

## **REPORTE 58va. REUNION DE LA COMISION BALLENERA INTERNACIONAL 2006, St. Kitts y Nevis**

**La intención de este reporte, es describir lo sucedido en la reunión de la CBI 2006, y que el mismo sirva como referencia a todos aquellos que necesiten comunicar en su país o región datos sobre lo sucedido. Se dispone de las fuentes de toda la información vertida.**

Previo al 16 de junio, comienzo de los 5 días de plenario de la CBI, las expectativas de muchos Gobiernos miembro y organizaciones internacionales eran que Japón contaría con una clara mayoría, comprada, pero mayoría al fin.

La campaña de la Agencia de Pesca del Japón para reclutar países en desarrollo, iniciada en 1999, ha servido para alcanzar la mitad de los votos de la CBI en 2006, este es el primer caso de un organismo internacional al borde de ser copado por la voluntad de un solo país, ya denunciado en el Reporte Anual de Corrupción 2004 de Transparencia Internacional (Ver también Anexos).

La lista de países comprados por Japón asciende a unos 27, éstos no cazan ni consumen carne de ballena, exceptuando a St. Vincent and the Grenadines que dispone de una pequeña cuota para caza de subsistencia:

Antigua & Barbuda, Benin, Camboya, Camerún, Costa de Marfil, Dominica, Gabón, Gambia, Granada, Guinea, Kiribati, Mali, Islas Marshall, Mauritania, Mongolia, Marruecos, Nauru, Nicaragua, Palau, St Kitts & Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Islas Salomón, Suriname, Togo, Tuvalu.

Innumerables funcionarios de estos países han admitido públicamente que la razón de su voto se debe a la ayuda económica recibida por Japón, y hasta existen varios casos de investigaciones a funcionarios que han recibido dinero proveniente de balleneros en su cuenta bancaria personal. Justo al final de la reunión de la CBI se develaron nuevas pruebas de la compra de votos del Gobierno del Japón, la compra del voto del país anfitrión, St. Kitts, y su declaración presentada a votación. (Ver también Anexos).

Un reciente sondeo encargado a una encuestadora independiente demuestra que en los países reclutados por Japón, y en el mismo país nipón, la mayoría de la población no esta de acuerdo con la caza de ballenas, (Ver también Anexos).

Los miembros más recientes llevados por Japón a la reunión de St. Kitts fueron:

Islas Marshall, Camboya, Senegal, Togo y Gambia.

Resulta sorprendente que varios países con una situación de inestabilidad social interna y con problemas tan serios como hambruna, inseguridad, y falta de los mínimos servicios de salud, gasten dinero en pasajes y en enviar funcionarios a un Hotel Marriot de cinco estrellas en una isla del Caribe para votar a favor de la caza de ballenas, es esta una prioridad para estos países?

De las siete votaciones llevadas a cabo, cinco estuvieron directamente relacionadas a la conservación de los cetáceos, de estas cinco, Japón obtuvo mayoría por un solo voto de

diferencia en la menos importante, la “Declaración de St. Kitts”, la cual no es vinculante y fue copatrocinada por 30 países.

El análisis de los resultados de la reunión mantiene en alto la esperanza de todos quienes luchan por la preservación del medioambiente, ya que Japón no logro copar la CBI y manejarla a su antojo mediante la compra de votos, pero significa una llamada de alerta para todos, especialmente para los Gobiernos conservacionistas: es hora de poner en marcha una mas activa defensa de los recursos marinos globales, a fin de evitar la gravedad que significaría que el año que viene Japón si logre su objetivo, con las implicancias que ello traería no solo para los cetáceos sino para la pesca global. Que el país que dispone de la segunda flota pesquera mas amplia del mundo responsabilice a las ballenas y delfines del colapso de las pesquerías es una burla al sentido común.

A continuación trataré de hacer un resumen de la situación de los países de Latinoamérica y su participación y antecedentes, y describir cada votación realizada.

Por favor sepan disculpar los párrafos en inglés, y no dudar en realizar consultas para ampliar o aclarar la información provista.

### **Los Países y su comportamiento:**

**Argentina:** Posición conservacionista, muy activa.

**Belice:** Presente con derecho a voto, conservacionista en todos ellos.

**Brasil:** Posición conservacionista, muy activa.

**Chile:** Posición conservacionista, muy activa (será sede de la reunión de la CBI de 2008).

**Costa Rica:** Debido al no pago de la cuota anual, sin derecho a voto, conservacionista.

**El Salvador:** Japón intenta reclutarlo desde 2003, a punto de ingresar a la CBI en 2006.

**Guatemala:** El gobierno del Japón realiza desde 2003 una campaña para reclutarlo, en 2005 el Congreso Nacional aprueba una ley, en la que el dictamen del Ministerio de Agricultura manifiesta por escrito que “La incorporación de Guatemala en la IWC y una activa participación, seguramente traerá consigo, líneas de cooperación internacional de diversa índole con beneficios tangibles.” El Canciller de Guatemala, Briz Abularach, manifestó a a su par del Japón durante una visita en Tokio que Guatemala “comparte” la posición del Japón sobre la caza de ballenas (Feb. 23, Kyodo News).

Guatemala se une en secreto a la CBI un mes antes de la reunión, paga la cuota, pero no envía a ningún funcionario. No existen dudas de que la intención de los Ministros de Agricultura y Relaciones Exteriores era vender el voto de su país al Japón.

**Honduras:** Desde 2003 Japón intenta reclutarlo, el Ministro de Agricultura, Mariano Jiménez Talavera participó en dos reuniones de la CBI como observador, acompañando a la delegación del Japón, y bajo el fuerte lobby del representante de Nicaragua, Miguel Marengo (Director de

Pesca de Nicaragua, y fiel defensor de la caza de ballenas y delfines). En la reunión de este año nadie se hizo presente, aunque se esperaba la asistencia como representante del Director de Pesca, Italo Tugliani.

**México:** Conservacionista muy activo.

**Nicaragua:** Ingresa a la CBI reclutado por Japón en 2003, los votos son prácticamente exactos a los del Japón desde ese momento, en 2002, durante la reunión de la CBI en Shimonoseki, Japón, son invitados el Viceministro de Relaciones Exteriores y el actual Comisionado por Nicaragua, como "observadores". El actual Canciller de Nicaragua, Norman Caldera y varios otros altos funcionarios del Gobierno manifestaron públicamente en innumerables ocasiones que el voto del país se debía a "favores económicos" de parte del Japón. Una reciente encuesta en un periódico nacional demuestra que el 90 % de los participantes esta en contra de la posición de su Gobierno en la CBI. El Comisionado por Nicaragua es conocido por confrontar hostilmente con los diplomáticos de Latinoamérica, y amenazar a representantes de organizaciones ambientalistas dentro y fuera de la CBI, nunca se ha presentado a debates públicos ni reuniones con ONGs en su país, también ha sido citado por el Congreso debido a cuestionables manejos de las pesquerías en Nicaragua.

**Panamá:** Presente con derecho a voto, posición conservacionista en todos los votos (Panamá fue reclutado por Japón en 2001, desde ese año hasta 2003 sus votos fueron exactamente idénticos a los del Japón, en 2004, 4 de los votos fueron a favor de la conservación, y 3 a favor del Japón, desde 2005 firmemente conservacionista junto al bloque Latinoamericano. El ex Ministro de Relaciones Exteriores de Panamá, Sr. Aleman, admitió públicamente que el voto del país era a cambio de favores económicos del Japón públicamente).

**Perú:** Debido al no pago de la cuota anual, sin derecho a voto, aunque si hubo dinero para que un representante del Gobierno viaje a la reunión innecesariamente. Crecen sospechas dentro y fuera del Perú que el no pago de la cuota fue una forma de devolver al Japón el favor de las últimas millonarias "donaciones" para la modernización y ampliación de un puerto. En 2003 y 2004 los votos del Perú fueron conservacionistas.

**Suriname:** Reclutado por Japón en 2004 votos prácticamente idénticos a los de Japón.

**\*\*\* Si bien parece algo demasiado patético y vergonzoso como para ser real, la compra de votos en la CBI es tan evidente que ni siquiera con los ojos cerrados puede pasar desapercibida. Es un síntoma de la corrupción en altos niveles gubernamentales en muchos países.**

Milko Schvartzman  
Greenpeace  
mmschvar@ar.greenpeace.org

## **Las votaciones:**

### **Dia 1:**

#### **Voto 1:**

Propuesta de Japón de eliminar de la Agenda de la CBI temas de conservación de “Pequeños Cetáceos” (delfines y marsopas), esto es que la CBI no contemple la situación de las estas especies ni cuestiones relacionadas con su status y conservación, ni proponga medidas de evitar la extinción de especies, como ser la “vaquita”, una marsopa de México, con una población estimada en menos de 600 animales.

Votos a Favor = 30

Antigua & Barbuda, Benin, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Cote d'Ivoire, Donimica, Gabon, Grenada, Guinea, Iceland, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nauru, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Russian Federation, St Kitts & Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent & the Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Tuvalu.

En Contra = 32:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Chile, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Oman, Panama, Portugal, San Marino, Slovak Republic, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, USA.

Abstenciones = 1:

Denmark.

Ausentes:

Guatemala, Senegal.

Notas:

- Senegal y Guatemala tenían la cuota paga pero no estuvieron presentes.
- Gambia y Togo no estuvieron presentes mientras debían dos años de cuota.

#### **Voto 2:**

Propuesta de Japón para que las votaciones sean secretas.

A Favor = 30:

Antigua & Barbuda, Benin, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Cote d'Ivoire, Donimica, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Iceland, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nauru, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Russian Federation, St Kitts & Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent & the Grenadines, Suriname, Tuvalu.

En Contra = 33:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Oman, Panama, Portugal, San Marino, Slovak Republic, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, USA.

Abstenciones = 1:

Solomon Islands

Ausente:

Guatemala, Senegal.

Notas:

-Gambia apareció con su deuda paga y tuvo derecho a voto.

## **Dia 2**

### **Voto 3**

Dos propuestas de Japón solicitando hacer una excepción a la Moratoria y autorizarlo para cazar 150 ballenas minke y 150 ballenas de Bryde en sus aguas territoriales.

Se necesitaban  $\frac{3}{4}$  de los votos para aprobarse, aunque una mayoría simple sería utilizada por Japón para decir que la CBI en su mayoría apoyaba una reapertura de la caza comercial.

A Favor = 30:

Antigua & Barbuda, Benin, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Denmark, Donimica, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Iceland, Japan, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nauru, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Palau, Russian Federation, St Kitts & Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent & the Grenadines, Suriname, Togo, Tuvalu.

En Contra = 31:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Chile, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, Portugal, San Marino, Slovak Republic, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, USA.

Abstenciones = 4:

China, Kiribati, Korea, Solomon Islands

Ausentes = 2:

Guatemala, Senegal

### **Dia 3**

#### **Voto 4**

Propuesta del Japón de abolir el Santuario ballenero Austral en la Antártida, necesitaba de  $\frac{3}{4}$  de los votos.

A favor de abolir el Santuario: 28  
(Nicaragua entre ellos)

En contra: 33

Abstenciones:

Korea, Morocco St. Vincent, Tuvalu

Ausentes:

Costa de Marfil, Guatemala

#### **Voto 5**

**“Declaración de St. Kitts”** Este es el único voto obtenido por Japón, luego de aproximadamente quince años.

Si bien no es vinculante, es una declaración que será utilizada por Japón para decir que la CBI apoya una reapertura de la caza comercial de ballenas. Contiene aberraciones tales como decir que los cetáceos compiten con los humanos por los recursos pesqueros, y que las ballenas y delfines consumen tanto pescado que son una amenaza para la seguridad alimentaria. Esto no tiene el mas mínimo sustento ni aceptación científica. (Ver texto de la Declaración mas abajo).

A Favor de la Declaración de St. Kitts = 33:

Antigua & Barbuda, Benin, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominica, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Iceland, Japan, Korea, Kiribati, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nauru, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Russian Federation, St Kitts & Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Togo, Tuvalu

En Contra = 32:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Chile, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Oman, Panama, Portugal, San Marino, Slovak Republic, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, USA.

Abstenciones = 1:

China

Ausente = 1:

Guatemala

#### Texto de la Declaración de St. Kitts:

IWC/58/16  
Agenda Item 19

#### ST KITTS AND NEVIS DECLARATION

St Kitts and Nevis, Antigua & Barbuda, Benin, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Dominica, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Republic of Guinea, Iceland, Japan, Kiribati, Mali, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nauru, Nicaragua, Norway, Republic of Palau, Russian Federation, St Lucia, St Vijncent and the Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Togo, Tuvalu.

EMPHASIZING that the use of cetaceans in many parts of the world including the Caribbean, contributes to sustainable coastal communities, sustainable livelihoods, food security and poverty reduction and that placing the use of whales outside the context of the globally accepted norm of science-based management and rule-making for emotional reasons would set a bad precedent that risks our use of fisheries and other renewable resources;

FURTHER EMPHAZING that the use of marine resources as an integral part of development options is critically important at this time for a number of countries experiencing the need to diversify their agriculture;

UNDERSTANDING that the purpose of the 1946 International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW) is to "provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks and thus make possible the orderly development of the whaling industry" (quoted from the Preamble to the Convention) and that the

International Whaling Commission (IWC) is therefore about managing whaling to ensure whale stocks are not over-harvested rather than protecting all whales irrespective of their abundance;

NOTING that in 1982 the IWC adopted a moratorium on commercial whaling (paragraph 10e of the Schedule to the ICRW) without advice from the Commission's Scientific Committee that such measure was required for conservation purposes;

FURTHER NOTING that the moratorium which was clearly intended as a temporary measure is no longer necessary, that the Commission adopted a robust and risk-averse procedure (RMP) for calculating quotas for abundant stocks of baleen whales in 1994 and that the IWC's own Scientific Committee has agreed that many species and stocks of whales are abundant and sustainable whaling is possible;

CONCERNED that after 14 years of discussion and negotiation, the IWC has failed to complete and implement a management regime to regulate commercial whaling;

ACCEPTING that scientific research has shown that whales consume huge quantities of fish making the issue a matter of food security for coastal nations and requiring that the issue of management of whale stocks must be considered in a broader context of ecosystem management since eco-system management has now become an international standard;

REJECTING as unacceptable that a number of international NGOs with self-interest campaigns should use threats in an attempt to direct government policy on matters of sovereign rights related to the use of resources for food security and national development;

NOTING that the position of some members that are opposed to the resumption of commercial whaling on a sustainable basis irrespective of the status of whale stocks is contrary to the object and purpose of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling;

UNDERSTANDING that the IWC can be saved from collapse only by implementing conservation and management measures which will allow controlled and sustainable whaling which would not mean a return to historic over-harvesting and that continuing failure to do so serves neither the interests of whale conservation nor management;

NOW THEREFORE:

- COMMISSIONERS express their concern that the IWC has failed to meet its obligations under the terms of the ICRW and,
- DECLARE our commitment to normalize the functions of the IWC based on the terms of the ICRW and other relevant international law, respect for cultural diversity and traditions of coastal peoples and the fundamental principles of



sustainable use of resources, and the need for science-based policy and rulemaking that are accepted as the world standard for the management of marine resources.

## **Día 4**

### **Voto 6**

#### **Resolución sobre la seguridad de embarcaciones envueltas en caza de ballenas y en actividades de investigación.**

Aprobada por consenso, con la abstención de St. Kitts y Nevis.

IWC/58/23  
Agenda Item 3

#### **Resolution on the safety of vessels engaged in whaling and whale research-related activities**

Submitted by  
Australia, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, United States of America

Whereas the safety of vessels and crew and the order of maritime navigation are, and have long been, the common interest of nations worldwide,

Whereas the Commission and Contracting Governments support the right to legitimate and peaceful forms of protest and demonstration,

Mindful of the fact that issues relating to confrontation between vessels at sea and in port have been discussed by this Commission as well as other international for a including the International Maritime Organization,

Recognizing the fact that domestic and international concerns have been expressed concerning confrontation at sea and port relating to whaling and whale research activities,

Seriously concerned that dangerous confrontations risk human life, property, and the order of maritime navigation, and may lead to grave accidents,

Recalling the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea which set uniform principles and rules for avoiding collisions at sea,

Recalling further the guidelines of the International Maritime Organization relating to consultation and cooperation in marine casualty investigations,

Now therefore this Commission,

Agrees and Declares that the Commission and its contracting Governments do not condone any actions that are a risk to human life and property in relation to these activities of vessels at sea, and urges persons and entities to refrain from such acts;

Encourages Contracting Governments to take appropriate measures, consistent with IMO guidelines, in order to ensure that the substance and spirit of this Resolution are observed both domestically and internationally.

### **Dia 5:**

#### **Voto 7**

Solicitud de St. Kitts de que la CBI, extraiga de sus reservas varios cientos de miles de dólares (inicialmente 700.000) para resarcir gastos extras que había tenido al ser anfitrión de la reunión. Francia mencionó que había propuesto ser sede de la reunión, y que St. Kitts desafió el pedido.

NO APROBADO

A Favor = 30

En Contra = 30

Abstenciones = 4

Ausentes = 2

---

**ANEXOS:** (Se recomienda su lectura para mayor comprensión del tema)

PRESS RELEASE GREENPEACE JAPAN

**St.Kitts Declaration has been revealed to be bought up!**  
**----Japan paid JPY600 million to St. Kitts last year**

It has revealed that St.Kitt & Navis which hosted IWC this time was granted JPY617 million (4,261,874 Euro, 5,359,094 US\$) from Japan as a grants-in-aid for marine industry last year.

This fact has become clear today in the written reply from the Japanese government to a MP, Shokichi Kina, of the House of Councilors who sent to the House of Councilors questions on the government policies about whaling. One of his questions was about how much is spent to increase numbers of states in IWC members in order to support Japan, i.e., for

vote-buying, and how the grants-in-aid for marine industry was used last year and to which countries.

In the government reply, the vote-buying itself was not denied and six projects were mentioned. Among those six, the biggest amount, JPY1,196 millions (8,261,266 Euro, 10,388,130 US\$), was granted to Nicaragua, and JPY617 million to St.Kitt which was granted on July 1st of 2005, just after the last IWC was over.

"Why as big amount as JPY600 million was poured into a country which very little Japanese knows. It is obvious that the aid has influenced a lot in issuing St.Kitt Declaration ", said Jun Hoshikwa, the executive director of Greenpeace Japan.

The media in Japan is busy reporting that Japan has at long last succeeded in getting a majority in voting at IWC, while the opinion poll, which was recently conducted by Greenpeace, shows that 77% of respondents does not support whaling in high seas.

"Tax payers' money is used for what tax payers do not want where they do not know, which the media does not report. Also, what is not demanded by consumers is being supplied to those who cannot choose, such as pupils in schools and patients in hospitals. Any food should not be forced to eat", said Jun Hoshikawa.

Greenpeace is going to monitor and protest in non-violent against Japan's "research whaling" which kill whales including the ones of endangered species in Antarctica which is specified as whale sanctuary.

Keiko Shirokawa  
Media Officer  
Greenpeace Japan  
Direct Number +813-5338-9816  
Mobile phone +8190-3470-7884

1, Nicaragua

- 1,196,000,000 yen (8,261,266 Euro, 10,388,130 US\$)
- signed on June 3rd, 2005
- "San Fan Del Sur" Fishery Facility Construction Project

2, Independent State of Samoa

- 707,000,000 yen (4,883,541 Euro 6,140,809 US\$)
- signed on July 15th, 2005
- "Asia" Port Improvement Project

3, Saint Christopher and Nevis

- 617,000,000 yen (4,261,874 Euro 5,359,094 US\$)
- signed on July 1st, 2005
- Promotion of Small Scale Fishery Project

4, The Republic of Palau

- 581,000,000 yen (4,013,207 Euro 5,046,407 US\$)

- signed on December 19th, 2005
- "Priryu" North Port Construction Project

5, People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

- 100,600,000 yen (694,886 Euro 873,784 US\$)
- signed on March 19th, 2006
- Preparation of the Training Equipment for Fish Farming

6, Peru

- 298,000,000 yen (2,058,409 Euro 2,588,347 US\$)
- signed on April 3rd, 2006
- "Tarara" Port Expansion and Modernization Project

---

**Gobiernos a favor de cazar ballenas, pero ciudadanos en contra**  
***A lo largo de veinte años de campaña estratégica en pro de la caza comercial de ballenas, Japón está listo para cantar "victoria" durante la presente reunión, pues cree haber conseguido la mayoría de votos necesarios en la Comisión Ballenera Internacional, para iniciar las acciones de desmantelamiento de políticas encaminadas a la conservación.***

*Ciudadanos de diez países se oponen a la caza de ballenas*

St. Kitts and Nevis, 15 de junio, 2006- En la víspera de la reunión número 58 de la Comisión Ballenera Internacional (CBI), una nueva encuesta de WWF, la organización mundial de conservación, revela que ciudadanos de diez países en el Océano Pacífico y el Mar Caribe, cuyos gobiernos históricamente han votado a favor de reanudar la caza comercial de ballenas, están en contra de la captura y matanza de esta especie.

La encuesta se aplicó en Palau, las Islas Solomón, Tuvalu, Islas Marshall, Kiribati, Grenada, Antigua y Barbuda, Dominica, Santa Lucía, y St. Kitts y Nevis, donde se realiza el encuentro.

El formulario indagó sobre si conocían la existencia de la Comisión Ballenera Internacional, si los países deberían votar a favor o en contra del comercio de ballenas, y sobre el apoyo a votaciones anteriores respecto de reanudar la caza de ballenas con fines comerciales.

"La evidencia es abrumadora", dijo la Sue Liberman, Directora del Programa Global de Especies de WWF. "Los gobiernos ignoran la opinión pública y pretenden votar pro- caza de ballenas en representación de sus ciudadanos. Sin importar cuántas veces se declare, esta caza con fines comerciales no ayudará a disminuir la pobreza", agregó.

En cada país encuestado del Pacífico, la mayoría de personas desconocían la existencia de la CBI. Sin embargo, más personas se oponen a que su país vote por

reanudar la caza comercial de ballenas, en comparación con las que están a favor. También opinaron que si su país ha votado en el pasado a favor de la caza, no debería haberlo hecho.

En respuesta a la pregunta: ¿Cree usted que su país deba votar en pro o en contra de restablecer la caza comercial de ballenas?, en las Islas Marshall un 64% de los encuestados dijo no. Así mismo en Tuvalu, un 64%, en Kiribati 47% (14% no sabe), en Palau 76% y en las Islas Solomon 72 % se mostraron en contra de la captura de esta especie.

En los cinco países caribeños consultados, una mayoría considera que su país no debe votar por la reanudación de esta práctica. Tampoco creen que su país debió haber votado a favor de este tema en años anteriores. En cuatro de los cinco países, la mayoría de encuestados conocía la existencia de la CBI

Como respuesta a la interrogante: ¿En reuniones anteriores los representantes de su país votaron en pro de reanudar la caza comercial de ballenas. Cree usted que su país debió haber votado de esta forma?. En Grenada un 33% (37% no sabe), en Santa Lucía un 50% (17% no sabe), en Antigua y Barbuda 79%, Dominica 40% (14% no sabe) y en St. Kitts y Nevis 54%, dijeron que no.

A lo largo de veinte años de campaña estratégica en pro de la caza comercial de ballenas, Japón está listo para cantar "victoria" durante la presente reunión, pues cree haber conseguido la mayoría de votos necesarios en la Comisión Ballenera Internacional, para iniciar las acciones de desmantelamiento de políticas encaminadas a la conservación de esta especie marina y para preparar el camino hacia un eventual restablecimiento de la caza comercial.

"El gobierno japonés ha apuntado de forma activa e inconciente a las naciones en vías de desarrollo en el Caribe y el Pacífico y del oeste de África, esto para que voten a favor de su agenda pro-caza comercial de ballenas", afirmó Gordon Shepherd, Director de Políticas de WWF. "Nuestra encuesta expone esta farsa que no tiene el apoyo de los países y sus ciudadanos", concluyó.

[www.ecoport.net](http://www.ecoport.net)

*Para más información:*

*Cinthya Flores Mora*

*WWF Centroamérica / Costa Rica*

*Tel: +506 234 8434*

---

Saturday, June 24, 2006

**Japan heats up whaling wars**

By JEFF KINGSTON  
Special to The Japan Times

The battle over whaling has grown more acrimonious in recent years principally because Japan has become a more vociferous and belligerent advocate for a resumption of commercial whaling. In the recently concluded meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC), Japan's representative browbeat and threatened other member nations, including the United States, in an effort to get its way. As a result, the Fisheries Agency has scored the diplomatic equivalent of an own-goal. Japan continues to hunt whales -- killing some 2,000 this year alone -- under the cover of "scientific research."

Its image has been further battered by allegations that it is aggressively leveraging its aid programs to island nations in the South Pacific and Caribbean to sway votes its way.

Given widespread indifference among the Japanese public about whaling and eating whale meat, why is the government pursuing such a confrontational foreign policy? It is important to bear in mind that the pro-whaling lobby in Japan does not represent a consensus view among Japanese, many of whom prefer whale-watching to nibbling on the fruits of research whaling. However, the government does favor resumption of whaling and is seeking to end the moratorium on whaling that did save the whales. Given that Japanese whaling operations nearly drove some species into extinction, its plans to resume commercial whaling have understandably drawn special scrutiny from conservationists all over the world.

Japan's case rests on culture, science, principle and propaganda. Whale consumption is portrayed as a deeply embedded culinary tradition and anti-whaling activists are accused of cultural imperialism. To advocates, eating whale meat is an issue of national identity, an identity that is under siege on many fronts. They also argue that science is on their side, citing studies that show a strong recovery among certain whale species that would permit a resumption of managed whaling.

There is also a sense that Japan has been double-crossed by anti-whaling nations in the IWC. Japan agreed to a moratorium on whaling, not a permanent prohibition, and IWC rules specify that whaling policies should be driven by science. So there is a perception that anti-whaling nations have hijacked the IWC and made it into a vehicle to impose their views on conservation regardless of science.

Standing up for whaling is thus projected as a matter of principle. And this is where the propaganda machine kicks in, hammering home the idea that Japan is the target of double standards. Otherwise urbane and sophisticated Japanese officials can suddenly morph into sputtering jingoists over the subject of whaling, exuding self-righteous indignation.

How has whaling become a talismanic symbol of Japanese identity? The Institute of Cetacean Research (ICR), funded by the government, is in the business of promoting whaling and also orchestrates a media campaign to convince Japanese that whaling is part of their national identity. They also try to spur whale consumption, but to little avail. The major problem for advocates of whaling is that Japanese consumers are not buying even heavily subsidized whale meat; one third of the harvest of "scientific research" remains unsold. That is why whale is being processed into dog treats. The trend toward declining whale consumption preceded the moratorium on whaling and now very few Japanese are eating it even though it is widely available at reasonable prices.

Japan's taxpayers are paying for this mind-boggling boondoggle, subsidizing research whaling expeditions that gain international opprobrium while funding a research institute that produces little research and also markets whale meat at tax-subsidized prices that most Japanese don't want.

The claim that resumption of whaling is based on solid science also doesn't wash. The data is dodgy, hard to confirm and tainted for a number of reasons. DNA testing reveals mislabeling of whale meat sold in Japanese markets to hide the fact that species in danger of extinction are being killed for a research program of dubious merits. So even if it is possible to sensibly manage whaling of some species, there is little confidence that whaling won't also involve endangered species.

Science is also inconvenient in exposing the dangers of whale consumption. There have been public health warnings that there are extremely high concentrations of toxic chemicals -- PCBs and mercury -- in whale meat, and pregnant

women have been warned not to eat any at all. Advocates have also blamed declining fish stocks on too many hungry whales, the scientific equivalent of blaming sheep flatulence for ozone depletion. Fishery resources have been badly mismanaged, a problem of over-fishing that raises legitimate concerns over proposals to manage whale stocks.

Conservationists are relieved that Japan lost four substantive votes on whaling and only prevailed -- by one vote -- on a non-binding declaration that reiterates the principles of the IWC. This minor propaganda victory is already being milked for what its worth. However, given dismal prospects for overturning the moratorium -- 75 percent of the votes are required to do so -- Japan will continue to evade it through research whaling.

As IWC delegates prepare for the next annual meeting in Anchorage, emotions on both sides are running high, trumping science and sensible compromises. The acrimonious impasse, and harpooning, will continue.

Jeff Kingston is director of Asian studies at Temple University Japan.

The Japan Times

(C) All rights reserved

---

Marine Pollution Bulletin 52 (2006) 363-366

Viewpoint

## Propaganda and pretext

Sidney Holt \*,1

Voc. Palazzetta 68, Paciano (PG) 06060, Italy

Abstract

This Viewpoint describes and analyses the history and current features of the strategy of the Government of Japan, and the associated Institute for Cetacean Research in Tokyo, to regain control of the International Whaling Commission (IWC), to legitimise renewed unsustainable commercial whaling and to dismantle conservation measures taken by the IWC over the past three decades. A key element in that strategy now is to promote and nourish the false idea that the present crisis in world fisheries is significantly caused by the consumption of valuable fish by increasing whale populations.

\_ 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

This Viewpoint is not about contamination of the ocean and its inhabitants by chemicals, sound or other forms of intrusive energy, but rather about verbal pollution, distortions and incompetence. My subject is whaling, fishing, the conservation of whales and the sustainable use of marine living resources.

For two decades the governments of a few countries, whose vessels and nationals were engaged in commercial whaling, controlled the International Whaling Commission (IWC) which had been created in 1946 to regulate whaling, and conserve whale resources for the benefit of both present and future (human) generations. That the IWC--labelled as a 'whalers' club--failed in all those tasks is widely known. In the third decade of its existence (1970-1979) those same states, augmented by a few new whalers, counterbalanced by a few new non-whalers, continued to hold control to the extent that the whalers held enough votes to block most proposed conservation measures. The outside world--represented as the UN General Assembly--had meanwhile called upon the IWC to consider declaring a precautionary 10-year moratorium on all commercial whaling. Whaling governments, such as Norway, that

had supported the UNGA Resolution, of course took the opposite view within the IWC, and continued to block action until 1979. In that year, however, the whalers lost their stranglehold and a proposal by the newly independent Republic of Seychelles to ban commercial whaling from the Indian Ocean was adopted.

Two years later all catching of sperm whales was banned, and the following year a pause in all other commercial whaling was declared, on another proposal by Seychelles, not for 10 years but indefinitely. This decision—commonly, but erroneously, called ‘‘the moratorium’’—applied to all whale species for which the IWC accepts responsibility, i.e., all baleen whales and, among the toothed whales, the sperm, the northern bottlenose and the orca. These supposedly binding decisions were made by the necessary three-fourths majority of voting IWC Members. The critical point had arrived when, early in 1982, some of the countries conducting whaling from land-stations to supply the Japanese meat market let it be known, very discreetly, that they would phase out their operations if given sufficient time—three years—to meet their advance contracts to supply meat and to make other social readjustments. The crux was that one of these—Spain—voted in favour of the pause and by so doing cast the decisive vote. Japan, Norway, Iceland and the USSR voted against the 1982 decision and subsequently all of them but Iceland filed ‘‘objections’’ to it, as the ICRW gives them the right to do. The Icelandic Parliament over-rode, by a single vote, the Government’s intention

0025-326X/\$ - see front matter \_ 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2005.12.002

\* Tel./fax: +39 075 830 7035.

E-mail address: [sidneyholt@libero.it](mailto:sidneyholt@libero.it)

<sup>1</sup> Adviser to Global Ocean Charity and Third Millennium Foundation.

[www.elsevier.com/locate/marpolbul](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/marpolbul)

Marine Pollution Bulletin 52 (2006) 363–366

to object. And although the USSR had objected as a matter of principle it did in fact also cease its whaling in the Southern Hemisphere, which had until then been conducted solely to serve the Japanese market and earn hard currency. Other Members engaged at the time in commercial whaling also voted against the pause but did not object to it and they all subsequently ceased operations, some of them— notably Brazil and Chile—becoming among the strongest advocates of continuing the pause in whaling. The delayed general ‘‘moratorium’’ came into effect in 1986. The ‘‘recruitment’’ by Seychelles, and other countries, of Indian Ocean coastal states, such as India, Kenya, Oman and Egypt, to IWC membership, in order to implement their national interests in marine conservation, had encouraged other non-whaling states to do likewise. But Norway, having exerted its right to ‘‘object’’ to the moratorium, as well as to a declaration by the IWC that the minke whales in the northeast Atlantic were depleted and therefore ‘‘Protected’’, continued its operations. Japan, which had also ‘‘objected’’, withdrew its objection as part of a deal with the USA that would allow Japanese fishing vessels to operate for a while in the US Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) in the North Pacific, under licence, but it continued its whaling through a loophole in the ICRW which allows Member states to award their nationals Special Permits for the professed purpose of scientific research. Such permits have no constraints with regard to numbers of whales to be killed, their location, the species, the duration of the killing programme, or the type of individual whale (e.g. its size, whether it is a calf or nursing mother etc.).<sup>2</sup>



In the year that Japan began large-scale 'scientific whaling' its authorities decided to launch a secret exercise to 'turn around' several of the countries that had supported the moratorium decision to ensure that a blocking vote (one fourth plus one of voting Members) would be able to prevent any further conservation moves.<sup>3</sup> They thought they had succeeded by 1993 but in 1994 failed to block the declaration by the IWC of the entire Southern Ocean as a whale sanctuary, following a proposal by France. This hitch was only temporary, however, and in any case the Southern Ocean was, in both political and scientific terms, a very special case, linked to the battle by many Antarctic treaty powers to delay (for at least 50 years) exploration for, and exploitation of, minerals on the continent. Thereafter, once assured of a blocking one-fourth, the Japanese authorities decided to move towards gaining a simple majority with which to block even non-binding 'unwelcome' IWC decisions and, as soon became apparent, to dismantle the fragile structure of conservation measures that had been erected since 1972. This was called, in Japan, 'vote consolidation' and by others 'vote buying' (see for example, ECCEA, 1997).

Readers of Marine Pollution Bulletin might be surprised at the attention now being given to this process. Various means of persuasion have, after all, been used by richer or more powerful states to ensure the support of the governments of weaker or poorer states throughout the array of inter-governmental negotiations and decision-making, not least in the United Nations system. However, what makes the IWC different is that the Japanese efforts have continued for two decades, with respect to what is, after all, a rather trivial and economically unimportant issue in world affairs. This is not the place to speculate on the deep reasons for this apparently irrational behaviour by the national authorities of one of the world's richest and most influential countries. But from one perspective it should be realised that the protection of endangered whales has been a global 'flagship' environmental campaign since 1972, and, from another perspective, Japan's actions have involved the systematic corruption of a particular field of application of marine science: the management of sea fisheries. That such corruption was possible raises serious questions about the way that scientific advice is formulated and used—or not used—in international marine affairs, and in particular the inherent weaknesses and flaws in the structure of the IWC and of its Scientific Committee.

Japan did of course have another option: to withdraw from the IWC and continue its commercial whaling virtually unimpeded. But this could have had adverse political repercussions, not least to flout the imperative under the Law of the Sea for management and conservation to be assured by intergovernmental instruments such as regional and specialised fisheries management commissions. Fear of those repercussions did not, however, prevent the authorities from repeatedly threatening withdrawal from time to time. (There were precedents for this, notably withdrawals by Norway and The Netherlands, in the years before 1972, when they did not like IWC decisions.) Instead, however, and to create an illusion of seriousness and responsibility, Japan constructed a rationale for its scientific whaling programme. This was, initially, that it was needed in order to provide better estimates of the parameters of mathematical expressions used to provide scientific advice regarding the application of the New Management Procedure (NMP) that the IWC had adopted in 1974 (formally in 1975, coming into effect in 1976) following the UNGA Resolution of 1972. In particular

the claim was that the scientific whaling programme

<sup>2</sup> The Icelandic authorities made the same decision and conducted 'scientific whaling' for several years; this was eventually stopped by pressure from the people of Iceland and the huge cost to the country, whose economy depends on fishing, of boycotts of fish imports from Iceland by traders in Europe encouraged by vigorous consumer campaigns by environmental NGOs, principally Greenpeace.

<sup>3</sup> An attempt to bribe the Government of Seychelles (to dismiss its delegation and to vote with Japan against its original conservation policy) failed because its President resisted and went so far as to publish the exchange of messages between his Government and the diplomatic representatives of Japan. The proposed pay-off was more than 20 million dollars. A few years later Seychelles decided simply to leave the IWC rather than be submitted to further continued diplomatic and financial pressures.

364 S. Holt / Marine Pollution Bulletin 52 (2006) 363-366

would, by allowing the taking of unbiased samples of whales, provide estimates of the natural mortality rate of minke whales in the southern hemisphere. This claim was subsequently shown by the IWC's Scientific Committee to be unrealisable. By the 1990s a revised claim was being made: that data would be provided to make more efficient the application of a Revised Management Procedure (RMP) for the regulation of the catching of baleen whales that had been developed by the Committee and adopted provisionally, though not yet implemented, by the Commission itself. This claim, too, was quickly shown to have no substance.

Some time in the early 1990s a decision was taken in Tokyo to work for a simple majority in the IWC. There were now few if any governments left to 'turn', so the strategy would have to be to persuade more countries to join the IWC and strengthen the Japanese-led coalition. The persuasion used in all cases was the false assertion that recovery of whales and the failure of the IWC to re-open commercial whaling constituted a threat to those countries' fisheries. The 'vote consolidation programme' went into second gear and, by the time of the 2005 IWC meeting in the Republic of Korea, the simple majority had been achieved. Or, at least the Japanese authorities thought it had been. Again it turned out that there were some hitches such as the required payments not being paid on time, credentials of delegations not being in order, and accessions to the IWC of some other countries adhering to the other, non-whaling coalition. Unless there are more adhesions to the latter coalition, in 2005-2006, Japan will in 2006 control a secure simple majority—and government officials have publicly declared that intention, and indicated in some detail what they will do with it.

So what will Japan do with its simple majority, since it cannot (without controlling three-fourths of the votes, an extremely unlikely development) end the current pause or abolish existing sanctuaries, as it would like to do. Previous speculations about this were proven correct when the aims were revealed at the meeting in Korea. They include: ensuring that future voting is by secret ballot (in the expectation that this will help take public pressure off the politicians and delegations of countries that back Japan in the IWC); abolishing the recently established Conservation Committee; removing from the IWC's Agenda annoying subjects such as whale-watching, humane killing and consideration of proposals for more sanctuaries, specifically in the South Atlantic and the South Pacific; and instructing the Scientific Committee to cease its ongoing consideration of the conservation status of the smaller cetacean species. We could also expect a cascade of Resolutions deeply critical of all other conservation measures, such as sanctuaries and of catch limits that might be set, outside sanctuaries, under the extremely

conservative and precautionary version of the RMP adopted but not implemented 14 years ago. Another speculation, to which I do not personally subscribe, was that Japan would act to exclude all international non-governmental organisations (iNGOs) from attending IWC meetings as observers.<sup>4</sup>

While all this political manoeuvring has been going on, and closely associated with it, Japan has been steadily expanding its 'scientific' whaling activities. They are now conducted also in the North Pacific (this helps the cost-benefit calculations for year-round pelagic whaling by a single fleet of one factory ship and a group of catcher boats). The annual catches of minke whales have been doubled, and special permits awarded also for the catching of Bryde's, fin, sei and sperm whales and the endangered humpback and fin whales. These expansions will contribute to the profitability of these operations if and when the large government subsidy to them is discontinued or reduced, especially as one of any of the larger species yields meat equivalent to several of the much smaller minke whales. As in earlier years the Japanese Government feels the need to give a plausible but spurious 'scientific' justification of its new strategy. This takes the form of excavating an old claim, dating from the 1970s, and renewing and updating it, that the minke whales (which official Japanese sources insist have been increasing rapidly, despite the complete lack of scientific evidence for this) are impeding the recovery of other depleted species such as the blue whale, and even of the humpback and fin whales (despite the fact that at least the humpbacks, which were almost exterminated, are increasing).

A different justification is needed, however, for the activities in the North Pacific. This is found in the fact that some of the baleen whales in that region—especially the minke—eat significant quantities of fishes, some of them of species that are exploited commercially by Japan and some other fishing nations. Claims that the whales are a threat to fisheries coincide with the revelations by the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the UN (FAO) and by other bodies and analysts that there is in fact a global fisheries crisis, although the general opinion is that this is due mainly to over-fishing with perhaps contributions from both natural and man-made environmental changes. Apart from other intentions, this claim allows the Japanese authorities to be more persuasive of yet more countries, none of which have ever previously shown the slightest interest in whales or whaling, to join the IWC. But they go further. In recent years we have seen the remarkable sight of those same members of the Japanese supporting group in the IWC playing exactly the same role in bodies such as FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI)—in many case with delegations composed of the same people (Holt, 2005). Accompanying these activities is an unending spate

<sup>4</sup> It is true that Japan has from time to time sought, and failed, to make specific exclusions—these have included IUCN, IFAW, Greenpeace and others—but exclusion of all would cause a financial crisis in the IWC because several hundred iNGOs have to pay exorbitant annual fees for the mere privilege of sitting in the conference room and not distributing documents or talking to delegates while doing so!  
S. Holt / Marine Pollution Bulletin 52 (2006) 363-366 365

of propagandistic materials declaring whales to be a prime cause of the fisheries crisis.

I think the underlying strategy of the Japanese authorities in this matter goes beyond the now revealed issues mentioned above. The 'whales-are-eating-our-fish' argument is a pretext for 'culling', to prevent the recovery of depleted populations and reduce others. It is a policy

of deliberately unsustainable whaling. In the present state of the world's whale stocks only levels of commercial whaling that are biologically unsustainable could possibly provide some short-term profits, without substantial subsidy. In the case of pelagic whaling by Japan the subsidy of course is in the partial government funding of 'research'; the rest of the 'research' costs are explicitly covered by the proceeds from sale of the whale meat obtained, a device that was certainly not envisaged by the drafters of the ICRW. If we may assume, reasonably, that the subsidised whaling by Japan has been just balancing its books, then it is evident that the greatly increased numbers of minke whales to be killed in the 2005/2006 southern and the 2006 northern hemisphere seasons, together with the significant numbers of larger species of baleen whales, will make these operations profitable with a reduced subsidy or perhaps even with none. Any other biologically sustainable and economically profitable pelagic whaling would necessarily have to await the recovery under protection of, at least, the fin, sei and blue whales in the Antarctic and the North Pacific: that will take several decades, at least. At this time in world affairs it needs a strong argument to swim against the idea of sustainable development and the sustainable use of wild living resources such as fishes. 'Culling' predators claimed to be harmful to human interests unfortunately appeals to many people with little appreciation of the complexity and essential unpredictability of ecosystems, particularly marine ones. Robert A. Heinlein's comment, attributed to the Notebooks of Lazerus Long, 1973, is appropriate here: 'The Truth of a Proposition has nothing to do with its Credibility. And vice versa'. To support this 'culling' strategy, and justify expanded 'scientific whaling', involving looking inside the stomachs of many more whales, the Government of Japan has, through its Institute for Cetacean Research (ICR) in Tokyo, distributed a number of pseudo-scientific documents purporting to show that whales consume immensely more 'living marine resources' than are caught by humans, and that this makes them a threat to human welfare. These papers have been very widely used as propaganda but never peer-reviewed or published except in numerous glossy pamphlets issued by the ICR, and quoted in many press releases and briefings all over the world. The claim is itself false but is also essentially irrelevant to the question of whether or not there really is a serious competition for food resources between whales and humans. The ICR documents contain stupendous mistakes of method and errors of calculation, highly selective use of limited data, grossly misleading 'conclusions' and other evidence of scientific incompetence. An institute that produces such materials, and uses them to prop up a national strategy to further deplete, for more short-term profit, already stressed marine resources, should not be treated by the international scientific community as a legitimate research body (see also Gales et al., 2005).

#### References

- ECCEA, 1997. Japan's Strategy to Control the World's Living Marine Resources IFAW and Eastern Caribbean Coalition for Environmental Awareness, Third Millennium Foundation, 2002, revised 2004.
- Gales, N.J et al., 2005. Japan's whaling plan under scrutiny. *Nature* 435, 883-884.
- Holt, S.J., 2005. Are whales enemies of people? Meeting of COFI, Rome 15-19 Feb 2005, available from AFAW, Bristol.
- 366 S. Holt / *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 52 (2006) 363-366

---

## Whales 'absolved' on fish stocks By Alex Kirby **BBC News**

Sorrento, Monday, 19 July, 2004

Japan has argued that cetaceans are damaging fish stocks.

**Whales are hardly ever in competition with humans for fish, a world respected fisheries expert says.** Dr Daniel Pauly, of the University of British Columbia, Canada, says Japan is wrong to blame whales and other marine mammals for reducing fish stocks.

Arguing that whales eat fish which could feed the world's hungry people is "cynical and irresponsible", he said.

Dr Pauly's comments were made as the International Whaling Commission began its four-day annual meeting in Italy.

### **Ocean maps**

The IWC has been split for years between a slowly dwindling anti-whaling majority and a group led by Japan, Norway and Iceland, which wants the 1986 moratorium on commercial whaling lifted. One of their arguments is the contention that whales (with the other cetacean groups, dolphins and porpoises) are eating fish that would otherwise feed humans.

### **There's no need to wage war on [marine mammals] in order to have fish to catch**

Dr Daniel Pauly, University of British Columbia But in a report for Humane Society International - called Competition Between Marine Mammals And Fisheries: Food For Thought - Dr Pauly and his co-author, Kristin Kaschner, say this is untrue. (...)

But they say: "What whales consume is largely stuff that we do not catch, in areas where we do not fish."

The authors reached their conclusion after mapping fish catches against what whales are known to eat.

Dr Pauly told BBC News Online they had made little use of Japanese data on whales' diet obtained from animals killed in Japan's scientific whaling programme. (...)

### **'No blame'**

They mapped catches in these cells during the 1990s and compared them with what the whales were known to have eaten.

The results showed that the degree of overlap between cetacean and human appetites was "very low".

Marine mammals, the authors say, find most of their food where fisheries do not fish, and most of what they eat (for example, plankton and deep sea squid) are of no interest to the fishing fleets. They say 99% of the grids are "low overlap areas".

Dr Pauly told BBC News Online: "The bottom line is that humans and marine mammals can co-exist. There's no need to wage war on them in order to have fish to catch.

**"And there's certainly no cause to blame them for the collapse of the fisheries. It's really cynical and irresponsible for Japan to claim that the developing countries would benefit from a cull of marine mammals."**

**"It's the rich countries that are sucking the fish out of the poor countries' own seas."**

---

**Monday, June 19, 2006**

### **Harpooning a dinosaur**

Immediately after the adoption of a so-called *St Kitts Declaration* at the annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission ([IWC](#)) this afternoon, the main spokesman of the Japanese delegation said it was "a historic day."

In the two operative paragraphs of the resolution, the thirty-three countries that voted in favour:

*\* [...] express[...] concern that the IWC has failed to meet its obligations under the terms of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling ([ICRW](#)), and*

*\* Declar[e][...] commitment to normalizing the functions of the IWC based on the terms of the ICRW and other relevant international law, respect for cultural diversity and traditions of coastal peoples and the fundamental principles of sustainable use of resources, and the need for science-based policy and rulemaking that are accepted as the world standard for the management of marine resources.*

[Commentators in the press](#) and elsewhere are saying that the end of the moratorium on commercial whaling is now one step closer.

But this may or may not be true:

*First*, the adoption of this resolution by 33 *Yeses*, 32 *Nos* and 1 abstention does not resolve the traditional divide within the IWC. It is even likely to deepen it (and, remember, to eliminate the moratorium the pro-whalers would need a three-quarters majority in accordance with the rules of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling). [Several countries are also on record questioning the legality of the vote for various procedural issues.]

*Second*, and more importantly, it is possible that this resolution could have a boomerang effect against the pro-whaling interests. It could trigger a *wake up call* for opinion- and policy-makers (and for the wider public as a result.) [For how long had the IWC not made the front page of the world press?]

The amazingly aggressive language in the resolution, and the unusually undiplomatic words used on the floor by delegations that sponsored the Draft Declaration will maybe ring the alarm bells in the capitals of the countries that have traditionally opposed commercial whaling in the last thirty years.

It could also change the political landscape in many of the countries who are supporting the resumption of commercial whaling. According to [public opinion polls commissioned by the WWF in pro-whaling countries](#), the public opinion in these countries does not support the position of their respective governments on this issue. Now that these governments have helped effectively Japan to win its first victory in 24 years (now that the threat of a resumption of commercial whaling is less hypothetical), it is likely that there will

be more public scrutiny in these countries. People will look more closely at what is behind the interest in whaling of the elites of these countries. We hear them say that they have been convinced by Japan that *whales are going to eat all the fish*. But according to Transparency International, the NGO that fights corruption and bribery, [there may be other reasons](#).

The preambular language of the resolution also:

\* Accept[s] that scientific research has shown that whales consume huge quantities of fish making the issue a matter of food security for coastal nations and requiring that the issue of management of whale stocks must be considered in a broader context of ecosystem management since eco-system management has now become an international standard;

*[This is what the whale conservation community calls the whalers's "whales-eat-fish" argument, which is based on junk science; isn't it ironic that countries known for being largely responsible for the collapse of world fisheries resources such as Japan, Russia, or Korea are blaming the remaining whales instead of getting their acts together? And isn't it sad that a country like Mali puts "whales-eat-fish" on top of their domestic food security agenda?]*

\* Reject[s] as unacceptable that a number of international NGOs with self-interest campaigns should use threats in an attempt to direct government policy on matters of sovereign rights related to the use of resources for food security and national development;

*[The issue of Greenpeace's observer status, with Japan's proposal to expell them from the IWC for their "[interference with whale research](#)" last year in the Antarctic will come up tomorrow.]*

\* Not[es] that the position of some members that are opposed to the resumption of commercial whaling on a sustainable basis irrespective of the status of whale stocks is contrary to the object and purpose of the ICRW.

*[There was an interesting and lively discussion yesterday, around Japan's paper on "normalization" of the IWC vs. a Dutch paper calling for a ministerial conference to "modernize" the IWC, including addressing the issue of compliance, unilateral "scientific catch" permits and a deadlocked Revised Management Scheme. No decision was taken on any of these proposals this year.]*

This afternoon's adoption of the StKitts Declaration is certainly a *coup* for Japan. But maybe only in the short term.

No-one should lose sight of the fact that in the previous two days and a half, Japan lost four other votes that were crucial for their whaling interests. Japan's proposals to exclude consideration of scientific recommendations regarding small cetaceans, to institute secret ballots, and to eliminate the Southern Ocean Sanctuary, as well as their request for a catch limit of 150 minke whales in the North Pacific, were all rejected. What made the difference this evening with the StKitts Declaration proposal was the support of Denmark and the late arrival of Senegal today, one of the countries said to be "*bought*" by Japan.

It is the first time in twenty years that I attend, this week, a meeting of the IWC.

I had been warned in advance that IWC meetings nowadays are in many respects much more chaotic than in the 1970s and the 1980s, when I used to attend them. But the chaos and dysfunctionality are much worse than I had expected.

I attend meetings of many different intergovernmental organizations, and there are of course always reasons to be frustrated or impatient by the slow pace of decision-making, by the weight of bureaucracy, or by political considerations that have little or nothing to do directly with the issues these organizations are meant to address.

But there is something else here in the Whaling Commission. How can I put it?...The IWC cannot hide anymore that it has aged. Many of its patterns are from different times. It's got to move into the 21st century.

[As we noted already a couple of weeks ago](#), this year marks the 60th anniversary of the adoption, in 1946 of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling.

In those sixty years, humankind as well as the Ocean and the rest of the environment, let alone international environmental law, have changed considerably.

But, as the use in the StKitts Declaration of the word "*normalization*" exemplifies (twenty years after Gorbachev's Perestroika !), the IWC continues to be stuck in the past.

Japan is seeking the right to harpoon whales. But today, they harpooned a dinosaur.

<http://www.chezremi.blogspot.com/>

---

## **Compromise talk after whaling win**

By Richard Black

Environment correspondent, **BBC News** website, St Kitts

---

**The International Whaling Commission's annual meeting has ended with talk of compromise, despite a key victory for pro-whaling nations.**

Japan says some anti-whaling nations are softening their stance.

And the anti-whaling US is talking of working with whaling nations to make the practice more sustainable.

But environmental groups are firmly against any compromise and are urging anti-whaling countries to stand firm against a return to commercial hunting.

Some are planning new campaigns to increase public awareness.

### **'Little achieved'**

Harking back to the "save the whales" campaigns of the past which ushered in the current global ban on commercial hunting, the new mantra appears to be "save the whales - again".

There is general disappointment in the environmental community that this meeting has seen anti-whaling countries on the defensive.



"Regardless of the rhetoric and posturing, very little has been achieved for either whales or people this week," said Sue Lieberman, director of the global species programme at WWF.

"Nearly 2,000 whales have been killed by Japan, Norway and Iceland since last year's meeting - where is conservation?"

Mike Townsley of Greenpeace, who found himself arrested along with nine other activists while attempting to hold a demonstration on the beach outside the IWC conference hotel, added: "We've got to remember that although nothing really bad happened, nothing good happened either.

"This year in December, the Southern Ocean sanctuary will be breached again by the Japanese so-called scientific whaling fleet."

Despite comments by Japan that it will seek to find ways of protecting its ships against Greenpeace's operations, the environmental group says it will be back in the Southern Ocean next season.

### **Moving together?**

Although environmental groups remain almost entirely united against a return to commercial whaling, there were signs emerging that some nations are prepared to work together towards a compromise.

"I think we are sensing a slight change of attitude among [anti-whaling] member countries of the IWC," said Joji Morishita, deputy whaling commissioner for Japan.

The country gained an important symbolic victory on Sunday with the adoption by just one vote of the St Kitts Declaration, a resolution endorsing an eventual return to commercial whaling.

"Because the sustainable-use side had the St Kitts Declaration adopted, there is more willingness to talk about the compromise or middle ground," Mr Morishita told the BBC News website. "I would definitely like to encourage that willingness for next year's meeting in Anchorage."

If Japan is willing to talk, so is the United States.

Its whaling commissioner William Hogarth said that although the US remained opposed to commercial whaling, it is prepared to work with pro-whaling nations to ensure that if the ban is eventually lifted, hunting would be conducted along sustainable lines.

The current situation, he indicated, could not be allowed to endure.

"The bottom line is that the number of whales taken is increasing; it increased by 1,000 between 2005 and 2006," he told reporters.

"And so the goal should be to put a process in place that will protect the whales and make sure that any removal will not impede their recovery or cause a return to the position they were in [before the ban]."

### **Business as usual**

What appears certain is that the three countries which currently catch whales will continue for the foreseeable future, unmoved by the protestations of environmental groups.

Norway lodged an objection against the moratorium at its inception, and is allowed to catch minke whales commercially.

"Norway's intention is to continue to develop commercial whaling," commented Rune Frovik, secretary of the High North Alliance, which promotes the interests of whalers and fishermen in the north of Norway.

"It will probably increase the quota in the coming years, and perhaps other species will be added," he told the BBC News website.

"But that depends on the scientific work that's done and also on the market conditions - we need access to the Japanese market, and that's what we think is paramount."

Japan and Iceland hunt under an article in the whaling convention allowing catches for scientific research.

Indigenous groups, principally around the Arctic, take smaller numbers for local consumption.

Quotas for these indigenous groups are due for review at next year's IWC meeting in Anchorage, when the US will take its turn to chair the Commission.

By then the anti-whaling bloc will probably be stronger, boosted by the extra number of countries which European delegates hope to bring onto the IWC now that the whalers have had their victory.

[Richard.Black-INTERNET@bbc.co.uk](mailto:Richard.Black-INTERNET@bbc.co.uk)

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/5100936.stm>

---

GREENPEACE

2005

## **THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN'S RECRUITING DRIVE AT THE IWC**

The June 8, 2005, edition of the Japanese language Newsweek called it 'Japan's whaling diplomacy' and said it has been doing very well. Japanese officials have called it 'vote recruitment'. Newsweek also reported that some criticize Japan by saying that they are buying votes, although Japan claims that it has nothing to do with aid (called overseas development assistance in Japan).

Whatever you call this effort, it is clear that it is going on and the Government of Japan is working to recruit a majority to vote with it at the IWC and overturn the global ban on whaling. This effort is being pursued at high levels.

The former vice minister of Agriculture, forestry and Fisheries, Hiroaki Kameya, said in June, 1999 that it was "essential to increase the number of nations supportive to Japan ... [and therefore] necessary to couple effectively overseas development assistance and the promotion of IWC membership."

On Friday, 27 August, 2004 the daily press briefing at Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs included a statement that: "[Parliamentary Secretary for Foreign Affairs Kazunori Tanaka] will visit places where Japan's economic cooperation is actually in action. He will also try to promote cooperative relations in the international arena on such issues as obtaining a non-permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council, Security Council reform and the International Whaling Commission." Mr. Tanaka was visiting Uganda, Malawi and Madagascar and although they have not yet joined the IWC, Mali did a few months later.

The Washington Post reported on 7 Jan, 2005:

"Yet the fate of the world's whales may be decided by landlocked Mali, which has just joined the World Whaling Council at the behest of the Japanese, and now could cast a deciding vote for the resumption of commercial whaling in exchange for development aid to cope with the country's many problems."

The Government of Japan's effort has concentrated on poor developing countries and has brought 14 of them into the IWC since 1999. Is it whaling diplomacy, vote recruitment or vote buying? The following items are recent news stories and reports.

-In an interview with Los Angeles Times in 1997, the then IWC Commissioner for St. Vincent, Stuart Nanton, acknowledged that aid played a role in his country's politics and said that it was 'only logical' that his country would support Japan as they had given aid (while at the same time saying that aid from the United States to developing countries was decreasing). ['Support of whaling is no fluke', LA Times 19/12/97]

-In 1999 a representative of the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Hideki Moronuki, was quoted as saying that Japan hoped to coax developing nations to join the IWC in exchange for financial assistance. Aid would be offered in hopes of balancing the votes in Japan's favour at the IWC. [Japan urges support for whaling', AP 6/13/1999]

-A senior minister in Dominica, when questioned about whether Japanese interests had paid for his country's annual IWC dues stated: "Put it like this, we make no allocation for it in our national budget." ['Save the whales? Not if Japan's bribes pay off.', Observer, 13/5/2004]

-During the 53rd IWC meeting in 2001, CNN reported a statement made by the Prime Minister of Antigua and Barbuda, Lester Bird (and confirmed in an interview with the Caribbean News Agency (CANA) saying "Quite frankly I make no bones about it ... if we are able to support the Japanese and quid pro quo is that they are going to give us some assistance, I am not going to be a hypocrite; that is part of why we do so."

[[www.cnn.com/2001/world/asiapcf/east/07/19/japan.whaling/](http://www.cnn.com/2001/world/asiapcf/east/07/19/japan.whaling/),  
[www.slucia.com/archive/news/old\\_news\\_040801.html](http://www.slucia.com/archive/news/old_news_040801.html)]

- On September 3, 2003, AP reported that the former Agriculture Minister in Grenada, Michael Baptiste, had been arrested the day before and charged with stealing a donation to the Government of Grenada which had been wired to his private bank account by an individual in the United States. Grenadian media reported that Baptiste had said the money was sent by persons or agents who are looking for Governments who support their view at the IWC.

-The 2004 Global Corruption Report from Transparency International, which had a special focus on political corruption, included an article entitled "Vote Buying at the International Whaling Commission". It can be found at [www.globalcorruptionreport.org](http://www.globalcorruptionreport.org) and is reproduced in full overleaf.

---