Multinational Energy Justice for Managing Multinational Risks

A Case Study of Nuclear Waste Repositories

Jenkins, Kirsten E.H.; Taebi, Behnam

DOI
10.1002/rhc3.12162

Publication date
2019

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Risk, Hazards and Crisis in Public Policy

Citation (APA)
Jenkins, K. E. H., & Taebi, B. (2019). Multinational Energy Justice for Managing Multinational Risks: A Case Study of Nuclear Waste Repositories. *Risk, Hazards and Crisis in Public Policy*, *10*(2), 176-196. https://doi.org/10.1002/rhc3.12162

Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy
www.psocommons.org/rhcpp/

Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2019

Multinational Energy Justice for Managing Multinational Risks: A Case Study of Nuclear Waste Repositories

Kirsten E. H. Jenkins and Behnam Taebi

This paper investigates the viability of Energy Justice as a framework to assist the governance of multinational risk. Positioned between local and universal scales, it advocates for the approach of multinational energy justice as a means of considering justice manifestations either between neighboring countries, or between geographically isolated countries that share common energy concerns or systems. Specifically, it focuses on how to govern the risk of nuclear waste in a multinational fashion, and questions the extent to which this approach could offer a useful account to help understand the justice issues multinational repositories give rise to. We present a content analysis of 10-years' worth of policy reports on nuclear waste repositories (2006–16), including 25 full-length reports documents relating to the Government of South Australia's now abandoned repository proposal. Following a discussion around the merit of energy justice approaches in relation of transboundary issues of justice, intergenerational justice and the role conflicting justice demands across time and space, we present three areas for further consideration: (i) We call for greater attention to issues of spatial conflict; (ii) further reflect on temporal justice conflict and its integration into energy justice frameworks; and (iii) reflect upon multinational responsibility for energy justice.

KEY WORDS: multinational energy justice, energy justice, nuclear waste repositories, systematic content analysis, technological risk

Introduction

Energy justice challenges, like our energy system, are present at every scale, from local discourse over the siting of energy structures and access to energy services, to multinational considerations of whole systems energy and global externalities such as nuclear risk. To explain this scalar manifestation, Labelle (2017) and Sovacool, Sidortsov, and Jones (2013) introduce "particular" or "local" energy justice, which emphasizes local debate and choice (see also Heffron, McCauley, & Sovacool, 2015), and "universal energy justice," which stretches across countries, is transboundary in nature, and emphasizes moral and political responsibility. This universal approach shares commonalities with "cosmopolitan" theories, arguing that (mainly distributive) justice approaches should be

doi: 10.1002/rhc3.12162

applied to the world as a whole. Radical cosmopolitanism (which is substantively different from distributive justice in its own right) claims firstly, that there are global principles of distributive justice and, secondly, that there are no state or nation-wide principles. A milder form simply says the former, retaining concern for fellow nationals or citizens (see Caney, 2001).

While the principles or tenets of energy justice can be effectively applied at a site, community, local, or national level (see Forman, 2017; Jenkins, McCauley, & Forman, 2017; Jenkins, McCauley, & Warren, 2017; Walker & Day, 2012 as examples), universal justice is also necessary to consider global challenges such as climate change and the global distributed responsibilities for dealing with it; the mitigation of greenhouse gases could only be successful when tackled in a globally coordinated manner, for instance. As a real-world exemplar, the Kyoto Protocol forwards the notion of "common but differentiated responsibility" emphasising this global challenge. Moreover, the Paris Agreement—as the continuation of Kyoto—is an acknowledgement of global responsibilities (although we acknowledge that these instruments differ in other aspects). Yet these large-scale, typically global approaches, present a very wide lens, restricting the fine-grained analysis of transboundary, multinational issues. Moreover, some argue that their current formation is not proving effective and that universal claims do not help us identify who is responsible nor make tangible progress toward justice goals (see Ikeme, 2003; Jenkins, 2018; Maltais, 2013). To illustrate this challenge with examples, what can universal justice say about the shipment of precious heavy metals for wind turbines from one country to another, or the transfer of chemical waste in the 1980s and 1990s? We argue that the failure to apply the energy justice concept at the multinational level could obscure potential justice challenges as well as potential solutions to remediate them. Indeed, understanding such multinational level potential challenges could be crucial for governing particular forms of energy (and specifically in this case, nuclear) risks.

Between the two approaches, this paper advocates for the approach of *multinational energy justice* as a means of considering justice manifestations either between neighboring countries, or between countries that are geographically isolated but share common concerns or interests with regard to their energy systems and the risks they present. This reinforces the need for a combination of the social science account of energy (policy) with its natural science counterpart (energy systems and chains) (Heffron & McCauley, 2014; Hoggett et al., 2014; Jenkins, Heffron, & McCauley, 2016). Both employing and challenging the tripartite model of energy justice—distributional, procedural, and recognition justice (Jenkins et al., 2016; McCauley, Heffron, Stephan, & Jenkins, 2013)—we form our argument using the case study of multinational nuclear waste repositories, where geographically isolated countries are connected by a shared concern for governing risks emanating from nuclear waste, and where the fundamental question of justice such repositories could create are particularly pertinent considering their multinational and intergenerational hazards (Drottz-Sjöberg, 2012; Ylönen & Litmanen, 2015). Our aim is not only to present an incremental analysis that applies the tripartite model of energy justice without

question, but through a focus on currently neglected multinational and nuclear waste issues, to highlight the current shortcomings of it.

In the history of nuclear energy, there have been many examples of multinational collaborations in nuclear safety, security and safeguards, either between geographically proximate countries—for example, regional approaches in the EU—or between geographically distant countries, such as the Franco–Indian collaborations (Sarkar, 2015; Taebi & Mayer, 2017). Ylönen and Litmanen (2015) provide a comprehensive overview of international nuclear safety collaborations, for example, including post-Fukushima crisis revisions of the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) Safety Standards and the Western European Nuclear Regulators' Associations' (WENRA) Reference Levels for nuclear reactors. Joint nuclear waste repositories, or the idea to dispose of nuclear waste collaboratively with a couple of countries, represent a further endeavor. Yet according to an analysis of 5,351 academic papers by Kuipers, van Grieken, and van Asselt (2018) the transportation of nuclear waste remains a comparatively neglected concern in nuclear research.

Many countries possess nuclear waste but only in fairly limited amounts; therefore, nuclear waste repositories are increasingly popular as a solution for the long-term nuclear waste issue among small nuclear energy producing countries (Taebi, 2012a). Collaborations and disposing of this waste multinationally would have many safety, security, and economic benefits that we will elaborate in Sections 3 and 4, yet they carry the environmental and social benefits and ills. We propose that through applications in this context, the multinational energy justice concept could facilitate a better understanding of transboundary cooperation on energy governance issues and risks than universal energy justice. Further, by better recognising the role and transboundary nature of the energy system, we argue that such an approach serves as a means of identifying both instances of injustice and the actors affected by and responsible for them (Jenkins et al., 2014; Jenkins, McCauley, & Warren, 2017).

To explore this case empirically, our paper presents a systematic content analysis of 10-years' worth of policy reports on nuclear waste repositories (between 2006 and 2016), including 25 full-length reports documents relating to the Government of South Australia's now abandoned repository proposal. These include formal summary reports, issue papers to stimulate debates around challenges and opportunities, replies to these issue papers, and the results of public engagement exercises. Using the tripartite analytical lens of energy justice, we assess if and in what form references to multinational energy justice notions emerge. Our purpose here is to inform our later conceptual reflections.

Following this empirical investigation, we then present conceptual reflections on the nature of the emergent challenges as we address three leading questions: How could we consider transboundary distributions and procedural issues? How can we deal with intergenerational justice issues of risk? And, could energy justice help us better understand and address conflicting justice demands across time and space, when multinational justice might demand different things than domestic justice? This reflection allows us to engage with which justice notions

play a dominant role at different systems stages, and explore the formation of transboundary and intergenerational risks.

In conclusion, we then introduce three emergent areas of importance for the multinational energy justice approach and energy justice more widely, both in academic scholarship and in policy-oriented practice. We call for (i) greater and geographically wider and better fine-grained attention to issues of spatial conflicts; (ii) further reflections on temporal justice conflicts and how these might be embedded in energy justice frameworks; and (iii) reflection on ideas of multinational responsibility for energy justice.

Multinational Energy Justice

To begin, it is necessary to discuss what we understand by energy justice—a term that is rapidly increasing in popularity and because of that, is beginning to be applied in new contexts and take on new meanings. It is also necessary to describe how we use it. We ascribe to the definition provided by McCauley et al. (2013): (i) That energy justice "aims to provide all individuals, across all areas, with safe, affordable, and sustainable energy." We also use the three-tenet model of McCauley et al. (2013), which sees energy justice as consisting of distributional justice, procedural justice, and justice as recognition pillars. As identified by Sovacool and Dworkin (2015), this means that energy justice exists as a *conceptual* tool for uniting usually distinct justice concerns, an *analytical* tool for energy researchers seeking to understand how values are embedded in energy systems or resolve their neglect and, importantly, a *decision making* tool that can help energy planners make more considered energy choices. More importantly, we understand from the offset that "justice" (as part of an overarching field of ethics) is a subjective concept, implying multilaterality in both time and space. This is to say that we acknowledge the temporal and spatial dimensions of energy justice, and that with this as our ontological foundation, have developed a study and review of the literature that aims to contribute to the understanding of these.

Within the academic literature, (at least) two competing strands of energy justice scholarship have emerged, each of which imply a different geographical scale of application: Universal and particular justice. Labelle (2017, p. 615) introduces their two definitions particularly effectively. While synthesising and referencing the work of others he states:

> The definition for a universal energy justice stretches across countries, there is a "transboundary nature of energy injustice [which] requires a similar conception of the reach of moral and political responsibility" (Sovacool et al., 2013, p. 29). Universal applications of the eight aspects of energy justice (such as affordability, good governance, and sustainability)[1] assist in building just universal energy systems (Sovacool & Dworkin, 2015). The definition of particular energy justice embraces local debate and choices by understanding justification for local decisions, actions (Heffron & McCauley, 2014) and even resistance to global

economic policies (see Heffron et al., 2015). Examining the local is even more salient in an age of rising populism, which places a country's citizenry first, over global cooperative efforts.

Yet despite the mention of "transboundary" above, and with applications of the energy justice approach to a number of different scales from local to global, it has not explicitly been considered as a tool for examining *multinational* interactions (Goldthau & Sovacool, 2012) (see Table 1 for distinction). To make this core advancement within this piece, we focus on a specific type of energy risk, namely nuclear risk, which very much requires multinational approaches as it interacts with the challenges of uncertainty through time, the complexity of nuclear governance, political friction, links to nuclear weapons and rule ambiguity; see for instance (Fiorentini, 2018; this special issue and Herron & Jenkins-Smith, 2014).

We see *multinational energy justice* primarily as a strategically impactful spatial development, yet it also has implications for how we think of energy justice *temporally*. The latter is significant not only because there are important distributive impacts of energy decisions that will manifest over (short- and long-term) time frames, but also because spatial *injustices* could easily be perpetuated temporally; for example, the siting of disposal places for nuclear waste that create spatial injustices among the present generations will continue to create some kind of spatial injustice emanating from nuclear risk for future people living close to those sites (e.g., Vilhunen, Kojo, Litmanen, & Taebi, 2019).

The treatment of time or temporality within current energy justice research is inconsistent, however. This is despite a lengthy history of consideration by parallel disciplines including environmental and climate justice (e.g., Kyne, 2016; Page, 2007). As an illustration, Sidortsov and Sovacool (2015, p. 306) state that "energy justice is best understood by examining instances of injustice" and that "it is unlikely that one would take note of how just and fair things are unless something disturbs the status quo." In this regard they highlight a tendency to look back in time, take an evaluative approach, and focus on the remediation of past injustice. In a separate piece, however, Sovacool (2013, p. 959) observes that energy justice raises the issue of fairness for "future generations, as we will leave them with the legacy of polluted atmosphere and a potentially unstable climate." In keeping with this statement, Heffron et al. (2015, p. 171) introduce the concept of thinking in the "future tense," whereby specific attention is given to future

Table 1. Comparison of Universal, Particular, and Multinational Justice Approaches

	Conceptual Approach	Scalar Application
Universal justice	Cosmopolitanism Multinational trade-offs	Global
Particular justice	Distributional, procedural, and justice as recognition Local debate and choice	Local
Multinational justice	Bilateral and multinational negotiations Systems of impact and responsibility	Transnational systems

generations, and to ensuring that they are treated as equally significant to the present populations. They neglect, however, potentially conflicting situations that could arise from an "equal treatment" of future generations, an idea we return to this issue in the discussion section of this paper.

In short, by (typically) focusing on the mitigation of potential injustices in the future and at "local" or "universal" scales, current approaches to energy justice present several shortcomings. In an attempt to present a coherent account, and alongside obvious gains in exploring the spatial nature of energy justice concerns, our *multinational* approach allows for the consideration of past, present, and future impacts on social justice outcomes, thereby raising normative questions around intra-generational equity, for example. It does so by considering, in this case, the past, present and potential transfers of nuclear wastes. The consideration of the *ex ante* (i.e., before implementation of energy systems or waste hosting sites) is especially important for the question of the nuclear waste legacy and how to govern its risks.

Multinational Energy Justice Failings

Of course, multinational energy negotiations with inter and intra-generational elements already occur for a range of reasons, be it security and proliferation, resource trading or skill share (see Findlay, 2011; Fischhendler, Herman, & Anderman, 2016; Herron & Jenkins-Smith, 2014; Kyne, 2016; Liping, 2011; Taebi & Mayer, 2017; Wieczorek, Raven, & Berkhout, 2015). Kuipers et al. (2018) highlight plentiful scholarship in the crisis and disaster literatures that engage with nuclear risk (and more specifically with citizen engagement, communication, and regulation) (see also Chien, 2014; Kuipers & Welsh, 2017), but this scholarship does not explicitly address the multinational aspects of nuclear risks and, thereby, also does not engage with the questions of multinational justice (Goldthau & Sovacool, 2012).[2]

With regards to the case of multinational waste repositories multinational exchanges have often been seen as purely economic transactions—a discussion of imports and exports and the economic value that will be offered in exchange. Approaching such problems as purely economic transactions is problematic for many reasons. We list two. First, such an approach neglects the different starting position of different countries, both economically and politically, leaving the potential for maldistributed winners and losers. When economically diverse countries engage in an economic interaction to share burdens transnationally, it will very much matter to what level each of those countries would depend on the revenues and the employment that come with such proposal. Looking critically, it seems to be an implicit assumption in economically wealthy countries that when they engage in such approaches, they would be able to find a sum *acceptable* to (presumably) less wealthy countries for accepting the responsibilities of such burdens. Secondly, the financial nature of the process stalls progress.

Despite the obvious challenges and stumbling blocks, in some places in the world, there is already legislation in place to regulate such multinational activity.

As an example, the EU waste directive requires members states to, first, have their own national plan ready before engaging in any multinational collaborations and, second, to only collaborate with and export to countries that are technically capable of dealing with this waste (Directive 2008/98/EC). The requirement to have a national plan does not, however, demand a specific time frame for the actual disposal of the waste. This means that some countries possessing small amounts of nuclear waste have proposed very long timeframes for the realization of underground nuclear storage; for example, the Dutch National Plan requires the Dutch nuclear waste is disposed of underground by 2130 only (ANVES, 2017; MIE, 2006). An implicit assumption underlying this long period is presumably, that small counties are counting on the realization of multinational disposal in the next few decades. Indeed, the issue of nuclear waste disposal has always been and will likely continue to be a controversial issue at a national and global level (Jenkins-Smith, Strandberg, & Trousset, 2010); the multinational disposal has no guarantee of being successful.

Against this background, we proceed with two dilemmas in mind. Firstly, that particular and universal approaches to energy justice do not adequately capture multinational justice relations across time and space, and, secondly, that these multinational dynamics raise fundamental normative and empirical questions about how we ought to proceed: How do we consider transboundary justice issues, how do we tackle intergenerational issues, and how can energy justice help make domestic versus multinational justice trade-offs? Our paper provides early reflections on these questions.

Research Methods: A Systematic Review and Content Analysis

The following sections outline the process of data collection and data analysis for our systematic review. We begin by giving information on our case study for this paper, the Government of South Australia's proposal for a nuclear waste repository. It is worth stating that while our case study is based on a single country case study, this is for the purposes of coherent data collection only. The case study in question—nuclear waste repositories—are by nature, multinational.

History of Australian Nuclear Waste Repository Development

To date, there are no operative multinational nuclear waste repositories, only proposals to develop them. As of August 2017, the World Nuclear Association reported that there are over 440 commercially operative nuclear power stations across 31 countries, with a further 60 currently undergoing construction. Together, these produce over 11 percent of the world's base-load electricity production, and large quantities of nuclear waste (WNA, 2017a).[3] Many countries possess nuclear waste but only in fairly limited amounts. Therefore, despite the recognition that each producing country remains ultimately responsible for its own output, there is growing interest to consider the possibility of regional or multinational repositories, especially among small members of nuclear energy countries (Taebi, 2012a).

Multinational collaborations on disposing of this waste would have many safety, security, and economic benefits. Most fundamentally, they are beneficial for regions or countries that do not have the necessary geological conditions for geological disposal. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA, 2005, p. 2) indicates the added incentive of "the assurance of non-proliferation." Moreover, Taebi (2012a) identifies that they have considerable economic and safety advantages, particularly for small nuclear club members with no more than two energy reactors (see also El-Baradei, 2003; IAEA, 1998, 2004; McCombie & Chapman, 2002). This also includes the 20 new countries for which nuclear power is under some degree of consideration, including, as a sample, Italy, Norway, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Tanzania, and Ecuador (WNA, 2017b).

Despite the listed benefits, however, proposals for multinational repositories also create many legal, financial, political, and ethical issues (Taebi, 2017), which, due to the recent nature of such discussions, have not been fully or systematically explored. Most apparently, they raise concerns over the shipment of nuclear waste by water, rail, and road over what can be great distances. As a pre-existing example, the Sellafield nuclear complex in the UK reprocessed waste for Japan, Germany, and Switzerland—extracting uranium and plutonium-before all was shipped back (Blowers, 2016); the development of multinational repositories would increase this flow markedly, with risk implications. Reported risks include the danger of accidents with human and environmental health implications and proliferation, mandating a need for multi-lateral and global governance for nuclear safety (Taebi & Mayer, 2017).

The idea of a multinational nuclear waste repository is being considered in depth by the EU countries that poses nuclear waste and formerly, by the Government of South Australia, who, in an initial report, outlined that using the region to host fuel from other countries is considered viable (Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission [NFCRC], 2016). The Australian case is explained in more depth in the following sections and throughout our results.

Government of South Australia

Australia has no operative nuclear power plants and as of 2017, the construction of them has been prohibited. As a result, Reznikov (2016) writes that most Australians have not been exposed to the nuclear industry and its safety and environmental risks. This is accompanied by a long history of anti-repository campaigns from Aboriginal peoples (Green, 2017; Nagtzaam, 2014). Australia does, however, have around 33 percent of the world's uranium mining deposits, which, behind Kazakhstan and Canada, make it the third largest uranium producer globally (WNA, 2017b). This secures the country's role in the global nuclear lifecycle. Moreover, low and intermediate level wastes from Australia's research reactors and medical facilities as well as uranium tailings (remaining of the uranium mining process) are stored throughout the country (Nagtzaam, 2014; NFCRC, 2016).

Despite not producing nuclear energy for commercial use, Australia has been positioned as one potential location for a nuclear waste repository, with initial

support from the South Australian Government (SAG). In 2015, the SAG established the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission (NFCRC) to independently investigate the potential to increase Australia's role in the nuclear fuel cycle (Reznikov, 2016). They collected evidence from written submissions, oral evidence in public sessions, their own research including overseas visits, and commissioned studies (NFCRC, 2017). On the back of the evidence gathered, one of their findings was that "the disposal of multinational used fuel and intermediate level waste could provide significant and enduring economic benefits to the South Australian community" (NFCRC, 2016, p. xiii). Thus, the commission recommended that the South Australian Government proceed with the opportunity following the processes and principles set out in the report.

The South Australian proposal seems to be put on hold (at least temporarily), because a citizens' jury has voted against it. Indeed, the Prime Minister (PM) agreed only to support the project if there was bipartisan support, which has not been achieved. The PM did, however, say that the case is not closed (ABC News, 2016). Despite this temporary halt in developments, as one of the most advanced proposals for a multinational repository globally, this case study provides plentiful opportunities to both explore empirical experiences of negotiations and plans, and to conceptually reflect on their challenges. It is for this reason that it was chosen for this research.

Data Collection

To collect data for our study, a systematic search was conducted for policy reports on the Government of South Australia's proposed nuclear waste repositories published between January 1st, 2006 and December 31st, 2016. Reports were gathered from the Government of South Australia "Get to Know Nuclear" website (GSA, 2017), which hosts all material from the initial scoping and consultation process around the repository proposal.

To ensure that only relevant material was captured in the samples, the authors searched report titles for a series of key terms: The word "nuclear" and any of the following: "Multilateral," "fuel cycle," "storage," "fuel," "international," "multinational," "disposal," "waste," and "spent fuel." Where appropriate, we duplicated the searches to include a hyphenated spelling for example, "multinational" and "multi-national." These categories were inclusive, meaning that a single report could not be counted multiple times in different categories, that is, it they appeared in "multilateral" and "international" they would only be coded once. All reports on the website were fully available and written in English and therefore, none were excluded.

Data Analysis

To analyze the relevant reports, we used a content analysis methodology similar to Sovacool (2014). Content analysis allows both quantitative and qualitative assessments of texts, delivering, in each instance, a systematic description of

the material. To determine emergent themes from the data, coders searching the article for key terms and phrases including "justice," "ethics," "moral," "equality," "acceptance," "risk," and "burdens." We also looked for statements concerning multinational relationships, using terms such as "multilateral," "transboundary," "multinational," "overseas," and "shipment" (plus hyphenated alternatives). This allowed us to investigate perceptions of cross-country relationships and the justice challenges they raised.

In the presence of statements on multinational nuclear waste issues, we inductively coded the contents of articles to capture the meaning of the text. This meant that no initial assumptions were made about contents, and allowed a more accurate portrayal of the material. This approach also fitted our aim to not only present an incremental analysis that applied the tripartite model of energy justice without question, but to develop one that illustrated conceptual additionality and novelty.

Results

This section of the paper presents the results of the content analysis where we assess if and in what form references to multinational energy justice notions emerged within the research sample. Not all analyzed documents are cited—only those from which we have taken direct quotes. The results from other documents are grouped into themes and reported on collectively. These results inform the conceptual reflections presented in Section 5.

Framings of Justice

Excluding one reference to "financial equity," the terms "justice," "equity," "fairness," and "equality" do not appear in the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission Report (NFCRC, 2016). Instead, the term "acceptance" appeared 11 times, and "moral" once as it stated:

> There is also a moral basis for communities that derive a benefit from the use of radioactive materials in science and industry to manage the waste that has been created. This ensures an unfair burden is not placed on future generations. It is recognized that there may be circumstances in which the management of a country's waste is contracted to another country (p. 79).

This suggests that from the Commission's perspective, there is a reluctance to engage with the direct use of normative terms—terms that are often missing from multinational agreements. This is, however, at odds with many of the other analyzed documents, which show widespread use of normative language. Safety from accidents, the effects on human health, environmental damage (including the contamination of aquifers), links to nuclear weaponry and potential proliferation,

and the costs of the Government of South Australia repository project all emerged as distributional justice themes from sample documents, with surrounding use of the statements "ethical," "just," "justice," "moral and fair." As one example reads:

> The whole issue is wrong ethically, morally and does not consider the safety of all citizens. It should NOT even be considered to have South Australia as a nuclear dump. No amount of money will fix any damaged caused by the dump breaking down. Nothing is 100% safe!!!!!! (Colmar Brunton, 2016a).

Such statements sat alongside procedural justice and justice as recognition concerns as the documents (some of which gave the results of public engagement exercises including questionnaires and telephone surveys) reported on the importance of trust, accountability, transparency, regular and appropriate stakeholder engagement and with particular emphasis, the need to recognize and procedurally engage with the challenge of future generations. These challenges were primarily discussed on a national scale, reflecting procedural concerns for Australian citizens. As an exemplar, a respondent in one document stated that:

> I don't believe that government always works in the best interest of the people. Certain representatives try but often policy (political ideas) overrides the needs of the community and what is ethical and moral (Colmar Brunton, 2016b).

In this regard, the multinational nuclear waste repository was clearly seen as an energy justice concern. The question that follows is *how* was it considered multinationally or across boundaries.

Multinational Links

Documents analyzed through the tripartite lens of justice as recognition showed most clearly where national and multinational considerations arose. The opening acknowledgement was that multinational arrangements are not simple, and that they would need to address the exploitation of past vulnerabilities, without imposing undue burdens on future generations. Nationally, the documents showed that attention was given to communities close to the proposed facility, aboriginal populations, and future generations (often without geographical boundaries) as particular stakeholder groups. *Multinationally*, justice as recognition concerns frequently focused on the responsibility for nuclear waste given the ongoing role of Australia as a uranium ore exporter, recognising an obligation to those overseas that used an Australian product. To this end, the appropriate handling of nuclear waste was seen to be intimately related to uranium mining operations, both positively and negatively:

> Someone has to make a decision—there is the moral question that if we are going to export uranium we need to be responsible for safe waste disposal (Colmar Brunton, 2016b).

This clearly shows that even though past (and ongoing) uranium exports are a separate issue from the recent proposal for multinational nuclear waste repository, the two issues have been connected in at least two ways; first, by earlier experiences that people have with the issue of radioactive materials and export to other countries (hence multinational justice concerns) and, second, because of the implicit responsibility that such export implies to also receive the emanating waste coming from those uranium ores. What is not clear from this statement, however, is the exact location of the right holders that are being recognized, leading us not to a statement on the protection of particular groups, but a consideration of the distribution of risks and benefits. Further work would be certainly required to "map" the stakeholder impacts of such facilities, leading to nuanced justice as recognition and procedural justice outcomes.

While universal justice approaches assume that we have equal moral right to access to energy, it does not adequately consider the burdens or responsibilities for them. Nor it deals with the issue of waste generated by energy production. The analysis shows that as uranium producers, Australian citizens feel a moral burden to host waste giving a lifecycle lens that reveals key multinational, stakeholders in these justice concerns. Proliferation was also a specifically identified apprehension, with regulation to protect against it. One example in the context of nuclear waste reads:

> The diplomatic problems in this are mind-blowing—would you trust e.g. North Korea to abide by any multinational guidelines or quality control?! (Colmar Brunton, 2016a)

There was recognition too, however, that multinational arrangements may manage proliferation risks more effectively than domestic arrangements. Indeed, extending this notion and despite referencing challenges, the NFCRC (2016) reported a series of (transnational) benefits of the multinational approach including: (i) Mimising the spread of enrichment technology to facilities in multiple countries; (ii) making the potential for any one participating country to withdraw from the "Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" and other multinational agreements for ensuring nuclear safety and security more challenging, particularly if that country seeks to do so without arousing suspicion at an early stage; (iii) reducing the potential for highly enriched uranium to be produced or diverted in secret; (iv) allowing for the efficient application of safeguards to a centralized facility by the Multinational Atomic Energy Authority (IAEA), especially if the multinational arrangement incorporates IAEA oversight; and (v) reassuring the multinational community that the development of enrichment capabilities is for exclusively peaceful purposes. Indeed, there are also serious

(transnational) burdens associated with multinational repositories, as the one that Australia has proposed.

In summary, beyond the statement that multinational justice proposals raise challenging justice questions, the results show the need to include multinational energy justice explicitly as one of the key frameworks for their assessment.

Discussion and Conceptual Reflections

Most fundamentally, we identify that not considering the ethical issues associated with multinational proposals could either lead to ethically problematic "solutions" or to the total failure of any multinational proposal. Thus, we seek to extend the consideration of multinational transactions to economic, environmental, and social justice transactions. In doing so, it seems possible to establish notions of responsibility that may, in turn, increase the likelihood of positive progress on multinational issues. In this context, the application of energy justice concepts and decision making tools is as useful as it is necessary.

We recognize, however, that the statement that "we should engage with multinational social justice patterns" is easy to make, but not necessarily easy to tackle. Indeed, governance and policy structures on the whole are not well equipped to engage with transboundary justice disputes (Lange, O'Hagan, Devoy, Le Tissier, & Cummins, 2018; Okereke, 2006). For this reason, we now present conceptual reflections on the nature of the emergent challenges. We address three leading questions: How could we consider transboundary distributions and procedural issues? How can we deal with intergenerational justice issues? And, could energy justice say something about conflicting justice demands across time and space, when multinational (multinational) justice might demand different things than domestic justice? This reflection allows us to engage with which justice notions play a dominant role at different systems stages, and explore the formation of transboundary and intergenerational risk.

How Could We Consider Transboundary Distributions and Procedural Issues?

Positively, there already frameworks in place which are concerned with the maldistribution of environmental ills—an element of distributional justice. One example is the Basel Convention, a response to chemical waste exports in the 1970s and 1980s that serves to highlight the significance of the justice discourses around global environmental management (Okereke, 2006). The emergence of the Basel Convention, which sets parameters on the multinational export of toxic wastes, is seen by many as an outcome of campaigns against the practice of richer countries dumping hazardous waste on the poorer and less industrialized (Clapp, 1994, 2001; Okereke, 2006; Puckett, 1992; Wynne, 1989). This was seen as being morally reprehensible and a "poisoning by pollution of moral principles" (Puckett, 1992, p. 94). Thus, it manifested as a concern for not just the environment, but also for long-term justice and economic development prospects. The convention sought to ban the export of toxic wastes from industrialized

countries, as well to achieve the transference of expertise in waste management to developing countries handling their own material (Clapp, 2001). It does not, however, apply to nuclear waste exports. It seems a logical extension that it should, or at least that a similar framework should be constructed.

Although somewhat abstractly, our analysis shows that the application of an energy justice approach allows us to identify systems chains and dependencies and responsibilities across them. Why is the energy justice concept capable of these considerations? Bickerstaff et al. (2013, p. 2), identify that energy justice "provides a way of 'bounding' and separating out energy concerns from the wider range of topics addressed within both environmental and climate justice campaigning." Energy justice does this by focusing on each stage of the whole energy system, encompassing resource mining through to waste management and energy consumption (Jenkins et al., 2014, 2016), thereby making justice and equity questions understandable to people by breaking them into smaller chunks (Jenkins, 2018). At each stage of the energy system—resource mining or energy production, for example—energy justice can engage with local, regional, and national justice questions. Indeed, many steps of the nuclear cycle have a clear international/multilateral aspect that—if not explicitly addressed—could easily be overlooked.

Multinational energy justice could therefore provide an important lens through which to assess our energy infrastructure. It is this element that is particularly key. The material infrastructure of the energy system allows us to chart distributive and procedural justice issues, not only at the local level but—whenever needed—as a matter of multinational justice in terms of benefits and ills of energy provision and use between countries. Once identified, transboundary issues become a discussion of more than economics, and of social justice. Further, this has procedural justice knock-ons as we identify the representative bodies, different stakeholders and appropriate processes needed in different countries involved in the "social justice transaction."

How Can We Deal With Intergenerational Justice Issues?

Nuclear waste and intergenerational justice are two terms that classically follow another, with a scholarship covering decades of research and lived experience (e.g., Sharder-Frechette, 1994, 2000; Taebi & Roeser, 2015). Taebi (2012a) summarizes the challenge from a multinational repository perspective as being a trade-off between the idea that (i) the number of facilities posing a risk to future generations will be reduced—if there are 5 facilities that need managing and recording instead of 15, for example—and (ii) the idea that they can only be successful if one nation accepts another nation's waste, meaning that potential multinational injustices become intragenerational as they extend into the distant future. At the same time, multinational nuclear waste repositories are arguably very dangerous in terms of their intergenerational justice impact. If waste is shipped from one nuclear energy producing country to another waste host country, it may increase the "unconsciousness" of the nuclear waste legacy. Put

another way, it may make it even easier to forget following the logic of "out of sight" means "out of mind." Therefore, alongside negotiating the justice realities of multinational negotiations, we also need to consider temporal ones.

As with large-scale governance issues and externalities, the issue of temporal justice can sometimes be too intangible to tackle. This may be behind the fact that in national legislations, the issues is often merely mentioned rather than extensively discussed and included in the regulatory process and the final outcome. Moreover, it may reflect the necessarily large degree of unpredictability regarding the timing and nature of events—a factor that Fiorentini (2018, this special issue) labels "time uncertainty." Yet, there are several important examples that have tried to include intergenerational justice issues as an explicit concern in governance decisions at the national level. The American Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has, for instance, proposed certain radiation protection standards for licensing the Yucca Mountain Repository. Even though the repository is not being further developed because the huge controversies it engendered in the State of Nevada and President Obama's promise to stop further development (a decision that could, of course, be undone), the licensing procedure was advanced. In this proposal, the EPA proposed a cut off line to distinguish between the next 10,000 years and beyond (up to one million years the period of radiotoxicity of American nuclear waste); the former period is entitled as the same level of protection as we deem acceptable today, and the latter must be protected against a level of radiation that could be more than six times higher than the current level (EPA, 2008). While this distinction seems to lack any serious moral justification, it seems needed from a pragmatic point of view; that is, to make it possible that we facilitate the building of such repositories deep underground (Taebi, 2012b). Another important example is the ongoing developments in Sweden in which, from the very early days of development, multinational justice seemed to be one of the key reasons behind their proposal for the development of underground repositories, and part of the process of public participation (KASAM, 1988).

In sum, regardless of whether we mention and include the issues of intergenerational justice as an explicit issue, current policy has an undeniable impact on future generations' interest. What exacerbates this problem in the case of multinational repositories is that the current instances of intragenerational injustice could easily be perpetuated into the future. Perhaps spatial multinational justice could be the best placeholder to also include the concerns associated with intergenerational justice for decision making on such repositories.

Could Energy Justice Say Something About Conflicting Justice Demands Across Time and Space, When Multinational Justice Might Demand Different Things Than Domestic Justice?

The shift away from concerns of energy resource self-sufficiency toward diversification and a growing role of energy networks and multinational cooperation (Hoggett et al., 2014) brings with it potentially conflicting justice

demands, as this paper has illustrated. We propose that through applications in this context, the multinational energy justice concept could facilitate a better understanding of transboundary cooperation on energy governance issues than universal energy justice.

In this respect, energy justice (and multinational energy justice) could be a core pillar to understand and—to the extent possible—to address issues of fair procedure, recognition and distribution, as well as potential trade-offs that could follow, both as a conflict between the demand of spatial and temporal justice, and as a conflict between local/national versus international/multilateral justice demands—political economy dimensions. Energy justice is then a *decision making* tool that can help energy planners make more considered energy choices.

It has to be quickly conceded that the strength of justice as a moral concept or a tool for political decision making does not derive from the precision of its meaning. We concur with Okereke (2006) in that energy justice itself cannot consider and prioritize competing demands, but as a framework, it will reveal the conflicting demands, and help decision makers, as well as other stakeholders to make informed choices. This is particularly relevant in energy decisions with multinational consequences.

Conclusion

Throughout our exploration, this paper has highlighted a comparatively neglected area in the energy justice literature—the importance of multinational perspectives—as well as presented novel findings from a systematic analysis of literature related to multinational nuclear waste facilities. Now, in the light of discussions around the merit of energy justice approaches in relation of multinational issues of justice, intergenerational justice, and the role conflicting justice demands across time and space, we introduce three emergent areas of importance for multinational energy justice scholarship and their relevance to governance decisions regarding multinational risk.

Firstly, we must consider how to engage with issues of *spatial conflict*. McCauley et al. (2013, p. 1) identify that energy justice "aims to provide all individuals, across all areas, with safe, affordable, and sustainable energy." Yet the globalized "energy for all" concept is at odds with our governance structures. There is a tendency to split our energy systems into small, understandable pieces, leading to ad-hoc, detrimental policy, as some of our "solutions" both cause and fail to recognize widespread externalities (Gagnon, Belanger, & Uchiyama, 2002; Meadows, 2009; Sovacool, Sidortsov, & Jones, 2014), including issues of social justice. This includes a continued focus on national strategies for energy provision and use, detached from the often multinational systems-wide upstream and downstream implications of these policies. Most fundamentally, this paper adds to a growing body of work which identifies that it is necessary to extend the national context, considering structures for energy justice at the multinational systems level, but to increase dialogue between these national contexts as we consider how one country might learn from another and how we may multinationally

collaborate. This is necessary to tackle what Michel (2009, p. 262) calls "the problem of hydra-headed complexities," where in an multinational policy arena and interconnected world, the policies undertaken by some almost inevitably affect the outcomes obtained by others. Our account of multinational justice helps appreciate some of these complexities regarding governance of energy systems that create multinational risk or whose governance requires multinational efforts. The case of multinational nuclear waste disposal is discussed elaborately to show such risk.

Secondly, we must further reflect on, engage with, and proactively tackle *temporal justice conflicts*, because they are often neglected, particularly when they have also multinational aspects. The drivers of energy systems transformation inevitably change, with different energy sources and usages being selected based on their ability to fulfil evolving political priorities. This includes a shift in concern for the cheap, plentiful supply of energy, to the provision of safe and secure electricity generation, resource efficiency, or the desire to transition to low-carbon production. Variations also include post-crisis policymaking decisions, such as those made after the Fukushima nuclear accidents in 2011 (Chien, 2014). Yet despite these dynamics, research is typically driven by spatial explanations of change. We identify that explicit engagement with temporality is largely neglected in current research, and that where it does appear it does so in very contrasting ways. Yet, governance decisions about such energy systems often create a temporal conflicts and not only between the present and future generations, but also between different people belonging to different future generations. Whether we make nuclear waste disposal retrievable or not will have, for instance, different implications for short-term and long-term future generations (Kermisch & Taebi, 2017), and that these future generations could belong to different countries in case of multinational repositories. One might argue that the multinational energy justice will then been perpetuated temporally. These temporal multinational justice conflicts are often overlooked in the literature. Our account of multinational energy justice will help facilitate informed governance decisions with regard to long-term multinational nuclear risks by making such conflict explicit and tangible.

Thirdly, and to reiterate, through better recognising the role and trans-boundary nature of the energy system, we suggest that multinational justice also serves as a means of identifying both instances of injustice and the actors affected by and responsible for them (Jenkins et al., 2014; Jenkins, McCauley, & Warren, 2017); this could best be done for spatial and temporal injustice challenges, and perhaps best in conjunction. Looking forward, the challenge then becomes one of ensuring that "ownership" of this responsibility is accompanied by responsible action.

On the basis of these reflections, our review challenges and extends the application of the energy justice concept. The result is reflections that go beyond the specific case of multinational nuclear waste repositories. Such conflict could also occur when combating climate change: For example, biofuel produced from food crops potentially exacerbates the problem of hunger in the producing

countries (causing a problem of multinational injustice between the producers and consumers); and the geological disposal of CO_2 creates burdens for local communities, while the benefits are mostly global and for climate change mitigations. Further, our contribution is policy-relevant as we argue that the notion of multinational energy justice also enables policymakers in different countries to focus on issues that might otherwise have been overlooked, thereby increasing the potential success of multinational projects.

Kirsten Jenkins is at the School of Environment and Technology, Cockcroft Building, University of Brighton, BN2 4GJL, UK [k.e.jenkins@brighton.ac.uk].
Behnam Taebi is at the Ethics/Philosophy of Technology, Delft University of Technology, Jaffalan 5, 2628 BX Delft, The Netherlands [b.taebi@tudelft.nl].

Notes

Behnam Taebi's work for this article was funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), under grant Ethics and governance of multinational nuclear waste disposal (grant number 275-20-040). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of RCUK Energy Program or NWO.

1. A separate definition of energy justice which instead of the three tenets of distributional justice, procedural justice, and justice as recognition focuses on eight key values: availability, affordability, due process, transparency and accountability, sustainability, intragenerational equity, intergenerational equity, and responsibility (Sovacool, Heffron, McCauley, & Goldthau, 2016).
2. The international relations scholarship does deal with the multinational aspects of nuclear risk, particularly with respect to nuclear security and nuclear non-proliferation (e.g., Fiorentini, 2018; this special issue), but this does not fully fit in the energy scholarship.
3. We note that there are only four or five Japanese reactors connected to the grid. The WNA counts all Japanese reactors, regardless of whether they are operative or not. In this sense, their figure is an overestimate.

References

ABC News. 2016. *Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission: SA Citizens' Jury Votes Against Storing Nuclear Waste* [Online]. http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-11-06/sa-citizens-jury-vote-against-storing-nuclear-waste/7999262. Accessed December 10, 2017.

ANVES. 2017. *Autoriteit Nucleaire Veiligheid en Stralingsbescherming (The Dutch Nuclear Safety Regulatory Agency)* [Online]. https://www.autoriteitnvs.nl/onderwerpen/nationale-programma-radioactief-afvall. Accessed December 17, 2017.

Bickerstaff, K., G. Walker, and Harriet Bulkeley. 2013. *Energy Justice in a Changing Climate: Social Equity and Low-Carbon Energy*. London: Zed Books.

Blowers, Andrew. 2016. *The Legacy of Nuclear Power*. Abingdon-on-Thames, UK: Routledge.

Caney, Simon. 2001. "Review Article: International Distributive Justice." *Political Studies* 49 (5): 974–91.

Chien, Herlin. 2014. "Crisis and Essence of Choice: Explaining Post-Fukushima Nuclear Energy Policy Making." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 5 (4): 385–404.

Clapp, Jennifer. 1994. "Africa, NGOs and the International Toxic Waste Trade." *Journal of Environment and Development* 3 (2): 17–46.

———. 2001. *Toxic Exports. The Transfer of Hazardous Wastes From Rich to Poor Countries*. London: Cornell University Press.

Colmar Brunton. 2016a. Feedback Forms (A3 version) (Complete Report), *Colmar Brunton*.

———. 2016b. Online Survey 2. (Complete Report), *Colmar Brunton*.

Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives.

Drottz-Sjöberg, Britt-Marie. 2012. "Perceptions of Nuclear Wastes Across Extreme Time Perspectives." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 1 (4): 231–53. https://doi.org/10.2202/1944-4079.1039

El-Baradei, Mohamed. (2003) *Nuclear Safety: A Maturing Discipline. Statements of the IAEA Director General, Berlin* [Online]. http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/statements/2003/ebsp2003n022.html. Accessed December 17, 2017.

EPA. 2008. Public Health and Environmental Radiation Protection Standards for Yucca Mountain; Final Rule. 40 CFR Part 197, Part III. Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency.

Findlay, Trevor. 2011. *Nuclear Energy and Global Governance: Ensuring Safety, Security and Non-Proliferation*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fiorentini, Enrico. 2018. "Governing Proliferation Risks: An Evolutionary Approach to an Uncertain World." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*. https://10.1002/rhc3.12152

Fischhendler, Itay, Lior Herman, and Jaya Anderman. 2016. "The Geopolitics of Cross-Border Electricity Grids: The Israeli-Arab Case." *Energy Policy* 98: 533–43.

Forman, Alister. 2017. "Energy Justice at the End of the Wire: Enacting Community Energy and Equity in Wales." *Energy Policy* 107: 649–57.

Gagnon, Luc, Camille Belanger, and Yohji Uchiyama. 2002. "Life-Cycle Assessment of Electricity Generation Options: The Status of Research in 2001." *Energy Policy* 30: 1267–78.

Goldthau, Andreas, and Benjamin K. Sovacool. 2012. "The Uniqueness of the Energy Security, Justice, and Governance Problem." *Energy Policy* 41: 232–40.

Green, Jim. 2017. "Radioactive Waste and Australia's Aboriginal People." *Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 22: 23–50.

GSA. 2017. 'Reports', *Get to Know Nuclear: Discover, Discuss, Decide., Government of South Australia*.

Heffron, Raphael J., and Darren McCauley. 2014. "Achieving Sustainable Supply Chains Through Energy Justice." *Applied Energy* 123: 435–7.

Heffron, Raphael J., Darren McCauley, and Benjamin K. Sovacool. 2015. "Resolving Society's Energy Trilemma Through the Energy Justice Metric." *Energy Policy* 87: 168–76.

Herron, Kerry G., and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. 2014. "Public Perspectives on Nuclear Security." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 5 (2): 109–33.

Hoggett, Richard, Ronan Bolton, Chiara Candelise, Florian Kern, Catherine Mitchell, and Jinyue Yan. 2014. "Supply Chains and Energy Security in a Low Carbon Transition." *Applied Energy* 123: 292–5.

International Atomic Energy Agency. 1998. "Technical, Institutional and Economic Factors Important for Developing a Multinational Radioactive Waste Repository." Vienna: International Atomic Energy Agency.

———. 2004. "Developing Multinational Radioactive Waste Repositories: Infrastructural Framework and Scenarios of Cooperation." Vienna: International Atomic Energy Agency.

———. 2005. "Multilateral Approaches to the Nuclear Fuel Cycle. Expert Group Report to the Director General of the IAEA." Vienna: International Atomic Energy Agency.

Ikeme, Jekwu. 2003. "Equity, Environmental Justice and Sustainability: Incomplete Approaches in Climate Change Politics." *Global Environmental Change* 13 (3): 195–206.

Jenkins, Kirsten E. H. 2018. "Setting Energy Justice Apart From the Crowd: Conceptual Lessons From Environmental and Climate Justice." *Energy Research & Social Science* 39: 117–201.

Jenkins, Kirsten E. H., Darren McCauley, Raphael Heffron, and H. Stephan. 2014. "Energy justice, a whole systems approach." *Queen's Political Review* 2 (2): 74–87.

Jenkins, Kirsten E. H., Raphael Heffron, and Darren McCauley. 2016. "The Political Economy of Energy Justice in Canada, the UK and Australia: A Nuclear Energy Perspective." In *Handbook of the International Political Economy of Energy*, ed. T. Graaf Van de, B.K. Sovacool, A. Ghosh, F. Kern, and M.T. Klare. Cheltenham, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jenkins, Kirsten E. H., Darren McCauley, and Alister Forman. 2017. "[Editorial] Energy Justice: A Policy Approach." *Energy Policy* 105: 631–4.

Jenkins, Kirsten, Darren McCauley, and Charles Warren. 2017. "Attributing Responsibility for Energy Justice: A Case Study of the Hinkley Point Nuclear Complex." *Energy Policy* 108: 836–43.

Jenkins-Smith, Hank C., Urban Strandberg, and Sarah R. Trousset. 2010. "New Perspectives on Nuclear Waste Management." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 1 (4): 1–1. https://doi.org/10.2202/1944-4079.1064

KASAM. 1988. Ethical Aspects on Nuclear Waste, in SKN Report 29. National Council for Nuclear Waste (KASAM), Stockholm.

Kermisch, Celine, and Behnam Taebi. 2017. "Sustainability, Ethics and Nuclear Energy: Escaping the Dichotomy." *Sustainability* 9 (446): 1–13.

Kuipers, Sanneke L., Bob J. van Grieken, and Marjolein B.A. van Asselt. 2018. "Risk, Hazards and Crisis in Research: What Risks Get Researched, When and How?" *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*. 9 (4): 384–396.

Kuipers, Sanneke, and Nicholas H. Welsh. 2017. "Taxonomy of the Crisis and Disaster Literature: Themes and Types in 34 Years of Research." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 8 (4): 272–83.

Kyne, Dean. 2016. "Living With the Invisible Risks in the U.S. Urban Areas: Potential Nuclear Power-Induced Disasters, Urban Emergency Management Challenges, and Environmental Justice Issues." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 7 (4): 176–208.

Labelle, Michael. 2017. "In Pursuit of Energy Justice." *Energy Policy* 107: 615–20.

Lange, Marcus, Annemarie M. O'Hagan, Robert R.N. Devoy, Martin Le Tissier, and Valerie Cummins. 2018. "Govnernance Barriers to Sustainable Energy Transitions—Assessing Ireland's Capacity Towards Marine Energy Futures." *Energy Policy* 113: 623–32.

Liping, Duan. 2011. "Analysis of the Relationship Between International Coopoeration and Scientific Publications in Energy R&D in China." *Applied Energy* 88 (12): 4229–38.

Maltais, Aaron. 2013. "Failing International Climate Politics and the Fairness of Going First." *Political Studies* 62 (3): 618–33.

McCauley, Darren, Raphael J. Heffron, Hannes Stephan, and Kirsten E. H. Jenkins. 2013. "Advancing Energy Justice: The Triumvirate of Tenets." *International Energy Law Review* 32 (3): 107–10.

McCombie, Charles, and Neil Chapman. 2002. Regional and International Repositories: Not If, But When. Proceedings of the conference World Nuclear Association Annual Symposium, 1–13, London.

Meadows, Donella. 2009. *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. London: Earthscan.

Michel, David. 2009. "Foxes, Hedgehogs, and Greenhouse Governance: Knowledge, Uncertainty, and International Policy-Making in a Warming World." *Applied Energy* 86 (2): 258–64.

MIE. 2006. *The National Programme for the Management of Radioactive Waste and Spent Fuels*. The Netherlands: Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment.

Nagtzaam, Gerry. 2014. "Pass the Parcel: Australia and the Vexing Issue of a Federal Nuclear Waste Repository." *Alternative Law Review* 39 (4): 246–248.

NFCRC (Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission). 2016. "Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission Report May 2016." Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission, Adelaide: *Government of South Australia*.

———. 2017. *Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission* [Online]. http://nuclearrc.sa.gov.au/. Accessed December 10, 2017.

Okereke, Chukwumerije. 2006. "Global Environmental Sustainability: Intragenerational Equity and Conceptions of Justice in Multilateral Environmental Regimes." *Geoforum* 37 (5): 725–38.

Page, Edward A. 2007. *Climate Change, Justice and Future Generations*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Puckett, Jim. 1992. "Dumping on Our World Neighbours." In *Green Globe Yearbook*, ed. H.O. Bergesen, M. Norderhaug, and G. Parmann. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 93–106.

Reznikov, Kyra. 2016. *A Nuclear Waste Repository for South Australia, The AusIMM Bulletin* [Online]. https://www.ausimmbulletin.com/feature/a-nuclear-waste-repository-for-south-australia/. Accessed December 10, 2017.

Sarkar, Jayita. 2015. "'Wean Them Away From French Tutelage': Franco-Indian Nuclear Relations and Anglo-American Anxieties During the Early Cold War, 1948e1952." *Cold War History* 15 (3): 375e394.

Sharder-Frechette, Kristin. 1994. "Equity and Nuclear Waste Disposal." *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 7 (2): 133–56.

Sharder-Frechette, Kristin. 2000. "Duties to Future Generations, Proxy Consent, Intra- and Intergenerational Equity: The Case of Nuclear Waste." *Risk Analysis* 20 (6): 771–78.

Sidortsov, Roman, and Benjamin K. Sovacool. 2015. "Left Out in the Cold: Energy Justice and Arctic Energy Research." *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences* 5: 302–7.

Sovacool, Benjamin K. 2013. "The Complexity of Climate Justice." *Nature Climate Change* 3: 959–60.

———. 2014. "What Are We Doing Here? Analysing 15 Years of Energy Scholarship and Proposing a Social Science Research Agenda." *Energy Research and Social Science* 1: 1–29.

Sovacool, Benjamin K., and Michael H. Dworkin. 2015. "Energy Justice: Conceptual Insights and Practical Applications." *Applied Energy* 142: 435–44.

Sovacool, Benjamin K., Raphael J. Heffron, Darren McCauley, and Andreas Goldthau. 2016. "Energy Decisions Reframed as Justice and Ethical Concerns." *Nature Energy* 1: 1–6.

Sovacool, Benjamin K., Roman Sidortsov, and Benjamin R. Jones. 2014. *Energy Security, Equality and Justice*. London: Routledge.

Sovacool, Benjamin K., Roman V. Sidortsov, and Benjamin R. Jones. 2013. *Energy Security, Equality and Justice*. New York & London: Routledge.

Taebi, Behnam. 2012a. "Multinational Nuclear Waste Repositories and Their Complex Issues of Justice." *Ethics, Policy & Environment* 15 (1): 57–62.

———. 2012b. "Intergenerational Risks of Nuclear Energy." In *Handbook of Risk Theory. Epistemology, Decision Theory, Ethics and Social Implications of Risk*, ed. S. Roeser, R. Hillerbrand, P. Sandin, and M. Peterson. Dordrecht: Springer, 295–318.

———. 2017. "Bridging the Gap Between Social Acceptance and Ethical Acceptability." *Risk Analysis* 37 (10): 1817–27.

Taebi, Behnam, and Maximilian Mayer. 2017. "By Accident or by Design? Pushing Global Governance of Nuclear Safety." *Progress in Nuclear Energy* 99: 19–25.

Taebi, Behnam, and Sabine Roeser. 2015. *The Ethics of Nuclear Energy: Risk, Justice, and Democracy in the Post-Fukushima Era*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Vilhunen, Tuuli, Matti Kojo, Tapio Litmanen, and Behnam Taebi. 2019. "Perceptions of Justice Influencing Community Acceptance of Spent Nuclear Fuel Disposal. A Case Study in Two Finnish Nuclear Communities." *Journal of Risk Research*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2019.1569094

Walker, Gordon, and Rosie Day. 2012. "Fuel Poverty as Injustice: Integrating Distribution, Recognition and Procedure in the Struggle for Affordable Warmth." *Energy Policy* 49: 69–75.

Wieczorek, Anna K., Rob Raven, and Frans Berkhout. 2015. "Transnational Linkages in Sustainability Experiments: A Typology and the Case of Solar Photovoltaic Energy in India." *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 17: 149–65.

WNA. 2017a. *Nuclear Power in the World Today, World Nuclear Association* [Online]. http://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/current-and-future-generation/nuclear-power-in-the-world-today.aspx. Accessed December 12, 2017.

———. 2017b. *Australia's Uranium, World Nuclear Association* [Online]. http://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/countries-a-f/australia.aspx. Accessed December 12, 2017.

Wynne, Brian. 1989. "The Toxic Waste Trade: International Regulatory Issues and Options." *Third World Quarterly* 11 (3): 120–45.

Ylönen, Marja, and Tapio Litmanen. 2015. "Signaled and Silenced Aspects of Nuclear Safety: A Critical Evaluation of International Nuclear Safety Thinking." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 6 (1): 22–43. https://doi.org/10.1002/rhc3.12072