



Submission to the UN Human Rights Committee at Geneva for the Periodic Review of Japan
(originally intended for the 130th session, now postponed to a future session)

Presented by:

Centre for Environmental and Minority Policy Studies (CEMiPoS), Japan

Supported by:

Citizens' Alliance for the Examination of Ainu Policy

Monbetsu Ainu Association

Sapporo Freedom School

2 December, 2020

Contact Information:

Meindert Boersma

Researcher, CEMiPoS indigenouspolicy2017@gmail.com

Introduction

1. As an allied citizens' group in Japan dedicated to the advocacy of the Ainu community's indigenous rights, the Centre for Environmental and Minority Policy Studies (CEMiPoS) hereby submits the following comments for the periodic review of Japan by the Human Rights Committee of the ICCPR (originally intended for the 130th session, now postponed to a future session because of the COVID-19 pandemic). This submission responds to the List of Issues Prior to Submission of the Seventh Periodic Report of Japan submitted by the Human Rights Committee (hereafter: the List of Issues), specifically paragraph 29 on the rights of minorities.¹
2. This submission focuses on Japan's failure to comply with its international human rights obligations with regards to the Ainu indigenous people, especially regarding:
 - I. The right to self-determination
 - II. Land rights
 - III. Repatriation of human remains
 - IV. Radioactive waste disposal

I. The right to self-determination

1. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) explicitly states that "Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination." (Article 3) Based on this right, UNDRIP requires States to consult and cooperate in good faith with indigenous peoples and "to obtain their free, prior and informed consent before adopting and implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them." (Article 19).² The UNDRIP, although it is not a legally binding instrument, clearly offers a moral obligation to Japan, which is a signatory to the Declaration.³ In line with UNDRIP, paragraph 29 of the List of Issues specifically recommends the Government of Japan

¹ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. 2017. "List of Issues Prior to Submission of the Seventh Periodic Report of Japan." CCPR/C/JPN/QPR/7. 11 December, 2017.

² UN General Assembly. 2007. *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. 2 October, 2007.

³ Hossain, Kamrul. 2020. "A Legal Opinion on Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Their Applicability in Japan's Legal System." *Centre for Minority and Environmental Policy Studies*, 1 June, 2020. Available at <https://cemipos.org/legal-opinion-kamrul-hossain/>.

[hereafter: the Government] to ensure respect for the right of the Ainu, Ryukyu and Okinawa communities “to engage in free, prior and informed participation in policies that affect them.”⁴ Since the previous review of Japan in 2014,⁵ the Government has failed to implement these provisions in some important respects.

2. In April 2019, the Government enacted the Ainu Policy Promotion Act (hereafter: the Act).⁶ This legislation recognised the Ainu as an indigenous people of Japan, replacing the Ainu Culture Law of 1997. However, the Act clearly falls short of offering substantive rights for the Ainu as an indigenous people according to the international legal standard; it does not guarantee any rights included in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.⁷ Amongst other issues, the Act has not been enacted with the free, prior and informed consent of the Ainu people to a high enough extent.
3. Civil society organisations and researchers alike have raised concerns over the low degree of Ainu influence over the policy-making process.⁸ The only organisation that played a role in the drafting of the Act was the Ainu Association of Hokkaido (AAH), which does not do justice to the diverse views and opinions in the Ainu community. Technically, AAH is the largest Ainu organisation, but peak membership in 2016 was only around 2,300 individuals, leaving at least 80-90% of the Ainu population without a voice.⁹

⁴ ICCPR. 2017. CCPR/C/JPN/QPR/7.

⁵ ICCPR. 2014. “Concluding Observations on the Sixth Periodic Report of Japan.” CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6. 20 August, 2014.

⁶ Government of Japan. 2019. “Ainu no hitobito no hokori ga sonchō sa reru shakai o jitsugen suru tame no shisaku no suishin ni kansuru hōritsu.” [Act on the Promotion of Measures to Realize a Society That Will Respect the Pride of the Ainu]. Available at

https://elaws.e-gov.go.jp/search/elawsSearch/elaws_search/lsg0500/detail?lawId=431AC0000000016.

Tsunemoto, Teruki. 2019. “Overview of the Ainu Policy Promotion Act of 2019.” Accessed 25 November, 2020. Available at <https://fpcj.jp/wp/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/b8102b519c7b7c4a4e129763f23ed690.pdf>.

⁷ Higashimura, Takeshi. 2019. “No Rights, No Regret: New Ainu Legislation Short on Substance.” *Nippon*, 26 April, 2019. Available at

<https://www.nippon.com/en/in-depth/d00479/no-rights-no-regret-new-ainu-legislation-short-on-substance.html>.

⁸ Higashimura, Takeshi. 2019. “No Rights, No Regret: New Ainu Legislation Short on Substance.” *Nippon*, 26 April, 2019. Available at

<https://www.nippon.com/en/in-depth/d00479/no-rights-no-regret-new-ainu-legislation-short-on-substance.html>.

⁹ Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. 2018. “Performing Ethnic Harmony: The Japanese Government’s Plans for a New Ainu Law.” *Japan Focus*, 16(2): 1-18.

4. Amongst those Ainu who have not been considered in the drafting of the Act, many have expressed their fervent opposition to the Act. The Citizens' Alliance for the Examination of Ainu Policy expressed that, while the Act recognizes the Ainu as an indigenous people of Japan and acknowledges the importance of Ainu culture, it ignores most of the basic rights guaranteed to indigenous peoples by States under UNDRIP.¹⁰ The shortcomings of the Act are further elaborated on in sections II-IV.
5. In addition to the highlighted concern of lack of free, prior and informed participation, there remains a range of other problems with the Act. The Government has failed to mention regret and apologise for the suffering of the Ainu under Japanese colonialism and forced assimilation. Furthermore, the Act falls short on addressing the gap in education achievement, economic marginalization and discrimination. These issues are elaborated on in more detail in a Cultural Survival report submitted for the 128th session of the Human Rights Committee in March 2020.¹¹

We encourage the Human Rights Committee to make the following recommendations to the Government of Japan:

1. Take measures to ensure the implementation of free, prior and informed consent by making indigenous consultation a permanent fixture in legislative and administrative measures that may affect them.
2. Open any dialogue concerning the Ainu to all Ainu organizations, including not only the AAH, but also the Shizunai Ainu Association, the Asahikawa Ainu Council, the Karafuto Ainu Association, the Monbetsu Ainu Association and others.
3. Base Ainu rights on the acknowledgement that the Ainu people have been the victim of settler colonialism, forced assimilation and incorporation into a legal system that is not their own.

¹⁰ Shimizu, Yuji. 2019. "Atarashii 'Ainu ni kan suru hō'an' no tekkai o motomeru seimei." [Statement Calling for the Withdrawal of the New 'Ainu Bill']. *Citizens' Alliance for the Examination of Ainu Policy*, 26 February, 2019. Available at <https://ainupolicy.jimdofree.com/市民会議の提案-声明/日本政府-アイヌ新法案-2019-に異論あり/清水裕二-少数民族懇談会会長-コタンの会代表-新しい-アイヌに関する法案-の撤回を求める声明-2019/>.

¹¹ Cultural Survival. 2020. "International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Alternative Report Submission: Violations of Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Japan." Available at <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/sites/default/files/ICCPR-Japan-Report-2020-FINAL.pdf>.

II. Land rights

1. Paragraph 29 of the List of Issues specifically recommends the Government “to revise relevant legislation and fully guarantee the rights of the Ainu, Ryukyu and Okinawa communities to their traditional land and natural resources.”¹² These rights to land and resources are embodied in UNDRIP, which explicitly emphasises the right to carry out subsistence activities (Article 20) and the right to water resources (Article 25). UNDRIP also specifically states the need for the implementation of free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples in all matters affecting their lands, traditional territories and other resources (Article 32).¹³
2. With regards to Ainu rights, paragraph 15 of the Concluding Observations on the Combined Tenth and Eleventh Periodic Reports of Japan by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination published in September 2018 concluded that “while some efforts are being made to preserve Ainu language and culture, the land and natural resource rights and the linguistic and cultural heritage of the Ainu people are not sufficiently protected.”¹⁴
3. With the enactment of the problematic Act in April 2019 and the continuing lack of willingness to revise local legislation, the Government has so far failed to ensure indigenous rights in this respect. While the Act recognises the Ainu as an indigenous people of Japan and acknowledges the importance of Ainu culture, including rituals and practices in connection to, for example, fishing salmon in rivers (Article 17), the Act has not led to the revision of local legislation obstructing the Ainu in carrying out these rituals and practices. Moreover, it does not lay out any concrete procedures for exercising indigenous control over natural resources through free, prior and informed consent. Hence, it clearly falls short of offering substantive rights for the Ainu as an indigenous people according to the international legal standard. The right to exercise Ainu culture,

¹² ICCPR. 2017. “List of Issues Prior to Submission of the Seventh Periodic Report of Japan.”

¹³ UN General Assembly. 2007. *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*.

¹⁴ International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. 2018. “Concluding observations on the combined tenth and eleventh periodic reports of Japan.” CERD/C/JPN/CO/10-11. 26 September, 2018.

including in connection to lands, traditional territories and other resources is still based on a narrow conception of cultural rights demarcated by the Government.

4. This failure of the Act to ensure indigenous rights with respect to lands, traditional territories and other resources is illustrated by the case of Hatakeyama Satoshi, an Ainu elder and chairman of the Monbetsu Ainu Association, who was denounced by the local official authorities in Hokkaido for fishing salmon in the Mobetsu river in September 2019.¹⁵ The authorities claimed that fishing salmon in the river without prior permission is illegal and that Mr. Hatakeyama's actions violated the rules embodied in the antiquated yet still-intact Hokkaido Regulation restricting the Ainu to use their freshwater resources.¹⁶ The Hokkaido Regulation places an exception for Ainu salmon fishing for ritual purposes only, albeit with prior permission granted by the governor of Hokkaido (Article 4). Mr. Hatakeyama maintains that the Ainu fished salmon as a part of their traditional livelihood in Hokkaido before they were colonised and that the Ainu had never abandoned their right. In this particular instance, his act of fishing salmon in the Mobetsu river was for the Ainu ritual called Kamuy-chep-nomi – “welcoming the first salmon” – a ceremonial event that has been observed by the Ainu for centuries. According to Mr. Hatakeyama, his actions only correspond to preserving and maintaining the right to Ainu culture and cultural identity as part of the acknowledged rights belonging to indigenous peoples.¹⁷

¹⁵ Centre for Indigenous and Minority Policy Studies. 2020. “A Conversation with Hatakeyama Ekasi.” 1 October, 2020. Available at <https://cemipos.org/a-conversation-with-hatakeyama-ekasi/>.

Indigenous Peoples Rights International. 2020. “Criminalising Rituals and Traditional Occupations: The Struggle of the Ainu.” 9 September, 2020. Available at <https://indigenousrightsinternational.org/criminalising-rituals-and-traditional-occupations-the-struggle-of-ainu-in-japan-a-century-hence/>.

Mainichi Japan. 2019. “Ainu association chief objects to criminal accusations over salmon fishing.” 16 September, 2019. Available at

https://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20190916/p2a/00m/0na/011000c?fbclid=IwAR0K-AL5dne6WiS4Mis9_yeMzIPtJcNSn-7dGXyvKeMudF17QV7Saggd6mE.

¹⁶ The legislation in question is the Act on the Protection of Fishery Resources, originally adopted in 1951 (and last amended in 2004) and the Hokkaido Inland Water Fisheries Adjustment Regulation of 1964, which gave effect to the former in local settings.

¹⁷ Hossain, Kamrul. 2020. “A Legal Opinion on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights and Their Applicability in Japan’s Legal System.”

We encourage the Human Rights Committee to make the following recommendations to the Government of Japan:

1. Enhance the language of Japanese legislation to emphasise indigenous participation in the interpretation, development and implementation of their rights.¹⁸
2. Take measures to ensure the implementation of free, prior and informed consent by making indigenous consultation a permanent fixture in the application of land rights, through indigenous platforms in governmental institutions and/or through government-supported commissions with indigenous experts on land tenure and customs guiding the process.
3. Further elaborate the notion of land rights, which delimits not only the traditional territory of indigenous peoples but also the means of territorialization, i.e. the system of social organization and relations by which indigenous peoples have related themselves to land. Indigenous peoples should have the right to articulate and define their relationship to land, and the Government must incorporate platforms in juridical spaces to accommodate the development of relationships to land.

III. Repatriation of human remains

1. Also in the case of Ainu demands for the repatriation of human remains, the Government has failed to ensure the right of the Ainu to engage in free, prior and informed participation in policies that affect them. The right to repatriation of human remains is enshrined in UNDRIP, which states that “States shall seek to enable the access and/or repatriation of ceremonial objects and human remains in their possession through fair, transparent and effective mechanisms developed in conjunction with indigenous peoples concerned.” (Article 12)¹⁹
2. Ainu activists have been struggling to recover the human remains of their ancestors in possession of twelve Japanese universities to their original or intended burial sites since

¹⁸ This is in line with recommendations set forth by the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, including A/HRC/15/35, A/HRC/18/42, A/HRC/21/55 and A/HRC/39/62.

¹⁹ UN General Assembly. 2007. *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*.

the issue was first raised in 1980. Social Darwinism and racialised eugenics, which gained a foothold in the scientific academies of Japan in the 1880s, prompted the removal of over 1600 Ainu human remains from their original or intended burial sites. Ever since the issue was first raised, Ainu activists demanding the return of these remains have been met with reluctance from the universities. The Ainu people of Japan have remained involved in this struggle for decades.²⁰

3. Meanwhile, the Government is culpable in perpetuating and at times even raising obstacles for Ainu activists through its legal guidelines. Prompted by the Ainu repatriation movement, the Government formulated guidelines regarding the repatriation of human remains and grave goods of the Ainu people held by universities in 2014 and 2018. Although the Government contends that the guidelines were formulated “with the understanding and cooperation of the people concerned,”²¹ only the AAH was involved, and many Ainu organizations remain actively opposed to the strict requirements set by the guidelines. Hence, the Government has failed to achieve the free, prior and informed consent of Ainu people.
4. Requirements such as governmental approval of organizations representing the regions to which the human remains should return have made it so difficult for Ainu to apply that only few Ainu have been able to apply for the return of ancestral remains under the guidelines.²² As of October 2020, less than 10% of the over 1600 human remains kept in universities have been returned. Rather than through the new regulations, the majority of

²⁰ Maruyama, Hiroshi and Leni Charbonneau. “Resistance for Repatriation: The Enduring Legacy of the Colonial Robbery of Ainu Graves.” In Hiroshi Maruyama et al. (Eds.) *Decolonizing Futures: Collaborations Towards Indigenous Rights Discourse in the Post-UNDRIP Era*. Uppsala Multiethnic Papers, Hugo Valentin Centre, Uppsala University [forthcoming].

Hirata, Tsuyoshi, Ryūichi Ogawa, Yuji Shimizu, Tsugio Kuzuno and Jeff Gayman. 2020. “Paradoxes and Prospects of Repatriation to the Ainu: Historical Background, Contemporary Struggles, and Visions for the Future.” In Cressida Fforde, Honor Keeler and Tim McKeown. (Eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Indigenous Repatriation: Return, Reconcile, Renew*. Pp. 238-258. London: Routledge.

²¹ Government of Japan. 2020. “Reply of the Government of Japan to the Request for Information from the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples” Available at <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/Reportrepatriation/submissions-states/Japan.pdf>.

²² Centre for Environmental and Minority Policy Studies. 2019. “Joint Submission to the 13th session of the UN Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, from 8 to 12 June 2020.” 13 April, 2019. Available at <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/Reportrepatriation/submissions-indigenous-peoples-ngos/CEMIPOS.pdf>.

the returned remains is due to out-of-court settlements between Ainu plaintiffs and Hokkaido University.

5. With the enactment of the Act in April 2019, the Government has designated the Symbolic Space for Ethnic Harmony in Shiraoui, Hokkaido, an ethnographic “theme park” dubbed “Upopoy”, as the consolidation site of the Ainu remains. This initiative has been met with resistance from Ainu activists ever since it was first conceived over a decade ago by the Government’s Advisory Council for Future Ainu Policy, without free, prior and informed Ainu participation outside of the AAH. In December 2019, the twelve Japanese universities whose scientists unethically collected and kept Ainu human remains over the course of a century, together with the AAH, carried out the relocation of Ainu human remains to the newly built repository at Upopoy with the active collaboration of the Japanese government. No information on the management of the repository has ever been given to the Ainu people.²³
6. The Upopoy project falls within the Government’s plans for the now-postponed 2020 Summer Olympics, which will heavily feature Ainu symbology and representation of their culture, despite limited Ainu participation in the Olympic commission or other relevant commercial endeavors. Notwithstanding resistance against this commodification of Ainu culture, Upopoy opened its doors in July 2020.²⁴
7. Kimura Fumio, who has been involved in the repatriation of Ainu human remains kept in Hokkaido University to his community in Biratori, compares the relocation of human remains to the forcible relocations of Ainu communities under the Japanese assimilation efforts: “In 1916, our ancestors were forcibly relocated to Biratori, the place where I was born. Later, their remains were exhumed from our communal grave and brought to Hokkaido University without our consent. In December 2019, they were forcibly relocated again to Shiraoui.”²⁵

²³ Centre for Environmental and Minority Policy Studies. “CEMiPoS Statement on the Opening of the Upopoy” 2020. 13 July, 2020. Available at <https://cemipos.org/upopoy-statement/>.

²⁴ Baggetti, Francesco. 2020. “Japan Opens the Upopoy Museum, the First Dedicated to Ainu Indigenous Identity.” *LifeGate*, 22 July, 2020. Available at <https://www.lifegate.com/upopoy-museum-ainu-japan>.

²⁵ Centre for Environmental and Minority Policy Studies. 2019. “Joint Submission to the 13th session of the UN Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, from 8 to 12 June 2020.”

8. Furthermore, the Archaeological Society of Nippon, the Anthropological Society of Nippon, the Japanese Society of Cultural Anthropology and the AAH called for public comments on their draft of “Guidelines for the Ethical Research of Ainu People,” which suggests conducting research on the relocated Ainu human remains in Upopoy in the future despite Ainu resistance.²⁶
9. Lastly, neither the Government nor one of the twelve universities has made a formal apology. Such negligence demonstrates their failure to acknowledge the institutionalised discourse regarding Ainu difference, the foundation upon which the Ainu were relegated as research objects in the 19th century. In the absence of a formal apology or acknowledgement, colonial rhetoric remains intact and the Ainu remain at risk of further exploitation under the guise of scholarship.
10. In October 2020, Mr. Kimura saved 34 Ainu remains from being relocated to the repository at Upopoy as a result of his application for their return to the Japanese government. However, he is determined to continue fighting for apologies from universities concerned and the Government, investigation of the research done on those human remains, and the repatriation of all the Ainu human remains relocated to the repository at Upopoy.²⁷

We encourage the Human Rights Committee to make the following recommendations to the Government of Japan:

1. Guarantee the Ainu their rights to self-determination and the repatriation of their ancestral remains, and create a framework for repatriation with their free, prior and informed consent.

²⁶ Ainu Association of Hokkaido. 2019. “‘Ainu minzoku ni kansuru kenkyū rinri shishin (an)’ ni kansuru o iken jōhō no boshū ni tsuite.” [Soliciting opinions and information on the ‘Guidelines for Ethical Research of the Ainu People’]. 16 December, 2020. Available at

<https://www.ainu-assn.or.jp/news/files/6393b7df3a4874e847a1e2980841c264c23fc9eb.pdf>.

²⁷ Hokkaido Shimbun. 2020. “Ainu ikotsu ‘henkan ga tōzen’: senzo no rekishi kenkyū, Biratori no dantai Kimura san ‘daigaku ya kuni wa shazai to ikisatsu kaimei o’.” [The Repatriation of Ainu Human Remains is ‘Justified’: Mr. Kimura of the Biratori Association Researching the History of Their Ancestors Calls Upon the Universities and the Government ‘to Apologise and Conduct an Exhaustive Investigation’]. 2 November, 2020. Available at <https://www.hokkaido-np.co.jp/article/477143>.

2. Scrutinize and apologise for the long-term injustices committed by the Government, the twelve universities and the academic societies, and commit to the repatriation and reburial of Ainu human remains in cooperation with the Ainu people, rather than using them for research.

IV. Radioactive waste

1. Also in the case of radioactive waste disposal, the Government has failed to ensure the right of the Ainu to engage in free, prior and informed participation in policies that affect them. With regards to radioactive waste disposal, UNDRIP requires States to take effective measures to ensure that no storage or disposal of hazardous materials shall take place in the lands or territories of indigenous peoples without their free, prior and informed consent (Article 29), and obtain the consent of indigenous peoples prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands and other resources, particularly in connection with the development, utilization or exploitation of mineral, water or other resources (Article 32).²⁸
2. On 9 October 2020, the town of Suttsu in Hokkaido, located along the coast of the Sea of Japan, applied to be considered for preliminary research as part of the Japanese government's process of selecting a municipality as a final disposal site for highly radioactive waste from nuclear power plants. Within a day, it was followed by the village Kamoenai near the nuclear power plant in Tomari. These two municipalities aim to receive huge subsidies from the Japanese government in exchange for undergoing research. Since the municipalities revealed their intentions this August, they have met the objection of key actors: local residents of Suttsu and Kamoenai, anti-nuclear citizen groups, surrounding municipalities, the city of Sapporo and the Hokkaido Prefectural government.²⁹ In Suttsu, a new citizens' group called "No Nuclear Waste for Children in

²⁸ UN General Assembly. 2007. *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*.

²⁹ The Asahi Shimbun. 2020. "Kaku no gomi 'nemiminimizu' Suttsu to rinsetsu suru chōchō-ra, saikō yōbō." [Nuclear Waste 'Great Surprise': Suttsu and Mayors of Neighboring Towns Request Reconsideration]. 25 August 2020. Available at <https://www.asahi.com/articles/ASN8S6SMTN8KIPE01T.html>.

Grau, Carmen. 2020. "In Desperate Search of Disposal Sites for its Nuclear Waste, Japan Offers Poisonous Grants to Two Small Villages." *Equal Times*, 9 November, 2020. Available at <https://www.equaltimes.org/in-desperate-search-of-disposal?lang=en#.X79qRi-iFmB>.

Suttsu” submitted the signatures required to demand their municipality to hold a referendum over its application on 7 October and declared a campaign to implement the referendum in cooperation with ten more citizens’ groups in Hokkaido the next day.³⁰ Both municipalities, however, rushed to a conclusion without taking into consideration these objections.

3. Both Suttsu and Kamoenai have been inhabited by Ainu for centuries (the municipalities are respectively named after their Ainu designations of Supki-pet and Kamuy-nai). Hence, through their applications, the municipalities are infringing the rights of the Ainu as well. Under both the UNDRIP and the List of Issues, any decision affecting Ainu land requires Ainu’s free, prior and informed consent. Hence, the municipalities of Suttsu and Kamoenai disparage not only the livelihood and safety of their local residents through their application for screening, but also their obligations toward the indigenous Ainu. This case illustrates that the failure to live up to international human rights standards at the national level is accompanied by local breaches of indigenous rights.

We encourage the Human Rights Committee to make the following recommendations to the Government of Japan:

1. Not only amend national legislation according to international indigenous rights standards, but also encourage local and prefectural authorities to act in accordance with these standards.
2. Acknowledge that indigenous people should not have to bear the burden of government projects that do not benefit them and commit to ensuring that radioactive waste disposal and other hazardous materials does not disproportionately affect Ainu lands.

³⁰ NHK Web News. 2020. “‘Kaku no gomi’ shobun-ba: Hokkaidō Suttsu-chō ga dai ichi dankai no chōsa ni ōbo kettei.” [‘Nuclear Waste’ Disposal Site: Suttsu, Hokkaido Decides to Apply for the First Stage Research]. 8 October 2020. Available at <https://www3.nhk.or.jp/news/html/20201008/k10012653931000.html>.