hollaback! website: <https://righttobe.org/guides/bystander-intervention-training/>
- Ito, S. (2018). *America de hirogaru daisansha kainyu training no torikumi: Mite minu furi suru “boukansha” mo seibouryoku no kagaisha da*. Retrieved March 8, 2023, from the COURRIER Japon website: <https://courrier.jp/news/archives/141229/>
- Kettrey, H. S., Marx, R. A., & Tanner-Smith, E. E. (2019). Effects of bystander programs on the prevention of sexual assault among adolescents and college students: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15*, 1–156.
- Maenosono, K. (2022). *Seibouryoku wo meguru katari wa nani wo motarasu noka: Higaisha hinan to kagaisha no tashaka*. Tokyo: Keiso Shobo.
- Makino, M. (2019). *Chikan to wa nanika?: Higai to enzai wo meguru shakaigaku*. Tokyo: etc.books.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (June 2, 2022). *Inochi no anzen kyoiku doga kyozaï (Koko)*. Retrieved March 8, 2023, from YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DBqxgs_KV1g
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. *Inochi no anzen kyoiku kyozaï (Koko (Sotsugyo Chokuzen), Daigaku, Ippan)*. Retrieved March 8, 2023, from Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology website: https://www.mext.go.jp/content/20210416-mxt_kyousei02-000014005_35.pdf

Miyaji, N. (2007). *Kanjo to: Trauma no chisei gaku*. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobo.

Saito, A. (2017). *Otoko ga chikan ni naru riyu*. Tokyo: East Press.

Shiorine. (October 11, 2020). (ENG SUB)#ActiveBystander= Kodo suru boukansha [Video]. Retrieved March 8, 2023, from
YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QZv4QhOx9UA>

Solnit, R. (2000). *Wanderlust: A History of Walking*. New York: Viking.

Notes

¹ Faculty of International Studies and Regional Development, University of Niigata Prefecture.