
Part II: Report on the GEJET 13:00 - 15:00

"Waste management toward restoration"

Prof Masanobu Ishikawa, Graduate School of Economics, Kobe University

"A Process of Improvement of Law and Institution in Disaster Management: Lessons from East Japan"

Prof Yuka Kaneko, Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies, Kobe University

"Collaboration for generating Hope"

Prof Masayoshi Morioka, Graduate School of Human Development and Environment, Kobe University

"Community recovery of Tohoku disaster hit area and recovery supports from outside"

Prof Yoshiteru Murosaki, Kwansei Gakuin University

"Waste management toward restoration"

Prof Masanobu Ishikawa, Graduate School of Economics, Kobe University



My presentation will be about the GEJET waste management problems, lessons we learned from them and some new proposals to help.

Most disaster waste can be classified into five groups; 1) unwanted articles from damaged houses, 2) waste from

damaged houses and dismantling, 3) everyday waste from refugee life, 4) damaged infrastructures and 5) waste from damaged natural objects. However, disaster waste of GEJET has the following four features: 1) Contamination by radioactivity, 2) Tsunami waste which contained sea sediment, 3) Swept away waste in the sea, and 4) Contamination by seawater. The estimation of the sea sediment transferred by the tsunami is 33.6 to 48.4 million tons in total which means that the volume of GEJET waste is almost equal to the volume of annual urban waste generation in Japan (50 million tons). However, if you add urban waste generation and industrial waste generation, it is about 450 million ton, which means GEJET produced one-tenth of the total volume of waste in a night. Compared to Hanshin/Awaji Earthquake, which generated 14.3 million tons, GEJET generated four times as much volume of waste.

The Ministry of the Environment (MOE) announced the roles to be played by the state, prefectural and the municipal governments. According to the MOE, the state government is to develop the master plan. The prefectural government is to provide general coordination and the development of an action plan. The municipality is to put the action plan in operation. The fundamental policy of waste processing in GEJET waste is on-site primary sorting. Secondary sorting is also necessary at temporary stock yard to look for any recyclable item and use rubbles as construction. Everything had to be in accordance of the recycling law. In respect to the necessity of the regional waste processing, some bigger joint instillation

plant and joint collection plant were installed and the processing of waste was treated by categories.

In addition to all of the above, there is a new approach taken from the Chinese policy for Sichuan Great Earthquake. It is the extended associations of prefectures and cities in the Kansai area to support an assigned Tohoku prefecture. Although the support offered is great, there are still the problems of extremely large quantity of waste (general and radioactive), decontamination of soil and the urgent needs for restoration. GEJET waste management taught us to anticipate the "unanticipated damage", the importance of risk communication and ex-ante partnership. With these in mind, I would like to make two proposals. One is to organize a stakeholder dialog and civic panel for management of radioactive waste and the other is to develop a triangle partnership between cities for mutual support in case of emergency. A three-city bound partnership with people moving around to learn how the city is organized and what to do in case of emergency.

"A Process of Improvement of Law and Institution in Disaster Management: Lessons from East Japan"

Prof Yuka Kaneko, Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies, Kobe University



The purpose of my presentation is to understand the needs for and observing the process of legal changes toward better disaster response. The method used for research was through field work and interview with the victims in one of the disaster areas, Iwate Prefecture.

Before we talk about changing the disaster law, we must understand that there are many factors contributing to the establishment of laws for such disasters. For example, tsunami brings about a totally different issue to consider from that of Hanshin/Awaji earthquake. We need to comprehend the historical changes of social needs for government's response and the occasional change of philosophy toward disasters.

In regard to the law for emergency rescue and the very early stage of emergency response of the government, there have been repeated improvements made to the basic disaster law established in 1961, especially after the Hanshin/Awaji earthquake. These improvements have brought about relatively good achievements such as horizontal assistance by other local government, concentration of commands to the cabinet, encouragement of volunteer and other citizens' initiatives, broader initiative of Self-Defense Force, and National government acted quickly to assure full budgetary support.

In regard to the assistance to disaster victims, the 1947 law for disaster assistance constitutes the legal basis, which has been developed and improved especially after Hanshin/Awaji earthquake for monetary aids to victims who lost housing.

However, there is a great shortage of assistance, particularly for those who lost the bases of livelihood. This is because the current law is set up to only help those who lost the minimum basis of living and prohibits aid to private properties.

In the reconstruction phase, both prefectural and municipality governments have limitations on the expenditure and institutional constraint because of the half-finished decentralization and the lack of basic law on post-disaster reconstruction. They are unable to make fiscal reconstruction planning in fear of the last moment budgetary cut by the national government.

The local government has three major choices of reconstruction plan; 1) the relocating to high grounds, 2) strengthening of lower grounds and 3) strengthening of individual building. The national government may be favoring the last one, possibly because it is the lowest cost of the three, in their campaign for the new philosophy of disaster mitigation. As illustrated above, local government officials are frustrated to be sandwiched between the national government and the call for help from disaster victims. It is clear that there is an urgent need for a fundamental change in the local autonomies.

The example of Yamada Town in Iwate Prefecture shows a chance of direct democracy of local government in producing a positive result for the reconstruction planning. Although reconstruction is still only half finished, this challenge

ultimately would achieve not just a reconstruction of hard infrastructure but also a construction of a totally new social institutional infrastructure. Only then will they be able to realize the real local autonomy based on the individual unique kind of democracy.

“Collaboration for generating Hope”

Prof Masayoshi Morioka, Graduate School of Human Development and Environment, Kobe University



The importance and application of the multiple forms of psychological support are explained in this presentation by introducing some cases of IASC (Inter-Agency Standing Committee) in WHO Guidelines.

There are three elements to achieve multiple forms of psychological support. The first is centered on the living person, psychosocial support has to be oriented toward recovering their sense of agency. Therefore having company is always an essential element for recovery. Secondly, a system of mutual aid is necessary for supporters to share their experiences. Thirdly, indigenous cultural resources are important for healing and we look for ways to care for people within their local community.

Professional psychologist worked quickly to provide organized social support in the disaster area. However, there is uncertainty about how we can be sure to establish important links with affected people when we leave the disaster area. Mental care is especially contingent on multiple layers of

actual practice and it is an outcome through joint action with the affected persons. We must keep our attention on supporting the disaster victims' personal level of difficulty by listening sincerely to their stories of what they experienced and/or still continue to experience. From this point of view, we decided to provide a predictably-effective practice of "ashiyu", which means "foot-bath" or the soaking of feet in warm water. It will relax both parties and is a good way to create natural conversation.

The support of psychological first aid means being beside the person and the warmth of another person is the first aid for mental care. This is regarded as the best form of support in the case of emergency. According to personal documentation, people's emotion seemed to seriously swing between the negative and the positive for a few months after the disaster. However, after three months had passed, their voices seemed to withdraw within themselves. This is the moment that mental care becomes necessary. Other documentation also shows the importance of the natural power for self-recovery and inter-relationship.

Psychosocial care is also necessary for supporters themselves. Sharing experience is very important to maintain a healthy mental state, therefore volunteers are given a chance to share and reflect on their experience in meetings with other volunteers after each activity.

The third elements for successful care are cultures and local factors. Mental and psychosocial care is provided within the cultural life setting. Hence, the person and community cannot be divided and we make it a point to care for individualism with "his" or "her" community. We also need to recognize the creative healing power of culture. Many collaborative approaches to psychosocial support are ongoing, in a form of creating *tanka* and *haiku*, which are short forms of Japanese poetry. Taking action and sharing with group have important meaning for psychosocial care.

Our hope is generated from the action of personal agency and the root of our hope is human connection. We have to reconstruct our society in terms of person centeredness and we can transform the model of psychosocial support from an individual pathology model to a collaborative, connecting and community model.

"Community recovery of Tohoku disaster hit area and recovery supports from outside"

Prof Yoshiteru Murosaki, Kwansei Gakuin University



I would like to talk about the current stage and problems of the recovery in the Tohoku disaster areas. Firstly, I will talk about the characteristics of the damage from the viewpoint of the recovery. It can be explained from two aspects: one is to capture the side of destruction and the other is to capture from the side of loss. Regarding destruction, I will classify it into "Wide" and "Compound". "Wide" indicates the area affected by GEJET, which is ten times that of the Hanshin/Awaji Earthquake in 1995. The area affected by GEJET is too wide and too many shelters for volunteers to help out at. "Compound" means various disasters occurred close to the same time like a chain reaction. As a result, response to the nuclear disaster neglected the response to the tsunami disaster. In terms of the characteristics of the loss, problems are summarized into the following two points; "Bankruptcy" and "Function paralysis". Victims lost not only buildings and property, but also their job and the land where they lived because of radioactivity and subsidence. Furthermore, the local government was paralyzed as well for many officials also died and the support from the state government was insufficient. Secondary, the support from outside should be mentioned. There are two aspects for needs in this disaster. First is the need for relief and second is the matching of need and supply. After the GEJET occurred, the largest support in the history was carried out from outside. Almost ten times that of the Hanshin/Awaji

Parthquake. However, this was not sufficient because of the serious blanks. The "one week blank" and "one month blank". The one week blank was the "blank of the thing" such as medicine and water, satellite and mobile phones which are necessary to life. The "one month blank" was the "blank of volunteers" which was brought on by the lack of information, since telephone line was not usable and the lack of gasoline made it impossible to travel by cars. The blank of volunteers was also caused by rumors that the disaster area was still dangerous or victims did not desire volunteers. Thirdly, I will briefly explain the recovery process. There are three stages of community recovery; the first is quick recovery, or the stage of the refuge; next is the short-term recovery, or the stage of the temporary housing; and the third is long-term recovery, or the stage of the permanent residence. Six months have passed and 100,000 households are now living in temporary houses. However, many people are still staying at shelters and others in their damaged houses where hazardous sludge still remains. The reconstruction plan for the permanent residence is to build housings on the high land while fishing or other work areas remain by the coast. The plan is to build a large supermarket, hospital and other facilities in between the two. I am against this plan for it will destroy the sense of community. I believe houses should be located near the work place. Finally, I would like to close my presentation with the following eight principles for recovery: 1) Solve social distortion such as problems regarding the aged society and medical depopulation; 2) Solve problems comprehensively, do not consider only safety but also convenience and comfort; 3) The recovery plan should include each individual's hope and dreams; 4) Support should ultimately encourage independence; 5) Aim for environmental symbiosis with nature; 6) Value the memory of the area's history and traditional culture; 7) Emphasize industrial reproduction and community business; 8) Continuation of the community by staying connected.