

## Summary

### **Shifting the Paradigm for Research on Nuclear Waste Management**

ONO Hajime

Although nuclear waste management (NWM) is a theme that requires a trans-disciplinary method of research, it has been discussed in divided academic territories. Is it possible to improve the explanatory quality by introducing boundary conceptions to analyze NWM policies? Generally speaking, we would imagine disciplinary, geographical (spatial) and diachronic (inter-generational) boundaries. The aim of this article is to clarify boundary conceptions and to rethink their applicability to NWM research.

Transcending disciplinary boundaries is the main topic of the first section of this article. The remarkable NWM process in Gorleben, Germany, the symbolic battlefield of the anti-nuclear movement, has acquired new meanings since the Repository Site Selection Act in 2013. The final report of the Commission for the Disposal of High-active Waste proposed a final repository with retrievability. Germany, which had strictly adhered to the IAEA principle of aftercare-free deep geological disposal, eventually adapted to the international trend of final repositories with retrieval. It symbolized the fall of techno-optimism and reinforced the recognition that NWM is not only a natural scientific but also a social and political issue. Simultaneously, a trans-disciplinary project supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, ENTRIA, was launched. The ENTRIA verified three options (disposal without retrieval, deep geological disposal with retrieval, and long-term storage near the surface). One of its reports simulated risks and uncertainties in eight phased periods of maximal 1,000,000 years. This inter-disciplinary research contributed to the increased reliability of sciences and to the legitimization of site-selection processes. Whether this cross-disciplinary dialogue will promote a “deliberative turn” of NWM should be tested in real-political developments.

In the second section, based on our research question (i.e., What impacts on NWM research will the relativization and realignment of geographical boundaries have?), we reconsider preceding theoretical and comparative studies. Political process analysis within national borders has been an important part of NWM research. This article contains an overview of German, French, Finnish, US

and Britain cases. We aim to expand our scope in two directions. The first is NWM in the European Union (EU), whose directive 2011/70/Euratom provides a common framework. In spite of an expectation for its potentialities, there are problems such as variable governability among member states with different nuclear policies, the exportation of nuclear waste inside and outside of the EU, and so on.

The other is nuclear oases theory. This insists that radioactive substances are likely to concentrate in peripheral regions which are economically dependent on nuclear industries and are characterized with inward-looking and acquiescent culture. Hanford (USA), La Hague (France), Sellafield (UK) and Gorleben are regarded as typical examples. Nuclear oases theory seems a variant of the centre/periphery theory, but a redefinition of boundaries would make it an advanced variant which transcends conventional argumentation. The centre/periphery threshold is not more than an ambiguous category and peripheral regions are full of diversities. Although nuclear oases are located downstream of nuclear power plants and some of them embrace reprocessing facilities, reprocessing facilities are not the terminal points of spent nuclear fuel. Final repositories are not always constructed in the areas of reprocessing facilities. It seems more rational to think that nuclear oases need their hinterlands, which are acutely vulnerable to being targeted for final repository siting. Such a consideration clarifies what the conventional centre/periphery theory cannot enough explain, i.e. Gorleben's peculiarity among nuclear oases.

Further investigation leads us to a fundamental problem: NIMBY facilities such as final repositories are issues of burden-distributive fairness. It matters how to realize an intra-generational and inter-generational sharing of the nuclear legacy. Nuclear waste must be isolated for thousands of years. We must think about diachronic factors to complete a model of boundary-conscious NWM research.

In the third section, we start from a viewpoint of an ethic political theorist who analyzes Canadian NWM and concludes that deliberative democracy rises more fully to some challenges than welfare utilitarianism and modern deontology, which suffer from a persistent indeterminacy of substantive principles. Whether this argumentation is persuasive is to be answered through three sub-questions: How does environment theory tackle uncertainties derived from the longevity of radioactive substances? How is the interest of future generations represented in today's decision making? And how is democratic theory applied to real-politics? The notion of deliberative democracy about mutual dialogue between present and future generations is accompanied with anonymity. Contrasting with such an abstract discussion, the stakeholder theory stresses the importance of negotiation in real-politics. All NWM processes are concerned with concrete issues. However, aporia of inter-generational burden-distributive fairness remains unsolved.

---

The appearance of a “wicked problem” would be a trigger for a paradigm shift in modern sciences. In the conclusion of this article, we refer to Japanese case of NWM, i.e. the final repository siting debate in local communities in Hokkaido.

## **Between the East and the West: The Third Position in Post-Socialist Czech Republic**

SAKATA Atsushi

The purpose of this paper is to show how a moment to de-territorialise the post-socialist space-time that emerged on the border of the East and the West with the end of the Cold War in 1989 is latent and manifest in this space-time. This paper regards the 1990s and 2000s as a period of post-socialism, the 2010s as a period of transition from post-socialism to post-post-socialism, and the 2020s and beyond as a period of post-post-socialism. The post-socialist period in the 2000s and the transition from post-socialism to post-post-socialism in the 2010s are the main focus of this paper.

Based on the aforementioned period classification, the first part of this paper (Chapter 1 and 2) examines the reception of the film “Pelišky,” which retrospectively depicts the ordinary life of people during the socialist period. The aim is to use the reception of the film to examine the structure of the ideological struggle in the cultural sphere of the Czech Republic in the 2010s between the “pro-Western group,” the political forces responsible for the “democratisation” of the country’s political and economic system under the banner of a return to the West, and the “pro-Eastern group,” the political forces that, in the eyes of the “pro-Western group,” were suspected of having links with the “pro-Eastern group.” In Chapter 1, I analyze the characteristics of “Pelišky” as a nostalgic film by comparing it with the film “Goodbye, Lenin!” In the following chapter, I focus on the controversy over a scene in the film, which had been going on for more than a year since 2017 in the comments section of YouTube, and analyze the structure of the ideological struggle in the cultural sphere of the Czech Republic in the 2010s. I argue that the post-socialist space-time has been organised in a complex of three dichotomies: the East and the West, “the Past and the Present,” Socialism and Capitalism.

In the second part of this paper (Chapter 3), I take up two documentary films released in 2004 and 2016 to show that, in the midst of the post-socialist ideological struggle, a moment to objectify

the struggle itself has emerged. In addition, I point out that such a moment not only undermines the framework of the struggle, but also has the potential to nullify the conditions for the establishment of a post-socialist space-time. Specifically, I firstly argue that the documentary filmmaker Filip Remunda, together with his co-producer Vít Klusák, satirised the overheated consumerism in their 2004 film “Czech Dreams,” as well as the “West-free-market” trend behind it. I secondly argue that in his film “Krték a Lao-C’,” released almost a decade later, Remunda satirised President Miloš Zeman as a politician with suspected links to former Eastern powers such as Russia and China. I then argue that at the time of the making of “The Czech Dream,” Remunda had already secured a position that was neither the East nor the West, that is, a third position, neither advocating nor condemning the socialist system of the past or the capitalist system of the present, but objectifying both equally. Finally, the third position, which takes an equally cynical attitude towards the two orders, the old and the new, is not only a moment that has the potential to invalidate the conditions for the establishment of post-socialism by evoking the baselessness of the three-way binary opposition between the East and the West, the Past and the Present, the Socialism and the Capitalism, but also a moment to promote the transition from post-socialism to post-post-socialism.

Finally, I affirm that the significance of this paper in two ways: firstly, it presents a moment to de-territorialise the space-time of post-socialism in contrast to previous studies that have focused on the conditions that make post-socialism possible, and secondly, it provides a starting point for understanding how the paradigm shift from post-socialism to post-post-socialism is occurring in the political and cultural sphere of the Czech Republic.

## **Munich Days: From an Interview with a Russian “Displaced Person”**

INOUE Takehiko  
SAITO Shohei

The aim of this article is to contribute to the study of Russians in exile, using the perspective of personal narrative of a second-generation Russian exile of Kalmyk descent as a resource. The research method of oral history was used to reconsider the lives of individual Russian exiles as “displaced persons.”

World War II produced an incomparable number of refugees. In 1941, the Allies established the

---

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) to protect and assist refugees and other victims of war. As a result of the havoc caused by World War II, those who were found outside their “country of origin” were referred to as “displaced persons” (DPs), especially in the United States. This situation shows the limitations of the UNRRA’s refugee resettlement program. The number of people displaced in Europe in the immediate aftermath of the war was as high as 11 million. An estimated 33,000 DPs were repatriated daily in the summer and early fall of 1945. By the end of September, the number of DPs in Germany had dropped to 1.2 million. However, many people of Eastern European origin were not willing to return because they were worried about the new political system in their home countries and their own treatment upon returning. They were referred to as “non-repatriable DPs.”

The subject of the oral history was a second-generation exile of former Russian Imperial subjects of Kalmyk descent (a Mongolian-speaking people); she was born in Belgium in 1931. Her mother left her when she was very young, and her father left home for work, leaving her in the care of her uncle and his wife. She was a stateless person with a Nansen passport. She traveled around Central and Eastern Europe in search of educational opportunities. In the late 1930s, her father and other first-generation exiles cooperated with Nazi Germany to seek to “liberate” their homeland (Russia). After the war, she was interned in the DP camp in Freimann, Munich, which became an American occupied zone. About 8,000 people of various nationalities stayed in the camp at Freimann. The gymnasium in the camp taught Russian, English, German, Church Slavonic, and Latin as required subjects. The camp had a cosmopolitan environment and was very intellectually rich, housing professors who had taught in many parts of Europe. There were several clubs of various ethnic groups in this camp, and they were very active. She enjoyed her youth in the “cosmopolitan” conditions of the camp.

The interviewee and other Kalmyks were moved with the Russians to a camp at Schleissheim around 1946-47. The reason for this was that the Russians and Ukrainians did not get along so well, so it was decided to put them in separate camps. However, the DP camps including Schleissheim were dismantled at the end of 1952 with the withdrawal of US troops. In addition, the housing of German refugees returning from many parts of Europe left the Kalmyks with no place to stay. Seventeen countries refused to accept migration of the Kalmyks. The fact that they were identified as Asians was a serious barrier to migration. After many twists and turns, the U.S. Department of Justice was finally able to conclude that the Kalmyks, although Asian in origin, were "a white, so-called European race" given generations of education, cultural activities, and Russian Soviet domination.

In 1952, the Interviewee was able to leave Germany and moved to the United States, where she

attended college and lived for more than a decade. However, she was never able to feel at home there and returned to Munich where she found a place to live. As a stateless person who had moved from place to place in Europe, the camp in Munich was the place where she could be, where the borders between those with and without a homeland, between European and Asian, and within the Kalmyk people were evened, even if only temporarily. Munich, where she had spent her youth as a DP, was the place where she could belong.

## **Collaboration between Japan's Borderlands Studies and Practices: Looking back on 10 years of JIBSN**

FURUKAWA Koji

This article focuses on the Japan International Border Studies Network (JIBSN), which entered the 11th year on its existence on November 27, 2021. Article 2 of the JIBSN byelaws states, "The focus of this organisation's research is on border affairs between Japan and other countries along with adjacent regions (hereinafter "the borders"). The goal is to advance our current understanding in this field of study via conducting relevant border research, exchanging expertise and appropriately dealing with various challenges faced in these regions. The organisation also promotes new social contributions through networking and interdisciplinary research and practices. " JIBSN has been engaged in various activities for 10 years. Of note is the conceptualization of "border tourism" and industry-academia-government collaboration with this idea as a key concept. On the other hand, JIBSN has been working on more than just 'border tourism' themes. What are the factors that have created and developed "border tourism" by JIBSN for 10 years?

This article looks back on JIBSN's 10 years and clarifies what was realized and challenged through collaboration between researchers and practitioners. Specifically, it explains the history of JIBSN by dividing it into the pre-establishment period (2007-2011), the post-establishment period (2012-2013) and the "border tourism" promotion period (2014-2021), referring to measures taken by Japan's government regarding border areas during the same period. It also explains why JIBSN has continued for more than 10 years, even though it lacks its own financial resources.

As a result, this article clarifies JIBSN has entered a period of border tourism promotion through the collaboration of researchers and practitioners. In other words, it can be said that it is a

---

collaboration between those that created the concept of border tourism and those that spread it as travel commodities. And in the post-corona era, its reconstruction has become an urgent issue. Also, it can be said that JIBSN has indirectly contributed to the realization of the Act on Special Measures concerning Conservation of Inhabited Remote Border Islands and Maintaining Local Communities on Specific Inhabited Remote Border Islands (the Act on Inhabited Remote Border Islands), the Comprehensive Agreement for the Embarkation of Domestic Passengers on Specified International Maritime Routes, and the Act on the Review and Regulation of the Use of Real Estate Surrounding Important Facilities and on Remote Territorial Islands. This is because JIBSN took them up at its seminars and published as reports on the web, although it was not directly affiliated with national institutions. On the other hand, the expansion of the exchange population in the borderlands of Japan continues to be an issue, so it will be an issue how JIBSN will be involved in these acts in the future. Therefore, increasing the number of JIBSN members will also be an issue.

As mentioned above, this article looks back on the achievements and challenges of JIBSN over the past 10 years. However, it cannot be denied that new issues for JIBSN may arise depending on the possibility of cooperation with local governments that have World Heritage Sites and the change in the position of border islands in the new National Security Strategy (NSS) of Japan that is expected to be revised at the end of 2022. Therefore, we should continue to assert the relevance of JIBSN.

## **Special Issue: “Upopoy Studies or Studies in Upopoy”**

CHIDA Tetsuro

On July 12, 2020, the National Ainu Museum and Park or “The Symbolic Space for Ethnic Harmony “Upopoy,” opened in Shiraoi, Hokkaido. Following the adoption of the resolution by the Japanese Parliament in 2008, calling for the Ainu people to be recognized as an indigenous people in Japan, the Advisory Panel on Ainu Policy positioned the establishment and promotion of Upopoy as the linchpin of Japan’s Ainu policy. Upopoy was to play the following roles: research and exhibition of Ainu history and culture (National Ainu Museum), revival and transmission of Ainu culture and human resource development (National Ainu Park or “National Ethnic Harmony Park”), and storage and memorialization of Ainu bones excavated and collected by universities in the past (Memorial Site).

Before and after the opening of Upopoy, various people have evaluated the role of the museum and the contents of its exhibitions from various perspectives. However, it is probably not well-known what kind of philosophy the Upopoy have in conducting research, exhibitions, and cultural transmission activities. Therefore, this special issue, entitled “Upopoy Studies or Studies in Upopoy,” aims to elaborate on the philosophy and logic of the exhibitions and activities inherent in Upopoy, which have not been widely reported by the Japanese media. We asked researchers of Upopoy (Shinichi Tateishi, Sakurako Koresawa and Mark Winchester) and an outside researcher, who has done researches on Upopoy after its opening from the perspective of indigenous people's rights (Yuko Osakada), to contribute to this special issue. To know the studies in Upopoy leads us to study the Upopoy itself. In addition, I decided to ask residents in Shiraoi with Ainu roots (Yoshinori Futamata, Naomi Tamura and Kenyu Yamamaru) to write a column, entitled “Upopoy for Shiraoi,” in which they would give their honest opinions about what they expect from Upopoy in the future.

## **The Development of Collaborative Exhibitions with Indigenous Peoples: A Comparative Analysis Between the National Ainu Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian**

OSAKADA Yuko

In 2020, the National Ainu Museum (NAM) was established in UPOPOY, namely the “Symbolic Space for Ethnic Harmony” in Shiraoi, Hokkaido. The special character of its exhibitions is indigenous narrative by making “We as the Ainu” the subjects of its exhibition descriptions. The NAM attached importance to the concept that the Ainu themselves, not the national government or the researchers, introduce their own cultures to the visitors, and respected the involvement of the Ainu in the creation of exhibitions, according to an interview with the director of NAM. However, there are various criticisms of NAM. One of them is that NAM did not respect the Ainu's proactive participation in developing its exhibitions. This article addresses how such perception gap occurs by comparing collaboration with indigenous peoples in the cases of NAM and the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI). This examination contributes to seeking better collaborative exhibitions with indigenous peoples.

This article reveals that although NAM learned the indigenous narrative for their exhibitions from



---

NMAI, how these museums collaborated with indigenous peoples is different. NMAI collaborated with indigenous curators who were appointed by the indigenous communities themselves. Indigenous peoples welcomed such collaborations as “shared authority”, or even as the effective implementation of their “cultural sovereignty”. While their exhibitions were, however, not free from criticisms, NMAI overcame these criticisms by creating a new exhibition with indigenous community curators.

On the other hand, NAM collaborated mainly with Ainu people who were considered professional in the Ainu languages or cultures. The members of the Working Group for NAM’s exhibitions were appointed by the Japanese government or the preparation committee of NAM, not by the indigenous communities themselves. Some Ainu people who were excluded from this collaboration process have criticized the way NAM’s exhibitions were created. They might consider that the collaboration with indigenous community curators just like NMAI did is more desirable. This is how the above-mentioned perception gap occurred.

As long as NAM uses the indigenous narrative by making “We as the Ainu” subjects of their exhibition descriptions, Ainu participation in developing its exhibitions is indispensable. The necessity for Ainu participation was consistently recognized through the establishment process of NAM. In addition, the number of Ainu experts in their languages and cultures is limited. Against these backgrounds, this author argues that the option of collaboration with indigenous community curators will become more important for NAM.

However, realizing collaboration with indigenous community curators requires that many difficulties be overcome. NAM and Ainu must confront existing problems, such as the lack of a nation-wide representative organization of Ainu, and the diversity of views among Ainu, more seriously. It should also be noted that such a collaboration will not prevent criticisms against its achievements, that is, their exhibitions.

Ultimately, how to collaborate with indigenous peoples depends on how to consider the role of museums. When it comes to NAM, the problem is how to consider the role of the museum which was established in the “Symbolic Space for Ethnic Harmony”. Different groups see it as a sightseeing facility, an enlightenment facility, a facility for preserving and developing Ainu culture, or even as a facility for realizing the right to self-determination of the Ainu. This issue requires further discussion among the concerned parties, thus the author does not give an immediate answer to this.

In the establishment process of NAM, it was emphasized that “by creating better conditions for the Ainu people to proactively participate in museum activities, NAM will develop its exhibitions through dialogue and interaction with them”. The author will continue to bring into focus how NAM addresses various criticisms by some Ainu people and how it develops its exhibitions. The

author believes that NAM could learn more from NMAI's collaboration experience with indigenous community curators to make its exhibitions better.

## **A Practical Attempt to Create a Museum as a Forum: The Exhibition Spaces of the National Ainu Museum**

TATEISHI Shinichi

The National Ainu Museum (NAM), a core facility of “Upopoy” or National Ainu Museum and Park, opened in Shiraoi, Hokkaido on 21 July 2020. From the time of the establishment of the Preparatory Office for the museum, we considered whether it would be possible to create a museum as a forum. Since its opening, NAM has received various criticisms and been subject to a variety of opinions. The main criticisms include the lack of exhibits concerning the “negative history” of the Ainu, and the subjectivity of the museum. There were also many slanderous and discriminatory remarks against Upopoy and NAM on Social Networking Services (SNS). To address this issue, NAM has set up a “Frequently Asked Questions” section on its website. The museum has also made active attempts to transmit information and opinions concerning its exhibits. The information presented here is information that cannot be covered by the exhibits alone. It can be divided into two points. The first concerns the history and culture of the Ainu people, and the second concerns the characteristics of the museum and the history of its establishment. This article mainly discusses the second. Behind these active attempts lies the special nature of NAM compared to other museums. It can be argued that some of the exhibits in the museum are misunderstood because the special nature of the National Ainu Museum has not been fully communicated. Therefore, in order for the museum to become a “museum as a forum”, it is necessary to show such peculiarities in the exhibition space in order to share its nature with visitors.

Based on the contents of the “Frequently Asked Questions” section, the author, as a representative of the museum, posited two themes for discussion: the history of the opening of NAM and the nature of NAM. NAM made several efforts to help visitors understand the nature and philosophy behind the establishment of the museum. Furthermore, in addition to the permanent exhibition, an entrance lobby exhibition called “National Ainu Museum 2020” was held on the first floor of the museum. This exhibition introduced the history of the establishment of NAM and the history of Lake Poroto,

where the museum is located. Through the “National Ainu Museum 2020” exhibition, we were able to show the historical process leading up to the establishment of the museum. However, due to the limited exhibition space available, there was little room for detailed commentary about the exhibition. Therefore, the connection between historical events could only be understood from the chronological table provided. Another issue is that the exhibition was only about history, so it does not display the nature and characteristics of the museum, which is still a challenge for NAM that lies ahead of us.