

Article 2

English Dominance in Whaling Debates A Critical Analysis of Discourse at the International Whaling Commission

TAKAHASHI Junichi

Obirin University, Tokyo, Japan

The International Whaling Commission (IWC), the inter-governmental body for management of whaling and whale resources, shifted from the science-based policies for the industry to the ethic-based policies for animal protection, which led to the moratorium for most whaling operations under its jurisdiction. This paper critically analyzes the discourse at the IWC for the most critical decades (1967-1987), and shows how scientific categories and arguments for resource management were replaced by essentially ethical (thus culturally bound) categories and arguments. It also points out that English, the only official and working language of the IWC, played a significant role in manipulation of the discourse.

Key words: ABORIGINAL, COLONIALISM, DISCOURSE ANALYSIS, ENGLISH, ENVIRONMENTALISM, INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION, INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION, INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE, IWC, LANGUAGE INEQUALITY, LINGUISTIC IMPERIALISM, OFFICIAL LANGUAGE, RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, WHALING.

1. INTRODUCTION

That language reflects its speaker's thought is a long acknowledged thesis in both East and West. But it is fairly recent in human history that people began to pay serious attention to the fact that language not only reflects the speaker's thought patterns, but also influences, shapes, and in some cases determines them. Linguistic determinism or theory of linguistic relativity as it once was called (Sapir 1925; Whorf 1956; Hoiijer 1954; Hayakawa 1978), is gaining new attention in the social and cognitive sciences. Since the early 1980s, analysis of texts and discourse materials, as well as more common lexical and sentential analysis, has become one of the most

productive and effective means for analyzing complex social and political ideologies in contemporary societies and organizations (Dant 1991; Van Dijk 1991, 1996; Fairclough 1989, 1995; Stubbs 1996, among others). Critical discourse analysis, as it is sometimes called, may be applied to any textual materials, including news reports, popular songs, ceremonial speeches, personal letters, social conversations, minutes of meetings, and many other types of documents and writings. By carefully examining the language usage and argumentation structures within them, one can uncover underlying (sometimes hidden) cognitive patterns and ideologies of the groups and people that have produced the texts. It is a far more sensitive tool for

analysis than ordinary content analysis employed in political science.

The International Whaling Commission (IWC) is an inter-governmental organization founded in 1946 for the regulation of whaling of great whales (i.e., all the baleen whales and sperm whales) and management of whale resources. It has a permanent secretariat in England and holds annual meetings to review the past year's practice, and to discuss and set policies for the next year. The IWC has two major committees—the Scientific Committee and Technical Committee which discuss problems from scientific and administrative perspectives respectively. Based on the information and recommendations provided by the two committees, Official decisions are made by the commission, which consists of commissioners from the contracting governments. (For IWC's organizational structure, see Birnie 1985; Asgrimsson 1989; Ohsumi 1991, Takahashi 1992.) Currently, the IWC has about 40 member nations, many of which are not engaged in whaling at all, while some whaling nations, such as Canada and Indonesia among others, stay outside the IWC for political reasons.

The IWC's policy during the last two decades and a half looks, at least on the surface, quite inconsistent and not easily comprehensible to outsiders, with many puzzling problems: e.g., a large number of governments joining the commission with intentions not necessarily consistent with the stated purposes of International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling—the very foundation on which the IWC was established; important decisions made against recommendations of its own scientific committee; and fundamental policies formulated based on non-technical categories which are not clearly defined,

just to mention a few. While to some degree ambiguity and inconsistency as well as secrecy, are not uncommon in any political processes, policy makers should have moral obligations to the public to account for their decisions. If the sensitive and complicated political situation prevents the policy makers from voluntarily offering honest and clear explanations, then it becomes the outside observer's responsibility to analyze the problem on the basis of available materials. That is exactly what this paper undertakes.

In this paper, a critical discourse analysis is attempted of the annually published chairman's reports of the IWC meetings for the period 1967-1987. Although there are many issues and concepts involved in the IWC discourse, the present analysis will be mainly focused on three key concepts—"commercial" whaling, "aboriginal/subsistence" whaling, and "small-type" whaling—because these are directly relevant to the current issue of "community-based whaling" (Japan 1996). My main objective is not a political analysis, but a cognitive analysis of the IWC as a collective body operating in English—the only official and working language of the organization. Although the analysis presented here is still provisional and not complete, it nevertheless throws some light into the black box and clarifies some of the key concepts in the IWC discourse which have been left undefined and arbitrary.

2. PRE-ENVIRONMENTALISM PERIOD

Before 1972, whale fisheries under IWC's jurisdiction were customarily identified and referred to by their geographical locations alone or geographical locations plus their target species. For the practical purposes of

regulation of whaling and management of resources, this is sufficient to identify each fishery. For example, in the report of 1971, the aboriginal whale fishery off Chukchi is referred to only by its geographical area. Any ambiguity that might remain as a result of this minimum designation is clarified by the context.

The Technical Committee recommended the continuation of the exclusion of "the North-east Pacific area" from the requirement that the meat of whales of the smaller dimensions prescribed in paragraph 9(a) and (b) of the Schedule must be used for local consumption as human or animal food and the commission approved the following amendments to the Schedule.

This kind of minimal encoding practice with little or no semantic redundancy is typical in the discourse held within a relatively homogeneous group in which the members know very well what they are doing. In fact, more than half of the IWC members in this period were still involved in whaling with several others having stopped only recently, and radical environmentalism had not seriously affected the IWC yet. In the IWC reports from 1967 to 1971 which are covered in this analysis, all the whaling operations in the world regardless of their economic characteristics or geographical location were lumped together as whaling, and no evidence of intentional sub-classification was found. Exceptional cases or exclusion from certain regulatory requirements were handled on individual bases rather than categorically with a shared designation. No terms that would indicate a dualistic classification of whaling, such as today's "commercial whaling" and "aboriginal/subsistence whaling" can be found.

3. INTRODUCTION OF "COMMERCIAL" WHALING

The situation changed very suddenly in 1972 when the term "commercial" whaling was first introduced in IWC discourse. In the welcoming speech at the annual meeting held in London, the records show that a UK minister used this term for the first time in the history of the IWC. He was referring to the UN Conference on Human Environment which was just closing at that time. After that speech, the Chairman distributed to the members a copy of a communication from the UN which called for a 10-year moratorium of all commercial whaling. The USA then proposed a global moratorium on commercial whaling, which was seconded by the UK. This set off a long lasting debate in the IWC.

It is important to note that the term "commercial" was introduced from outside by the UN Conference on Human Environment, and not by some internal need the IWC had. Neither its definitions nor the reasons for choosing this word were provided, but it was probably chosen for its association with money and profit—a notion with negative moral implications in Western culture. (Parry and Bloch 1991) It is therefore no surprise that most IWC members were neither cognitively nor politically ready for the new notion. Apparently, just what was meant by "commercial" whaling was not clear at first to other IWC members, and only later "*in the course of discussion in the plenary session of the Commission it was made clear that the proposed ban would apply only to the commercial (emphasis by the author) taking of whales. The present exception granted in the Schedule to the small scale whaling from Greenland and the Faeroe Islands, where the whales are taken for consumption by*

the local population, would not be affected" (IWC 1972: 6).

As mentioned earlier, the term commercial whaling had not been used previously in IWC discourse, and it would be a safe assumption that commercial whaling did not exist as a clearly marked cognitive category in the minds of the members of the IWC. In fact, members of the IWC paid little attention to the marking of that aspect of whaling which was later called commercial, probably because it was too obvious and did not need to be marked at all. To support this assumption we can point out a fact that in the following several years, UK ministers never used the term commercial whaling in any of their welcoming speeches again. Instead they simply used the unmarked word "whaling" as in "*10-year moratorium of all whaling*" to refer to the same UN initiated proposal (IWC 1973). The USA repeatedly, in 1973 and 1974, made the same proposal for a moratorium, in which context the term commercial whaling appeared in the Chairman's reports. However, in no other contexts of the IWC discourse was the same word used at all. Clearly, commercial whaling is not a category generally employed in dealing with scientific and technical matters in the IWC. The term was used only in a limited political context.

It is also important to note that the term aboriginal whaling was not used as a contrast with commercial whaling. The term aboriginal did not occur in the IWC discourse in 1972, the very year the notion of commercial whaling was introduced to the IWC. As a matter of fact, the term aboriginal whaling was not used at all in the previous years covered by the current analysis. These facts seem to suggest that the aboriginal-commercial dichotomy, which is so prevalent in the IWC discourse in later

years, had not yet been established.

In 1973 the term aboriginal occurred for the first time in the same paragraph as commercial whaling. Consider the following paragraph:

Technical Committee.....proposed that the Commission decide that commercial whaling for all species of cetaceans should cease for a period of ten years beginning not later than three years from the date of the adoption of the resolution, except aboriginal catches where they do not endanger the species. (IWC 1973: 4)

However, linguistically in this context aboriginal and commercial are not necessarily taken to be mutually exclusive. In fact aboriginal catches are stated to be exceptions of the proposed commercial whaling ban, which seems to imply that aboriginal whaling was conceived to be a sub-category of the more generic category of commercial whaling. If aboriginal whaling was held at the same taxonomic level as commercial whaling, which would have been the case if these two categories were contrastive, such a statement of exception would not have been necessary and the same situation would have been phrased differently. This is another piece of evidence suggesting that the aboriginal-commercial contrast was not in the minds of most IWC members.

In the same year the term aboriginal can be found in another context, but the term commercial did not occur there.

...the Scientific Committee considered the problem of the loss of whales in the United States aboriginal fishery. (IWC 1973: 9)

In 1974, the USA made its third unsuccessful attempt to call for a moratorium on all commercial whaling. The occurrence of this term was again limited to the context of the USA proposal and is found nowhere else in the discourse.

However, in the process of amending the USA proposal, Australia and Denmark, following the advice of the Scientific Committee, proposed a new management procedure. This new management procedure had a three-way classification of the stocks, and each of the three categories (initial management stocks; sustained management stocks; protection stocks) was characterized by, in addition to abundance, allowance for commercial whaling. This became the first adopted IWC resolution which contained the term commercial whaling. In 1975, the same new management procedure was reaffirmed, but the term commercial whaling can be found nowhere in the Chairman's report.

In the 1976 meeting, the Scientific Committee recommended that *steps should be taken to limit the expansion of the fishery of bowhead whales off North America and to reduce the loss rate of struck whales*. Here the operation was designated by location and target species alone. In the same meeting the Commission, based on this SC recommendation, adopted a resolution which stated:

The IWC having noticed the evidence for an increased effort on bowhead whales in the North American Arctic which species generally is protected in all Oceans;recommends that contracting governments as early as possible take all feasible steps to limit the expansion of the fishery and to reduce the loss rate of struck whales. (IWC 1977: 33)

Here again the fishery was referred to by the geographical area and the target species, and not by the term "aboriginal whaling".

In 1977, in agenda item 10 the reporting requirement for small-type whaling operation was discussed, and a redefinition of "small-type whaling" was proposed by

the SC. The commission decided to amend the final definition of section I of the Schedule as follows:

Small-type whaling—means catching operations using powered vessels with mounted harpoon guns hunting exclusively for minke, bottlenose, beaked, pilot or killer whales. (IWC 1978: 33)

Here the definition was based on the target species and the technology used, and no mention was made with regard to its economic or "commercial" characteristics. However, in the session on humane killing, an issue introduced by the USA two years earlier, the term native, apparently a free synonymous variant of aboriginal used in the IWC discourse in later years, first appeared in the same context as the term commercial.

The commission agreed that data gathering on the number of whales struck but lost by native peoples and information on the time of death and consistence of force generated in all whaling operations should commence immediately if possible. These data would be reviewed next year together with further consideration on the value of receiving reports on the number of harpoons used to kill each whale by commercial operation,...(IWC 1978: 25)

4. EMERGENCE OF "ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE" WHALING

A very drastic shift in the texture of discourse occurred in the 1978 meeting. In this year a deliberate effort was made (which would be significant to later developments in IWC discourse) to emphasize the notion of aboriginal and to establish a category of whaling which would contrast with commercial whaling by the USA. In the section called "*review of subsistence/aboriginal whaling*" (note that

the order of the two words is the reverse of today's common usage), with regard to Bering Sea stock of bowhead, the USA put forward specific proposals for future action including a catch limit set at the **aboriginal subsistence need** (IWC 1979: 26), and the bowhead fishery in Alaska became referred to as "**aboriginal bowhead hunt in Alaska**". Since there was no other fishery targeted for bowheads other than that of the Eskimos, there was no need in terms of denotative semantics to use "aboriginal bowhead hunt" as opposed to simply "bowhead hunt"—the normal usage in the IWC then. Hence it must be regarded that this referentially redundant usage of the term was specifically aimed for the connotative meaning the term aboriginal had in the English (very culture-specific) cognition. Also, there appeared to be a clear intention to turn an unmarked or covert concept into a marked and more overt category. The following citation from the text illustrates this very clearly:

*The Technical Committee,...recommended the Schedule paragraph 11, section (a) should be amended so that the 1979 Alaskan bowhead hunt should end when 24 whales have been landed,...a working group of the Technical Committee will examine the entire **aboriginal whaling** problem and develop proposals for a regime for the **aboriginal bowhead hunt in Alaska** and if appropriate a regime or regimes for other **aboriginal hunts** to be submitted to the commission for consideration at the next annual meeting. (IWC 1979: 26)*

Influenced by the discussion on the Alaskan case, the usage of the term aboriginal was extended into the contexts of Greenland humpback catch and Greenland whaling suddenly became aboriginal whaling:

The Scientific Committee recommended

*that the present exemption allowing up to 10 humpback whales to be taken in Greenland waters by **aborigines** be removed. They urged that fin whales should be taken instead....After discussing the subsistence needs and practical aspects explained by Denmark, the commission agreed to increase the fin whale catch limit for the West Greenland stock from 4 to 15,...(p. 26)*

Gray whale hunt off Chukchi Peninsula, USSR also came to be referred to as aboriginal whaling:

*Available to be taken by **aborigines** or a contracting government on behalf of **aborigines** pursuant to paragraph 11 but not for **commercial purposes**.....No member nation is proposing **commercial** operation on gray whales...(p. 26)*

It is to be noted that one subsistence (undefined) aspect was emphasized in aboriginal whaling and at the same time contrasted with commercial purposes.

This sudden emphasis on the aboriginal associations (to different degrees and directions) of the three fisheries mentioned and immediate attempt to establish a very exclusive category of aboriginal whaling without sufficient examination, appears too facile and meaningless. But its reason became clear in the 1979 meeting in which Australia and the USA proposed a worldwide ban on whaling.

In the welcoming address at the 1979 meeting, the UK minister stated his government's position against commercial whaling, which was practically a repetition of the 1972 speech. But this time commercial whaling was carefully placed in the dichotomous matrix against aboriginal whaling. He stated that:

*The UK would support the proposals for a moratorium on **commercial whaling** and the principle of whale sanctuary although*

*accepting that special considerations applied to **aboriginal whaling** which should be allowed to continue under suitable control.* (IWC 1980)

An Australian proposal called for a ban on all whaling, while the USA proposal called for a partial ban—a ban on commercial whaling but allowing aboriginal whaling. With these two proposals in hand at the Technical Committee, a neat cognitive taxonomy was constructed:

WHALING	
COMMERCIAL WHALING	ABORIGINAL WHALING

It is important to note that the term commercial extended its context of use into the discussion on infractions. In the session on infractions, for the first time in the IWC discourse the term quota was added to the modifier commercial and became commercial quota. This was referentially redundant but has an important semantic function to call attention to the dichotomous classification.

*The commission was pleased to note that no violations of **commercial** quotas were reported and no whales from Protection Stocks were taken by **commercial** operations.* (IWC 1980: 31)

It is also to be noted that in the resolution regarding Bering Sea bowhead whaling, the establishment of a Technical Committee working group on **aboriginal/subsistence whaling** was recommended. This is the birth of the terminology which later became, with some variation, regularly used in contrast to commercial whaling. This new convention was quickly adopted into the wording of the resolutions. For example, the Resolution on the Documentation of Aboriginal Need of 1980 stated:

...The IWC HEREBY RESOLVES that all

*Contracting Governments under whose jurisdictions **aboriginal/subsistence whaling** operations conducted under paragraph 12 of the Schedule occur shall document annually for the information of the Commission: the utilization of the meat and products of any whales taken for **aboriginal/subsistence** purposes.* (IWC 1981)

Thus, the binary classificational scheme was terminologically solidified. This scheme became so dominant, that without questioning of its meaning, it controlled the direction of the IWC's discourse on small-type whaling in the latter half of the 1980s and 1990s. The Agenda for the 1981 meeting, a year before the adoption of a moratorium, exhibits a very interesting case of full marking of these whaling categories.

6. World-wide Ban on Whaling

A. Proposals for Banning Commercial Whaling

A.1 All commercial whaling

A.2 Indefinite ban of commercial whaling in the North Atlantic

A.3 Commercial moratorium for the pelagic catch of minke whales

A.4 Commercial catching of sperm whales

12. Aboriginal/Subsistence Whaling

12.1 Management principles and guidelines for subsistence catches of cetaceans by indigenous peoples

12.1.1 Report on subsistence whaling

12.2 Documentation of the utilization of the meat and products of any whales taken for **aboriginal/subsistence** purposes

12.3.2 Documentation of **aboriginal** needs by the USA

14. Measures to Discourage Whaling Operations Outside IWC Regulations (IWC 1982)

5. SHARPENING THE FUZZY CATEGORIES

The period between 1979 and 1982 is a very crucial period in which cognitive and linguistic schemes concerning various types of whaling were firmly, but in fact arbitrarily, established by some native English speaking nations—notably USA, UK, and Australia.

Although the term aboriginal/subsistence whaling was established in the binary oppositional scheme against commercial whaling, it denoted in fact diversified fisheries. First of all, while the fisheries in Alaska and the USSR are single species fisheries, the Greenland fishery was a multi-species fishery: the former hunt large whales (bowheads and gray whales respectively) the latter hunts both large whales (sei and humpback) and small whales (minke). In this respect the former bears a resemblance to large-type whaling and the latter (at least a part of it) resembles some small-type whaling operations.

Secondly, the technology involved in the hunt is quite diverse. The Alaskan fishery employs the least mechanized and simplest technology of all, while the USSR fishery off Chukchi uses the same large-scale technology as its Antarctic pelagic whaling. The Greenland fishery fell in between, employing the technology similar in scale to small-type whaling.

Thirdly, the ethnic configuration of the population involved was quite different. In Alaska the population concerned was distinct from the surrounding population, and its ethnic heritage was clearly indicated by the terms "Eskimo" or "Inupiat". In Greenland, the population concerned was referred to by the geographical term "Greenlanders", and no term to denote a

specific ethnicity was used. Hence it was not clear how inclusive a category Greenlanders was, since there are both Eskimo and non-Eskimo Greenlanders. In the USSR, the population concerned was referred to simply as aborigines and its ethnic identity was never given. It is important to note that, unlike the case with the aboriginal fisheries in Alaska and Greenland, the aboriginal population in USSR aboriginal/subsistence whaling was not necessarily involved in the hunt itself, but it is only the recipient of the benefit of the whaling. In that case it appears that aboriginal/subsistence whaling does not signify a cohesive semantic category but it is just a label attached to three partly similar and partly different whale fisheries.

Given the situation, it is not possible to give a clear-cut and scientifically objective definition for aboriginal/subsistence whaling which would apply to all three aboriginal fisheries in the same way. As a result, aboriginal/subsistence whaling developed into a fuzzy cognitive category which could be conceived only in terms of its semantic core and not by listing necessary and sufficient criteria. Thus in an attempt to present clearly the core meaning of aboriginal/subsistence whaling in contrast to commercial whaling, an equally fuzzy category, an ideal prototype was constructed. It was the Alaskan bowhead fishery that was used as the prototype of aboriginal/subsistence whaling, and Alaskan Eskimo whalers became the ultimate aboriginal/subsistence whalers against whom others were judged. On the other hand, the large-scale industrial whale fishery of the previous decades was used as the prototype of commercial whaling. A variety of semantic tactics was employed in the discourse to strengthen the contrastive images.

First of all, there was obvious and deliberate emphasis on being aboriginal for Alaskan, Greenland, and Chukchi fisheries, which is linguistically evident in double and triple marking.

cultural and nutritional requirements of indigenous (aboriginal) people engaged in aboriginal/subsistence whaling (IWC 1983: 28)

catch limits for aboriginal subsistence whaling to satisfy aboriginal subsistence need (IWC 1983)

Such practices of excessive marking are not only unusual but also semantically redundant. Nevertheless they are eye catchers and function as intensifiers. Thus they emphasize, without overtly saying, that those whale fisheries are truly, genuinely or authentically aboriginal. Excessive marking became less common later after the three fisheries concerned had established their aboriginal status in the IWC.

Another conspicuous semantic manipulation is use of the word "kill" or "killing" which tends to evoke strong negative emotion. In the 1979 proposal the USA called for a ban on "commercial killing of whales", instead of "commercial whaling", a paraphrase which was to evoke a strong emotion. This semantic practice continued, and in the discussions on the proposed whaling ban in following years, kill is frequently used in association with commercial whaling and never with aboriginal whaling. The following examples show this striking contrast.

The Commission asks those States which have lodged objections to the ban on the use of the cold grenade for the killing of minke whales for commercial purposes to comply fully with the provisions of paragraph 6...(IWC 1983)

The taking by aborigines of minke whales from the West Greenland

stock...(IWC 1983)

In amendments of the Schedule (IWC 1983), discriminatory wording was also conspicuously evident:

Notwithstanding the other provisions of paragraph 10, catch limits for killing for commercial purposes of whales from all stocks....shall be zero.

Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 10, catch limits for aboriginal subsistence whaling to satisfy aboriginal subsistence need...

For stocks below the MSY level but above a certain minimum level, aboriginal subsistence catches shall be permitted so long as they are set at the levels which will allow whale stocks to move to the MSY level.

Would these examples imply that whales taken by aboriginal subsistence whaling are not killed? The author clearly remembers in the field work conducted about 10 years ago, a Japanese harpooner was protesting the IWC's use of the word kill (which he learned in translation) for what he had been doing for his life. He considered what he and his fellow whalers did was *toru* (take) and not *korosu* (kill). There is a significant difference between the two. *Toru* is for life's necessity, and he takes the harvest of the sea to support the lives of himself and his family. Killing for him was an act without necessity, and he claimed he had never killed an animal in that sense, but the IWC does not think so although it appears (or pretends) to believe that aboriginal whalers do not kill whales. This whaler's frustration is a typical example of what non-western and marginal (in Europe) whaling peoples feel against the Anglo-American dominated IWC in which their cultural views are neglected or denied.

Both commercial and aboriginal whaling involve killing of whales, and therefore

ethical problems need to be discussed for both if the IWC seriously believes ethical problems are important for resource management. However, in the context of TC's discussion on humane killing, only killing in commercial whaling was chosen to be a target of criticism. Although aboriginal fisheries involved equally or even more difficult problems, discussion of them was deferred and avoided until several years later after aboriginal whaling had established a secure status in the IWC.

It should also be pointed out that there is a peculiar contrastive use of the terms "need" and "interest" in the reports. The word need always appears in association with aboriginal whaling: e.g., aboriginal need, Alaskan Eskimo need, human need, cultural need, dietary need, nutritional need, and so on. On the other hand, the word interest is used very frequently in association with commercial whaling: e.g., interest of consumers. This is compounded with another example of discriminatory use of terms: need for aboriginal whaling is always associated with "people", while interest for commercial whaling tends to be associated with "industry" or "consumers".

Furthermore, aboriginal whaling is assumed to be solely for subsistence and cultural purposes, and hence its products are "locally" (criteria undefined) consumed. From this period on, the word aboriginal whaling is accompanied by the word subsistence and appears as "aboriginal subsistence whaling" or "aboriginal/subsistence whaling". In addition, local consumption becomes more frequently mentioned than before. On the other hand commercial whaling, by its own label, is assumed to be solely for profit and its products are "nationally" (criteria undefined) and internationally distributed.

WHEREAS the Commission also

recognizes the importance of accommodating the need for aboriginal people who are dependent upon whales for subsistence and cultural purposes,...(IWC 1980: 35)

The Working Group attempted to evaluate the social and economic effects of a ban on whaling,...Non-commercial whaling has many characteristics in common with the above (commercial whaling), but with a stronger emphasis on the cultural aspects and less on the national economy. (IWC 1981)

Thus, a pair of contrastive stereotypes were formulated and came to be regarded as though these represent all the operations in both groups of whaling, which in later years would play a central role in determining the direction of discourse in the IWC.

6. MORATORIUM: ESTABLISHMENT OF DOUBLE STANDARDS

During the period when the commercial-aboriginal dichotomy was being formulated and strengthened, the three fisheries which had become labeled as aboriginal whaling were facing very difficult problems, which was reflected in IWC Discourse.

As mentioned before, the three fisheries are considerably different in several ways: 1) those of Alaska and the USSR are single species fisheries while Greenland is a multi-species fishery; 2) whaling is conducted by the "aboriginal" people themselves, while in the USSR it is done by "non-aboriginal" whalers; 3) the technology employed in hunting is of large-type whaling in the USSR, small-type in Greenland, and smaller and simpler type than the latter in Alaska. In addition, cultural need is stressed as much, if not more, as dietary and nutritional needs for Alaskan whaling, while cultural need is not overtly stressed in Greenland

and not stressed at all in USSR whaling. In the session on "subsistence/ aboriginal whaling" (note the reverse of today's common usage), the IWC was very understanding and flexible to aboriginal whalers and was willing to accommodate the different needs and conditions of different groups. For Alaska, for example, **keeping a balance** between human need and conservation effort for the depleted stock was emphasized, and provision for interim measures was granted in the absence of complete information. For Greenland, **local consumption** of the products was stressed, while for the USSR the fact that their products are **consumed by humans** (as opposed to as animal feed) was stressed. Compare the following paragraphs:

The USA emphasized the need for a balance to be struck between the interests of the whales and those of the Eskimo,...(IWC 1980: 30)

Denmark stressed the importance of this catch to the local communities, and that "consumption is extensively by Greenlanders". (IWC 1980: 30)

*The USSR provided information to the Scientific Committee and is expanding its research program on this species (gray whales). The whales are taken for **human consumption only** and the USA encouraged the USSR to supply data requested by the Scientific Committee including information on utilization. (IWC 1980: 30)*

The most difficult problem was, however, the status of the stocks from which some aboriginal whalers were taking whales. The bowhead whale stock, from which Alaskan Eskimos were taking was depleted and, according to the IWC's own new management procedure the stocks had to be classified as protection stocks. The humpback whale stock off Greenland was

also classified as protection stock, and the SC recommended the taking of whales from the stocks of other species as a substitute. The condition of the bowhead stock was seen as especially serious, so that the SC was repeatedly advising and warning against taking any whales from this stock. In that situation, the USA had to introduce double standards and have the IWC accept them. That was done exclusively in the TC against the SC's advice, by means of proposing a distinct management scheme specifically aimed at the Alaskan bowhead whaling, and not a general and open management scheme which would be fair to all.

...a working group of the technical committee examine the entire aboriginal whaling problem and develop proposals for a regime for the aboriginal bowhead hunt in Alaska and if appropriate a regime or regimes for other aboriginal hunts to be submitted to the commission for consideration at the next annual meeting. (IWC 1979: 26)

*A TC working group which had considered the Alaskan Eskimo fishery for bowheads had proposed a **dual system of management involving research and management** to be undertaken by the USA and a Schedule amendment which set a ceiling to any catches taken. A proposed amendment included provision for **interim measures in the absence of complete information on the stocks**. (IWC 1980: 30)*

*The Scientific Committee stated at the fourth successive meeting of the Commission that from a biological point of view **the only safe course is for the kill of bowhead whales from the Bering Sea stock to be zero**. It also believes that if present estimates of gross recruitment rate are accepted, then **the population will decline even in the absence of catches**. (IWC*

1980: 30)

Despite this warning by the SC, the TC recommended a Schedule amendment by majority vote. Some nations, including Australia and New Zealand, objected to this recommendation at first, but this was just a token objection. When the USA repeated its purposes and emphasized the need to keep a balance between the need for Eskimos and conservation of the stock, the resolution was easily accepted with slight modification. The approved resolution on Bering Sea bowheads reads as follows:

WHEREAS IT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE International Whaling Commission to provide for the effective conservation and management of whale stocks,

WHEREAS the Commission also recognizes the importance of accommodating the need for aboriginal people who are dependent upon whales for subsistence and cultural purposes,

WHEREAS three expert panels were assembled by the Technical Committee ... in order to provide the factual basis for the development of an aboriginal whaling regime for the take of the Bering Sea stock of bowhead whales by Alaskan Eskimos,

WHEREAS the United States has demonstrated its continued ability and willingness to conduct research and effectively to regulate aboriginal whaling in cooperation with the aborigines of the United States and thereby to conserve the Bering Sea stock of bowhead whales while permitting aboriginal whaling.

WHEREAS the Commission believes it appropriate to establish guidelines for the management of the Bering Sea stock of bowhead whales which recognize both conservation and subsistence needs,

NOW THEREFORE, THE COMMISSION HEREBY RESOLVES as follows;
The Commission agrees to institute a

regime such as that recommended by the Technical Committee Working Group on Aboriginal/Subsistence Whaling...

.....(IWC 1980: 35)

Thus, with a separate management regime accepted by the IWC, aboriginal whale fisheries became protected from anti-whaling pressures as long as the pressures are diverted towards commercial whaling and not all whaling. The political pressures against commercial whaling were strengthened after that, which was evidenced by the tone of discourse as well as by a sudden increase in the number of the nations, especially non-whaling nations, newly joining the IWC, some of whom were allowed to join while the IWC meeting was already in session. In the 1981 meeting the USA displayed its determinism in its position against commercial whaling which was sharply contrasted with its generous attitudes toward Alaskan whaling:

Finally, the USA affirmed its continuing commitment to whale protection and an indefinite moratorium on commercial whaling in a message from its President. This position is backed by administrative powers to take action against non-cooperative nations. (IWC 1982: 18)

It was only later that some nations saw the double standards and raised questions, but a proposal for a moratorium on commercial whaling was adopted by the Commission in 1982.

It (Norway) queried the distinction created between various types of whaling operation, which it believes is not compatible with the convention,.....Spain spoke of the need for careful management and a uniform approach for all types of whaling,....(IWC 1983)

7. NO ROOM FOR "SMALL-TYPE" WHALERS

The issue of small-type whaling was brought up to the IWC by the government of Japan in 1985, when it stopped filing objection under a threat of economic sanctions imposed by the US government. However, by then the aboriginal-commercial dichotomy was rigidly established and had created two mutually contrastive categories of whaling: one is the very exclusive category of IWC approved "aboriginal whaling"; the other is the residual category for all other whaling operations not identified as aboriginal by the IWC. These are lumped together and labeled "commercial". No definition has ever been provided for either "aboriginal" or "commercial whaling", but the dichotomy is totally fixed. It is within this rigid matrix that small-type whaling has had to look for its own place.

In a discussion of aboriginal subsistence whaling at the 1985 meeting, Japan called attention, for the first time, to the fact that *its small-type coastal whaling (STCW) had similar characteristics to aboriginal subsistence whaling, including the nature and size of the operation, the history, and meeting the nutritional and cultural needs of the local people*, and expressed its hope to have this type of whale fishery be permitted to continue. (IWC 1986: 19) The countries that had been very eager to establish their own aboriginal whaling were remarkably indifferent to the Japanese request. The only response indicated in the Chairman's report was made by India: It pointed out a need for defining aboriginal subsistence whaling.

India expressed its view that there is a need to define aboriginal subsistence whaling in the Schedule, and that the

humpback take off Greenland should be identified as for local consumption. It prepared draft wording on these matters to be considered further in the plenary, defining aboriginal subsistence whaling in terms of 19th century or earlier methods, equipment and utilization of products. (p. 19)

This statement is especially interesting and noteworthy in two respects. 1) It clearly acknowledged the fact that aboriginal subsistence whaling had not been defined. 2) It also showed a typical stereotype of aboriginal people as being primitive and backwards.

In the following year, Japan submitted a paper which described the operation of its STCW in some detail and pointed out many similarities with aboriginal subsistence whaling. However, the Japanese paper received little acknowledgment and was all but ignored. The Chairman's report is remarkably indifferent and is without any substance at all.

The Japanese submission concerning its view that certain domestic whaling has similarities to whaling in other countries in terms of subsistence, nutritional and cultural consideration was reviewed. The sub-committee gave the submission detailed consideration, sought and recommended clarification in some areas, and identified certain other areas in which additional information was requested for future consideration. (IWC 1987: 18)

In the same year the problem of definition of aboriginal subsistence whaling was briefly discussed, and *the sub-committee noted the possible conflict between traditional whaling techniques and the desire to utilize the most humane methods in all whale killing operations.* (p. 18) "Traditional whaling techniques" in this paragraph could only refer to Alaskan

whaling, since the other aboriginal fisheries use mounted harpoon guns. This was another example of Alaskan whaling being used as the prototype to represent all aboriginal subsistence whaling operations. The issue was not discussed any further and was deferred to the next meeting by India's proposal. However, to the embarrassment of the commission, the promised discussion on the definitional problem on aboriginal subsistence whaling did not take place at the 1987 meeting.

There was no discussion of this matter in the Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling Subcommittee in the absence of the proposer. (IWC 1988: 20)

In 1987, Japan repeatedly presented its case for the STCW with additional information and documents, and insisted that its STCW should be recognized as aboriginal subsistence whaling on the basis of similarities with Greenland and Soviet Bering Sea whaling. Note that comparison was made with the peripherals and not the central core (Alaskan bowhead whaling) of the fuzzy category. Then Norway pointed out *the inappropriateness of attempting to fit small-type whaling into the Schedule terminology originally developed for factory ship and land based operations for large whales. It saw a distinction between large-scale industrial operations and family enterprises by isolated communities.* (p. 21) From the point of view of social science, these statements addressed very significant problems.

The responses to these comments were once again vague and without substance; they were nothing more than an act of putting negative labels on STCW. A typical stereotype about the aboriginal people was also expressed implying that aboriginal whaling was for primitive peoples.

Sweden expressed concern over the

introduction of commercial distribution of whale products into the aboriginal subsistence category,...(p. 22)

The UK was also perturbed at the commercial aspect of the Japanese proposal, a view shared by the USA. (p. 22)

Switzerland was worried that members of **highly industrialized societies** could fall under the terms of Schedule paragraph 13,...(p. 21)

This is the pattern that has been repeated over and over by the same member nations in all of the following meetings up until now. Since 1988, the Japanese government has submitted a substantial number of papers and documented the nature and situation of its STCW in more detail and depth than any other whaling in the world, including the highly celebrated Alaskan Eskimo whaling (Japan 1996). Yet, none of them seems to have received due regard or substantive responses. The IWC's cognitive scheme has been kept completely frozen at the state of 1982, and no progress has been shown at least in its policy on small-type whaling. As long as it stays frozen, there will be no room for small-type whaling even in the 21st century.

8. CONCLUDING REMARKS

As shown above, commercial whaling and aboriginal/subsistence whaling essentially are not scientific categories, but are moral categories which reflect the deep moral complexes of the English speaking cultures (and to a lesser degree some other Western cultures). It is no coincidence that native English speaking nations played the central role in formulating and maintaining the cognitive scheme of the aboriginal vs. commercial dichotomy, and establishing policies on the basis of it. In fact, virtually none of the whaling peoples today speak

English natively, and the strongest advocates against whaling in general and commercial whaling in particular in the IWC are native English speakers.

The concept of "aboriginal" in English has many implications based on the unique history of the English people who have colonized many peoples and spread the language all over the world (Beatty 1987). The contemporary notion of aboriginal has been unquestionably influenced and shaped by the history of the English expansion. The spread of English as the most powerful international or global language (Crystal 1997) has certainly been a great benefit in facilitating international and intercultural communication, but with a cost of creating linguistic inequality which could easily lead to political and cultural domination and distortion. (Pennycook 1994; Philipson 1992; Tsuda 1986)

The English (both people and language) expansion caused numerous clashes with peoples who were vastly different in racial and cultural characteristics. The consequences in many cases were among the most unfortunate and tragic in human history—conquering of the weaker by the stronger and in some cases replacement of populations as typically seen in North America and Oceania, which is regretted by many today. As a result, the notion of aboriginal in English has come to be associated with strong emotional connotations and moral implications. However, it is questionable whether rational and scientific regulation of whaling and resource management can be based on such a culturally specific and value laden notion.

Cross-cultural confusion about the meaning of aboriginal is evidenced in Japanese whaling communities. In the late 1980s when the Japanese government was insisting that its STCW should be granted a

similar treatment as aboriginal whaling, many whalers and community residents naively believed that their request would be accepted, because "genjumin (原住民)", the closest Japanese translation of English "aborigines", meant something like "people who live in the same region as their ancestors". For the Japanese who do not share the same kind of intense history of interracial and inter-ethnic clashes in the modern period as the English and some other European nations, there is no easily recognizable notion which would be equivalent with the English "aboriginal". Therefore, most people did not have a slightest doubt that they were anything other than "aborigines".

According to the rules and procedures for International Conventions for the Regulation of Whaling, the English language is the only official and working language in the IWC. Member nations whose mother tongue is other than English are forced to operate in English, which could be a considerable strain to them because of lack of fluency, limited vocabulary, lack of semantic clarity and uncertainty, unexpected cultural implications, costs of hiring interpreters and translators, and so on (Takahashi 1991). Therefore, it may be necessary to take some active measures immediately to reduce the existing language inequality and cultural bias, and eliminate unjust linguistic practices caused by the organization's unfair linguistic policies.

There are several possible steps that can be taken to prevent certain native English speakers from having undue advantages and ensure fair and free discussion for all. For example,

- 1) selecting alternative languages for the official and working languages of the organization;
- 2) balancing the opportunities and

effectiveness of speech by limiting the range of lexicon and grammatical constructions to be used and allowing equal numbers and length of utterances for each member;

- 3) establishing ethical codes to prevent any speaker's (especially native English speakers) unfair and unjust use of the official and working language of the organization. For example, no newly introduced terms should be used in resolutions and other official documents without providing clear definitions (in writing) and allowing a sufficient amount of time to ensure that all members understand them correctly.

The author believes the third solution to be the most realistic and needed for the time being.

After having had English as the only official and working language for a half century, it is now the time to review the IWC's linguistic practices critically and to establish fair and unbiased linguistic policies. The same should apply to many other international and intergovernmental organizations.

REFERENCES

- Asgrimsson, H. 1989. Developments Leading to the 1982 Decision of the International Whaling Commission for a Zero Catch Quota 1986-90. In Andersen, S and W. Østreng (eds.), *International Resource Management*. Belhaven Press.
- Beatty, J. 1987. Who is the "Aborigine"? Position paper of Japan Seamen's Union circulated at the 39th IWC meeting.
- Crystal, D. 1997. *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dant, T. 1991. *Knowledge, Ideology & Discourse: A Sociological Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. 1991. The Interdisciplinary Study of News as Discourse. In Jensen, E. B. & N. W. Jankowski (eds.) *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*. New York: Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. 1996. *Discourse, Opinions and Ideologies*. In Schaffner, C. and H. Kelly-Holmes (eds.) *Discourse and Ideologies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Hayakawa, S. Y. 1978 (1941). *Language in Thought and Action*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Hoiyer, H. 1954. The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, in H. Hoiyer (ed.) *Language in Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- International Whaling Commission. 1950, 1967-1987. *Report of the International Whaling Commission*.
- Japan, Government of. 1996. *Papers on Japanese Small-Type Coastal Whaling Submitted by the Government of Japan to the International Whaling Commission 1876-1995*. Tokyo: The Institute of Cetacean Research.
- Ohsumi, S. (大隈清治) 1991. 「国際捕鯨委員会の活動と鯨類資源調査の変遷」 桜本・加藤・田中 (共編) 『鯨類資源の研究と管理』 恒星社厚生閣
- Parry, J. and M. Bloch (eds.) 1989. *Money & the Morality of Exchange*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, A. 1994. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. London: Longman.
- Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*.

- London: Oxford University Press.
- Sapir, E. 1925. Sound Patterns in Language. *Language* 1. 37-51.
- Stubbs, M. 1996. *Text and Corpus Analysis*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell.
- Takahashi, J. (高橋順一) 1991. 「国際会議にみる日本人の異文化交渉」高橋他(編)『異文化へのストラテジー』川島書店.
- Takahashi, J. (高橋順一) 1992. 「捕鯨の国際ルール作りの持つ問題」『組織科学』25.4.62-67.
- Tsuda, Y. 1986. *Language Inequality and Distortion*. John-Benjamin.
- Whorf, B. L. 1956. *Language, Thought, and Reality*. John B. Carroll, ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

捕鯨論争における英語支配：国際捕鯨委員会における言説の分析

高橋 順一

要旨：鯨類の利用と資源管理を目的に設立された国際捕鯨委員会は、1970年代から1980年代にかけて急速にその性格を変え、捕鯨と鯨資源の科学的管理よりも倫理的管理を重視する政策へと移行して、ついに管轄下のほとんどの捕鯨を禁止するに至った。本論文は、1967年から1987年の間の議長報告とテキストとして IWC 会議における言説の変化の過程を分析し、そこにネイティブ英語国代表によって行われた会議公用語である英語の意味論的操作が重要な役割を果たしていたということを実証する。