## **Becky Alexis Martin and Thom Davies**

## **Abstract**

Since the discovery of radioactivity in 1895, ionising radiation has become an increasingly prominent part of modern life. Here, we explore the diverse modes of interaction that occur between bodies and nuclear technology, and point towards the scope for further research on nuclear geographies. We bring together different strands of this nascent discipline and by doing so, highlight how nuclear technology interacts across a spectrum of geographic scales, communities and bodies. Although nuclear geographies can be sensational and exceptionalising, such as the experiences of nuclear accident survivors and the creation of ‘exclusion zones’, they can also be mundane, everyday and largely unrecognized, such as the production of nuclear energy and the life-giving nature of radioactive medicine. To frame our discussion we take three cuts at nuclear geography, highlighting the importance of zones, bodies, and communities. By discussing this gamut of spaces and societies created through ionizing radiation, we open the way for more research into the cross-section of benefits, challenges and social phenomena that arise, as we co-exist with nuclear technology.

## **Introduction: Nuclear matters**

Far from there being "limited geographical research" (Castree, Rogers, & Kitchin, 2013) into nuclear issues, nuclear geography has become an emerging field that encompasses a wide range of perspectives and approaches to the study of humans and ionising radiation. However, these varied themes are yet to be integrated. Here, we attempt to address this gap by exploring nuclear spaces and societies, from the exceptional to the everyday. We aim to provide an *introduction* to existing literature on nuclear geography, and produce a critical review that points to potential new directions for future research. Though it is beyond the scope of this Compass article to uncover all aspects of nuclear geography, we hope here to provide some interesting insights into an emerging and exciting area of research.

Nuclear technology is an important geographic issue. At its grandest scale, geographers often cite the detonation of nuclear bombs in the 1940s as demarcating the official start of the atomic ‘Anthropocene’ by the presence of man-made isotopes in the soil and sediment of our planet (Castree, 2014, Lewis and Maslin, 2015, Millar and Mitchell, 2015, Castree, 2017). From the perspective of imperceptible radiation, we are all geologically and biologically timestamped by this diffuse haze of fallout, which has irrevocably merged radiation with land and bodies. In some senses we are all touched by nuclear technology, with ionizing radiation having the capacity to connect disparate geographies through its vibrant and invisible materiality (Bennet 2010). In a more everyday sense however, nuclear technology has far-reaching importance. Since the discovery of x-rays by Roentgen in 1895, nuclear technology has become a vital means of enhancing our lives; from therapeutic uses of radiation that improves the health of thousands of people each year, to the increasing importance of nuclear energy to power the homes of millions of people around the world. Indeed, mounting concerns about climate change in our contemporary anthropocentric epoch has pushed a new agenda of energy resilience - and therefore nuclear energy - to the forefront once more (Bickerstaff et al., 2008, Corner et al., 2011, Malin, 2015).


Whilst nuclear technology has proven to be versatile and useful to society, issues have also arisen surrounding defence, waste disposal and disaster management that span vast spatial and temporal distances. These long-range questions present many challenges for critical geographers (Pasqualetti, 1997). The multifaceted use of radiation means that ‘nuclear technology represents a heterogeneous area of social practices’ (Irwin, 2013), and it is precisely this heterogeneity and its dynamic interrelation with society and space that nuclear geography is well placed to explore. It is impossible to view nuclear technology as a separate whole that exists apart from the social, political, and spatial relations that bring it to life (Hecht 2012). It is therefore important to examine how nuclear technology interacts with space and place, inhabiting a wide range of geographic scales. We focus here on three critical sites of nuclear geography: the zone, the body, and the community. By exploring these important sites of nuclear technology, we demonstrate how nuclear issues inhabit spaces that can be simultaneously quotidian and spectacular, exceptional and everyday.

We foreground this discussion by pinpointing the origins of nuclear research within the discipline of geography and contextualise the meaning of nuclear geography by reference to relevant historical and contemporary literature. Reaching beyond the confines of geographic scholarship, we alos find critical intersections with anthropology, history, sociology, science and technology studies (STS), and many other disciplines. By placing this work together with important scholarship by geographers on nuclear issues, we provide an introduction to nuclear geography.

## **Nascent Nuclear Geography**

Early works by geographers of nuclear issues contained unbridled optimism about the potential for nuclear technology to reinvigorate a European continent that had been ravaged by the Second World War (Hoffman, 1957; Jones, 1951).  The potential *mobility* of nuclear energy, unrestrained by the location of natural resources, was an attractive proposition to geographers (see Jones 1951), who held the understanding that ‘power will be produced where needed at practically no additional cost’ (Armand, 1955 , cited in Hoffman, 1957).  Possibilities seemed limitless, and a peaceful ‘geography of atomic energy’ (Hoffman, 1957: 39) was foreseen, predicated on international scientific and political cooperation. Between 1957 and 1973 for example, ‘Project Ploughshare’ used atomic energy as a tool for ‘geographical engineering’ (Kirsch, 2000: 184), modifying the physical geography of landscapes through atomic excavation. At this time, the aim of developing abundant nuclear energy was widely accepted both by geographers and the public (Weart, 2012).

However, as both nuclear energy and nuclear defence flourished internationally, there was a change in the direction of geography scholarship towards a more subversive and critical study of the influence of ionising radiation upon society. The nuclear geography of the late Cold War focused upon worst-case scenarios and nuclear warfare, in anticipation of the social, economic and health consequences of a mutually assured destruction that was thankfully never realised (Bunge, 1973; MacDonald, 2006; Openshaw & Steadman, 1982; Openshaw & Steadman, 1983). The scope of this era includes studies of the potential social impacts of hypothetical nuclear power plant sabotage, and the long-term consequences of nuclear waste sites (Openshaw, 1986; Openshaw, Carver, & Fernie, 1989; Openshaw, Forbes, Miller, & Schmalz, 1992). Geographers also critiqued the social impacts of nuclear deterrence (Wisner, 1986), critically disrupting geography's historical links to war and empire by creating new ways to discuss nuclear weapons within the context of peace (Cutter, Holcomb, & Shatin, 1986; Solecki & Cutter, 1987; Wisner, 1986). A more bombastic genre of geographical literature also emerged from these early forays into nuclear geography, that explored the cultural hysteria of the Cold War through dystopian cartography. Bunge’s Atlas of Nuclear War is a classic example of this, and visually explored the (im)plausibility of human survival following mutually assured destruction (MAD) [see Figure 1] (Bunge, 1989).



*Figure 1: William Bunge’s Atlas of Nuclear War (Bunge, 1989).*

Created prior to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1996, Bunge’s atlas visually represented data from 1970s spatial studies of nuclear attack, to provoke thought and generate radical social change, rather than present an accurate perspective on nuclear risk. However, despite the belief that ‘issues of nuclear war and deterrence are inherently geographical’ (Cutter, 1987: 132), academic radicals felt a lack of influence upon nuclear policy (Pasqualetti, 1986; White, 1988).

It is notable that these early endeavours into nuclear geography reflect the divisive nature of ionizing radiation, with its capacity to both enhance life, and bring it to a swift end. Nuclear technology produces a dialectical relationship between life and death, reflecting recent geographical scholarship on bio/necropolitics (McIntyr & Nast 2011; Davies et al 2017). In what follows, we explore three key sites of nuclear geography: the zone, the body, and the community, that are important areas of existing and future research. For each site, we demonstrate how nuclear technology inhabits spaces that both enhance and diminish life, in both spectacular and quotidian ways. Through this analysis we are able to show how nuclear technology occupies both a biopolitical (Foucault 1978) and necropolitical (Mbembe 2003) role in modern life.

## **Zones**

One of the more explicitly geographic aspects of nuclear technology is its close association with ‘zones’. From exclusion zones and zones of nuclear industry, to nuclear-free zones, and enclosed spaces of technological experimentation or bunkers; zoning and nuclear technology are intrinsically linked. Nuclear spaces are unlike many others, as the invisible nature of ionising radiation means that there must be an active human designation and delineation of space in order for nuclear places to come into being. Creating nuclear spaces becomes a *process*, so that the nuclear environment is actively controlled, designed and constructed (Kuchinskaya, 2012). Spaces of nuclear contamination for example occupy distinct geographies, but for these places to become noticeable to the human senses requires work (Hecht 2012). A human influence is a prerequisite for making spaces ‘nuclear’; for instance warning signs must be placed within the landscape; exclusion zones must be designed, mapped and enforced; and technologies such as Geiger counters are needed in order to interpret, translate, or ‘see’ the geographic spread of radiation. Without such active zoning of irradiated spaces, the ‘nuclear’ aspect of these landscapes effectively disappears. In this sense, nuclear spaces are constructed socially and politically, and are subject to a diverse array of different influences, that extend far beyond the ontological presence of radiation.  Drawing the boundary between what is considered ‘nuclear’ and what is not becomes a political technology, as much as a scientific one (Hecht 2012). Nuclear zones do not just predicate around accidents, but are also constructed around places of nuclear medicine, nuclear energy, and the nuclear military industrial complex. Within these day-to-day places of healthcare and industrial activity, zone design is  present to protect both humans and state from risk.

Perhaps the most spectacular examples of such nuclear zones are those that are constructed in the wake of nuclear disasters. Nuclear accidents demonstrate the complex intersections that occur between technology and society when both go wrong, and have generated much empirical geographic research  (Bickerstaff, 2012; Bickerstaff, Lorenzoni, Pidgeon, Poortinga, & Simmons, 2008; Freudenburg & Davidson, 2007; Alan Irwin & Wynne, 2003; Morris-Suzuki, 2014). Whilst nuclear accidents are infrequent, compared to other technological hazards they are perceived by society to be very high impact events regardless of actual effects to health and the environment (Beck, 1992; Meyer, 1996.; Venables, 2012). The exclusion zones that are produced in the aftermath of such accidents become spatial symbols of ongoing technological failure, and have parallels with ‘fallout zones’, as discussed by Bunge (1989). Nuclear accident risk can therefore be described as existing in a state of *constant becoming*, and such sites of nuclear zones, waste storage or defence, are seen as places of latent risk to be mitigated (Beck, 1992; Davies, 2013; Freudenburg & Davidson, 2007).

The Chernobyl and Fukushima ‘exclusion zones’ in Ukraine and Japan are the most notable examples of post-nuclear accident landscapes. Though there are other important nuclear accidents, including Windscale, UK (1957); Kyshtym, Russia (1957); and Three Mile Island, USA (1979) - the scale the 1986 Chernobyl disaster is especially striking. Fallout from the accident covered 150,000 km2 of Europe, affecting Belarus, Ukraine and the Russian Federation in particular (UNSCEAR, 2000). Due to the enforcement of a 2600 km2 ‘Zone of Alienation’ (Зoнa вiдчyжeння Чopнoбильcькoї AEC) around the epicentre, about 350,000 people had to evacuate, and 2.1 million Ukrainians still inhabit land officially designated affected by the accident (Davies & Polese 2015). As Lesham and Pinkerton note, the Ukrainian use of the word ‘alienation’ is particularly fitting in this example of a nuclear zone, as it gives ‘attention to less visible ruptures in the life fabric of individuals and communities medically and economically affected by the event’ (2015, 8). Communities are another important site of research into nuclear geography, as will be discussed later.

On a smaller scale to Chernobyl, the restricted region around the Fukushima accident in Japan showcases another site of the nuclear sublime (Shaprio 2016).  Around 210,000 individuals within a 20km radius of the epicentre were rapidly evacuated after the 2011 nuclear accident, and there remains uncertainty surrounding the anticipated physical, mental, and social impacts of the disaster (Hamada, Ogino, & Fujimichi, 2012; Steinhauser, Brandl, & Johnson, 2014). Though this nuclear accident occurred 25 years after its Soviet predecessor, Fukushima was zoned in a similar way to Chernobyl, with the surrounding landscape being carved-up between ‘clean’ and ‘unclean’ territory, emphasising the crucial importance of Zones within the governance of nuclear space (Davis & Hayes-Conroy 2017).

Both these exclusion zones have been extensively explored by geographers as sites of distinct biopolitical importance (Davies 2013; David & Hayes-Conroy 2017) where the zoning of landscapes has tested the limits of biological citizenship and environmental justice (Petryna 2002). The exclusionary ‘no man’s lands’ (Lesham & Pinkerton 2015) that are constructed after nuclear accidents are simultaneously spaces of enclosure; designed to contain radiation and exclude human life.  In this sense, these exclusion zones are spaces of sovereign exception, where different rules and laws are enacted to protect the rest of society from invisible radiation (Davies & Polese 2015).  Such exclusion zones have parallels with other polluted geographies, including ‘mitigation landscapes’ (Little 2012) or ‘sacrifice zones’ (Lerner 2010), where certain places (and people) are rendered disposable and ‘wasted’ for the greater good (Bauman 2004). The designation and zoning of places as contaminated and obsolete has direct consequences for inhabitants of these exceptional geographies. As Davis and Hayes-Conroy (2017, 1) found from their research in the Fukushima exclusion zone: ‘nuclear power as a social institution can require states to sacrifice the well-being of hundreds of thousands of their citizens’.

Beyond these disaster geographies, nuclear bunkers are other notable zones of nuclear exceptionality. They are curious spaces that both preempt and embody risk (Klinke 2015). Unlike exclusion zones which are designated spaces of pollution, nuclear bunkers are designed to exclude radiation and protect its inhabitants.  Recent scholarship by geographers has found that nuclear bunkers are spaces where sovereign power can either be entombed (Klinke 2016) or playfully disrupted (Ziauddin 2016). Beyond the concrete materiality of the bunker, the progression and expansion of zones of industrial and military nuclear technology have also mirrored the spatial patterns and pathways of human development over the last sixty years (Merle-Lucotte, Heuer, Le Brun, & Loiseaux, 2006). Nuclear technology is therefore globalised but also geographically enclosed, from uranium excavation to processing for energy and defence; to the economics of ownership and energy production, and nuclear waste management (Findlay, 2010). The zoning of the nuclear industrial complex also present challenges of unequal power relations: as Hecht (2012) has found from her research in Africa, exploitative patterns of uranium extraction, distribution and exposure give the nuclear industry a curiously postcolonial spatiality.

Within the context of weaponry, there are nine nuclear states that possess deterrence and create international zones of defence. Whilst many other non-nuclear deterrence nations are protected by mutual defence treaties under organisations such as NATO, there are also places that have spurned the nuclear military industrial complex to create nuclear-free zones. These nations have become prominent spaces for protesting nuclear weapons. The earliest intentionally nuclear-free zone was uninhabited Antarctica, as a result of the 1961 Antarctic Treaty (Stokke and Vidas, 1996). This treaty consisted of fourteen articles that were designed to enforce peaceful international collaboration during the Cold War, and persists to the present day (Peterson, 1988). Within the Treaty, Article 1 specified that Antarctica was to be used for peaceful purposes only; and Article 5 explicitly prohibited nuclear explosions and the disposal of radioactive waste (Stokke and Vidas 1996). The intention is that Antarctica will be preserved for scientific study for perpetuity. There are also intentionally nuclear-free zones that are populated, such as New Zealand, Austria, Nepal and Mongolia. In the case of New Zealand, both nuclear energy and nuclear weapons have been prohibited, to create a nuclear-free zone (Mayell, 2004; Priestley 2006; Clements, 2015). The decision against nuclear armament was initially undertaken by New Zealand as a member state of South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty, that also included Australia, the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Tonga and other South Pacific islands, that was first signed  during 1985 (Clements, 2015). New Zealand has taken this one step further, by including the prohibition of nuclear energy within  national policy - as a nation that is rich in geothermal and other energy sources, this seems to be not just a product of nuclear activism, but also pragmatism. In line with MacDonald's (2007, 592) call for outer space to become a 'mainstream concern of critical geographers', it is also notable that celestial spaces - including the moon - have also been declared nuclear-weapon free zones, since the 1967 UN Outer Space Treaty.

In a less spectacular sense, nuclear-free zones also exist at the regional level. In the UK for example, 50 councils support the work of the ‘Nuclear Free Local Authorities’ movement, where cities are encouraged to claim responsibility for disarmament, highlighting how their locality might present potential for empowerment and participation (Schregel 2015). At a smaller scale still, de Socio (2010) points to campaigns for *local* ‘nuclear-free zones’. For example, activists in Worcester, Massachusetts consciously sought small scale zones of nuclear disarmament, as a means of challenging the wider geopolitical status quo ‘from below’ (Miller 1994).  These peaceful uses of zonal geographies highlights more prosaic aspects of nuclear technology. The Zone then, in terms of nuclear issues, retains the possibility of becoming a space of resistance, as well as enclosure and biopolitical exclusion.

Zones are of key importance to geographers researching nuclear issues, and they can be sites of exceptional nuclear governance, or new possibilities of peace. As the next section will demonstrate, it is also vital to uncover the more quotidian experiences of nuclear technology. Through this, we can see how the body is an important site of nuclear geography.

## **Bodies**

Nuclear technology is entwined into our daily rhythms and activities in ways that often go unseen. This mundane spatiality of nuclear technology is another avenue through which human geographers are able to uncover and explore the role of high technology in our everyday lives. While the previous section attended to the spectacular spaces created through rare but explosive nuclear errors, nuclear technology also inhabits more mundane spaces; from the hundreds of cities around the world that are powered through nuclear energy; to the thousands of lives that are saved each year due to radioactive medicine; or the routine irradiation for fruits, vegetables, and meat to eradicate food-borne diseases. Indeed our everyday interaction with nuclear technology renders us unknowingly cyborg-like (Haraway 1991). The routine reach of nuclear technology into our everyday spaces is perhaps best demonstrated by the millions of domestic smoke alarms that protect us from fire, most of which contain the artificially produced radioisotope, americium-241. Discovered in 1945 during the Manhattan Project in the USA, this small facet of nuclear technology plays a key role in keeping our bodies safe as we go about our day-to-day lives.

An important yet prosaic way that many of us come into contact with nuclear technology is through health care. The geography of nuclear medicine is relatively unexplored, yet is one of the most significant applications of nuclear technology and its interactions with the human body. Many will personally experience a nuclear medicine diagnosis or treatment during their lifetime (Early & Sodee, 1995; Gnanasegaran, 2014). Therefore, nuclear medicine has an equally significant social and cultural influence, compared with accidents, energy or defence. Like other kinds of health provision, an uneven ‘politics of cancer care’ (Macdonald 2016, 226) has emerged, meaning the availability of nuclear medicine is globally unequal. Whilst there are differences in general health care accessibility and treatment, there has been little exploration into the geographical differences in accessibility and experience of nuclear medicine (Kim, Farmer, & Porter, 2013; Van Doorslaer et al., 1997).  Therefore, nuclear medicine should form an important future component of future health and wellbeing geography as an indicator for diagnosis and treatment worldwide.

Nuclear imaging and medicine was a originally a transatlantic endeavour, with x-ray imagery originating in Europe in the 1930s, whilst approaches toward nuclear pharmaceuticals for the treatment of health conditions were created in the USA from the 1950s onwards, often at military sites such as Oakridge Laboratory (Carlson, 1995). Nuclear medicine includes the broad-spectrum diagnosis and treatment of disease by radioactive materials, from medical imaging to medications (Mettler Jr & Guiberteau, 2011; Ziessman, O'Malley, & Thrall, 2013).

The nuclear geography of both the human body and of the hospital environment are both relevant as the personal experience of medicine has a significant influence upon patient outcome (Payne et al 2001). During imaging, ionising radiation provides insights into the hidden geography and aesthetic of the body. There is a distinction between x-ray examination where radiation is passed through the body to create an image, and the more intrusive process of nuclear medicine imaging; where radiopharmaceuticals are  given internally and radiation is used as a tracer within the spaces of the body for either organ-based or whole body diagnosis (Mettler Jr & Guiberteau, 2011; Ziessman et al., 2013). Whilst exposure to medical radiation is not considered to be a significant risk, there is a focus upon ensuring minimisation within ‘As Low As Reasonably Practicable’ (ALARP) guidelines (Ziessman et al., 2013). Radiotherapy is a common treatment-based nuclear medicine, used for autoimmune diseases and cancers including hyperthyroidism, thyroid cancers, lymphomas and endocrine tumours and conditions (Gnanasegaran, 2014). Linking the necropolitical experience of nuclear disaster or war with the biopolitical realities of health provision, radiotherapy has notable side effects with similar pathology to the symptoms of Acute Radiation Syndrome (ARS). These include nausea, hair loss, sore skin, tiredness, and impacts upon libido and fertility (Gnanasegaran, 2014). The bodily geography of radiotherapy should be included within future study remits, as could the geographies of community support, diagnosis communication, and perception of treatment risks.

The body and embodiment are vital aspects at the forefront of nuclear geography, and as such we need to consider how humans are constituted by and with nature. This feeds into prominent work by geographers that highlight the important role of the body, corporeality, and embodiment within human geography (Hall 2000; Silvey 2017). As geographers have long argued, the body is more than ‘a site invaded by a disease’ (Dorn & Laws 1994, 107) – or indeed by radiation – but rather presents a space of negotiation and lived-experience. Beyond health care, the figurative formulations of culture, nature and subjectivity cannot be removed from the influence of toxic environments (Schnabel et al., 2016, Krupar, 2012). Spaces of the body, which are porous, renewing and transforming (Choy 2011), are therefore key sites for nuclear geographers; the body being as much a landscape and a repository for radiation as any other place (Brown, 2016). It is therefore possible to explore the bodily archive, and to understand how the atomic Anthropocene is changing human bodies, the very essence of human geography, as the broader spatial consequences are echoed within us. Geographers have focussed on the body as a key site of nuclear geography. For example, Cram (2015) discusses how planners of imaginary future nuclear accidents recast potential victims of radiation into quantifiable and neutral bodies – as bounded and statistically verifiable containers of radiation – who have specific exposure thresholds and easily manageable evacuation plans. As the next section will demonstrate however, communities impacted by nuclear technology are heterogeneous, and experience both exceptional and mundane encounters with radiation.

## **The Nuclear Community**

Of critical importance to geographers researching nuclear spaces are the distinct societies have arisen due to interaction with ionizing radiation, from securitized nuclear defence towns to uranium mining communities and groups of nuclear accident survivors. Geographers have examined the experience of these communities within both local and global contexts. Originally, the term ‘nuclear community*’* arose from disaster risk reduction literature, after the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear accident (Lowrance, 1980; McKeown, 2003; Meyer, 1996.). Its purpose was to distinguish between the ‘expert’ and local community, whereby lay persons were deemed empty vessels into which the correct ‘facts’ about nuclear power needed to be poured (Eden, 1998, Irwin, 2013). This secrecy and geographic distancing was in part enshrined through the spatialized governance of nuclear technology itself, and the geographically bounded way it was researched. It also propagated a ‘deficit’ model of public understanding, that was not always inclusive of local perspectives and knowledge  (Eden, 1998; Irwin, 2013). The aspect of expertise was notably critiqued by Wynne (1996) who reflexively explored the lay-expert divide in his work in irradiated rural spaces. He described how sheep farmers on land contaminated by nuclear pollution were often ignored by scientists, despite farmer communities acquiring their own distinct and useful expertise about radiation.

Scientific ‘nuclear communities’ were extant long before definition, hidden internationally in places of Cold War scientific nuclear research such as Mercury, Los Alamos and Oakridge in the USA, Aldermaston in the UK, and Zelenogorsk in Russia. These ‘Plutopian’ cities provided a secure environment and consistent employment for workers after the social and economic upheaval of World War II (Brown, 2013: 5). Neat, ‘clean’ and affluent, the aspirational nature of these research communities ‘normalized and rendered invisible the massive nuclear installations hidden in plain sight' (Brown, 2013: 336). There was a quiet prestige associated with membership of the nuclear community at this time, due to its significant role in national protection during the Cold War nuclear arms race (Hunner, 2014: 216).

The contemporary interpretation of the nuclear community has shifted away from solely scientific expertise to include those who have experienced ionising radiation in other ways. This change is notable within communities of nuclear accidents and nuclear medicine, as the individual has greater access to information, more autonomy, and experts have realised the value of personal local and bodily expertise (Charles, Gafni, & Whelan, 1999; Davies & Polese, 2015). Interestingly, this development of a more inclusive and extensive nuclear community has been mirrored by greater public participation in public policy and citizen science (Chilvers, 2008; A. Irwin, 1995; Malin, 2015; Morris-Suzuki, 2014; Wynne, 1994). We now define a nuclear community as being any group that is associated with ionising radiation, which offers significant scope for exploration of different perspectives, demographics and geographies (Blowers, 2016; Butler, 2014; Litmanen, 2010; Parkhill, 2010; Venables, 2012; Whittaker, 2009). Within the context of nuclear geography, there is a significant back-catalogue of research that has not been considered despite its significance to nuclear communities.

Whilst nuclear technology plays a positive and important role in low-carbon energy generation and peacekeeping, occasions of historic mismanagement have created a human legacy of cultural and social impacts. The communities of Kazakhstan’s Semipalatinsk nuclear weapons testing site and the British nuclear test veterans provide insights into the other side of the nuclear experience. The community of Semipalatinsk were living in a region of extensive USSR nuclear weapons testing from the 1950s to 1990s (Jumazhanova, Tursungozhinova, Belenko, Iskakova, & Amanova, 2016; Stawkowski, 2016). The history of this place has led to community concern about the genetic and long-term risks of radiation exposure.  Interestingly, members of this relatively isolated nuclear community claim to be ‘mutants’ as a way of creating ownership of their marginalised situation, viewing themselves as biologically transformed, rather than disabled (Stawkowski, 2016). This provides insights into ways that affected communities can own their experiences. In contrast, the nuclear test veterans were the soldiers and scientists who tested the UK’s nuclear weapons in Australasia and the South Pacific in the 1950’s and 1960’s (Alexis-Martin 2016). This community has had difficulties in gaining recognition of their status, and identification of their specific needs, and individuals have also experienced contested and unmedicalised conditions that may, or may not be due to exposure to ionising radiation (Sørensen, 2015; Trundle, 2013). Whilst the work of the nuclear test veterans have been memorialised, their individual experiences have not been shared. There has been little consideration of the long-term cultural and social impacts, and intergenerational effects of perceptions of genetic damage within this community  (Trundle, 2013).

A further example of a vibrant nuclear community can be found in the Chernobyl exclusion zone in north-central Ukraine. Within and beyond the 30km Zone that surrounds the damaged reactor, members of a defiant local community returned to continue a bucolic existence, inside this fenced-off landscape (Davies & Polese, 2015; Dobraszczyk, 2010).  Significant work has recently been undertaken within the exclusion zone to discover residents’ everyday relationships with risk and place, to understand how these communities ‘make uses of spaces that cannot be seen’ by state due to perceptions of contamination (De Certeau 1984, cited in Davies 2013). As Petryna (2002) found in her research in Chernobyl, nuclear spaces can create distinct identities. This can range from communities being stigmatised for their association with a polluted place (Mori 2015; Davis & Hayes-Conroy 2017), or a sense of pride and resilience in their communal ability to survive in such an environmentally hostile situation (Petryna 2002; Davies 2015; Stawkowski, 2016, Bickerstaff 2012). What connects these disparate nuclear communities together is a shared experience of radiation. Future geographical scholarship employing literature on the geographies of diasporas and identities (see Christou  & Mavroudi  2016) may offer new in-roads into exploring these interconnections.

## **Discussion and Conclusion**

Throughout this short review we have highlighted how nuclear technology is an important and heterogeneous component of modern life.  We have shown that nuclear technology inhabits spaces that are both exceptional and everyday, spectacular and mundane. Geographers are in a unique position to tackle both the quotidian aspects of nuclear technology, as well as its more extreme ramifications across space and place. Nuclear technology, from energy generation to medicine, remains a burgeoning sector that is only likely to expand over the coming decades. This article has not aimed to give a definitive account of nuclear geography, but rather presents a first attempt at synthesising the diverse interactions of humans and ionising radiation, across space, place and time.

In this paper we have reviewed the historical work of geographers on nuclear issues, finding that a dialectic between positive and negative sides of nuclear technology has always been prominent in the discipline. We then took three cuts into nuclear geography, discussing how the zone, the body and the community relate to nuclear geography. In doing so we reveal multiple ways that we come into contact with ionizing radiation across a range of geographic scales.  This article is by no means an exhaustive  account of the many ways that nuclear issues become geographic, rather we hope to inspire further engagement by human geographers interested in nuclear matters. Other avenues into nuclear geography have remained beyond the scope of this short review, including critical geographies of nuclear energy, waste mobilities, nuclear geopolitics, or more-than-human interactions with ionizing radiation. Further, there exist many exciting theoretical approaches that geographers could use to explore nuclear issues, from assemblage theory (Garstin 2014), to critical materiality (Bosworth 2016), to phenomenological accounts of radiation, among many more. The door is surely ajar, then, for renewed focus on nuclear issues within human geography. Here we hope to have given a snapshot of the potential avenues of exploration for future geographers interested in nuclear things.  If other human geographers and allied social scientists are inspired to research the spatiotemporality of nuclear issues both small and large, then we have achieved our aims.

## **References**

Aday, S., & Livingston, S. (2009). NGOs as intelligence agencies: The empowerment of transnational advocacy networks and the media by commercial remote sensing in the case of the Iranian nuclear program. *Geoforum, 40*(4), 514-522.

Alexis-Martin, B. (2015). The Chernobyl necklace: the psychosocial experiences of female radiation emergency survivors. *Belgeo. Revue belge de géographie*(1).

Alexis-Martin, B. (2016). Grapple Slings and Moonshine: Conversations with the men who tested atomic weapons on Christmas Island. *Toxic News, European Research Council Toxic Expertise*.

Alexis-Martin, B. (2017a). Radiation brain moms and citizen scientists: the gender politics of food contamination after Fukushima. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 1-2. doi:10.1080/0966369X.2017.1280929

Alexis-Martin, B. (2017b). *"RADPOP: A New Modelling Framework for Radiation Protection.* (PhD), University of Southampton, Southampton

Armand, L. (1955). *Some aspects of the European energy problem: suggestions for collective action; report prepared for the OEEC*: Organisation for European Economic Cooperation.

Arnold, L. (2016). *Windscale 1957: anatomy of a nuclear accident*: Springer.

Bauman, Z., 2013. Wasted lives: Modernity and its outcasts. John Wiley & Sons.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity* (Vol. 17): Sage.

Bickerstaff, K. (2012). “Because We've Got History Here”: Nuclear Waste, Cooperative Siting, and the Relational Geography of a Complex Issue. *Environment and Planning A, 44*(11), 2611-2628.

Bickerstaff, K., Lorenzoni, I., Pidgeon, N. F., Poortinga, W., & Simmons, P. (2008). Reframing nuclear power in the UK energy debate: nuclear power, climate change mitigation and radioactive waste. *Public Understanding of Science, 17*(2), 145-169.

Blowers, A. (2016). *The Legacy of Nuclear Power*: Routledge.

Bosworth, K., 2016. Thinking permeable matter through feminist geophilosophy: Environmental knowledge controversy and the materiality of hydrogeologic processes. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*.

.Bowen, W., Esfandiary, D., & Moran, M. (2016). Introduction: Understanding Iranian Proliferation Behaviour *Living on the Edge* (pp. 1-13): Springer.

Bromet, E. J., & Havenaar, J. M. (2007). Psychological and perceived health effects of the Chernobyl disaster: a 20-year review. *Health physics, 93*(5), 516-521.

Brown, K. L. (2013). *Plutopia: Nuclear families, atomic cities, and the great soviet and American plutonium disasters*: Oxford University Press, USA.

Bunge, W. (1973). The geography of human survival. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 63*(3), 275-295.

Bunge, W. (1989). *Nuclear war atlas*: Blackwell Oxford.

Butler, C., Parkhill, K. and Pidgeon, N. (2014). From the material to the imagined: Public engagement with low carbon technologies in a nuclear community,. *in. Devine-Wright P. [ed] Renewable Energy and the Public: From NIMBY to Participation*, 301.

Carlson, S. (1995). A glance at the history of nuclear medicine. *Acta oncologica, 34*(8), 1095-1102.

Castree, N., Rogers, A., & Kitchin, R. (2013). *A dictionary of human geography*: Oxford University Press.

Charles, C., Gafni, A., & Whelan, T. (1999). Decision-making in the physician–patient encounter: revisiting the shared treatment decision-making model. *Social science & medicine, 49*(5), 651-661.

Chilvers, J. (2008). Environmental risk, uncertainty, and participation: mapping an emergent epistemic community. *Environment and Planning A, 40*(12), 2990-3008.

Christou, A. and Mavroudi, E., 2016. Dismantling diasporas: Rethinking the geographies of diasporic identity, connection and development. Routledge.

Choy, T., 2011. *Ecologies of comparison: An ethnography of endangerment in Hong Kong*. Duke University Press.

Clements, K., 2015. *Back from the brink: The creation of a nuclear-free New Zealand*. Bridget Williams Books.

Cram, S. (2015). Becoming Jane: The making and unmaking of Hanford’s nuclear body. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 0263775815599317.

Cutter, S. L. (1993). *Living with risk: the geography of technological hazards*: Edward Arnold London.

Cutter, S. L., Holcomb, H. B., & Shatin, D. (1986). SPATIAL PATTERNS OF SUPPORT FOR A NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREEZE∗. *The Professional Geographer, 38*(1), 42-52.

Davies, T. (2013). A visual geography of Chernobyl: Double exposure. *International Labor and Working-Class History, 84*, 116-139.

Davies, T., (2015). Nuclear borders: informally negotiating the Chernobyl exclusion zone. In *Informal Economies in Post-Socialist Spaces* (pp. 225-244). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Davies, T., & Polese, A. (2015). Informality and survival in Ukraine's nuclear landscape: living with the risks of Chernobyl. *Journal of Eurasian Studies, 6*(1), 34-45.

Davis, S. and Hayes-Conroy, J., 2017. Invisible radiation reveals who we are as people: environmental complexity, gendered risk, and biopolitics after the Fukushima nuclear disaster. *Social & Cultural Geography*, pp.1-21.

De Groot, J. I., & Steg, L. (2010). Morality and nuclear energy: perceptions of risks and benefits, personal norms, and willingness to take action related to nuclear energy. *Risk analysis, 30*(9), 1363-1373.

De Groot, J. I., Steg, L., & Poortinga, W. (2013). Values, perceived risks and benefits, and acceptability of nuclear energy. *Risk analysis, 33*(2), 307-317.

De Socio, M., 2010. Geographers Mobilize: A Network‐Diffusion Analysis of the Campaign to Free Ghazi‐Walid Falah1. *Antipode*, *42*(2), pp.310-335.

Dobraszczyk, P. (2010). Petrified ruin: Chernobyl, Pripyat and the death of the city. *City, 14*(4), 370-389.

Dorn M and Laws C (1994) ’Social theory, body politics and medical geography: extending Kearns‘s invitation’ Professional Geographer 46( 1 ), 106-1 0

Early, P. J., & Sodee, D. B. (1995). *Principles and practice of nuclear medicine*: Mosby Incorporated.

Eden, S. (1998). Environmental issues: knowledge, uncertainty and the environment. *Progress in Human Geography, 22*(3), 425-532.

Findlay, T. (2010). *Nuclear energy and global governance: ensuring safety, security and non-proliferation*: Routledge.

Freudenburg, W. R., & Davidson, D. J. (2007). Nuclear families and nuclear risks: The effects of gender, geography, and progeny on attitudes toward a nuclear waste facility. *Rural Sociology, 72*(2), 215-243.

Garstin, S.A., 2014. Assembling the atom: development legacies, dialogue and the process of nuclear development in Pomerania, Poland (Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham).

Gnanasegaran, G. (2014). *Atlas of clinical nuclear medicine*: CRC Press.

Hamada, N., Ogino, H., & Fujimichi, Y. (2012). Safety regulations of food and water implemented in the first year following the Fukushima nuclear accident. *Journal of radiation research*, rrs032.

Hall, E., 2000. ‘Blood, brain and bones’: Taking the body seriously in the geography of health and impairment. *Area*, *32*(1), pp.21-29.

Haraway, D., 2013. *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.

Havenaar, J., De Wilde, E., Van Den Bout, J., Drottz-Sjöberg, B., & Van Den Brink, W. (2003). Perception of risk and subjective health among victims of the Chernobyl disaster. *Social science & medicine, 56*(3), 569-572.

Hoffman, G. W. (1957). The role of nuclear power in Europe's future energy balance. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 47*(1), 15-40.

Holt, M., Campbell, R. J., & Nikitin, M. B. (2012). *Fukushima nuclear disaster*: Congressional Research Service.

Hunner, J. (2014). *Inventing Los Alamos: The Growth of an Atomic Community*: University of Oklahoma Press.

Irwin, A. (1995). Citizen science: A study of people, expertise and sustainable development. *Psychology Press.*

Irwin, A. (2013). *Sociology and the environment: a critical introduction to society, nature and knowledge*: John Wiley & Sons.

Irwin, A., & Wynne, B. (2003). *Misunderstanding science?: the public reconstruction of science and technology*: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, S. B. (1951). The Economic Geography of Atomic Energy: A Review Article. *Economic Geography, 27*(3), 268-274.

Jumazhanova, G., Tursungozhinova, G., Belenko, O., Iskakova, M., & Amanova, A. (2016). Ecological Consciousness of a Personality Living in an Ecologically Unfavorable Region. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education, 11*(7).

Kim, J. Y., Farmer, P., & Porter, M. E. (2013). Redefining global health-care delivery. *The Lancet, 382*(9897), 1060-1069.

Krupar, S. R. (2012). Transnatural ethics: revisiting the nuclear cleanup of Rocky Flats, CO, through the queer ecology of Nuclia Waste. *cultural geographies, 19*(3), 303-327.

Kuchinskaya, O. (2012). Twice invisible: Formal representations of radiation danger. *Social Studies of Science*, 0306312712465356.

Kyne, D., & Bolin, B. (2016). Emerging Environmental Justice Issues in Nuclear Power and Radioactive Contamination. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 13*(7), 700.

Langlois, L. (2013). IAEA action plan on nuclear safety. *Energy Strategy Reviews, 1*(4), 302-306.

Litmanen, T., Kojo, M. and Kari, M. (2010). The rationality of acceptance in a nuclear community: analysing residents' opinions on the expansion of the SNF repository in the municipality of Eurajoki, Finland. *International Journal of Nuclear Governance, Economy and Ecology, 3*(1), 42-58.

Lowrance, W. W. (1980). The nature of risk *Societal risk assessment* (pp. 5-17): Springer.

Macdonald, A., (2016). Delivering breast cancer care in urban India: heterotopia, hospital ethnography and voluntarism. *Health & place*, *39*, pp.226-232.

MacDonald, F. (2006). Geopolitics and ‘the vision thing’: regarding Britain and America's first nuclear missile. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 31*(1), 53-71.

MacDonald, F., 2007. Anti-Astropolitik—outer space and the orbit of geography. *Progress in human geography*, 31(5), pp.592-615.

Malin, S. A. (2015). *The Price of Nuclear Power: Uranium Communities and Environmental Justice*: Rutgers University Press.

Marples, D. R. (1991). Chernobyl: five years later. *Soviet Geography, 32*(5), 291-313.

Mayell, P., 2004. Beyond the ‘Outer Crescent’: the mackinder century in New Zealand geopolitics. *The Geographical Journal*, 170(4), pp.368-376.

McIntyre, M. and Nast, H.J., 2011. Bio (necro) polis: Marx, Surplus Populations, and the Spatial Dialectics of Reproduction and “Race” 1.*Antipode*, *43*(5), pp.1465-1488.

McKeown, J., 2003. IAEA Bulletin, 45(1), pp.24-29. (2003). Decommissioning: lessons to learn. Sharing experience and working together is important to allow the world nuclear community to respond to the challenge of restoring nuclear facilities safely, and cost effectively. . *IAEA Bulletin, 45*(1), 24-20.

Merle-Lucotte, E., Heuer, D., Le Brun, C., & Loiseaux, J. (2006). Scenarios for a worldwide deployment of nuclear power. *International Journal of Nuclear Governance, Economy and Ecology, 1*(2), 168-192.

Mettler Jr, F. A., & Guiberteau, M. J. (2011). *Essentials of nuclear medicine imaging*: Elsevier Health Sciences.

Meyer, M. A. ( 1996.). The nuclear community and the public: cognitive and cultural influences on thinking about nuclear risk. *Nuclear Safety, 37*(2), 97-108.

Miller B (1994) Political empowerment, local–central state relations, and geographically shifting political opportunity structures. Political Geography 13(5):393–406

Mori, M., 2015. Geographies of precarious condition in the post-Fukushima. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 5(1), pp.122-124.

Morioka, R. (2014). Gender difference in the health risk perception of radiation from Fukushima in Japan: The role of hegemonic masculinity. *Social science & medicine, 107*, 105-112.

Morris-Suzuki, T. (2014). Touching the grass: Science, uncertainty and everyday life from Chernobyl to Fukushima. *Science Technology & Society, 19*(3), 331-362.

Moysich, K. B., Menezes, R. J., & Michalek, A. M. (2002). Chernobyl-related ionising radiation exposure and cancer risk: an epidemiological review. *The lancet oncology, 3*(5), 269-279.

Openshaw, S. (1986). Nuclear power: siting and safety.

Openshaw, S., Carver, S., & Fernie, J. (1989). Britain's nuclear waste: siting and safety.

Openshaw, S., Forbes, G., Miller, E., & Schmalz, R. (1992). The safety and siting of nuclear power plants when faced with terrorism and sabotage *Natural and technological disasters: Causes, effects and preventive measures* (pp. 455-468): < The> Pennsylvania Academy of Science.

Openshaw, S., & Steadman, P. (1982). On the geography of a worst case nuclear attack on the population of Britain. *Political Geography Quarterly, 1*(3), 263-278.

Openshaw, S., & Steadman, P. (1983). The geography of two hypothetical nuclear attacks on Britain. *Area*, 193-201.

Parkhill, K. A., Pidgeon, N.F., Henwood, K.L., Simmons, P. and Venables, D. (2010). From the familiar to the extraordinary: local residents’ perceptions of risk when living with nuclear power in the UK. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 35*(1), 39-58.

Pasqualetti, M. J. (1986). The dissemination of geographical findings on nuclear power. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 326-336.

Pasqualetti, M. J., & Pijawka, K. D. (1984). Nuclear power: Assessing and managing hazardous technology.

Payne, S., Jarrett, N., Jeffs, D. and Brown, L., 2001. Implications of social isolation during cancer treatment.: The implications of residence away from home during cancer treatment on patients’ experiences: a comparative study. *Health & Place*, *7*(4), pp.273-282.

Peterson, M.J., 1988. *Managing the frozen south: the creation and evolution of the Antarctic Treaty System* (Vol. 20). Univ of California Press.

Phillips, S. D. (2004). Chernobyl's Sixth Sense: The Symbolism of an Ever‐Present Awareness. *Anthropology and humanism, 29*(2), 159-185.

Priestley, R., 2006. The search for uranium in ‘nuclear‐free’ New Zealand: Prospecting on the West Coast, 1940s to 1970s. New Zealand Geographer, 62(2), pp.121-134.

Schmidt-Thomé, P., & Kallio, H. (2006). Natural and technological hazard maps of Europe. *SPECIAL PAPER-GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF FINLAND, 42*, 17.

Schregel, S., 2015. Nuclear war and the city: perspectives on municipal interventions in defence (Great Britain, New Zealand, West Germany, USA, 1980–1985). Urban History, 42(04), pp.564-583.

Silvey, R., 2017. Bodies and Embodiment. *The International Encyclopedia of Geography*.

Solecki, W. D., & Cutter, S. L. (1987). Living in the nuclear age: Teaching about nuclear war and peace. *Journal of Geography, 86*(3), 114-120.

Sørensen, B. R. (2015). Veterans’ homecomings: secrecy and postdeployment social becoming. *Current Anthropology, 56*(S12), S231-S240.

Stawkowski, M. E. (2016). “I am a radioactive mutant”: Emergent biological subjectivities at Kazakhstan's Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Site. *American Ethnologist, 43*(1), 144-157.

Steinhauser, G., Brandl, A., & Johnson, T. E. (2014). Comparison of the Chernobyl and Fukushima nuclear accidents: A review of the environmental impacts. *Science of the Total Environment, 470*, 800-817.

Stokke, O.S. and Vidas, D., 1996. *Governing the Antarctic: the effectiveness and legitimacy of the Antarctic Treaty System*. Cambridge University Press.

Suzuki, Y., Yabe, H., Yasumura, S., Ohira, T., Niwa, S.-I., Ohtsuru, A., . . . Abe, M. (2015). Psychological distress and the perception of radiation risks: the Fukushima health management survey. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 93*(9), 598-605.

Trundle, C. (2013). Memorialising the veteran body: New Zealand nuclear test veterans and the search for military citizenship. *War and the body: militarisation, practice and experience*, 194-209.

UNSCEAR. (2000). *Sources, effects and risks of ionizing radiation, 2000: report to the General Assembly*. Retrieved from New York<http://www.unscear.org/docs/reports/gareport.pdf>

UNSCEAR. (2008). Maps of radionuclide deposition.   Retrieved from<http://www.unscear.org/unscear/en/chernobylmaps.html>

Van Doorslaer, E., Wagstaff, A., Bleichrodt, H., Calonge, S., Gerdtham, Gerfin, M. Leu, R. E. (1997). Income-related inequalities in health: some international comparisons. *Journal of health economics, 16*(1), 93-112.

Venables, D., Pidgeon, N.F., Parkhill, K.A., Henwood, K.L. and Simmons, P. (2012). Living with nuclear power: Sense of place, proximity, and risk perceptions in local host communities. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 32*(4), 371-383.

Visschers, V. H., Keller, C., & Siegrist, M. (2011). Climate change benefits and energy supply benefits as determinants of acceptance of nuclear power stations: Investigating an explanatory model. *Energy policy, 39*(6), 3621-3629.

Walker, G. (2012). *Environmental justice: concepts, evidence and politics*: Routledge.

Weart, S. R. (2012). *The rise of nuclear fear*: Harvard University Press.

White, G. F. (1988). Paths to risk analysis. *Risk Analysis, 8*(2), 171-175.

Whittaker, R. C. (2009). Fusing the Nuclear Community: Intercultural Memory, Hiroshima 1945 and the Chronotopic Dramaturgy of Marie Clements’s Burning Vision. *Theatre Research in Canada/Recherches théâtrales au Canada, 30*(1\_2).

Wisner, B. (1986). Geography: War or peace studies? *Antipode, 18*(2), 212-217.

Wynne, B. (1994). May the Sheep Safely Graze? A Reflexive View of the Expert-Lay Knowledge Divide in Lash, S. Bronislaw, S. and Wynne, B.(eds) Risk Environment and Modernity: Towards an New Ecology: London: Sage.

Ziessman, H. A., O'Malley, J. P., & Thrall, J. H. (2013). *Nuclear medicine: the requisites*: Elsevier Health Sciences.