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Abstract
The prehistory and history of whaling is first summarized. This includes a review of archaeological approaches to prehistoric whaling. Next, whaling is situated within the current international political climate vis-à-vis the International Whaling Commission and the ‘whaling problem’. To establish the context for the papers that follow, we present an extended essay on Japanese contributions to both the anthropology of whaling and the current international discourse on the ‘whaling problem’.

1. Introduction
Whereas anthropological as opposed to historical studies of whaling and whaling societies have a long although sparse history (see Lantis 1938; Heizer 1941; Clark 1947; Rainey 1947 for examples of some early studies), it is only relatively recently that a substantial body of themed literature has begun to emerge. Initially, this was mostly a result of the UN human-environment conference held at Stockholm in 1972, during which it was proposed to protect whales with the goal of “protecting the environment”. This was followed a decade later by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) moratorium on whaling. Combined, those two events represent a historical turning point in human-whale relationships, and have given rise to the recent and ongoing pro- versus anti-whaling discourse.

In this paper we (1) summarize the prehistory and history of whaling, including a review of archaeological approaches to prehistoric whaling (parts 1–5); (2) briefly situate whaling within the current international political climate vis-à-vis the International Whaling Commission and the ‘whaling problem’ (part 6); and (3) present an extended essay on the Japanese contributions to the anthropology of whaling and the discourse on ‘the whaling problem’ (part 7). This essay appeared earlier in publications (Kishigami 2008, 2011) intended for a restricted audience. We have included a slightly modified form here because it is both germane to the present volume and would not be otherwise generally available to a wider audience.

2. Earliest Evidence
Evidence for the earliest human use of whales relates either to whale bones in archaeological sites or to petroglyphs (unless specifically identified, the terms ‘whale’ and ‘whaling’ refer to whales, dolphins and porpoises). Whale bones at the earliest archaeological sites typically occur in very small numbers, with little or no other evidence to suggest active whaling (see e.g. Whitridge 2000; Mulville 2005). Examples include various Mesolithic sites (the time range varies, but is generally around 10,000–6,000 B. P.) in Scandinavia (Larsson 1990), 8000–6000 B. P. sites in the North Pacific and Bering Sea regions (Whitridge 2000), and Initial Jomon sites (9000–6000 B. P.) in Japan (Hiraguchi 2002). This type of evidence relates to what can be termed ‘low-level’ or ‘opportunistic’ whaling.whale use, very likely involving the collection of whale bones and other whale parts from drifted carcasses or stranded live whales.
The three most impressive petroglyph examples are the Bangu-dae archeological site near Ulsan, in southeast Korea (Nelson 1993), the series of sites near Alta, Norway (Helskog 2004), and the series of sites bordering the White Sea in the Belomorski District of Russia (Lobanova 1995, 2007). All these depict whales or dolphins, boats, and/or apparent whale hunting scenes, and have been suggested to date to approximately 8000, 6000, and 5000 years B. P., respectively. Unfortunately, an inherent problem in accepting such early evidence of active as opposed to opportunistic whaling is that none of these depictions have been dated directly. Instead, the dates are based on the probable dates of associated prehistoric settlements that investigators link to the petroglyphs. Given that in most such cases associated settlements or settlement complexes span several millennia (at the Alta sites, for example, associated sites span the period 6000 to 2500 B. P.), these do not constitute unequivocal evidence for the earliest active whaling societies.

Evidence for active whale hunting, although still sometimes problematical, generally rests on more robust evidence. Glassow (2005), for example, presents convincing evidence of dolphin hunting at the Punta Arena site on Santa Cruz Island, California, between approximately 6300–5300 B. P., based primarily on the changing relative abundance of dolphin remains (and thus changing importance in the diet) through a stratigraphic sequence. Although the material came from two small test excavations (0.25 x 1.5 m each), if the interpretations are confirmed by additional research, this would represent the earliest active whale hunting known anywhere in the world. Otherwise, the earliest sites with strong evidence for active whale or dolphin hunting are concentrated primarily in the North Pacific Rim and adjacent Arctic regions. At the Early Jomon Mawaki site on the Noto Peninsula, Japan, which has been securely dated to approximately 5000 years B. P. (Hiraguchi 2002; Itoh et al. 2011), the remains of at least 286 dolphins have been found in one stratum associated with a village and ceremonial complex, and are presumably the result of a drive hunt(s). At this site there is evidence of ritual treatment of the dolphin remains, and associated features and artifacts all indicate a mixed maritime/terrestrial diet. Elsewhere in the Pacific Rim, a whaling scene incised on walrus ivory recovered from a dwelling at the Un’en’en site on the Chokotka Peninsula, Russia, was found beneath the collapsed roof of a dwelling dating to approximately 3000 B. P. (Odess et al. 2008). The scene includes an illustration of men in umiaks (large open skin boats) harpooning large baleen whales, which suggests a sophisticated whaling adaptation presumably targeting bowhead and gray whales. Archaeological sites on Vancouver Island, Canada, have also yielded strong evidence of whaling, possibly as early as 3000 B. P. (Dewhirst 1980, 1982; Monks 2001: 137).

Although both the Punta Arena and Mawaki sites seem to represent active and possibly low-level logistically-organized hunting, continuation of such hunting in their respective areas (California and Japan) is sporadic. However, this may be a result more of the patchiness of the archaeological record than a cessation of such activities per se. Whaling, primarily dolphin hunting, apparently continued throughout Japan following its initial appearance in Early Jomon (Hiraguchi 1991, 1992, 2003a, 2003b, 2004, 2009; Tatehira 2003). It is certain that by approximately 1500 B. P. active whaling had become
established throughout much of the Northern Pacific Rim, including the Chokotka Peninsula (e.g. Arutiunov et al. 1982; Csonka 2003; Dinesman and Savinetsky 2003), Alaska (e.g. Mason and Gerlach 1995; Mason and Barber 2003; Savelle 2005), the Northwest Coast of Canada and the USA (e.g. Matson and Coupland 1994; Huelsbeck 1994; Acheson and Wigen 2002) and California (Jones and Klar 2007). In the eastern North American Arctic, by approximately 800 B. P. whaling societies of the Thule culture had spread across much of northern Canada and into Greenland (see especially Whitridge 2000; Friesen 2004; Morrison 2009; McGhee 2009). Outside the northern Pacific Rim/Arctic later prehistoric whaling has been recognized in several regions including, but not limited to, additional sites in California (e.g. Porcasi and Fujita 2000), Britain (e.g. Mulville 2002), and throughout Scandinavia (e.g. Clark 1947). In addition, based on early and later written accounts whaling (non-commercial; for commercial whaling see below) also has a relatively long history in Indonesia (Barnes 1996) and possibly Oceania (Gilbert and Ellis Islands, now Kiribati and Tuvalu; Gimble 1952), the Solomon Islands (Takekawa 1996a, 1996b) and Madagascar (Heizer 1941), although for the later three, at least, the extent of historic European and Euro-American influence is uncertain. Finally, archaeological evidence suggests that dolphin drive hunting was apparently conducted on Easter Island early in its occupation, approximately 800 years ago (Steadman et al. 1994).

3. Archaeological Approaches to Prehistoric Whaling

Studies of the earliest whaling sites often focus on species identification and are typically incorporated within larger studies of the whale remains found in a particular site(s) and the context of the whale bones (e.g. Higaguchi 1991, 2002; Yesner 1992; Mulville 2002; Monks et al. 2001). From this it cannot be ascertained if the bones represent simply whale use, with the whale materials having been acquired through scavenging of stranded dead or live whales, or whether they derive from active hunting (see e.g. Freeman 1979 vs. McCartney 1980). This is often a contentious issue with obvious implications for the academic study of the origins and development of whaling. Further, distinguishing between the two modes of acquisition has important implications in the current debate between proponents and opponents of whaling. Proponents often use archaeological evidence to support long, uninterrupted whaling histories of various societies, whereas opponents often question or refuse to accept the validity of a particular whaling antiquity presented by archaeologists (see especially Mulville 2005). Beyond the simple presence/absence of whale remains, evidence used to support or deny active hunting is become increasingly sophisticated. For example, it is now often based on the suitability of hunting gear associated with sea mammals (e.g. McCartney 1980; Darwent and Darwent 2005), species selection vis-à-vis species availability (Mulville 2005); age/size selection within a given species (e.g. Savelle and McCartney 1994, 1999, 2002, 2003), dietary importance based on isotope analyses (Coltrain et al. 2004), and zooarchaeological contextual analysis (e.g. Betts 2008).

Other studies of the later cultures have concentrated on various material, social, and
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religious aspects, and typically are based heavily on ethnographic analogy. This is especially true of the circumpolar regions, where most traditional whaling societies continued until the present and for which direct analogies clearly are appropriate (see especially commentaries in Whitridge 2002, Savelle 2002, and Savelle and Wenzel 2003). In the context of archaeological whaling studies, Mathiassen’s (1927) descriptions of artifacts and dwelling features provided the ‘standard’ for most later material culture studies, at least in the Canadian Arctic and Greenland. Mathiassen’s description, in turn, relies heavily on ethnographic materials collected from Alaska and Canada. Other material approaches, including zooarchaeological, include the investigation into whale size selection by prehistoric whalers, as noted above (see also Krupnik 1993), the total numbers of whales harvested (Stoker and Krupnik 1993; Savelle 2010), the architectural use of whale bone (McCartney 1979; Habu and Savelle 1994; Savelle 1997; Savelle and McCartney 2002; Dawson 2001), and what that reveals about the social organization of whaling cultures, both at the site (e.g. McGhee 1984; Whitridge 2002; Dawson 2001), and regional levels (e.g. Savelle 2000), and the ideology relating to whaling ceremonialism and whale cults (e.g. Whitridge 2002; Patton and Savelle 2006; Savelle and Vadnais 2011). Among other studies that go beyond strictly material descriptions of prehistoric whaling societies are those stressing culture-environment interrelationships, initially by McGhee (1969/70) and McCartney (1977) and later by Savelle (1987), Savelle and McCartney (1988), Mason and Barber (2003), and Crockford (2008), Sheehan’s (1985, 1997) investigation into social process, Betts and Friesen’s (2006) study of changing whale/environment/human relationships, and the investigations by Grier (1999), Betts (2007) and Whitridge (2004) into social and material production processes, including Whitridge’s from an agency-based perspective. This list is not comprehensive, and focuses primarily on Canadian Arctic and North Alaska studies. However, it does suggest that most current investigations into prehistoric whaling are entrenched within prevailing discipline-wide anthropological approaches.

4. History of Commercial Whaling

In general the history of commercial whaling is well documented in several sources, most notably those of Ellis (1991) and Francis (1990; see also Jenkins 1921, Dolan 2007, Starbuck 1989, Lubbock 1937; Hacquebord 1990), but also of late 19th–20th century ‘modern’ whaling, especially those by Tonnessen and Johnsen (1982). Much of what follows is based on Ellis (1991). Regarding the earliest commercial whaling, it has been suggested that the Norse were active as early as the 9th century (Jenkins 1921: 60–61), and that probably Icelanders were whaling by the 12th century (Whitiaker 1984). However, such whaling was sporadic. Generally, the first whaling conducted for commercial profit is attributed to the Basques in the 11th century (Ellis 1991: 45; see especially Markham 1881). After initial operations in the Bay of Biscay, during the 11th and 12th centuries, Basque whaling had spread to the English Channel and Ireland by the 14th century, to Newfoundland and Labrador by the 16th century (Proulx 1993; Barkham 1984), and to Iceland and Spitsbergen by the 17th century (Hacquebord 1990).
followed a decline, and cessation in the 18th century.

Concomitant with the 17th century expansion of Basque whaling activities into the Arctic regions, Dutch, British, French, Danish, and, to a lesser extent, German whaling fleets all competed there (see the summary in Ellis 1991), with the Dutch dominating. During the 18th century all Arctic whaling decreased in intensity, and the Dutch whaling ceased almost entirely as a result of the French Revolution and Napoleonic wars (Ellis 1991; see also Schokkenbroek 2008). Toward the end of the 18th century and into the 19th there was a resurgence in British whaling in the Arctic. They were joined in the mid-19th century by American whalers in the Bering/Chukchi Seas (Bockstoce 1986) and Baffin Bay/Davis Strait/Hudson Bay (Ross 1975). Most major Arctic commercial whaling ceased during the early 20th century, although small-scale local whaling continued until the late 19th century in Iceland, for example, and until modern times in the Faroe Islands. However, it was also during the late 19th and early 20th century that mechanically-propelled (as opposed to hand-held) harpoons were perfected, most notably by the Norwegian, Svend Foyn, which initiated ‘modern’ whaling (Ellis 1991: 257–262; Tonnessen and Johnsen 1982).

Prior to modern whaling, the primary target species in the Arctic were the North Atlantic right whale and the bowhead whale. The desired products were oil from blubber and bone used for lighting and secondarily for heating and lubrication, and also for soap, varnish and paint, and also baleen for such (especially late 19th century) uses as buggy whips and corsets, among numerous other uses (Ellis 1991: 131–160).

Elsewhere, European whalers, especially British, Dutch and French, expanded their operations into the Middle and Southern Atlantic, Pacific, and Antarctic oceans during the 18th and 19th centuries, as did American whalers, who were predominant during that period. The primary targets were sperm whales and lesser numbers of other species, especially right and humpback whales (Ellis 1991; Jenkins 1921). Essentially from the Basques onward all whaling used hand-held harpoons and open whaling boats, after which the whales were towed to whaling ships, or in some instances shore whaling stations, to be flensed. This expansion led to major local whale fisheries during the 19th century in Australia, (based initially on right whales and later on humpbacks), New Zealand (right whales), the Sea of Ohkotsk region of Russia (primarily right and bowhead whales), South Africa (right whales), Newfoundland (right and humpback whales), and Vancouver Island (right whales; see also Webb 1988), California (grey whales), and Alaska (bowhead whales; Bockstoce 1986). All these fisheries collapsed toward the late 19th or early 20th century (see detailed summary in Ellis 1991, and also Tonnessen and Johnsen 1982).

Apart from aboriginal whaling, until the modern period most whaling was of European and Euro-American origin. However, there were exceptions in East Asia. Early prehistoric whaling in Japan, and evidence at the Bangu-dae site for whaling in South Korea have been discussed above. In addition, Ellis (1991: 90–91) has suggested that a traditional whaling culture developed independently of external influence in China, based on a 1673 account by an East India Company official and a second account in a Honolulu newspaper in 1844. However, it is only in Japan that a thriving indigenous
commercial whale fishery has been historically and thoroughly documented (see e.g. Kalland and Moeran 1992: 65–75; various papers in this volume).

In Japan, organized hand-held harpoon whaling of right whales and grey whales was documented in Ise Bay during the Ganki Period (1570–1573), and from which the meat was distributed commercially to other regions (Komatsu and Misaki 2004: 78–79). This hand-held harpoon method diffused to other regions, such that by the mid-17th century, four whaling grounds had been developed: in Kishu Peninsula (present Wakayama Prefecture), Tosa (present Kochi Prefecture), Awa (present Chiba Prefecture) and Saikai (western seaboard of Kyushu) (see e.g. Morikawa 2009). Local whaling groups continued harvesting whales off these regions until the end of Edo Period (1603–1867).

Net whaling was invented toward the end of the 17th century, with initial trials conducted in Kayoi, on the west coast of Japan, and at Taiji, on the east coast. The Kayoi method involved using a net to close off the entrance to a narrow bay, after whales had been pursued into it. The Taiji method, developed in 1675 or slightly after the Kayoi method, was more efficient, and involved driving whales into nets set in the open sea (Kalland and Moeran 1992: 68). Typically, these methods targeted right and humpback whales. The Taiji method spread throughout much of Kyushu from where it diffused to other whaling regions (see map in Komatsu and Misaki 2004: 81). From the 17th to mid-19th centuries local whaling communities enjoyed economic prosperity. However, beginning in the early 19th century European and American whalers discovered the rich whaling grounds in Japanese waters, and by 1846 more than 300 American ships alone were engaged in the fishery there (Kalland and Moeran 1992: 71), primarily targeting sperm and right whales. This Euro-American whaling had a major impact on local whaling by greatly reducing the number of whales available for inshore Japanese whalers. Attempts were made during the late 19th century to adopt American open water whaling methods, but were generally unsuccessful (Kalland and Moeran 1992: 75).

5. Modern Whaling

The modern whaling era begins with the advent of the deck-mounted harpoon gun firing an explosive grenade, often referred to as the ‘Norwegian method’ of whaling, which made possible the successful hunting of larger fast-moving species like blue, fin, and sei whales (Kalland and Moeran 1992: 75). Associated with this type of whaling are catcher boats and factory ships (Ellis 1991). Traditionally-hunted whale stocks were being seriously depleted by the advent of modern whaling during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Together with the replacement of whale oil by petroleum products as well as the development of other alternative materials, that led many nations to decrease their whaling activities or eventually cease whaling entirely. Thus the USA ceased whaling in 1924, Britain in 1963, New Zealand in 1964, the Netherlands in 1964, Canada in 1972, Australia in 1978, and South Africa in 1979 (see summary chapters in Ellis 1991). Nations that continued modern whaling after the IWC moratorium came into effect in 1985–1986 were Russia, Korea, Japan, Norway, Iceland, Denmark, Peru and Chile (Ellis 1991; see especially Ohmagari 2005).

The preceding sections have reviewed some of the major studies and events dealing with prehistoric and historic whaling. Although by no means comprehensive, they do permit the following conclusions.

1. The human use of whale products is probably as old as the time fully modern humans (and perhaps even earlier) encountered stranded whales or whale remains. However, there can be no doubt that as early as 5,000 years ago in Japan, and possibly 6,000 years ago in California, active as opposed to passive whaling had been developed, with later independent development occurring in the North Pacific and Scandinavia.

2. Archaeological studies of whaling attempt to differentiate between passive whaling (i.e., the use of whale material primarily from stranded animals) and active whaling (usually the deliberate pursuit and killing). Archaeologists do not equate whale bone presence with active whaling; rather that must necessarily be demonstrated. Thus, many potential examples of active prehistoric whaling remain equivocal, and should be treated as such. Perhaps this implies that the term 'passive whaling' should be retired.

3. Current archaeological approaches to prehistoric whaling have advanced well beyond descriptive studies of whale bone and whaling-related artifacts, to contribute significantly to the knowledge of past whale hunting practices and understanding of social and ideological realms of whaling societies.

4. Data on early active whaling is wholly archaeological, therefore documentation of a given society as whaling historically does not necessarily indicate a long prehistoric whaling tradition.

5. Commercial as opposed to subsistence whaling can be traced back at least 1,000 years in Europe and independently for at least 500 years in Japan.

6. The history of commercial whaling is one of 1) the initial exploitation of readily accessible whaling grounds in North Atlantic and Arctic by northern European, primarily Scandinavian, societies followed by rapid expansion to the Pacific and Antarctic, and 2) the initial exploitation of readily accessible whaling grounds in coastal areas of Japan, but with very little further expansion.

7. Modern (industrial) whaling has been conducted by a few nations, the major ones being Norway, Japan, Russia, USA, and Britain. Of these all except for Russia have a long historical tradition of whaling, and all have have evidence of prehistoric whaling, whether active or passive.

7. The International Whaling Commission and Current Whaling

The literature dealing with the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICWR) and its regulatory body, the International Whaling Commission (IWC), is extensive, so just a brief historical summary follows to set current anthropological whaling research in context. A useful recent summary and political commentary is
provided by Ohmagari (2005), and detailed book-length treatments have been produced by Stoett (1997) and especially Burnett (2012). The brief summary below is based on those works and various IWC reports (www.iwcoffice.org).

7.1 The International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW)
As competitive whaling increasingly intensified, whalers and whaling companies became concerned with the depletion of target populations. Thus during the early 20th century their focus changed from unlimited maximization to managing whale stocks. As a result, the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW) was signed by several whaling countries in 1946, leading to the establishment in 1948 of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) to manage whale populations. Although the quota for annual harvests was set under the ICRW regime, since whalers attempted to maximize harvests within the allowable limits whale populations declined. As noted above, together with the rise of the petroleum industry this resulted in the eventual withdrawal of many nations from the whaling industry.

At the UN human-environmental conference in Stockholm in 1972, US representatives proposed a 10 year moratorium on commercial whaling. A decade later this proposal was approved by the IWC, with the moratorium coming into effect in 1985–1986. However, the moratorium did not call for either a nationworld-wide or species-wide ban. Instead, it applied only to the 13 species of large whales then being hunted: the blue, fin, bowhead, right, sei, sperm, humpback, gray, Bryde’s, common minke, Antarctic minke, bottlenose, and pygmy right whales. Further, specific categories of whaling were allowed to continue with the approval of the IWC. These were whaling for scientific purposes, aboriginal subsistence whaling, and commercial whaling, provided a formal objection was submitted at the time the moratorium came into effect (Friedheim ed. 2001; Gambell 1993; Peterson 1992). In addition, countries that were not members of the IWC were not compelled to follow IWC regulations. As a result, and as noted by Ohmagari (2005: 146, citing Freeman 2001), 97% of all whaling is exempt from IWC regulation.

7.2 Whaling under IWC Management
Aboriginal subsistence whaling under IWC management (Donovan 1982) includes the bowhead hunt by the Inupiat and Yupiit in Alaska, the bowhead and gray whale hunt by the Chukuchi and Yupiit in Russia, the gray whale hunt by the Makah in Washington State, USA, the minke, fin, and bowhead whale hunt by the Kalaallit (Inuit) in Greenland, and the humpback whale hunt in Bequia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Makah whaling has been suspended owing to domestic regulations and law suits filed by environmental NGOs.

Norway temporarily halted commercial whaling activities and instead conducted scientific research whaling after the moratorium came into effect. However, it resumed commercial whaling in 1993. Iceland withdrew from the IWC in 1992 and established the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO). Although Norway continued commercial whaling, it rejoined the IWC in 2002. Iceland also rejoined the
IWC in 2002, but with a reservation to the moratorium, and began commercial whaling in 2006.

Although in the past the USA and the former Soviet Union also carried out scientific research whaling with a special IWC permit, only Japan and Iceland continue to do so. In Japan, the Institute of Cetacean Research (ICR) conducts research on age, food habits, nutritive status, accumulation of pollutants, and DNA on several species of whales in the Antarctic and northwestern Pacific Oceans. After the research is completed, meat and skin are sold domestically as by-products, according to the IWC rules.

7.3 Whaling not under IWC Management

Canada and Indonesia are not members of the IWC, but harvest large whales (i.e., one or more of the 13 IWC-regulated species). In the Canadian Arctic, Inuit harvest bowhead whales whereas on Lembata Island, Indonesia, local whalers harvest sperm whales. In addition, Reeves (2002) provides details of Bryde’s whale harvesting conducted until recently in the Philippines.

Small whales, which are not under IWC management, are harvested for food in various parts of the world. These include beluga whales and narwhals harvested by Inuit in the Canadian Arctic, beluga, narwhal, and pilot whales taken by Kalaallit in Greenland, beluga whales harvested by indigenous peoples in Alaska, pilot whales by the Faroese and various Caribbean nations, and dolphins hunted by local fishermen in the Solomon Islands (see Mitchell 1975 for a review of small whale fisheries of the world to that time).

In Japan, Small-Type Coastal Whaling and dolphin fisheries are carried out from bases in Hakodate and Abasiri in Hokkaido Prefecture, Ayukawa in Miyagi Prefecture, Wadaura in Chiba Prefecture, and Taiji in Wakayama Prefecture. The species harvested include Baird’s beaked whales, short-finned pilot whales, and Risso’s dolphins. In addition, drive and hand harpoon fisheries focusing on Dall’s porpoise and bottlenose dolphins are carried out in various parts of Japan. Finally, whales of various species are retrieved as incidental by-catches from fixed shore nets in Japan and Korea, and parts of them are consumed in both countries.

7.4 Whaling Issues

Although anti-whaling countries constitute the majority of the IWC membership, pro-whaling countries comprise more than 25%. Typically, therefore, neither side is able to obtain the 75% of votes required to either resume commercial whaling or ban it entirely, a situation that is unlikely to end soon. Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) like Greenpeace, began extensive anti-whaling campaigns in the 1960s, and have had a huge influence on international public opinion. In essence, the whale has become a major global symbol of environmental protection. Its mystification by the Euro-American mass media and environmental NGOs has been likened to the creation of a God (Kalland 1993a, 1993b; Morita 1994). Consequently, there is much support for activities like whale watching and ‘swim with the dolphins’ programs, and strong opposition to using whales as food and industrial resources. On the other hand, Japan, Norway, Iceland, and
indigenous whalers worldwide insist on the continuation of aboriginal whaling and/or hope to resume commercial whaling.

At the 64th IWC annual meeting, held in Panama from June 8 to July 6, 2012, while proposals for the continued aboriginal subsistence whaling from USA, Russia, and Bequia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines were approved, that from Greenland to increase its harvest quota was not. In addition, a proposal by Japan to resume small–type coastal whaling of minke whales was not accepted. Clearly, in contemporary political contexts what has been referred to as “the whaling issue” is still very current.

8. Anthropological Studies of Whaling and Whaling Cultures

Although cultural anthropologists tend to explore various economic, social, and symbolic aspects of whaling, they have focused also on the issue of aboriginal whaling as an indigenous right. Because most contemporary large whale hunts are conducted in the Arctic, most studies of aboriginal subsistence whaling are done there also. In addition, there have been several studies of commercial whaling in Norway and Iceland (Broch 2003; Brydon 2006). Milton Freeman, Richard Caulfield, and others have investigated aboriginal subsistence whaling in Arctic North America and Greenland and have applied their research results to solving practical problems (e.g. a special issue of whaling in the Journal Arctic 46(2), 1993; Caulfield 1993, 1997; Freeman et al. 1998; Stevenson, Madsen and Maloney eds. 1997). This is a characteristic of anthropological studies of indigenous whaling. Similarly, Brydon (2006) conducted a cultural analysis of the politics of Icelandic whaling. Brydon’s study attempts to explore reasons that whaling is not accepted in many European countries and how the anti-whaling movement socially and economically affects whaling communities in Norway and Iceland.

8.1 General and Cross-Cultural Studies of Whaling Cultures

Although some studies of general and cross-cultural studies of whaling and whaling cultures have been published in English (Bockstoce and Burns 1993; Reeves 2002; Reeves and Smith 2003; Ross 1993), a large body of research has also been published in Japanese. This is reviewed below.

Tomoya Akimichi did a comparative study of the relationships between whales and human beings in the Circum-Pacific region. He describes different whale classification systems, images and myths concerning whales, and the influences of Euro-American commercial whaling on indigenous cultures (Akimichi 1994). His latest work deals comprehensively with the cultural diversity of whaling cultures in the world, whaling culture in Japan, and the international politics of whales and whaling activities (Akimichi 2009). Also, he has examined problems relating to the ownership of whale resources from the perspective of commons theory (Akimichi 1999, 2009).

Whereas Akimichi deals with whaling in non-Euro-American societies, Katsuaki Morita investigated various relationships between whales and humans from the 16th century to 20th century, with a focus on Yankee and Japanese whaling (Morita 1994). He describes and discusses the formation of modern whaling, Yankee whaling, whaling and
Kujiragumi (whaling crew groups), representation of whales in various accounts of travels and academic books, historical relationships between Japan and American whaling activities adjacent to Japan, the genesis and development of modern whaling, and whales as symbols. He argues that many Euro-Americans believe in a fictitious “media whale”, created by anti-whaling NGOs through the mass media (Morita 1994: 391).

Similarly, Shoto Yamashita (2004) discusses the 400 year economic-cultural history of whaling in the context of technology, the organization of whaling, and the use of whales in both world historical and cross-cultural perspectives. He is concerned with the development of modern whaling and resource management, environmental problems, regional diversity of whaling cultures, commercial whaling, Japanese whaling, Yankee whaling, modern whaling, whaling in the Antarctic Ocean, whaling as a state strategy, and indiscriminate overharvesting and resource management.

Hisashi Hamaguchi (2002a), in a book entitled An Introduction to Whaling Cultures proposes the sustainable use of whales as a biological and cultural necessity, after first describing Japanese whaling, the IWC and whaling problems, and various whaling activities worldwide. His book is essentially an encyclopedia of whaling that provides concise information of the current state of whaling and its associated problems. Seiji Osumi (2003) reviews current whaling conflicts after discussing Japan’s whaling history, whaling culture, the management of whale resources, current whaling, and whale use worldwide.

8.2 Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling

Aboriginal subsistence whaling is a category approved by the IWC based on the historical, nutritional, and cultural needs of aboriginal peoples. It includes hunts by the Inupiat and Yupiit of Alaska, the Chukchi and Yupiit of the Chukotka Peninsula, the Makah in Washington State, the Kalaallit in Greenland, and by inhabitants of Bequia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Euro-American researchers have conducted many studies on aboriginal whaling activities by the Kalaallit, by the Inuvialuit, Inupiat, and Yupiit in the western Arctic, and by the Makah in Washington State (e.g. Caulfield 1997; McCartney ed. 1995, 2003; Stevenson, Madsen and Maloney eds. 1997). On the other hand, Japanese anthropologists have carried out a series of field studies on the bowhead whale hunt by the Inupiat of Alaska (Kishigami 2007a, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2012), the gray whale hunt by the Chukchi of the Chukotka Peninsula (Ikeya 2006, 2007a, 2007b), and the humpback whale hunt in Bequia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines (Hamaguchi 2003a, 2011).

Nobuhiro Kishigami (2007a, 2007b, 2013a, 2013b) conducted field research on whaling activities and sharing/distribution of whale meat and maktak (skin with blubber) among the Inupiat in Barrow, Alaska, USA. He examines contemporary spring and fall whaling activities and demonstrates that there is a “subsistence complex” relating to whaling in that seal and caribou hunts are carried out as a part of the preparations for the whaling activities. In addition, he reports on the sharing of whale meat and maktak immediately after the hunt, at feasts in successful boat captains’ houses, at the Nalukataq (Blanket Toss Festival), Thanksgiving Day and Christmas, and Messenger Feast, as well
as on general daily life in the whaling community. He also describes how whale meat and *maktak* are distributed by whaling crew members to their family, kin, and friends outside Barrow. He notes that whaling and the sharing/distribution of whale meat, etc. are significant in contemporary Inupiat society in nutritional, social, economic, political and cultural terms. Also, from the perspective of political economy, he describes whaling as being carried out under a co-management regime between the Inupiat and the US government, as well as under IWC regulation and the political anti-whaling pressure of the US government and several environmental NGOs. Finally, he insists that the Inupiat’s positive participation in resource management is required for the sustainable use of whales. He also explores the relationships between climate change and the Inupiat’s bowhead hunt (Kishigami 2010) and studies the significance of the hunt as a means to achieve cultural security (Kishigami 2009). Further, he shows the internal differences of meat sharing and distribution among the whaling crews in Barrow, Alaska (Kishigami 2012).

Fujishima and Matsuda (2001) explore the factors contributing to successful whale resource management by the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC). In 1981, the co-management of bowhead whales was initiated by the AEWC and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Since then, the AEWC has been active in the planning and management of whaling regulations, improving hunting efficiency, and scientific research. Fujishima and Matsuda (2001: 32) note that there are several effective organizational characteristics in the co-management system. They attribute the management success to the presence of clear organizational structure, decision making processes, and fair quota allocation systems. The co-management system is also supported by the traditional boat captains' association, strong cooperation among whaling communities, a traditional whale meat/ *maktak* distribution system based on the traditional world views and customs, and the leadership of boat captains (Fujishima and Matuda 2001: 39).

Tsuyoshi Takeda (1998) gives an account of whaling on the coast of the Chukotka Peninsula by the Chukchi in the Post-Socialist era that followed the collapse of the Soviet Union. However, no systematic research on whaling there had been conducted until Kazunobu Ikeya’s (2006, 2007a) recent studies. Ikeya studied gray whale hunting by the Chukchi of Lorino on the Chukotka Peninsula, Russia, from an ecological anthropology perspective. He reports on the current situation of whaling there, after first discussing the ecology of gray whales. He discusses the role of whaling in the local economy and analyzes state and private enterprise involvement in whaling in Lorino. The whaling crews are made up not of family members and kinsmen, but of workers of the public enterprise “Kepel”. The whale meat, *maktak*, blubber, etc. are used as food and oil by local people as well as to feed foxes and dogs. He reports that the sale of skins and furs from fox raising and seal hunting with dog-teams contribute to cash income of the Lorino residents. In addition, he examines the territoriality of the Chukchi in relation to their hunting of bowhead and gray whales. Although the gray whales generally migrate close to the village, they are highly mobile, making it difficult for the Chukchi to predict their movement and location. So there is little need to establish whaling territories. On
the other hand, the hunters apparently view the harvesting of bowhead whales outside their territory as being extra-territorial, since bowheads must be harvested at locations far from their village (Ikeya 2007b: 106–109).

Hisashi Hamaguchi (2003b) compares Alaskan and Chukotkan aboriginal subsistence whaling. The Chukchi and Yupiit people of Siberia engaged primarily in bowhead hunts and harvested gray whales only in several specific areas until the 1930s. However, because the number of bowhead whales decreased in the 1940s, hunters were forced to discontinue hunting them, and intensified the gray whale hunt instead. Then, in 1969, following the IWC quota system, the gray whale was hunted on behalf of the indigenous peoples from Russian Government whaling ships. However, this governmental harvesting of gray whales ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union, after which the Chukchi resumed traditional gray whale hunting (Takeda 1998; Hamaguchi 2003b: 31). As a result, at present the gray whale hunt is not associated with traditional rituals and customs (Hamaguchi 2003b: 30). On the other hand, the Alaskan aboriginal bowhead whale hunt continued throughout the historic period without serious disruption. As a result it is still correlated with Alaskan cultural traditions. Hamaguchi argues that the revival of the bowhead whale hunt is important for the Siberian Yupiit in the reactivation of their traditional culture (Hamaguchi 2003b: 32).

Hisashi Hamaguchi has also investigated humpback whaling in Bequia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, which resulted in the publication of a number of papers (Hamaguchi 1995, 1998, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2002b, 2003a, 2005a, 2006). In these studies, he discusses the history and current situation as it relates to hunting methods and use, sharing/distribution, and management of humpback whales, the development of tourism, and notes the social, economic and cultural importance of whaling and whale resources in Bequia society. Although most of the whale meat and skin parts are sold for cash, the IWC regards Bequia whaling as aboriginal subsistence whaling. The sharing/distribution of whale meat is important in Bequia culture. According to Hamaguchi, whalers are not paid in cash, but, in a formalized manner obtain the meat and other parts of humpback whales as shares from the hunt (Hamaguchi 2005a: 93). Further, each man’s share, except that portion reserved for family consumption and that given or gifted to his kin and friends, is sold to others. In this way the meat is distributed throughout the island. Leftover meat is salted and dried, and then sent to the fish market in Kingstown, on St. Vincent Island. Although the whale meat is not exported, it is distributed both within Bequia Island and on neighboring islands. In addition to supplying food, the distribution of the whale meat and blubber is closely associated with the maintenance of social relationships and cultural traditions.

Hamaguchi argues that the use and management of whales should be left not in the hands of the state, but rather with the Bequia islanders, since they are the primary users (Hamaguchi 2003a, 2005a). Also, he notes that whaling is still replete with cultural meaning to the Bequia islanders, despite development of the tourism industry (Hamaguchi 1995, 2003, 2005a).

Comparison of these research results reveals that there are several differences among the indigenous groups categorized as practicing “Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling”. In
fact, whale meat and skin are distributed locally through monetary exchange in the all cases of Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling except in Alaska. Considering and recognizing the existence of a globalized market economy, the concept of “subsistence whaling” requires a through re-examination to analyze the relationship between “subsistence” and the “use of money” (cf. Moeran 1992).

8.3 Studies of Local Whaling

Several whaling activities are not approved as “aboriginal subsistence whaling” by the IWC. Also, several groups hunt small whales that are not under IWC regulation. For convenience, they are collectively referred to as “local whaling”.

There are a large number of studies on beluga hunting in the North American Arctic and Greenland (Iwasaki-Goodman 2005b, 2011; Kishigami 2005; Reeves 1993; Stevenson, Madsen and Maloney eds. 1997; Tyrrell 2007, 2008). Also, there have been several research projects on dolphin hunting in the Solomon Islands and on sperm whale hunting in Indonesia.

In Canada, Inuit have a constitutionally protected right to hunt whales. Thus, even though the Government of Canada withdrew from the IWC in 1982, when requested it approves a bowhead whale catch in the western Canadian Arctic, Nunavut, and Nunavik. Also, the Inuit and Inuvialuit in the Arctic regions of North America may harvest beluga whales and narwhals under certain conditions. Masami Iwasaki-Goodman and Nobuhiro Kishigami have investigated local whaling activities regulated not by the IWC, but by the Government of Canada.

Masami Iwasaki-Goodman (2005b) describes the revival of the bowhead whale hunt by the Inuvialuit in Aklavik, Northwest Territories, Canada. The Inuvialuit and the Government of Canada reached the Western Arctic land claims agreement in 1984. Under this agreement, which recognized a number of Inuvialuit indigenous rights, the bowhead whale hunt was resumed after a hiatus of 70 years. Iwasaki-Goodman argues that the resumption of the bowhead whale hunt has not only a symbolic meaning, but also that it is an important example of the successful implementation of the agreement based on congenial working relationships between the Inuvialuit and the Government of Canada (Iwasaki-Goodman 2005b: 241). She also discusses successful examples of the co-management of other wildlife resources by the Inuvialuit. Scientific ecological knowledge (SEK) and traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) are well integrated into the co-management system. She ascribes the success of the system to the existence of a recently-fostered positive relationship between the Government of Canada on the one hand, and the Inuvialuit as a resource user on the other, based on mutual understanding through political dialogue (Iwasaki-Goodman 2003a, 2005c).

Nobuhiro Kishigami (2001, 2002, 2003) investigated the hunting, sharing, and management of beluga whales in Nunavik, Canada. He examines the beluga hunt and community-wide sharing of beluga products within the context of the Nunavik Hunter Support Program from the mid-1980s to 2004 in Akulivik, Nunavik. He shows that the Inuit people make use of the program to fulfill their cultural and economic needs in their own way in a rapidly changing Inuit society. Also, he points out there is a serious
conflict between the Inuit and the Government of Canada over beluga whale resource management in Nunavik. In principle, the relationship is one of co-management between the Inuit as a user and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) of the Government of Canada. However, the DFO resource management proposal concerning the restriction of hunting locations and hunting periods, as well as quotas, based on SEK, is imposed on the Inuit (Kishigami 2001, 2002). This causes conflicts over the beluga whales not only between the Government of Canada and the Nunavik Inuit, but also among the Nunavik Inuit communities. He argues that the Inuit’s active involvement is needed for effective co-management, and that the Inuit should use the Hunter Support Program for the fair distribution of scarce resources like beluga whales (Kishigami 2003, 2005).

Daishuke Takekawa (1995, 1996a, 1996b) describes the hunting, associated traditional knowledge, sharing, distribution and use of dolphins in Malaita, Solomon Islands, where the local people engage in dolphin hunting to obtain the meat and teeth. Based on his research on the dolphin hunts, and the use and distribution of dolphin meat and teeth, he notes that the meat is widely distributed to people in neighboring agricultural villages and cities through exchange, sale, and gifting after equal sharing of the meat within the village. The local people use the dolphin teeth as ornaments, as special exchange goods, and as money in Malaita Island. Takekawa notes that the teeth, as money, are shared unequally within the village, being different from the meat, and then distributed throughout Malaita Island (Takekawa 1995). Tomoya Akimichi points out cultural significances of whale products in Oceania (Akimichi 1992).

Local people hunt whales in the seas around Indonesia and Philippines (Hamaguchi 2002a: 84–97). Toothed whales, such as the sperm whale, are hunted in Lamalera of Lembata Island, Indonesia, where Robert Barnes conducted detailed field research in the 1970s (Barnes 1996, 2005). In Lamalera, Tomoko Egami and Kotaro Kojima carried out team research in the late 1990s. While Egami investigated several aspects of life of women including women’s work, local markets, peddling trips, cooking, and cuisine, Kojima investigated several aspects of men’s lives, including whale hunting, fishing, boat building, rituals, and fishing gear (Kojima and Egami 1999). Also, they give a detailed account of whaling, exchange of whale meat with farmers, distribution of the whale meat, food and cuisine. The people of Lamalera use whale meat as exchange goods for agricultural products, rather than for their own consumption (Egami and Kojima 2000). The research on women’s activities represents an original contribution to Indonesian whaling community studies since Barnes and others did not examine these activities in detail.

In addition, Egami and Kojima published two papers on whaling and social change in Lamalera between 1994 and 2009 (Egami and Kojima 2010; 2011). They described several changes in sperm whale hunting observed over the 16 year period and examined certain changes in whaling methods resulting from the Indonesian modernization and the uneasy social situation of the village under pressures that arose from the prohibition of whaling by environmental NGOs. Egami and Kojima’s longterm research will greatly contribute to exploring social change of a whaling village, as well as the social significance of whaling in the village society.
Takemitsu Natori (1945: 1–31) studied Ainu whaling in Funka Bay, Hokkaido. He recorded whale hunting methods involving the use of a detachable aconite-poisoned harpoon head, beliefs, Ainu names for whales, etc. Based on existing literature, Masami Iwasaki-Goodman and Masahiro Nomoto discuss Ainu use of whales, relationships between the Ainu and whales, Ainu place names, the spiritual world, and tales and dances relating to whales and whaling, (Iwasaki-Goodman 2005a: 120–149; Iwasaki-Goodman and Nomoto 1999). Nomoto and others argue that revival of the Ainu whale dances is closely related to the construction of Ainu identity (Iwasaki-Goodman and Nomoto 2000; Iwasaki-Goodman, Nomoto and Fujishima 2000).

Sun-Ae Ii, of Miyazaki Municipal University, has investigated whale food culture in Ulsan, Korea (Ii 2006, 2007, 2008). Ii points out that the whale food culture developed as a regional culture within the Ulsan region during the early 20th century under the influence of Japanese-Russian whaling activities (Ii 2007). In addition, she examines the formation of this regional culture with a specific focus on whale festivals in relation to the international politics of whaling and social change in Korea (Ii 2006).

Hajime Ishikawa (1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 1999d, 1999e) briefly discusses contemporary whaling in Norway, whereas Iwasaki-Goodman (1997: 150–163) traces the development of small-type coastal whaling in northern Norway, arguing that the whaling there is subsistence-related and utilizes existing social organization and traditional culture.

These studies of various local whaling activities indicate that whale hunting is common in many parts of the world, and that it is both economically and socio-culturally important.

8.4 Studies of Small-Type Coastal Whaling in Japan

After World War II, small-type coastal whaling was carried out by local fishermen and companies at Abashiri in Hokkaido Prefecture, Ayukawa in Miyagi Prefecture, Wadamachi in Chiba Prefecture, and Taiji in Wakayama Prefecture. Following the IWC’s adoption of the moratorium on commercial whaling in 1982, Japanese whalers stopped harvesting minke whales in 1987. This had significant social and economic effects.

Milton M. R. Freeman, a Canadian anthropologist, and other foreign researchers together with Tomoya Akimichi, Junichi Takahashi and Masami Iwasaki-Goodman held an international workshop on small-type coastal whaling in Japan, in April, 1988. They examined and reported on the history of whaling in Japan, small-type coastal whaling, whaling communities, commercial and non-commercial distribution of whale meat, the Baird’s beaked whale hunt in Bōsō Peninsula (Chiba Prefecture), food culture and religious beliefs relating to whales, and the social, economic and cultural impacts of the moratorium on local whaling communities (Freeman et al. 1988, 1989; Kalland 1990). Freeman and others argue that whale meat is analogous to blood in that it reaches every part of each whaling community. Also, they compare Japan’s small-type coastal whaling to aboriginal subsistence whaling in Alaska and Greenland, and find that the former has characteristics of both commercial whaling and subsistence aboriginal whaling. Based on that, they argue that Japanese small-type coastal whaling fits neither in the commercial whaling nor the aboriginal subsistence whaling categories. Rather, it represents a distinct
Junichi Takahashi (1987) describes and analyses how cultural traditions relating to whaling activities are utilized as a political and symbolic resource by people to maintain their local community identity in Taiji, Wakayama Prefecture. He does this using the perspective of Abner Cohen (1969), who regards an ethnic group as an interest group. In addition, he explores historical processes of integration and revitalization of the Taiji community, which has successfully engaged in whaling since the 17th century. Takahashi points out that on various occasions the people of Taiji have used objects and events relating to whales as symbols of identity.

According to Takahashi (1987), four types of symbols are related to Taiji community identity. The first type demonstrates the historical distinctiveness of Taiji as a whaling community. It includes historical documents relating to whaling, items in the local whaling museum, architectural or other remains of historical whaling sites, etc. The second type enhances pride in the people of Taiji. This includes, for example, publication of Taiji’s whaling history, construction of a whaling museum, designation of historical whaling sites, and performing arts as they relate to whaling as important cultural assets. The third type mobilizes the community, and includes whale dances and Buddhist ceremonies for dead whales, etc. The fourth type has a “reminder” function, such as visual symbols incorporating whale imagery. Takahashi argues that the Taiji community identity is manifested and enhanced by the use of these whale symbols, and leads to a strong cohesion and political activization among the Taiji people (Takahashi 1987: 165).

Takahashi (1992) also published an ethnography of the Taiji community. He considers culture as an organic whole, and describes Taiji community culture as a system whose parts, such as knowledge, technology, value, beliefs, organizations, institutions, and customs associated with the harvesting, and the processing and consumption of whales, are organically inter-related.

Iwasaki-Goodman conducted field research in two small-type coastal whaling communities, Ayukawahama and Abashiri, and stressed the social and cultural significance of whaling in them (Iwasaki-Goodman 1994, 2000, 2003b, 2004, 2005a; Iwasaki-Goodman and Freeman 1994). She notes that whaling activities have two functions: (1) internal and external social integration of the community, and (2) integration of the whaling community with the spiritual world. She calls the former “horizontal integration” and the latter “vertical integration” (Iwasaki-Goodman 2005a: 46–47).

Whereas Freeman et al, Takahashi and Iwasaki-Goodman focus primarily on land-based whaling communities, Mikako Yamaguchi (2007) carried out ecological anthropological research on Baird’s beaked whale hunting crews, especially gunners, of small coastal whaling ships based in Abashiri, Hokkaido. From her interviews with crew members, she describes whaling crew composition, training, religion and taboos, knowledge of Baird’s beaked whales, and whaling activities. She notes that the whaling success rate varies greatly between gunners.

Hiroyuki Watanabe (1998, 2006) conducted a historical sociological study of the relationship between whales and Japanese. He describes the development of modern
whaling in Japan, the spread of whale meat dishes throughout the country, and the commercial over-catching of whales after World War II. He then examines the discourse relating to “whaling culture” by anthropologists like Takahashi (1992). According to Watanabe (2006), the relationships between whales and Japanese, which had originally been diverse, were gradually simplified to essentially one form of relationship during the Japanese expansion and colonial rule in the last century. Then, he criticizes the anthropological representation of whaling culture by Takahashi (1992) and Freeman et al. (1988, 1989), noting that their representation is political in nature and based on essentialism. Watanabe argues that whaling is not a Japanese cultural tradition because the whale meat dishes were spread throughout Japan through a national policy to solve the food shortage problems following World War II. After criticizing the politics of whale culture representation, he notes his support for sustainable whale resource use under the following two conditions: (1) to protect the natural environment and (2) to recognize and maintain a variety of relationships between whales and human beings.

8.5 Studies of Anti-Whaling Movements and Non-Consumptive Use of Whales

8.5.1 “Super Whale” and “Media Whale”

At the 1972 UN human-environment conference held in Stockholm, under the influence of the anti-whaling movement by several environmental NGOs and the US government, a proposal was made “to protect whales” with the aim of protecting the environment. This event turned the whale into a symbol of environmental protection. A decade later the IWC officially decided to impose a moratorium on commercial whaling, beginning in 1986. Japanese large-scale commercial whalers ceased whaling in April, 1988. Since then, the Government of Japan has proposed various times to resume harvesting several species of whales whose populations have increased to the point where sustainable use is possible. However, the Japanese proposals have never been approved at IWC annual meetings. It is interesting to note that the emphasis of anti-whaling countries, environmental NGOs, and animal rights NGOs has changed from the argument that whaling is ecologically sustainable, to one that whaling is immoral, to anti-ethical conduct (Barstow 1991).

Several anthropologists took notice of the international movement concerning whaling at the end of 1980s. A. Kalland, a Norwegian anthropologist examined how the whale became a symbol of environmental protection (Kalland 1992, 1993a, 1993b, 2009). He examined the argument of Robin Barstow, President of Cetacean Society International, that a whale is a special being in biological, ecological, cultural, political and symbolical terms, and proposed a new concept of “super whale”. Human beings have found several characteristics of whales, such as its being the largest animal on earth (blue whale), animal with the largest brain (sperm whale), animal with a large brain relative to body size (bottlenose dolphin), cheerful and singing animals (humpback whales), animals friendly to humans (gray whales), animals at risk of extinction (bowhead and blue whales), etc (Kalland 1993a: 4, 1993b: 126). Kalland argues that a fictional image of a whale having all these features was created and spread by the mass media. He calls this “super whale”.
Further, Kalland points out that because a whale is a difficult animal to classify or categorize, has a longer history than human beings, and is characterized as an ultimate pure being because it lives in the sea, it has become a kind of totem. Thus, it is believed that people who protect whales are ‘good’ persons whereas those who kill or/and eat them are ‘bad’. Based on such logic, whales can function as a symbol of environmental protection. Since the image and discourses concerning the fictive whale became a common myth, it has had a significant influence on many people’s behavior and ideas. Large environmental NGOs use the whale as a symbol to raise enormous amounts of funding. On the other hand, many national governments and industrial companies use their willingness to protect whales as a means to project a clean public image (Kalland 1992, 1993a, 1993b: 127). Kalland exposes the strange symbiotic relationship among the national governments, industrial circles and environmental NGOs that insist on the protection of whales, and points out the simultaneous phenomena that while whale meat and oil become non-commoditized, the symbolic “super whale” becomes commoditized (Kalland 1992).

Katsuaki Morita (1994) developed the concept of “media whale” at the same time as Kalland proposed the “super whale”. According to Morita (1994), once a virtual or ‘god-like’ whale is created by mass media, those accepting this image acquire a moral superiority vis-à-vis those who support whaling. He points out three features of the “media whale”. First, it is supposed to be intelligent. Second, in keeping with the image contemporary values such as love, non-violence, etc. are emphasized. Third, virtual reality is used in the visual and sound expression of the “media whale” (Morita 1994: 391). He argues that once the message of the “media whale”, that is, whale equals ideal human or god, is amplified by mass media, it is a natural consequence that whaling is regarded as ethically wrong (Morita 1994: 396). Also, he warns of the possibility that while an anti-whaling argument based on vulgar animal centralism may move toward eco-fascism, an extreme cultural traditionalism argument, such as eating whale meat as a distinctive Japanese tradition, may proceed to eco-nationalism (Morita 1994: 415). Although this concept of the “media whale” is not the same as that of the “super whale”, the former shares several common arguments with the latter (Kalland 1993a, 1993b; Morita 1994).

8.5.2 Studies of Anti-Whaling Movements and Environmental NGOs
Arne Kalland (2009) points out that several environmental and animal welfare NGOs that participate in the annual IWC meeting as observers actually play an important role in its decision-making process. First, they strenuously lobby representatives of each IWC member country and try to convince the public that their opinions are right. Second, these NGOs control information flow primarily through their own media, which in turn is directly accessed by supporters, thus by-passing mainstream media such as television and newspapers. Third, they monitor the records of the proceedings of the IWC meeting, evaluate the opinions of each country’s representatives, and then give their comments to the general mass media (Kalland 1993a: 6; 2009). These NGOs have had a significant influence not only on public anti-whaling views, but also on politicians’ and policy-
makers’ decision-making (Stevenson 1997: 3).

Masami Iwasaki-Goodman (2001, 2005a) examines IWC discussions on the Japanese minke whale hunt from 1986 to 1993. She notes that more than half the member countries officially oppose Japan’s proposal to resume the commercial small-type coastal minke whale hunt, although many of these same representatives sympathize with it. In addition, she presents an analysis of the various discussions about Japanese small-type coastal whaling at the 43rd IWC annual meeting. She finds a polarization within the IWC member countries between those supporting and those against whaling. She argues that this polarization results from (1) different views of whale resource management, (2) differing ethics, (3) different use of whales, and (4) the influence of anti-whaling NGOs. Further, there is a conflict regarding whether or not whales should be viewed as food resources (Iwasaki-Goodman 2001, 2005a: 96–113).

Kayo Ohmagari (2002, 2003, 2005) suggests that the ban on commercial whaling is decided at the IWC annual meetings not based on scientific reasons but on international politics. She argues that the USA, in particular, views whales not as marine resources but as political resources; specifically, whales in this context are seen as symbols of the environment. In addition, she explores why the whaling issues have not been resolved at the IWC in more than 30 years. Whereas Japan, Norway and several other countries regard whales as marine resources, anti-whaling countries, such as the USA and Australia, do not see whales in the same way. These two opposing views have made it difficult to resolve the “whaling issue”.

Motohiro Kawashima critiqued the reason that many Euro-Americans see whales as special beings (2010a) and the environmental NGOs’ anti-whaling campaigns (2010b). According to him (2010a), because whales are at risk of extinction and regarded as ‘special’ animals by many Euro-Americans, there is a huge support in Europe and North America for the anti-whaling position. He examines Barstow’s six reasons why Euro-Americans treat whales as special beings (Barstow 1991) in relation to Peter Singer’s concept of “speciesism”6). He argues that Euro-Americans’ special treatment of whales comes from their selfish “speciesism” and that Euro-American discourses stressing the uniqueness of whales are based on one-sided convictions (Kawshima 2010a: 14).

Kawashima examines the activities of a giant environmental NGO “Greenpeace”, and points out that the NGO uses its anti-whaling stance as a major fund raising strategy. Thus, he argues that the NGO is involved in a “protest business” (Jordan and Maloney 1997: 22). Also, he points out that several politicians in Europe, Australia, and North America adopt an anti-whaling position to project a ‘clean’ image and thereby gain supporters7) (2010b: 32). Also, Kawashima (2011) explores (1) the processes through which whales have become a special animal in Europe, (2) actors and their objectives that make it a special animal in Europe, (3) the ways in which whales and whaling are dealt with by mass media in Europe, and (4) the universality of the regard for whales being a special animal. From that he demonstrates the special treatment of whales as being historically and culturally a phenomenon peculiar to modern Europe. Hajime Ishikawa (2006, 2008) argues that the environmental NGOs Greenpeace and Sea Sheppard conducted disruptive activities against Japanese research whaling ships in the
Antarctic Ocean not for ‘environmental protectionism’ as such, but rather to encourage financial donations from their supporters.

8.5.3 Studies of Anti-Whaling Activities
Employing actor-network theory, A. Blok examines how whales have changed drastically from being industrial resources to almost sacred symbols (Blok 2007). By examining several cases like Greenpeace’s anti-whaling movement, whale watching, and whale behavior, he demonstrates that non-humans, such as whales, enter the social stage via a human spokesperson, and then gain sociality as animals to be loved and protected.

A. Peace elucidates why Australians oppose Japanese scientific research whaling in the Antarctic Ocean, and especially why they slandered Japanese whalers and whaling activities in 2007 and 2008 (Peace 2010a). He argues that the Australian anti-whaling public opinion was formed under the influence of the following four factors. First, migrating whales can be directly seen near Australian seashore. Second, whale watching fosters interest in whales and empathy toward them. Third, saving stranded whales creates special feelings and sympathy for them. Fourth, Australians regard the Japanese as “devils” because they hunt whales (Peace 2010a: 191). This public opinion is so widespread nationally that it affects the results of national elections. Also, Peace points out that migrating whales within Australian waters is deeply related to Australian identity in that it fosters an image of Australia as a humanitarian, progressive, safe, and civilized nation (Peace 2010a: 191). In this process of Australian identity formation, the Japanese from an Orientalism perspective are slandered as liars, irrational, backward, savage, and uncivilized. Furthermore, he argues that the manner of scapegoating and slandering the Japanese is not essentialist, but racist (Peace 2010a: 191–192). He calls this conflict between Japan and Australia a “whaling war” (Peace 2010b). Peace’s studies may contribute to our understanding of the Australian anti-whaling phenomenon.

8.5.4 Studies of Non-Consumptive Uses of Whales
As a non-consumptive use of whales, whale watching tourism has become increasingly popular in various locations around the world, and has resulted in several anthropological studies of whale watching tourism. In northern Norway, where local people engage actively in small-scale coastal whaling, whale watching tourism was operated by a Swedish company. It resulted in intense conflicts with whalers. The Swedish company attempted to change the whalers’ attitude toward whales and their economic situation, but failed owing to cultural resistance (Ris 1993). Saki Tanaka (2007, 2008) examined the use of whales as a tourism resource in Wada-machi, Chiba Prefecture, which also has a small-scale coastal whaling base. Several studies concerning relationships between dolphins/whales and humans in Australia show that experiences in whale watching and swimming with dolphins give participants a strong sense of the animals being special and human-like (Peace 2005; Servais 2005).

Tomoya Akimichi reported on several examples of the non-consumptive use of whales, such as the exhibition of whales in aquaria, dolphin therapy, and swimming with dolphins (Akimichi 2009). Kazunobu Kogi studied dolphin swimming as part of dolphin
therapy in Mikurajika, in the Izu Islands of Japan. His study suggested that dolphin watching might grow as an ecotourism project, but could have negative impacts on wild dolphins. Although several environmental and animal rights NGOs generally encourage non-consumptive use of wild whales/dolphins, such uses are not problem-free. Anthropological study of this important topic requires further investigation.

8.6 Research Directions in History, Sociology, Marine Economics, and Other Disciplines on Whaling in Japan

In addition to anthropology, research on whales and whaling in Japan has also been conducted in other disciplines, including archeology, history, sociology, folklore, and fisheries science. The archaeological studies have been discussed in the first part of this paper. In addition to the largely descriptive discussions of early historic period Japanese whaling discussed above, whaling activities carried out in several places in Japan have been examined in detail by non-anthropologists. Susumu Tatchira (1995), Kyoichi Torisu (1999), Shigeo Nakazono (1999, 2001), and Senzo Hidemura (2007) reviewed whaling activities and organizations along the western shores of Kyushu, especially in the Nagasaki region. Yuukichi Habara (1933) presented a history of whaling activities in Tosa (Kochi Prefecture), and Tsutomu Wada (1968, 1971, 2005) presented a similar history of whaling in Ise (Mie Prefecture), and in Kishu and Kumanonada (Wakayama Prefecture).

Kazuo Fukumoto (1993) examined the history of whaling in Japan in terms of development of methods, and recognized five stages: (1) hunting with bow and arrow, (2) harpooning, (3) netting, (4) harpooning with a bomb lance, and (5) employing the Norwegian system of mounted harpoon guns. Shigeo Nakazono (2006) criticized this scheme because of chronological overlay in the methods. Instead, he proposed three periods of Japanese whaling: early, old, and modern (Nakazono 2006: 22–25). A comprehensive book on Japanese whaling from the medieval period to the moratorium has been written in English by two European anthropologists (Kalland and Moeran 1992). Since most books on Japanese whaling are in Japanese, that by Kalland and Moeran is an excellent introduction to the topic for English readers.


Japanese sociologists such as Motohiro Kawashima and Dai Tanno have shown that examination of Euro-American views on whales can contribute much to an understanding of the background of the anti-whaling movement in Europe and North America (Kawashima 2004, 2005, 2007; Tanno and Hamazaki 2000; Hamazaki and Tanno 2001, 2002). Likewise, Takako Kakinuma (2007) contrasts the cultural differences relating to views on whales between the USA and Japan through comparison of literary works, historical remains, and museum exhibitions. Jun Miura also examines Japanese and Euro-American views of whales and dolphins. He argues that contemporary whaling problems arise not from the differences in recognition of whales and dolphins by Japanese and
Euro-Americans, but from the world political structure originating in European and American colonialism since the 19th century (Miura 2009).

As the IWC does not function normally as a decision-making organization for whaling matters, resumption of some commercial whaling, including Japanese small-scale coastal whaling, is not an immediate prospect. Masayuki Komatsu (2010) argues for the resumption of the hunting of several species of whales whose numbers have recovered sufficiently. He describes the political negotiations in the IWC for the last 20 years as a “whaling war”. Also, several scholars who are neutral concerning whaling issues have tried to examine critically the issues in order to clarify hon-ne (real intentions) and tatemae (professed intentions) of various stakeholders (Ishii ed. 2011).

Ken’ichi Tanigawa (1997) published an edited volume on whale and dolphin studies by Japanese folklore specialists. Takao Kojima (1988, 1989) described whale-hunting gear and methods of Baird’s beaked whale hunting, use of the whale meat, and food culture in Wada-machi (Minamiboso City), Chiba Prefecture. He has also considered the problem of transmission of whaling culture within the community after World War II (Kojima 2004), and published an edited volume on the history and contemporary situation of coastal whaling in various places in Japan (Kojima ed. 2009). This book describes whaling, and food culture, ceremonies, and religious traditions relating to whaling in several regions, whale watching in Mikurajima, one of the Izu Islands, and the current state of Japanese small-scale coastal whaling. Kojima attempts to demonstrate that the relationships between humans and whales vary regionally in Japan. Also, Miyazato (1988) describes dolphin fisheries in Nago, Okinawa, Japan.

There are five types of whaling activities in contemporary Japan: (1) scientific research whaling in the Antarctic and the northwest Pacific Oceans (The Institute of Cetacean Research 2009, 2010), (2) scientific research whaling in inshore waters of the northwest Pacific Ocean adjacent to Japan, (3) small-scale coastal whaling, (4) drive and hand harpoon fisheries, and (5) incidental by-catch. Whale meat from these activities is sold domestically through several distribution channels. In the field of fishery economics, Aiko Endo and Masahiro Yamao (Endo 2008; Endo and Yamao 2006, 2007) discuss the distribution channels and price determination of whale products, as well as policies governing the distribution of whale meat from Japanese scientific and small-scale coastal whaling. Also, Endo reports temporal changes in whale resource use on basis of her research in Taiji, Japan (Endo 2011).

Hajime Ishikawa (2000) and Yoshihiro Hayashi (2006), both veterinarians, discuss environmental ethics and humane killing (Sato 2005) as it relates to whaling. Hayashi argues that while we tend to stress cultural differences or opposing points of view between whaling countries and anti-whaling countries, we should not ignore the commonalities between them. People from a whale food culture and those from a stock raising food culture are familiar with different types of animals. However, both peoples have a common characteristic in that they strive to make maximum use of the animals (Hayashi 2006: 51–52).

Recently, several countries have criticized Japanese scientific research whaling from a perspective of animal welfare, but have avoided any debate on whaling from within the
scientific community (Ishikawa 2003). Also, animal rights and environmental NGOs increasingly emphasize notions of animal welfare and bioethics in the international anti-whaling campaign. Concerns regarding animal welfare, animal rights, or bioethics have not been examined anthropologically in relation to whaling activities (Ishikawa 2006, 2008; Hamaguchi 2005b; Misaki 1996).

Ishikawa argues that if we do not accept killing and use of animals by humans, the concept of animal welfare will be only an empty, abstract theory (Ishikawa 2010: 1). In his view, animal welfare means the minimization of pain and suffering of an animal (Ishikawa 2010: 1, 3). Although animal welfare is often confused with animal protection in Japan, there are differences. Whereas Europeans tend to emphasize the “consciousness” or “individual mental and physical condition” of an animal, the Japanese tend to lay stress on its life (Ishikawa 2010: 2). Thus, the former emphasize killing an animal without causing pain and suffering, the latter stress saving its life. The meaning of the latter may correspond to animal protection and differ from the original meaning of “animal welfare”.

Animal welfare assumes that humans own and use animals. But the concept “animal rights” is often assumed to mean that all animals are equal in terms of rights, and that any animal has the same right to life as humans. Thus, proponents of animal rights do not generally approve the killing or eating of any animals (Ishikawa 2010: 2–3). Many environmental NGOs and several scholars support animal welfare, animal protection or animal rights. But the problem is that these groups and people regard whales as a special animal without any reasonable scientific basis (Ishikawa 2003: 4–5). Concepts such as “animal welfare”, “animal protection”, “animal rights” have yet to be investigated comprehensively from an anthropological perspective.

9. Concluding Statement

In this first chapter we have attempted to provide a context for the papers that follow. We have done this by an overview of what we consider the major themes in archaeological and anthropological research into whaling and whaling societies, based on the major studies associated with them. We make no claim that our overview is complete. However, we are not aware of any other attempt to outline the major research themes and areas as we have presented them here. We encourage those with an interest in whaling and whaling societies, whether related to prehistory and history, contemporary anti-whaling vs. pro-whaling discourses, or the entire ‘animal rights’ movement, to pursue appropriate and well-grounded research.

Notes

2) The Inuvialuit did not catch a bowhead whale every year after 1991. They caught the second one only in 1996.

3) The participants in the workshop included Tomoya Akimichi (Japan), Pamela J. Asquith (Canada), Harumi Befu (USA), Theodore C. Bester (USA), Stephen R. Braund (USA), Milton M. R. Freeman (Canada), Helen Hardacre (USA), Masami Iwasaki (Japan), Arne Kalland (Norway), Lenore Manderson (Australia), Brian D. Moeran (UK), Junichi Takahashi (Japan).

4) Many Euro-Americans believe that the whale is a special animal and that Euro-American countries do not have an economic interest. Thus, several environmental NGOs and national governments chose the whale as a symbol of environmental protection (Miura 2009: 263).

5) Peterson, Jr. points out several similarities between a whale and an elephant, both of which environmental NGOs use a symbol of environmental protection (Peterson, Jr. 1993).

6) Peter Singer defines “speciesism” as prejudice and attitude to deny other species’ interests while protecting its own species’ interests (Singer1975: 26).
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