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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animoto</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>The head of fishermen’s group</td>
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Note: All translations that appear in this thesis from Japanese to English have been made by the researcher.
Abstract

Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) aims to develop the capacity of all individuals to be socially-critical and take social and political action to achieve sustainable development through all forms of education. However, schooling and the formal education system has dominated ESD policy, research and implementation. Consequently, ESD has tended to overlook the non-formal and informal education processes within community development, which encompasses the empowerment of local people to contribute to sustainable community development. As a result, the experiences, actions and struggles of practitioners and community members, particularly the socially-marginalised, have been silenced, despite its value in advancing socially-critical ESD.

This research aimed to bridge this gap between ESD and community development and examined the contributions of critical environmental education (EE) to the policy, research and practice of ESD. Hence, this research (i) investigated the relevance of critical EE to socially-critical approaches to ESD in a community development context, and (ii) developed a praxis framework so that both fields would be mutually supportive to strengthen the practices.

To address these questions, the research conducted a critical ethnographic study of Mopet Sanctuary Network (MSN) in Hokkaido Japan. MSN was established in 2010 by both the indigenous Ainu and non-Ainu people to achieve sustainable community development based on the indigenous fishing rights claim initiated by the local Ainu elder fisherman, Hatakeyama. Through my engagement with MSN as an educator, I attempted to integrate critical EE into the planned ESD activities. The resulting research can be divided into two parts. Each part was guided by a different methodology and produced contrasting results.

Part I was described as within socially-critical ESD, to mean that as the educators we were working within the framework of critical EE. The practice of ESD, as conducted by MSN, resulted in ‘patchy empowerment’, whereby a few MSN members were observed to have been disempowered, while the majority were empowered to challenge the current development policies. The disempowerment of the few manifested through Hatakeyama’s irrational behaviour during the process where two groups within MSN conflicted each other over the strategies for Hatakeyama’s rights claim. This was symbolically represented as ‘swing’ of a pendulum. Furthermore, the cause of the patchy empowerment could not be explained using critical theory. These findings motivated me to go beyond the current theoretical and methodological frameworks for the research in Part II.

Part II applied a decoloniality approach to understanding the meaning of knowledge creation and experience learning of the local community from the perspective of the few MSN members who were disempowered, in particular, Hatakeyama. In this attempt, I gained valuable insight into how the power difference between modern knowledge and ‘embodied local/indigenous
knowledge’ can significantly influence outcomes, even within inclusive and participatory processes.

The concepts of ‘place’, ‘language’ and ‘knowledge’ that made possible the inclusive and participatory process of MSN actually oppressed Hatakeyama and his embodied local/indigenous knowledge, by linking with Hatakeyama’s ‘feeling of inferiority’. Through ESD activities, a part of Hatakeyama’s embodied local/indigenous knowledge was taken out from his local context, translated into modern Japanese (the language of the coloniser), and made to fit into modern knowledge used by the majority of members. During this process, Hatakeyama was compelled to ‘swing’, because none of the conflicted groups represented his knowledge and ways of learning. Thus, patchy empowerment emerged.

This research produced four key findings. Firstly, critical theory, which supports critical EE, has epistemological limitations. Secondly, critical EE, which continues to be dominated by a focus on ‘schooling’, further enhances the epistemological problem of critical theory. Thirdly, this epistemological limitation suggested the necessity to look beyond the perspective of modern knowledge, by taking a decoloniality approach. Fourthly, taking a decoloniality approach helped to establish the epistemology of the marginalised people from their own perspective.

Finally, this research proposed a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context. This framework recognised the theory and practice of ESD within communities, with a particular focus on the socially marginalised, and identified the valuable role of the educator in contributing to learning and empowerment for all.
CHAPTER 1. Introduction

1.1 A journey in two parts

The thesis reports on a research journey both within and beyond the socially-critical approach to Education for Sustainable Development (ESD). Compared with just providing individuals with knowledge and skills for living sustainably, a critical approach to ESD aims to create “a world where everyone has the opportunity to benefit from education and learn the values, behaviour and lifestyles required for a sustainable future and for positive social transformation” (UNESCO, 2005, p. 6). This aspiration has significant transformational potential, not just in its scope and goals but also because of its wide societal focus. This wide focus involves all people, young and old, and people in all sectors related to sustainable development, including people in formal, non-formal and informal education and continues a life-long process (UNESCO, 2005, 2012).

The meaning of ‘everyone’ in this definition challenged the research journey. While this approach was implemented to ESD during the work as a community educator with a marginalised, indigenous Ainu people’s community in northern Japan (the first part of the journey — within socially-critical ESD), it became apparent that the socially-critical orientation of ESD was limited. Its principles and pedagogical practices were unable to empower all members (‘everyone’) in the community to achieve sustainable development. An analysis of the reasons for this led to the second part of the research journey. This necessitated going beyond socially-critical ESD to explore the possibilities of integrating a decoloniality perspective, not just a socially-critical one, in the approach. Viewing and studying
this approach from the perspective of decoloniality, required replacing socially-critical lenses with a more empathetic openness to the experiences of colonised and marginalized participants.

However, like ESD, the first journey in this thesis had its beginnings in critical EE.

### 1.2 Research context

Critical environmental education (EE), or education *for* the environment (Fien, 1993; Huckle, 1993; Huckle & Sterling, 1996; Robottom & Hart, 1993) has socially-critical and political action goals (Stevenson, 2007), which has provided the theoretical foundation of ESD. Critical EE is based upon a socially-critical orientation that challenges its reproductive functions in perpetuating unsustainable social and economic development (Fien, 2004). Critical EE is based on the critical theories of Jürgen Habermas, particularly his theory of communicative action (Huckle, 1993, 1996b), and the critical pedagogies of Paulo Freire, and, therefore, seeks to advance learning for social critique and empowerment of the oppressed (Fien, 1995; Huckle, 1993, 1996a).

Global policy discourses have accepted critical approaches in the policies on EE, Education for Sustainability (EfS) and ESD since the 1970s without critically examining what the word ‘socially-critical’ really means.\(^1\) However, there have

---

\(^1\) The discussions and outcome documents from international and intergovernmental conferences contributed to the development of EE, EfS and ESD. Education conferences included Belgrade Charter (UNESCO, 1975), International Conference on Environmental Education in Tbilisi (UNESCO, 1978), UNESCO-UNEP International Congress on Environmental Education and Training in Moscow (UNESCO, 1987), and International Conference: Environment and Society: Education and Public Awareness for Sustainability in Thessaloniki (UNESCO, 1997). Programs include such as UNESCO-UNEP International
long been “rhetoric-reality gaps” (Fien, 1995, p. 78). These policies do not mean that critical EE is universally accepted (Jickling, 1992, 1999, 2006) or that critical EE is easy to implement (Lucas, 1991; Stevenson, 1987, 2007; Walker, 1997). The recent United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (UNDESD, 2005-2014), which promoted ESD by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) members’ state governments, was no exception.

At the end of the UNDESD conference in Nagoya, 2015, participants evaluated the UNDESD as ‘successful’ in two ways (Heila Lotz-Sisitka, 2015; The Government of Japan, 2015; UNGA, 2015a). Firstly, the UNDESD was seen as successful at infusing the concept of *sustainable development* into education. The Nagoya conference showcased some of these efforts, including regional strategies, initiatives, projects and networks. Secondly, the UNDESD infused *education* into sustainable development. The UNDESD impacted on the wider global

Environmental Education Programme (IEEP: 1975-1987) and the UNDESD (2005-2014). Broader global community for sustainable development, including CSD, have also responded the claim of the global education community on the significance education in achieving sustainable development. The importance of education has been clearly remarked in the reports and outcome documents from the conferences, such as *Our Common Future* (WCED, 1987), *World Conservation Strategy: Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development* (IUCN, UNEP, WWF, FAO, & UNESCO, 1980), Chapter 36 of Agenda 21 (United Nations, 1992), and *Future We Want* (UNGA, 2012). In forty years, the interrelationship of the unsustainable problems between/amongst the fields, generations and species became widely understood (WCED, 1987), the views, scope and methods of educators in EE became widened and broadened. The debates on EE produced a new concept of Education for Sustainability (EfS) in the 1980s and provided the foundation to grow Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) after Earth Summit in 1990.

These included the UNESCO Associated School Project (ASP), the Higher Education for Sustainable Development (HESD), the Promotion of Sustainability in Postgraduate Education and Research Network (ProSPER.Net) in Asia, the Regional Centre for Expertise (RCE) movement, and the European Network on Higher Education for Sustainable Development (COPERNICUS Alliance, 2015). For example, ASP successfully increased the number of ASP schools to 9,556 in 180 countries (ASPnet, 2015). The United Nations University (UNU) has catalysed 136 Regional Centres for Expertise (RCE) to support ESD through partnerships between the higher education institutes and the local community (UNU IAS, 2014).
community’s ability to achieve sustainable development, particularly through the process of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) specifically at the UN World Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in 2012. Similarly, the Future We Want, a document prepared by Rio+20 for the 66th Session of the UN General Assembly, called for the further promotion of ESD beyond the UNDESD (UNGA, 2012, p. 41). Now, ESD is incorporated into the framework for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Target 4.7 supports the promotion of ESD (UNGA, 2015b). Furthermore, UNESCO developed the key strategies toward 2030 through The Global Action Programme (GAP) on ESD (UNESCO, 2013) and the Incheon Declaration by the World Education Forum confirmed UNESCO’s commitment to promoting the SDGs through ESD (UNESCO, 2015b).

Experiences from the UNDESD led to the question of who ‘everyone’ was. The efforts made during the UNDESD remained largely within formal education by schools and higher education institutes. At the Nagoya conference, the efforts in formal education were evaluated by the same formal education and schooling experts. It was a self-congratulatory evaluation. The UNDESD generally overlooked the informal education experiences in the everyday life of a local community. The educational dimensions of community development were silent in the UNDESD. As a result, overlooking community development during the UNDESD devalued the concept of “everyone” in ESD.

3 Reports from the three Rio Conventions, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) emphasised the importance of education in achieving goals of these conventions (Sarabhai, Ravindranath, Schwarz, & Vyas, 2012).
Nevertheless, the local community continues to be a key focus in efforts for sustainable development. Governments and experts can provide legal frameworks, economic incentives and technologies, which may facilitate and mobilise local communities. Indeed, global policies have recognised the importance of the local community in development. For example, strategies were developed to implement Agenda 21 (United Nations, 1992a)\(^4\) at the local community level after the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. Later, the local community was one of the key priorities in the UNDESD (UNESCO, 2005), and is still identified within five key strategies in the \textit{GAP on ESD} (UNESCO, 2013).

These top-down statements, however, are not enough. They reflect the views and interests of the governments and majority-members of a society or community, and do not respond well to the needs and interests of the minority or marginalised people (Gboku & Lekoko, 2007). Marginalised people experience their problems comprehensively and totally, while top-down policies can only see the problems of marginalised people partially and abstractedly, often overlooking the totality of the problems (Kitoh, 2009). This mismatch in understanding, and the way of dealing with problems of the local community, particularly of marginalised people, is often silenced by those in power.

\(^4\) Agenda 21 recognises the importance of the commitment by local communities in the efforts to achieve sustainable development. It points out in Chapter 28 on \textit{Agenda 21} as: ‘...Local authorities construct, operate and maintain economic, social and environmental infrastructure, oversee planning processes, establish local environmental policies and regulations, and assist in implementing national and subnational environmental policies. As the level of governance closest to the people, they play a vital role in educating, mobilizing and responding to the public to promote sustainable development ...’ (United Nations, 1992a).
Sustainable development can only be achieved when its associated values and lifestyles are internalised and contextualised in real-life. As Tilbury and Fien (2002) argue:

Yes, governments and international agencies can hold conferences, issue reports and create structures that encourage individuals, communities and companies to change, and these are important in setting broad goals and catalysing action. However, we can only effectively change the things we have most time to work on and, for most of us, this is ourselves and our local communities (p. 6).

Change from below through community education and development echoes the goals of ESD and its theoretical grounding in critical EE. Change from below is the heart of community development (Ife, 2016), particularly when marginalised people are the key participants. Experiences of community development could contribute to a bottom-up approach to ESD and enrich ESD policies and practices.

The endogenous development theory of Japanese sociologist, Kazuko Tsurumi (b. 1918- d. 2006) explains the process of change from below:

[The] ultimate goal of endogenous development is to seek the process, in which no one is excluded, and no one is killed. Bringing the marginalised, those who are disadvantaged and those who are discriminated to the centre and treat them as Sui-ten (Sui 萃 means meeting and ten 点 means point in Japanese). By moving Sui-ten, the member of the society will be shuffled, and the society will be transformed. (Tsurumi, 1999, p. 344)

The goal of endogenous development is ‘no-one’s exclusion’. No-one’s exclusion demands a decentralisation of the system and the creation of small Mandala-like networks at the local level. A society could be transformed by decentralising and

---

5 Tsurumi owed the idea of Mandala-like society and Sui-Ten on the works of Kumagusu Minakata (1867-1941), a Japanese ecologist, natural historian and folklorist. Minakata
repositioning its members, thereby changing its power balance. Thus, the genuine change from below will involve some aspects of an informal unlearning and relearning process of different members of society if we are to achieve holistic structural changes. Both majority and marginalised people may experience discomfort, pain and resistance. Their emancipation and empowerment involve their realisation of the injustice caused by the power structure of the society in which they are embedded. The political and economic sensitivities and interests of dominant social groups may come under question, thus rendering the ideas and interests of various marginalised people and groups of ‘dangerous knowledge’ (Maher, 1986). This is a process of consentização (conscientisation) (Freire, 1972).

Critical EE emphasises local experiences and places, and that education only becomes meaningful when people learn and act in a real-life context (Fien, 1993; Maser, 1996; Tilbury & Fien, 2002). So far, however, critical EE research has largely focused on formal education and schooling. There are discussions on how adult environmental education differs from education in/about and through the environment; however, the role of critical EE in adult environmental education remains unclear (Clover, 2002; Clover & Hill, 2013; Clover, Bruno, Hall & Follen, 2013).

attempted to merge two philosophies, the causality principles of Western natural science and Buddhism Karma theory, resulted in the development of his Mandala theory and the idea of Sui-ten (Tsurumi, 1998). Tsurumi was trying to posit a non-Western and non-violent model based on the history, traditions and ecological circumstances of a society at the grassroots level based on Minakata’s work. Tsurumi explains that the “Minakata-Mandala” is “a sketch for the interaction and inter-comparison of the way of all living flora, fauna and human on everywhere on the Earth” (Tsurumi, 1998, p. 349), and describes Sui-ten as meeting point where things are caused by the necessity and contingency and all the relationships, such as cause and effects, necessity and accident, meet each, influence each other, and are converged beyond time and distance (Tsurumi, 1998).
To make critical EE based practices meaningful to our everyday life context, Inoue and Imamura (2012) advise:

"The concepts of ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable society’ can embody its real meaning, only when environmental education steps in the area of efforts that are often regarded as radical, without being restrained with the ‘common sense’ and ‘routine of a dominant society’. This is the very point where the value of environmental education is challenged. (Inoue & Imamura, 2012, p. 18)

Thus, the first research journey in this thesis investigated the value of critical EE as it stepped into an area of dangerous knowledge to the common sense and the radical challenge to a dominant society.

1.3 The search for socially-critical ESD in a community development context

Guided by the critical EE theories and practices learnt during the late 1990s, the meanings and effectiveness of critical EE in the people’s everyday life outside of formal education (i.e., in community development) for the last twenty years were studied. The work from 2003-2015 for the Japan Council on Education for Sustainable Development (ESD-J), a non-governmental organisation (NGO),

---

6 Founded on 21 June 21 2003, the Japan Council on Education for Sustainable Development (ESD-J) is a networking organisation dedicated to promoting education for a sustainable society, given impetus by the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD). ESD-J was established by a civil group of NGOs and individuals of Environmental Education Working Group of the Japan Forum for Johannesburg (JFJ), who advocated the UNDESD with the Government of Japan at the WSSD. ESD-J members included those who are with the background of the environment, development, human rights, peace, gender, and youth education. ESD-J has created the consortium for the multistakeholders inviting citizens, governments, local authorities, companies and educational institutions to promote ESD. The organisation’s name changed in 2015 from the Japan Council on Education for Sustainable Development, following the conclusion of the UNDESD. See ESD-J (2016) . A community-based approach was also the key organisational principle of ESD-J. ESD-J has emphasised; i) the importance of a community-based approach in ESD, ii) the significant
guided the conduct of this study. These ESD-J experiences facilitated research into the meanings, roles and value of critical EE in community development in a real context at a time when theories, policies and practices for ESD were being developed during the UNDESD.

Mainly two types of works were engaged at ESD-J: (i) networking with NGOs in Asia\(^7\) and policy advocacy with the national government and international communities for sustainable development and ESD; and (ii) promoting ESD to community development NGOs. The NGOs that participated in the ESD-J projects were from Asia and had extensive expertise in working with rural and local community development, post-war peacebuilding, reproductive health, etc. Such projects at ESD-J facilitated opportunities to work across multiple social sectors, scales (global, national and local), communities, as well as the policy, theory and practice nexus, and to experience the tensions between and across all of them.

---

\(^7\) Three projects at ESD-J that I coordinated gave me the insights of informal ESD in the community development context. The one is Asia Good ESD Practice Project (AGEPP: 2006-08). AGEPP aimed to network the Asian community development NGOs on the theme of ESD. Six NGOs from six Asian countries were selected through the open application process and participated in this project with ESD-J. During the project, the participants explored the meaning of ESD in the community development context and reported 34 practices based on their own understanding of ESD in English and key Asian national languages (ESD-J, 2006). The other is ESD X Biodiversity Project (2008-2010). Nine NGOs reported their activities from the perspectives of biological diversity conservation and community empowerment. Workshops and meetings were also coordinated to share the understanding of ESD and biological diversity among the project participants. The third one was NGO Networking Project from 2009-2011. Japanese NGOs that worked for rural and community development in the other Asian countries, education, agriculture and foreign affair ministries, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and United Nations University (UNU) had discussions to identify ESD and the necessary policy to support Japanese civil efforts for ESD and sustainable development in Asia (ESD-J, 2009, 2010, 2011a, 2011b) .
The discussions and projects with community development NGOs on the theme of ESD provided insights about the potential of dynamic learning processes, through which sustainable development could be embedded in community development. This could be identified as ‘informal ESD in a community development context’. This insight became an underlying pillar of my policy advocacy. It also highlighted that there were confusion and contestation over ESD at the local community level.

These were particularly noticeable in the initial stages of my ESD-J work. While most practitioners agreed that community empowerment was the foundation of any actions to achieve sustainable development, few saw linkages between community empowerment and ESD as it was being conceptualised internationally. For them, ESD was something to do with formal education. Sustainable development was something to do with environmental protection and conservation (ESD-J, 2009, 2010, 2011b). They found little relevance for it in their work.

Informal ESD in a community context could not be found within the national and international institutional frameworks. The education ministries understood informal ESD in a community development context as ‘capacity building’, and therefore found very little relevance for it (ESD-J, 2013). Non-education ministries, such as those for the environment, industries, and rural and community development, did not see the relevance of informal ESD either, despite the clear statement of ESD promotion through formal, non-formal and informal education and learning (UNESCO, 2005). They regarded ESD as solely about formal education and, hence, the responsibility of education ministries.
Indeed, the nature, scope and purpose of the processes observed in discussions and projects with community development NGOs in Asia had many of the characteristics of critical EE. The actual practices of educators in local communities reflected a broader meaning, similar to the concept of praxis (Freire, 1972). While previous experience provided insights into informal ESD in a community development context, these lacked theoretical rigour; they were too empirical to challenge the dominant understanding and perceptions of ESD.

The problem of a policy-theory-practice gap and of a global-national-local gap around informal ESD in a community development context became explicit when the project was started with the MSN in northern Japan, 2009. The MSN seeks sustainable community development through a focus on the rights recovery of indigenous Ainu people. Theoretically guided by critical EE, insights on informal ESD in a community development context were integrated into the practice at the MSN. Relevant literature and theorising for the application of critical approaches in the community development context, however, were difficult to find.

1.4 The research questions

The gaps and problems in ESD encountered in the work seemed to ultimately stem from the gap between two fields: ESD and community development. The silence in ESD over community development has possibly arisen from the lack of linkage and interaction across these disciplinary fields. This is despite the potential of ESD approaches to be valuable tools in building capacity for
sustainable community development and, likewise, the potential of sustainable community development approaches to enrich the theory and practice of ESD.

This research investigates this gap and explores the way in which both fields can contribute to each other, by conducting two critical ethnographies of MSN. It investigates my interactions, as a community educator, with the key participants of MSN, particularly the marginalised Ainu people in a local community, as we sought to identify the meaning, role and value of critical ESD.

Thus, the aim of the thesis is:

To develop a praxis framework to integrate ESD and community development to be mutually supportive, ultimately strengthening the practices in both ESD and community development field.

This aim seeks to find out how critical ESD can contribute to (or be integrated within) community development, and vice versa, and how a community development practice can enrich critical ESD discussions. It is grounded in three assumptions about informal ESD in a community development context.

The first assumption is that the sustainable community development and empowerment process could be understood as informal ESD in a community development context. The second assumption is that informal ESD in a community development context from the marginalised people’s perspective can carry key characteristics of praxis and have significant implications on the theory and practice of critical ESD, such as the meaning of ESD to a local community and the role of the educator.
The third assumption is that imbalances in ‘power’ in both ESD and community development practice can deflect practitioners and researchers into directions that overlook the diverse learning and knowledge of local communities and silence the voices of those who convey these.

As a result, the following three sub-research questions were developed to explore informal ESD in a community development context:

1. How useful is critical EE in understanding ESD in a community development context? Answers to this question might provide an understanding of the relevance and effectiveness of critical EE to ESD in a community development context.

2. What are the key elements of ESD that can facilitate the empowerment of marginalised community member in efforts to achieve sustainable community development? Answers to this question might contribute to the development of a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context.

3. How might this praxis framework be validated and how might it add new insights to current critical EE? Answers to this question would lend validity to a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context.

This study was primarily informed by critical theory acknowledging that there is no value-free and neutrality in research. It is value-laden and concerns dominant social systems that have created perpetuating social and economic injustice, as well as environmental problems in a society and within institutional frameworks aimed at supporting sustainable development and ESD. To ensure consistency, the socially-critical approach to the practice of ESD that was investigated in this study
was guided by a socially-critical orientation to research (Malone, 1999; Robottom & Hart, 1993). Such was the case in the research journey, at least.

In the course of the research, issues of decoloniality (Ndlovu-Gatsueni, 2013, 2015) arose and increasingly influenced the second part of the research journey. Decoloniality recognises the limitations of critical theory and aims to go beyond it to generate knowledge of the marginalised people through their own epistemologies. Integrating these ideas into the research helped to enrich the research by ensuring the perspectives of the Ainu people in MSN were taken seriously.

Informed by the critical and decoloniality theories that guided the research, this study was conducted as a critical ethnography. Unlike interpretive ethnography which brackets out any a priori assumptions, critical ethnography emphasises both “understanding and critique in research” (Fien & Hillcoat, 1996, p. 35) and uses the phenomenological approaches of interpretive enquiry guided by theoretical frameworks such as critical theory and decoloniality (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Masemann, 1982; May, 1997; Quantz, 1992). Critical ethnographic research produces a thick description of the meaning, but creates socially-critical, reflexive and emancipatory empowerment processes between the lived experiences and a priori theory for both the researcher and participants.

1.5 Significance of this research

This study is significant in five ways, which, together, contribute to further enriching the theory and practice of critical approaches to EE and ESD. These five
ways are: (i) challenging the rhetoric-reality gap; (ii) listening to unheard voices; (iii) enriching the practice of critical ethnography; (iv) contributing to the ‘others’; and (v) giving a direction for my own praxis.

(i) Challenging the rhetoric-reality gap

Despite the critical and socially transformative bases of ESD theories, research and practices in ESD have prioritized formal education, generally on scientific and technological themes, while overlooking informal education in a community development context. As a result, much current EE and ESD has not responded to (un-)sustainability issues in real-life (Huckle & Wals, 2015). This study contributes to the questioning of power structures in the fields of EE and ESD, that have caused the exclusion and silencing of community development experiences, diverse knowledge systems and everyday learning experiences in a local community. This study exposes these power structures through the process of knowledge production using current critical EE and ESD. Thus, this study explores the value of critical approaches to EE and ESD and seeks ways to update these approaches by responding to community life experiences through informal education.

(ii) Listening to unheard voices

Secondly, this study draws its significance from its concerns for the unheard voices in the field. Despite its broad scope, nature and perspective, critical EE predominantly looks at formal education and only a part of non-formal and informal education that can be captured within the lens of formal education. This study attempts to hear the unheard voices that can identify the diverse knowledge and learnings in a local community, particularly from the marginalised people.
Identifying these from the perspectives of informal ESD in a community development context helps to enrich the current theoretical and political discourses of EE and ESD. Theory and practice can complement each other’s shortcomings, and that will bring a new dimension to critical EE and ESD in achieving sustainable development.

(iii) Enriching the practice of critical ethnography

Thirdly, the use of the critical ethnography method with the help of decoloniality in this study presents an example of ESD research that can create a process where the researcher and participants can mutually emancipate and empower, and produce knowledge together. This study allows the practice and voices of a local community to engage in a dialogue with theory-based discussions of ESD. Integrating decoloniality into a critical ethnography makes the unheard voices and the experiences of the local community to be heard, by finding ‘communicable words’ with participants. This is “the journey to connect our inquiry and learning with their inquiry and learning, and have a conversation about where we saw things differently” (Wadsworth & Patton, 2010, p. 61).

(iv) Contributing to the ‘others’

Fourthly, this research may help practitioners who are concerned with empowerment as a goal in community development. In this study, a search was carried out to determine an effective approach for local community empowerment, especially for marginalised people to solve the local community problem toward sustainable development. This study may guide both practitioners and community members to know where they stand, what they are doing, how they work together,
and what to do next in improving their lives in situations where there is no clear role for facilitators and participants, unlike in formal education and schooling.

(v) Giving a direction for my own praxis

Fifthly, this study provided the opportunity to stop and critically reflect on previous work. In the process of developing a praxis framework, conversations between practice and theory were engaged, providing the key for future practice. Although this study is not action research, it is a part of a series of action research cycles being conducted through this researcher’s life. Like PhD research by Julie Davis (2003), this thesis has contributed to the development of the researcher’s own ‘living theory’. Thus, this research articulates current concerns and living theory, which may remain and/or be challenged again in future practice. Nevertheless, it is guiding the direction to follow in the field. Thus, this “thesis is a work-in-progress” (Davis, 2003, p. ii): the more the research proceeds, the more questions may arise and the more that is learnt about practice. The more practices experienced, the more research into the researcher’s own living theory of ESD in a community development context will continue.

1.6 Outline of thesis

Figure 1-1 shows the structure of this thesis, which includes the chapter for reviewing the literature and the chapter for designing the research followed by two sets of critical ethnographic research.
Chapter 2 reviews literature from the field of EE, EfS and ESD, critical pedagogies, and policy documents by UNESCO and UNCSD. This chapter investigates the gap in the field of ESD, which was empirically observed through the work. It explored how critical EE/EfS theories (my *a priori* theory) were relevant to informal ESD in a community development context. It also explored the power structures that facilitated the development of theory, policy and practice in formal and science-based ESD. Such power silenced diverse voices, experiences, knowledge and learning that the community development field can convey.

Chapter 3 outlines the research design used for this study. It clarifies the underpinning knowledge and framework that guides the research (critical theory methodology and decoloniality), how the research is conducted (critical
ethnography), and the theoretical and practical procedures for data collection and analysis. This clarification is important to this study’s trustworthiness, as well as ensuring the matched methods and techniques meet the critical, ideological and value-laden nature of this study.

The rest of the chapters are divided into two parts. Part I is the first research journey within socially-critical ESD, which includes Chapter 4, 5 and 6. Chapter 4 will provide the contextual background of MSN ESD, which briefly describes the colonisation history of Hokkaido and the problem of the current Ainu indigenous rights movement in Japan. Chapter 5 will look into the silent area of ESD, and reviews the praxis of MSN that portrays the first critical ethnography. This illustrates the interaction of the key members of MSN, the broad community people in/outside of Mombetsu community and myself, who tried to incorporate ideas obtained from critical EE into MSN’s ESD in 2010 to 2012. This chapter explores the learning and empowerment process of MSN, informed by critical theory.

Chapter 6 reports the critical reflections from the findings of Chapter 5. This chapter will also review the literature on the theoretical and methodological issues that emerged from the 1st critical ethnography. To answer these emerging questions, this chapter developed assumptions on how and why critical EE had limitations. It used the decoloniality methodology to help me further explore the knowledge creation and learning process of the marginalised people that critical EE could not.

Part II includes Chapter 7, 8 and 9, which provides another cycle of the research journey: beyond socially-critical ESD. Chapter 7 briefly describes the contextual
background of the proposed government plan for the industrial waste management facility construction through which critical limitations emerged. Chapter 8 explores the learning and knowledge creation process of MSN’s ESD by employing decoloniality methodology. In this chapter, Satoshi Hatakeyama, who was the most marginalised person in the MSN, was interviewed. Through immersion in local community life, Hatakeyama was observed to understand how he learned and what knowledge meant to him, or his epistemology. Finally, the analyses of this chapter highlighted the power imbalance between different sources of knowledge and between multiple learning processes across the diverse community members.

Chapter 9 is the second critical reflection, as the conclusion of this study. It presents the findings from the reflexive analysis between the critical ethnography #2 findings and engages back to the theoretical discussions. Finally, this chapter develops a praxis framework for ESD from the below. This chapter also presents the implications and recommendations for further ESD practice and research in a community development context.
CHAPTER 2. Unpacking the silencing of ESD

The aim of this thesis is to develop a praxis framework for Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) in a community development context ‘from the margins’, as outlined in Chapter 1. This aim is addressed through investigation of two dimensions of ESD in a community development context: (1) a literature review based upon theoretical, policy and practice reports; and (2) a reflection of my practice in the context of key issues discussed in the literature.

This chapter investigates the first dimension in the following three sections:

- **Background of ESD**: This section reviews the historical background of ESD. It helps to understand where and how the theorising of critical EE has historically provided the conceptual framework to support the broad scope and wide settings of ESD.

- **Unpacking the gap**: This section explains how ESD policies and research promoted a particular part of ESD (formal education and schooling), while overlooking the rest (community development), especially the UNDESD. Thus, it identifies a rhetoric-reality gap between formal prescriptions for EE, EfS and ESD and what has actually been occurring.

- **Exploring the silence**: This section seeks to explain the reasons for the rhetoric-reality gap.

### 2.1 Education for Sustainable Development

Very often when people hear the word ‘education’, they think of learning in formal education organisations such as kindergartens, schools and universities,
learning activities such as music lessons, craft-making and gardening classes hosted by private and community learning organisations. However, education also happens outside schools. There are mainly three forms of education, which are applicable to ESD:

- Formal education is carried out in the school, college and university system, and is provided by state, regional, municipal and local educational authorities, and by individual schools and teachers.

- Non-formal education occurs outside the formal school system, but through other organised learning settings, e.g. youth groups, women’s associations, zoo and park programmes, extension systems, community and church organisations, adult literacy classes, and other settings to provide information and encourage practices.

- Informal education reaches audiences outside organised groups. It is provided by news media, traditional and entertainment media, community mobilisation efforts and other channels of communication. (Fien, Scott, & Tilbury, 2001, p. 388)

This section traces the history of EE, EfS and ESD. By so doing, it investigates two issues. The first is the way ESD has inherited the broad approaches of integrating formal, non-formal and informal education, rather than the single approach offered through only formal education. The second way is how the theorising of ‘critical environmental education’, or ‘education for the environment’, during the 1990s, has provided the conceptual foundation to the supporting policies of EE, EfS and ESD.

2.1.1 Historical background of ESD

ESD is both an emerging field and a concept that integrates all aspects of learning (Hopkins, 2012). Officially, the following sentence has been used to define ESD
in many policy papers: ESD “envisions a world where every person has the chance to benefit from educational opportunities and to learn the lifestyles, behaviours and values necessary to create a sustainable future” (UNESCO, 2005, p. 6).

As with the concept of sustainable development itself, ESD is not fixed, but rather an evolving concept (Tilbury & Fien, 2002). UNESCO (2009b) also acknowledges that slightly different interpretations have been made by the international stakeholders for ESD, but share the following descriptions of ESD:

- A transformative and reflective process that seeks to integrate values and perceptions of sustainability not only into education systems but also into people’s everyday personal and work lives;

- A means of empowering people with knowledge, skills and commitments that equip people to address the challenges of global society in local everyday contexts both now and in the future;

- A holistic approach to achieve economic and social justice and respect all life;

- A means to improve the quality of basic education: ESD aims to reorient existing educational programmes and to raise awareness. (UNESCO, 2009b, p. 26)

ESD relates to the major UN-supported education initiatives such as Education for All (EFA) and UN Literacy Decade (UNLD), however it goes beyond what is commonly understood as ‘education’, which often narrowly refers to formal education and schooling activities (UNESCO, 2009b). Broadly, ESD has two aims. Firstly, ESD aims to reform the current education. This includes transforming the school system, learning contents, and teaching approaches. Secondly, ESD aims to transform the society through education. ESD articulates actions and projects for achieving sustainable development in everyday life.
context at a local community, covering concepts of peace, human rights and economic viability (UNESCO, 2009b). The two aims of ESD indicate that it is holistic and inclusive in its efforts to achieve sustainable community development across a wide array of educational approaches including formal, non-formal and informal education.

ESD is an affinitive educational concept with EE and EfS. EE, EfS and ESD are often used interchangeably, by those who emphasise the importance of education that aims to go beyond individual behaviour change and seeks to empower people for systemic change (Tilbury & Cooke, 2005). On the other hand, there have been strong contestations and disagreements over the wording and definitions. The choice of terminology can depend on how the culture of academia and socio-ecologically engaged scholarship, or geo-epistemologies, might interact with each other and challenge the implementation, enactment, and evaluation of ESD in the academic, political and economic power structure (Payne, 2016, p. 70).

In Australia, for example, the acronym ESD has been widely understood to refer to Ecologically Sustainable Development (Australian Government, 1992). This meaning came into use before the term Education for Sustainable Development (and its acronym ESD) became popular worldwide after the Rio Summit in 1992. Instead, in Australia, Education for Sustainability (EfS) is commonly favoured. Payne (2016) asserts that such “mashing” (p. 71) holds together the different histories, purposes, interests, commitments, and tensions but results in the word usage of ‘critical’ uncritically in EE, ESD and ESD. And now, the same “mashing” seems to apply to the area of Global Citizenship Education (GCED) (See 2.1.3), using ‘critical’ uncritically.
2.1.2 Critical EE: Conceptual foundation of ESD

Beyond the arguments on the similarities or differences, EE, EfS and ESD share at least one point in common. The theoretical and political discourses on each tend to be founded in the theorising of ‘critical environmental education for the environment’. Critical EE is developed in the late 1970/80s by Robottom (1987) and Lucas (1991) and theoretically synthesised in the 1990s by Fien (1995, 1993) and (Huckle & Sterling, 1996). As the proposition for in ESD suggests, EfS and ESD conceptually draw mostly upon critical EE, which gives the socially-critical orientation to ESD.

2.1.2.1 In/about, through and for

Lucas (1991) described the ideological orientations of environmental education and categorised environmental education into three types: education in/about, through, and for, the environment. Among the three, education for the environment is contrasted with education in/about and through the environment. Each of these reflects a set of values and beliefs that may guide educational decisions and explain their consequences (Fien, 1995).

Key features of education in/about and through the environment are summarised below, according to the description of Fien (1995)

Education in/about the environment emphasises the knowledge about natural systems and processes and the ecological and political factors that influence decisions about how people use the environment.

Education through the environment takes a learner-centred approach to add reality, relevance and practical experience to learning. It provides students with an appreciation of the environment through direct contact with it, which may
develop skills for data gathering, photography, interviewing and using scientific instruments as well as social skills such as cooperation and group responsibility.

Table 2-1 briefly summarises the differences between about, through and for in EE, which this research does not touch upon in detail.

Table 2-1: Key characteristics of education about, through and for the environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>about</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Vocational/neo-classical and liberal/progressive</td>
<td>Uncritical</td>
<td>Knowledge based</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Positivism/interpretivism</td>
<td>Liberal/progressive</td>
<td>Romantic and positively reactionary</td>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>Environment and social aspect</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>Teacher and Learner</td>
<td>Critical theory</td>
<td>Liberal/Progressive and Socially critical</td>
<td>Counter-hegemonic</td>
<td>Social participation</td>
<td>Environment and human life</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Fien (1995, pp. 14-23)

In contrast to critical EE, education in/about and through the environment understand ‘environment’ as the physical environment and the ecological system. Education in/about take a weak or naïve approach to environmental and social issues, and maintain the dominant liberal/progressive and neoclassic education rather than challenge to the current socio-economic systems and education (Sterling, 1996). Critical EE has “socially-critical and political action goals” (Stevenson, 1987; 2007, p. 140). It views the environment as inextricably linked with social, economic and cultural systems. It is based upon the integration of the New Environmental Paradigm and socially-critical orientation in education which challenges the perpetuation of unsustainable economic development and the reproductive functions of education (Fien, 1995). Hence, it is “radical” (Sterling, 1996, p. 19).
Fien (1995) identifies five key principles of education for the environment. He argues that it emphasises:

1. the development of critical environmental consciousness based upon:
   - a holistic view of the environment as a totality of the interdependent relationship between natural and social systems,
   - a historical perspective on current and future environmental issues, and the study of the causes and effects of environmental problems, and alternative solutions to them;
2. the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills through a variety of practical and interdisciplinary learning experiences which focus on real-world problems and involve the study of a wide range of sources and types of information;
3. the development of environmental ethic based on sensitivity and concern for environmental quality;
4. the development of the understandings, values and skills of political literacy which promote participation in a variety of forms of social action to help improve and maintain environmental quality; and,
5. teaching strategies that are consistent with its goals. These strategies have been called ‘critical praxis’. (p. 55)

It should be noted that ‘critical praxis’ is one of the key principles of critical EE. Praxis is an approach to critical pedagogy that was developed by Freire (1972). It is the integration of theory and practice or reflection and action upon the world to transform it. It aims to raise the consciousness of learners to the ideological interests served by the present construction of their environment and to empower them to engage in reflective action (praxis) and to transform it (Freire, 1972). Praxis occurs through critical reflection on the situation of those who are trapped in the oppressive structure by gaining the language to describe it through conscientisation (conscientização) (Souto-Manning, 2010).
2.1.2.2 Theorising of critical EE

Theorising of critical EE draws mostly on critical pedagogy and critical theory, which determines two contrasting roles of EE; *subject* and *agent* for social change (Sterling, 1996). Firstly, environmental education must contribute to educational reform by breaking away from the reproducing, unsustainable paradigm (*subject*). Secondly, environmental education has to play a role in changing values and attitudes by problem-solving, developing action skills, raising awareness about the environment and development related problems (*agent*). The former helped educators to critically reflect on education, which has functioned as a tool for a reproducing, unsustainable society and alienating, un-official knowledge. The latter brings ‘hope’ to educators who see education as playing a role in social transformation.

*Reforming education through environmental education (a subject)*

Critical pedagogy expresses concern that schooling has functioned as a tool for the reproduction of an unsustainable society. Five points of evidence have been offered in support of this.

The first involves questions about the legitimacy of a particular form of knowledge in education, as official knowledge. Authorities in power, such as the government, prioritise and legitimate Western scientific knowledge as official knowledge in its educational policies, believing its contribution to the industrial growth and existing power structures (Apple, 1993, 2000; Carspecken & Apple, 1992; Freire, 1972).

The second involves the institutionalisation of official knowledge. That is, such knowledge has been legitimatised and promoted as official knowledge in formal
education, including in schools, universities, vocational schools and government supported community programs. (Apple, 1993, 2000; Freire, 1972; Illich, 1973).

The third is the one-sided and unidirectional way official knowledge is transferred. Freire (1972) calls this “banking education” through which official knowledge is poured into “the students’ brains like money banks” (Souto-Manning, 2010, p. 11). Banking education has made official knowledge into “common sense” through which people can fit into society. It also plays a role as a “funnel” (Illich, 1973, p. 71), channelling people into academic and vocational education streams, with the former held up as more worthy than the latter (Connell, 1993; Illich, 1973; O’Hern & Nozaki, 2014).

The fourth is the supremacy of official knowledge creating hierarchical relationships between academically-educated people and the non-academic. In creating and legitimising subordinated relationships, schooling excludes other forms of knowledge. This includes the knowledge of not just the non-academic, but also the knowledge of non-Western, indigenous and local communities, which is thus held to be substantively and functionally inferior (Connell, 1993; O’Hern & Nozaki, 2014, p. 24).

The fifth is the unsustainable nature of the world that results from all the environmental problems, injustice and inequality, political alimentation, conflict etc. This unsustainable world has established a social system where education as a tool for reproduction, can be sustained.

Transforming society through environmental education (an agent)
While criticising schooling for reproducing an unsustainable society, critical educators still find hope in education. As Carspecken and Apple (1992) argue,
“Schools can be and are arenas in which alternative and oppositional cultural practices evolve” (p. 509). Similarly, critical environmental educators placed their hope in environmental education to play a role for educational reform as well as social transformation. Education can challenge the dominant beliefs, values and practices that sustain a society.

In support of this point, Tilbury and Fien (2002) assert:

...education for sustainability would embrace alternative epistemologies, and would value diverse ways of knowing, identify with the people and communities it purports to serve and respect community-based approaches to social change. This new outlook would extend the focus of education (and environmental education) from schools into the community. Education would no longer be interpreted solely as an academic subject for schools but as a participatory process which would involve all areas of civil society, including businesses and public services. (p. 10)

These words indicate a key point in making a move away from education as a tool for reproducing an unsustainable society, and toward social transformation instead. These words advocate that ‘education’ in ESD should go beyond the traditional understanding that limits it within a formal setting, and should take a community-based approach, bringing formal and non-formal entities and community development (informal education) together.

To make education an agent for social change, environmental educators have drawn on critical theories from the 1980-90s. Critical theory aims for consensus, based on an open and public argument, essential for more sustainable forms of development. Huckle (1993, 1996b) integrates critical theory in the learning and teaching methods for the critical EE and EfS in a school education context.
Huckle (1993) summarises discursive communicative action theory in four points:

- Universal moral consensus is inherent in the nature and use of human language;
- All human communication can be an ideal speech situation in which all participants have equal power to defend their contributions as meaningful, true, justified and sincere;
- Claims to truth and justification to public scrutiny are revealed; and
- A rational consensus is made, based on an open argument, which undermines the false consensus. (Huckle, 1993, p. 61)

Discursive communicative action theory has been integrated and practised as a critical approach to EE and EfS. This has occurred mostly in formal education settings, in the form of workshops, peer learning, multi-stakeholder participation, and through the facilitation role of teachers.

Fien (1992, 1995) draws on structuration theory by Anthony Giddens to explain the process of integration of critical EE into a school education context. Structuration theory seeks to explain the reflexive and dialectic relationship between the social structure and the individuals as agents within the social structure (Giddens, 2012). It describes that social change is possible as the individuals can determine the social structure, and vice versa, the social structure can determine the resources and rules for the individual. Both can limit as well as enable each other to change. There is a tension between the agent and the social structure, which accompanies the resistance and conflict. Fien (1995) argues that critical EE is possible based on the struggles of teachers who played a role as an intellectual transformative being, struggling in integrating the rhetoric and reality of our lives and works and challenging both the educational systems and the social structure (p. 98).
2.1.2.3 Policy supports for critical EE

The attributes of critical EE outlined in previous sections emphasise a transformational intent. One highlight of the theorising of critical EE is its strong interaction with international policies. Critical EE has influenced international organisations, particularly UNESCO, who has also responded to the critical EE discourses. UNESCO and its member government states have incorporated the key concepts of critical EE into their policies. These policy commitments have facilitated the conceptual growth of their sustainability-related approaches to education through more research and implementation of practices.

The policy commitments have drawn political and economic interests that affect what the sustainability-related educations could be named and how it should be interpreted and implemented. EfS became popular at the same time as sustainability and sustainable development concepts became widely accepted. For example, during the 1997 Thessaloniki Conference and until the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), UNESCO preferred to use the phrase, Education for Sustainability (EfS) (UNESCO, 1997). Then Hopkins (2012) chose to use ESD, rather than EfS, during the drafting process of Chapter 36.

Hopkins (2012) explains the reason of the name change from EE/EfS to ESD is that the broad scope and settings of EE and EfS tended to be ignored and narrowed to one of adjectival education during implementation. It remained as an elective outside the core curricula or as an after-school activity, despite the strong statements from international documents such as Tbilisi Declaration. To avoid
repeating the problem, ESD was chosen and expected to simply overcome the problem of EE.

Despite the name changes, the history shows that critical EE has been consistently taken up in international policy documents, even if only as rhetoric. Lucas (1991) states that the international community on EE, and later for EfS and ESD, has moved toward a critical, or *for*, view of EE. This includes the Belgrade Charter (UNESCO-UNEP 1975), which contains a statement of the goal of environmental education based on *for*.

The history of education and sustainable development has experienced five waves where educational concepts become broadened and widened, as Table 2.2 shows. The first wave was the time around the 1960s to the late 70s, which includes Stockholm Conference in 1972. The educational debates around the issues of the environment established the field of EE. This conference designated the UNESCO as a responsible UN organisation that should lead educational debates in relation to the environment, development and sustainable development. Although the main focus of EE around this time was school education, the policy documents show some of the key elements of critical EE. The Belgrade Charter in 1975 emphasised not only gaining skills, knowledge and attitude but also action through participation to solve the environmental issues, based on the broad understanding of the interrelatedness of culture, environment, economy and society (UNESCO, 1975).

The second wave is the time around the late 1970s-80s, which include the Tbilisi Conference in 1978. The interrelationship of the unsustainable problems between/amongst the fields, generations and species became widely understood in
the 1980s (WCED, 1987), and such recognition resulted in the birth of the sustainable development concept. Responding to the sustainable development debates, critical educators aimed to go beyond school- and science-based EE, and developed a new concept of EfS in the 1980s. The main focus of EfS was still school education, but the life-long non-formal and informal education became identified in the EE/EfS debates.

The third wave is the time around 1990 to 2000, which follows the 1992 UNCED and the formation of the UNCSD. Chapter 36 of Agenda 21 from UNCSD clearly states the role and meaning of education in achieving sustainable development (United Nations, 1992a). This meets the critical educators’ assertion of education for the environment covering environment, society, economy and culture. Chapter 36 emphasised a practical approach by emphasising EE and EfS at the local community level. In parallel to EfS, the follow-up process of Chapter 36 generated the concept of ESD.

The fourth wave is the time that the policy commitments became intensified to establish the UNDESD, which called for the commitments of member state governments. The word social transformation, which was long-argued in the critical EE/EfS, was firstly used in the UNDESD documents. While EE and EfS play the central role of the debates, ESD became an umbrella concept to embrace all sustainability-related educational initiatives. This included the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), UN Literacy Decade, and Education for All, which all recognised the UN Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 (UNESCO, 2005, p. 25), and included peace, human rights and gender education.
“Criticism of the concept of sustainable development itself is an integral part of ESD” (Hopkins, 2012, p. 27), and ESD does not intend to teach about the concept of sustainable development. Now, the criticism toward ESD has been leading the fifth wave; a new educational concept for the post-UNDESD; Global Citizenship Education (GCED) is said to complement the education that ESD does not include, such as human rights and peace education (UNESCO, 2017). The UNESCO acknowledged, however, that ESD embraced these forms of education even at the beginning of the UNDESD (UNESCO, 2005). It could be argued that the difference between ESD and GCED is subtle or even nil. There could be political interests behind the emergence of this new concept, which are not investigated in this thesis.
Table 2-2: Interaction between sustainable development and EE, EFs and ESD policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging educational concepts</th>
<th>Key Sustainable Development Events</th>
<th>Key essence in relation to education</th>
<th>Key Educational documents</th>
<th>Key essence</th>
<th>Key discussions of critical EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Wave late 1970s</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment (Stockholm, Sweden); Stockholm Declaration, No.19</td>
<td>EE is essential to enhance the knowledge to understand and to protect the environment</td>
<td>Role of UNESCO to promote EE</td>
<td>Recognition of inter-linkage between society, economy, culture, peace and environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1975 Belgrade Charter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFS</td>
<td>1978 Inter-governmental Conference on Environmental Education (Tbilisi, USSR)</td>
<td>EE framework in the global political context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Wave late 1970s late 80s</td>
<td></td>
<td>1972 UN Conference on Environment and Development: UNCED Agenda 21</td>
<td>EE is essential to enhance the knowledge to understand and to protect the environment</td>
<td>Role of UNESCO to promote EE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1980 The Declaration of the Thessaloniki</td>
<td>EE framework in the global political context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development: UNCED Agenda 21</td>
<td>EE is essential to enhance the knowledge to understand and to protect the environment</td>
<td>Role of UNESCO to promote EE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1992 The Declaration of the Thessaloniki</td>
<td>EE framework in the global political context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995 - 2014 International Implementation Scheme (IES) on UNDESD</td>
<td>ESD should be promoted beyond the UNESD</td>
<td>UNESD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 World Summit on Sustainable Development: WSSD</td>
<td>ESD should be promoted beyond the UNESD</td>
<td>UNESD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Rio+20 Future We Want (Article 231)</td>
<td>ESD should be promoted beyond the UNESD</td>
<td>UNESD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015 GCED</td>
<td>ESD should be promoted beyond the UNESD</td>
<td>UNESD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Recurring rhetoric-reality gap

Strong policy commitments to EE, EfS and ESD have created power pressures that draw the political and economic interests to interpret and implement in a particular way. As a result, conservative interpretations of EE/EfS (in/about and through) have dominated. This is the ‘rhetoric-reality gap’ (Fien, 1995; Huckle, 1996b) between the theory of critical EE and its practice. The objectives of critical EE have tended to be ‘diluted’ and ‘deleted’ in practice in many parts of the world throughout the history of EE, EfS and ESD (Fien, 2004; Greenall, 1981a; Tilbury & Fien, 2002). The UNDESD was no exception.

2.2.1 Is policy support empowering?

In 2014, the UNESCO and the Government of Japan co-organised the end of the UNDESD conference in Nagoya, Japan. This conference celebrated the achievements of the last decade and presented the further commitment of UNESCO for ESD promotion beyond 2014. The UNDESD successfully infused sustainable development concepts into the educational strategies of member states and conducted initiatives, projects and networks globally.\(^8\) It is also said to have

---

\(^8\) These included the UNESCO Associated School Project (ASP), Higher Education for Sustainable Development (HESD), Promotion of Sustainability in Postgraduate Education and Research Network (ProSPER.Net) in Asia, and Regional Centre for Expertise RCE), and the European Network on Higher Education for Sustainable Development (COPERNICUS Alliance, 2015). ASP successfully increased the number of ASP schools to 9,556 in 180 countries (ASPnet, 2015). RCE United Nations University (UNU) has conducted Regional Centre for Expertise (RCE) (UNU IAS, 2014) to support ESD conducted based on the strong partnership between the higher education institutes and the local community. 136 local areas were acknowledged as RCE in the world (UNU IAS, 2015).
impacted on the wider global community particularly through the UNCSD.\textsuperscript{9} These successes showed that the concepts and methods of ESD were actively promoted during the UNDESD. The dialogue of policy, research and practice contributed to the advancement of ESD. However, there are critiques that the UNDESD was a failure. As Huckle and Wals (2015) noted:

Our central argument is that the Decade represents 'business' as usual in the end' since the majority of those who determined its rationale and develop educational projects and programmes under its umbrella failed through inadequate guidance, misplaced idealism or the censoring of more critical ideas and content, to face up to current global realities (Huckle & Wals, 2015, p. 492).

One of the main causes of the failure seems to be the imbalance in the policies during the UNDESD. All the efforts were made mostly for formal education and schooling rather than for informal education. The review of the UNDESD showed how significant the evaluation of formal education and schooling efforts of the member governments were, while how little information on informal education and community development were included (UNESCO, 2009b, 2012, 2014c). Indeed, UNESCO (2014c) states, “Non-formal and informal ESD is increasing” (p. 9); however, they understand narrowly the informal ESD as public-awareness through campaigns and media (UNESCO, 2014c, p. 132). This understanding did not include informal learning and empowerment processes through social participation and actions for sustainable development, which should relate to critical EE principles for social change.

\textsuperscript{9} The three Rio Conventions, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) has gradually infused the importance of education in achieving goals of these conventions (Sarabhai, Ruvindranath, Schwarz & Vyas, 2012).
This lack of informal ESD brings many of the claimed successes into question. Indeed, as early as 1991, Lucas had argued that there was “little reliable evidence of success in meeting the goals of education for the environment” and that many claims of successes were either “self-praise” descriptions of courses by their producers or “pious hopes” “that the goals of programs were being achieved” (p. 36). It could be argued that the celebrations of the UNDESD at Nagoya were similar ‘self-praise’ or ‘pious hopes’. The reports on the decade mostly represented the stakeholders of formal education evaluating their own formal education efforts. That is, the idea of ESD for ‘everyone’ in the eyes of the UNDESD was not a part of the Nagoya discourse.

2.2.2 Articulating the silencing of educational modes and characteristics

ESD has still largely remained an adjectival education, or optional add-on, and formal education has mainly dominated ESD during the UNDESD (Hopkins, 2012, p. 28). On the other hand, what is not commonly regarded as ‘education’ was overlooked, including the works of practitioner and researchers who tackled the issues of poverty, exclusion and economic issues in everyday life contexts (Hopkins, 2012, p. 28). These are mostly covered and tackled in the disciplinary field of community development.

The categorisation of educational modes and characteristics types of La Belle (1982) helps us clearly to identify the gaps of the UNDESD (Figure 2-1, see next page). From the perspective of educational mode, the UNDESD focused on formal education efforts and any efforts that could be understood from formal
education (schooling). From the perspective of educational characteristics, the UNDESD looked at the works and stakeholders that could be understood with the methods and approaches of formal educational characteristics, or schooling. These included structured learning and training activities by government, NGOs and business/industries. An area the UNDESD overlooked was informal education, in particular, where the informal education mode and informal education characteristics overlap; informal education through daily experiences.

Figure 2-1: Silence of the UNDESD in educational modes and characteristics.

Out of three educational approaches, formal education and schooling dominated discussions in educational research and policies for EE, EfS and ESD, by the UNDESD. By focusing on formal education and schooling, the UNDESD overlooked the area where informal learning characteristics and informal education modes cross; informal education through ‘daily experience’. This
diminishes the fact that the most education happens informally outside of what people normally see as ‘education’ (Illich, 1973, p. 20).

Informal education through everyday life experiences accounts for only one of nine cubes of Figure 2-1, but it qualitatively comprises vast parts of human life. Illich (1973) says that most learning is commonly believed to be the result of teaching at formal education and schooling is in ‘illusion’ (p. 20). In fact, the time we spend in formal education and schoolings is only a part of our lives, considering how little time people are likely to be in formal or non-formal learning situations across one’s lifetime. Most learning happens casually outside school, throughout our lives, in an unstructured and intangible way (Illich, 1973, p. 20). There may not be qualified teachers, official curriculum, learning purpose, objectives and textbooks, but we still learn. We think, learn and decide to act through our everyday lives, joys, struggles and acts of resistance.

Community development is the area that covers mostly informal education through everyday life experience. The part that is overlooked by the dominant ESD policies and research includes informal education that happens in a community development context. Figure 2-2 (see next page) shows the overlooked part in the UNDESD. This part can be named as ESD in a community development context, which comprises informal learning processes embedded in community development efforts for sustainability.
2.2.3 Community development as a praxis

Community development concerns people’s everyday reality of life in their local communities, and is the initial context for sustainable development (Ife, 2016; Ledwith, 2005). It is “an ongoing and complex process of dialogue, exchange, consciousness-raising, education and action aimed at helping the people concerned to construct their own version of community (Ife, 2016, p. 117). A few community development writers have focussed on the overlap between community development and education. Warburton (2013) sees this process as “an educational process in the broadest sense, where participants learn by doing” (Warburton, 2013, p. 28). They see that praxis, which constitutes the ultimate goal of critical EE, is also the integral part of community development (Ife, 2016; Warburton, 2013).
The following five elements of community development as praxis identify the significant implications of adopting a socially-critical approach to ESD in a local community development context.

(i) **Community development as process of empowerment**

Through community development practices, local community people reflect their social, economic and political structures which create opportunities and challenges, and take the necessary steps to improve their lives and their communities. They enrich their ideas, thoughts and concepts about sustainable development in a real-life context. Any action in this process is backed with new learning and re-learning. Learning happens informally, un-intentionally and un-structurally throughout community development process.

In the field of community development, Ife (2016) argues that, “genuine empowerment is the aim of community development and can bring effective changes in a local community” (p.6). Learning inextricably links with practice; learning and practice empower community people and result in sustainable community development. Sustainable community development coincides with a process of community empowerment. Learning in a real life context at a local community level can bring a real change (Tillbury and Fien 2002). Governmental agreements or new institutional structures and programmes alone do not bring real change effectively. Learning helps community people to take an action to change their situation, and they also learn through doing a practice.

Conscientisation is at the heart of genuine community empowerment. It involves the local community people’s articulation of real-life experiences, sufferings and aspirations and analysis of the relationship between their problems and the
broader social, economic and political structures causing their oppression by the people themselves (Ife, 2016). Through conscientisation, community people become able to control their own lives and the conditions under which they live (Tilbury and Fien, 2002). This is the point that attributes community development as praxis.

(ii) Change from below

‘Change from below’ is the heart of community development (Ife, 2016, pp. 138-139). This ‘from below’ idea challenges the hierarchical relationship between local community people and experts that is commonly accepted in many community works. The experts, who have “degrees or diplomas or who are members of a recognised profession” (Chambers 1993 and 2005 in Ife, 2016, p. 139), often play a key role in applying universal knowledge onto a complex reality of a local community. Community development challenges the power relationship between these parties, attempting to regain the autonomy or self-determination of a local community in relation to government and international organisations, or marginalised people in relation to the majority, in regards to their future. At the same time, it humbles the expert who works simply as “a resource that may be used by the local community people” (Ife, 2016, p. 122).

Particularly, in the context of this thesis, ‘from below’ perspective concerns people in “a form of acute and persistent disadvantage rooted in underlying social inequalities” (UNESCO, 2010, p. 135). Social, economic, cultural and/or political factors inextricably cause the marginalisation of a particular group of people in a local community. Marginalised people are often the hardest hit by the challenges created by development proposals with short-term goals and often have the least
resilience in major conflicts and crises. Their difficult situation is exacerbated in this process as their accumulated educational, health and livelihood problems pose major obstacles for them in responding to problems appropriately and taking initiatives to preserve or improve their situation. Community development aims to make the marginalised people visible, hear their voices, and bring them to the centre of any sustainable development efforts for the local community. This point echoes with the central concept of endogenous development by Tsurumi and Kawada (1986).

(iii) Mutual learning between community people and experts

The process of ‘from below,’ becomes the learning approach for both the experts and the local community. This process challenges the fixed image of the roles and knowledge that both parties normally have. Community people often see that experts in authority who can provide all (or even some) of the answers (Ife, 2016), such as problem identification, establishing the approach to the solution of problem and designing and making a decision on a project. They often devalue their experiences and knowledge about their own community and do not even think that they have a right to participate in their local community development process. Experts also often do not expect that they can learn from the local community people.

Together they can re-think their position, attitudes to each other, and the knowledge they already have while in search of new knowledge for the local community. Experts have to be willing to listen and learn from the local community. Community people need to know that they have knowledge which is locally contextualised and often difficult to convey or be understood based on the
dominant universal ‘expert’ knowledge. This process requires new learning and unlearning from both sides about what they have possessed from their previous experiences, which leads to mutual liberation (Warburton, 2013, p. 28).

(iv) Lifelong learning

Formal education and schooling have been major target areas of ESD policies, practices and research. However, formal education engages with a part of everyday life and targets specifically children and youth. Learning contents are determined based on governmental policies and the interests of teachers. The vast majority of people in everyday life contexts at a local community level have little or almost nothing to do with shaping the contents of formal education and schooling. The issues that local community people find very important may not be identified or prioritised as learning contents for formal education and schooling.

Sustainable development relates to all humans and involves all aspects of our lives, and learning must, therefore, be part of a lifelong process (UNESCO, 2005, p. 6). Formal education and schooling are not enough to achieve sustainable development. Fien (1995) argues that whether education can function for reproduction of unsustainable society or social change depends on “how they (educators) work together with efforts for social change in and beyond the school” (p.90). The field of community development holds the clue for social change beyond the school.

Community development often tackles the locally identified issues in the everyday lives and involves people beyond those whom formal education and schooling activities could involve. Education also happens informally and un-structurally in a community development process, which dominant ESD
discourses do not often see from their limited perspective of ‘education’. Understanding and analysing community development processes from the perspectives of ESD can therefore have a significant implication as praxis.

(v) Structural approach

Community development challenges the structural basis of individualised community problems and seeks alternatives to the commonly accepted assumptions of the existing social, economic and political system (Ife, 2016). This approach is more than a community-based approach, which has “an individualised and professional orientation” (Ife, 2016, p. 127). A community-based approach is an important aspect of community development. It has been emphasised by many international and government policies, NGOs and research, as well as integrated into programmes and initiatives for sustainable development, including EE, EfS and ESD. However, a community-based approach by itself is not enough, and can at times even be problematic in trying to solve problems fundamentally.

The community-based approach does not necessarily challenge the social, economic and cultural systems that have been producing these problems. It focuses on the most obvious issues but may not see them holistically, in relation to other problems and the systems that create the problems. The professional orientation permits a hierarchy between experts, as a central player, and the community, as subordinates, by only including the experts’ knowledge. Professional orientation also makes it economically unviable for the local community to receive continuous community service. Such an orientation of a community-based approach does “not empower communities or consumers,
because knowledge and wisdom tend to be confined to the professional and not shared with others” (Ife, 2016, p. 127).

Community development attempts to bridge different contexts (global-local), knowledge paradigms (modern-traditional/indigenous), theory and practice, localities (urban-rural), peoples (majority and marginalised people) and times (past-present-future). In such efforts, it aims to identify colonial pressures and oppression between/amongst these and facilitate the participation of diverse stakeholders to a community practice and the mutual-learning amongst them (Ife 2016). Community participation and mutual-learning contribute in empowering the local community members for achieving sustainable development. Such challenges of community development to the systems based on participation and empowerment share the key features of praxis.

Therefore, these above five elements indicate that community development is itself a bottom-up mutual learning process for all the stakeholders in everyday life settings. The experience of community development could enrich the theory and practice of critical EE’s application to ESD in a local community context.

2.3 Causes of silencing

Critical educators in EE, EfS and ESD have seen the problem of the rhetoric-reality in critical EE as inescapable because of critical EE’s strong linkage with policies. Politics seeks to accommodate all views and therefore, makes it impossible to present one’s favoured view of sustainable development or philosophy of education (Fien, 2004, p. 4; Greenall, 1981a; Tilbury & Fien, 2002).
Policies for ESD were planned and implemented in a politically acceptable manner that did not offend anyone during the UNDESD (Hopkins, 2012, p. 24). The earlier discussions identified that the policies for the UNDESD manifested the rhetoric-reality gap as a form of silencing of ESD in a community development context. As a result, critical components that were declared in the UNDESD policies were ‘diluted and deleted’ again. So, given the fact that the rhetoric-reality gap of critical EE comes from the unchangeable nature of politics, it is possible to conclude that the silencing of ESD in a community development context was an unavoidable result.

An important question to address is whether critical EE should stay where it is or move beyond the rhetoric-reality. Critical EE practitioners, who have struggled and attempted to break this cycle, suggest that we undertake a situational analysis or ‘read the context’ of ESD programmes (Fien, 2000; Tilbury & Fien, 2002). Understanding the silencing of ESD in a community development context involves asking questions such as: (i) What is the nature, cause and impact of the silencing of ESD in a community development context? and (ii) How has the theory of critical EE responded to this? These questions are to be examined in the following two subsections.

### 2.3.1 Issue of power in the field

Two factors seemed to have caused this silencing of the praxis-based learning experiences of community development. The first one includes the dominant beliefs in education and community development among many stakeholders.
Following Greenall (1981b), Fien (2004) has traced that the dominant influences of mainstream beliefs and practices have turned socially-critical and transformative objectives into acceptable forms of education in/about and through in the history of EE, EfS and ESD. Fien’s words also imply the mainstream beliefs and practices in ESD and what can be named as a ‘common understanding’ of ESD. The nature of critical ESD that figured in the rhetoric of the UNDESD is outlined below.

The second factor is the political and economic pressures inside/outside of the UNDESD that formed the ‘common understandings’ of ESD. This came through policies and initiatives of power authorities such as UNESCO and member governments. Thus, it was deemed legitimate and prevailed amongst the wider stakeholders.

In this power relationship, UNESCO has authority to decide the policies of the UNDESD at the international level, but at the same time, they are also under the pressure of the governments of member states. The success of the UNDESD was evaluated, at least in part, by how many member states accepted and implemented ESD. Given that education ministries were generally the contact point for the UNDESD\textsuperscript{10}, UNESCO had to focus on educational areas that these ministries could understand and work in – and these were in almost every case, formal education and schooling (ESD-J, 2013).

\textsuperscript{10} Commented by Dr Yoko Mochizuki, the former Programme Specialist UNESCO ESD Section, Paris, at the ESD-J International Open Forum: Further ESD promotion by Civil Society Organisations in Asia towards the end of the UNDESD and beyond”, on 30 Nov. 2013, Tokyo, organised by the Japan Council on the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD-J).
Given these in- and external pressures, it is not surprising that the UNDESD was dominated in practice by forms of ESD that were considered politically ‘safe’. In other words, non-transformative practices focused on formal education to the detriment of transformative education in the informal settings of community development. The ‘common understanding’ of ESD, alluded to above, required elucidation to justify this claim. Such evidence may be seen in the epistemology of ESD that emerged during the UNDESD, particularly how key elements of ESD came to be understood. These were: (i) the meaning of sustainable development (end goal); (ii) the process of ESD (education); and (iii) the content that ESD promotes (knowledge).

(i) Sustainable development (end goal)

Sustainable development has been interpreted in many ways, with many criticisms. As a result, the meaning of sustainable development has become “multifaceted and fluid” (Hoppener, 2016, p. 102), “ambiguous” (Yvon, 2009, p. 24), “ambivalent” (Mitcham, 1995, p. 311), “contradicted” (Lélé, 1991, p. 608), and “oxymoronic” (Radcliff, 2006, p. 66). Such ambiguity reflects the every day (rather than scientific) nature of sustainable development and helps makes the concept acceptable to most people. As a result, sustainable development can be accepted as “necessary” and “noble” even though the exact intended meaning tends to be interpreted to various stakeholders’ advantage. This is similar to the way in which the word “peace” is understood, as noted by Galtung (1969, p. 167). A non-scrutinising approach acts to conceal issues of power and justice. Thus, the political interests and economic influence of dominant stakeholders in ESD means
that all terms, especially sustainable development (and education), must be ‘value-laden’.

Various writers have described the many interpretations of sustainable development as being along a continuum with polar opposites, such as “technological” or “ecological” (Orr, 2011, p. 94) or “strong” or “weak” (Huckle, 1996a, p. 9). The technological or weak approach is directed at maintaining current approaches to economic growth, but minimises the negative environmental impact through new technologies and legal frameworks. This is a top-down approach and is driven by experts, science and technological advancement. The technological approach has contributed to the rise of the environmental science and management field, which Huckle (1996a, p. 9) describes as strongly linked to the spread of modernity and economic development. This is also known as “ecological modernization” (Dryzek, 1997, p. 169), and was referred to in the recent discussion on the “green economy” (Bina, 2013; Brand, 2012) after Rio+20 in 2012. This leaves the current model of economic growth and its basis in neo-liberalism and globalisation unchallenged. In particular, Rostow’s (1960) ‘stages of economic growth’ model, provides a framework for all the nations to aim for to achieve industrialisation, commercialization and a centralisation of social and political systems through the progress of science, technology and supporting legal systems (Baker, 2006; Mitcham, 1995).

On the other hand, the ecological or strong approach to sustainable development aims for a structural transformation of the current systems. This could occur by integrating the social, economic, environmental and political dimensions of
development to optimise a more balanced matrix of sustainability outcomes. This requires expert, technology-based, scientific knowledge to be complemented by local and indigenous knowledge. This approach requires societal collaboration driven by the shared efforts of both experts and ordinary citizens. Such a democratisation of science also reflects moves toward a democratisation of society and power.

A number of global initiatives were launched with the objective of integrating ecological approaches with the technological efforts for sustainable development. This included the creation of new forms of governance and collaborative projects involving multiple stakeholders. These tend to be rhetorical, however, as conceptual fluidity renders these policies and practices prone to political and economic priorities. Global politics on sustainable development emphasises the technological or weak approach by seeking to minimise the negative environmental impacts until appropriate new technology is discovered (WCED, 1987). Hence, knowledge of the technological approach tends to be recognised and valued, whereas the ecological approach is generally unrecognised and not fully appreciated in policy discourses.

(ii) Education (process)

Socio-economic and political pressures have enhanced the formal education and schooling concept (Apple, 1993; Freire, 1972; Illich, 1973; Shor, 1986). This is the same for ESD. The dominant technological approach to sustainable
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11 For example, Earth System Governance Project (http://www.earthsystemgovernance.org/) and Future Earth Project (http://www.futureearth.org/).
development has impacted the way education is conceived and highlighted the role of educational experts.

Formal education and schooling detach people from everyday life experiences (Illich, 1973, p. 19). They act as a funnel to channel people, particularly youth and children, into educational programmes developed and packaged by governmental authorities (Illich, 1973, p. 71). This is the prevailing form of education, which Freire (1972) refers to as the ‘banking concept’. In these educational approaches, knowledge transfer is one-way, from the teacher (depositor) to the students (depositories) (Freire, 1972, p. 53). The students are treated as empty containers to be filled with the knowledge by the teacher, educational institutes and other authorities who can decide what knowledge is and how it should be transmitted. This way of knowledge transfer makes students dependent on teachers and educational institutes as experts, and at the same time, renders them incapable of organising their lives around their own experiences and resources within their own communities (Illich, 1973, p. 12).

The UNDESD highlighted formal education and schooling by focusing on the education experts, including formal education organisations such as schools and higher education institutes. They also looked at a selection of non-formal education organisations, including community learning centres and public sectors who incorporate a schooling approach to their activities. These included business industries and governments that all provided structured learning opportunities targeting the vast local community. On the other hand, the UNDESD did not provide an opportunity for community organisations to participate in ESD debates. In addition, community organisations hardly found any relevance in the common
understanding of ESD. The policies ignored the point made by critical educators that formal education cannot make a major contribution to the sustainability transition unless major educational reforms are enacted (Fien, 2004).

(iii) Knowledge (content)

The technological orientation of sustainable development, and a strong emphasis on formal education and schooling concepts, also influenced which ‘knowledge’ should be priorities for ESD. Critical educators have pointed out that particular knowledge is legitimised and transmitted through formal education institutes and schooling concepts. Apple (1993, 2000) refers to this as ‘official knowledge’.

The legitimised or ‘official knowledge’ is the result of complex power relations (Apple, 1995). Indeed, this was the case for knowledge enhanced and transferred under the UNDESD. In addition, official knowledge in ESD refers to environmental management knowledge and all the knowledge that basic education can provide, particularly in the developing countries. Critical educators have noted that prevailing economic and political pressures tend to make education facilities choose content that minimises the factors that contribute toward unsustainable problems, but do not challenge the fundamental basis of these social systems (Berberet, 1989; Fien, 1995, 2004).

The government and authorities’ definition of ESD tends to be accepted as a standardised norm by practitioners, when promoted by the official institutes. ESD policies overlooked the unmeasurable experiences outside of school. This included everyday life experience and other local and indigenous knowledge (Illich, 1973, p. 71). Emphases on scientific knowledge, environmental and basic education have made ESD overlook the diverse knowledge that exists outside of
the official knowledge, particularly within the indigenous and local knowledge, and opportunities for their integration.

The official knowledge creates a hierarchy between teacher and students, where the teachers determines both the content and the learning process. As Illich (1973) argues, schooling allows the learners’ imaginations to be formed by curricular instruction, and conditioned to institutional learning of every sort. Content determined by someone else can deprive the opportunity for conscientisation. Such education also excludes knowledge held by the socially subordinate groups (Connell, 1993, p. 39). This is also the same to EE, EfS and ESD.

Gough (1997, 2014) has argued about this marginalisation in EE, EfS and ESD over the years. The ‘official knowledge’ in this field has silenced the voices of women, indigenous, gay and disabled people, as well as those defined by race, class and body size. They are not being given the opportunity to participate in EE, EfS and ESD and have their voices heard.

Exclusion in ESD has two problems. Firstly, excluding these people also excludes their knowledge, because they are the knowers and the agents of the knowledge (Gough, 2014; Gough & Whitehouse, 2003). This is despite the fact that their knowledge may carry useful insights for sustainable development that have not been adequately pursued (Gough & Whitehouse, 2003). Teachers could take something from the local community groups and their vast knowledge systems, and work with it so it still fits with their intention and/or the mainstream education goals. Instead, the second problem of exclusion in ESD is that the local and indigenous knowledge presented in classroom activities do not relate to the reality of local community. Rather, they tend to reflect views of “romanticism and/or
wish for an idealistic return to a lost Eden which was never an Eden at all” (Le Roux, 1997, p. 17).

2.3.2 Is critical EE theoretical enough?

A critical question in addressing the rhetoric-reality gap in ESD is whether critical EE is sufficiently potent and efficacious to respond to the broader scope and settings of ESD. UNESCO has recognised local community and informal education as key focus areas for promotion of ESD during and post UNDESD (UNESCO, 2014c) as detailed in the GAP (UNESCO, 2014b). There are a number of projects that took community-based approaches, however, formal education dominated the implementation of ESD. Few projects to date included informal education processes in the community development efforts. Of the research that is available, most studies of EE and ESD are in/about or through sustainable community development, which can be categorised as any of the following three types of research detailed below.

The first type of research includes case-practice reports for community development, which describes sustainable development efforts. These only provide minimal analysis of how and why they are educational, however, and how

12 For CSD, Agenda 21 was localised in 6000 local authorities as Local Agenda 21 (United Nations, 2012, p. 6). Community based ESD projects included “Regional Centres of Expertise on ESD (RCE)” by the United Nations University (UNU), “COE Programme for ESD” and “Innovation Programme for ESD” by Asia/Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO (ACCU), and “Asia Good ESD Practice Project (AGEPP)” and “Asia NGO Network on ESD (ANNE)” by the Japan Council on the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD-J).

13 Formal education organisations such as universities and government-supported non-formal education organisations played central roles in UNU-IAS and ACCU projects. ESD-J showcased the community development efforts by NGOs from informal ESD perspectives, which are discussed in Chapter 4.
they relate to the socially-critical and transformative objectives of EE, EfS and ESD. The second type of research is the literature, which examines the learning processes involved in formal education (i.e., schools) within community projects (see Andrzejewski, Baltodano, & Symcox, 2009; Oikawa, 2009; Shaw & Oikawa, 2013; Smith, Wheeler, Guevara, Gough & Fien, 2012). In these efforts, community leaders, experts and indigenous/traditional knowledge holders participate in the learning activities of formal education. School-community partnerships may enrich the content of education and the curricula. These forms of education may also have some impact on the wider community, however, the impact is often indirect and many community members are left uninvolved. The third type of research is on environmental adult education, for example, Clover (2002); Clover and Hill (2013); Clover et al. (2013), which provides many examples of appropriate pedagogies that address the power and marginalisation issues that exist within a local community. These pedagogies still carry a schooling focus, however, and the community education is still viewed within a very structured framework in terms of its curricula, facilities and teacher qualifications. These programs do not teach the dynamic process of learning that occurs in community development.

Research in these three categories is critically important to EE, EfS and ESD. These have broadened the concept, process, and content of socially-critical and transformative education, however, are more focused on formal education or schooling, in comparison to community development. These research areas provide little guidance on appropriate pedagogical practice, especially in relation to knowledge creation and learning processes through community development.
Educators such as Jickling and Walker have criticised critical approaches to EE and ESD. Jickling (1991) contends, “environmental education is not problem solving and the students in education for the environment are simply participating as intelligent individuals in the constant re-examination and re-casting of society” (p. 155). Walker (1997) points out its inefficiency: “While the theory is an effective mechanism to critique practice, it does not provide the strategies to solve educational problems. If environmental education is to become important in school education, a more adequate theory is required (p. 155).” These statements relate to ESD in a formal setting rather than within a community development context.

These critiques overlook an important aspect of theorising education for ESD. That is the critical educators’ understanding of the limitation of achieving social change through only formal education. Critical EE could be socially transformative only if education works closely with other struggles in/beyond school education (Fien, 1995; Whitty, 1985). From this view, these critiques do not look at EE, EfS and ESD that occur outside of formal education and schooling. They still look at critical EE from the dominant perspective of formal education or within a schooling context. Little attention is paid to informal education in a community development context, which could have significant value for praxis.

The current critical EE is not sufficient to counter these critiques or the power pressures around EE, EfS and ESD policies because of its strong focus on formal education and schooling. These words pose an assumption that the critical EE also may be trapped in the modern education thinking, which sees education as a funnel.
Wals (2007) elaborates on critical EE in the social learning process, which may in part share the same issues as informal education in a community development context. His work is not explicit about the problems of power and tension among the stakeholder groups, however, particularly between the dominant majority and the marginalised within a local community. Thus, it is still unclear what critical EE in a social learning process really means to community development as detailed below.

Theorising about ESD in a community development context has yet to adequately recognise the learning, capacity-building pathways and potential outcomes of its own practices particularly in regards to empowerment for social change. This is needed for two reasons. Firstly, it can update the current critical EE by providing a realistic approach to its social transformation goal. Secondly, it can provide a firm theoretical grip that critical EE can hold on in their communication with community development practitioners. It may help the practitioners to become explicitly conscious about community empowerment as the foundation of their works and its relevance to ESD. Eventually, theorising of ESD in a community development context can contribute to bridging the disciplinary gap between ESD and community development.

2.4 Summary of Chapter 2

As the concept of sustainable development grew in the 1980s, the scope and settings required to support critical EE became broader in both the school and real-life contexts. Policies also responded to critical EE discussions and integrated
it as a conceptual foundation of the educational policies of EE, EfS and ESD. Critical EE has provided the conceptual framework to the EE, EfS and ESD policies, in particular UNESCO. Strong policy commitments, however, caused a rhetoric-reality gap in the implementation of policies, which critical EE practitioners repeatedly pointed to over the years (Fien, 1995, 2004; Tilbury & Fien, 2002). The rhetoric-reality gap in critical EE means that the real meaning of a critical approach has tended to be “diluted and deleted” (Greenall, 1981a) when these are implemented through the policies. The UNDESD was no exception.

This chapter argued that this rhetoric-reality gap during the UNDESD was caused because of an imbalance during policy implementation. The UNDESD focused mostly on formal education and schooling, while overlooking informal education through everyday life experiences. The silencing of the community development experiences resulted in ESD’s not responding to the problems within the local community. Despite this, ESD within a community development context has important implications as praxis to critical EE.

This chapter identified two factors that caused the silencing of community development experiences in the ESD field. The first was the economic and political powers surrounding the policies on ESD, which created a common method for implementation of critical approaches. These have impacted the understanding of the concept, process (education) and content (knowledge).

The second factor is that the current critical EE might not have enough reach to properly encompass what ESD has to deal with, including informal education in a community development context. Most research policies and projects focus on formal education or schooling, rather than on community development. The
effectiveness and applicability of critical EE to ESD in a community development context was unknown.

In the following chapters, this research conducts an empirical study that examines the relevance and effectiveness of current critical EE within a community development context. If not relevant and effective, it explores how critical EE can be updated through developing a praxis framework for it. The next chapter presents the research design of this thesis, which makes a methodological link between the conceptual discussions of this chapter and the field-work conducted. It provides a description and rationale for the research design used, touching on some discussions of the research orientation in critical EE and ESD.
CHAPTER 3. Research design

Chapter 3 outlines the research design of this study. It describes and explains the nature of the study, methodology, methods and techniques used. Van Manen (1990) makes a clear distinction between research methodologies, methods, and techniques. Methodology is defined as “the philosophic framework, the fundamental assumptions and characteristics of human science perspective” (p. 27), which helps explain “the general orientation to life, the view of knowledge, and the sense of what it means to be human which is associated with or implied by a certain research method” (p. 27). The methodology also becomes an underpinning ‘theory’ to determine which method one should follow and why. Thus, a method is the ‘way’ or the ‘how’ in which the research is conducted. Techniques are the practical procedures for data collection and analysis that are used within certain research methods.

Justifying the research methodology, methods and techniques that are used in a research project are important for two reasons. Firstly, the ideological orientation of the research needs to be matched with the methodologies of the research. As Fien and Hillcoat (1996, p. 26) warn, “research methodologies are very much a puppet of their underlying assumptions” (p. 26). Thus, methodologies reflect the ideology upon which the research is based and, as a result, affect the ways (or
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14 There is a definitional discrepancy on how the terms of methodology, method and technique are used among researchers. Some use ‘paradigm’ to refer positivism, interpretivism and critical theory, ‘methodology’ to refer the way how the research is conducted, ‘method’ to refer the practical procedures such as interview and observation, which are understood as ‘method’ and ‘technique’ in this study. By following the definition of van Manen, this study uses the term of ‘methodology’ to refer three philosophical paradigms which guided this research, ‘method’ to refer the way to conduct the research and ‘technique’ to refer the procedures employed under a certain method.
methods) of research that are used. Indeed, they even affect the research questions that are asked and how the validity of the produced knowledge should be do justified; or as Robottom and Hart (1993) state, methodologies “prefigure what is to count as appropriate research topics, appropriate research questions, and even appropriate research outcomes” (p. 18). Furthermore, the chosen methodology legitimises the choice of methods and techniques used for data collection and analysis, which lead researchers to take different research paths and possibly produce different outcomes.

Critical educators have long argued that knowledge can never be objective, neutral, and interest-free (Freire, 1972, 1998; Harding & Norberg, 2005; Lather, 1986; van Heertum, 2005). This is particularly true for research in EE, EfS and ESD. In such values-laden fields, practitioners and researchers are not the ‘lens of camera’, but ‘selective interpreters of all they observe (Carew & Lightfoot, 1979).

As Carew and Lightfoot (1979) add:

> No matter how quantitative and objective the research strategy appears, there is a point when researchers offer their interpretations, use their intuitions, and apply their values. Research, therefore, is a selective process that combines empirical data, rational thinking, judgment, and intuition. Each of these modes of understanding and analysing phenomena is valid and valuable and can be made conscious parts of the research process. (Carew & Lightfoot, 1979, p. 23)

As they suggest, researchers should be explicit about the interests that guide their research. Such interests have two meanings, that exist both outside and inside the researcher. While external interests influence researchers about what they want to investigate, internal interests guide the way in which the researcher responds.
This research is socially-critical and oriented to both challenging and unsustainable external political and economic interests in society. This research is important for emancipating both researchers and research participants (Robottom & Hart, 1993). This study is aware of the external political and economic interests that have formed particular types of knowledge in ESD, both globally and in Japan, and legitimised the ways in which it can be known. These socially-critical interests guided the research to address many of the orthodoxies in the EE, EfS and ESD field. The socially-critical interests provided a conceptual and normative orientation to the research (Carspecken & Apple, 1992, p. 510). Consequently, this orientation positions this research in a critical praxis-oriented methodology (Lather, 1986, 1988) as discussed in section 3.2.2.

Such clarifications of the methodological orientation are important in critical-praxis research in two ways. Firstly, it helps to establish the trustworthiness of this research, and the selection, justification and use of appropriate research methods as well as the validity of data, interpretations and conclusions. Van Heertum (2005) argues that even though research is ideological, it still has to maintain a scientifically coherent and rigorous inquiry processes. He adds, “through a balanced and reflexive approach, science could be implemented that is verifiable, open to critique, and that looks for evidence that does not simply produce the results that comport with researchers’ desires” (p. 13). Secondly, the methods and techniques used in the research should also help to satisfy the emancipatory aims of a praxis-oriented research. Rigorous research design allows the research methodology to produce emancipatory knowledge through “maximised dialogic,
dialectically-educative encounters between the researcher and the researched” (Lather, 1988, p. 570).

Howe and Eisenhart (1990, pp. 6-8) offer the following standards to ensure the quality of educational ‘anti- or non-positivist’ qualitative research. These include:

1. Clear alertness to and coherence of the research against the background assumptions, and/or ‘existent knowledge’;
2. Coherence linking between research questions, methodology, and method;
3. Effective application of specific data collection and analysis techniques; and
4. Ensuring validity, including overall warrant and value constraints.

(Howe & Eisenhart, 1990, pp. 6-8)

These standards are discussed in the following section of this chapter. Section 3.2 reviews the focus of the research, research problems, questions and link with existing knowledge. Section 3.3 outlines the research methodology and methods that operationalise the research. Section 3.4 explains the procedures or techniques used in the research process, including data collection and analysis, and the ways in which issues of validity and ethics are handled.

### 3.1 The Focus of the study

This section briefly outlines the interests that guided this research and its link with current ESD discourses. This research originates from my attempts over the last twenty years, to seek out the meaning and effectiveness of socially-critical approaches to ESD in a community development context. The goal of this research is to develop a praxis framework for ESD in a community development
context. In particular, this research seeks to elucidate the meaning of informal educational processes within a social activism setting that helps achieve sustainable community development by empowering both educator and local community, particularly marginalised people.

This research is developed from three assumptions about the application of critical EE to ESD in a community development context. For the first assumption, critical EE, which has theoretically underpinned the practice and research of formal and schooling ESD, could also be meaningful in a community development context, as well as enrich the theory and practice of ESD. The second assumption is that there could be key elements identified as relevant to ESD while trying to achieve sustainable development by community development organisations. This could include the meaning of education to the local community, particularly, the marginalised, as well as the role of the practitioner as an educator. These elements have a socially-critical, transformative and emancipatory nature that supports ESD in a community development context, or praxis. For the third assumption, despite its significance and potency, there could be a power pressure in understanding and knowing ESD in a community development context in light of the policy and theoretical discourses for ESD. In particular, the power pressure could affect the process of understanding, and knowing the meaning behind the learning and knowledge-creation process of the marginalised people. These three assumptions explain how ESD can contribute to (or be integrated within) community development, and vice versa, and how a community development practice can enrich ESD discussions, which are the central aims of this research.

This research explores the three questions as defined in section 1.3.
3.2 Research Methodology and Method

Guba (1990) states the three ways a researcher may respond to research questions as ontological, epistemological and methodological:

1. Ontological: What is the nature of the knowledge? Alternatively, what is the nature of ‘reality’?
2. Epistemological: What is the nature of the relationship between the knower (the inquirer) and the known (or knowable)?
3. Methodological: How should the inquirer go about finding out knowledge? (p. 18)

Methodologically, this research begins with critical theory. This is because the approach needed to investigate ESD in the context of community development requires a socially-critical orientation to the research (Fien, 1992; Malone, 1999; Robottom & Hart, 1993). Hence, critical theory primarily informed this research, particularly Part I of this thesis. This was determined as the socially-critical aspect of this research aligned with the idea of critical theory. The findings from the first critical ethnography, however, required that I go beyond critical theory and take a methodological shift in the conduct of this critical ethnography. This involved integrating a “decoloniality” approach to Part II of this thesis, which included the second critical ethnography.

3.2.1 Methodology informing Part I: Critical theory

Critical theory is one of the three methodologies that critical EE identifies as a research paradigm and it informs Part I of this thesis. The other two methodologies include positivism and interpretivism. These relate to the nature of the research and its philosophical orientations, and determine the epistemological
approaches. This includes what knowledge is known and understood in relation to the research, and how the research questions are developed and solved.

Table 3.1 shows how the three methodologies support the purpose of the research, the nature of the research (ontology), the nature of the questions, the relationship between the research and the researcher (epistemology), and the way to approach the questions (methodology).

**Table 3-2:**
**Different approaches in three research paradigms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research paradigm / Approaches to the knowledge</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Interpretivism / Constructionism</th>
<th>Critical theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Purpose of the research                       | • Discovery of the ‘true’ nature of reality  
• Search for generalisations | • Describing a social setting as it really is | • Social critique & transformation  
• Emancipation and empowerment  
• Critique of positivism and interpretivism understanding of reality |
| Ontology                                       | • Reality exists externally to the observer  
• Influenced by what business and economy favours | • Reality is socially constructed and can have multiple reasons | • Reality is a social and cultural construction, linked to wider power relations  
• Ideological  
• No neutral and universal research exists |
| Epistemology                                  | • Objective and empirical  
• Values are excluded  
• A distant and non-interactive | • Value-laden  
• Researchers subjectively influence on the interpretation  
• Interactive | • Value constituted and value-constituting  
• Interactive  
• Social  
• Inter-subjectivity  
• Become conscious of the power relations underlying realities |
| Methodology                                   | • Experimentalist  
• Manipulation and control of variables | • Reveals only what was already implicit  
• Field-based & inductive  
• Practice-based and contextual | • Uncover the meaning and causes of contradictions behind the normal and unquestioned interactions of daily lives |
| Contribution of the research                  | • Concrete results but less critical  
• Rename and redefine the unsustainable problems | • Essentially conservative regarding social transformation | • Production of new knowledge, based on the collective lived experience |

Adapted from May (1997); Robottom and Hart (1993); van Heertum (2005).
Critical theory provides the methodological foundation of critical EE in determining the nature and way to conduct research. According to Fien and Hillcoat (1996), critical EE research has the following three attributions: ‘scientific, ‘critical’ and ‘practical’.

- Scientific: seeking to provide comprehensive explanations subject to public, empirical evidence;
- Critical: unmasking and analysing the structures of oppression which hinder educational reform;
- Practical: providing teachers and other educational stakeholders, such as students and parents, with the sorts of understanding, skill and motivation they need to bring about desired changes. (Fien & Hillcoat, 1996, p. 29)

These three attributions determined the socially-critical orientation of critical EE research. Firstly, ‘scientific’ indicates that critical EE research is conducted in an explanatory manner to understand a research problem identified in everyday life experiences. This also extends trustworthiness to the research, which is expanded in section 3.3.3.

Secondly, ‘critical’ means the role of critical EE on the following three issues in research: ‘power’, ‘agency’ and ‘desire’, in which “people are caught and to illuminate which social forces are at work to either enhance or limit an individual’s ability to act” (Gough, 2014, p. 40). These issues make a critical EE researcher conscious about questions on ‘epistemological claims’, such as who can be an agent of knowledge, what counts as knowledge, what constitutes and validates knowledge, and what the relationship should be between knowing and being (Gough, 2014, p. 34).
Thirdly, ‘practical’, indicates the close linkage of critical EE to the real-life context. This notion is founded in critical pedagogy, in which the research questions arise out of everyday life and construct the researching process with an eye toward solving them (Fay, 1987 cited in Fien, 1995, p. 6).

Drawing on the work of Carr and Kemmis (1986), Fien (1995) elaborates the five implications of critical EE research. These are to:

1. eschew positivist notions of rationality, objectivity, and truth in favour of a dialectical view of rationality;
2. be grounded in the experiences and interpretations of teachers and other participants in educational processes;
3. distinguish ideologically distorted interpretations in teachers’ understandings of their experiences (i.e., instances of false consciousness) from those that are not;
4. identify aspects of the existing social order that frustrate the attainment of critical educational goals; and
5. integrate theory and practice, by providing a language and strategies for action to address false consciousness and obstructions to critical pedagogy and also, by providing support for teachers who wish to engage in further critical reflection and action. (Fien, 1995, p. 6)

What characterises critical theory is the criticism against the other two methodologies. Positivism is the dominant research paradigm for most natural science research. Positivist research sees that reality exists outside human beings. It aims for universalisation and generalisation of knowledge. It seeks neutrality and objectivity of the researcher, and the research question and process are independent of the researcher. On the other hand, critical theory sees reality as socially constructed, and illuminates that the ideological and mutual influence between researcher, knowledge and social structures.
Interpretivist research shares the same concerns with critical theory. Both critique the positivist research characteristics of being value-free and neutral, as well its views on reality, (Angus, 1986; Lather, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1989; van Heertum, 2005). Both also understand that reality is socially constructed and reflect the research questions, process, and outcomes based on the meaning of the reality as the research finds it. Interpretive research, however, contextualises the meaning of reality within a particular social context and does not generalise or replicate it. On the other hand, critical theory extends its reflexivity to the critique of the social structure that influences the construction of the reality. As a result, while the political agendas of positivist and interpretive research are implicit and remain hidden in the research assumptions, process, and outcomes, the agendas of critical theory are explicit (Fien & Hillcoat, 1996).

Among the three methodologies, critical theory is conscious of power in/outside of research. Robottom and Hart (1993, p. x) argue: “Whereas ‘critical’ can mean internal criticism from the perspective of analytical that ties ideas, thought, and language to social and historical conditions; that is social criticism based on notions of power and control” (p. x). Internal criticism refers to the power that can exist in-between the researcher and the researched. External power is a particularly political and economic influence, that favours positivism and interpretivist research, and makes research outcomes further contribute to reproducing the injustice (van Heertum, 2005).

Critical theory originates from the works of German Philosophers, including Hegel, Marx, and the Frankfurt School. Other philosophers and theorists, including Foucault, Derrida, and Freire, contributed to developing critical theory.
later on (Lincoln & Guba, 2013). They used research to critique the social structures that cause oppression and to advocate for social transformation. The sensitivity of power in critical theory comes from the “definitive critique of positivism” (Lather, 1988, p. 570). Positivist research objectifies the research area one-sidedly, and uses them as the sole source of data they want to collect, making outcomes contribute only to the career advancement of researchers. This is built on their use of alienating, and exploitive, inquiry methods (Lather, 1988, p. 570), that Reinharz (1979) refers to as “rape research” (quoted by Lather, 1988, p. 570).

The sensitivity of internal and external power creates two distinctive orientations within critical theory; socially-critical and emancipatory. Critical research that encompasses both orientations is made possible by a researcher who carries reflexivity as his/her essential skill. May (1997) explains that reflexivity creates “complex dialectic process with the researcher, the research process, and the research outcome(s)” (p. 200), and this has two key characteristics.

Firstly, the process is democratically based on “a deep respect for the intellectual and political capacities of the dispossessed” (Lather, 1986, p. 262). This process allows both to search for knowledge through dialectic and negotiation-based communication and their learnings. Secondly, the dialectic process is empowering for both the participants and the researcher “to increase awareness of the contradictions hidden or distorted by everyday understandings, and in so doing, directs attention to the possibilities for social transformation inherent in the present configuration of social processes” (Lather, 1986, p. 259). Dialectic process and social critique are inextricably linked to produce knowledge for social transformation. This knowledge has “a provisional and collective nature, tied to
place and time, and to larger issues of culture, language, and social structure” (Lather, 1986, p. 259). Critical research is comprised of socially-critical, emancipatory, reflexivity, dialectic, democratic and empowering processes. Put together, Lather (1986, 1988) describes critical research as ‘praxis’.

3.2.2 Methodology for Part II: Decoloniality

The need for a methodological shift to include decoloniality emerged in the research process. As it is difficult to explain decoloniality separately from the problems I confronted within the local community, this subsection provides a minimal description about decoloniality. The decoloniality methodology is explained further by linking it to the problem that emerged in the research and practice for MSN in section 6.3.

Decoloniality goes beyond the methodological understanding of critical EE. It shares the same concerns as post-colonialism literature that critical social theory is founded in, as well as post-modernity and post-structuralism. Both decoloniality and post-colonialism concern the ‘darker side’ of development, modernity and coloniality (Ndlovu-Gatsuheni, 2013, p. 12). Neither focuses on the process of political and economic exploitation, assimilation and discrimination, which happened or is still happening between developed and former colonial/developing countries. Rather, they find the legacy of colonial power in all aspects of the human relationships between those with dominant power, including those who are colonisers, modern, Western and male, and the marginalised people, including those who are colonised, traditional/indigenous, non-Western, female and queer.
(Young, 2003). Both attempt to shift the dominant Western, modern, colonial and male points of views of the world and marginalised people (Ndlovu-Gatsuheni, 2013; Young, 2003). Both post-colonialism and decoloniality investigate such negativity in all aspects of human society. This includes the events, research, language, social/legal and economic systems as well as their way of understanding and knowing the problems and beings (Said, 1978). Both concern the people (Ndlovu-Gatsuheni, 2013, p. 11).

The difference between post-coloniality and decoloniality highlights the problems and elucidates the direction of the enquiry. Post-coloniality criticises the power that causes injustice and social, economic and political disparities between the dominant power and the marginalised people. It divides the world into categories, such as coloniser or colonised, men or women/queer, modern or traditional/indigenous and developed or under-developed (Ndlovu-Gatsuheni, 2013, p. 14) and seeks a solution for the dichotomised relationship using modern thinking (Ndlovu-Gatsuheni, 2015, p. 314). Post-coloniality overlooks that modernity has ‘two faces’, as well as those living in two realities. Modernity has brought liberal democracy and human rights, rather than just the darker side of modernity.

Decoloniality attempts to go beyond not only the limitations of post-colonialism, but also modern thinking. It understands the power differential, such as who generates which knowledge, for what purpose and from where. It acknowledges both the progress and negative legacies of modernity, and attempts to generate the ‘knowledge’ of marginalised people, for and by themselves. By establishing their epistemologies, decoloniality wishes to go “toward puriversality, a world within
which many worlds fit” (Ndlovu-Gatsuheni, 2015, p. 314). Hence, it goes beyond the three dominant knowledge paradigms of positivism, interpretivism and critical theory. Therefore, the research has adopted a decoloniality approach to further examine the knowledge-creation and learning process of socially-marginalised people, which could not be known or understood based on modern knowledge.

3.2.3 Research Method: Critical ethnography

Critical ethnography was chosen for the conduct of this PhD research. It is characterised by its “emphasis on understanding and critique in research” (Fien & Hillcoat, 1996, p. 35). It takes phenomenological approaches to interpretive ethnography, but within the theoretical framework of critical theory (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Masemann, 1982; May, 1997; Quantz, 1992). In other words, critical ethnography research produces not only a thorough description of meaning, but also aims to apply a socially-critical, reflexive and emancipatory process to the research which is inherent in critical theory.

Nevertheless, critical ethnography is similar to interpretivist ethnography in some ways. For example, both aim to produce a dense description of the phenomena, which locates the multi-layered significance of events within their social context (in Angus, 1986; Geertz, 1973). They also share the same research techniques, such as participant observation, field note taking, and interviews. The critical intent of critical ethnography, however, makes it explicitly different from conventional ethnography in four ways. Table 3-2 (see next page) summarises the differences between two ethnographies.
Table 3-2: Critical ethnography and interpretivist ethnography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Component</th>
<th>Critical Ethnography</th>
<th>Interpretivist ethnography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Critical theory</td>
<td>Interpretivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Priori theory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research goal</td>
<td>Hermeneutic + emancipation (power recognition)</td>
<td>Hermeneutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>Participant observation, document collection, field note taking, interview, etc.</td>
<td>Participant observation, document collection, field note taking, interview, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>Grounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher's position</td>
<td>Value-laden</td>
<td>Value-laden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher-participants</td>
<td>Dialectic</td>
<td>One-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency in knowledge production process</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research process</td>
<td>Results emerge as meanings are revealed and challenged</td>
<td>Results emerge from constant comparison of data and cases and through grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective/political action</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Anderson (1989); Cohen et al. (2011); May (1997)

The first difference is the political emphasis in critical ethnography. While interpretivism ethnography concerns ‘what is’, critical ethnography concerns ‘what could be’, influenced by the critical theory tradition (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 243; Thomas, 1993).

The second point is the existence of the *a priori* theory. Interpretive ethnography research takes a grounded theory approach to knowledge based upon theories that emerge from the data (Charmaz, 2003). The research result of interpretivist ethnography is contextualised within a particular social setting so that it is hard to extrapolate to the larger social structure and theories (van Manen, 1990). On the other hand, critical ethnography goes beyond such contextualised knowledge (May, 1997) by the use of socially-critical assumptions and theories that can enable the researcher to address questions of reproduction and transformation.
(Angus, 1986). In this regard, critical ethnographers seek to bridge ‘macro-micro’ gaps through theory-driven ethnography (Scott & Garner, 2013, p. 388).

The third point is reflexivity. The meaning of reality is sought through a reflexive process from setting questions, and honing the research process, until the research is complete (May, 1997). In a critical ethnography research, there is no clear distinction between theory and data, whereas theory derived from the data is interpretivist ethnography (Angus, 1986). Dialectic reflection is carried holistically throughout the research, between theory and data, researcher and informants. This process maintains respect from the researcher to the participants. The researchers recognise the power of participants’ ‘language of practice’, which is often embodied in thought and action rather than speech, but which nevertheless, provides clues to the way they organise their world (Fien & Hillcoat, 1996; Yinger, 1987).

The last difference relates to flexibility. In critical ethnography, the study emerges as meanings are revealed and challenged from the position of ideology critique (Cohen et al., 2011). A critical ethnographic study may create new research questions that demand the revision of research design and techniques, as meanings emerge and need to be tested. Thus, five integrated stages in conducting a critical ethnography may be identified (Carspecken, 1996, 2015b; Carspecken & Apple, 1992):

Stage 1: Compiling a primary record through collection of monological data
Stage 2: Preliminary reconstructive analysis
Stage 3: Dialogical data collection
Stage 4: Discovering system relations
Stage 5: Using system relations to explain findings
The semi-cyclical and emergent nature of critical ethnography, as used in this study, is further elaborated in section 3.3.

3.2.4 Justification of research method for this study

Some aspects of critical ethnography are similar to participatory action research. Malone (1999) argues that all the methods in critical theory tradition are, at least to some extent, empowering or have the aim of facilitating empowerment. Critical ethnography and action research are distinguished by whether or not political action is taken within the design of research or not. Critical theory based methods are limited to increasing the researcher and participants’ understanding, and “not to supporting political action within the design of the research with the potential of empowerment as political consciousness-raising” (p. 168). In contrast, action research “supports action within the design of the research with the potential of empowerment as collective action/struggle” (p. 168). The lack of explicit planning for collective action within the design of research differentiates this research from the other forms of critical research, such as participatory action research (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Huckle, 1993, 1996a; Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988; Kemmis, McTaggart, & Nixon, 2013; H. Lotz-Sisitka, Fien, & Kettlehilew, 2013) and ‘research as a praxis’ (Lather, 1986, 1988).

In the early stages of this research, participatory action research was selected as the method, because of my practical engagement in the planning and implementation of the Mopet Sanctuary Network (MSN) work, my intention to empower the local community and facilitate collective action. I chose to use a
critical ethnography method, however, rather than participatory action research, due to the four reasons as follows.

Firstly, there is an *a priori* theory to the data collection and analysis. The *a priori* theory of this research was critical EE, which provided theoretical guidance to my practices for MSN before my PhD research. It was the theoretical framework used to examine the relevance and gaps in the community development process of MSN. Secondly, there is a time constraint in this research, so it was important to ensure that any ‘action’ taken was not imposed within a limited timeframe. It is not ethical to guide the community’s will toward a particular action within a limited timeline. Such guidance is against the dialectic, democratic, and empowerment emphasis of critical EE. Even if any democratic and dialectic process could be reached by the community consensus for a collective/political action, there would be numerous and unpredictable factors that could postpone or disrupt it. These are totally outside of the researcher’s control. Finally, the decision for not choosing action research came from the sensitivity of the issues that the research participants faced. These issues include the MSN Ainu members’ potential action on indigenous fishing rights for traditional whaling that they might appeal to the Japanese government. Despite the potential legitimacy of their rights under international laws, their action could be considered as illegal under the current Japanese law. From an ethical point of view, the research cannot be a part of the action on politically sensitive issues.

Rather than seeking an action to solve the problem, the critical ethnography research design of this study explores the meaning of the question by taking a phenomenological interpretation. According to van Manen (1990), the emphasis
of phenomenological interpretation is the systematic attempt to uncover and describe the structures, or more specifically the internal meaning of these structures, within lived experiences. This systematic attempt can give ‘insights’, upon which people may act more thoughtfully and more tactfully in certain situations. This research attempts to reveal the hidden power issues in the historical, social and economic context of the local community, to identify the meaning of informal ESD in their social activism, and to develop a praxis framework that can give strategies for further reflection and action in the future.

3.3 Conduct of the Study

Answering the research questions requires three investigations: (i) a theoretical analysis; (ii) a praxis analysis; and (iii) a synthesis of the two. Each of these constitutes an objective of the study.

(i) Theoretical Analysis (literature review)

With the first objective, this research investigates the ways in which current thinking and practice in ESD act to silence the socially-critical and community development approaches to ESD, in particular, within marginalised sectors of society. This research reviews the literature on EE, EfS and ESD and sustainable development to exemplify my concerns and show how discussions in the literature relate to my research concerns. It reviews critical EE, as an a priori theory in this study. It investigates the issue of silence on ESD in a community context in political and theoretical EE, EfS and ESD discourses, and articulates the critical assumption for the silencing factor.
(ii) Praxis Analysis

With the second objective, this research conducts critical ethnographies of MSN to identify the key elements of ESD in a community development context. This research sets the following four sub-objectives in meeting the second objective.

Content analysis of MSN

The experiences of MSN as a sustainable community development movement was documented from historical, social, economic and cultural contexts, and analysed from the perspective of empowering and learning. Existing secondary data from 2009 to 2012 were collected and consolidated. These data include symposium and workshop reports, case reports, meeting memos, emails and other organisational reports.

Preparing questions

Questions were developed to identify the significance and meaning of the propositions for MSN. The questions were developed in a way that the academic or technical words did not overwhelm the informants while ensuring the original meanings were retained in the right context. Building trust with key informants before the interviews and focus group discussions was considered critical in order to obtain a deeper understanding of their perspectives of both the local and organisational situation in relation to sustainable community development.

Sample questions included:

- What were the significant events in the process of establishing the social movement, including positive events and difficulties?
- Do you see any change in the local community regarding the solution of the local problems?
• How did it change?
• Why did it change?

Identification of the key informants
Local stakeholders were identified for the interviews. The central player of the movement in Mombetsu formed MSN, and, therefore, MSN key persons became the reference group for this research. This included Hatakeyama as the local Ainu elder fisherman and MSN leader, 2-3 local non-Ainu supporters (local residents), Ainu and non-Ainu supporters (non-local residents), and NGOs in Sapporo and Tokyo, which are based outside Mombetsu. They provided the insights for the meaning of sustainable development and learning in the local community context.

Examination of the key findings with MSN stakeholders
Qualitative techniques, including individual interviews, focus group discussions, and participant observation were used to obtain answers to the questions. Individual interviews were conducted to examine the real meaning of the propositions at the early stage of the field work and focus group discussions were used at the later stages of the fieldwork to understand how local stakeholders could further develop strategies for MSN. This was based on their understanding of the importance of their empowerment in relation to the MSN efforts for sustainable community development in Mombetsu.

(iii) Critical reflection (praxis framework development)
The third objective of this research was the critical reflection to synthesise the findings from Objective 1 and 2 above, which developed into a praxis framework. Theoretical and practical concepts were further developed to provide the strategies
for MSN, and contribute to the promotion of ESD in a community development context.

**Research process**

The above three investigations are incorporated into the five stages of critical ethnography by Carspecken (1996, 2015a); Carspecken and Apple (1992) (see section 3.2.4), and establish a semi-cyclical research process in two parts; Part I (Within) and Part II (Beyond) as shown in the table below (Table3-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3-3: Five stages of critical ethnography in this research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1: Literature review and research design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2: Praxis review</strong>  This stage involves the contextual background review of the colonial history of the Hokkaido and Ainu rights movement in Japan, which resulted in the establishment of MSN and its ESD efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3 &amp; 4: Field Study</strong>  Data were collected in the field study in Mombetsu and the analysis informed by critical theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 5: Critical reflexion</strong>  This stage involved: (i) self-reflection; (ii) additional literature review; and, (iii) modification of research methodology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Stage 2: Praxis review**  This stage involved the contextual background review of the problem identified from Part I research. |
| **Stage 3 &4: Field Study**  Additional data were collected in Mombetsu for analysis informed by decoloniality. |
| **Stage 5: Critical reflection**  This stage involved: (i) self-reflection, (ii) reflection of the critical assumptions, and, (iii) development of praxis framework for ESD in a community development context by synthesising the key findings of the research. |

Figure 3-2 (see next page) summarises the phases and stages of this research, including the collection and analysis of data and verification with research participants in Mombetsu, Tokyo and Sapporo during December 2012 to January 2016.
Figure 3.2: Five stages in two parts in the research process
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3.4 Research techniques and their application

This section discusses the argument of Howe and Eisenhart (1990) on maintaining the standard of qualitative educational research (see section 3.0), which requires the effective application of specific data collection and analysis techniques. Data collection and analysis is a process of “a systematic search for meaning” (Hatch, 2002, p. 148) to answer the research question. For data collection, techniques used must match the research methodology and method of the study. This is because research techniques “emerge from a theoretical position and therefore, reflect values, beliefs and dispositions toward the social world” (Popkewitz 1978, p.29).

This section describes the techniques used for data collection and analysis. It details how these techniques were applied issues of ethics, validity and reliability associated with the study, as well as the critical ethnography research design. These ensure these techniques are used effectively, the researcher must respond reflexively, which is the key principle in critical ethnography research.

3.4.1 Data collection techniques

The field work in this study involved 30 days in Mombetsu, Sapporo, and Tokyo, between 2013 to 2015. Various techniques were used for data collection, analysis and validation in this study. These included (i) collection and analysis of documents; (ii) interviews; and (iii) observation. This section defines these techniques and explains how these were used.
(i) Collection and analysis of documents

Relevant documents to the research were collected and analysed through two phases of the research. The documents collected for the praxis analyses of MSN (Stage 3 and 4 of Part I and Stage 3’ and 4’ of Part II) included books, government and NGO reports, newspaper articles, newsletters, pamphlets, electronic media reports, emails and meeting minutes. These documents were used to gain a thorough understanding of the social, cultural, economic and historical context of the Mombetsu local community, particularly, the Ainu people.

(ii) Interviews

Two types of techniques were employed for this study, including interviews and focus group. Interviewing is “a kind of conversation; a conversation with a purpose” (Robson, 1993, p. 228) and is one of the most commonly used techniques by qualitative researchers. The purpose of interviewing is “to gain insight into the views and opinions of individuals or groups, to obtain information about practical and technical know-how, to collect life narratives and oral histories, and/or to comprehend organisational movement ideologies” (Scott & Garner, 2013, p. 280). Interviewing postmodernists means more than this. Postmodernists see it as a co-creation process of knowledge through the participation of both the interviewer and the interviewee in “a speech act wherein the interviewer and interviewee together construct through dialogue a view of social reality” (Alvesson, 2002, p. 281).

Interviewing is commonly categorised into (fully) structured, semi-structured and unstructured, depending on the degree of formality. There are arguments, however, that reject this typology. Powney and Watts (1987) focus on the degree of control
an interviewer has during the interviews and make a distinction between respondent interviews and informant interviews (cited by Robson, 1993). The structured and semi-structured interviews are respondent interviews, where the interviewers remain in control. During informant interviews, control of the interview is given to the interviewee. This style of interview is unstructured for the interviewer. Informant interviews are often conducted in the interviewee’s life context, and are also referred to as “life narratives” (Scott & Garner, 2013, p. 311).

In this research, interviews were conducted with the stakeholders of MSN, using both respondent and informant techniques. Depending on the situation and context, the researcher changed the degree of control whilst interviewing. Semi-structured interviews were used when the questions could be easily understood and answered by the participants. A more informal approach was taken in a real-life context and was more common with the Ainu elder informant. These happened in his everyday life settings, such as walking through the local community and at home. Unstructured interviews in these settings allowed him the best opportunity to articulate his internal struggles, which he always found difficult to express. Words were often fragmented and unorganised, but provided clues to the struggle he had experienced through his whole body and life. Capturing such experiences indicate the effectiveness of the unstructured interview in building trust with the informants and drawing out some of the struggles that the informant may find hard to describe, put in context or take some time to verbalise.

Another interview technique used for the research was a focus group. Focus groups contain elements of both interviews and observation, which allow the researcher not only record what a small number of people say, but also to observe
how they interact with each other as they respond to a set of questions posed by the researcher (Scott & Garner, 2013). The focus group technique was conducted in Stage 4, to collectively evaluate efforts made by the MSN in 2009 and to observe how group dynamics and hierarchies affected who spoke and what they said.

(iii) Observation

A participant observation technique was used for field work in Stage 2 and 4. A key feature of participant observation is that the observer becomes a member of the observed group to learn their social conventions and habits, their use of language and non-verbal communication (Scott & Garner, 2013). The researcher’s position in the field was regarded as a ‘participant-as-observer’. Participant-as-observer involves being known as a researcher and participating in the ongoing activities of the group (Scott & Garner, 2013).15

To facilitate the participant-as-observer technique, it was necessary to be immersed in Mombetsu everyday life. It was observed through staying with the elder’s family and a few other MSN members’ places in Mombetsu, and trying to engage with their work of fishing and farming. A dual role of researcher and a practitioner was maintained. Life narratives and participant observation were used to understand the learning process and knowledge creation process in the local community context. During data collection, building trust with members of the group was vital for using the observation technique. Other techniques such as informant interviews, document collection and analysis also helped to build trust in the participants.

15 Participant-as-observer is also known as semi-participant observation, who moderates to active participation.
3.4.2 Data analysis and interpretation

Data analysis includes organising and interrogating the data to see patterns, identify themes, discover relationships, develop explanations, make interpretations, mount critiques or generate theories (Scott & Garner, 2013). In this research, all collected data was transcribed in Japanese. To identify key themes and patterns, coding was used as an integral part of the initial phase of the data analyses.

Two techniques were used for data analysis and interpretation in this study: critical reflection and symbolic interactionism. Reflexivity is the main feature of the research process that characterises critical ethnography. Critical reflection was done through self-reflection and verification with the participants. This was required in most of the data collection, interpretation, documentation of critical ethnography and in theorising a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context. Self-reflection was done in Stage 5 of both Parts I and II, mostly through cross-reviewing between the theoretical literature, documents, and experience.

Critical reflection was done in a variety of ways during the different stages – orally during interviews, emails, and in written summaries in Japanese. In particular, an opportunity arose to verify the accuracy of the data analysis and interpretation, by a supervisor and colleague at the University of Tokyo. This was drafted into Japanese and presented at seminars three times to gather comments from colleagues. The outcomes of the critical reflection were also published in Japanese, and the draft was shared with key research participants, particularly Hatakeyama, for reinterpretation and negotiation.
Another analytical technique used for this study was ‘symbolic interactionism’. Symbolic interactionism is named by Blumer (1969; in Tracy, 2012), and takes a hermeneutic approach to “nonliteral meaning of language and other forms of communications” (Lapan, Quartaroli, & Riemer, 2012, p. 385). Through this technique, researchers focus on the symbolic dimensions of human communication, including words, numbers or gestures that stand for something else and to investigate how meaning and identity are co-created through interaction. The emphasis on the nonliteral world is what clearly distinguishes critical ethnography research from the interpretivism research. Symbolic interactionism was used in Stage 3 and 4 of both Parts I and II of this research. This technique helped interpret Hatakeyama’s views on the Ainu world from words like whale, behaviour, as well as emotions from key participants of MSN.

Hatch (2002, p. 151) perceives that the data analysis process never ends, as it can produce more understanding and more stories. He suggested that the time to stop was when the data answered the research questions. This suggestion was applied to this research, and data collection and analysis continued until the research question was answered.

### 3.4.3 Issues of validity and reliability

‘Bias’ is a key issue in establishing the trustworthiness of any scientific research (Robson, 1993). As discussed above, however, all research is value-laden to some extent. Based on this premise of no research being completely unbiased, Scott and Garner (2013) find that in qualitative research the issue is not “whether or not the
study is biased, rather the concerns on how to deal with bias in the research” (Scott & Garner, 2013, p. 68). This includes issues such as the degree of bias, clear consciousness on the bias, and moreover, the potential impact of bias in data collection and analysis.

As a strategy for these concerns, the researcher should pursue “transparency: and “falsifiability” in the research (Scott & Garner, 2013, p. 69). Transparency means the researcher needs to clarify their point of view, and take steps to ensure they record information accurately. This measurement should be pursued through all steps of data collection and analysis. Falsifiability means the researcher should be prepared for “inconvenient facts,” where they may encounter results that may diverge from their initial hypotheses. This is particularly necessary during analysis, and requires flexibility in the research design and openness in the researcher’s mind.

Five sets of approaches were used in this research to enhance transparency and to test ‘falsifiability’ during data collection and analysis. These included (i) prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field; (ii) triangulation; (iii) construct validity and systematised reflexivity; (iv) face validity; and (v) catalytic validity.

(i) Prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field

Prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field is required to establish the trustworthiness of data analysis. This technique is advised by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and used by many qualitative researchers until now, including (such as Ely, 1991; Golafshani, 2003; Loh, 2013). Data were collected using semi-structured interviews with individual participants in focus groups, life
narratives of Hatakeyama and two other participants, and participant observations. In addition to the fieldwork, communication with participants was continued through phone calls, emails and letters, and used to report back to the participants about collected data and to facilitate negotiation. During the research period, data was collected in Mombetsu, Sapporo and Tokyo during four visits: 1-28 February 2012; 10-15 February 2013; 13-23 December 2013; and 22 December 2015 - 8 January 2016.

(ii) Triangulation

Triangulation is an essential technique that ensures the trustworthiness of data and its interpretations. It is a technique used to analyse data by integrating multiple data sources, methods and theoretical schemes, or obtaining information relevant to a topic or issue from several participants (Robson, 1993). Using multiple sources of data through multiple data collection and interpretation techniques help to minimise researcher bias. In this study, triangulation was used in three ways. The first was conducted by crossing between data and theory to find the relevance and the gap. The second was the analysis of data obtained through different data collection techniques, such as combining semi-structured interviews, life narratives and participant observations, to understand differences in the reactions of the same participant in different settings (e.g. change in Hatakeyama’s words and behaviour during a group in a meeting room and during individual meeting in his life context). The third was the analysis of data by involving multiple participants. This helped particularly in the interpretation of words and hidden meanings in Hatakeyama’s behaviour.
(iii) **Construct validity and systematised reflexivity**

Construct validity and systematized reflexivity is a constant dialogue between data and theory (Lather, 1986, p. 270). It is necessary to understand how data based on the experience of participants, relates to or challenges an *a priori* theory. Construct validity was integrated into data collection and analysis in Stage 3, 4 and 5 of Part I and II. The progress of the study on my educational practice at MSN, especially with Hatakeyama, was systematically analysed. In particular, how the critical EE/ESD related to the process of emancipation and empowerment of the local community, particularly the marginalised stakeholders like Hatakeyama.

(iv) **Face validity**

Face validity is referred to as ‘member checks’, and refers to people who are not necessarily experts in what the researchers are studying (Lather, 1986). It recycles descriptions, emerging analysis, and conclusions back to the participants for their opinions and advice. Member checks were done in Stage 3, 4 and 5 of both Parts I and II in this study. All transcribed data and interpretations were circulated to key MSN members for the verification. Analyses were also checked by researchers in Japan working in the area of local community-based ESD. Data collection and analyses were conducted during 2013 to 2014 at the University of Tokyo. Extensive advice on the analysis process was received from one of the supervisors and fellow higher degree students. The member checks were also conducted by the researchers at Tokyo Gakugei University, and Tokyo University of Technology and Agriculture, who examined the relevance and effectiveness of the analyses in the broader local community context.
(v) **Catalytic validity**

Catalytic validity refers to the extent to which the research process reorients, focuses and energizes participants toward knowing themselves and their situation to transform it (Lather, 1986). Catalytic validity is referred to a process of conscientisation. It was an essential part of this study, which aimed to construct the emancipatory empowerment of participants through the critical ethnography research design. Catalytic validity was confirmed in Stage 5 with Hatakeyama on how he found the relevance and effectiveness of the conceptual framework that was theorised through the research.

### 3.4.4 Ethical issues in the study

This section reviews the ethical considerations of this study. Ethics were considered in two ways throughout the research. The first ethical consideration acknowledged the compliance of all the rules for ethics in qualitative research. Following the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (Government, 2015), the approval for data collection and analysis with the participants of MSN was obtained initially from the RMIT University Ethics Committee in November 2012 (CHEAN Approved No: A-2000786-10-12).

Prior to the conduct of any data collection and analyses, information about its purpose and procedures, the participants’ roles, as well as confidentiality, was explained. All participants provided their consent to the various aspects of the study. Confidentiality of the participant was always maintained.
All transcripts and recordings were managed using the Australian Code for Responsible Conduct of Research. Research data were kept in secure storage during and after the research. The data may be destroyed after a minimum retention period, however, should be kept permanently for the work that has community value (RMIT University, 2016).

Confidentiality was also protected in documenting this thesis. Participants who wished to remain anonymous were respected. This was particularly important in this research because of the political and social sensitivity of issues of MSN. This includes whaling rights and community conflicts over the waste management facility construction, and the potential negative impact of disclosure of personal information into the complex social and familial relationships of the participants.

Pseudonyms were used for the research participants except for three research participants who agreed to have their name in this thesis. This included Hatakeyama, Masahiro Koizumi and Mikio Washizu. Koizumi was a community educator of Sapporo Free School ‘Yu’ (SFSY) in Sapporo City, Hokkaido\(^{16}\) and was an active member of ESD-J. He engaged with MSN as a co-educator. Washizu was the organic farmer in Mombetsu. He was the close friend of Hatakeyama and knew Hatakeyama’s family and the family history. He supported Hatakeyama’s indigenous claim before MSN’s establishment and was an active MSN member.

\(^{16}\) Sapporo Free School ‘Yu’ (SFSY) is the NGO, which was established in 1990. “SFSY aims to conduct alternative, non-formal learning activities organised by citizens for citizens. Through the learning activities at SFSY, the citizens discuss and learn together the issues to be tackled, including human rights, peace, development, environment and gender. SFSY aims to provide the space where every one of us can empower through such meetings and collaborations” (SFSY, 2017).
Going beyond the obligations and responsibilities of a researcher following the role of the university and government, ethical consideration is particularly important in critical research. Cannella and Lincoln (2011) note, “being critical requires radical ethics” (p. 81). The ‘power’ consciousness is not only related to the content and outcomes of the research, but also to the way researchers relate to the research community and his or her mind frame as a researcher.

The power of the research can oppress the researching community and construct the power as a new truth (Cannella & Lincoln, 2011, p. 81). The power in research closely links with two issues of ‘being privileged’ as the researcher. The first issue is about understanding the gap between the researcher and the research community. The researcher may enter people’s everyday life, feeling ‘privileged’, having a purpose for collecting data for his/her own research through interviews and observations of the researched people. Conversely, the research participants may not feel the same. As Beuving and de Vries (2015) warn, participants may be busy, minding their own affairs and hoping the researcher will not stand too much in their way. The other problem is that the researcher may be seen as being privileged because of his/her connection with the dominant (e.g., education, economic level, race, gender) that the participants may not express (Cannella & Lincoln, 2011).

Drawing on these problems above, researchers need to be equipped with some form of humility, honesty, respect and empathy to the participants’ sufferings, struggles, and agonies. Ultimately, the researcher must be aware of what the research is about and whom it contributes to, and how documentation and conceptualisation of the people’s lived experience can impact on the research.
participants. Cannella and Lincoln (2011) suggest that researchers should “join with” and “learn from” the research participants, rather than “speak for” or “intervene into” (p. 83).

3.5 Summary of Chapter 3

This chapter described the research design of this study and justified the selection of methodology, method, and techniques used. To ensure reliability and validity in this research, this chapter discussed (i) ideological background and research assumptions; (ii) research methodology; (iii) research method; (iv) data collection and analysis techniques and its application, including concerns on validity and ethical issues in this study. The researcher’s interests in social justice and the potential of ESD in a community development context to be socially-critical and emancipatory empower both the researcher and the participant, and underpins this study.

The sensitivity of power, social critique, and emancipation illustrate the value-laden orientation of the study background, and hence, such orientation positioned this research within the critical theory paradigm. The research method that guided this research was critical ethnography. Despite many aspects of critical theory shared with other praxis-oriented methods such as participatory action research and ‘research as praxis’, the selection of critical ethnography was justified due to the lack of collective and political action within the design of research. This came from the constraints of the research timeframe, authority of the community action, and political sensitivity of the local issues.
Data collection included document collection and analysis, interviews and participation. Reflexivity, which is an integral part of critical ethnography, was enhanced throughout the data analyses and the writing-up. Reflexivity helped elucidate its relevance and gap to the *a priori* theory, but also ensured the validity of the data, and to build trust with the participants. It also created a co-learning, emancipatory process through communication between the researcher and the participants. Reflexivity also highlighted the potential for this study to develop another research cycle as it revealed the meaning of reality and challenged the balance of power. Reflexivity during the research process was sustained using triangulation, construct validity, face validity and catalytic validity. Lastly, this chapter outlined the process of this study. It described two research phases covering seven major stages.

The research questions of this study were addressed using the selected methodologies and method, and by setting three objectives, including ‘theoretical analysis, ‘praxis review’ and ‘critical reflection’. These objectives were conducted in two research phases and five research stages. The five stages included ‘literature review’ (Stage 1: Chapter 2), followed by two sets of critical ethnographies in Part I and Part II, both of which included contextual background (Stage 3: Chapter 4 and 7), data collection and analyses (Stage 3 &4: Chapter 5 and 8) and critical reflections (Stage 5: Chapter 6 and 9).
Part I: Critical Ethnographic Research within Socially-critical ESD

Part I reports the first part of the two critical ethnographies in this thesis. This part portrays the application of socially-critical approaches to ESD in a community development context and attempts to understand socially-critical ESD within the understanding of critical theory. It contains three chapters. The first chapter (Chapter 4) presents background information of the ESD efforts by MSN. The second chapter (Chapter 5) depicts the process of integrating socially-critical approaches to ESD efforts by MSN and analyses the effectiveness and challenges of ESD informed by critical theory. The third chapter (Chapter 6) provides critical reflections on my thoughts and struggles during the analysis, and analyses the key findings from Chapter 5 in relation to the literature.
CHAPTER 4. Overview of indigenous Ainu rights recovery movement in Japan

Figure 4-1: Map of Japan

Note: Locations depicted within red circle denote key areas of MSN activity

(Maps of World, 2012)
Indigenous rights recovery of Ainu people is the key element in the search for sustainable development in Hokkaido, the northernmost island of Japan (Figure 4-1). MSN was established to bring together the collective actions and learnings for achieving sustainable development, based on the indigenous Ainu rights claim in Mombetsu, the most north-eastern part of Hokkaido. Therefore, Masahiro Koizumi, the co-educator, and I committed to this community development process, integrating socially-critical approaches to ESD.

This chapter investigates why the indigenous rights recovery is an essential issue in achieving sustainable development in Hokkaido. It also investigates why the socially-critical approach to ESD was taken to address the problems confronting Satoshi Hatakeyama, the Ainu fisherman and elder in Mombetsu. It provides an overview of the colonisation and modernisation process of Hokkaido, the marginalisation and assimilation of the indigenous Ainu people, the efforts for indigenous rights recovery that are predominantly driven by Wajin (the dominant native ethnic group of Japan), and the struggles of Hatakeyama for indigenous recovery based on his life experiences as a fisherman.

4.1 **History of Hokkaido from a colonial perspective**

Hokkaido is rarely viewed as a colonised area in Japan. In addition to the Wajin, even the Ainu people often believe ‘nothing happened’ in the history of Hokkaido. Due to long-lasting assimilation policies and discrimination (Kaiho, 2008), colonisation has been concealed in educational, social and political systems in Japan, despite the indigenous recognition of the Ainu people in 2008.
The major areas of Hokkaido were inhabited by the indigenous Ainu people before the modernisation of Japan in the late the 19 Century (Figure 4-2). These areas encompassed the current Japan-Russian border, including Hokkaido, the Chishima (Kuril or Kurile) Islands, Sakhalin, and a part of Kamchatka Peninsula (Figure 4-2). Before colonisation, these areas were called Ainu Mosir (the land of Ainu people) by Ainu people, or Ezo-chi by Wajin Japanese, which stands for ‘foreigners’ land’ in Japanese; they did not see Ainu Mosir as part of Japan.

Figure 4-2: Map of Ainu Mosir (traditional Ainu Land)

‘Ainu’ means ‘(good) human/people’ in the Ainu language (Uemura, 2008, p. 105). The Ainu people sustained their lives and society in Hokkaido before the Wajin settlement, having their own social system and cultural traditions, including their own language. They engaged in the fishing, hunting, extensive agriculture, and trading in the greater areas including Japan, Eastern Russia and Northern...
China. Their knowledge to sustain such life should constitute the core of the indigenous rights.

Wajin Japanese people began colonising Ainu Mosir and assimilating Ainu people in the 1850s, while the Wajin Japanese were under colonial pressure from the Western countries who eagerly expanded their territories all over the world around that time. The United States of America, England, France, Holland and Russia pressured the Tokugawa Shogunate (feudal government) to open their country. In the negotiation process for the Japan-Russia Treaty of Amity and Commerce in 1855, Japan took a stealthy approach to the negotiations on the northern national border with Russia. The Wajin Japanese claimed their territorial rights to Ezo-chi by depicting the Ainu people as Japanese and under Japanese dominion, and Ezo-chi as terra nullius, or belonging to no one. The Wajin regarded the Ainu people as ‘non-human’ and with no capacity to govern their land, hence, granting them no territorial rights to their land (Uemura, 2008). This treaty confirmed the Kuril (Chishima) Islands as Japanese territory, while the governance of Sakhalin was shared between Japan and Russia (Uemura, 2008).

The Meiji government, founded in 1868 by the fall of the Tokugawa Shogunate, enthusiastically embraced modernisation to become the first Westernised country in Asia. The Meiji government inherited the diplomatic policies of the Tokugawa

---

17 The Edo Shogunate had their missionary, Matsumae-han (clan) in Ezo-chi, which set four trading districts in 1670s and gained the economic profits by depriving the trading rights from the Ainu people (Uemura, 1990). There are extensive evidences to show the economic exploitation by the Japanese people, numerous revolts by the Ainu against feudal rule and discrimination against Ainu by the Japanese during the Edo era (Uemura, 2008). However, The power of the Ainu people as much superior to the Japanese in Ezochi, so that the impact of the Japanese was still far for the Japanese to get the ruling power from the Ainu people (Uemura, 1990, p. 79). Ainu Mosir was still regarded as the Ainu’s land before the colonisation in 1880s, as this is seen in the way how the Japanese called the Ainu land as Ezo-chi, in contrast with the Japanese land as Wajin-chi (Uemura, 2008).
Shogunate on Ezo-chi and strategically modernised this area. To justify their land claim against Russia, the Meiji government renamed Ezo-chi to ‘Hokkaido’ and established the Hokkaido Development and Colonial Agency (北海道開拓使: Hokkaido kaitakushi) for the promotion of modernisation and development policies in Hokkaido.¹⁸

The rapid modernisation of Hokkaido dispossessed the Ainu people of everything, including their culture, language, and access rights to the natural resources (Siddle, 2003, p. 451). During the negotiation with Russia, the Japanese government forced the Ainu people to choose whether to live in the Japanese or Russian parts of Ainu Mosir. At the same time in 1872, the Meiji Government nationalised the Ainu land and formally had control over the Ainu people’s resources (Siddle, 2003, p. 452).

**Assimilation policies and formal education**

The government enacted “the Hokkaido Ex-Aborigines Protection Act (北海道旧土人保護法: Hokkaido kyudojin hogohou)” in 1899 and legitimated the assimilation of the Ainu people through economic and social activities, educational systems and research. The original Japanese words for ex-aboriginal are 旧土人 (kyu-dojin; former ‘uncivilised’ people), which showed the government’s discriminative attitudes toward the Ainu people. The Ainu people were differentiated from the Wajin and referred to as the “secondary-class, uncivilised and barbarian citizens” in the policies (Uemura, 2008, p. 54). Under

¹⁸ According to Uemura (1990, p. 249), Hokkaido development policy drew much of the model of the Western colonial frontier in the United States. Kiyotaka Kuroda, the first Minister to the Hokkaido Development Agency, and 76 advisors from the United States developed the master plan for Hokkaido development. The chief advisor was Horace Capron, who was the Second Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture in the United States.

The Japanese government banned Ainu people from using the Ainu language and Ainu names, and from conducting their ritual activities and traditional life practices, including wearing their customary clothes, ornaments and tattoos. The government encouraged the settlers from all over Japan, which displaced the Ainu from their ancestral land to less fertile areas. To protect the growing commercial and industrial activities, the government stripped Ainu people of their access rights to natural resources (such as salmon, deer, bear and whale, which had cultural significance as both a staple food and a spiritual symbol) (Iwasaki, 2011; Nomoto & Iwasaki-Goodman, 2000). The 1899 Act enabled the government to enhance commercial agricultural and industrial activities of the Japanese settlers, which in turn contributed to the economic growth of the nation.

Formal education accelerated the assimilation process, which forced Ainu children to become Wajin Japanese. The Meiji government developed the Ex-Aboriginal Children Education Regulation (旧土人児童教育規定: kyudojin jidou kyoiku kitei) in 1901 and established 33 Ainu schools for the Ainu children in Hokkaido (Ogawa, 1991, pp. 259-260). This separated the Ainu children from the Wajin and provided a simplified and easier teaching approach compared to the regular primary schools (Ogawa, 1993, p. 58). The teaching content was not sufficient for Ainu children to proceed to the secondary level even if they could finish the primary education (Ogawa, 1993, p. 58). By 1940, Ainu schools were

---

19 These mainly included people from the poor villages in Tohoku region (northern Honshu) settled in Hokkaido. Convicts were also taken to Hokkaido and engaged in labouring on infrastructure construction, such as roads, bridges and railways (Abashiri Prison Museum, 2017).
abolished and Ainu children were accepted into the Wajin schools. By then, the
government saw that the assimilation education policy had effectively destroyed
Ainu language and customs, and successfully entrenched the Japanese language
among the Ainu children (Ogawa, 1993, p. 58). The discrimination against the
Ainu people became more severe and more explicit at these mixed schools than in
the Ainu schools. The school became the place of persecution by the Wajin, which
resulted in a large number of Ainu children dropping out of primary school. Ainu
discrimination within schools continued until only recently (Nozaki, 2010).

The 1899 Act legitimatised the superiority of the Wajin Japanese race, and the
inferiority of the Ainu people, which was instilled into both the Ainu people and
the Japanese settlers over the generations (Gayman, 2011; Siddle, 2003). Even
after the 2008 official recognition of Ainu as the indigenous people,
discrimination and superior-inferior views still continued at “personal and
structural levels” (Gayman, 2011, p. 18), at school, in the workplace and in
marriages (Gayman, 2011; Hokkaido Prefectural Government, 2006; Siddle, 2003,
p. 453).

Interracial marriages between the Ainu and, mostly, Wajin increased the
assimilation process. Siddle (2003) points out the possibility of biological
assimilation, following a group of Japanese bureaucrats who encouraged
intermarriage, believing that mingling Ainu blood with that of Wajin should bring
progress for the Ainu (p. 452). Although there is hardly any research conducted on
biological assimilation, mixing Wajin blood with Ainu did not eliminate the
discrimination toward Ainu in reality. “However mixed you are, a tiny single drop
of Ainu blood makes you Ainu” (Gonai, 1972, p. 201).” The issue of blood still
continues even now as current arguments, mostly by the Wajin,\(^\text{20}\) seek to recognise Ainu people by their percentage of Ainu blood.

Aside from losing their culture, Ainu people continue to experience interrelated socio-economic problems, such as low income, unemployment, low school and higher education enrolments, alcoholism and domestic violence throughout the generations (Center for Ainu & Indigenous Studies, 2010, 2014, 2015; Y. Nakamura, 2008; Voice of Ainu Buraku and Zainichi Korean Women, 2016). These problems have pushed Ainu people to migrate from their homelands into “the anonymity of the working-class ghettos in Japan's large cities” (N. Nakamura, 2015). Here they are identified as a dogai Ainu, a person who left their original homeland of Hokkaido and now live elsewhere in Japan and overseas.

### 4.2 Wajin driven indigenous Ainu rights recovery

Despite historically having people with multi-cultural backgrounds,\(^\text{21}\) the ‘myth’ that Japan is an ethnically homogenous country has been sustained in every aspect of life in Japan for a long time (Siddle, 2003). Indeed, this was recently observed

\(^{20}\) For example, Yasuyuki Kaneko, the former Sapporo City Council member stated on the social media (Kaneko, 2014, translated by the researcher): *The Ainu people do not exist anymore. At most there are the Japanese who have the Ainu descendants. It is irrational that the Ainu people can enjoy their privileges. It is unaccountable to taxpayers.* His tweet has triggered the hate speeches towards the Ainu people by the conservatives until now.

\(^{21}\) The main cultural communities include Ainu people, Ryukyuan in Okinawa Prefecture, Chinese and Korean people. The Ainu people and the Ryukyuan people (琉球民族 Ryūkyū minzoku) are the indigenous people in Japan. They live on the Ryukyu Islands, the Southernmost Islands between Kyushu and Taiwan. Despite their claim on the recognition of the indigenous status and their self-determination rights to the Japanese government and the repeated UN recommendations, the Japanese government does not recognised them as indigenous people, asserting that the Ainu people are the only indigenous people and so far (Aragaki, 2016).
in a statement made by high-profile politicians. In the Ainu people’s fight against the dominant notion of an inferior and ‘dying race’ (Siddle, 2003, p. 454), they hoped to ensure their participation in political life, access to the wealth and resources of Japanese society, and to re-create their cultural identity in a way that makes them feel at home. Their hope led a movement in the 1920-30s to establish local Ainu organisations to improve the social status of the Ainu people (Ogawa, 1993, p. 42).

The movement led to the establishment of the Ainu Association of Hokkaido (AAH) in 1931, which was the first organisation for Ainu people at the Hokkaido municipal level. The AAH was closed once during World War II (WWII) and re-established by the Ainu people in 1946. Since then, AAH has networked and supported Ainu people in Hokkaido, and conducted public advocacy for the Ainu people to the general public (AAH, 2017b). AAH drafted the New Ainu Law and proposed it to the government in 1984 as part of their claim for rights recovery.

The 1899 Ex-Aboriginal Act continued until 1997 when the Japanese government officially recognised the Ainu people as an ‘ethnic minority’ group of Japan through the enactment of the Ainu Cultural Promotion Act (CPA) (The House of Representatives Japan, 1997). In the same year, the Hokkaido Former Ex-Aborigines Protection Act was repealed.

---

22 For example, this statement was made by the former Prime Minister, Yasuhiro Nakasone, in 1896, and by the former Education Minister, Bunmei Ibuki in 2007 (The Japan Times, 2007).

23 CPA, in full, the Act for the Promotion of Ainu Culture, and the Dissemination of Knowledge and Education concerning Ainu Traditions, アイヌ文化の振興並びにアイヌの伝統等に関する知識の普及啓発に関する法律 Ainu bunka no shinko narabi ni Ainu no dento nado ni kansuru chishiki no fukyu oyobi keihatsu ni kansuru horitsu, Law No. 52.
In 2008, the Ainu rights recovery movement led the parliamentary resolution for ‘indigenous’ recognition (The House of Representatives Japan, 2009). The indigenous recognition was also pushed forward by two international events, namely, the adoption of the UN Declaration on Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) in 2007 by the UN General Assembly that the Japanese government voted in favour of (United Nations, 2007); and the 34th G8 Summit held in Hokkaido in 2008 (MoFA, 2008). These international events motivated the government to recognise the indigenous status of Ainu people.

Despite all the outcomes that the indigenous rights movement has brought till now, the indigenous Ainu rights recovery is still tokenistic. This tokenism can be seen in the way the CPA, which was founded on the recognition of Ainu people as the ethnic minority of Japan, still continues to support the ‘indigenous’ policies, even after the 2008 ‘indigenous’ recognition. Indigenous recognition has a clear awareness of “the pressure to integrate a group of people into the larger society of the national states of which they are a part” (Viergever, 1999, p. 335), but ethnic minority recognition does not. That is, indigenous recognition implies the identification of a colonial power of one group over the other. On the other hand, ethnic minority recognition is vaguer in its identification of this pressure.

The distinction between indigenous, and ethnic minority, recognition is important. In the case of Ainu people, indigenous recognition includes acknowledging the colonisation of Hokkaido. This comprehends that the Japanese politically forced Ainu people, who were not originally Japanese people, to become Japanese. In contrast, ethnic minority recognition is acknowledging that Ainu people who are Japanese, as a minority group of Japan. The government continues to use the
phrase ‘ethnic minority’ in policies, instead of a more appropriate expression such as, ‘indigenous people’.

The tokenism of the indigenous Ainu recognition comes from the lack of Ainu’s leadership in their rights recovery movement. This is not new. Non-Ainu (mostly Wajin-Japanese) scholars and policymakers are dominant in the Ainu rights movement from an early stage. Few Ainu leaders led the early rights recovery movement in the 1920-30s (Ogawa, 1993, p. 42). In addition, few Ainu leaders of the 1990s took the initiative to lead what would ultimately become the 2008 indigenous recognition. Even AAH could not have been established without a Wajin named, Masaaki Kita, who united the local Ainu leaders of the Ainu movement in 1930 (Ogawa, 1993, p. 65).

In 1997, the CPA was formed by Wajin scholars and policymakers, without reflecting the views of a proposed ‘New Ainu Law’ formed by the Ainu people in 1984. It reflected the narrow and one-sided definition of the Ainu culture, rights and people, by the Wajin scholars and policymakers. As a result, the CPA further “de-politicised” (Siddle, 2003, p. 454) the Ainu people, who were further discouraged to take leadership in and engage with the rights movement.

After the CPA, the Ainu rights movement was initiated by non-Ainu (mostly Wajin) groups of scholars, policymakers and activists. They can be classified into two groups. The first asserts the validity (or criticism) of the current Ainu rights legislation based on what the current Japanese Constitution permits, and the CPA.

---

24 These leaders include Giichi Nomura (1914-2008) who made the statement to claim the Ainu indigenous rights recovery at the UN General Assembly in 1992 (Uemura, 2008, p. 82), Shigeru Kayano (1926-2006) who became the first National Diet member and claimed the indigenous recognition of the Ainu people at the Diet in 1994 (Uemura, 2008, p. 80), and Ryukichi Ogawa (1935-) who has committed to the return of the Ainu communal properties and Ainu remains (Yoshida, 2011, p. 41).
The second group points out the limitations of the current law and seeks a solution that goes beyond the current Japanese law, particularly on the international framework for the rights of indigenous people, such as the UNDRIP. For the purpose of this discussion, the first group will be called ‘Group A’ and the second, ‘Group B’.

In these two, Group A has a strong influence in maintaining the validity of the CPA. The CPA process established two ad-hoc committees and one permanent committee. This includes “the Advisory Council for Utari Policy” in 1996; 25 “the Advisory Council for Future Ainu Policy” in 2008; and “the Council for Ainu Policy Promotion” in 2009 (Chief Cabinet Secretary of Japan, 2016). These committees are organised in a way that is more favourable to the rights claim within the current Japanese law. This is in terms of the Ainu/Wajin representative ratio within the member groups, and the way to select Ainu members. The Advisory Council for the Utari Policy has no Ainu member (The Advisory Council for Utari Policy, 1996); the Advisory Council for Future Ainu policy has only one Ainu out of eight experts in 2009 (Chief Cabinet Secretary of Japan, 2016); and the Council for Ainu Policy Promotion has five Ainu members out of 14 in 2017 (Council for Ainu Policy Promotion, 2017). The non-Ainu members are influential in selecting who the Ainu members will be in these committees.

N. Nakamura (2014b) justifies the rationale for Group A:

In Japan, numbers of ethnic minority groups are few and we do not have the education to support them. Particularly in Ainu case, their lifestyles are much more assimilated to the Wajin than the indigenous people in the other countries. There are some people, who see the Ainu policies as a privilege, contend that the

25 Utari is usually glossed as people, family and compatriot in Ainu. This term is also used to refer the Ainu people.
Ainu people do not exist, as they neither speak their language nor continue their traditional lifestyle. Hence, it is hardly accepted by the Wajin people the fact that they are living together with other ethnic minority groups... To avoid unnecessary and unconstructive criticism, it is better to propose alternative options. In any case, rather than criticising the current policies regardless, it is realistic to find the way to recover the indigenous rights step by step, considering the special situation of the current Ainu people. (N. Nakamura, 2014b, p. 73). *Underlined and emphasis by the researcher.

The text above includes four key problems that Group A and B argue about in the current understanding of Ainu policies. These are about understanding (i) the indigenous status; (ii) the population; (iii) the culture; and (iv) the indigenous rights. These four problems motivated Hatakeyama to commit to his indigenous fishing rights claim, which is described in the next section.

(i) Indigenous status

The Ainu people are recognised as an ethnic minority group, not as an indigenous people, in the current policies written since 2008. Koji Sato, an authority on Japanese constitution, based at Kyoto University, and the Wajin chair of the Advisory Council for Future Ainu Policy, gives a detailed interpretation on the meaning of ‘ethnic minority’ of Japan:

Recognition of ‘the Ainu people’ as indigenous means that there are ethnic minority groups who are clearly different from the majority, and who call themselves as ‘we are the Ainu people’ among us, Japanese people. Both groups of people are those who should create and support the normative world of Japanese constitution as the Japanese citizens. (Sato, 2013, p. 39)

Examining the word, indigenous, in an uncritical manner, ignores the connotations associated with colonisation. The scholars of Group B have criticised that such an understanding ignores the responsibilities associated with ‘colonisation’ and ‘assimilation’, which the term ‘indigenous’ implies (Science
Council of Japan, 2011). A non-critical understanding of the term, indigenous, has resulted in their attitude of taking assimilation for granted.

(ii) Ainu population

It is difficult to ascertain the exact number of Ainu people. Government data appears to underestimate the actual numbers. Currently, policies and projects are based on the Ainu population as determined by: i) a demographic survey of the Ainu people in Hokkaido conducted every seven years by the Hokkaido Prefectural government; and ii) the number of dogai Ainu, or those outside of Hokkaido, obtained in 2011 by the Council for Ainu Policy Promotion. The latest 2013 survey shows 16,786 Ainu individuals in Hokkaido (Center for Ainu & Indigenous Studies, 2015) and the 2011 dogai Ainu survey counted 210 (Ainu Policy Promotion Council, 2011). Simply adding the two figures accounts for approximately 17,000 Ainu people in Japan.

The method employed for these demographic surveys, however, is flawed. To determine the population number of the Ainu people in Hokkaido, the Hokkaido Prefectural government collated data from returned questionnaire forms provided by the members of the local AAH chapter. These forms were distributed to the local AAH members and their personal relationships (Okinawa Times, 2017). The data did not include AAH members who did not respond and non-AAH members whom the local AAH chapter president did not know. Mostly, the data did not include those Ainu people who did not want to make their identity public. N. Nakamura (2014a, p. 209) argues that AAH members are “less than half” of the total Ainu population in Hokkaido (p. 209). Regarding the demographic survey of dogai Ainu, once again, a similar method was used as the Hokkaido Ainu survey.
The Council for Ainu Policy Promotion collected the data by asking the local AAH chapter presidents if they knew any Ainu people who lived outside of Hokkaido and calculations were based on the number of responses (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, February 19, 2013). Once again, the data did not include any Ainu people who did not relate to the local AAH presidents or the Ainu people who live overseas. Chikappu (1998, p. 20), an Ainu elder, estimates that there are 50,000-200,000 Ainu people distributed throughout the world (p. 20). Ultimately, there is no reliable data for the Ainu population, but the government has used data that does not provide a solid foundation to develop an understanding of the current Ainu situation and their rights issues. Underestimation of the Ainu population has disadvantaged the rights claim of the Ainu people.

(iii) Ainu culture

A narrow understanding of the Ainu identity and population are incorporated into cultural promotion policies and projects, which further constricts and dilutes the Ainu culture in relation to music, dance and handicraft (Maruyama, 2013, p. 205). The government believe that cultural events and learning activities could raise the understanding of the non-Ainu people. In addition, it could also help the Ainu people learn about their culture, provide employment opportunities, and help them regain their indigenous identity and develop pride in recovering their indigenous Ainu rights. In reality, the Ainu culture is defined by the Wajin and is likely based on the experiences of the Wajin, who may not be familiar with other cultures. The Ainu people have to fit into the Ainu culture as defined by the Wajin-driven policy framework, to be Ainu people.
Unfortunately, those who benefit from such cultural products are the non-Ainu people, rather than the Ainu people (Gayman, 2011, p. 21). An example of this is the CPA project, such as the Iwor (traditional hunting territory) Restoration Centre development project. This benefited the Wajin Japanese tourists, and visitors to the centre, where they were able to learn the Ainu culture from the Ainu people. The Ainu rights recovery policies provide minimal cultural promotion and dissemination of information about the Ainu to the Wajin Japanese (Levin, 2001, p. 467). Current policies and projects do not encourage the Ainu people to learn and research the real situation of their indigenous identity, culture and rights.

(iv) Ainu rights recovery

The issues discussed above (i-iii), have created the current situation where Ainu people are forced to fit into a standard set by the Wajin Japanese, to live as Ainu people. The policies and projects have not recognised the critical need to protect the human rights of the Ainu people, including their rights to land and natural resources, as well as an economic base. The assimilation has been implicit in continuing the policies for indigenous rights recovery, but in so doing, has forced the Ainu people to fit in with a standard the Wajin decides.

The underlying cause of a narrow, one-sided and paternalistic understanding of the Ainu identity, population and culture is due to the Ainu people’s lack of self-determination or collective rights (Gayman, 2011; Levin, 2001; Maruyama, 2013; N. Nakamura, 2014b, 2015; Siddle, 2003). These rights allow the indigenous people to make decisions about policies for themselves, based on their own definition of identity, culture and their rights as ‘people’ (Australian Human

Regarding the claim for self-determination and collective rights, the scholars of Group A raised two reasons why the Ainu people should not have self-determination and collective rights. Firstly, they are concerned that there is a lack of solidarity within the Ainu people. “They do not have their official organisation for the collective decision-making” (N. Nakamura, 2014a; 2014b, p. 69). “The internalised oppression, disempowerment, and physical distance” (Gayman, 2011, p. 24) have resulted in a lack of solidarity among the Ainu people. These outcomes are the result of assimilation and colonisation by the Japanese. This explanation sounds like an excuse to Group B, however, whose criticisms include that the government “defers the decision” (Maruyama, 2013, p. 206), which is “irresponsible evasiveness” (Gayman, 2011, p. 20). In fact, current policies have put the Ainu people in a negative spiral; lacking these rights has disempowered the Ainu people and it hinders them from uniting and recognising the barriers that they face (Gayman, 2011, p. 24). Furthermore, Group B was afraid of the backlash by the majority Wajin Japanese for the ‘special treatment’ of the Ainu people (Gayman, 2011, p. 20). Hence, they asked the Ainu people to compromise with the current situation, and do the best they could within the current laws’ framework. This law was developed soon after WWII when the belief in the ethnic homogeneity was much more dominant than it is now.

The rationale behind the second explanation is found in Article 14 of the Japanese constitution that ensures equal individual rights under the law (Gayman, 2011;
Maruyama, 2013; N. Nakamura, 2014a; Siddle, 2003). In fact, Tsunemoto, who has been the key member of the governmental committees says:

The rights of indigenous people benefit only to the individuals who belong to a particular group of people, so that the recognition of the rights of a particular group of people may conflict with this article. (Tsunemoto, 2011, p. 50).

The government sees that all Japanese are equal under the law and that Ainu people are regarded merely as Japanese citizens (N. Nakamura, 2014a, p. 209). The government believes that any special treatment of Ainu people may result in negative feelings among the non-Ainu people in Japan. Therefore, the government asserts that individual rights provide basic protection of human rights, which covers the protection of the Ainu rights as a Japanese person. Hence, collective rights are not needed.

**Ainu people are missing in the Ainu rights recovery movement**

The CPA process overarches these four problems and has undoubtedly left the Ainu people in a colonial situation. It does not reflect their real voices (Gayman, 2011, p. 21). A critical problem in the Ainu rights recovery is that the Ainu people are too disempowered to take bold action to advocate their substantial rights recovery (Gayman, 2011, p. 21), or to claim political power or special status as the indigenous people of Japan (Levin, 2001; Maruyama, 2013; N. Nakamura, 2014a; Siddle, 2003; Yoshida, 2011). In any discussions, events and texts, no matter the assertions made by Group A or B, the activist Ainu people were not well numbered at the frontline. This did not mean that they did not have thoughts or opinions about the entire situation, or that the Ainu population is very small. In
fact, the discrimination and assimilation over 150 years have created feelings of 
humiliation and inferiority in the Ainu people, especially those of the older 
generation (Gayman, 2011, p. 24). The ongoing colonial pressure through the 
Ainu rights protection policies discourage the Ainu people from conscientising 
and speaking out about their indigenous roots, their unreasonable situation, and 
their potential rights.

Arguments between the two Wajin groups put these few Ainu activists at the 
frontline in a ‘twisted’, messy situation, without having much control over the 
outcome. They were swayed and divided by the Wajin arguments. Some Ainu 
people, who try to fit in with the identity, culture and rights as defined by the CPA, 
and its policies, work as government policy members. Others who disagree with 
CPA definitions, join in with the other Wajin group, and aim to go beyond the 
domestic legal protection based on international law. The Wajin controls the 
indigenous rights arguments, which has divided the Ainu people, and made them 
turn against each other. The remaining individuals – Ainu people, who do not 
appear in either camp, are unknown, but there are many who would rather stay 
away from the arguments, remaining silent and confused.

Colonial history and the ongoing assimilation have created a complicated situation 
for the Ainu rights recovery movement, where the Ainu people are too 
disempowered to proactively commit to improving their situation, or even realise 
what they could have as their indigenous rights. It is necessary for both the Ainu 
and Wajin people to unlearn the history of Hokkaido from the colonial 
perspectives, and to relearn the Ainu people’s indigenous roots, their unreasonable
situation, and their potential rights. Such unlearning and relearning are the central focus of socially-critical ESD in Hokkaido.

In the current situation of Ainu rights recovery, Hatakeyama initiated his own indigenous rights recovery activism based on his own life experience as a fisherman. Hatakeyama’s key claims had critical elements that provided the foundation of socially-critical ESD. His story for the indigenous rights recovery is detailed in the next section.

4.3 Indigenous rights movement in Mombetsu

Satoshi Hatakeyama is a fisherman as well as the ‘ekashi’ (male elder or grandfather) of the Mombetsu Ainu people. Hatakeyama stood up to recover the ‘substantial indigenous rights, without being guided by the two groups of non-Ainu people. He boldly stood at the frontline of the rights recovery movement based on his own concerns developed through life experience as an Ainu fisherman in Mombetsu, Hokkaido, Japan.

4.3.1 Northern fishing town, Mombetsu

Mombetsu is a small fishing rural town. Across the Okhotsk Sea is Russia (Figure 4-1). It is named after the main river that runs through Mombetsu and originated from the Ainu word, mo (quiet) and pet (river) (Ito, 2006, p. 183). Of the official population of 24,500 individuals in Mombetsu, many engaged in fishing, forestry and agricultural industries. The main fishing products included salmon, cod, sole,
and trout from the coastal waters (Mombetsu City Government, 2013). Food processing industries using marine products were also active. The rich natural environment of the Okhotsk Sea resulted from the deposition of rich soil from the Amur River basin (Shiraiwa, 2011).

**Figure 4-3 Record of the elder, Kuhechain, in Mombetsu**

![Image of the record of the elder, Kuhechain, in Mombetsu]

Note: Circled in red by the researcher (Hokkaido Prefectural Library, 1731)

The oldest record referring to the Ainu people in Mombetsu is found in a history book written by Tsugaru han, which records “There are about 100 Ainu residents in Mombetsu in the 1600s and the elder was called Kuhechain” (Ito, 2006, p. 183) (Figure 4-3). As discussed in the previous section, there is no reliable demographic data about the Ainu people in Mombetsu. The Hokkaido

---

26 Tsugaru han (domain under Edo Shogunate governmental system) documented 250 years history of the greater Tsugaru area, including Ezo-chi. This was compiled in ‘Tsugaru Ittoshi (Compilation of Tsugaru History)’ in 1731.
Prefectural Government counted 355 in Okhotsk region (five cities including Mombetsu) (Center for Ainu & Indigenous Studies, 2014), while Hatakeyama estimates approximately only 400-500 individuals in Mombetsu (MSN, 2011d). Hatakeyama pointed out that many Ainu individuals, including most of his relatives, were hiding their identity or may not even be aware of their ethnic background (MSN, 2011d).

4.3.2 Hatakeyama’s life story

The rights-based sustainable community development movement in Mombetsu was initiated by the Ainu fisherman, Satoshi Hatakeyama. Hatakeyama was born in Mombetsu in 1941 and grew up in poverty and experiencing discrimination. After dropping out from junior high school at age fourteen, he hid his Ainu identity until the age of fifty, due to the discrimination he experienced, and simply worked as a fisherman. Table 4-1 (see p.128) summarises and the key events in the Ainu rights movement and Hatakeyama’s life events.

He recalls Mombetsu community and his life:

In the past, there was a Kotan (Ainu village) holding about 17 houses around the area where the Okhotsk Sea Ice Museum of Hokkaido is now located and about eight to nine families were Ainu. It was where the sea water came at the front of the houses when the sea was rough. That bridge, now called Imaryuhyo hashi (bridge), used to be called Kotan hashi. As I grew up with seven other brothers and sisters, I was always hungry. I ate the grass for the cows and even frog eggs around this area. The house where I was living was a poorly built, and the thin wooden roof was easily damaged. I saw the moon and sky from the holes in the roof when I was lying on the futon mat and saw snow on my blanket when I woke up. Bullying toward me became severe when I was in year eight and I
eventually stop going to school. I am not sure whether or not I finished the compulsory education.

Around 15 years old, I started helping with my father’s fishing job and sometimes worked for many Amimoto (translated as ‘the head of the fisherman’s community’). I learnt how to make fishing nets by watching others. In the wintertime when the fishing was not busy, I worked in the wood industry. To sleigh the chopped wood out from the mountains, I carried water from the stream and watered the mountain paths to make the path icy. I went up and down the mountains many times a night. I became an independent fisherman after I owned my own boat for the first time at the age of 25. While I engaged in cod and ray fishing in the summertime, I began searching for the business during the winter. One day, I saw the ships from Iwate prefecture (northern part of the main island of Japan), which were operating dolphin spearfishing. After this, I learnt dolphin spearfishing and had engaged with it for over thirty years. I enlarged my business in Mombetsu and also established my fishing base in Iwate Prefecture.
It was through Hatakeyama’s daily fishing activities, that he became increasingly concerned about the negative impacts of industrialisation and commercialised fishing practices on the rich ecosystem of the Okhotsk region. He observed water pollution, an increase in garbage drifting with the current, the deformation of fish, the destruction of the sea bottom ecosystem by large trawl-boats, and decreasing sea ice each year caused by climate change. He related these observations to the growth of industrial activities and to people’s lives that contributed to this environmental degradation.

Hatakeyama eventually made the connection between local ecological problems and his concerns about indigenous rights issues, when he was fishing off the coast of Mombetsu in the 1980s. He saw big trawlers from Honshu, the main island of Japan, conducting mass fishing.

All of a sudden, I could not resist thinking, “This is my sea, our sea, Ainu’s sea. Why are those Wajin outsiders catching fish here? These are our resources. They are even destroying our sea.”

(MSN, 2011d).

At the same time, all the painful memories and emotions, and memories of his fuchi (female elder or grandmother in Ainu) that he had kept within himself, were rushing into his mind.

Drifting sea ice in Okhotsk contributes to enriched marine biodiversity. Sea ice normally drifts from Russia towards the northern coastline of Hokkaido between February and March. Sea ice enhances rich planktonic activity underneath and drifting sea ice carries the nutritious plankton across the Okhotsk Sea. The amount of sea ice has decreased and the period of sea ice has shortened due to climate change (Shiraiwa, 2011).
While watching the fishing trawler in front of me, I felt my emotions and memories all mixed up. And I became unable to contain myself.

目の前のトロール船を見ていたら、いろんな感情や思いが湧き上がってきて、いっても立ってもいられなくなった。 (MSN, 2011c).

These memories and emotions slowly changed Hatakeyama, who “hated to talk to or even look at Ainu, despite my Ainu background” (Sonobe, 2010, p. 4). Hatakeyama said that he was ‘reluctant’ (Washizu, 2001), but took the position of AAH Mombetsu Chapter president. He began learning about traditional ceremonies by visiting twenty communities in Hokkaido, with his late brother, Mineo Hatakeyama. Gradually, Hatakeyama also got involved in the indigenous whaling rights claim activism movement in 1997 because of Mineo’s influence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ainu key events</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hatakeyama’s key life events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Ainu land separation between Russia and Japan began (-1872)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Hokkaido Development and Colonial Agency established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Hokkaido Ex-Aborigines Protection Act (Assimilation policy) enacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Ex-Aboriginal Children Education Regulation developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Local Ainu organisations established at various places in Hokkaido (-1930)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Ainu Association of Hokkaido (AAH) established (closed during the WWII)</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Born in Mombetsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>AAH re-established</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Dropped out of junior secondary school and started to help father’s fishing jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Owned his first fishing boat</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>AAH drafted the New Ainu Law and proposed it to the government</td>
<td>Mid-1980s</td>
<td>Concerns began about marine environmental issues and Ainu rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Giichi Nomura made the statement to claim the Ainu indigenous rights at the UN General Assembly</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>‘Reluctantly’ took over AAH-MC president position from his late father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Shigeru Kayano became the first National Diet member as an Ainu who claimed the indigenous recognition at the Diet</td>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Began studying Ainu ceremonies with late brother, Mineo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Ex-Aboriginal Act abolished Official ‘ethnic minority’ status recognition by the government Ainu Cultural Promotion Act (CPA) enacted</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Began indigenous whaling claim with Mineo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Mineo died Publicly identified as an Ainu person Began Ancestor memorial ceremony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Began Kamuy Chep Nomi (Salmon ceremony) in Mombetsu River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Mombetsu City Government (MCG) proposed the industrial waste management plant construction on the Ainu secret area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Adoption of the UN Declaration on Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Hokkaido Government granted permission to MCG for the plant’s construction Began lobbying to the government with Mikio Washizu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Official indigenous recognition of Ainu people by the government G8 Summit held in Hokkaido</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Hatakeyama met Koizumi in Sapporo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>MSN established Wife died Attended CBD-COP10 in Nagoya, Japan Made policy proposal at Fishery Agency of Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Daughter, son-in-laws and grandson died from the Great East Japan earthquake tsunami</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>House burnt down in fire Re-married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Son died</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 I want to live as an Ainu fisherman

Hatakeyama became more seriously committed to his indigenous fishing rights claim soon after he lost his brother, Mineo in 1999.

Although I began to commit to the indigenous rights claim, I found it was very difficult. After my brother passed away, I did not feel like getting involved in everything. Then one day, I made a big decision to give up everything including indigenous whaling rights claim. On the night, I had a dream of my late brother, Mineo. He was angry standing and glaring at me. It was as if he were blaming my denial of being an Ainu. After this dream, I decided to live as an Ainu thoroughly.

自分はアイヌの先住権にかかわるようになったけど、なかなかうまく行かなかった。兄が亡くなってからは、何もかも関わりを持つのが嫌になり、そして、アイヌのことも捕鯨のこともあきらめようと一大決心をした。その夜、夢で兄が、俺のことをじっと睨んでいる姿をみた。まるで、俺がアイヌを辞めようとしていることを責めているみたいだった。この夢のあと、俺は、アイヌに徹して生きようと決めた。（MSN, 2010b).

This dream catalysed Hatakeyama to proclaim publicly that he was an Ainu person and wanted to live as the Ainu people. He began committing to the position of *ekashi* (Ainu elder) of the Mombetsu Ainu, and president of the AAH Mombetsu Chapter (AAH-MC). After this dream, he began to link social, economic and environmental problems in Mombetsu with his Ainu rights claim in Japan.

Hatakeyama’s main objective was ‘substantive rights’ (MSN, 2010b) recovery based on a holistic understanding of Ainu culture. His word, ‘substantive’ includes four meanings. Firstly, ‘rights’ have to be sought in a real-life context (in this case, his livelihood of fishing), not only as words in legal documents. Secondly, efforts to recover Ainu rights have to link with economic sufficiency.
Thirdly, rights recovery should be based on Ainu values, not Japanese values. Lastly, rights recovery should challenge the social transformation of Japan. That is, from the current context of nature’s depletion, to a context where people share the view that humans are part of nature, consistent with Ainu values of human-nature relationships.

Hatakeyama’s claim on substantive rights was founded in his criticism against the Japanese government’s policies for Ainu people. He argued that Ainu policies depict Ainu culture narrowly as only encompassing music, art, dance and craft (The House of Representatives Japan, 1997). He said:

I am a fisherman; I cannot dance or do embroidery. These policies for Ainu cultural promotion are determined by the Japanese, not the Ainu people. I want to live as an Ainu fisherman.

俺は漁師だ。踊ったり刺繍なんか出来ない。アイヌの文化振興政策は、和人が決めていているのであって、アイヌが決めているものではない。アイヌの漁師として生きさせてくれ。(S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, February 19, 2013).

Hatakeyama was also frustrated about the indigenous Ainu policies based on the CPA (see Chapter 4.2). These were represented by craft making and art activities that he believes are only part of the whole practice of living. Hatakeyama searched for the ‘substantive’ indigenous rights based on his life experience as a fisherman. He particularly focused on two areas of fishing rights, including salmon and whale.

**Indigenous salmon fishing rights**

In regards to the salmon fishing rights, Hatakeyama revived the *kamuy chep nomi* in Mobetsu River in 2001. This is the indigenous ceremony (*nomi*) to welcome the
return of their god (*kamuy*) fish (*chep*) (salmon) to the original river in autumn. The Ainu people traditionally believed in salmon as one of their gods, as well as valuing it as their staple food. The assimilation policy banned Ainu people from hosting *Kamuy chep nomi*, and the development policy prohibited all Japanese residents, including the Ainu, from fishing for salmon in the rivers, to protect the commercial fishing industry.  

Reviving the *kamuy chep nomi* was only an entry point of the indigenous substantive rights that Hatakeyama wanted to recover. This included the right to access the local natural resources for the Ainu people’s livelihood, in particular, salmon and whale, in which the Japanese government had significant economic and political interests. Hence, Hatakeyama lobbied the Japanese government, including the Fisheries Agency of Japan, Hokkaido Prefectural Government (HPG) and Mombetsu City Government (MCG), negotiating the indigenous fishing rights on these resources for twenty years.

**Indigenous whaling rights**

The indigenous whaling rights claim was far more difficult and complex than salmon fishing because of stronger political pressures around whaling inside/outside Japan. Hatakeyama wanted to claim the indigenous whaling rights in regards to minke whale, which would allow the Ainu people to hunt a certain number of whales and sell their products for the commercial purpose of creating economic and employment opportunities for the Ainu people. There were two frameworks that were related to the Hatakeyama’s indigenous whaling rights.

---

28 Catching salmon in the river is strictly regulated under the Inland Waters Fishing Field Management Regulations, as part of the Fishing Law in 1949 (The Government of Japan, 1949).
claim. One was the Aboriginal Substance Whaling framework under the International Whaling Commission (IWC). This allows indigenous groups to hunt a certain number of whales but not for commercial purposes. The other framework was to hunt whales through coastal community-based whaling, which would enable him to engage in whale hunting outside of the IWC (MSN, 2011f). In both ways, Hatakeyama had to compromise his rights claim.

The Aboriginal Substance Whaling framework needs to be made by the national government where indigenous people live. Hatakeyama had already negotiated the possibility of an application for the Aboriginal Substance Whaling framework with the Fisheries Agency of Japan in the previous twenty years. He was already aware, however, of the Japanese government’s disinterest in supporting his application.

The government explained to Hatakeyama that the application would require an enormous amount of preparatory work, and it would be hard to obtain at least 3 out of 4 votes at the IWC AGM without a clear rationale (Terachi, 2011). The government responses sounded like an ‘excuse’ to Hatakeyama, as he had observed that IWC had previously permitted whaling rights to the indigenous people (MSN, 2011f).

The government, instead, suggested Hatakeyama go to the second option, Coastal Community-based Whaling. Hatakeyama said, “Joining the small-scale whaling is like digging my hands into the other’s rice storage and stealing their rice.” [沿岸捕鯨やろっていうのは、他人の米びつに手突っ込んで盗むみたいなもんだ] (MSN, 2010b). He was not interested in this suggestion, not only because he had to catch whales
he did not want, but also because it sounded as though he would be mixed in with Wajin whalers.

Hatakeyama resented the government’s stealthy approach to commercial whaling under the name of scientific research. He knew about this through a family member, who had worked on Nisshin Maru, a vessel for scientific whaling. He knew this had been a source of huge profit for the Japanese government. The government outlawed the sale of whale meat under the name of ‘scientific research’, while they claimed their ‘traditional’ rights, to preserve the Japanese food culture in the Antarctic Ocean.

The government established a public corporation under the Fishery Agency, which gave the posts to retired governmental officials. All the profit from the trade also flowed to these ‘public’ corporations. While monopolising the whaling rights of minke whales, the government strictly regulated whaling by coastal fishermen, who hunted whales traditionally. The government limited their whaling rights to non-IWC regulated whales, such as beaked whales and fin whales.

---

29 The Japanese government began their ‘scientific research’ on whaling in the Antarctic Ocean, because of the International Whaling Committee’s (IWC) decision on the moratorium on commercial whaling (International Whaling Commission, n.d.).

30 Greenpeace Japan (2017a) contends that the whaling in the Antarctic Ocean as the Japanese tradition is not Japanese tradition, so that they have shown the opposition against the Japanese government’s claim on the whaling rights in this area. According to Greenpeace Japan, the whaling in the Antarctic Ocean began for the purpose of whale oil in 1930s by importing the whaling technic from Norway. In the post-WWII time, they resumed the whaling in this area to resolve the malnutrition in Japan, by the instruction of General Douglas MacArthur under the US Occupation.

31 There are three corporations under the Fishery Agency, which are involved in ‘scientific research’. Institute of Cetacean Research conducts the research (Institute of Cetacean Research, 2017). Kyodo Senpaku Co. Ltd. operates the vessel and deals with the ‘sub-product’ whale meat from the research (Kyodo Senpaku Co., n.d.). Japan Whaling Association does the public relations for scientific research and whaling (Japan Whaling Association, 2017). About 250 ex-officials of the Fishery Agency are employed by these corporations (MSN, 2012). Terachi argued in a MSN meeting that the government claims that whaling is the part of Japanese culture, in order to maintain the political and economic interests of the government, business and public corporations (MSN, 2012).
whales. As Hatakeyama complained these whales were not traditionally consumed by either Wajin or Ainu people.

These are not what humans eat. Their oil is indigestible and causes diarrhoea. Ainu did not eat them.

あれは、人間の食べるものじゃない。あの脂が消化されなくて、食べるとおなかを下してしまう。アイヌは、もともとあの鯨を食べちゃいない。(S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

Hatakeyama argued, “the challenge is the Fisheries Agency of Japan, not the IWC” [問題は水産庁であって、IWC じゃない] (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, February 19, 2013). In fact, the government has hunted large numbers of IWC protected whales in the Antarctic Ocean under the research guise of conserving ‘Japanese tradition’. In reality, however, the whale meat has been also sold for commercial purposes. 32 The government established a system, whereby a particular group of people in government-affiliated organisations enjoyed all the market profit.

Lonely resistance

In any case of fishing rights, either salmon or whale, the process to recover what Hatakeyama defined as the indigenous rights, was not easy at all. Over 150 years’ history of assimilation, and 50 years of denying his Ainu identity, made it difficult

---

32 The Japanese arm of Greenpeace criticised whaling in the Antarctic Ocean, saying it was not a Japanese tradition at all. Whaling in the Antarctic Ocean began following instruction by the General Headquarters of General MacArthur in the post-WWII period for the solution of the food shortage. It is different from traditional Japanese whaling that occurs within the coastal villages (Greenpeace Japan, 2017a, translated by the researcher). Despite this, the Japanese Government claims traditional rights on whaling in the Antarctic Ocean and hunts approximately 850 Minke whales per year. According to the Fisheries Agency, whale meat that remains after the scientific research is complete, is sold commercially. This is based on the “rules of IWC, under which Japan has to utilise the hunted whales as much as possible” (The Fisheries Agencies of Japan, n.d.).
for Hatakeyama to know what it really meant to be an Ainu, and what the Ainu substantive rights should really look like. He had little support when he first began his activism, and he did not know whom to ask.

Hatakeyama developed his rights claim by visiting other Ainu elders’ and experts who knew the local history, knowledge and practices (Washizu, 2001). Physical evidence, or ‘written’ documents, that could prove the history of Ainu whaling practice were extremely difficult to locate. Few studies had been conducted to show the relationship between whales and the Ainu culture. This was further complicated by the fact that such studies were based on the systemic analyses of places in Hokkaido and Ainu’s folk stories, many of which were lost in the assimilation process. All the information that he collected was fragmented, missing or even manipulated by the Japanese people. He knew that he had to fight against the Japanese systems for his goal to be achieved, but he did not know what to target or how to do it. The rights claim to salmon fishing and whaling was particularly difficult, as these were connected to the economic and political interests of the Japanese government in a very complex way. Hatakeyama was re-weaving the lost Ainu memories with his life experience as a fisherman in the modern Japanese context.

His approach consisted of trial and error for twenty years. He tried every method that seemed an effective way to change the policy. He learnt from fishermen and contractors and copied their way of getting close to the politicians. He approached potential politicians and paid to lobby them. Hatakeyama laughed, “I do not know how much money I wasted in 20 years.” [20年間で、どんだけお金を使ったか分からない。] (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 22-24, 2015). He
looked for anyone who could support him, including fishermen friends and various researchers. Whenever he found a relationship with supporters that were inconsistent or unsuccessful, he turned away from them. Many came and left him over the twenty years.

4.3.4 Development plan for the industrial waste management facility

In 2005, a critical event pushed Hatakeyama’s activism into the limelight. The Mombetsu City Government (MCG) decided to stop accepting industrial waste at the public waste landfill site as they estimated the site would be full within a few years. This decision created economic problems for the food manufacturers’ association and the farmers, including animal husbandry and dairy husbandry unions, who now had to take their waste to an industrial waste management plant outside the city and pay a disposal fee. These groups put pressure on the MCG to build an industrial waste management plant in Mombetsu City. MCG responded to this request and proposed the construction of a 41-hectare industrial waste plant on a mountain in the Toyooka District, citing that this would also help revitalize economic activity. The chosen site was also the source of Mobetsu River, where Hatakeyama had been hosting kamuy chep nomi. Hatakeyama expressed his concern about the planned construction. He saw the potential environmental damage to the river, the forest and the marine ecosystems as an extension of over 100 years of colonisation. Once again, this “could erode the Ainu’s life foundation and their potential access rights to the natural resources” (MSN, 2011b).
In this process, Washizu influenced Hatakeyama to change his approach to the indigenous rights claim by introducing international, indigenous legal frameworks. Washizu told Hatakeyama about the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) (United Nations, 2007), and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (United Nations, 1992b), which could justify his indigenous rights claim. At the public hearings held under environmental impact assessment regulations, Hatakeyama asserted the necessity of receiving prior consensus from the local indigenous community for such developments, drawing on international indigenous rights protection laws.

The Hokkaido Government granted permission to MCG for the plant’s construction in 2007. Despite what Hatakeyama argued at the public hearings, the proposed plan seemed irreversible. The public hearings provided the residents only a “token participatory” (Arnstein, 1969, p. 217) opportunity, which enabled those with the power, the government and the developer in Mombetsu, to maintain the original construction plan, making the participants powerless. The participants were able to say what they were concerned about and gained the necessary information. In reality, however, they had no rights to change the plan. The plan was pre-determined before the public meetings, prioritising the interests, mostly economic interests, of the majority. This tokenism was observed at the public hearing in February 2010. The developer justified the plant in terms of local

---

33 The Article 29 of the UNDRIP ensures the following three points: (i) their right to the conservation and protection of the environment and the productive capacity of their lands or territories and resources; (ii) no storage or disposal of hazardous materials shall take place in the lands or territories of indigenous people without their free, prior and informed consent; and, (iii) programmes for monitoring, maintaining and restoring the health of indigenous people, as developed and implemented by the people affected by such materials, are duly implemented (United Nations, 2007)
economic benefits, and claimed that strict environmental safeguards would be in place.

Hatakeyama’s lobbying of the local and provincial governments continued to be unsuccessful. While the City of Mombetsu, the Fishermen’s and Dairy Husbandry Unions welcomed this and signed a pollution prevention agreement with the developer, only a few groups of local residents and Hatakeyama’s AAH Mombetsu Chapter maintained their opposition. Hatakeyama lost much of his support within the AAH, as the Mombetsu fishermen union, to which Hatakeyama and other AAH members belonged to as part of their fishing businesses, also supported the proposal. Hatakeyama became increasingly isolated in Mombetsu.

4.4 Summary of Chapter 4

Colonial perspectives clearly showed that the Ainu issues were the hidden central factor in achieving sustainable development in Hokkaido. Ongoing assimilation of the Ainu people has been creating an unfair and unjust situation to them throughout their lives in Hokkaido. Despite the official indigenous rights recovery movement since the 1930s, and the 2008 official indigenous recognition, the policies for the ‘indigenous rights protection’ still have a significant way to go. The Wajin stakeholders dominated the indigenous rights recovery efforts in Japan, who were further classified into Group A and Group B. These two groups argue

34 Hatakeyama submitted the letter of protests to Mombetsu City Governor, Mombetsu Industrial Pollution Examination Council, and Hokkaido Prefectural Governor in May, August 2009 (SFSY, 2012) and March 2010 (Hatakeyama, 2010).
35 Pollution prevention agreement is one of the means taken under the environmental policy in Japan. It aims to prevent environmental pollution by the development actions, but also aims to ensure consensus between the developer and the local stakeholders (Teraura, 2013).
within themselves, while excluding the proactive participation or the leadership of Ainu people in their own rights recovery claim.

The central focus of socially-critical ESD in Hokkaido should involve an unlearning for both Ainu and Wajin people about the history of Hokkaido from the colonial perspectives, and the consientisation of the Ainu people about their indigenous roots, their unreasonable situation, and their potential rights. This focus of ESD was obtained from the discussion of this chapter about the ongoing assimilation that has created a complex situation of the Ainu rights recovery movement in Japan. The Ainu people have been so depoliticised that they do not wish to proactively commit to improving their situation or do not even realise what they could have as their indigenous rights.

In this very situation, Satoshi Hatakeyama, a Mombetsu-based Ainu elder, was distinctive in the current Ainu rights recovery movement in Japan, and the indigenous rights claim contained the critical elements for Hokkaido ESD. Hatakeyama began this activism by himself in the 1980s, when he publicly identified with his indigenous identity. His rights claim required him to learn about the history of local Ainu people, their potential rights protection, and the best approach to claim it, in particular, the fishing rights of salmon and whale. The government construction plan of the industrial waste management plant, in particular, made his indigenous rights claim more difficult. Hatakeyama became more isolated, the more he claimed the indigenous rights for a small Mombetsu community.
The next chapter portrays how ESD by the MSN developed his solo indigenous rights claim into the collective actions and learning for social change, as well as analyses of its effectiveness and challenges.
CHAPTER 5. Socially-critical approach to ESD for MSN: Light and shadow

Colonisation of Hokkaido resulted in a double-faceted outcome depicted by light and shadow. ‘Light’ means that colonisation modernised the nation through rapid economic growth, which brought prosperity to the majority of Wajin Japanese people and the nation. ‘Shadow’ means that this prosperity was achieved through loss of the land, resources and society of the Ainu people. Ongoing assimilation and suffering of the Ainu people still exists unrecognised in the everyday life of Hokkaido, while most of the Wajin believe nothing ever happened.

The indigenous rights recovery of the Ainu people, and their empowerment, are the ‘hidden’ central issues in the search for sustainable development in Hokkaido. These require the consientisation and emancipation of both the Ainu and Wajin Japanese people through unlearning and new learning. Due to the unfathomable degree of assimilation, however, the Ainu people are too disempowered to question their situation and assert their rights for self-determination in regards to identity, culture, and needs. This search for a path to sustainable development requires more work to look back at the past, as well as to look forward into the future. It should begin with determining if it is necessary for Ainu people to know who they really are, reveal their concealed history, and discuss the future that both Wajin and Ainu people want to achieve.

Following this interplay between ‘light’ and ‘shadow’ of the continued colonisation of Hokkaido, the activities of the MSN became apparent. Contributing to the MSN movement required a learning process that was referred
to as ESD. This was guided by the discussions in Chapter 2 that defined ESD as a transformative, empowering, holistic and quality education needed to achieve sustainable development, largely drawing on critical EE.

This story of implementing an ESD process is documented in the 1st part of this chapter, which illustrates the process of how the socially-critical ESD was infused into the MSN activities from 2010 to 2013. Therein, the next step as community educators was to meet Hatakeyama, get to know his struggles for his indigenous rights recovery, and commit to developing his efforts into collective and collaborative social actions, and learning through taking a socially-critical ESD approach. The second part of this chapter highlights the successes and the challenges that MSN faced in terms of the empowerment of the local community members, particularly the marginalised Ainu people, and attempts to understand the gap within the understanding of critical EE (theory) and critical theory (methodology).

This chapter draws from a range of data sources, including document analyses, individual interviews, focus group discussions and participant observation of key members of MSN in Mombetsu, Sapporo and Tokyo in 2012 and 2013. These techniques are used not only to describe the organisational processes of MSN, but also to identify the successes and challenges of MSN, and to find any gaps between what was highlighted during the interviews and what was observed as a participant of MSN.
5.1 A turning point

A significant turning point came in Hatakeyama’s twenty-year-long, lonely, individual struggle, when his activism encountered ‘ESD’, as introduced by Koizumi. Koizumi met Hatakeyama through events for the G8 Summit he organised for his organisation, SFSY, in 2008. He developed a strong interest in Hatakeyama’s indigenous rights claims, through which he gained important insights of critical elements of Hokkaido ESD.

Koizumi’s strong interest in developing ESD based on Hatakeyama’s indigenous claim was shown in his email from 2009.

Until now, there are efforts for environmental education and environmental conservation in Hokkaido, which makes use of Ainu’s nature views and their spirit. But I think these are not enough. The perspectives on recovering the social and economic rights of the Ainu people are necessary for such efforts. (Isn’t it ESD?) I am really interested in Hatakeyama’s efforts because I can see the elements that could link to the recovery of social and economic rights of the Ainu people.

Yet, it is also true that this type of rights claim is often taken as ‘(ethnic) egoism’ generally. I think that it would be better if we could express such rights claim and could positively work on conserving the local natural environment and establishing a self-sufficient economy. We also need the widespread sharing of this strategy within the public arena.

36 In these workshops, both Ainu and non-Ainu participants identified the key Ainu issues and explored a possible path to develop Hokkaido, in which Ainu and non-Ainu people could live together. The workshops resulted in forming a pressure group of Ainu and non-Ainu citizens, called Chi Kara Nisatt, to influence the Advisory Committee on Ainu Policy and Hokkaido Toyako G8 Summit in 2008. Chi Kara Nisatta (discussions for tomorrow in Ainu language) conducted a rally walk called, Pirika Kéutom Apkashi (Walk with Heart). Ainu and non-Ainu youth walked 400km from Wakkanai to Ebetsu, in commemoration of Ainu who had been displaced from Sakhalin to this area in the territorial dispute between Japan and Russia in the 1980s (Koizumi, 2010).
Indigenous Ainu issues tend to be well understood by outsiders rather than locals, outside Hokkaido rather than inner Hokkaido, and overseas rather than inner country. The locally based approach is, in a sense, the most difficult but most important approach. If we could make such process, it would be a great success to the Ainu people, the majority Wajin Japanese and ESD.

As Koizumi argued, the Ainu’s knowledge tends to be ‘particularised’ (Agrawal, 2002, p. 290) as an ‘educational’ resource based on the environmental educator’s needs in mostly the formal and non-formal education settings. As argued in

37 For example, Sapporo City council developed the education modules for Ainu education for the schools in Sapporo City. Schools in Sapporo City shows the case practices of the primary and junior high schools in Sapporo which have conducted Ainu lessons about traditional salmon fishing, the traditional life practices around salmon and the Ainu’s spiritual connection with salmon (Sapporo City Council, 2017). Ureshipa Club of Sapporo University, which develops Ainu youth to be Ainu educators, has also provided the visiting lectures by Ainu youths on the Ainu culture, such as traditional dance and songs at schools in Sapporo (Sapporo University, 2017).
Chapter 4, the current EE and ESD activities in Hokkaido do not go beyond the narrow cultural understanding, such as dance, songs, music and the demonstration of traditional fishing technique. These could benefit the general public, particularly, the majority Wajin Japanese, who might enhance their understanding of the Ainu culture. These could not touch colonial history, however, and could not improve the social and economic situation of the Ainu people, who could not fit within this narrow cultural understanding.

Koizumi organised the ESD workshop in Sapporo in 2008 to discuss the future of Hokkaido and invited Hatakeyama as a guest speaker. Hatakeyama’s life story and his rights claim motivated the workshop participants to obtain a contextual understanding of Hatakeyama’s rights claim. They planned a study tour to Mombetsu in 2009, which became the first meeting with Hatakeyama and his indigenous rights claim. Henceforth, his rights claim was examined from a socially-critical ESD perspective.

5.1.1 Problem identification within the Mombetsu community

Based on the 2009 study tour experiences, a search began for key strategies for implementing ESD in Mombetsu, and the role of educators. The study tour included visits to six local learning organisations, which were based on themes such as local history, environmental conservation and Ainu culture. From the study tour, two problems were identified with current local learning activities in relation to Hatakeyama’s indigenous rights claim. Firstly, the learning activities overlooked the Ainu people following modernisation (or colonisation). Secondly,
these tended to objectify the natural environment, by separating nature and humans, and seeing nature only as an entity to be protected or to be utilised. Underlying the two problems of local learning activities was the dominant modern, Western, and scientific educational views, which seek “scientific and technological solutions to the environmental problems without addressing the root social, political and economic causes” (Tilbury & Fien, 2002, p. 9). Such a view did not facilitate participants reflecting on current lifestyles in Hokkaido, or eliminate the fact that modernisation was achieved through colonisation of the Ainu land and people.

This modern, western, and scientific educational view created two types of gaps in Mombetsu, which could have obstructed Hatakeyama’s indigenous rights claim within the Mombetsu community. The first gap was between the Ainu and Wajin people, as well as within the Ainu people. Previously, the local Ainu and Wajin Japanese never had a chance to discuss or work together on local indigenous issues. In addition, the local Ainu people were not united in their rights claim. Few Ainu people like Hatakeyama were active. Some Ainu people did not wish to publicly identify themselves as Ainu people, especially, the older generations. They were afraid of recalling their experiences of discrimination and abuse. Furthermore, younger generations were not even aware of their Ainu blood because they were not told about it by their families.

Interest in the proposed industrial waste management plant development in Mombetsu complicated the situation. The local community and local Ainu community were divided into those in favour, and those against, the development plan. Through the study tour, it was observed that there was hesitation from local
Wajin and Ainu members in supporting Hatakeyama’s indigenous rights claim and AAH. They supported Hatakeyama’s claim in their minds, but they did not want to support him publicly because their organisations, such as the Fishermen’s Union, Farmers’ Union and Mombetsu City Council, had already made an agreement with the developer.

The second gap which could have obstructed Hatakeyama’s indigenous rights claim was the knowledge gap. Local learning activities understood local history and issues predominantly from the Wajin Japanese perspective. At the same time, the dominant Wajin Japanese influence dismissed Ainu knowledge and history. This occurred for two reasons.

Firstly, long lasting assimilation policies, particularly formal education, played a key role, as discussed in section 4.1. The situation remained unchanged until now, even after the 2008 official indigenous recognition. Ainu education is not compulsory and it really depends on the teachers’ interests and efforts (Shinada, 2010). Even though teachers are interested in it, it is still difficult to find space for it in an already busy curriculum, and to identify how to teach it effectively. As a teacher in Mombetsu describes, years three and four might be the only space for teachers to integrate Ainu study, however, students at that age are too young to comprehend sensitive colonisation issues and the indigenous rights recovery (MSN, 2010c). Needless to say, teachers outside Hokkaido find little relevance in teaching Ainu issues, which are not considered local issues.

Lack of teaching materials and guidelines also makes it difficult for Mombetsu teachers to conduct Ainu education. A statement about Ainu people in the primary and high school textbooks are “fragmented, inappropriate and limited” (Shinada,
Teachers also find that existing supplementary textbooks are also not enough.39

Secondly, the nature of the modern, Western knowledge dismissed the Ainu people’s knowledge, which was orally transmitted through tales, legends, experiences, and morals for everyday life from generation to generation (Ainu Museum, 2017). Lack of written records makes difficult for anyone to access Ainu knowledge. Assimilation policies of the past and present discouraged Ainu people from keeping their language40, or passing their culture on to future generations. Reflecting this, Hatakeyama recalled a critical memory from his childhood:

In Japan, if the Wajin were to find out that the Ainu were speaking in Ainu, they would have strictly punished them for it. So, my grandmother and her friends totally stopped speaking in Ainu whenever they saw me near. Because of such things, Ainu people cannot understand Ainu language after my generation.

39 In April 2016, the Ministry of Education made a modification on the statement in the junior secondary school text book regarding the ex-Aboriginal policy on the Ainu people in 1899. The original draft stated, “the government enacted the ex-Aboriginal policy in 1899 and took the lands of Ainu, who mostly engaged in hunting and gathering and forced them to engage in agriculture.” The government changed this statement to “the government... gave the land to the Ainu people and tried to change their life into the Agriculture-based life”. This modification has been criticised by the media and the AAH, who see it as “distortion of the history” (Kadota, 2015).

38 In April 2016, the Ministry of Education made a modification on the statement in the junior secondary school text book regarding the ex-Aboriginal policy on the Ainu people in 1899. The original draft stated, “the government enacted the ex-Aboriginal policy in 1899 and took the lands of Ainu, who mostly engaged in hunting and gathering and forced them to engage in agriculture.” The government changed this statement to “the government... gave the land to the Ainu people and tried to change their life into the Agriculture-based life”. This modification has been criticised by the media and the AAH, who see it as “distortion of the history” (Kadota, 2015).

39 The supplementary text books on the Ainu people, which were published with the aim of compliment with what was missing in the curriculum, was first published in the 1984 (Shinada, 2010, p. 68). The side readings for the Ainu education have been published by the four organisations, including Hokkaido Education Board, Sapporo City Education Board, Hokkaido Teachers’ Union and Foundation for the Research and Promotion of Ainu Culture. UNESCO categorises Ainu language as ‘critically endangered’ (UNESCO, 2009a).
Even if the Ainu people had some local knowledge, they also became unsure about it in relation to the evidence-based, modern, Western knowledge. This was assumed from Hatakeyama’s words, as he often said that there were no (written) records to prove the local historical sites in Mombetsu (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 13, 2013). All these factors resulted in erasing the existence of the Ainu people, and their knowledge, when juxtaposed against the modern Wajin and their knowledge.

5.1.2 Key ESD strategies for Mombetsu

Based on these possible ‘people’ and ‘knowledge’ gaps in Hatakeyama’s indigenous rights claim, two strategies were engaged for ESD in Mombetsu during this initial phase. This included ‘multi-stakeholder’ and ‘participatory’ approaches. These were the key approaches that characterised critical EE (see 2.1.2). It was assumed these could help open up Hatakeyama’s rights claim to a broader stakeholder audience in/outside of the local community. This could reveal the complex connections of local Ainu issues to diverse fields, raise their ‘tojisha ishiki (当事者意識)’ and, hopefully expand Hatakeyama’s solo activism into dynamic and collective social actions.

---

41 There is no appropriate English word to translate ‘tojisha-ishi (当事者意識)’. This word is often used to describe the degree of commitment of a person to a social and economic issue from which he/she is not directly affected. The online-based Digital-Daijisen Japanese dictionary (Shogakukan Digital-Daijisen, 2017) explains: “An understanding that he/she directly related to a particular issue. An awareness to be a part of connected party.” This world could be translated in English as: a person who sees the other’s problem as if his/her problem and feels ‘responsible’ and ‘committed’ to the solution. There is no single word to describe it in English. Thus I used the original Japanese word in this thesis.
Initial works, from February till June 2010, involved workshops and meetings in Mombetsu, Sapporo and Tokyo with Ainu and Non-Ainu individuals. This brought together organisational resources from SFSY and ESD-J. The multi-stakeholders had expertise in diverse fields, including human rights, local primary industries, Ainu issues, environmental issues both inside and outside Mombetsu. Many of them had never met or previously worked together.

At all the workshops and meetings, Hatakeyama shared his life experiences and concerns on indigenous rights, particularly in relation to the Ainu culture and its practices around salmon and whale. A facilitated discussion of the participants was also carried out. These discussions highlighted the complex link between Hatakeyama’s concerns with issues from diverse fields, and the limitations of current Japanese and international legal frameworks. These were limited by their ability to respond to his claims and concerns in a holistic manner (MSN, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c).

Discussions held over a six month period crystallised the ‘Mopet Sanctuary Concept’ (Figure 5-1, see next page), and established the MSN to bring collective actions and learnings to realise this concept. This concept aimed to achieve sustainable community development based on Hatakeyama’s rights claim.

Three principles constituted the Mopet Sanctuary Concept. The first principle was to understand Hatakeyama’s claim from a local and historical perspective. His life story showed that his individual experiences were deeply rooted in the history of colonisation. The trauma and emotional scars, which he, his family and people experienced in the past, continued to the present, creating the ongoing economic and social problems of the Ainu people. The second principle was to understand
Hatakeyama’s claim from the bio-regional perspective. Hatakeyama pointed out the impact of farming, and industrial activities, on the marine ecosystem. As Hatakeyama observed, the sea, forests, and rivers were a unified concept, and the traditional Ainu people’s lives, values and knowledge were interwoven in *Iwor*, a sphere where the Ainu lived and conducted their traditional hunting and gathering. His story indicated the necessity of the bio-regional approach in the solution of the marine environmental problems.

**Figure 5-1: Ainu participant explaining the Mopet Sanctuary Concept**

The third principle was to understand Hatakeyama’s claim from a practical, everyday life perspective. One participant said:

> Now we have UNDRIP, and the government recognised Ainu as indigenous people. However, these are nothing more than abstract. The Ainu rights recovery
movement won’t proceed without the movement for claiming the right in the real-life context. Thus, Hatakeyama’s indigenous fishing rights claim is meaningful. More people will resonate with him if we keep passing his claim to the public rightly. We have to deliver his claim to those who are around us in a compelling manner.

While understanding the importance of substantive indigenous rights recovery stemming from an everyday life context, participants were concerned that any legal framework for indigenous rights recovery was too great a stretch to affect indigenous rights substantively. They found that the international legal framework such as UNDRIP and CBD could give more relevant guidance to Hatakeyama’s claims than the current Japanese legal framework. They found, however, that these were still too abstract to make sense of in a real-life context.

Finally, participants agreed to establish MSN. This became the space for members to share information related to Hatakeyama’s rights claim with each other, the wider community as well as connect stakeholders in/outside of the local community with Mopet Sanctuary Concept. During the establishment of MSN, the government’s construction plan of the final industrial waste management facility became imminent in Mombetsu. Hence, MSN began the activities that were mostly responsible for challenging this local development.
5.1.3 Meaning of ESD and the role of educators

As shown in Figure 5-2. Responding to the social actions made by MSN members, diverse learning activities were organised by 2012. These learning activities were organised in multiple forms, including workshops, seminars, informal meetings and participatory citizenship research activities in/outside of Mombetsu.

It was proposed that all activities should strengthen the linkage between the MSN movement and local schools, as well as with national and global issues on sustainable development. MSN learning activities also included the periodic local environmental and historical studies. The data collected through these studies provided the source of information that supported Hatakeyama’s claim at the arbitration process through the Hokkaido Environment Dispute Coordination Commission (HEDCC) (see 7.1). Alongside these events, closed informal meetings were carried out with key members of MSN. The informal meetings

---

42 MSN organised learning activities to link the MSN’s Ainu rights movement to schools in Mombetsu, and to the global efforts for sustainable development outside Mombetsu. For the school-community linkage, teachers who participated in the MSN workshop organised special classes with Hatakeyama and Washizu for year six and year eight students at their schools in Mombetsu in 2010 and 2011. In the classes, Hatakeyama shared his life story, and Washizu taught the colonisation history of Hokkaido and the on-going Ainu issues. The teacher who invited Hatakeyama and Washizu said that the year three students were still too young to comprehend the complexity of the Ainu issues and the depth of the problems that they have faced historically. He considered that the ages over year 5-6 seemed appropriate for Ainu study. He also found, however, that it is not easy to conduct Ainu study for these years, as the current primary and secondary school curriculum guidelines do not support these Ainu studies.

43 These included sustainable fishing and Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster debris after the Great East Japan Earthquake in 2011.

44 A group of MSN has checked the water quality at six fixed points at Mombetsu River every four months since 2010. Interviews of the local community stakeholders of Mombetsu Museum and Okhotsk Sea Ice Museum were conducted. The literature on the local Ainu history was reviewed to confirm the ancestral roots of Hatakeyama, who is a descendent of a Mombets Ainu elder, Kikenimpa, in the oldest record of Mombetsu (Hokkaido Prefectural Library, 1731).
became the space for participants to share confronting issues, such as strategies for the arbitration process, and to discuss possible actions to be taken.

**Formula for socially-critical ESD in a community development context**

Through these activities, a clearer understanding was obtained about socially-critical ESD in a community development context and the role of educators. It was understood that the socially-critical ESD process could be created through coordinating timely and effective learning opportunities that should respond to the social and political actions of a local community. This understanding is described using the formula as ESD=Social actions X Learning Activities (Figure 5-2, see next page).
Social Actions

- Hatakeyama submitted the policy request to Hokkaido governor (twice in 2008-2009)
- MSN submitted the statement on the proposed development plan of the industrial waste management plant to UN Human Rights Council (2010)
- MSN submitted to Hokkaido prefecture and Mombetsu city government with the signatures of 56 overseas (Twice in 2010)
- Hatakeyama filed the official complaints regarding final industrial waste facility construction plan with Hokkaido Environment Dispute Coordination Commission (HEDCC) and entered in the arbitration with the developer (2011-2012)
- Hatakeyama passed the policy proposal submitted to Fisheries Agency of Japan for rights recovery of Ainu indigenous whaling (Twice in 2011)

Learning Activities

- Hatakeyama participated in ESD key players’ meeting in Hokkaido, organised by SFSY (2008, Sapporo City)
- ESD-J and SFSY co-organised Okhotsk Mombetsu ESD Tour – Okhotsk forest, sea, history of Ainu, and Now (2009, Mombetsu City)
- ESD-J and SFSY co-organised the workshop in Mombetsu: “Towards sustainable Mombetsu – what Ainu rights recovery movement tells to modern society” (2010, Mombetsu City) => MSN established
- ESD-J organised the seminar on Hatakeyama’s indigenous rights claim (2010, Tokyo)
- MSN organised the seminar at Earth Day event (2010, Mombetsu)
- Hatakeyama gave lectures at Ainu seminar (2010, Kobe City)
- MSN began regular water quality study and local indigenous historical study in Toyooka River => Found the wild salmon (2010, Mombetsu)
- ESD-J organised the side event at UN Conference on biodiversity inviting Hatakeyama as a resource person. Hatakeyama also participated in Indigenous and Local Community group discussions at UNCBD (2010, Nagoya)
- Hatakeyama gave lectures on Ainu rights and history at the local primary and middle schools (2010-2011, Mombetsu)
- MSN organised ESD seminar in Mombetsu: Learning about the locality and its future – History, culture, environment and Ainu people (2011, Mombetsu)
- MSN organised a seminar: Thoughts of an Ainu on sea, river and forest of Mombetsu (2011, Tokyo)
- ESD-J and SFSY organised ESD seminar: Listening to the sea and land – what questioned for us who survived post 3.11 (2011, Mombetsu)
It was assumed that the learning activities and social actions that the MSN had been conducting could synergistically interact and create a process of socially-critical ESD, as shown in Figure 5-2. This idea echoed with the ideas of a socially-critical approach to ESD that should extend beyond formal education by responding to the struggles of a local community (Fien, 1995; Tilbury & Fien, 2002).

Based on this ESD formula, an understanding of the two roles that educators should play in MSN’s ESD process was developed.

1. Create learning spaces for local community members to provide detailed, alternative and timely information on the important issues related to the policy advocacy issues and activities;
2. Facilitate participatory processes for the diverse stakeholders to meet, express themselves freely, and learn from one another.

Using this formula, it was postulated that ‘learning’ could be the key to create the bottom-up process in the MSN, and could prevent further isolation of Hatakeyama and the other Ainu people in Mombetsu. In asserting the indigenous rights against the developer, key members of the MSN appeared to favour the top down approach to policy change. They conducted public advocacy activities through lobbying, collecting petitions, and making statements through international organisations. Such a top-down approach, which was taken by key MSN members, seemed to naturally and commonly be taken by the rights-based activism in general. Ife (2016) describes, “The conventional approach to human rights has been through the law: legislation, bills or charters of rights, United Nations (UN) conventions and the use of legal mechanisms to work for human rights protection” (p. 79).
This tendency was noticeable in some MSN members who experienced social activism in the 1960s to 1970s in Japan. They opted for legislative change as the means to recover their indigenous rights. They believed these could effectively give external pressure to the authorities to change their attitude toward the marginalised groups (MSN, 2010b). With this understanding, some MSN members conducted a number of policy advocacies, such as a written statement to the UN Human Rights Council (2010); a proposal to Hokkaido Prefectural Government, Mombetsu City Council (2010) and the Fisheries Agency of Japan (2011); and the arbitration process through Hokkaido Environmental Dispute Coordination Commission (HEDCC) from 2011 to 2012. Thus, it was considered that a bottom-up process through learning activities in combination with the top-down social actions could empower the local community members effectively. This process of learning and action using both a bottom-up and top-down approach could prevent the isolation of the Ainu people in a local community.

45 Some members of the MSN had experienced opposition activism against the treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan, and the opposition movement against the Narita (Tokyo) International Airport Construction in 1960-70s. Others had commented on the Minamata Disease problems, and were concerned the science was used as a political and economic tool to support development in Japan, which caused Minamata Disease. Underlying their comments in MSN, they commonly had strong criticisms of the governmental structure and the modernisation process that resulted in a destructive pattern of development.

46 Participants with expertise in the indigenous rights protection and international human rights issues, organised a petition, which collected 56 signatures from the indigenous people’ organisations overseas in 2010. This petition supported these MSN’s policy advocacies, such as local and municipal governments, and the UN Human Rights Council in 2010 (UNGA, 2010).
5.2 Success and challenges of MSN’s ESD

Reflecting on the MSN experiences from the establishment till 2012, two key questions were investigated to understand informal ESD in the community development context:

1. How effective were the critical approaches to EE, EfS and ESD in community development?
2. What challenges remain regarding empowerment of the local community, particularly socially-marginalised Ainu members?

The unstructured interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with key MSN members in February and December, 2012. The next section reports the impact that key members of the MSN, and media reports, considered as ‘successes’.

5.2.1 Success stories

There were four successes identified mainly by respondents from MSN who participated in the focus group discussions conducted in 2012, and from the MSN documents from the establishment.

(i) Recognition of Ainu as the key stakeholder in community development

In 2012, as a representative of the AAH Mombetsu Chapter, Hatakeyama signed the Industrial Pollution Prevention Agreement with the developer, and the reconciliation process through HEDCC was terminated (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications, 2012). The media, the researchers and the lawyer who were involved in MSN regarded this outcome as the first ‘success’ case (Hokkaido Shimbun Press, 2012; The Asahi Shimbun, 2012; The Mainichi
Shimbun, 2012; The Yomiuri Shimbun, 2012), although MSN could not stop the construction plan. The agreement recognised the Ainu, as a key stakeholder in the development plan and industrial operation. It secured the rights to allow the Mombetsu Ainu people to inspect the operation at any time based on their free will, and to receive regular monitoring reports on the operation of the waste treatment facility.

(ii) More opportunities for sharing life stories of Hatakeyama

Through the MSN actions and learning activities of MSN, Hatakeyama had the chance to share his experiences at various occasions, including conferences and seminars at the global, national and local levels. COP10 in 2010 gave Hatakeyama the opportunity to learn more about global indigenous people’s rights, develop his own connections with the indigenous people of the world, as well as with the dogai Ainu (Ainu people outside Hokkaido), who worked on the same goal of indigenous rights recovery.

Washizu, Hatakeyama’s close friend in Mombetsu, observed that the opportunity to share his life experiences might have eased Hatakeyama’s burden that he had carried throughout his life. Washizu went to the primary and secondary schools with Hatakeyama to teach the history of local Ainu people and their issues. He described how he became energetic during his talk.

Satoshi-san talked happily about Ainu Kamui [God] to the schoolchildren. Moreover, he passionately talked about the Ainu culture and the Ainu fishing rights like a pure, innocent boy. Kids were so fascinated by his talk and just concentrated on it for two hours. His talk seemed to be a cleansing process for Hatakeyama, whose desire for money and loss of faith in humans had burdened him throughout life. This was like his [Hatakeyama’s] emancipation process.
敏さん、学校で、アイヌのカムイのことや、アイヌの文化のこととか、アイヌの漁業権のことなんかを、もう純粋な少年のように話した。子ども達も、敏さんの話にすっごくひきつけられて、2時間も集中して聞いていた。それは、人間の金への欲望や名誉の損失といった、敏さんが人生の中で背負ってきたような重荷を浄化するような感じだった。まさに、敏さんの解放のプロセスだった。
(M. Washizu, personal communication, December 25, 2015).

Hatakeyama admitted he had never had the chance to talk about himself before MSN. He even avoided talking about himself in public. It was proposed that sharing his life experience might help him gain back his confidence and self-esteem. During the initial phases of MSN, Hatakeyama often avoided expressing his thoughts and concerns in his own words, even during a closed meeting. Instead, he would ask someone else, often Washizu, to represent his thoughts and feelings. Whenever he was invited to make a speech, Hatakeyama insisted on going with Washizu. After a while, he eventually travelled by himself and spoke about his life story of his own words.

(iii) New information on the local community to fill the knowledge gap

Data collected from the environment and history survey on Mombetsu Ainu helped fill the knowledge gap, particularly in the arbitration process at HEDCC. The community’s public opinion was often based on the information provided, reflecting one-sided views of the developers and local government. Such information provided only a part of the whole picture that tended to be dominated by narrow economic arguments and a bio-physical environmental perspective. The local community members based their opinions on such information from the developers. The political and economic interests of the organisations and industries that the community members belonged to also strongly influenced their decision-making process.
Hatakeyama describes:

There were Ainu fishermen friends who said that they really agreed with me but their position at the fishermen’s union, which supported the construction, made it difficult for them to give me full support.

俺に賛同するアイヌの漁師連中もいるんだが、漁組の中での立場っちゅうのか、全面的に支援することは難しいって。 (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

The change in the attitude and words of the community members caused emotional frictions with those who did not support the proposed plan and information. Scientific and theory-based evidence helped MSN members avoid emotional arguments and justify the Ainu rights during the HEDCC process. Alternative data also helped the MSN attract the interest of a wider range of stakeholders, including the media and researchers.

(iv) Collective actions and learning for sustainable development

The meetings and workshops of the MSN motivated diverse participants inside/outside Mombetsu to commit to Hatakeyama’s rights claim. They developed their sense of ‘tajisha ishiki’ (see 5.1.2) to Hatakeyama’s claim and the indigenous issues in Hokkaido through the discussions.

An MSN member commented during a meeting in 2010:

This is a kind of the movement to re-think where we come from. MSN activism will benefit the wider range of non-Ainu people in/outside of Mombetsu.  
これは、ある種、自分の足元を考え直す運動だ。モベッの活動は、紋別内外のアイヌ以外の人たちにとっても有意義な活動。 (MSN, 2010a).

One MSN member felt the weight of Hatakeyama’s burden, as a descendant of Wajin colonisers who had taken Ainu Mosir and forced assimilation for their own
benefit. Some also saw the Ainu culture as the guiding values that Hokkaido society should emphasise in their search for the post-modern and post-colonial process. Others had shared their concerns about potential environmental damage caused by the local development.

The meetings and workshops produced more collective actions and learning activities by the MSN members through their networks and organisations. The social actions included the policy advocacies to the UN, national and local governments (as shown in Figure 5-2), and the learning activities in/outside MSN. This included seminars at Earth Day Mombetsu, and local teachers’ Ainu education, as well as local historical and environmental citizen’ research. The knowledge accumulated through the actions and learnings provided the data that MSN utilised to support Hatakeyama’s claims in the arbitration process at HEDCC.

5.2.2 Challenges

While the above success stories were identified during the focus group discussions with MSN members, the challenges were hardly shared. This was because any negative outcomes tended to be avoided in the group meetings in Japan in general. It could be assumed that the sensitivity of the issues the MSN was facing included Hatakeyama’s irrational behaviour, as discussed in this section. Hence, the challenges reported in this section were identified mainly from the individual interviews and observations.

There were two challenges in MSN’s ESD.
(i) **Ainu is not a homogenous group**

Firstly, MSN’s ESD efforts indicated that the local Ainu group was not homogenous. In fact, they were diverse, complex and at times contradicted each other within a group and in the relationship with the majority, Wajin Japanese people. The discussions on the proposed industrial management plant showed significant complexity within the Ainu group. The local Ainu people had diverse thoughts on the construction plan and Hatakeyama’s rights claim. While Hatakeyama personally heard members of Hatakeyama’s AAH Mombetsu Chapter support him, few did so publicly (MSN, 2010b).

Other than the Ainu individuals who were under the political and economic pressures from their organisations and industries in Mombetsu, some Ainu individuals did not want to get involved in any action related to the Ainu because of their fear of discrimination. They said:

> Wake not a sleeping baby! 47 Don’t mention the word of Ainu anymore. I just want to forget about it and live quietly.

寝た子を起こさないでほしい。アイヌ、アイヌって言わないでほしい。むしろ忘れて、静かに暮らさせてほしい。(MSN, 2010c)

They feared that Hatakeyama’s activism would remind them of past discrimination and pain. These were issues that they did not want to recall, and would rather forget.

One Ainu MSN member made the following comment that indicates the complex relationship within the Ainu group:

---

47 Japanese idiom. This has the same meaning as ‘wake not a sleeping lion’ in English.
The Ainu people never come together. They are always busy fighting. Wajin Japanese are more trustworthy than Ainu.

アイヌは、ばらばら。いつだってけんかばかり。和人のほうがアイヌより信頼できる。(F Noguchi, 2013).

Colonisation destroyed their community, including their social ties. Current local Ainu people do not have opportunities to unite themselves to share their thoughts and concerns.

Critical EE and critical theory recognise the marginalised people in a society. It identifies their struggles, and resistance to the power of the majority. In these theories, however, marginalised people tend to be treated as if they were a homogenous group against the majority. In these theories, the complex relationship within a marginalised group is rarely understood. Likewise in MSN, a socially-critical approach to the activities helped participants understand that there were struggles and resistances of the local Ainu people in relation to the Wajin people. This could not bring participants a clear understanding, however, on what to do with such diversity, complexity and contradiction within a marginalised people when both the marginalised and the majority had to work on the common goal of achieving local sustainable development.

(ii) Disempowerment of few Ainu

The second challenge was identified through observations at MSN meetings. The MSN efforts left some Ainu members feeling disempowered, including Hatakeyama. This was a contrasting or even contradicting finding, because the social actions and learning activities of MSN effectively empowered many key members, as presented in 5.2.1. These members were mostly Wajin, Japanese and
some Ainu member who were relatively from a younger generation than Hatakeyama.

The most symbolic incident of the disempowerment was Hatakeyama’s ‘irrational’ behaviour during and after the arbitration process through HEDCC from 2011 to 2012, as detailed in Chapter 7. Around that time, MSN members were split into two groups over the strategies for Hatakeyama’s claim at the HEDCC process. Hatakeyama’s words and attitudes were inconsistent between the two groups. While many MSN members celebrated the result of the arbitration, Hatakeyama seemed unsatisfied with the result and asserted his wish to conduct illegal whaling. It was observed that Hatakeyama became depressed, angry and irritated during and after the arbitration process. His behaviour upset the MSN members, who saw it as irrational (F Noguchi, 2013).

5.3 ‘Patchy empowerment’: Success or ‘unsuccess’?

The cross-analysis between successes and challenges of MSN’s ESD efforts highlighted different degrees of local empowerment. The MSN’s ESD efforts resulted in a mosaic; an uneven and unbalanced degree of community empowerment between the larger majority of Wajin, the younger generation of Ainu people, and people in Hatakeyama’s generation. Hence, different degrees of local community empowerment were referred to as ‘patchy empowerment’.

Patchy empowerment was contrary to the intention of ESD for MSN that aimed to achieve community development with “no-one’s exclusion” (Tsurumi, 1999, p. 344). Among the Ainu members observed as disempowered, Hatakeyama’s
disempowerment was so critical that it had the potential to eliminate all the successes of the MSN. While Hatakeyama’s empowerment through the actions and learnings of MSN were of critical importance to ESD, he became the least empowered of all. Patchy empowerment implies a problem in the understanding of a socially-critical approach and in the guiding theories which include critical EE. This sets social actions and empowerment as its own goal of education (Fien, 1995, p. 6).

Audience feedback following my presentation on MSN’s ESD practice in 2010 became the very beginning of the investigation into the possible problems in the understanding of ESD. After the presentation, this audience came up to me and commented as follows: “This is not ESD. How many Ainu people are living in Mombetsu?” It was ultimately assumed that this comment might relate to the struggle in understanding ‘patchy empowerment’. Ultimately, it questioned what socially-critical ESD is really for.

The assumption was that some degree of utilitarian view might be embedded in critical EE. When the presentation on the MSN was made in 2010, the MSN had only just been established based on the interests of a few individuals and had not yet achieved any large social impact through mobilising the networks of the MSN members. It was assumed that this audience might not have seen the MSN as part of ESD because of this lack of social impact. Based on the same understanding, it was assumed that this audience would see the MSN as part of ESD once they knew of the social impact the MSN’s ESD efforts made through collective efforts by 2012. With that in mind, it must be asked what ESD really means to the few Ainu people, like Hatakeyama.
5.4 Summary of Chapter 5

The evaluation of ESD could vary depending on who counted it as a success or ‘un-success’, for whom and at what stage of the project. With this utilitarian view, the MSN’s ESD efforts could be seen as ‘successful’ for its significant social impacts. This view could not explain, however, the diversity, complexity and contradictions within the marginalised group and the cause of ‘patchy empowerment’. The disempowerment of a few marginalised people could be overlooked for the sake of the positive social impact observed on a large scale, on the MSN’s ESD. The cross-analysis between the successes and challenges of the MSN’s ESD was conflicting. The problems of disempowerment of a few Ainu members, including Hatakeyama, could not be improved, and these could not explain the cause of patchy empowerment within socially-critical ESD.

The next chapter reports on my reflective process. Here it was explored why and how socially-critical approaches retain a ‘utilitarian’ view, yet cannot explain the patchy empowerment that occurs within socially-critical ESD.
CHAPTER 6. ‘Letting go’: Critical Reflection on Critical Ethnography 1

This chapter reports critical reflections on the key findings from Chapter 5. In particular, it illustrates the struggle in understanding ‘patchy empowerment’ and exploring it in the context of the literature within critical EE, ESD and beyond. The reflection process facilitated a more appropriate methodological approach in comparison to the first critical ethnographic study, to get closer to socially-critical ESD in a community development context from the marginalised people’s perspectives.

It should be noted that this chapter is not the report of the retrospective analysis on MSN’s ESD efforts in the past. ‘Patchy empowerment’, which emerged in practice, took place simultaneously to this research in 2013. Hence, this chapter presents real-time dilemmas and struggles in the approach taken. The discussions in this chapter assisted in finding a better way of my engagement with the local community, particularly the marginalised people, for the remainder of the research and future practice.

6.1 No-way out

The guiding theory (critical EE) used in the MSN resulted in patchy empowerment and the research methodology (critical theory) could not explain the cause of this gap in the community empowerment. There seemed to be no way
out beyond the critical situation of the research and practice for MSN. At that time, there were two options.

Option one was to continue the research within the theoretical and methodological understanding of critical EE. With this option, the research would examine the successes of MSN, and analyse the motivations and behaviour changes of the members who initiated a wider range of social actions and learning activities, and the broader impact of these actions to people in Mombetsu and in Japan. It was assumed that the research with option one would still produce ‘acceptable’ outcomes. However, the struggles of the very few Ainu in the MSN would be ignored in this option, in comparison to the significant ‘amount’ of social impact, and the ‘numbers’ of people who were mobilised through the social actions and learning activities of the MSN.

Option two was to go beyond critical EE and critical theory. With this option, a micro-focus analysis would be conducted on a few Ainu members, in particular, Hatakeyama. Concerns over option two included uncertainties about the methodology and timeframe. Hatakeyama’s disempowerment was contrary to my intention of ESD, and almost derailed this aspect of the project.

The literature was re-visited within and beyond critical EE to find a way to break through the critical situation. It was investigated why critical EE appeared ‘utilitarian’ when it was applied to socially-critical ESD in a community development context. The theories within and beyond critical EE provided a guide to re-engage back with the research questions and option two, by taking on a decoloniality methodology.
6.2 Re-engaging with the literature

There are two assumptions that indicate the utilitarian aspect of critical EE, which could make critical EE insufficient for socially-critical ESD in a community development context. The first one is the homogenous view of marginalised people in critical theory. This view overlooks the diversity, complexity and contradictions in the power relationships within a marginalised group. Critical theory could create an epistemological oppression in modern knowledge over the knowledge of marginalised people. The other is the schooling concept, which is the built-in formal education settings that most critical EE is based on. Formal schooling in critical EE increases the homogenous view in critical theory so that critical EE overlooks the different degrees of empowerment within a marginalised group, and bears the epistemological oppression of those with modern knowledge over the few marginalised people with a different knowledge.

6.2.1 Homogenous view in critical theory

The homogenous view in critical theory emerges through classifying whom the marginalised are and identifying what their knowledge is in relation to modern knowledge.

Identifying indigenous knowledge by modern knowledge

Agrawal (2002, 2005) argues that what is generally defined as ‘indigenous knowledge’, or ‘knowledge of the marginalised’, is created one-sidedly by those with modern, scientific, and Western knowledge. According to Agrawal (2002), those with modern knowledge (particularly scientific knowledge) recognise
particular information from indigenous or marginalised people (“particularisation”), seek its relevance to science and modern knowledge (“verification”), then generalise and apply it to respond to their needs for development and environmental conservation (generalisation) (pp. 290-291). This process is referred to as ‘scientisation’ (Agrawal, 2002, p. 291).

Those with modern knowledge are the ones driving scientisation. In this process, what they think is necessary as ‘knowledge’, is separated from the original context while ignoring “multiple, crucial, little-noticed details (Agrawal, 2002, p. 291)”.

A part of the language, knowledge or experiences of the indigenous and marginalised people is taken (particularisation), considered in relation to modern knowledge (verification), and integrated to reproduce the modern and scientific knowledge (generalisation). A homogenous view characterises the process of scientisation, where marginalised people and their knowledge are simplified and generalised within a complex reality. Following the scientisation process, questions remain: “To what extent is re-defined ‘indigenous knowledge’ by modern knowledge useful to indigenous people and who actually benefits from such knowledge?” (Agrawal, 2002, p. 291).

**Epistemological oppression of other knowledges by modern knowledge**

The process of scientisation creates an ‘oppressive’ epistemological power differential between those with modern knowledge and those without, in any form of research including positivism, interpretivism and critical theory. This oppression is caused because of different epistemological approaches between modern knowledge and other knowledges.
Those with modern knowledge have overwhelming control in knowing and understanding what the knowledge means. Drawing on the experiences of environment-development disputes in Japan, in particular, the Minamata disease (Figure 6.1, see next page), Kitoh (2007, 2009) identifies the epistemological power differential between two contrasting views in the research for marginalised people in a local community. The first view is ‘policy systemic’ and the second is that of ‘resisting individuals’.

The policy systemic view characterises the epistemology of the modern knowledge production process. It understands the problems of marginalised people from a general, universal, and bird’s eye point of view. It seeks its solutions systemically like a policy maker (Kitoh, 2007, p. 135). The other view is the one of resisting individuals, who are “forced to crawl on the bottom of the society” (Kitoh, 2007, p. 141) and manage to live taking the burden of the society individually.

There is a power differential between these two views; the policy systemic view oppresses the view of the resisting individuals. The policy systemic view supports those in positions of power - often government officials and researchers, who have a modern knowledge background. This makes resisting individuals abstract and simplifies socially complex and politically sensitive problems so that everyone can easily accept and comprehend them (Kitoh, 2007, p. 135). At the same time, the policy systemic view deflects away from understanding the totality of suffering the marginalised people have experienced psychologically, physically, economically, and socially (Kitoh, 2007, 2009; Ui, 1971).
Minamata disease collectively describes the industrial pollution that caused severe health and environmental problems in Japan since the 1950s. It was caused by the release of waste water, contaminated with heavy metals, by the Chisso Corporation (Ui, 1992). Many of the victims were marginalised community members.

In 1956, at a small, poor fishing village in Minamata, Japan, a cat began having seizures and dived into the sea with severe convulsions. Then, other cats and dogs did the same. One day, crows fell from the sky. Local residents were suspicious as to why these animals died in such a strange way. Eventually, they also saw many fish floating in the sea. (NIMD, 2001, p. 2) Then some villagers began suffering from continual convulsions, became unable to walk or talk properly, seemed to lose their mind, and died. One after another had similar problems in the same village, and the same things happened in the surrounding villages (Ui, 1968).

The local public health department called this unknown illness, the ‘strange disease’ and suspected it was infectious (Ui, 1968). The health department isolated the patients and disinfected their homes. Those affected first were mostly from marginalised and impoverished fishing families. People stopped buying fish from them. They were stigmatised and discriminated against. They became poorer and even more marginalised. Eventually, the problem became more commonly known as ‘Minamata disease’.

In 1968, over ten years since the first outbreak of Minamata disease, the government finally admitted its cause. (Some argue victims were already suffering from mercury poisoning since the late 1940s (Soshisha, 2017)) The government, together with Chisso, concealed the interim report in 1959 by the University of Kumamoto. It pointed to the probable cause of Minamata disease as the organic mercury in the waste water caused by the Chisso Corporation. During that time, Chisso kept dumping waste water into the Shiranui Sea, creating more victims.

The total numbers of victims is unknown. The birth of stillborn babies and miscarriages were treated secretly; many died before official identification. A large number of people are still unrecognised by the government. Soshisha (the supporting centre for Minamata Disease) estimates over 100,000 victims, excluding approximately 40,000 deaths that occurred in the past (Soshisha, 2017). As of 2013, the government has only recognised 2,977 applicants from this total, as victims who are eligible for official relief measurement (Ministry of the Environment, 2013, p. 7). An unknown, large number of people are still struggling in sickness, prejudice, discrimination and poverty.

In Minamata, economic growth was prioritised over anything else. The government supported the Chisso Corporation to continue their industrial activities, which contributed to the country’s economic growth in the post-WWII period, and ignored the voices of victims for ten years. Shiranui Sea, once described by a local villager as the bountiful sea overflowing with fish (Ishimure, 2003), was polluted with 4 meters of sludge containing 500ppm mercury. The local society sustained by cultural and economic systems based on fishing, collapsed. The poor became poorer and more marginalised. The word, ‘disease’, refers to the ‘sick’ social and economic structure that has been created by the development, and the knowledge, value and belief systems that underpin it (Ui, 1968).
The policy systemic view picks up only what it is able to perceive, and wants to know and understand, based on the limitations of modern knowledge, while simultaneously dismissing a significant part of the victims, marginalising and forcing them to be silent about their problems. Hence, with the policy systemic view, researchers and the government officials neither understand the overall picture of the problems faced by marginalised people, nor establish the research and policy to fundamentally solve them (Kitoh, 2009, p. 164). This is the epistemological oppression of the experiences, knowledges and problems of the marginalised people.

The official recognition process of the Minamata disease victims since 1969 demonstrates how epistemological oppression occurs. The government and experts have defined and recognised whom they believe the victims are. Unrecognised victims are forced to live with undiagnosed symptoms and in prejudice within local communities. Others have already passed away without recognition (for example, Harada, 1985; Ishimure, 2003; Oiwa, Ogata, & Colligan-Taylor, 2001; Saishu, 1984). The one-sided classification of marginalised people exacerbates this discriminatory effect, and causes further social injustice (Kitoh, 2009, p. 164).

Epistemological oppression occurs in any form of research, including positivism, interpretivism and critical theory. This is because critical theory “emerged and flourished within the same system of knowledge production as modern thought” (Morris-Suzuki, 2011, p. 17). On this point, critical theory is no different from positivism and interpretivism, despite its strong criticism on the injustice and power disparity created by them.
The issues faced by marginalised people are identified in critical theory, however, they are not understood at the level of truly knowing and understanding the marginalised people. Their problems tend to be understood in a way that is acceptable within the modern knowledge production system. This method of understanding in critical theory is entrenched within modern knowledge which re-interprets the problems of the marginalised people and marginalises them even further.

6.2.2 Schooling focus of critical EE

The second factor that could make critical EE utilitarian in a community development context is the schooling focus of critical EE, or more precisely, the ‘framework’ that schooling provides. Schooling provides a conditioned, formal education. As (Illich, 1973) argues, schooling sets a framework onto a social reality to enclose a particular type of knowledge that fits within it. This framework is socially and physically conditioned; the curriculum guidelines, educational policies, school cultures, and teaching contents provide social conditions, while the space, facility, and target groups provide the physical conditions. These conditions all come together and enable educators to conduct their activities.

Critical EE is predominantly theorised in the formal education setting. Critical EE has challenged this schooling framework, aiming to re-direct the education system to facilitate social change (See sections 2.1-2.2). Critical EE may be able to stretch the schooling framework or even change its shape or the size, however, it
cannot remove it. This is because schooling is the foundation upon which critical EE is based.

The framework that schooling provides can be problematic when critical EE is applied to ESD in a community development context. The framework imposes limitations upon teachers who wish to teach beyond the schooling boundary. At the same time, however, it allows the teacher to choose how to contribute within this context, such as selecting a resource person, teaching content, targeting a group of people, or defining aims. The actions of the teacher can enhance the modern knowledge based-approach so that application of critical EE to ESD does not sufficiently reflect local community problems. Activities within the schooling framework enhance the ‘homogenous’ view in critical theory because of the modern knowledge upon which the modern education is based.

### 6.2.3 Critical theory in critical EE

The schooling focus of critical EE and the homogenous view of critical theory negatively synergise in a community development context. This negative synergy can be explained by unpacking how critical EE draws upon critical theory and how it explains the process of social change through school education.

Most theorising in critical EE, EfS and ESD draws on critical theory (Huckle (1993) or post-modernism (Sauvé (1999) in school education contexts. The communicative discursive action theory of Habermas becomes the central feature of praxis in EE, EfS and ESD (Huckle, 1993, 1996b). The approach is based on critical EE in practice, including multi-stakeholder approaches, participatory and
inclusive approaches, as well as action-oriented learning (UNESCO, 2014c, p. 174).

Habermas’s discursive communicative action has the following four points:

1. Universal moral consensus is inherent in the nature and use of human language;
2. All human communication can be an ideal speech situation in which all participants have equal power to defend their contributions as meaningful, true, justified and sincere;
3. Claims to truth and justification to public scrutiny is revealed; and
   The rational consensus is made based on an open argument, which undermines the false consensus. (Huckle, 1993, p. 61)

Discursive communicative action believes that careful discussions can reach a rational consensus among a diverse group of people, providing people can express themselves safely and freely. This concept is based on the belief that words can explain everything and can bring consensus among multiple stakeholders. It dismisses, however, any other knowledge that cannot be expressed in words.

**Teacher's challenge for social change**

In critical EE, educators such as Fien (1995) and Edwards (2015) draw upon the theory of structuration by (Giddens, 1984) to explain the process where teachers try to take critical approaches in the teaching activities at their schools. Structuration theory conceptualised the relationship between social structure and the agent as the driving force of human action. Unlike Marxism that observes how social structure determines human acts, structuration theory considers that the social structure and the agent are mutually constructed and that its relationship is interactive and dialectic. The social structure provides the rule and resources for the agent. At the same time, the agent retains the ability to understand the
surrounding environment and to reproduce the social structure. Hence, the social structure and the agent can both constrain and enable:

**Figure 6-2: Educational challenging process for sustainable development in critical EE**

In a schooling context, teachers act as agents who bring the environmental paradigm, and their struggles and resistance in challenging the dominant social paradigms, particularly school education system. Figure 6.2 illustrates the process of achieving sustainable development in education, drawing on social theories of Habermas and Giddens. In this figure, the schooling context provides the framework, within which the individuals participate in the learning, discussions and activities. The challenging against the framework is not easy. However, critical EE finds the possibility of reproduction, confirmation and entrenchment of existing structures for school education and through school education (Fien, 1995). Hence, the process of critical environmental education is ‘counter-hegemonic’, where the resistance and conflict accompany with their efforts. Therein, teachers
are viewed as capable of enacting themselves with educational and environmental belief as an agent for social change (Fien, 1995).

**Applicability of critical EE to ESD in a community development context**

When critical EE is applied to ESD in a community development context, it comes with a concept of schooling that frames a particular aspect of the local community, such as community members and their knowledge, based on the educators’ intention for social change. The schooling focus of critical EE allows community educators to set the framework and decide upon which activities fit within the framework. The educators choose, modify or simplify the diverse experiences and knowledge of the local community, to fit within the framework, influencing the time, space, resources dedicated to these learnings, and whatever else the educators decide the local needs.

Critical EE is sensitive to the power disparity and marginalisation inherent in formal education. Critical EE values the knowledge and experiences of marginalised people, and facilitates a learning and action process where the majority and marginalised people co-create a new knowledge. This inclusion and participation only occurs, however, within the framework that is based on modern education and modern knowledge.

There is an unknown number of marginalised people with unidentified experiences and knowledge that resides outside the framework. A significant issue, however, is that education within the framework dismisses what is outside the framework. Selected individuals engaging in these educational activities may not fully represent the marginalised group, as they may not have any functioning social ties, or a system for consensus building, like the Ainu people in Japan (see
Chapter 4). New knowledge, however, is created based on discussions with these marginalised people within the framework. Stakeholders within the framework then re-interpret the problems of marginalised people based on the newly created knowledge.

Kitoh warns about the policy systemic view in environmental education.

The response toward the environmental problems from the global perspectives seems to be an unarguable logic to everyone. Such EE expects everyone to see the Earth as if each one of them were a policy maker, supervise each other, raise the awareness of the individuals and establish each environmental ethics for the solution of these problems. Such EE certainly can contribute to solving a part of problems and sounds valid. However, there are the problems that become covered and invisible in such overwhelming understanding of the problem from the policy systemic view (Kitoh, 2007, pp. 139-140).

To this point, Harako (2013) argued that the views, scope and orientation of critical EE are “too systemic, gigantic and extroverted” (p.2). These indicate some aspect of the problem in critical EE, which looks utilitarian when critical EE is applied to ESD in a community development context.

The above arguments imply that there might have been an epistemological problem in the ESD approaches applied to the MSN. The socially-critical approach to ESD created an inclusive and participatory process for the learning and social actions by both Ainu and non-Ainu people. This openness was only possible, however, because the MSN became an ‘invisible framework’ of schooling. There, the educators were able to decide who should be there, what needed to be discussed, and how to facilitate participatory discussion among the ‘multi-stakeholders’. Such intentions may have deflected the focus from the diverse and complex issues, and contradicted the reality of the entire Ainu group,
including the power disparities within their group and the broader local community. This was the cause of patchy empowerment.

6.3 A way out: Decoloniality

The crisis encountered during research with the MSN implied that there was no way forward while a solution was sought within an understanding of modern knowledge. To this point, Agrawal (2005) argues that the oppression that modern knowledge imposes on others is a “catch-22 situation” (p. 73). A catch-22 also occurred in the knowledge production process that appeared in Minamata disease research in Japan. As Tsurumi argues:

The problems in Minamata are the ones of those who were forced to endure extreme harm during the modern industrial civilisation. In that case, our analytical tools for research are the languages that have been developed within the framework of modern industrial civilisation. As long as we use these, the most objective and scientific assumption that we could get in breakthroughs of Minamata disease could be ‘no way out’. Any research with such an approach cannot make any change in Minamata disease problems. (Irokawa et al., 1983, p. 501)

The only possible way to change course, was to adopt a decoloniality methodology (Mignolo, 2007, 2011, 2014; Ndlovu-Gatsuheni, 2013; Smith, 1999). With the decoloniality methodology, the a priori theory was set aside and the epistemological activity was given to a few Ainu members, particularly, Hatakeyama.

Although its conceptual linkage has not yet been discussed, ‘outsider methodology’ by Kitoh (2007, 2009), which is proposed for research on the
development-environment conflict, provides practical insights in understanding the decoloniality methodology. The outsider methodology is described as follows:

The ‘outsider’ methodology begins with leaving intentionally the methodological objectivity. Instead of taking the stance of ‘third party’ as a researcher, with this methodology, the researcher ‘listen’ to the victims by standing on the ‘view of the resisting individuals’ and analyse their words from not the objective but the outsider’s views, and weave the universal language (for the research). This does not mean that the researcher should stand on the same political ground as the victims. Rather, the researcher should attempt to stand on the victim’s views in terms of epistemology. The approach premises that a researcher engages with the research participants in the field and mutually transform through the intellectual and academic acts. (Kitoh, 2009, p. 168)

The ‘outsider’ methodology shares many characteristics of the critical ethnography method, in particular, retaining a critical view of the disparity, and seeking mutual transformation through the research. It differs from the critical ethnography method however, in the point that it stands on the perspectives of the marginalised, establishes their epistemology, and understands the problem of the environment-development disputes through the views of established epistemology. This part echoes with the decoloniality methodology and takes much wider theoretical perspectives than critical theory.

In an attempt to obtain an in-depth understanding of patchy-empowerment, the field of Mombetsu was revisited in December 2014 with the decoloniality methodology. The process of engaging a decoloniality approach adopted the following four principles:

1. Observing the everyday life situation of Hatakeyama and other key MSN members, through living and working with them in their everyday life context;
2. Setting aside, or ‘bracket out’, the guiding theories and research;
3. Trying to understand the learning and knowledge creation process of Hatakeyama, from his views and perspectives obtained from their everyday life context;
4. Re-engaging with critical EE based on key findings using the decoloniality methodology and contributing to the current understanding of critical EE if needed.

6.4 Summary of Chapter 6

Patchy empowerment, which was highlighted from the analysis in the previous chapter, created a critical situation in the practice and research of the MSN’s ESD. This chapter reported on the self-reflection process during the time of crisis, where the literature was re-visited within and beyond critical EE to investigate ‘patchy empowerment’. In particular, the utilitarian aspect of critical EE that was assumed through the discussions in the previous chapter was thoroughly examined. The literature review beyond critical EE involved an investigation on the struggles of marginalised individuals in the conflict between development and environment. The literature of Minamata disease in Japan in particular, guided the identification of two factors that could make critical EE utilitarian, and could cause patchy empowerment in a local community context.

The first factor was that critical theory could cause epistemological oppression in the understanding and knowing of marginalised people and their problems, despite its strong focus on the marginalisation and the power issues that cause it. Modern knowledge overpowers other types of knowledge; it *scientises* the knowledge of marginalised people for the sake of reproducing modern knowledge.
Critical theory can identify marginalised people and the power problems that cause marginalisation, but cannot go beyond what the modern knowledge system understand regarding language, and local/indigenous knowledge that is often embodied and hardly verbalised. The oppression problem is inherent in the knowing and understanding of modern knowledge, that is, epistemology. Epistemological oppression can occur in all forms of critical research, including positivism, interpretivism and critical theory.

The second factor was that the schooling focus of critical EE negatively reacts with a homogenous view of critical theory, when it is applied to ESD in a local community development context. Critical EE enlarges the problem of epistemological limitation and oppression of critical theory. Particularly, the ‘frame’, which schooling could set, gives educators the ‘authority’ to choose who to be in the frame, such as the resource person, as well as the curriculum and the teaching aims. The educators can take a part of the diverse marginalised people, their knowledge and dynamic learning processes that are inextricably connected with community development process, to fit within the frame of schooling. Such authority makes educators focus on what happens within the frame, but deflects their attention away from the complex reality of marginalised people that exist outside of the frame. This includes people, their knowledge and their complex power relationship within the group and with the majority.

Critical EE is insufficient in a community development context. This finding necessitated modification of the methodological approach applied to the rest of the research. The decoloniality methodology was chosen to get closer to the learning process of the few marginalised people who were not empowered by the MSN’s
ESD, particularly Hatakeyama. There, the *a priori* theory was set aside for a certain period and Mombetsu was revisited to observe key MSN members in their everyday life context. This helped establish Hatakeyama’s epistemology and to understand the learning and knowledge creation process of Hatakeyama based on his epistemology.
Part II: Critical Ethnographic Research *beyond*

**Socially-critical ESD**

Part II reports on the second part of the two critical ethnographies in this thesis. This part contains three chapters. The first chapter (Chapter 7) details the contextual background of Hatakeyama’s ‘swing’. The second chapter (Chapter 8) portrays Hatakeyama’s ‘swing’ as a symbolic representation of his disempowerment during the arbitration process with the developer. It analyses Hatakeyama’s Swing based on the theoretical and methodological understanding beyond critical EE, that is, decoloniality. The third chapter (Chapter 9) offers a conclusion to this thesis. It draws together reflections on the key findings from previous chapters through a critical EE lens. As part of this critical reflection, the final chapter offers a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context.
CHAPTER 7. Hatakeyama’s Swing

Chapter 7 briefly describes the background of Hatakeyama’s Swing from three perspectives. Firstly, it looks at why the ‘swing’ happened. Particularly, it looked at the process where MSN members, who were split into two groups, confronted each other during the arbitration for the proposed industrial waste management facility on Ainu’s sacred land.

Secondly, this chapter describes Hatakeyama’s so-called ‘irrational’ behaviour that occurred during the arbitration, and his differing behaviour between the two groups. This behaviour mimicked a pendulum swinging between two poles and hence the term Hatakeyama’s Swing was coined.

Lastly, this chapter focuses on his persistent avocations for whaling, which did not make sense at all to most MSN members, including myself.

Overall, this chapter provides the contextual ground, upon which Hatakeyama’s Swing and patchy empowerment can be further analysed in Chapter 8.

7.1 Confrontation between ‘Group A’ and ‘Group B’

As described in 4.3.3, the Mombetsu City Government (MCG) proposed the construction of the industrial waste management facility at the upper stream of the Mobetsu River. This development plan divided the local community into those in favour and those against. Hatakeyama’s Ainu Association of Hokkaido Mombetsu Chapter (AAH-MC) was one of the few local opposition groups. Hatakeyama had held the traditional ceremony, kamuy chep nomi, since 2000 to welcome the return
of their *kamuy chep* (sacred fish in Ainu that is regarded as the messenger of the god) to the original river in autumn, as part of his indigenous fishing rights claim.

Policy advocacies and learning activities\textsuperscript{48} by MSN could not effectively stop, or even slow down, the planning process. The Hokkaido Prefectural Government (HPG) which supervises the local city governments at a prefectural level, fully permitted the plan in October, 2011, and construction began. By then, the remaining opposition groups gave up and signed an agreement with the developer. They were mostly older individuals who were running small-scale farms (MSN, 2011a). They feared that making an issue out of the potential pollution by the plant operation, could motivate the developer to investigate if any pollution of the Mobetsu River had been caused by the animal waste from the farms and paddocks around the construction site. They were financially struggling, and had no successors who could take over their business in the future. They did not feel good about the proposed waste management plant but they could not keep up their opposition. They wanted to continue to live on their farms quietly and close it down early or late in their lives on their own terms. AAH-MC became the only group that did not sign the agreement.

The situation appeared to have no-way-out for Hatakeyama. Hatakeyama’s isolation became more severe than what he already experienced in 2010 (when MSN was established to support Hatakeyama who had already been isolated in the

\textsuperscript{48} MSN handed the petitions of over 300 indigenous organisations and individuals in Japan, and from overseas, to Hokkaido Prefectural Government (HPG) and Mombetsu City Government (MCG) (Takenaka, 2010; Yomiuri Shimbun, 2010) and made statements at the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) (UNGA, 2010). Koizumi and I organised workshops and forums in Mombetsu, Sapporo and Tokyo to attract the attention and raise understanding of indigenous rights, sustainable fishing and environment and development issues.
small Mombetsu community (See 4.3.4.)). In this situation, MSN came up with the idea of filing a complaint about the potential environmental damage by Hatakeyama’s AAH-MC against the developer through the arbitration at the Hokkaido Environment Dispute Coordination Commission (HEDCC), located in Sapporo City, the main city of Hokkaido, 300km from Mombetsu.

The HEDCC arbitration process caused the splitting of the MSN into two groups over the strategies of Hatakeyama’s key claim. The fundamental cause of the MSN member’s split was that the MSN could not include any of the MSN members as a co-applicant with Hatakeyama or co-agent for him in the application for the HEDCC arbitration, despite that MSN proposed the idea of the arbitration. The arbitration process was strictly closed only to the applicants and the agents. More precisely, the applicants had to be the residents who lived in the area near the proposed construction site. At this point, most MSN members supported Hatakeyama from outside this area. So, they were not eligible to be co-applicants with Hatakeyama. There were a few local residents in MSN, however, they had already been involved in multiple interests in Mombetsu, and this made it difficult for them to be a co-applicant, despite their wish to support Hatakeyama. Other members were part of other local opposition groups and had recently signed the agreement with the developer. Others were fishermen, who were the members of the local fishery cooperative, and they too had already agreed to the development plan. There were also Ainu members who did not want to make public their identity by becoming a co-applicant.

MSN could not choose the agent who would support Hatakeyama, either. We ended up inviting an external expert to be an agent for Hatakeyama - a lawyer
from Sapporo City. The lawyer was one of a few lawyers in Japan with extensive expertise in indigenous and environmental rights protection. On March 4, 2011, Hatakeyama submitted the application form that included the lawyer as the only agent.

Since MSN members could not get involved in any real-time discussions at the arbitration meetings, we had to decide the strategies based on secondary information (mostly provided by our lawyer). In this process, Hatakeyama struggled with comprehending the unfamiliar legal and scientific terms used at the meetings. However, the lawyer had enough expertise and knowledge and he effectively had control of the communication with the MSN and in developing the strategies for the arbitration. This situation, however, created distance, delay and misunderstanding in the communication between the lawyer and the MSN members and among the MSN members. It made the split between the two groups of MSN members even wider, those who supported, and those who were against, the lawyer's strategies. Ironically, the MSN’s member’s confrontation between their split groups followed exactly the same pattern as the confrontation pattern of the Ainu rights recovery movement (as discussed in Chapter 4). That is, the two groups of Wajin Japanese stakeholders who had confronted each other (Group A claiming the indigenous rights claim within the Japanese domestic law) and Group B aiming to go beyond the Japanese domestic law and claiming these based on the international legal standard) did so without the Ainu people’s active participation.

In MSN, ‘Group A’ was formed by the members of MSN who supported the strategies of the lawyer. They wished to take a ‘realistic’ approach based on what
current Japanese legal provisions could provide. Their strategy for the arbitration process was stated in an email to the MSN core members as below:

I guess that a well-established and active civil movement would be necessary if we seriously want to stop the construction. Without an established civil movement we are now claiming Ainu rights in the waste management construction plan. In this situation, what we could achieve, at most, through the arbitration would be a compromise. What we can do now is to make the Ainu people ‘tojisha’ [see 5.1.2] as the local stakeholder in community development by signing the agreement rather than asking ‘hard requests’ at the arbitration to stop the construction. So, we should not intend to stop but to bring them to the surface as ‘tojisha’ at upfront.

阻止であれば、もっと市民運動で環境問題として運動が出来ていなければならな
いと思います。今回は、市民運動が出来ていない中で、アイヌの先住権を主張す
る中で、産廃に取り組みました。審査会への調停である以上、妥協の産物です。
そして厳しい要求をすることで調停を不調にすることではなく、成立させること
に拠ってアイヌも当事者になるのだという実績を作ることに主眼がありました。
つまり阻止ではなく、当事者性を全面に出すということです。(The lawyer,
personal communication, March 5, 2012).

‘Group B’ was identified by the members who had what was considered ‘hard requests’ to submit, according to the lawyer. They intended to use the arbitration to suspend the construction as long as possible, and, eventually, wanted to cancel the construction (MSN, 2011a, 2011e). They asserted that the ‘compromise’ within the current Japanese legal system was ineffective in realising Hatakeyama’s indigenous rights claim, drawing on the UNDRIP and CBD. By so doing, they also intended to open up a new path to the Ainu’s indigenous rights recovery by developing a more appropriate legal system in Japan (MSN, 2011b).

The debris issue of the Great East Japan Earthquake (also known as the ‘3.11’ Earthquake) complicated the conflicts within MSN even more. Only a week after
the arbitration application submission, a magnitude 9.0 earthquake hit Tohoku (in the Northern region of Japan) on March 11, 2011. In the process of post-disaster rehabilitation, the national government called for the contribution by municipal and local governments to share the debris clean-up, which was estimated at 80 million to 200 million tons in the devastated areas (Makinen, 2011). This call from the government grew into a controversy, with the wider residents throughout Japan, concerned about the spread of radiated debris near the tsunami devastated areas around the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant and its potential hazards to health and the environment.

Group B was also concerned about the potential harm caused by the radiated debris if it were to be disposed at the proposed waste management plant in Mombetsu. They thought that the debris issues might attract support from the wider community residents for Hatakeyama. Group B members eventually formed the opinion that Hatakeyama should include the claim that the proposed waste management facility should not accept the radiated debris into his assertion during the arbitration. Group B became more militant in their approach about the earthquake debris as time went by.

49 In a typical year, the entire country generates about 71 million tons of household waste and more than 400 million tons of industrial waste, according to the Environment Ministry (Makinen, 2011).

50 Responding to their interests, Koizumi and I organised workshops and meetings for MSN to learn about the radiated debris issues in relation to the impact on the natural environment and human health and the indigenous rights protection (MSN, 2012).
7.2 Hatakeyama’s ‘irrational’ behaviour

Hatakeyama was gradually losing his leadership between the two groups of the MSN. His behaviour began to be viewed as irrational because it would ‘swing’ and vacillate, as mentioned briefly in 5.2.2. He accepted one group’s opinion whenever he went and spoke to them, denied the other group but then repeated the same ideas as he did for the other group. One Group B member, who drove Hatakeyama from Mombetsu to the meeting with the lawyer and Group A in Sapporo, observed how Hatakeyama changed his words and behaviours before and after the meeting during their travel between Mombetsu and Sapporo.

“Hatakeyama-san changed during the travel back from Sapporo, as if he became a totally different person” [畠山さん、札幌の行きと帰りで、全く違う人みたいだっ
て。] (Ex-MSN member, personal communication, February 11, 2013). After the meeting, the ex-MSN member lost his trust in Hatakeyama and completely stopped further communication with Hatakeyama. One day, Koizumi muttered to me, “Hatakeyama-san, he kind of ‘swings’...” [畠山さん、揺れるっていうか・・・](M. Koizumi, personal communication, June 23, 2011).

Figure 7-1: Hatakeyama’s Swing
Hatakeyama’s behaviour looked like the ‘swinging’ of a pendulum between two different opinions: of Group A and B; and also between two locations, Sapporo and Mombetsu. Figure 7-1 shows a visualisation of Hatakeyama’s Swing.

It is reasonable to assume that Hatakeyama’s family situation around the arbitration process might also have contributed to making him more vulnerable - but this research could not investigate this claim because of the sensitivity of the issues. Hatakeyama had lost four close family members in six months, including his wife from a terminal illness (October, 2010), and his daughter, son-in-law and their two-year-old grandchild in the tsunami caused by the earthquake in Tohoku (March, 2011). As Hatakeyama hardly talked about his family members around that time, it is assumed that his suppressed emotions might have influenced his behaviour to some extent.

The time constraints of the arbitration process forced Hatakeyama to make a final decision. In March 2012, Hatakeyama decided to sign the agreement with the developer, and followed Group A’s strategy. The agreement gave the go-ahead for the developer to finalise the construction for its opening in November. The agreement recognised: (i) the local Ainu as the local key stakeholder; (ii) prevention of the negative impact by the plant operation on their cultural

---

51 The tsunami swept through villages over 500 km alongside the coastal line of Northern Japan, including the town where his daughter’s family were living to help Hatakeyama’s fishing business. A week after the Earthquake, Hatakeyama could not confirm their safety, so he took his car and drove 1,000km to their town. His daughter, her husband and their son were caught in the tsunami and they had been trying to escape the area by car. The bodies of his daughter’s husband and son were found in the car, 500 m from the coastal line, and his daughter’s body was found on the other side of town (The Hokkaido Shim bun Press, 2011). Hatakeyama found their bodies amongst the other unidentified bodies in the gymnasium, where the bodies were placed. Words cannot describe how he was feeling around that time.

52 The arbitration process at HEDCC has to be concluded in one year after the submission of the application.
activities; (iii) conservation of the local natural environment; and, (iv) the rights of the local Ainu to inspect the plant operation any time upon their request.

7.3 Impossible whaling dream

In contrast to the praise by the media and the researchers on the outcome that Hatakeyama obtained from the arbitration, Hatakeyama was unsatisfied. The media and the researchers saw the recognition of the Ainu people in the local community development process as the first achievement in the history of the Ainu rights movement in Japan (Hokkaido Shimbun Press, 2012; The Asahi Shimbun, 2012; The Mainichi Shimbun, 2012; The Yomiuri Shimbun, 2012). However, Hatakeyama’s ‘irrational’ behaviour continued. Rather than looking into strategies that could optimise what he got from the arbitration, he began to speak a lot about his desire for hunting a minke whale - which is illegal in Japan.

At a focus group discussion in 2013, where the core MSN members reflected on the MSN activities, Hatakeyama was irritated and angry, stating:

I want to take action [by hunt a whale] in the early summer of this year, when the weather is good... I am ready to be jailed for this. Catching salmon in the river, and hunting whales... I want to catch these based on my decision, on my indigenous rights as a Mombetsu Ainu descendant, not based on the permission of someone else.

夏の初めの天候も見ながら、実力行使をするつもりだ。留置所に入る覚悟で。誰かの許可じゃなく、俺の判断で、紋別アイヌの末裔の権利っちゅうことで川で鮭を獲る、鯨を獲る。(F Noguchi, 2013).
Hatakeyama’s words put MSN members into further confusion, particularly those in Group B who were already disgruntled that their opinion was not considered over Group A’s:

“If you hunting a whale now, who would support you?”

“Hunting a whale is illegal. It would make a tremendous impact on your son who is going to take over your fishing license at the Fishermen’s Union and your family.”

“After hunting the whale, who would process it?”

“You should not cause the local supporters any trouble.”

“Yes, the outside experts and the world may say to you that this is your right. However, without getting support from your family and your local community people, your action will be almost like a suicide attack.”

「今、鯨を獲ったら一体誰が支援してくれるのか？」

「捕鯨は違法だ。そんなことしたら、漁組での漁業権を相続する息子にも影響するし、家族にも影響がある。」

「鯨を獲っても、どう処理をするのか？」

「地元の支援者に迷惑をかけてはならない」

「よその大電気や世界がそういったらって、家族や地域の人たちに理解してもらえなかったら、捕鯨なんて自爆テロにしかならない」 (F Noguchi, 2013).

Hatakeyama contended:

AAH predominantly understands the meaning of indigenous rights only as cultural activities, such as dancing and singing. Our Mombetsu Chapter is the only one claiming indigenous rights connected with our livelihood. We would lose our indigenous spirits if we were to do ‘cultural’ activities only as they say. Fifteen years ago, I got the permission to catch rays from the Mombetsu City government. My fellow [Wajin] fishermen tore me down by saying that Ainu
would get everything. If I sought permission [for whale hunting] from all the Mombetsu residents and fishermen, I am 100% sure that I would never be able to do it.

MSN members understood well that whaling had been the central indigenous claim of Hatakeyama for over twenty years. Yet, whaling, particularly hunting a minke whale, did not make sense to the MSN members who knew that it is illegal. They could not understand why Hatakeyama clung to the idea of whaling so much. It could be more realistic for them if Hatakeyama just committed to developing the follow-up strategies based on what they had agreed to through the arbitration. Hatakeyama’s persistent advocating for whaling puzzled MSN members. Other than political challenges around indigenous whaling rights claims (see 4.3.3), MSN members found no point in his whaling claim. There had been drastic reductions in economic potential in whaling, particularly the minke whale, in the last thirty years. Whaling was no longer an economically profitable business in the 2010s.

When Hatakeyama began his claim of indigenous whaling rights in 1987, Hatakeyama expected that this would provide income opportunity for the Ainu people to improve their economic situation. Through his work of spearfishing dolphins, he saw the inflated market prices of whale meat compared to the cheap
dolphin meat that was consumed as the substitute for whale meat in Japan.\(^{53}\) Hatakeyama wished to get back whaling rights in the hope it might create jobs and income opportunities for him and his fellow Ainu fishermen.

**Figure 7-2 Demand-supply of whale meat in Japan, 2011**

![Diagram showing demand-supply of whale meat in Japan, 2011](Sakuma, 2012)

As Figure 7-1 depicts, while whale meat is over-supplied in Japan, the demand has drastically dropped.\(^{54}\) The market supplies whale meat at a low price, not only by catches from scientific research, but also by imported meat, mostly from Iceland (Sakuma, 2012). The golden age when fishermen dreamed of making profits out of the whaling industry had already dissipated. Hatakeyama, of course, knew that whale meat had lost market value in Japan. His ‘swing’ during the arbitration and his clinging to whaling were totally beyond comprehension for all.

---

\(^{53}\) Greenpeace Japan noted that JPY 650,000,000 (approximately AUD 80,000,000) was gained in 2008 from the trade of the whale meat from scientific research (Greenpeace Japan, 2017b).

\(^{54}\) Sakuma (2012) argues that the annual average amount of the whale meat consumption per capita is only 23.7g, which is “virtually the same weight as half of a chocolate bar or a slice of ham” (p. 1).
the MSN members, including myself (where I tried my best to stick with Hatakeyama without agreeing to the assertions of either group).

7.4 Summary of Chapter 7

The problem of the indigenous rights recovery movement at the national level of Japan also emerged in the arbitration process over the governmental proposed plan for the industrial waste management facility. The MSN members had split into two groups: Group A and B. Wajin members of both groups confronted each other, arguing either that Hatakeyama should either: (i) claim his indigenous rights within the premise of Japanese law that did not stop or slow down the construction; or, (ii) that he should claim that the construction goes beyond Japanese law based on international legal frameworks, to stop or slow down the construction. During the arguments between the two groups, Hatakeyama lost his leadership and his irrational ‘swing’ behaviour emerged. This eventually led to the disarray of the MSN in the post-arbitration process. Hatakeyama’s Swing and his continued irrational behaviour (in particular, his avocation for the illegal hunting of minke whales), went far beyond the tolerance of the MSN members, including myself.

The next chapter analyses Hatakeyama’s Swings from the viewpoint of his idiosyncratic way of understanding and knowing, and by letting go of my guiding theory of critical EE.
CHAPTER 8. Rethinking ESD from the perspective of a socially-marginalised individual

The experiences of socially-marginalised individuals with Minamata disease provides clues to understand Hatakeyama’s Swing and his puzzling behaviours with the MSN. In particular, it is the life experience of one fisherman with Minamata disease, Masato Ogata (b. 1953), that provides the strongest explanations (Ogata, 2001; Ogata & Oiwa, 1996; Oiwa, Ogata & Colligan-Taylor, 2001).

Despite several differences between Hatakeyama and Ogata (such as the nature of issues with which they struggled, and ethnic background - Ogata as a Wajin), both had gone through similar experiences. Ogata was a fisherman from a poor village and had gone through struggles of discrimination. He had also fought for the rights of victims suffering from Minamata disease. Ogata’s experiences provide clues to understand the causes behind Hatakeyama’s Swing.

8.1 Ogata, a fisherman victim of Minamata disease

Ogata was born into the Amimoto family, in a small fishing village of Minamata, Japan. Around that time, the outbreak of the symptoms of methylmercury poisoning began spreading (Ogata, 2000). This was diagnosed as Minamata disease and life for Ogata’s family changed drastically. Ogata lost his father when he was six from acute mercury poisoning (which was not identified as a cause of
the sickness at that time). “His [father’s] hands and legs shook. He could no longer stand and walk. He drooled, went into fits of madness, and finally died” (Oiwa et al., 2001, p. 113). This new disease took the lives of his brothers, sisters, nieces and nephews almost at the same time.

It took over ten years for the Nippon Chisso Company (NCC) and the government to finally admit that there was methylmercury in NCC’s wastewater. It was determined that a sub-chemical product from the production of acetaldehyde caused the disease. During that time, Ogata’s family was subjected to discrimination by the residents in their small village. They were cast as having “the strange disease” or “the contentious disease” (Ogata, 2000, p. 184). Fishermen, in general, were looked upon as “lower than beggars in Minamata” (Oiwa et al., 2001, p. 54), and the discrimination toward victims and their families multiplied.

Having experienced tragic deaths of close family members, discrimination and poverty, Ogata grew with anger and held a grudge against the NCC and society in general. “Fighting among school kids was an everyday occurrence” (Oiwa et al., 2001, p. 55). Ogata’s anger drove him to social activism when he was 15 years old. He searched for a way to “avenge his late father” (Ogata, 2000, p. 187). In his own ‘swing’ as he changed his political stances from right to left - similar to Hatakeyama.

55 NCC changed the company name to JNC Corporation in 2011 (JNC, 2017).
56 Acetaldehyde is used as the agent to produce plastic material.
57 The University of Kumamoto found that the methyl mercury in the NCC’s waste water caused Minamata disease in 1959. However, this finding was concealed by the Kumamoto Municipal government and NCC until 1968 (Harada, 1995).
Ogata took a philosophical right-wing position in his teens (although later he switched to the left in his 20-30s). After leaving home at the age of fifteen, he joined an organisation which was a front for criminal *yakuza* operations in Kumamoto City. He spent a few years fighting against left-wing organisations and selling amphetamines (Oiwa et al., 2001, p. 67) and was arrested in 1971. After that experience he decided to go back to his hometown to live as a fisherman. During this time he was influenced by the leftist students in his community, who supported the Minamata disease movement. Within a few years, Ogata joined the Minamata Disease Certification Applicants’ Council (MDCAC) to support the lawsuit for the official recognition of Minamata disease victims in 1974. He became the president of MDCAC in 1975.

**Figure 8-1: Banners used by MDCAC**

*怨 represents grudge in Japanese. Photo taken by the researcher in 2013 at Soshisha.*

He spent ten years arguing and fighting with government officials, police officers, and doctors. He became notorious – “if they ignored me, I showered them with verbal abuse, kick them or threw ashtrays” (Oiwa et al., 2001, pp. 79-81). However, one day in 1985, he suddenly resigned as the president of MDCAC and
withdrew himself from all social activism and his application for official recognition as a Minamata disease victim.

His decision came from his realisation of the contradiction in the dominant approaches to social transformation, including both political left or right activism. He noticed that Minamata disease victims had to stand on the very same ground and understanding that was held or understood by modern society. However, to fight against modern society, which kept producing problems like Minamata disease, contributed in maintaining the modern society (Oiwa et al., 2001). Ogata saw that social activism was entrapped in this understanding of modern society. Social activism only looked at the nation as a whole. It hardly recognised whose responsibility the Minamata issue was, and did not do anything with the symptoms that the victims experienced through their suffering in their everyday life at the local community level.

Social activism did not give back what Minamata disease had destroyed. Ogata stated:

There is something, which could be described as a problem of ‘un-savable’ souls in Minamata disease, which could not be saved by institutionalisation or by compensation money. (Ogata, 2001, p. 137)

Compensation and lawsuits were insufficient to save all the people and animals that had lost their lives or lived the suffering from Minamata disease in the past and present. Minatama disease destroyed the whole ecosystem around the Shiranui Sea. This ecosystem supported complex life cycles created through the interaction of the sea, rivers and mountains - including the lives of humans who subsisted on that environment (Ogata, 2001).
This realisation pushed Ogata to choose to live as a local fisherman, wishing to reconnect his broken social ties, spiritual connection with the spirits of the dead victims, and broken ties between humans and nature. For Ogata, the ideological right or left was not the final goal. These were just present there when he was desperately searching for any possibility of relieving them from the situation where the problems unreasonably kept occurring in every aspect of his community’s lives.

8.2 Hatakeyama’s Ainu world

The life of Ogata guided me to the assumption that Hatakeyama might not be ‘swinging’ because of his weakness or a defect in his personality. Like Ogata, Hatakeyama might have desperately searched for a solution to the unreasonable problems that he had faced in his life – one where the political thoughts of ‘left’ or ‘right’ could not really give a clear answer. I began investigating this assumption by asking Hatakeyama what ‘rights’ recovery meant to him.

“Rights recovery of the Ainu is to get back what the Ainu used to have. 権利の回復とは、アイヌがもともと持っていたものをアイヌに返してもらうこと。” (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 13, 2013). I assumed that ‘what the Ainu used to have’ could be akin to Ogata’s ‘unsavable souls’ - where compensation would not help.

If Hatakeyama was not able to describe this ‘something’ that the arbitration or the international legal framework could not solve, then what? I tentatively labelled
this ‘something’ as ‘Hatakeyama’s Ainu world’ and explored it by focusing on Hatakeyama’s words of ‘whale’ to find clues to define and understand it.

**What ‘whale’ represents to Hatakeyama**

For Hatakeyama, ‘whale’ had more meanings beyond just catching and consuming one. When asked why he wanted to catch one, Hatakeyama’s answers provided insight into how he understood the word, ‘whale’:

I do not intend to make a profit out of it [hunting a whale] at all. This is my rights claim, as an indigenous individual. Challenging the largest [animal] and top [sic] of the ecosystem on the globe would be just a full privilege of being born as a man... I always perceived myself as a loser. I put on a brave face at work. However, it was only at work. I am always carrying a feeling of inferiority. I really want to tell Wajin who have insulted Ainu until now. Even Ainu can do. We can do, because we are Ainu. I don’t want to end my life as a loser.

俺はそれで儲けようなんていう気持ちは全くない。ただ、ひとりの民族としての権利要求。地球上で最も大きい生き物の鯨にアイヌが挑むってことは、男冥利に尽きる。俺は負け犬だったんだという認識もあった。商売で強がって生きてきた。それは、仕事上の生き様。そういう劣等人間という気持ちを今も持っている。その中で、アイヌを卑下してきた連中を見返してやりたい。『アイヌだから出来たんだ』というね。劣等人間で終わっちゃうんじゃないね。(S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

Three words in his remark struck me; *the largest and top [sic] of ecosystem... a full privilege of being born as a man, and I really want to tell Wajin*. These statements gave me an insight of what ‘whale’ really meant to Hatakeyama. For Hatakeyama, catching the largest animal on the globe might represent his revenge against Wajin. It would demand attention given that it was the top of the ecosystem for a fisherman. It would be the biggest catch. ‘Whale’ might have also represented himself and his people. And now, as a fisherman, his power of
catching such a mighty beast had been taken away from him and his Ainu people. The rights now controlled by a bigger power than he - the nation of Japan.

Hatakeyama saw an association between the unfairness and unreasonableness of the government of Japan in their control over whaling rights with the control of him and his people through assimilation and modernisation policies. He viewed them as ignoring his peoples’ history in return for national growth instead.

For him, regaining control of whale hunting could have two implications. The Ainu rights to access natural resources based on his and his people’s decisions could be reinstituted. This point would be congruent between Hatakeyama and other MSN members.

The other implication could be the emancipation of him and his people. The Ainu people traditionally believed in the spirits of all living creatures, plants and commodities that they related to in their everyday life. In their belief, Kamuy (spiritual being) appears in the Ainu (human) world in the outer form of animals (such as bears, owls, and salmon), plants (such as monkshood), diseases (such as smallpox), and natural phenomena such as fire and lightning (Utagawa, 1992). The Ainu people understand that killing, consuming or using these things meant freeing their spirits from their outer forms, and sending them back to the place where their ancestral spirits dwelled (Fujimura, 1982; Utagawa, 1992). The Ainu people conduct a ceremony to express gratitude toward the spirits for these things that they believe have been bestowed upon mankind, and this may be seen as a “respectful return gift from humanity to the heavens” (Utagawa, 1992, p. 255). This Ainu belief in the “spiritual sending-back” (Utagawa, 1992, p. 255) is “a different notion of sacrifice in Christian belief” (Fujimura, 1982, p. 177).
The second implication could make Hatakeyama’s words of ‘catching whale’ much more than the indigenous rights as understood in the Western or Japanese modern context. Hatakeyama could see the spiritual connection between humans and whales, like Ogata had with his experience in Minamata. Hatakeyama had a memory of his *fuchi*, who told him not to mess with a particular area near the local mountain because the ancestral local Ainu people enshrined the head bone of a whale there for their ceremony purposes (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 22, 2015). Hatakeyama might one day wish to return to this place, his people and connect with his ancestor’s spirits through catching a whale. Hence, the underlying meaning of ‘full Ainu as human’ could be the emancipation of him and his people. This understanding of what Hatakeyama means by ‘whaling’ might be the best way his can express, using his limited vocabulary that had been shaped by his life as a fisherman.

The researcher conducted an interview with an MSN key member (MSN member A) who offered an interpretation of Hatakeyama’s meaning of ‘whale’ and ‘whaling’:

It is very easy to understand that ‘whaling’ symbolises something about what Japan has done to Ainu, such as losing Ainu culture and its oppressive history. Many unreasonable problems have always been around Hatakeyama’s life. Hatakeyama had fought against these, but he cannot see and express the entity that has always caused him problems. Considering his age, Hatakeyama is of the generation that cannot express their thoughts and feelings in words well. This is very different from the Ainu younger generation who are educated and can express their thoughts in straightforward and sophisticated Japanese words – this helps Japanese people understand them more easily. Such young Ainu people have hardly had unreasonable experiences such as those that Hatakeyama experienced. So, even the young Ainu, just like the Japanese people, are never
going to be able to understand what Hatakeyama symbolically meant by his use of the word ‘whaling’. When the words of ‘whaling rights’ or ‘indigenous rights’ are spoken by these Ainu youth, these lose they very important meaning that Hatakeyama wanted to express.

It would be interesting whether or not Hatakeyama still wanted to seek whaling rights, if he were well-educated and not a fisherman. It was apparent that Hatakeyama used a specific language in his daily life and in his Ainu world so that when he tried to express ideas, such as through the words ‘indigenous whaling rights’, it was understood differently by others. Hatakeyama speaks Japanese, and specifically, the dialect of the Mombetsu fishermen. Just like most of the Ainu in his generation, he had little opportunity to study in modern educational systems in Japan. He was not familiar with particular Japanese words currently spoken in specific contexts, such as in the arbitration process, and even at MSN meetings. It was difficult for him to express and present his ideas logically and meaningfully to his audience.

On the other hand, the words ‘indigenous whaling rights’ also meant more to him than ideals. Hatakeyama had long dreamed of hunting a whale as a fisherman, as
he had worked in the environment where fellow fishermen envied whaling as a profitable business and he understood the political and economic power surrounding it; and he had detested the Japanese government’s attitude toward whaling. Hatakeyama’s feelings, experiences and concerns had a depth of complexity that meant to describe them to others was a difficult challenge, yet it would be important to do so, so that everyone, including those at the MSN meetings could really understand what Hatakeyama stood for in regard to the emancipation of his people.

8.3 Embodied local and indigenous knowledge

Hatakeyama could not express the meaning embodied in his local knowledge when he appeared to advocate ‘whaling’ in his beliefs. Berger and Luckmann (1985) explained that the process of forming identity occurred in “the period during which the human develops towards its completion in interrelationship with its environment is also the period during which the human self is formed” (pp. 67-70). Drawing on their explanation, the reason why he could neither verbalise nor recognise his Ainu world as different from modern understandings by others can be assumed that his identity and knowledge was developed from his childhood through his particular life experiences.

Hatakeyama was born in the 1940s when the Ainu culture had already been decimated. The values, social ties, traditional ceremonies, materials and languages that had supported Ainu society were vanishing. The Ainu adults belittled their culture and convinced Hatakeyama to believe in the superiority of the Japanese
people and their culture over the Ainu’s ways. Hatakeyama grew up hardly having opportunities to learn traditional Ainu culture.

At the age of fifty, when he came out as identifying as Ainu for the first time, he began to explore what his Ainu identity meant. Hatakeyama had to confront memories that he had wanted to deny and forget for a long time. Then, he had to weave pieces of memories of Ainu ways into a firm and stable cultural ground upon which he could stand for his rights claim. However, this process was not easy as his Ainu memories were fragmented.

Some memories were clear though. He often told stories of his early childhood days in conversations with MSN members. Hatakeyama spoke about the drunken Ainu fishermen of his kotan (village), who had spent days drinking whenever the sea was rough. Hatakeyama, as a child, had to run to the town to buy saké for them. Their drinking always ended up with a fight amongst them. He also often talked about his grandmother who had a traditional Ainu tattoo around her mouth. His grandmother told him the stories of the Ainu gods who lived in all the natural creations (MSN, 2011c). In my own listening to these stories, they were not coherently linked to each other, but distinct from each other without relation.

To fill in missing pieces of his memories, Hatakeyama drew on his life experiences as a fisherman. Wind, temperature, swell, humidity, smell, the colour of the ocean and sky, flying seabirds, fish running in waves, fishing techniques, business, values, trust relationship and ethics – he has experienced these and expressed them through his daily practice as a fisherman. Pálsson (1997) described that fishermen’s knowledge about fishing was mainly the result of practical engagement with the environment, based on his participant observation.
on the Iceland fishermen. This statement indicates that fishermen’s knowledge covered not only technical fishing information but also a comprehensive knowledge of trust and relationship with the local community people and was constructed through the interaction with local nature and cultural influences.

Hatakeyama also obtained the knowledge to be a fisherman from his local social environment. He filled in the gaps of his fragmented Ainu memories with his embodied local fishing knowledge and his imagination of what life was like for his Ainu fisherman ancestors. Hatakeyama’s Ainu world was understood now by this type of distinct knowledge – a knowledge which could be characterised as tacit, practical, embodied and locally and historically contextualised. This knowledge can also be referred to as ‘embodied local and indigenous knowledge’.

8.4 Epistemological oppression

There was a power differential between modern knowledge and Hatakeyama’s embodied local and indigenous knowledge. This did not surface in the MSN’s arbitration process. It can be assumed that the power differential created epistemological oppression, without any of MSN members’ and even Hatakeyama’s being aware of this oppression.

The epistemological oppression that Hatakeyama experienced can be explained by the work of Berger and Luckmann (1985), which explored how social interaction with others affects the process of one’s knowledge creation.

Only a small part of the totality of human experience is retained in consciousness. The experiences that are so retained become sedimented, that is, they congeal in
One can identify a part of his/her life experiences and store it as his/her knowledge while he/she repeats the interaction back and forth with surrounding people. In this process, the values, thoughts, the way of understanding and knowledge of the surrounding people significantly affect one’s understanding and knowing of a part of his/her life experiences as ‘knowledge’.

This process of social interaction and knowledge creation also happened to Hatakeyama in the MSN’s ESD process. Hatakeyama tried to recognise a part of his life experience in the conversation with the people around him in regard to his rights claim. He did this, in particular, through meetings, workshops and seminars. Hatakeyama interacted back and forth with the MSN members and the participants at the events. He tried to recognise, verbalise and socialise his Ainu world. Hatakeyama recalled his life and talked about his concerns at the meetings, seminars and workshops in, and outside, of Mombetsu and at international conferences. The conversations with other participants and the documents that recorded his talks might have helped him to re-develop his Ainu identity.

In this process, unfortunately, there was a mismatch between two parties - Hatakeyama and most MSN members. The reasons behind this mismatch can be categorised into four obstacles: place, language, knowledge and a feeling of inferiority.
**Place**

The first obstacle was the place where the social interactions happened. These included the locations of the meetings, workshops and seminars. These settings physically cut Hatakeyama from his connection with his life as an Ainu and a fisherman. Hatakeyama had to recognise that was locally contextualised and he needed to identify it as knowledge in an entirely different context. It could be argued that Ainu communication methods, like drawing and singing, could be incorporated in these meetings. However, these options would be able to represent only a part of his Ainu world. Because of its local and historically contextualised nature, Hatakeyama could hardly verbalise, or even conceptualise, in a narrow and closed meeting room his arguments for indigenous rights in a place that was foreign to him.

**Language**

The second obstacle was the language used for the communication at the meetings (Japanese, more specifically, modern Japanese – the language of the coloniser). In the discussions at MSN, the following Japanese words were often used, such as, 権利 (kenri; rights), 先住民族 (senjyu-minzoku; indigenous people), 捕鯨 (hogei; whaling), 鯨 (kujira; whale) and 鮭 (saké; salmon) to represent his Ainu rights claim. However, these words relate highly to the cultural and political contexts of Japan, which colonised the Ainu people. Hatakeyama did not know the Ainu language so he had to use Japanese words to describe things that did not exist in Japanese society, or were subjugated by the Japanese. Thus, these key Japanese words used for Hatakeyama’s rights claim did not fully represent Hatakeyama’s Ainu world. Further those words inherited the oppressive relationship between the
colonisers and the colonised, without anyone being aware of it, including Hatakeyama.

**Knowledge**

The third obstacle was the knowledge that predominantly underpinned the communication, thoughts and the language used for the discussions of the MSN meetings, workshops and seminars. The members mostly had some modern background, in terms of their education, lifestyles and career. Many of them were not the subject of this activism and were without direct experience of discrimination or working in the primary industries like Hatakeyama. They were concerned with environmental and human rights issues largely based on their learning at schools, seminars, media, documents, or observing someone else’s life experience. It was difficult for MSN members to fully know and understand the life experiences of Hatakeyama. Hatakeyama’s words tended to be understood literally through the lens of modern Japanese, which meant Hatakeyama could not accurately express his Ainu world.

**Feeling of inferiority**

The last obstacle was Hatakeyama own outlook – that he felt inferior toward the Japanese people and their modern knowledge backgrounds. Hatakeyama grew up receiving physical and verbal abuse which imprinted on him and contributed to his feeling of inferiority. He did not complete his compulsory education due to the discrimination.

Wajin children at school chased me and threw rocks at me, swearing ‘Ah, Inu!’ [a dog in Japanese] or ‘Ice cream’. I went to the local junior high school which had about 1,200 students. The bullying started at the end of my first year. Eventually, I stopped attending school.
Remembering multiple and ongoing experiences of discrimination in the school and local community resulted in his feeling of inferiority toward the Japanese people and those with modern educational backgrounds. Even after a few decades since he publicly claimed his Ainu identity, the feeling of inferiority still rankled Hatakeyama:

I never have the right words to describe my concerns because I do not have an education. It does not matter how many years have gone by after telling the world I am Ainu. This thought of ‘I am stupid’ keeps haunting me, even after shaking it off again and again.

His feeling of inferiority obstructed him from recognising and expressing what he felt through his body. Despite the strong confidence that he obtained through his hard work in his fishing business, Hatakeyama felt inferior to Wajin. He felt fear and anxiety in relation to the Japanese experts who live their lives by using the skills and knowledge obtained through the modern educational system.

The four obstacles above blended together, creating an epistemological oppression between those with modern knowledge and those without it in the MSN. At the MSN meeting in Mombetsu, during the process of arbitration, Hatakeyama murmured that he felt ‘threatened’ when he was discussing issues with Group A.
members (MSN, 2012). He did not say any more about how he felt about Group B but he told me later that he had a similar feeling with both groups (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 13, 2013). None of the MSN members had any intention to threaten him at all; rather, what was present was each member’s sincerity, and all of them did their best to try to help Hatakeyama from their own sense of justice. It seems reasonable that it was more his fear and inferiority in relation to modern knowledge and the Japanese (who control this modern knowledge) that made him feel threatened.

I am such a dumb person. My emotion always comes first before the words...

俺は頭が悪いっていうか。言葉が出るよりも感情ばかりが先に走ってしまう・・・。
(S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

I often observed Hatakeyama putting himself down in his everyday life. However, his claims were not true. Hatakeyama could not put his concerns into articulate statements not because of his lack of an academic background. He was engaging with a very local and historically contextualised knowledge, which was far beyond the understanding, thoughts and languages of modern knowledge. Furthermore, the power of modern knowledge placed most MSN members’ knowledge and their epistemology superior to Hatakeyama’s knowledge and his epistemology. In so doing, it dismissed a large part of Hatakeyama’s Ainu world and even re-defined it by the understanding obtained through discussions at the MSN. As a result, the MSN discussions were sometimes oppressive to Hatakeyama, even though it was organised in a ‘participatory’ and inclusive way. This view of the discussions might be because he felt that something in him was oppressed silently in an unexplained way.
8.5 Rethinking Hatakeyama’s Swing

Hatakeyama’s Swing behaviour emerged while he was struggling to deal with the power differential between two knowledges and epistemologies. In the conversations with MSN members, without most MSN members’ and even Hatakeyama himself knowing, Hatakeyama had to cross over the different knowledges and different epistemologies; between modern knowledge and embodied local and indigenous knowledge. He was trying to recognise what he never recognised before, and to verbalise his recognition that he never verbalised, by looking for the words of the coloniser that underpinned the modern knowledge of the Japanese people. At the same time, however, he resisted the power that could drag him back into the modern and colonial understanding.

MSN members with modern educational backgrounds and expertise knowledge interpreted Hatakeyama’s concerns and provided advice (drawing on the concepts and approaches within the modern knowledge system, such as the Japanese legal system or the UNDRIP). Their suggestions did not fully represent Hatakeyama’s true concerns. Hatakeyama even tried to make every effort to fit into their perspectives – motivated by the nature of his knowledge and his feeling of inferiority. After a while, he began to feel unsettled because he felt somewhere in his body that none of the advice fully addressed what he wanted. It was at this juncture that he would meet yet another expert. His behaviour and conflicted thinking made him look like a pendulum in motion.

Hatakeyama’s Swing was not a one-time phenomenon that happened only in the MSN process. It happened in his activism, even as early as the 1980s. One time, he approached politicians and researchers who were renowned for their
conservative opinions to lobby and research possible activities related to his activism. Another time, he worked with activists in the field of environment and human rights who committed to their efforts for social change, like MSN members). One day, a journalist pointed out a lack of clarity in Hatakeyama’s ideological standpoints, half blithering: “Hatakeyama-san, are you right or left? 畠山さん、あなたは、右なんですか左なんですか?” (MSN, 2010b). Like Ogata, Hatakeyama looked for whatever he could to improve his outcomes but he could not find it in either ideological camp of right or left. Hatakeyama had struggled with the power differential between these knowledge paradigms for a long time.

According to the MSN members, there was no intention to disempower Hatakeyama at all. There was only the ‘good’ intention for social justice and attempts to stop the modernisation process of Japan by working with marginalised people. But all this occurred without going beyond the understanding of modern knowledge.

Washizu said:

I may be able to call it ‘overcoming of modernity’. Both Hatakeyama and I are carrying plenty of dirty modernisation stuff. The possible way to go beyond modernity is, I always think, that I, ‘shamo’ [another way of calling Japanese in Ainu, in a slightly discriminative way], as a being charged with the responsibility for the Ainu issues, could stand on the same ground with the Ainu people for us to work together.
“Translation was never possible” (Atwood, 1986, p. 5), even in the ‘participatory’ and ‘inclusive’ MSN process. None of MSN members, even Hatakeyama, realised that there was something that could go far beyond the words in their conversations. Ideas and Weltanschauungen (worldviews) are only part of the sum of what passes for knowledge (Berger & Luckmann, 1985, pp. 26-27). Hatakeyama could express only a part of his ‘Ainu world’ that arose from the unverbalised daily environment in which he lived. And even then, Hatakeyama’s words were interpreted into a coloniser’s modern Japanese language and their true meaning lost their accuracy.

As pointed out before, Hatakeyama’s Swing was the result of him being torn between two knowledges. His Swing behaviour represented his struggles in expressing his knowledge when the power of modern knowledge excluded his knowledge from its understanding. He showed his irritation, anger and desperation when he struggled to express his Ainu world - one that he could not articulate or verbalise.

From my experience, critical theory-based approaches could be effective only for those who share the same languages, ways of communicating and approaches to social change within modern knowledge. This could be an effective approach with most MSN members who possessed the modern knowledge and lived in urban cities. But, unfortunately, it was not effective for the few Ainu people, like Hatakeyama, who were contextualised in their own Ainu world.
8.6 New beginning

After withdrawing from the rights claim for official recognition of Minamata disease victims, Ogata in Minamata, decided to live as a fisherman on the Shiranui Sea of Minamata. He stepped away from the social activism that challenged the nation because it was the modern knowledge and the same system of modernisation in which he would need to fight that was also producing problems, such as Minamata disease. His word, “moyai (tying two ships together in Japanese)” (Ogata, 2001), symbolically represented his decision to return to a simple life:

I would like to rejuvenate the values [in Minamata] that we lost by reconnecting and strengthening the weakened moyai. (p. 213)

I will really have a feeling of ‘I am living’ when I could be a part of the world where our sea, mountains and islands of Shiranui are ranging. (p. 71)

For Ogata, reviving his traditional way of living through simply living as a fisherman in Minamata was the only way to save his spiritual and cultural beliefs.

The amount of the social impact that Ogata’s change actually brought was very little. However, he internally made a large paradigm shift. He had left the social context that someone else had created and suppressed him for many years. He overturned the understandings about ‘rights’ and the approach to obtain the rights, which were taken for granted by those who live in the modern Japanese society. He began to establish his own context based on his understanding and his words, to solve the Minamata disease problem. His struggles through his life enabled him to see its internalised contradictions when he attempted to enact major social
change. This was, in fact, the process of Ogata’s spiritual emancipation and his learning for his growth.

In an interview with Hatakeyama, I noticed that there were a few words that indicated the new beginning of his own personal paradigm shift, which appeared similar to Ogata’s experience (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 13, 2013). In our conversation, Hatakeyama talked about his dream to create a locally based enterprise, as well as a space to connect socially-marginalised people in Mombetsu. He told me that he had visited a few organic farms and food processing factories for disabled people to explore his interests.

Hatakeyama told me his dream to build his own chisé (Ainu traditional house) on his land where his house and his warehouse were formerly. From this land, about 300 Ainu people’ remains were excavated when his house was built in the late 1990s (Hayasaka Komuten and Takanaka Consultant, 1998). In 2012, his land needed reimagining due to the fire that burnt his house. He was thinking about what to do about his land:

The Ainu used to not only catch salmon and trout but also traded these with the Wajin and Russians. I think that I should revive our trading culture in this modern context –producing and selling the fishery products, with a label that tells you about Ainu rights. In this production work, I want to create the work for those who are struggling to live, such as the youth, the disabled and the elderly. I want to give these people work to obtain skills. This land should not be used for building a house or a warehouse. Developing such people will console the ancestral spirits who sleep here. There, we can get together and talk about the problems that we face. This is my humble dream.

アイヌは昔、鮭鱒を獲るだけじゃなくて、実際にそれを和人やロシア人と物交したり交易にしたりしていた。こういった交易を今の社会の中でとりもどすのはど
He believed that creating a space for sustainable fishing, and for socially-
marginalised people to get together, would comfort his ancestral spirits’ sleep.

Then, I asked him:

For most MSN members, the indigenous fishing rights are about whether or not
the Ainu people would catch something, such as salmon and whales. However,
what you said to me that it is more than that. Your indigenous rights are about re-
connecting people and creating a new sustainable livelihood. The Ainu used to
enjoy very rich ‘human to nature’ relationships regarding salmon and whales
before. Yes, the government still does not give you the rights to catch these, but,
doesn’t it mean there has already been some indigenous rights recovery?
Especially, if you are launching some efforts to regain such a rich human-nature
relationship, before obtaining the actual fishing rights?

Hatakeyama became silent for a moment, staring at me for a while. Then he
replied:
Oh, yes. It does. ああ、そうだね。 (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

and added:

The meaning of indigenous right recovery includes the realisation of a society where the socially-marginalised can live together. I had such a kind of idea but I could not get the right words.

いろんな社会的排斥を受けた人たちが共生できる社会の実現を含めての先住権。こういったことは、漠然と考えていたけど、言葉にならなかった。 (S. Hatakeyama, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

After the arbitration, most MSN members and the media regarded the recognition of Ainu as a local stakeholder as a success. This result might have a socially transformative impact on the knowledge and social framework that the majority of Japanese supported. However, I question what was meant by ‘success’, and for whom. This success belittled Hatakeyama’s Ainu world, and reinterpreted it to fit into the knowledge and social framework of the majority.

The conversation above with Hatakeyama points toward the idea that he was at the beginning of his own paradigm shift. Hatakeyama expressed his thoughts about his indigenous rights in more diverse and richer words than what I had heard in my early involvement with the MSN in 2010. These words were not given to him by the experts. Years of struggling and ‘swing’ finally brought him to the landing point at which he is now at. And this is neither a right nor left ideological camp. He began to localise himself; to find the right words to articulate, and even to realise a glimpse of his true Ainu world.
8.7 Summary of Chapter 8

Hatakeyama’s paradigm shift and his ‘swing’ formed a significant part of his learning and knowledge creation process – one that could not be understood with critical theory. Decoloniality in this research allowed an understanding of his struggles and dis-empowerment process that modern knowledge overlooked. Hatakeyama also took his own decoloniality approach where he de-contextualised himself from thoughts and approaches that were taken for granted in modern society; and he began finding his own words and approaches based on his local Ainu identity.

Ogata in Minamata and Hatakeyama in Mombetsu made very little social impact. However, their individual internal paradigm shifts could be the essential learning step to achieve sustainable community development. If the challenge for social change of marginalised people was understood through modern knowledge, could their epistemological oppression actually be changed? It would be necessary for socially-critical ESD to re-establish the knowledge and the epistemologies of the socially-marginalised people so that they would be enabled to engage in a real dialogue between the modern knowledge holders and other indigenous knowledge holders.

The next chapter presents a critical reflection and conclusion to this thesis. It theoretically summarises the experiences of MSN’s ESD, including Hatakeyama, MSN members, and myself as an educator. It also presents the theoretical implication of these on the gap between critical EE and socially-critical ESD. The chapter will then offer a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context based on the critical reflection of this research. The framework could then
provide guidance for educators, socially-marginalised people and wider community members who work in sustainable community development.
CHAPTER 9. Discussion and conclusion: Critical reflection and a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context

This research explored a tacit part of ESD that was observed through my practical experiences of twenty years. The research focussed on informal education that sought to empower local community members in a development process for achieving sustainability. In particular, a tacit gap between two fields was identified; ESD and community development. This research assumed that the underpinning conceptual framework of ESD, which was part of critical EE, might not be efficacious to the wider and broader scope of, and settings for, ESD. This assumption went beyond the dominant assumption by critical educators who identified political, socio- and economic pressures as the cause of the rhetoric-reality gap in ESD.

Therefore, this research sought how ESD might contribute to (or be integrated within) community development, and vice versa; and how a community development practice might enrich ESD discussions. The main aim was summarised as:

To develop a praxis framework for integrating ESD and community development as mutually supporting to strength the practices in both ESD and community development field.

The relevance of critical EE to socially-critical approaches to ESD in a community development context was also explored. Critical EE had provided a
theoretical framework for policies and research on ESD and had been the guiding theory for my practices with the MSN.

The following three subset research questions were developed to explore informal ESD in a community development context more fully:

1. How useful is critical EE in understanding ESD in a community development context? Answers to this question might provide an understanding of the relevance and effectiveness of critical EE to ESD in a community development context.

2. What are the key elements of ESD that can facilitate the empowerment of marginalised community members in efforts to achieve sustainable community development? Answers to this question might contribute to the development of a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context.

3. How might this praxis framework be validated and how might it add new insights to current critical EE? Answers to this question might lend validity to a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context.

To address these subset aims, this research conducted two critical ethnographic studies of MSN, presented as separate parts: Part I – *within* socially-critical ESD; and, Part II - *beyond* socially-critical ESD. This research began with an investigation of the effectiveness of socially-critical approaches to ESD in relation to local community empowerment, particularly marginalised community members. The research in this section was informed by critical theory (Part I). However, the results of Part I made it evident that critical EE (guiding theory) and critical theory (methodology) were insufficient to understand the learning process and knowledge construction of the few Ainu people (including Hatakeyama). This finding necessitated a methodological shift of this research to decoloniality (Part
II). This resulted in the findings of the two parts to be contrastive; one could not explain particular data but the other one could, and vice versa.

Reflecting on the key findings from the research, this chapter concludes with critical reflections and a conclusion. These are presented in three sections: (i) proposing ‘a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context’; (ii) an analysis of the significance of the study; and, (ii) the way forward.

9.1 Proposing a praxis framework

Praxis integrates theory and practice, or reflection and action, for the conscientisation and the emancipatory empowerment of the learners for the transformation of themselves and the society. A praxis framework in this research comprised of a theoretical lens and a practice framework. The theoretical framework (that informed the praxis framework) was developed based on four key findings of this research.

The four key findings that this research identified are:

- **Key finding 1**: Insufficiency of critical EE due to epistemological limitation of critical theory;
- **Key finding 2**: ‘Schooling’ in critical EE as the enhancer of epistemological limitation;
- **Key finding 3**: Necessity of a decoloniality lens to surface what ‘critical’ overlooks; and,
- **Key finding 4**: Silencing of different knowledges and different learnings for ESD in a community development context
The practice framework, in turn, operationalises the theoretical framework in four steps. These four key findings became the theoretical lens that supported each of these steps:

- Step 1: ‘Conscientising’ the limitation of understanding local community problems within an understanding of critical EE;
- Step 2: ‘Stepping out’ from the dominant frame of views and knowledge, which is supported by modern knowledge;
- Step 3: ‘Establishing the epistemology’ of marginalised people from their perspectives; and,
- Step 4: ‘Re-engaging’ back with dialogue about social change with majority members.

My experiences as an educator are also incorporated into the praxis framework. This included the struggles I had in finding a better methodological approach and my pursuit of understanding the real meaning of knowledge and learning of the Ainu community.

Based on the four key findings and four steps, a praxis framework for ESD in a community development context is proposed. This framework is summarised in Table 9-1 (see next page). This praxis framework has three elements, including:

(i) a practice framework; (ii) a theoretical framework; and, (iii) a role of educator. These three elements can involve four steps in practice.

This framework can be used by anyone who is involved in seeking solutions for community problems and to support mutual learning among the stakeholders (which might, for example, include researchers, practitioners, local residents, marginalised people, and government officials). This framework encourages a
mutual learning and reflection process where the diverse stakeholders have a chance to take a leadership role and to participate in actions for social change.

Table 9-1: 
**A praxis framework and its three pillars (summary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Theoretical framework</th>
<th>Practice framework</th>
<th>Role of the educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step1</td>
<td>Key finding 1: Critical theory and decoloniality integrated</td>
<td><em>Conscientising</em> the limitation of understanding in local community problems</td>
<td>In addition to the roles of the educator as facilitator and coordinator, this research describes additional roles as a cultural broker and escort runner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step2</td>
<td>Key finding 2: Decoloniality</td>
<td><em>Stepping out</em> from the dominant frame of views and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step3</td>
<td>Key finding 2: Decoloniality</td>
<td><em>Establishing</em> the epistemology of the marginalised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step4</td>
<td>Key finding 3: Critical theory and decoloniality integrated</td>
<td><em>Re-engaging back</em> with the multi-stakeholder dialogue with the reconstructed epistemology from the below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theoretically, a **praxis framework** takes the integrated approach of decoloniality into critical EE. It concerns both modern knowledge and other knowledges of marginalised people. This framework acknowledges the importance of critical EE in understanding the dominant and powerful modern knowledge of a society and its oppression of other knowledge types. But rather than criticising this as the march of modernity, it integrates a decoloniality lens. This understands the modern knowledge, including its benefits to, and problems of, marginalised people by shifting the positionality of knowing, and establishing a new epistemology – as discussed below.
Learning and knowledge creation can occur through the four steps, when the participants and educators attempt to transcend the boundary of a dominant social framework, and allow themselves to be immersed in the different context of others.

**Figure 9-1: A praxis framework for ESD in a community development context: Four steps in practice**

This section presents the four steps (in their own subsection from 9.1.1 to 9.1.4) and the role of educator in the process of going through the four steps (subsection 9.1.5).

### 9.1.1 Step1: Conscientisation

**Figure 9-2: Step1**

This step encourages stakeholders who engage in the process of community development to consider three aspects of the knowledge paradigm upon which the
majority people stand (Figure 9-3). Firstly, it encourages them to understand the oppression and limitations of modern knowledge that causes the marginalisation of particular groups of people, their views and indigenous knowledge. Secondly, it raises an understanding that this modern knowledge (that supports the majority, critical EE and critical theory) has epistemological limitations for understanding the knowledges and learning processes of marginalised people. Thirdly, applying modern knowledge to know and understand the problems of marginalised people can oppose the marginalised people even further.

**Theoretical framework**

The theoretical framework of this step helps the stakeholder to understand the epistemological limitation of modern knowledge, including through critical theory. The step is informed by Key finding 1 of this research. Methodologically, though, this process is informed by the integrated approach of decoloniality and critical theory.

**Key finding 1: Insufficiency of critical EE due to epistemological limitation of critical theory**

This research identified that critical EE was insufficient when it was applied to socially-critical approaches to ESD in a community development context. This finding was determined because of the epistemological limitations of critical theory. The insight about the potential for this epistemological limitation arose from the review of literature in section 2.3. It became clearer when this research confronted the problems of ‘patchy empowerment’ and Hatakeyama’s Swing that were portrayed in sections 5.2 and 5.3. ‘Patchy empowerment’ meant that there was a presence of a few disempowered people amongst the larger numbers of
community members who were effectively empowered by the inclusive and participatory learning and actions of MSN. These large numbers of community members included both Japanese and Ainu people. They were mostly urbanised, had a modern education background up to a higher education level, and were not engaged in primary industry. They took part in many local learning activities and undertook a range of actions on national and international issues. On the other hand, the same activities resulted in less-empowerment or disempowerment of a few Ainu members, including the MSN founder, Hatakeyama. Guiding theory (critical EE and critical theory) could not explain the insufficiency of critical EE in the MSN.

The epistemological limitation of critical theory was elaborated in the literature review (Section 6.2) when discussing the impact of Minamata disease in Japan.\(^58\) The Minamata disease literature highlighted the issue of a “policy systemic view” (Kitoh, 2007, 2009) that prevented the research, practices and policies to provide a fundamental solution for Minamata disease, and instead, caused epistemological problems. The policy systemic view understood the problems of marginalised people systemically with a bird’s eye like ‘a policy maker’. With this view, those who search for the solutions to the Minamata disease problems saw the victims as one mass and understood them based on their knowledge (mostly scientific and universal knowledge). They overlooked the diverse, complex and even contradictory reality of the same group of victims, who individually are burdened and experience the problems through their whole body and through their everyday

\(^{58}\) At this time, the opportunity to study at the University of Tokyo in 2013-14 as an exchange PhD fellow allowed me to study the causes and impacts of Minamata disease after 1950s, where extensive studies had already been conducted.
life at the bottom of society. This view creates a new knowledge for solutions that “particularises, verifies and generalises (Agrawal, 2002)” the totality of the victim's experiences. In the power relationship between those who hold the agency of knowing and the marginalised people, the newly created knowledge defined who the victims were and the problems, and could be applied to solutions. The victims were forced to fit into this new definition and solutions for the problems were decided by others. As a result, problems with Minamata disease were never solved. The Minamata disease literature provided an internal understanding about why critical theory was problematic in a local community context.

Critical theory concerns who, whose voices, what perspectives are missing in a society, and attempts to bring marginalised people into a space for discussion with diverse stakeholders (Habermas, 1972, 1979). However, as shown in Figure 9-4, it has three problems.

**Figure 9-3: Epistemological limitation of critical theory**
Firstly, critical theory does not concern itself about marginalised people’s view. While it is true that critical theory can decide who is to be in the discursive dialogue space, it can, however, overlook marginalised people and leave them. It treats marginalised people as a mass and it is not mindful of their diversity, complexity and contradictions within their group and in the relationships they have with the majority.

Secondly, critical theory does not question their viewpoints or the ground upon which they stand. Whereas, the stance of the majority is highly supported by their modern knowledge, leaving marginalised people to conform (by fitting into the modern languages, concepts and knowledge used in the modern knowledge paradigm). The act of bringing even part of a marginalised people’s group to this paradigm could distort their own understanding of their experiences, relationships, knowledge and epistemology.

Despite its strong criticism of modernity, critical theory also emerged from, and was developed, based on the same knowledge production system that supported the modern knowledge paradigm (Morris-Suzuki, 2011). It produces newly created knowledge with some of marginalised people. It reintegrates this into the current modern knowledge and uses it for redefining the problems of marginalised people. However, the power imbalance between modernity and the marginalised people still remains.

Thirdly, critical theory does not question the ‘good intentions’ of those who engaged with activism for social justice, environmental problems and solutions to those problems. Part II portrayed that many participants of the MSN believed their approaches or tools for liberation and emancipation of the marginalised people
were still problematic in terms of knowing and understanding of the true nature of the problems of the marginalised people. Such approaches/tools included participatory and inclusive workshops, seminars, facilitation, rallies, petitions, lobbying, and participatory research.

These approaches/tools for liberation and emancipation were still the products of modern knowledge. In terms of learning and knowledge creation, such approaches still oppress marginalised people. The power of modern knowledge in these tools tended to dismiss the epistemologies of marginalised people, and became stronger when it was connected with social status, class, race and gender of the modern knowledge holders. This majority could not understand that there were different ways of knowing and expressing the problems of marginalised people.

But also the power of modern knowledge reproduces the modern knowledge by focusing on only the part of marginalised people’s knowledge that the modern knowledge can understand and integrating it into the modern knowledge. Such reproduction of the knowledge does not challenge the epistemological oppression of the modern knowledge over the knowledge of the marginalised people.

**Practice framework**

The theoretical framework is applied in the practice framework of Step 1. Considering the epistemological limitation of critical theory involves the process of *consicentisation* (Freire, 1972). Individuals within the dominant framework need to recognise the epistemological limitations of the current critical methodological and theoretical frameworks. These frameworks may guide practitioners and researchers in their engagement with marginalised people in terms of sustainability. In this process, individuals might acknowledge that
knowledge paradigms exist outside the dominant framework and cannot be fully known and understood solely by remaining within the lens of the dominant framework.

9.1.2 Step2: Stepping out

Figure 9-4: Step 2

This step encourages the stakeholders to step out from the knowledge framework that they are familiar with, in terms of the way of knowing and learning the knowledge of marginalised people. Individuals educated within the dominant framework need to set aside their guiding theories and thoughts, and step out from the dominant social framework to engage with marginalised people (Figure 9-5). The people from the majority group should attempt to hand over their agency of knowing and understanding into the hands of the marginalised people. The experiences in this step can help the modern knowledge holders to re-capture and re-identify problems of the marginalised people. In this step, the marginalised people also need to step out from their own boundaries (such as beliefs of negativity and inferiority of their own values, images and knowledges) that were borne out of the oppressive relationship with the majority.
Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of this step helps the stakeholders to understand the need to step out from their existing knowledge framework to understand marginalised people from theirs. The theoretical framework of this step was informed by Key finding 2 of this research. Methodologically, this represents the bridging process between critical theory and decoloniality.

Key finding 2: ‘Schooling’ focus of critical EE enhances epistemological limitation

The second key finding was that schooling (which is the dominant focus of most research in critical EE) enhances the epistemological limitation of critical theory, when critical EE is applied to community development context. As section 2.1 shows, critical EE has grown mostly in formal education settings based on the premises of curricula, learning goals and schedules, pedagogical approaches, educational materials, roles of teacher and learners. The adaptation of critical EE to non-formal and informal education settings was often discussed by looking at the part that could be understood within a particular schooling environment, rather than from the broad and dynamic learning processes in a local community (see sections 2.1 and 2.3).

This schooling focus sets a frame for a clear perspective, the aims, the role of educator and the learners. When a schooling concept is applied to a community development process, it creates a setting where a practitioner may associate their role with a teacher in a formal education setting or a school. Therefore, a practitioner attempts to set a semi-structured learning process in the community development process, such as seminars, workshops and participatory citizen
research. (Often, only these parts are highlighted and named as ESD in the literature.) Such semi-structured learning process becomes an invisible framework that functions more like a school. In this framework, the practitioner may think that she/he holds the agency of knowing. They may choose who should be in the learning frame, who the marginalised people are, what their problems are and what the goal of learning is, how the problem can be solved, and whom the local community people can work with.

The practitioner may apply participatory and inclusive approaches to the whole learning process. But, once again, she/he may be unaware of the knowledge paradigm that produced these approaches. As seen in the arbitration process of the MSN, the participatory workshops, seminars, field surveys and policy advocacies – all of these provided learning opportunities for only those who were familiar with the way of learning and knowledge that schooling could provide. These approaches may not be relevant to those who live based on the embodied local/indigenous knowledge, such as Hatakeyama, who struggled at the MSN meetings.

Because of its strong focus based on schooling, it limited the community learning process, and may have even oppressed different knowledges and ways of learning from becoming explicit. As discussed in section 6.2, while critical EE tends to ‘particularise’, ‘validate’ and generalise, diverse, complex and even contradicted marginalised people within the schooling frame, it does not see what exists outside of what modern knowledge currently understands. Community learning processes need to be explored beyond just a schooling way of understanding.
In a local community development context, critical EE needs to expand its understanding of learning and knowledge which often narrows the settings of ESD to a schooling context. To make ESD more socially-critical, ESD practitioners in a local community development context may need to understand the process of sustainable development (ESD=SD), where the dynamic learnings and actions are inextricably embedded in everyday life experiences in a local community.

In a local community development context, the stakeholders need to be aware of the particular framework that is imposed on them. The framework can include the knowledge framework, social framework and curriculum framework. It is important for stakeholders to step out from the way of understanding and knowing that they are familiar with and to step into the context of the marginalised people. This is the decolonising process that was discussed in section 6.3 and in Part II.

**Practice framework**

This step encourages both the educators and the participants to focus on what is overlooked in the understanding of modern knowledge. It suggests that stakeholders set aside their dominant knowledge, values and ways of knowing and instead immerse themselves in the very real context of the marginalised people. They should seek to experience what the marginalised people tacitly experienced in their day to day lives, if the situation allows.

The approaches taken here may include living in the local community context and actually experiencing the life of the marginalised people as one. They should seek to understand and listen to the knowledge of the marginalised people from their perspective. Through this, they will come to understand the totality and
complexity of their issues that the marginalised people experience in their everyday life.

9.1.3 Step 3: Establishing the epistemology of the marginalized

Figure 9-5: Step 3

This step encourages the stakeholders to immerse themselves in the context of the marginalised people (Figure 9-6). It is required for them to be apart from the modern knowledge for a certain period, and provide them with an opportunity to learn the knowledges and way of learning of the marginalised people.

Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of this step facilitates the stakeholders in identifying the knowledge and the learning process of the marginalised people. The theoretical framework of this step is informed by Key finding 3 of this research. Methodologically, this process is informed by decoloniality.

Key finding 3: Necessity of establishing the epistemology of the marginalised people

The third finding reveals the necessity of establishing the epistemology of the marginalised people. This provides the stakeholder with a decoloniality lens that allows them to surface the knowledge and the learning processes of the marginalised people. This is often overlooked in the modern knowledge
framework, and it also helps to the stakeholder understand why and how this overlooking occurred.

The idea of establishing the epistemology of the marginalised people was developed from the Minamata disease experience in Japan, as discussed in section 6.3. It was asserted that it would be the ‘only way’ to get close to the real problems of the marginalised people. This was to know and understand the problems of the marginalised people from their way of understanding and knowing, or establishing epistemology of the marginalised people (Kitoh, 2007, 2009). This approach was similar to decoloniality methodology in the Western research literature (Ndlovu-Gatsuheni, 2013, 2015).

The assumption of epistemological limitation in critical EE required a methodological shift to decoloniality for Part II. Theoretically, I set my guiding theory and methodology aside by handing over my agency of knowing to Hatakeyama, who was the most marginalised Ainu member in MSN. In so doing, I immersed myself in the Mombetsu local community to understand the meaning of knowledge and learning process of Hatakeyama and other MSN local community members.

Decoloniality helped to establish Hatakeyama’s way of knowing and learning - or his epistemology - which brought to the surface his embodied local/indigenous knowledge and previously unrevealed oppression that he experienced in the process of ‘participatory and inclusive’ discussion process of the MSN (see this analysis in sections 8.3 and 8.4). My experience of a decoloniality shift in this research highlights the necessity of ‘stepping out’ from the modern knowledge frame.
**Practice Framework**

This step encourages stakeholders to immerse themselves in the context of the marginalised people. They are encouraged to learn the knowledge, the problems and ways of understanding from the marginalised people by immersing themselves into the marginalised people’s community context. In this step, the stakeholders might come to better conceptualise and understand the plight and perspectives of the marginalised people.

**9.1.4 Step 4: Re-engaging back with the multi-stakeholder dialogue**

**Figure 9-6: Step 4**

Step 4 facilitates the marginalised people to re-engage back into dialogue with modern knowledge holders. This is based on the established epistemology of the marginalised people (see Figure 9-7).

**Theoretical Lens**

The theoretical framework of this step facilitates the marginalised people to re-engage back into dialogue with the majority people. The theoretical framework of this step is informed by Key finding 4 of this research. Methodologically, this process is informed by the integrated approach of decoloniality and critical theory.
Key finding 4: Silencing of different knowledges and different learnings

A decoloniality lens helps to bring to light the different knowledges that have been overlooked and oppressed by modern knowledge. Gaining insights from the life story of Ogata (Ogata, 2000, 2001; Oiwa et al., 2001), presented in section 8.1, helped to analyse Hatakeyama’s thinking based on his words of ‘whale’ and ‘whaling’ and the assumed existence of ‘Hatakeyama’s Ainu world’ (see section 8.2).

Hatakeyama’s embodied local/indigenous knowledge provided the base for his Ainu world. This knowledge significantly contributed to Hatakeyama’s identity as an Ainu. In this process, he drew on his experiences as a fisherman, which were embedded in Hatakeyama’s body movement, actions and senses in an everyday, local community context, together with his emotional struggles from targeted discrimination. This research identified that Hatakeyama’s knowledge was tacit, locally contextualised and embodied in nature. It contrasted with the modern knowledge that was verbal, conceptual, universal and rational.

In the MSN process, the power of modern knowledge oppressed his embodied local/indigenous knowledge. The discrimination, assimilation and oppression he faced resulted in the feeling of inferiority of himself and for his Ainu people. Three factors (‘place’, ‘language’, and ‘knowledge’) impacted on the way he communicated with the MSN members, and a fourth, Hatakeyama’s feeling of ‘inferiority’, oppressed him at the workshops, seminars and in the participatory citizen’s research. These factors work like a ‘frame’ that set the boundary in a community context, wherein modern knowledge dominated. While this frame
allowed the members to discuss freely within the understanding of modern knowledge, it separated Hatakeyama from his own context and his epistemology. Through a decoloniality lens, the real issues behind Hatakeyama’s Swing came to be understood. His ‘swing’ symbolically represented his struggles and resistances that he experienced when his embodied local/indigenous knowledge was excluded and alienated from the understanding of modern knowledge. However, this allowed Hatakeyama to obtain his own words to describe Ainu rights and to re-engage back into dialogue with the modern knowledge holders using his own words and knowledge (see section 8.6).

**Practice framework**

In Step 4, the marginalised people are encouraged to re-engage back with the modern knowledge holders in the dominant social paradigm. Given the modern knowledge stakeholders now have a better understanding of the marginalised peoples’ plight, both parties should be able to re-engage in dialogue within the modern knowledge paradigm. This should lead to outcomes and solutions to the problems of the marginalised people.

**9.1.5 Role of educator: Cultural broker and escort runner**

Throughout the four steps of this praxis, the role of the educator goes beyond what has been recognised in the critical EE literature, where the educator acts more as facilitator and coordinator (see section 2.1). In these new roles, linked to the praxis framework, they could be described as a *cultural broker* and or an
escort runner. Hereafter, these roles are briefly explained based on my personal and research experiences, and supported by relevant academic literature.

During this research, I, as the educator and the researcher, experienced crossing between two knowledge systems of modern knowledge and the local knowledge of Hatakeyama. This experience allowed me to discover the role of the educator to deal with these different knowledges. This role of crossing between different knowledge paradigms can be related to the concept of the cultural broker which has been recognised in the field of community development and social work. Particularly, this term describes a person who deals with people from multiple cultural backgrounds and multiple knowledges (see, for example, Escobar (1991) and Jenkins (2015)). The term is used to describe educators who are willing to cross over different knowledges, including both dominant modern knowledge and the knowledge of the marginalised people. They immerse themselves in the knowledge of the marginalised people to understand their epistemology and to reflect this back to the modern knowledge paradigms, but from the perspective of the marginalised people. They create the space for the dialogue between the majority people and the marginalised people. They facilitate the discussions during multi-stakeholder dialogues, with the epistemology of marginalised people. The role of the educator as described in the praxis framework, as a cultural broker could be further examined in the literature and investigated in future research.

However, the research also helped me to identify that the educator needs to go beyond the role of dealing with different knowledges. In the process of exploring different knowledge paradigms, educators also act as what I can best describe as an escort runner. The idea of an escort runner was gained from my personal
experience when I was attending a conference in early 2015. I was connecting between flights, on my way from India to Australia. The flight from India was delayed and I had only five minutes to transit in the airport in Singapore. A conference co-participant from Japan was on the same flight from India with me but was connecting to a different flight, headed for Japan. She saw my confusion and panic, and said, “OK, I will run with you to the boarding gate.” Running with her gave me the encouragement I needed to overcome what was otherwise a very confusing and panicked feeling. This experience illustrated for me the important role of the escort runners, who guide and assist blind people in running competitions.59

Escort runners need to have analytical eyes because they are seeing on behalf of someone else and have to be able to communicate instructions to the runner. Therefore, they must have knowledge of the runner, their preferred language, and so on. This is similar to the role that I played in the journey with Hatakeyama. Despite the conflict between the two groups of the MSN and Hatakeyama’s ‘swing’, I attempted to go through the process with Hatakeyama, all through my engagement with MSN. Based on my experience, I have described the term escort runner in this research to mean a person who crosses the different knowledges, shares the experience of the ‘swing’ in crossing different knowledge paradigms with marginalised people, but who maintains an analytical view to see what is really behind the ‘swing’. The role of escort runner may include elements of cultural broker in terms of dealing with multiple knowledges. However, the role

59 The role of escort runner in a running competition is well explained in (The Japan Times, 2016): “…running with eyes covered while being guided by someone else, in order to experience what it feels like for blind people to run.”
of escort runner is different from the role of cultural broker, in the point that it attempts to understand the learning and knowledge creation process of the marginalised people from the perspectives of the marginalised people. Whilst the role of cultural broker may concern the sensitivity of dealing with different knowledges, however, it still stands on the modern knowledge to understand the problem of the marginalised people (Escobar, 1991; Jenkins, 2015). This research indicated that both roles were required for the educator.

In the praxis framework, the two roles of cultural broker and escort runner are integrated throughout the four steps. The degree of how these two roles are integrated may vary depending on the stages of practices. It is also worth to explore the role of the educators as an escort runner in future researches.

9.2 Reflection on the significance of the research

This section reflects on: (i) the validity of the research process (section 9.2.1); and, (ii) the contributions it has for the research community (section 9.2.2). This section responds to the third sub-research question of this thesis.

9.2.1 Validity of research process

The validity of the analyses of data and theoretical discussions are discussed in the following six categories.
(i) Validity of the critical ethnography method

The critical ethnography method created a mutual learning process between the research participants and I, as the researcher. This process contributed to the empowerment and emancipation for both Hatakeyama and for me.

Throughout the research process, I shared all the transcribed data and analyses with the key MSN members who participated in this research. These communications created the opportunities for us to critically reflect on what the MSN had or had not achieved and what the obstacles were. After the arbitration process was complete and the construction plan for the final industrial waste management facility was finalised, I shared all collected communication with the MSN members. This raw data and its analyses allowed MSN members and I to reflect what we had done and what were the actual factors behind Hatakeyama’s Swing.

The communication with Hatakeyama also brought me countless learning opportunities. These often challenged my pattern of thinking and my understanding of my research discipline. It encouraged me to hand over my epistemological agency into his hands. Hatakeyama came to see his words and behaviour from a different perspective than that he had held until the end of the arbitration process. The analyses on the power differential between modern knowledge and his embodied local/indigenous knowledge helped Hatakeyama to move away from his feeling of inferiority both of himself and his view of the Ainu people. Hatakeyama’s new knowledge that arose from the analyses, provided the strength for me to re-engage back into the conversation and reconsider my theoretical stance.
The following words of Hatakeyama\textsuperscript{60} indicate some of our mutual learning:

You came to see me a number of times. Then, you drew a picture [see Figure 9-2] to make ‘what Hatakeyama is thinking of, and what he is aiming at’ concrete. Well, Noguchi-san, you also, kind of, went through huge struggles in your heart, just like me.

These words confirmed the value of the framework. He was aware that he could not change the power differential between modern knowledge and his embodied local/indigenous knowledge in the short term. But he stated that he was now in a better place. He could engage with different knowledge and perspectives from his own, and he could better understand the limitation of modern knowledge. It was an inspiring moment for me as a researcher and as a practitioner when I heard his words. I felt that this research, through sharing someone’s life’s burdens and emancipation, validated the methodological framework of this thesis by giving a new, empowered voice to the marginalised.

(ii) Validity of the data analyses with local community people: What do theoretical discussions mean to local community people?

The verification of the data and analyses were made through circulating the drafts of two book chapters in Japanese (Noguchi, 2014a, 2014b). These publications helped the participants to understand how their words were analysed for the purpose of the research and how it would be used in any publications. I

\textsuperscript{60}These words were from an interview with Hatakeyama when I went back to Mombetsu in December, 2015. I went back to share my preliminary conclusions with Hatakeyama and a few key members of the MSN.
communicated with the participants via post, telephone and fax message between Melbourne and Japan, as I found that they did not use email or social media. The continual communications with them after the data collection in the field helped me to maintain a trusting relationship with the key participants. This also provided both participants and myself the confidence to deeply reflect and provide rich detail on the events and experiences of all in this thesis.

(iii) Validity of the analysis in the Japanese research context

To ensure the relevance of my research in the theoretical discussions on ESD and community development in Japan, I presented my research progress at ESD-related conferences of the Japan Society of Environmental Education, and shared the manuscripts of the publications of critical ethnographies with researchers in the field of ESD and community development. These researchers worked for the University of Tokyo, Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Tokyo Gakugei University, and Kyoto University. The opportunity given by RMIT to be an exchange PhD fellow at the University of Tokyo (2013-14) allowed me to obtain consistent and critical feedbacks on my analyses of Part I and II, the key discussions around the epistemological limitation of critical EE and the need for decoloniality. Further discussions with my supervisor and colleagues who were familiar with the ESD in Japan and the issue of marginalisation in the environment-development problems like Minamata disease further acted to increase the reliability of the interpretation and findings of this research.

---

61 Presentations were made at JSOEE conference in 2013 and 2016, Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology in 2016, University of Kyoto in 2017.
(iv) Validity of the analysis in English-speaking, Western research context

It was also necessary for this research to be valid in terms of the theoretical discussions of the Western English speaking research community where this PhD research was conducted. In so doing, the research process was presented at conferences for EE, EfS and ESD. Particularly, the analyses of Part I and II were presented at the Australia Association for Environmental Education (AAEE) Biannual Conference in 2012, 2014 and 2016 and the Contemporary Approaches to Research Symposium at Deakin University in 2015 for their comments.

(v) Validity of the analysis in practical context in Asia

This research also considered the validity of the analyses with the NGO practitioners in ESD and with those involved in community development fields in Asia. The analyses and key discussions of this research, particularly, the epistemological limitation of critical EE and the praxis framework, were presented at the ESDGs International Conference in 2015 for their comments.

(vi) Validity of the data translation from Japanese into English

Some of the literature used in this research, and almost all of the interview data were in Japanese. The interviews were all transcribed in Japanese characters initially, and the parts that I quoted for the thesis were translated by me into English. To keep the accuracy of the original language, a professional translator, who had a 20 year translation and interpretation career in social science (including many works in EE, EfS and ESD), proof-checked the translated texts presented in this thesis.
9.2.2 Contributions of this research

This research presents two major contributions that might enrich current theory and practices of ESD and the theoretical grounding of critical EE.

(i) Re-affirming the value of critical ethnography method

This research re-affirmed the value of a critical ethnography methodology in terms of challenging against the dominant knowledge paradigm. The key findings from the critical ethnographies challenged my guiding theory and methodological frameworks that were supposed to influence the way of understanding and knowing in the research. These resulted in a methodological shift in this research where critical ethnography was replaced by a decolonisation methodology as being more appropriate for the research questions.

In this research, the finding from the analyses based on a critical ethnography methodology indicated the epistemological insufficiency of critical theory. The need for a methodological shift became apparent during data collection. The decolonisation methodology reverses the understanding of critical EE that methodology decides a research method (Fien & Hillcoat, 1996). This research highlights that critical ethnography, in itself, can keep hidden the oppression of the dominant social and knowledge paradigms. It was through the decolonisation methodology (including the joint efforts made by the research participants and the researcher), that the process of ‘unlearning’ and re-learning between the participants and the researcher occurred more profoundly, and that it enhanced the understanding of modern knowledge holders with the perspectives held by marginalised people.
(ii) Decoloniality gives an unwavering perspective to theoretical and policy discourses on ESD

In the middle of this research, the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (UNDESD) ended in 2014. The global education community had been searching for a direction in education for sustainable development (ESD) toward new Sustainable Development Goals by 2030. Currently, the new educational concept, GCED, is being added to the post-UNDESD policy discourses for sustainability related education by UNESCO (UNESCO, 2015a). This responds to the call for GCED that would address sustainability problems in everyday life context that ESD could not do during the UNDESD (Huckle & Wals, 2015).

EE, EfS, ESD, and now, GCED, all have differing mantras that can confuse research into this area. This is similar to when ESD became the key educational framework at the start of the UNDESD in 2005. While the ongoing conceptual confusion over sustainability-related education, UNESCO focuses on ‘local community’ as one of the five key priority action areas for the GAP on ESD (UNESCO, 2013). Can, then, GCED solve local community problems that ESD could not solve during the UNDESD?

Unfortunately, the situation around community-based approaches to ESD appears not to have changed much during this research. Theoretical frameworks that might support community-based ESD is still lacking and a formal education and schooling approach still dominate in the sustainability-related education field.

This research gives a firm perspective from a decoloniality perspective to
practitioners who are searching for ways to move ESD forward in their everyday context in local communities.

This research strongly supports decoloniality as an unwavering approach to overcome the ongoing confusions around sustainability related education, including EE, EfS, ESD and GCED. It could enhance the local community-based ESD to confront severe realities at a local community level. Recently, Lotz-Sistika (2017) advocated decolonisation as a future frame for sustainability education. She contended, “hearing those that have been silenced and marginalised would appear to be vital to the project of more socially just, sustainable societies characterised by a renewed commitment to the common good” (p. 14). This research aims to move forward decolonisation as an appropriate methodology.

ESD (and also EE and EfS) could not face the local community reality during the UNDESD because it was unaware of the epistemology of the marginalised people and pushed ESD into a schooling frame. The changing of the labels of in sustainability education will not be effective unless ESD decolonises its understanding and steps out from its epistemological boundaries.

Political and economic pressures remain strong and have been making the ground of sustainability-related education “shaky” (Selby, 2006, p. 355). This research confirms that decoloniality could truthfully, authentically and carefully help to understand and articulate local community problems, such as those who are marginalised. The praxis framework suggested in this research could provide a firm and stable ground for those who are in search of sustainability-related education at a local community level.
9.3 The way forward

This final section of the thesis offers implications for practice and further research arising from the findings of this thesis. A praxis framework has potential applicability to other areas, not just ESD. It is hoped that it would especially encourage fellow practitioners in the field of ESD and community development to further their work on the emancipation and empowerment of local communities, particularly marginalised people.

During this research, I often thought how my thinking and a praxis framework could be relevant to different problems in a different context, and I have not explored its applicability yet. Like the MSN situation presented in this thesis, similar oppression and marginalisation seem to be occurring all around the world, even when the efforts might be believed to be ‘good’. For example, I foresee the potential of a praxis framework for practices and research on topics such as community resilience in a post-disaster period, gender issues, and the livelihood of Australian indigenous people.

In the first example, of community resilience in a post-disaster experience, I immediately think of a symbolic incident that happened at the start of this research in 2011. It was the 3.11 Earthquake and Fukushima nuclear power plant accident. I was living in Tokyo and experienced this earthquake and its aftershocks for over a month. I lived in fear of nuclear radiation poisoning. Since then, Japan has experienced numerous natural disasters, more earthquakes, typhoons and storms, floods and bushfires. The situation is very similar to the rest of the world, including Australia.
A praxis framework could be applied to understand the process of redevelopment in the post-natural disaster process. Local community people, particularly who engage in primary industries in rural areas of Japan, hold so much embodied local/indigenous knowledge. In the redevelopment process, they often find themselves struggling to express their claims and concerns in the discussions with the governments and experts. This situation is no different from the struggles of Hatakeyama in this thesis. In the re-development process of 3.11 Earthquake, there were issues around the ‘Giant Sea Wall’ construction project by the Japanese government. These need to be re-thought to be more inclusive and understanding of the local indigenous people of that area.

The second example is one of gender. This research was initially based on critical EE, which has its theoretical root in critical feminist theory. I would like to see how this research might contribute to critical feminism studies. I also have observed the mismatch in understanding gender-related problems - those between what women experienced tacitly and what Western, modern and male dominant knowledge understands as a problem. For example, through my experiences of natural birthing and the home birth of my two sons in Australia, I have observed that what a mother experiences through my body in my prenatal and postnatal period were often neglected, ignored and silenced by the power of modern scientific Western medical knowledge. In particular, when I had my second son in Darwin, I often saw Australian indigenous pregnant women loitering outside the hospital. They had been transported to the hospital in advance of their due date because of Northern Territory government policy which viewed the high risk of

62 Japanese government has been building 400km-long, four storey-high walls on coastal lines of Tohoku region to stop tsunami (Stone, 2015).
complications in childbirth of indigenous women (Carson, Berger, & Taylor, 2013). The issue was that they did not have a choice to homebirth. I wondered how a praxis framework might inform the government and change policy. Based on Hatakeyama’s experience, I assume that these mothers may lose their opportunities to learn and embody their indigenous knowledge to be a mother in their own local context and may be forced to fit into the frame of Western scientific maternity care set by the government.

What does such experience really mean to those indigenous women in relation to the power differential between their embodied indigenous knowledge and the modern knowledge? A praxis framework could provide key perspectives in understanding the epistemological problems of women in childbirth. Such study might contribute to new concepts and new words to describe their problems from their own epistemology, and re-engage them back into discourses around the dominant Western medical science and the better birth choices for the Australian indigenous women.

The last example, relates to the rights of the livelihood of the Australian indigenous people. Based on my work experience, attending seminars, and my life in the Northern Territory, I have observed the epistemological mismatch between those with good will (those who intends to ‘help’ the Aboriginal people) and the Aboriginal people. The situation is similar to the MSN in this thesis. A praxis framework could be used in search of solutions for the problems associated with sustainable development in Australia and the Aboriginal people. Likewise the indigenous recognition in the Constitution and the rights of the indigenous people are debated and argued in English, and in the meeting rooms of big cities. This
discussion happens in a framework based on the majority of Australians who are coloniser of the land, rather than the indigenous Australian people. This situation can be appreciated in the reports on Aboriginal fishing rights:

Indigenous people have a culture that relates to the land and sea in a holistic way that also includes connections to powerful and significant places. However, the emphasis that is now put on the management of discrete sites can overlook and diminish Indigenous connections to the environment as a whole. (National Oceans Office, 2002, p. 1)

In discussion spaces for indigenous rights recovery, the Aboriginal people could share only a part of their entire knowledge by borrowing the words of the coloniser’s language. On the other hand, efforts have been made toward a solution of indigenous problems with the Aboriginal people in a local community context. One such example is the Outback Pride, a small-scale enterprise that promotes and sells bush food cultivated and produced by Aboriginal people (Outback Pride, 2017). Despite the potential of these small-scale influences, indigenous rights recovery (based on local, sustainable community development) have not moved beyond its epistemological boundary, and are not yet at the interface with the rights recovery arguments that happen in a modern, English-speaking context. My passion now, is to develop comparative critical ethnographic studies between the Ainu people and the Australian Aboriginal people. By so doing, it might facilitate mutual learning, and provide the basis for empowering marginalised people the world over.
REFERENCES


261


ESD-J. (2013). 国連持続可能な開発のための教育の 10 年および UNDESD 以降のアジアの市民社会によるさらなる ESD 推進にむけて (ESD promotion by Civil Society Organisations in Asia towards the rest of and post UNDESD). Tokyo, Japan: ESD-J.


Harako, E. (2013). ESD is all about re-
thinking and re-orienting education. If so, how can it be done?) Paper presented at the Japan Society of Environmental Education 24th Conference, Shiga, Japan.


Hoppener, M. (2016). ‘We think We’re Helping, But Are We Really?’ Critical Reflections on Engineering for Sustainable Development. In G. Nhamo & V. Mjimba (Eds.), Sustainability, Climate Change and the Green Economy (pp. 84-114). Pretoria, South Africa: Africa Institute of South Africa.


Kaneko, Y. (2014). アイヌ民族なんて、いまはもういないんですよね。せいぜいアイヌ系日本人が良いところですが、利権を行使しうまくいくこの不合理。納税者に説明できません。(The Ainu people do not exist anymore. At most there are the Japanese-Ainu people. Unreasonableness is that (the Ainu people) can enjoy their privileges. It is unaccountable to the taxpayers.) Retrieved from https://twitter.com/kaneko_yasuyuki/status/498816070531031041


Kitoh, S. (2007). 水俣と抵抗の原理としての環境倫理学 (Minamata and environmental ethics as principle of resistance). In S. Saishu & H. Tamba (Eds.), 水俣五〇年: ひろがる「水俣」の思い (Minamata 50 years: Expanding thoughts on 'Minamata') (pp. 131-164). Tokyo, Japan: Sakuhinsha Publisher.


Walking with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and their Communities: Practice implications - Self-determination. Retrieved from http://www.workingwithatsi.info/content/PI_selfdetermination.htm


NIMD. (2001). In the Hope of Avoiding Repetition of the Tragedy of Minamata Disease -What We Have Learned from the Experience-. Minamata, Japan: Social Scientific Study Group on Minamata Disease, National Institute for Minamata Disease.


Science Council of Japan. (2011). 報告 アイヌ政策のあり方と国民的理理解 (Report on the situation of Ainu policies and national understanding). Retrieved from Tokyo, Japan:


Soshisha. (2017). 水俣病のしつもんばこ (Minamata disease Q&A). Retrieved from http://www.soshisha.org/jp/about_md/for_child/%E6%B0%B4%E4%BF%A3%E7%97%85%E3%81%AE%E3%81%97%E3%81%A4%E3%82%82%E3%82%93%E3%81%B0%E3%81%93#patients


274


