

- NAMMCO-

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

**Report of the
Third Meeting of the Council**

**Reykjavík, Iceland
1-2 July 1993**

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Report of the Third Meeting of the Council Reykjavík, Iceland - 1-2 July 1993

Contents

Report of the Council	Page ... 3
Appendixes:	
1. Agenda	... 9
2. List of participants	...11
3. Address of Welcome by Mr Þorsteinn Pálsson, Minister of Fisheries, Iceland	...13
4. Opening Statement - Faroe Islands	...15
5. Opening Statement - Greenland	...17
6. Opening Statement - Norway	...19
7. Lecture: "Whales - Commodities for Whom?" by Dr Arne Kalland, Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, Copenhagen	...21
8. Statement from Government of Japan	...33
9. Report of the First Meeting of the Scientific Committee	...35
10. Report of the Second Meeting of the Management Committee	...41
11. Rules of Procedure for the Management Committee	...43
12. Report of the ad hoc Working Group on Information	...45
13. Press Release	...51

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Report of the Third Meeting of the Council Reykjavik, Iceland 1-2 July 1993

The third meeting of the Council of NAMMCO was held at Borgartún 6 in Reykjavik on July 1 and 2, 1993. The meeting was chaired by Kjartan Hoydal, Chairman of the Council. The agenda is contained in Appendix 1. The meeting was attended by delegations from the member countries: the Faroe Islands, Greenland, Iceland and Norway. Also present were observers from the Governments of Canada, Denmark, Japan and the Russian Federation. Observers from the International Whaling Commission (IWC), the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), and the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) also attended the meeting, as well as observers from a number of non-governmental organizations. Participants are listed in Appendix 2.

Opening Procedures

1. Address of Welcome

Mr Þorstein Pálsson, the Minister of Fisheries of Iceland, gave an address of welcome (Appendix 3).

2. Opening Statements

Opening statements were made by the heads of delegations from the Faroe Islands, Greenland and Norway (Appendices 4-6).

3. Lecture

Dr Arne Kalland of the Nordic Institute of Asian Studies was invited to give a lecture to the meeting. The title of his paper was: "Whales - Commodities for Whom?".

Dr Kalland discussed the way in which "non-consumptive" views of whales have gained prominence in the West in recent times, in line with a form of totemic thinking in which whales have become potent symbols for environmental issues in general. In this context, whales, once commodities in commercial whaling, have been transformed into different, but arguably even more lucrative commercial commodities in non-whaling urban Western cultures today, through media presentations and whale watching tours. According to Dr Kalland, conflicts exist because this diversion of the commodity path with respect to whales does not allow for a recognition of cultural differences or alternative views of whales as resources for human consumption. Rather it promotes simplistic views of whaling as unnecessary and of whalers as the "bad guys" and "greedy capitalists".

Dr Kalland's paper is contained in Appendix 7.

4. Appointment of Rapporteur

Kate Sanderson (Faroe Islands/interim secretary) was appointed as rapporteur.

5. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda, as contained in Appendix 1, was adopted.

6. Admission of Observers

A number of observers from governments, inter-governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations were admitted to the meeting.

The observer from Japan, Mr Masahiro Ishikawa, presented a statement to the meeting on behalf of the Government of Japan (Appendix 8).

Administration and Finance

7. Establishment of Secretariat

The Chairman reported on the selection of applicants for positions in the secretariat. He noted the large number of well-qualified people who had applied for the position of secretary. He reported that the position had been offered to two candidates, and that it had been decided that Kate Sanderson would be secretary, and Jens Paulsen assistant secretary. It was expected that the secretariat would be established within the next 2-3 months and should be functioning properly in the autumn. Norway stated that the location of the offices of the secretariat had not been fully confirmed, but that the secretariat would likely be housed in the same building as the Institute of Arctic Biology at the University of Tromsø.

8. Budget/Finance

The Chairman reported that the expenses of NAMMCO so far in 1993 were well within the limits set for the financial year. It was clarified that the proposed budget as put forward at the inaugural meeting of NAMMCO in Tórshavn in 1992, was calculated in Danish kroner, and that Norway's extra contribution was 250,000 Norwegian kroner.

9. Meeting arrangements

The idea was discussed of holding every second meeting of NAMMCO at the headquarters of the secretariat. Also discussed was the need of working groups for sufficient time prior to Council meetings to finalize work and prepare reports. Greenland also pointed out that, as far as bookings for tickets and accommodation in Greenland were concerned, dates for meetings held in Greenland in the autumn would have to be agreed upon well in advance.

Scientific Committee

10. Report from the Chairman of the Scientific Committee

The Chairman of the Scientific Committee, Jóhann Sigurjónsson, reported to the Council on the first meeting of the Scientific Committee which was held in Tromsø in January 1993. The report of the Scientific Committee is contained in Appendix 9.

The Chairman expressed his desire for the support of the Council for his wording of the terms of reference for the Working Group on Management Procedures. The Council acknowledged its support for the way in which the Chairman of the Scientific Committee had interpreted the mandate of the Working Group. Reference is made to item 3 in the Report from the Management Committee, July 1 1993 (Appendix 10).

The Chairman of the Scientific Committee also referred to the possible need for outside expertise and the expenses involved with this. The Chairman of the Council referred to the proposed budget, which included a budget of DKR 390,000 for the use of the Scientific Committee, and pointed out that such expenses should be accommodated within this overall budget.

11. Cooperation with ICES

The Chairman of the Council explained that no formal arrangements had yet been made with ICES, but that this would be done in due course. This would also involve arrangements for fees from NAMMCO to ICES.

The Chairman reported that a new Chairman, Dr Doug Butterworth, had been appointed to the ICES Study Group on Pilot Whales, and that the Study Group would be meeting in Copenhagen in August/September 1993.

The Chairman also pointed out that there had been a misunderstanding on the part of the Chairman/Secretariat as to the way in which advice on harp and hooded seals was transmitted to ICES. The matter would be clarified with the ICES secretariat as well as the NAFO secretariat as soon as possible.

12. Other matters

Iceland referred to the valuable and constructive data obtained from the North Atlantic Sightings Surveys conducted in 1987 and 1989, and proposed that another such survey should be conducted under the auspices of the Scientific Committee. This was important for two reasons: firstly, sufficient time had passed since the last survey was carried out in 1989 and, secondly, close and regular monitoring of baleen whale stocks was a necessary basis for recently developed management schemes, and such monitoring should also apply to small cetaceans. It was considered unlikely that any other body would take the initiative for such joint research efforts in the foreseeable future, and that this would be an appropriate task for NAMMCO to undertake.

The Council therefore requested the Scientific Committee to plan joint cetacean sighting surveys in the North Atlantic by coordinating national research programmes.

The possibility of conducting the survey in 1994 was discussed, as a large-scale joint survey was also planned to take place in the North Sea in 1994. Greenland, however, expressed its preference for conducting the survey in 1995 due to other work planned for the forthcoming year. The Chairman suggested that the timing and arrangements for the survey be left to the Scientific Committee to decide according to what it considered most appropriate and practical.

Management Committee

13. Report from the Management Committee

The Management Committee held its second meeting on July 1 in Reykjavik. The report of the Management Committee is contained in Appendix 10. The Rules of Procedure for the Management Committee, which were adopted at the meeting, are contained in Appendix 11.

The Council decided to establish a Working Group to consider inspection and observation schemes, in order to harmonize national regulations and thereby *interalia* ensure that data collected will be compatible.

14. Advice on specific stocks

No further advice on specific stocks was requested by the Management Committee.

Environmental Questions

15. Impacts on marine mammals and their environment

The Council agreed to entrust the secretariat with the task of planning an international conference on "marine mammals and the marine environment", to be held in 1994. The conference shall address questions relating to pollution of the marine environment and how and when marine mammals are affected by this. An informal working group consisting of one member nominated from each Party shall be consulted as to the explicit content of the conference programme.

The Council also discussed the need for increased cooperation with other international fora in which the critical elements of the concept of sustainability are being discussed and developed, with particular reference to the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, as well as continued international cooperation and dialogue in other contexts resulting from the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED).

Other matters

16. Report from the ad hoc Working Group on Information

The report of the ad hoc Working Group on Information was presented to the Council by the group's convener, Kate Sanderson.

The Council agreed to establish the NAMMCO Fund, as proposed by the Working Group on Information. The Fund will initially be established with surplus funds from the annual NAMMCO budget for 1993. Further contributions will be discussed at subsequent meetings of the Council. A Board will be established consisting of one representative from each NAMMCO member country, and the Fund will be administered by the Secretariat. The Fund will be used to support projects which contribute to increased knowledge and understanding of the rational and sustainable utilization of marine mammals.

It was suggested that a clause be included in the statute for the Fund to make provisions for the settlement of finances in the event that the Fund is dissolved.

The Working Group also pointed to the importance of maintaining the International Conference on the Rational Utilization of Marine Mammals, which, it noted, had not been organized in 1993.

The report of the ad hoc Working Group on Information, including the draft statute for the NAMMCO Fund, is contained in Appendix 12.

17. External relations

The Interim Secretary reported on contacts and correspondence established between the secretariat and other inter-governmental organizations since the last meeting of the Council. The secretariats of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS - Bonn Convention) had both expressed interest in establishing informal observer relations with NAMMCO, but for practical reasons were unable to send observers to the present Council meeting. A request for observer relations with NAMMCO had also recently been received from the interim secretariat of ASCOBANS (the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans in the Baltic and North Seas) - an agreement under the Bonn Convention.

Jóhann Sigurjónsson agreed to represent NAMMCO at the forthcoming 81st Statutory Meeting of the Council of ICES in Dublin. Arrangements for the appointment of NAMMCO observers to other meetings would be made later through the Secretariat.

The observer from the European Bureau for Conservation and Development, Despina Symons, informed the Council of recent developments and activities in the EC which have implications for NAMMCO, and where more input from NAMMCO members would be useful. These included the drafting of a report on fisheries and marine mammal interaction by the Fisheries Sub-Committee of the European Parliament. This report would likely call for further research into specific aspects of interactions between marine mammals and fisheries and a review of the seal culling ban. Ms Symons also reported on plans to create an Intergroup for Resource Conservation and Development within the European Parliament, which would also be a valuable forum for presenting more balanced information on environmental and resource management questions. Finally, Ms Symons

stressed the importance for NAMMCO of establishing contact with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and in particular their Working Group for the Sustainable Use of Wildlife.

Greenland thanked the observer from EBCD for her information, and suggested that the Secretariat should in particular aim to gather information on the following areas and report back to the next meeting of the Council:

- 1) recent developments in CITES, as also mentioned by Mr Ishikawa, the observer from the Government of Japan;
- 2) the next IUCN conference and the possibilities of NAMMCO becoming a member of IUCN;
- 3) other meetings, conferences and working groups of relevance to NAMMCO in which issues related to marine mammals and the principles of sustainable utilization of living resources were being further discussed and developed.

It would be left to the Chairman to decide whether the Secretariat should be represented at the next IUCN conference to be held in Buenos Aires in January 1994.

Closing arrangements

18. Adoption of report

A final report was not adopted by the meeting. It was agreed that the Interim Secretary would complete the report and send a draft to members for comments before the final version is distributed to participants.

19. Adoption of Press Release

The Press Release, as contained in Appendix 13, was adopted.

20. Any other business

The Council asked the observers from Canada and the Russian Federation to convey to their respective Governments the sincere wish of the Council of NAMMCO for Canada and the Russian Federation to join the organization. The Chairman would also convey this message in writing to the Governments of Canada and the Russian Federation.

It was suggested that meetings in the Working Groups on Hunting Methods and Inspection and Observation be held in Copenhagen from September 20 - 22.

It was agreed to hold the next meeting of the Council in January/early February 1994 in Tromsø, when, amongst other things, the annual budget for 1994 and the report from the November meeting of the Scientific Committee could be discussed.

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Third Meeting of the Council
Reykjavik, Iceland - July 1-2, 1993

Agenda

Opening procedures

- 1.# Address of Welcome by the Minister of Fisheries, Þorsteinn Pálsson
- 2.# Opening Statements
- 3.# Lecture by Dr Arne Kalland, Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, Copenhagen
Title of lecture: "Whales - Commodities for Whom?"
4. Appointment of Rapporteur
5. Adoption of Agenda
6. Admission of Observers

Administration and finance

7. Establishment of Secretariat
8. Budget/Finance 1993
9. Meeting arrangements

Scientific Committee

10. Report from the Chairman of the Scientific Committee
11. Cooperation with ICES
12. Other matters

Management Committee

13. Report from the Management Committee
14. Advice on specific stocks

Environmental questions

15. Impacts on marine mammals and their environment

Other matters

16. Report from the ad hoc Working Group on Information
17. External relations

Closing arrangements

18. Adoption of Report
19. Adoption of Press Release
20. Any other business

Public sessions

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Third Meeting of the Council
Reykjavík, Iceland - 1-2 July, 1993

List of Participants

NAMMCO member delegations:

Faroe Islands

Kjartan Hoydal (Chairman)
Kate Sanderson (Interim secretary)
Jústines Olsen
Hans Jacob Hermansen

Greenland

Einar Lemche
Jens Paulsen
Amalie Jessen
Hansi Kreutzmann

Iceland

Kjartan Júlíusson
Guðmundur Eiríksson
Halldór Árnason
Jóhann Sigurjónsson
Gisli Víkingsson
Arnór Halldórsson
Hörður H. Bjarnason
Grétar Már Sigurðsson
Snorri Pálmason
Kristján Skarphéðinsson
Kristján Loftsson
Konráð Eggertsson
Óskar Vigfússon
Helgi Laxdal
Benedikt Valsson
Laura Konráðsdóttir (interpreter)

Norway

Stein Owe
Halvard P. Johansen
Jan Arvesen
Alf Håkon Hoel
Hallstein Rasmussen
Hild Ynnesdal
Jon Lauritzen
Steinar Bastesen
Runar Hartvigsen

Government observers:

<u>Canada</u>	Dan Goodman Ken Brynaert
<u>Denmark</u>	Otto H. Larsen
<u>Japan</u>	Masahiro Ishikawa Shigeko Misaki (interpreter)
<u>Russian Federation</u>	Iouri A. Rechetov Mikhail Y. Ponomarev

Inter-governmental observers:

<u>ICES</u>	Jóhann Sigurjónsson
<u>NAFO</u>	Hallstein Rasmussen
<u>IWC</u>	Otto H. Larsen

Non-governmental observers:

<u>EBCD</u>	Despina Symons
<u>High North Alliance</u>	Georg Blichfeldt
<u>Inuvialuit Game Council</u>	Larry Carpenter
<u>IWGIA</u>	Mats Ris
<u>Regional Authority of Northern Norway</u>	Jostein Angell

Invited speaker: Dr Arne Kalland, Nordic Institute
of Asian Studies, Copenhagen

**Opening address of Mr Thorsteinn Pálsson, Minister of Fisheries
3rd meeting of the NAMMCO Council
Opening session, Reykjavik, 1 July 1993**

Dear ambassadors, representatives of contracting parties, observers, ladies and gentlemen.

With great honour and pleasure, I welcome you to Iceland on behalf of my Government. The next two days the established North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO) will hold its 3rd formal meeting, which I am convinced will bring us some few steps forward towards our common goal of proper management and conservation of marine mammals in the North Atlantic Ocean.

As you all know, Iceland is totally dependent on its living marine resources, with no less than 80% of its export earnings derived from marine products. Management based on scientific findings is of the utmost importance for Iceland's livelihood. While new technology has helped us to exploit the natural resources in this harsh part of the world, we find ourselves now in the situation where we must apply every effort to avoid over-exploitation of the stocks. I am convinced that the situation in the countries represented here is the same. Among other factors, this formed the basis for the establishment of NAMMCO, for which we in Iceland have great expectations.

With respect to marine mammals, management in recent years has increasingly taken the form of full protection of the species rather than rational utilization of the stocks, despite the fact that many of the stocks are at present at such a high level that they can sustain a controlled harvest. The reason for this is that in some western countries interest groups that regard marine mammal species in some ways more special than other animal life have distributed to the public misleading information on the status of the stocks. Many of these groups in fact oppose the harvesting of these species under any circumstances and do not regard them as an exploitable resource. Unfortunately, some Governments have acted accordingly by imposing measures that are rather irrational with respect to the optimal utilization of the marine ecosystem, and in fact which are contradictory to the results of the 1992 Rio Conference on the Environment on sustainable development and utilization of natural renewable resources.

The dominance of these attitudes lead the Government of Iceland to take the serious step of leaving the International Whaling Commission (IWC) with effect from 30 June last year. After having devoted great resources to research and other activities within that organization, and after having contributed significantly to the work of the Commission to ascertain the situation of the whale stocks and after having indeed thus established the basis for resumption of limited and controlled whaling, all Iceland's proposals for such whaling were rejected. One year later, the situation within the Commission seems to be just the same, and nations interested in the rational management of whale resources continue to meet limited understanding of the fellow members of the IWC.

The withdrawal from the IWC was a difficult decision for Iceland, but we continue to be convinced that it was a correct one. The organization still fails to live up to its responsibilities. Some member states have even declared that their position on the whaling issue is no longer governed by scientific findings and that they would not be in favour of any commercial whaling despite the healthy status of some of the stocks.

The recent resignation of the Chairman of the IWC Scientific Committee is perhaps the single most clear demonstration of the serious difficulties the IWC finds itself in and reflects the disrespectful attitude of the Commission towards the work of its own Scientific Committee.

To me it seems thus that there is no future for the IWC as a responsible organization for the management of whaling. In fact, it does not sound convincing when some members of the IWC express their wish to expand the scope of the organization's activities to include the numerous small cetacean species and stocks throughout the world when the organization does not even cope with its present tasks.

Therefore, the Government of Iceland considers NAMMCO's role extremely important and will give all its efforts to strengthen the organization. In order to have that happen member governments of NAMMCO must recognize their commitments and obligations as responsible coastal states as regards research and active cooperation in management. We would like to see our scientific cooperation strengthened and will propose at this meeting that first steps be taken in planning the conduct of joint international surveys sponsored by NAMMCO member nations.

We also have other important tasks to do, such as intensified activities in dissemination of information with respect to marine mammal stocks and the situation of the northern communities that are dependent on these animals as a resource. I am convinced that well organized and well founded information activities will yield more favourable public response than we may have experienced up to now.

All this will strengthen NAMMCO as an appropriate international organization in the area of research, management and conservation of marine mammals. We are aware of the need for patience in building up an internationally acknowledged and widely respected organization of this kind. In fact, we have appreciated the important progress already made within this organization, given the short time since its formal establishment. However, in light of the fact that we already have available information showing that some stocks of whales in our waters can sustain controlled catches at present and taking into account that no less than seven whaling seasons have passed since Iceland carried out commercial whaling, Icelanders generally regard that the time has come for the resumption of commercial whaling at some scale.

It is clear that the attitude of the members of NAMMCO to the IWC differ, reflecting their differing situations. But we all share the same basic interests. We in Iceland wish to take steps to expand the scope of NAMMCO's activities in order to strengthen our position towards the clear goal of commencing the harvesting of minke whales in Icelandic waters. I would hope that cooperation on a wider basis than we had envisioned for our initial activities would not prejudice the obligations of our NAMMCO partners with respect to the IWC. It is clear that regional cooperation with respect to the conservation, management and study of marine mammals is fully consistent with our obligations under international law. It would appear appropriate to take the first further steps towards such expanded cooperation under the auspices of NAMMCO in the field of scientific research. I hope this view can be shared by those present at this meeting.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome you all to our country. And I wish you pleasant and fruitful discussions on the important issues on your agenda. May this meeting strengthen NAMMCO and the important goals the organization was formed to serve.

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Third Meeting of the Council
Reykjavik, Iceland, 1-2 July 1993

Opening Statement by the Faroe Islands

The Faroese delegation wishes to thank the Ministry of Fisheries of Iceland for hosting this 3rd Meeting of NAMMCO. The Faroe Islands are reassured by the rapid building up of our organization, which is now almost fully functional and able to undertake the work ahead of it.

This meeting follows the 45th Annual Meeting of the IWC in Kyoto. We would like to share with the other delegations our assessment of the present situation.

NAMMCO has a full mandate on all marine mammals in our region. In our scientific approach we have to deal with all elements in the ecosystem with regard to marine mammals - seals and small and large cetaceans alike.

For the time being it is the consensus of the Parties that as far as management is concerned, we only deal with seals and small cetaceans, for which no other appropriate international organization is in place. The Faroe Islands maintain their right to exploit large cetaceans, if this can be done on a sustainable basis. At present it would seem that the stock numbers of large whales around the Faroes are not such that exploitation could be allowed.

We have an obligation to cooperate with other countries on large whales, and at present this is done within the IWC through our representation on the Danish delegation. The Faroe Islands are, however, very dissatisfied with the operation of the IWC for two reasons. Firstly, the IWC repeatedly interferes in questions over which it has no competence. The escalation in the war of resolutions on the Faroese pilot whale hunt is an extremely worrying fact. Secondly, the majority in the IWC seems now to openly neglect the IWC's own Convention in the decision-making process. In other words, the IWC seems to have reached a point where it is not able to fulfil its own responsibilities, and this leaves the large whales in a vacuum.

In a press release issued on May 28, the Faroese Prime Minister, Marita Petersen, declared that she would seek a position for the Faroe Islands outside the IWC. This has been pursued for the last two years by the Faroese Government, but no political or legal formula has been found so far that has allowed this. There has as yet been no political decision on how we should proceed when the Faroe Islands cease to be bound by the International Convention on the Regulation of Whaling. But it is obvious that we will seek cooperation on large whales in addition to the management cooperation we already have on seals and small cetaceans. As it was said in the Prime Minister's press release: "The Faroe Islands have already established the necessary basis for multilateral cooperation on science and sustainable exploitation of marine mammals in the regional agreement on NAMMCO."

We have no doubt that the IWC has reached a point where one can be fully justified in saying that it is not fulfilling its statutory responsibilities. When that has been fully and widely realised, then the time will have come to find the correct procedure for dealing with the large whales elsewhere, according to international agreements. We have no doubt that the obvious candidate for taking over the job will be NAMMCO.

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Third Meeting of the Council
Reykjavik, Iceland, 1-2 July 1993

Opening Statement by Greenland

Mr Chairman,

Opening statements are normally used to emphasize standpoints which are specific to delegations - or to comment on new developments.

It appears from the opening statements at our meeting in Tromsø in January that there is widespread agreement between NAMMCO members. We all favour rational management and sustainable utilization of marine mammals based upon the UNCED principles. We all favour management decisions taken on a scientific basis, and we are certainly keen to maintain the scientific integrity of NAMMCO.

With this in mind, there is no apparent reason for Greenland to underline specific standpoints vis a vis other members. Of course there are distinctions between our delegations, due to different interests, different priorities and different considerations with regard to our hinterlands - but in general we are in agreement.

Why, then, make an opening statement? Have there been any new developments? Yes, there have. It is not news that we have our common basic standpoints. It is not news that our standpoints are seen as peculiar in the eyes of the world - or the world media. It is not news that the majority - the marine mammal majority in the world - does not play by the rules.

The news is that this majority has openly declared and shown that they do not intend to play by the rules, as was clearly seen in Kyoto.

Where does this leave us? When the majority plays without rules - what should the minority do?

- Should we continue to stick to the rules, hoping that fair play will eventually prevail? In this connection, the position of the Greenland Home Rule Government is well known. But it should also be mentioned that KNAPK, our fishermen and hunters' organization, clearly wants a strong regional organization instead of a lame global organization.
- Should we start playing by our own rules, as the majority does?
- Should we expand the role of NAMMCO? The Icelandic Minister spoke of an expanded role. Should we also expand NAMMCO's role into fisheries, taking into account recent developments as revealed in the latest film by Magnus Guðmundsson?
- Should we in common, as a kind of minority in the world, seek minority treatment? Do minorities only occur within states? Should we claim global minority rights as other minority rights were claimed a fortnight ago at the United Nations Conference on Human Rights in Vienna?

Mr Chairman, I realize that this is not so much an opening statement as an opening questionnaire.

I wish all of us fruitful discussions at this meeting. Not all of my questions are likely to be answered here and now, but I am confident that out of our discussions will emerge elements which will prove useful for any future answers to these questions.

Thank you Mr Chairman.

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Third Meeting of the Council
Reykjavik, Iceland, 1-2 July 1993

Opening Statement by Norway

There is a relationship between the development in the IWC and the future of our organization.

Norway's primary goal at this year's Annual Meeting of the IWC was the adoption of the Revised Management Scheme. This would have meant that the moratorium no longer applied to i.a. the Northeast Atlantic minke whale stock, and that Norway would have been allocated a catch quota.

However, a majority of the IWC members, for a number of reasons, opposed a decision that would have opened the way for whaling approved by the IWC. The Government of Norway deplores this attitude, especially given the fact that the Norwegian viewpoints met with wide support in the Scientific Committee and notable sympathy in the working groups.

The pattern that appears to be emerging is that the IWC is avoiding decisions that may lead to the resumption of whaling, deliberately disregarding the work of the Scientific Committee. However, the 1946 Whaling Convention states that all decisions made by the IWC are to be taken on a scientific basis. Thus it can be noted that the credibility of the IWC as an international organization for the management of natural resources has been further eroded during the Kyoto meeting.

Nevertheless, the Government of Norway has decided to maintain Norwegian membership in the IWC, and will continue to work for the changing of the IWC into a genuine management organization.

Regardless of the outcome of the Kyoto meeting, the Norwegian Government has confirmed its decision of resuming the traditional minke whaling this year. The decision rests on various considerations.

The whaling issue concerns the right of a nation to utilize available natural resources on a scientific and sustainable basis in accordance with the principles adopted by the international community at the UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. It is an established scientific fact that Norwegian minke whaling is ecologically justifiable. Whaling provides employment and income in areas where there are few alternatives to activities based on marine resources, and forms an integral part of the local culture of many coastal communities. It is also clear that whale stocks should be harvested in order to develop the soundest possible management regimes for marine resources, based on a multi-species approach.

The quota for this year's whaling season has been determined by applying the management procedure for baleen whales developed by the Scientific Committee of the IWC. The 1993 quota of 296 minke whales, 136 of which are to be taken under the scientific programme, is even set somewhat lower than the minimum quota that the IWC would have specified if it had followed its own rules.

For Norway as a small country heavily dependent on the utilization of its natural resources, it is important to be able to resist the unfounded pressure from major powers. If countries are forced to accept rules prohibiting the sound use of certain resources, the very foundation of international cooperation and agreement on environment and development issues will be endangered. This is why the question of Norwegian minke whaling might be said to be bigger than whales.

Whales: Commodities for Whom?

Paper presented at the 3rd meeting
of the Council
of the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission
Reykjavik, July 1, 1993

Arne Kalland
Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, Copenhagen

Introduction

During the last 15-20 years, the so-called "low-consumptive use" of cetaceans has been in vogue, and today such usage has become a multi-billion dollar industry. In 1991 more than 4 million people reportedly spent more than US\$ 300 million on whale watching activities alone (Hoyt 1992:1). Moreover, large amounts of money are spent on dolphinariums, "swim-with-a-whale" programmes, on glossy picture books and other literature featuring whales, on "cetacean art", "whale music", stickers, posters, photos, stamps, bags, T-shirts, soft toys, buttons, jewellery, computer games, etc. And last, but not least, many organizations gain most of their income from anti-whaling campaigns.

It would be wrong, however, to assume that it is only money that keeps the anti-whaling campaigns going. Such an assumption would seriously underestimate the strength of the movement.

People are attracted to the "save the whale" cause and are receptive to pleas for money for a number of reasons, not least because whales have become metonyms for nature. Environmental issues are complex and beyond the comprehension of most of us. To mentally organize a bewildering array of conflicting messages, simplifications are called for. We bring order into this chaos by creating distinctions where none actually exist. We think in categories, in stereotypes. Symbols are used to organize the world around us. Totemism is one powerful symbol system, whereby people are divided into categories, each associated with an animal, plant, natural phenomenon or object.

Certain sectors of the environmental and animal rights movements make use of such totemic systems of thought, in which mankind is divided into two opposing categories: Those who care for the earth and the future *versus* those who seek short-term profit. In *this* worldview whales serve as a totem for the nature-loving people, while money serves as the totem for the greedy capitalists, represented by the whalers.

If we are to understand the anti-whaling campaign it is necessary to go into this totemic system and uncover inconsistencies and contradictions in the system itself. The worldview of many of the protectionists divides mankind according to the following set of binary oppositions:

Totem: whale	:	Totem: money
nature	:	man-made objects (commodities)
subsistence	:	commercialism
indigenous people	:	industrial world
traditional	:	modern
protectionist	:	whaler
pure	:	polluted
good	:	bad
civilized	:	barbaric

I will not argue for the validity of these oppositions here (see Kalland 1993), but only stress the dichotomy between whale, nature, and subsistence on one side and money, man-made objects (commodities), and commercialism on the other.

One immediate problem in this worldview is, of course, where to place the so-called "aboriginal subsistence whaler". This has caused some controversy, but many of the anti-whalers have accepted aboriginal whaling as long as it is for subsistence and not commercial. Commercialism in itself seems to be considered bad by the protectionists as well as by the majority of the contracting members to the IWC, and it is ironic that this view is expressed by governments that are usually strong advocates of free trade and movement of capital. But apparently, some people must be denied access to the world market in order to preserve the worldview. Protectionists seek to "freeze" the "aboriginal" cultures, thus appropriating their obvious right to self-determination. If they want to whale and partake in the world economy it shall not be on their own terms but on the outsiders', otherwise the totemic worldview becomes muddled.

Another, but related, contradiction, is the dichotomy between nature and commodity. A commodity is often understood in a narrow sense as "manufactured good (or service) associated only with a capitalist mode of production, and therefore found only in those societies penetrated by capitalism" (Moeran 1992:3). With such a definition commodities are closely associated with transactions using money, which in addition to being the protectionists' totem for the whalers, serves as a metaphor for commercialism.

This is far too narrow a definition, however, and anthropologists have recently defined commodity as "anything intended for exchange" (Appadurai 1986:9), whether through the medium of money or not. With this definition commodity exchange becomes one type of exchange, like gifting and barter, and it exists in all cultures. Consequently, the distinction between "aboriginal subsistence whaling" and "commercial whaling", as defined by the IWC, disappears.

Whale Symbols as Commodities

With the narrow definition of commodities, which is a prerequisite for the distinction between the two types of whaling on which the totemic worldview is built, it is a logic step to try to destroy the markets for whale products, i.e. to remove whale products from the "commodity state" (Appadurai 1986).

In his book *The Social Life of Things* (1986), the anthropologist Appadurai talks about the path through which a commodity travels from production to consumption. From a whaler's perspective, he is a part of such a path; he is a step in a long chain of interconnected parts. His task is to hunt and capture whales and bring the carcasses to processors or merchants.

Meat goes one way in the chain of exchange and usually money goes the other way, although a lot of whale meat is also bartered or gifted. The money thus earned, the whalers spend on various things, including equipment and provisions.

I do not think it is necessary here to go into how the whale protectionists have tried to destroy the commodity path of whale products like meat and blubber by imposing import restrictions, by placing whales on "endangered species" lists, by passing recommendations that products from scientific whaling should primarily be consumed locally, and by the USA imposing sanctions on whaling nations. On the ideological level it has become barbaric — bordering on cannibalism — to eat whale meat (cf. *Daily Star*, May 11, 1992). Today more people have an aversion to eating whale meat than most other kinds of meat (Freeman and Kellert 1992:29).¹

Whalers see the policy of the anti-whaling movement as an attempt to close the whale fishery and appropriate the whales in order to "sell" them or give them away for "adoption" (against a price, of course).² We are faced with two simultaneous processes in changing the commodity path: one seeks to remove the whalers' products from the commodity state; the other turns whale symbols into new commodities. Both processes are highlighted at the annual IWC meetings and other "tournaments of value", where "central tokens of value in the society" are contested (Appadurai 1986:21).

Turning the "Super-Whale" into a Commodity

What has been commoditized is a mythical creature, a "super whale", that combines traits found in more than 70 different species of cetaceans, that swims in the world oceans — symbol of a lost paradise — and that moreover has been given certain human characteristics. This "super whale", with all its cetacean and human qualities, has proved to have enormous economic and political potential. What has turned this image into a commodity, however, is the emergence of a new demand among individuals, companies and governments to appear "green". This demand has been created by the growing environmental awareness among people, fuelled by the crisis-maximizing strategies of many environmental groups. In the ecological discourse, whales have come to play the role of a metonym for nature and the image of the "endangered whale" has become a symbol for environmentalists. "Saving whales is for millions of people a crucial test of their political ability to halt environmental destruction", writes Holt (1985:192). If we cannot save whales, what else can we save?

The whaling issue has become a symbol for the environmental and animal welfare movements because this issue provides them with an easily identifiable enemy and a sense of urgency, two factors a consultant to Greenpeace identified as the requirements for raising money (Spencer 1991:179). The creation of an enemy and an urgency are closely associated with the animal welfare and ecological discourses, respectively. Tournaments of value provide the arena and ecological and animal welfare discourses provide the cultural framework that protect transactions between companies, governments and environmental/animal welfare groups from being classified as bribes or blackmailing.

Creating an Enemy

The war metaphor is a favourite one among the "Green Warriors". At one level the metaphor is used to convey an image of an uneven fight between "defenseless" whales and "greedy" whalers, often ending in "massacres". In their rhetoric whales are depicted as "lovely", "gentle", "peaceful", "graceful", "magnificent", "delightful", "beautiful", "playful", "loyal", "innocent", and so on. The list of positively valued characteristics can be extended almost endlessly. "Whales and dolphins are one-dimensional beings. They are only *positive!*" writes Paul Spong (1992:25), who brought the anti-whaling issue into Greenpeace (Brown and May

1991:32). Another of Greenpeace's founding fathers, Patrick Moore, says that to get people to "save the whale you have to get them to believe that whales are good" (Pearce 1991:27). That the killer whale is the largest predator on Earth is, on the other hand, concealed, as is recent research showing that most species are promiscuous, suitors often engage in brutal fights over females, commit "gang rapes" and might secure females by chasing and harassing them into submission (Carpenter and Schmidt 1992:60-61; Winton 1992:18).

The whalers are portrayed as the whales' opposite. They are "cruel", "brutal", "reckless", "barbaric", "insatiably greedy", "butchers", "savages", "sadists", and so on. They are "pirates" engaged in "evil" and "criminal" activities "defying" international law. D'Amato and Chopra (1991:27) suggest that whalers are more likely to commit genocide of "inferior" human beings, and World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA Circular No.881406) suggests that children exposed to hunting activities are more likely to show violent, criminal behaviour toward others. Typically, Brian Davies, the founder of IFAW, states in his fund-raising plea as follows (December 1991): "we're pressing for peace ... not pain. For care and compassion ... not clubbing and killing. For kindness ... instead of cruelty".

The above quote brings to light yet another aspect of the rhetoric, namely how the whales are put to death. Some of the more moderate organizations claim that whaling methods are "inhumane" and not worthy of "civilized" nations without going into detail. But others — and the mass media seems to take the lead — think that the crueller the slaughter can be depicted, the better. The Faroese whalers "smash gaffs into the flesh" of the pilot whales and "hack" them to death, and the "gentle" minke whale is left "to thrash around for hours in its death throes" (*Daily Mirror*, June 25, 1992, p.30).³

At another level the war metaphor seeks to divide mankind into "good" and "bad" people. In the worldview of the whale protectionists, the positive qualities ascribed to whales are extended to people who "defend" them and "fight" against the "bad" whalers and their supporters. Through this process the anti-whalers create a totemic dichotomy of mankind, with whales as the totem for themselves and with money as the totem for the whalers (Kalland 1993), a worldview strongly opposed by the whalers.

One of the oppositions in this scheme is that between the civilized (whale saver) and uncivilized (whaler). Caring about whales has become a mark of personal and societal maturity (Scheffer 1991:19) and a qualification for membership in the "world community" (Fuller 1991:2). The whaling issue provides a cheap way to satisfy people's demands for being "civilized" members of the "global village".

Whalers make excellent enemies. That there are few nations engaged in whaling means that the cost of the moratorium is born by the few and makes whalers easily identifiable and thus ideal scapegoats for environmental disasters and human cruelty to animals. Moreover, they tend to live in remote areas with only limited possibilities of influencing central governments.⁴ Nor are their products regarded as "necessary" by the anti-whalers.

The "need" argument has been introduced by animal rights advocates in order to solve the contradiction between life and death. For, as Albert Schweitzer (1950:189) once remarked, life depends upon taking life. Peter Singer (1978:9), a leading philosopher behind the animal rights movement, is against whaling because "animals should not be killed or made to suffer significant pain except when there is no other way of satisfying important human needs". Singer has nutritional needs in mind, but there are other needs to consider. Subsistence and cultural needs were taken into account when the IWC authorized aboriginal subsistence whaling (Donovan 1982; Gambell 1993).

Whereas a concession has been given to aboriginal peoples who are allowed to catch whales to satisfy subsistence and cultural needs, this has been denied commercial whalers. Needs are seen strictly in material terms, and the whalers have no need to catch whales because they share the general prosperity of the capitalist societies in which they live and work. They can afford to buy pork, beef and turkey.⁵ But whaling is more than making a living. Whaling is a

way of life and must be seen "as a process whereby hunters mutually create and recreate *one another*, through the medium of their encounter with prey" (Ingold 1986:111). To deny them cultural needs, the protectionists take an extreme materialistic attitude, which may surprise many people who have taken their general anti-capitalist rhetoric at face value. But by arguing that there is no need to kill whales, they turn whaling into a "senseless" activity which can only be understood in terms of "greed" and "short-term profit".

Exaggerating Crisis

It seems to be easier for the animal and whale rights groups than for the environmental groups to accept the new estimates of whale populations since the arguments of the former are not based on ecological considerations but on the ethics of killing. Their argument is thus not "endangered" by higher whale population figures. To groups who pretend to be concerned with ecological issues, however, the logical consequence of higher estimates ought to be a feeling of relief accompanied by a switch to more urgent matters. But this has by and large not happened. Some anti-whaling advocates have changed their arguments from ecology to ethics, thus crossing the line between environmentalism and animal welfare,⁶ while others stubbornly keep to the ecological discourse or argue from both perspectives at once. This is not necessarily in order to earn money, but to protect their own interpretation of the world.

Knowing that ecological arguments against whaling are more palatable than ethical and moral ones to a number of people, firms, and government agencies, and realizing that the "terms of the [whaling] convention have required that this debate be conducted in a scientific guise" (Butterworth 1992:532),⁷ many protectionists are more than reluctant to change their rhetoric from an ecological discourse to one based on animal welfare or rights. Instead they stick to the myth of the endangered whale by accusing the scientists behind the new estimates of being incompetent, biased and "bought" by governments of whaling nations by refusing to accept new population estimates, by refuting their relevance or by introducing new arguments into the ecological discourse.

Some continue to argue as if all whale species are close to extinction. Greenpeace launched a "Save the last whales" campaign as late as in 1992, just in time for the annual IWC-meeting, writing that the Norwegian government "seems hell bent on waging a war of eradication on marine mammals" (Ottaway 1992:13). And in its "SOS Save the Whale" campaign, WWF-Denmark rather emotionally appealed for support to save the last whale (WWF-Denmark 1990). Many of these organizations, as well as media, live by crisis maximization and, by giving the impression that the moratorium is about to be lifted (e.g. *The Mail on Sunday*, June 21, 1992), they exploit upcoming IWC meetings to launch fund-raising campaigns.⁸

It is also claimed that the extent of whale populations is irrelevant because commercial whaling will — by a law of nature, it seems — lead to over-exploitation and extinction. They tend to take the history of pelagic, industrial whaling as evidence (e.g. Greenpeace International 1992:1). By doing this, the protectionists can feed on the memory of bygone days when large pelagic fleets hunted some large species close to extinction in search of whale oil. But such an argument ignores the progress in the IWC's management procedures during the 1970s, when the IWC enjoyed a short period with a science-based approach to whale management (Hoel 1986; Freeman 1990). The argument further denies mankind the ability to learn from past mistakes. Finally, the argument overlooks important differences in whaling regimes. That coastal minke whaling in Iceland, Japan, and Norway has very little in common with the old pelagic whaling but, on the contrary, that it shares many of the characteristics found in subsistence aboriginal whaling (ISGSTW 1992), does not seem to affect their rhetoric in the least.

Tournaments of Value

The images of enemies and crisis are brought into prominence during tournaments of value, and the media has turned some of these encounters into major events. The most spectacular are the annual IWC meetings, where the world is divided into the so-called "like-minded group" and the "whaling nations". Here activists can display their whale art objects and emblems (a typical totemic trait, Durkheim 1976) on badges, T-shirts, posters, and so on. At the meetings privileged participants compete for status, rank, fame, and reputation by contesting central values. In addition to diplomats and bureaucrats, delegations may also include scientists (mainly natural scientists but increasingly also social scientists), environmentalists and animal rights advocates (in the case of anti-whaling nations) and whalers (in the case of whaling nations). Their task is to contest opposing values pertaining to whales and their exploitation (Moeran 1992) and to give scientific legitimacy to their positions.

A large number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are allowed to attend the proceedings, without rights to vote or speak.⁹ The NGOs play important roles during the IWC meetings. Firstly, they lobby the delegates and try to convince the general public through the mass media that their worldview is the correct one. In addition to press conferences and demonstrations, about 20 protectionist groups jointly issue a paper called *Eco* during IWC meetings, while the High North Alliance, representing fishermen's and hunters' organizations in the North Atlantic, publishes *The International Harpoon*. Secondly, they report directly back to their followers without going through the whims of mass media, thus enabling them to control the distribution of information regarding their own activities. Finally, and this is the most important point for our discussion, the NGOs monitor the proceedings and report their interpretations and evaluations of the delegates' performances to their supporters or to the mass media that do not have access to the conference room. By this arrangement the NGOs are in a unique position to manipulate the flow of information, to put pressure on national governments and politicians, to endorse their opinions and statements thus enhancing their prospects of being reelected, and to create a "ranking list" of the most "progressive" delegations and nations.¹⁰

The last actor at the IWC meeting is the mass media without whose participation the meeting would have been a much less attractive arena for contesting the commodity path. But the press is severely restricted in their work as it has no access to the conference room, and only parts of the proceedings are transmitted to the press room. Instead, pauses in the proceedings have been turned into intense press-briefing sessions where the media rely heavily on the services of the NGOs and some of the delegates. With anti-whaling NGOs in the majority and with most of the media coming from anti-whaling nations, it should come as no surprise that anti-whaling sentiments dominate the newspaper columns and news broadcasts. Anti-whaling demonstrations also contribute to this situation. Moreover, the media willingly reports from the latest anti-whaling publications, particularly if they are sensational in character and grossly exaggerate crises. In short, the IWC meetings provide environmental and animal rights groups with a rare opportunity to get their message out to millions of people.

Whale strandings offer other occasions for tournaments of value, with different sets of participants. Whalers and their supporters are usually excluded, and these tournaments are left to protectionists, companies, and government agencies — which may compete in leadership, in suggesting solutions, and in getting credit for progress. For example, in a recent stranding of 49 false killer whales in Australia rescue work — undertaken by several animal welfare groups in addition to National Parks officials, employees of marine parks and Sydney zoo, the Army and the Salvation Army — suffered from conflicting advice and priorities, culminating in the walk-out of the Organization for Research and Rescue of Cetaceans in Australia (Wheatley 1992:14-15).

At times rescuers make strange bedfellows, as when Greenpeace and the Alaskan oil industry in October 1988 joined hands with each other and with local whalers, U.S. and Soviet government agencies, and industrialists to free three gray whales trapped in Alaskan ice. The media may well have turned the case into "the World's Greatest Non-Event" (Rose 1989), but they were only a tool in the PR contest between the rescuers, each trying to outbid the others and not be left behind.¹¹

Direct confrontations during the hunt constitute another important arena which helps to bring about a diversion of the path. They usually take place far from shore and therefore provide the activists with the opportunity to invent news — a role much appreciated by Greenpeace's co-founder Robert Hunter (Pearce 1991:20) — or to monopolize news coverage. Although a nuisance to whalers these actions are not necessarily meant to bring forth an immediate termination of whaling activities, but they tell the world that the activists are concerned about the environment, that the issue is urgent and cannot wait, and that they are fighting against powerful enemies and great odds. The activists are always depicted as the underdogs; it is the small zodiac against the big catcher boat, or swimming Greenpeaceers in front of a Japanese factory ship. The situation is ideally suited for presenting pictures of David fighting Goliath. By skilfully manipulating the mass media, an enormous sympathy to their cause is brought forth, which is one reason behind their success in removing whale meat from the commodity state and placing the "super-whale" in its stead. It matters little that the picture is false and that with environmentalism being a multi-billion-dollar industry, it is rather the whalers who are the weak party.

Conclusion

What we have witnessed during the last two or three decades is, to use a phrase taken from Appadurai (1986), a diversion of a commodity path, i.e. the route a commodity — loosely defined as goods and services of exchange value — used to travel from production through consumption has been altered. The moratorium imposed on commercial whaling by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) in 1987, has left whale protectionists as the main economic beneficiaries of cetaceans, which, together with seals, have turned out to be the most important source of income for environmental as well as for animal rights and animal welfare groups.¹²

At first sight one would assume that low-consumptive use of whales, such as whale watching, could co-exist with whaling, particularly where tourists and whalers seek different species. The "swim with a whale" programmes, as well as the use of cetaceans in literature and art, should be even more able to co-exist peacefully with whaling. But this is not the case. The same cultural framework which has turned the "super-whale" into a commodity, has also removed whale meat and oil from the commodity list and created the "evil whaler". Consequently, the "super-whale" cannot coexist with whaling. Moreover, western urbanites tend to impose their totems on others, and it is this blend of totemization of whales and cultural imperialism which has left the whale issue in a stalemate. With powerful environmental and animal rights groups behind them, anti-whalers have gained political and moral recognition. WWF with its many members and royal patronage has gained a position from where it can appropriate nature and farm it out to those who wish to pay for a clear conscience or a green image. Greenpeace, with its millions of members, has also gained power and international recognition sufficient to lay claim to being a steward of nature. Both organizations have been able to form coalitions with national governments, international bodies such as the EC, UNEP and IUCN, and industrialists.

The whaling issue is an ideal issue for national governments and polluting industries to support. Whaling being of only marginal economic importance — and in most countries of no importance at all — this is a "safe" issue and there is hardly anything to lose by joining the

crowd. The rewards in terms of "green images" are, on the other hand, substantial (Rose 1989). The anti-whaling campaign, therefore, offers governments and industries an opportunity to show their consideration for the environment, while the campaign has proved an excellent fund raiser for the environmental and animal rights movements (Gulland 1988:45). By giving support to the "super-whale" myth, companies and governments have acquired "green" legitimacy (and partial immunity) while the movements have acquired political legitimacy in return. In so doing, these coalitions have redefined the whale as a commodity and managed to interrupt the path.

Appadurai refers to this phenomenon as "diversion of commodities from their preordained path". One kind of diversion is theft, and many whalers see the sales and adoptions of whales — and here they include sales of whale images which have contributed so importantly to the finances of environmental and animal rights groups — as theft; not only of the whales, which they feel belong to them through several generations' involvement in whaling, but theft of their livelihood, pride, and of their culture.

Notes

1. In the survey of people's attitudes to whales, only seal meat met with the same disapproval as whale meat among the following alternatives: chicken, deer, horse (ranked 3rd after whales and seals), kangaroo, lamb, lobster, seal and wildfowl.

2. When organizations singlehandedly appropriate whales to be used in "adoption" programmes, they not only contradict their own ideology that wildlife is everybody's property, but also face the problems of recognition of such claims and of sanctioning infringement. Some have tried to solve these problems by shooting photographs of whales and giving them names. A few species can be identified by their flukes or colour patterns, and it is precisely these species which are appropriated by WWF and other organizations and offered for adoption.

3. Cases of prolonged suffering are told again and again, but such incidents occur in all kinds of hunt and are rather the rule in bull-fights, fox hunts and executions of convicts. Yet, the governments in Spain, the U.K. and the U.S.A., all strongly against whaling because of its "inhumanity", equally strongly defend bull-fights, fox hunts and executions. In the rhetoric of the protectionists whaling is never compared to hunting or other sports involving animals, but only to what goes on in abattoirs and slaughterhouses.

4. The sealers make good enemies for the same reasons. Environmental and animal rights groups have gone against hunting of seals off Newfoundland, although by no means were the seals endangered (Wenzel 1991). At the same time "international conservation organizations [including Greenpeace and WWF] are allowing one of the world's most endangered species [the Mediterranean monk seal] to slip silently into extinction" (Johnson 1988:5). The monk seal, of which there are only a few hundred left, is the victim of massive degradation of its habitat due to military activities, high population concentration around the ocean and millions of tourists flocking to its beaches every year. It is almost impossible to identify and give "face" to the enemy, and the forces behind the depletion of monk seals are powerful and influential. Add to this that there is no "face-to-face" confrontation between the monk seal and the killer, no dramatic deaths and no blood. Compare this with the seal hunt off Newfoundland which is conducted during three short weeks in a very limited area. The white ice makes the perfect photographic background for slaughter and spills of blood of white pups with big, black eyes. These are the ideal conditions for making dramatic footage, while the Mediterranean setting is not.

5. The argument, of course, begs the question of how to decide what we need without being ethnocentric or culturally imperialistic. And why is there apparently a need to hunt foxes and big game for sport when there are non-lethal recreations like cinemas and soccer games?

6. This caused an editorial in *The Times* (June 30, 1992) to observe that "the moratorium was flawed. It was introduced originally in the name of conservation, at a time when the extinction of virtually all whales seemed imminent. Its continuation is demanded now in the name of animal welfare. Iceland and Norway are entitled to accuse the anti-whaling majority of nations in the International Whaling Commission of changing the rules half way through the game". The editorial concludes that "the IWC's mistake has been to present the moratorium on minke harvesting as an issue of preservation, needing international cooperation. It is not. Norway and Iceland have at least taught the world a lesson in candour".

7. Since this is becoming more and more difficult to do with integrity, WWF and U.S. Marine Mammal Commission, among others, have voiced the opinion that it is time to rewrite the whaling convention so that it can take account of "non-consumptive values" of whales (e.g. U.S. Marine Mammal Commission 1991).

8. Often this approach goes hand in hand with a tendency to exaggerate the potential scope of commercial whaling. "Once again the blue whale... will be ruthlessly hunted, although there are probably less than 1,000 remaining from 250,000 that used to roam the oceans", complains The Mail on Sunday (June 21, 1992, p.8). Beside offering an incredibly low figure for the remaining blue whale population, the newspaper fails to mention that blue whales have been protected since 1965 and that there is still unanimity as to upholding this protection.

9. It was the U.S. government that took up the issue of admitting NGOs and mass media to the IWC meetings, apparently in an attempt to mobilize international public opinion (Sumi 1989:344) and to have its own "greenness" reported to the electorates.

10. The EC parliament as well as some national parliaments can also be seen as tournaments of value where NGOs are given the opportunity to lobby for cessation of whaling and to endorse the opinions and voting behaviour of the politicians, thus providing politicians and political parties with arenas where they can compete in being "green".

11. In his book Freeing the Whales, Tom Rose (1989) vividly narrates the \$5.8 million rescue operation and the prizes at stake. To Greenpeace the event meant the biggest source of new money and members in its history and for the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), which led Operation Breakout and activated a new satellite ahead of schedule in order to provide the Soviets with ice information, it meant its "coming of age". The oil industry improved its image considerably, only to lose much of the new-won goodwill in the Exxon Valdez oil-spill five months later. But its involvement in freeing the whales helped VECO, Alaska's largest oil constructing company, to land the prime contract to clean up the mess after the spill. The Eskimos benefitted by suddenly being pictured as good-natured humans and not as greedy whale killers and, by his personal interest in the affair, President Reagan tried to shape up his environmental record, as did the Soviets who, by providing ice-breakers, presented a "human face" to the faltering regime and made the world forget that Soviet is the only nation hunting gray whales. Industrialists got their products advertised worldwide.

12. The term "environmental group" refers to a group of persons who through an ecological discourse express concern for the environment as a system in order to secure habitats and species diversity. Animal welfare groups are concerned with our treatment of animals, including killing methods, while animal rights groups condemn the killing of animals per se. They are engaged in an animal welfare (or animal rights) discourse. (For simplicity, no distinction will be made between animal welfare and animal rights groups or between animal welfare and animal rights discourses in this paper.) There is no sharp line between environmental and animal welfare/rights groups (Wenzel 1991:36). Animal rights groups become increasingly concerned about ecological systems in order to protect the habitats of animals, and environmental groups have recently engaged themselves in the protection of non-endangered species. The confusion also afflicts U.S. lawmakers (Manning 1989).

References

- Appadurai, Arjun, 1986, *The social life of things - Commodities in cultural perspective* (Introduction), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Michael and May, John, 1991, *The Greenpeace Story*, London: Dorling Kindersley.
- Butterworth, D.C., 1992, "Science and sentimentality", *Nature*, Vol.357 (June 18), pp.532- 534.
- Carpenter, Betsy and Schmidt, Karen F. 1992, "Whales. Demystified, the watery giant may come under the harpoon again", *U.S. News & World Report*, July 13, pp.58-64.
- Daily Mirror*, 25 June, 1992.
- Daily Star*, "Sickest dinner ever served: Japs feast on whale" - 11 May 1991.
- D'Amato, Anthony and Chopra, Sudhir K., 1991, "Whales: Their emerging right to life", *American Journal of International Law* 85(1):21-62.
- Donovan, Greg P., 1982, "The International Whaling Commission and Aboriginal/Subsistence Whaling: April 1979 to July 1981", in G.P. Donovan (ed.) *Aboriginal/Subsistence Whaling*, Cambridge: International Whaling Commission, pp.79-86.
- Durkheim, Emile, 1976, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, (translated from French by Joseph Ward Swain), London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Freeman, Milton M.R., 1990, "A commentary on political issues with regard to contemporary whaling", *North Atlantic Studies*, 2(1-2):106-116.
- Freeman, Milton M.R. and Kellert, Stephen R., 1992, *Public Attitudes to Whales: Results of a Six-Country Survey*, Edmonton: University of Alberta, Canadian Circumpolar Institute/New Haven: Yale University, School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.
- Fuller, Kathryn S., 1991, Letter to the ambassadors of whaling nations, dated May 24.
- Gambell, Ray, 1993, "International management of whales and whaling: An historical review of the regulation of commercial and aboriginal whaling", *Arctic* 46(2):97-107.
- Greenpeace International, 1992, "A Whale Sanctuary for Antarctica", (Paper distributed at the 44th IWC meeting, at Glasgow.)
- Gulland, John, 1988, "The end of whaling?", *New Scientist*, 29 october, pp.42-47.
- Hoel, Alf Håkon, 1986, *The International Whaling Commission, 1972-1984: New Members, New Concerns*. Lysaker, Norway: The Fridtjof Nansen Institute, 2nd edition.
- Holt, Sidney, 1985, "Whale mining, whale saving", *Marine Policy* Vol.9(3):192-213.
- Hoyt, Erich, 1992, "Whale watching around the World", *International Whale Bulletin*, No.7.

- Ingold, Tim, 1986, *The Appropriation of Nature*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- ISGSTW (International Study Group for Small-Type Whaling), 1992, "Similarities and diversity in coastal whaling operations: A comparison of small-scale whaling activities in Greenland, Iceland, Japan and Norway", *Report of the Symposium on Utilization of Marine Living Resources for Subsistence (Vol.II)* held at Taiji, Japan. Tokyo: The Institute of Cetacean Research.
- Johnson, William, 1988, *The Monk Seal Conspiracy*, London: Heretic Books.
- Kalland, Arne, 1993, "Management by totemization: Whale symbolism and the anti-whaling campaign", *Arctic*, 46(2):124-133.
- Manning, Laura, 1989, "Marine mammals and fisheries conflicts: A philosophical dispute", *Ocean & Shoreline Management*, 12(3):217-232.
- Moeran, Brian, 1992, "The cultural construction of value. 'Subsistence', 'commercial' and other terms in the debate about whaling", *Maritime Antropological Studies*, 5(2):1-15.
- Ottaway, Andy, 1992, *The Whale Killers*, Greenpeace-UK.
- Pearce, Fred, 1991, *Green Warriors. The People and the Politics behind the Environmental Revolution*, London: The Bodley Head.
- Rose, Tom, 1989, *Freeing the Whales. How the Media Created the World's Greatest Non-Event*. New York: Birch Lane Press Book.
- Scheffer, Victor, 1991, "Why should we care about whales?" In *Why Whales?* (ed. by N. Davies, A.M. Smith, S.R. Whyte and V. Williams), Bath: Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society.
- Schweitzer, Albert, 1950, *The Animal World of Albert Schweitzer: Jungle Insight into Reverence for Life* (translated and edited by Charles R. Joy), Boston: Beacon Press.
- Singer, Peter, 1978, "Why the whale should live", *Habitat* (Australian Conservation Foundation), Vol.6(3):8-9.
- Spencer, Leslie with Jan Bollwerk and Morais, Richard C., 1991, "The not so peaceful world of Greenpeace", *Forbes Magazine*, November 11, pp.174-180.
- Spong, Paul, 1992, "Why we love to watch whales", *Sonar*, No.7:24-25.
- Sumi, Kazuo, 1989, "The 'Whale War' Between Japan and the United States: Problems and Prospects", *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy* 17(2):317-372.
- The Mail on Sunday*, June 21, 1992.
- The Times*, June 30, 1992.
- U.S. Marine Mammal Commission, 1991 Letter to the U.S. Commissioner to the WC, John Knauss, dated December 5th.

Wenzel, George, 1991, *Animal Rights, Human Rights - Ecology, Economy and Ideology in the Canadian Arctic*. Toronto: University Press of Toronto.

Wheatley, Jane, 1992, "The three-day miracle of New South Whales", *TheTimes Saturday Review*, August 22, pp.14-15.

Winton, Tim, 1992, "Dolphin *Mania*", *The Independent Monthly* (Australia), Sept. pp.14-19.

WSPA (World Society for the Protection of Animals), 1988, Circular No. 881406.

WWF-Denmark, 1990, An appeal to business executives for donations, dated 19 June.

OPENING STATEMENT FOR THE THIRD MEETING OF NAMMCO
BY
GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN

1. Today, at the beginning of the third meeting of the NAMMCO, Japan would like to express its respects to the Contracting Parties of the NAMMCO for their efforts in getting the organisation on the right track. We would also like to thank them for their participation in the 45th IWC meeting held in Japan. With cooperation from the Faroese, Greenlandic, and Norwegian delegations, it ended without undue hindrance. We also appreciated Ambassador Eiriksson's company as the governmental observer from Iceland.

2. Japan hosted this year's IWC, upholding the following three fundamental ideas: 1) the principle of sustainable utilisation of marine living resources, including cetaceans; 2) respect for cultural differences in dietary customs; 3) respect for scientific research and objective information. Again the Commission rejected our request for the resumption of whaling based upon the principle of sustainable use of cetaceans. However, in the light of understanding, it is noteworthy and encouraging to us that some progress were made. As regards the resumption of community-based whaling, although the Commission rejected both Japanese and Norwegian requests, the Working Group and the Technical Committee, in particular, received them with greater understanding and compassion. We hope that soon IWC will accept our request.

There were some merits of hosting the Annual Meeting of the IWC; above all it is encouraging for us to note that the whaling issue is now viewed more accurately. This seems to be the result of the program offered to the visitors around the Kyoto IWC meeting; for instance, Commissioners and journalists were given opportunities to visit whaling communities in Japan and in Norway to acquire first-hand knowledge of the situation under the moratorium. And during the Meeting the real-time transmissions of the discussions at the Commission clearly revealed that not all of the whale species were endangered.

3. One month has passed since IWC adjourned in Kyoto. Norway has resumed traditional whaling, setting its own national catch limit, based upon the discussion in IWC Scientific Committee. We also note that Dr. Philip Hammond, Chairman of the IWC Scientific Committee has resigned, protesting the Commission's ignoring the recommendation of the Scientific Committee. Given these actions, it is difficult to say that IWC has been functioning in its proper course. Therefore, what is necessary for whaling nations, many of which are the Contracting Parties to the NAMMCO, is to promote further understanding for the sustainable use of all living marine resources, guiding international opinions toward sustainable use.

4. Concerning small cetaceans: the anti-whaling nations, with little knowledge about the realities pertaining to the small cetaceans, have been trying to place these animals under the mandate of IWC. However, as you are well aware, because small cetaceans have saliently regional distribution and migratory patterns, a more effective and practical management would be for those coastal nations to bear responsibilities for those animals that distribute and migrate within their waters. Therefore, the role of regional organisations like the NAMMCO will be increasingly important. Fortunately, many states seem to regard IWC's extended exercise of its jurisdiction over small cetaceans as inappropriate. Japan thinks it necessary to exchange views with neighbouring states on the management of small cetaceans. For the time being we intend to begin our task by promoting communication among scientists in Japan and our neighbours.

5. We would like here to draw your attention to another point although it has little direct bearings on the NAMMCO. As you may be aware, the CITES is now revising the current criteria for listing of the species in its Appendices. Japan basically supports the idea of developing quantitative, scientific, and objective criteria which will replace the current qualitative criteria. However, the draft contains points which could possibly cause some serious damages to the rational fishing activities. In other words, it might lead to the listing in the Appendices of those species which fishing industry currently harvest, even if they were far from being in danger of extinction. For example, the current listing includes all dolphins and porpoises. The proposed criteria stipulates for the listing of prey species of the dolphinade in order to protect the listed cetaceans. Such revision may lead to the limitation of the international trading of all the creatures upon which the listed marine mammals feed.

The regional fishery organisations properly manage and conserve many species in the sea. These regional organisations already possess in-depth scientific knowledge about these species; therefore, we should primarily entrust those organisations with the tasks related to fishery resources management. Japan hopes that the Contracting Parties of the NAMMCO will express due concern on this issue and submit their comments to the CITES Secretariat.

6. Finally, we would like to convey from Mr. Shima, Japanese IWC Commissioner, his expectations of the furtherance of the NAMMCO activities and his friendship to you all.

NAMMCO SC REP. 01/93

**Report of the Scientific Committee of NAMMCO
1st Meeting, Tromsø, Norway, 19-20 January 1993**

1. Opening

The members of the Scientific Committee listed in Appendix I met at its first session on January 19 from 14.45 - 15.00, and were welcomed by the convener, Jóhann Sigurjónsson. Items 1-5 of the agenda were dealt with. Second and third sessions were held on January 20 from 10.00 - 11.45 and 12.15 - 12.30, when items 6-7 were discussed.

2. Appointment of rapporteur

Finn Kapel was appointed rapporteur of the meeting.

3. Election of Chairman and Vice-chairman

Jóhann Sigurjónsson was elected Chairman, and Tore Haug Vice-chairman, by consensus.

4. Adoption of Agenda

The Agenda contained in Appendix II was adopted.

5. List of Species

It was agreed that any comments or corrections to the list of priority species of pinnipeds and cetaceans prepared for this meeting, with the addition of a section on the bottlenose dolphin, Tursiops truncatus (to be prepared by Dorete Bloch), should be forwarded to the Chairman no later than March 15 by the members of the Scientific Committee, having consulted the relevant national specialists on each species. It was further agreed that this list should constitute a reference list which would be updated as new information becomes available, but not an exhaustive account of the status of all stocks.

6. Priority tasks and establishment of working groups

The Management Committee of NAMMCO had recommended that the Scientific Committee be asked to provide advice on the following priority species and tasks (the exact wording of these requests was not available at the time of discussion in the Scientific Committee):

6.1 North Atlantic long-finned pilot whale (Globicephala melas)

The Scientific Committee noted that a request from NAMMCO had already been forwarded to ICES, who had replied that the matter would be dealt with by the ICES Study Group on Long-Finned Pilot Whales at a meeting in Copenhagen from August 30 to September 3, 1993. Under these circumstances the Scientific Committee saw no reason to establish a special NAMMCO working group on this species but would base its advice on the findings of the above-mentioned ICES Study Group.

6.2 Northern bottlenose whale (Hyperoodon ampullatus) and killer whale (Orcinus orca)

The Scientific Committee recommends establishing a joint working group to assess the status of these two species, and charged its Chairman to find a candidate to chair this working group, and in consultation with that person develop its terms of reference, membership and time schedule. This could then be approved by the Scientific Committee by correspondence.

6.3 Harp and hooded seals (Phoca groenlandica and Cystophora cristata)

The Scientific Committee saw no reason to establish a special NAMMCO working group on these species, but recommended that requests be forwarded to the Joint ICES/NAFO Working Group on Harp and Hooded Seals that has the mandate and potential for assessing and giving management advice on all stocks of harp and hooded seals. The Scientific Committee was informed that the next meeting of the Joint Working Group had not yet been formally scheduled, but that its members had agreed that a suitable time and place for such a meeting would be 1-7 October 1993 in Copenhagen.

6.4 Atlantic walrus (Odobenus rosmarus rosmarus)

The Scientific Committee was aware that a meeting of the Walrus International Technical and Scientific Committee (WITS) had just been held in Winnipeg (11-15 January 1993). It was felt that more information on the work of this group was needed to evaluate whether NAMMCO in future could draw upon the expertise of this committee for evaluating the status of walrus stocks and consider the need for management options. It was agreed that Finn Kapel should attempt to collect copies of meeting reports and other information about WITS, and distribute this material to other members of the Scientific Committee as soon as possible.

6.5 The ecological role of marine mammals

The predecessor of NAMMCO, NAC, had forwarded requests for advice from ICES on the current state of knowledge on the

interrelations between marine mammals and fish and shrimp stocks, and the use of multispecies models in that connection. These requests were carried over by NAMMCO at its inaugural meeting in September 1992. The ICES General Secretary has referred to these requests in his letter of October 15 1992, by stating: "The requests dealing with multispecies matters will probably be considered to the extent and when possible by existing Working or Study Groups."

The Scientific Committee noted that questions relating to interactions were included in the terms of reference of the Study Group on Long-Finned Pilot whale as well as the Joint Working Group on Harp and Hooded Seals. It was aware of a number of on-going studies on the feeding and consumption by these and other species, and of efforts to include such data in multispecies models.

It is difficult to find an example of a study that has described the ecological role of a single species of marine mammal satisfactorily. It is, clearly, even more difficult when more species are involved. Due to the complexity of the issues, and because other high priority tasks were identified, the Scientific Committee could not recommend that a special working group on ecological relations be established within the NAMMCO framework at this stage, but the work being done within ICES and elsewhere should be followed closely, and the Committee decided to have the matter on its agenda for continued consideration.

6.6 Management procedures

The Management Committee has recommended the establishment of a working group on management procedures, consisting of specialists in areas such as population dynamics and management models, as well as biologists with relevant knowledge of the species in question.

The Scientific Committee discussed this recommendation at some length, but was unable to reach consensus within the limited time available at this meeting. It was agreed that it was important to establish a special working group on this matter as soon as possible, but some members felt that these issues were not exclusively of a scientific nature, and that such a working group, therefore, from the outset should include representation of the managers, ie. in order to ensure a discussion of the management principles or objectives which should form the basis for formulating management procedures.

For these reasons the Scientific Committee was also unable at this stage to make a suggestion for a person to chair this working group. It was agreed that the Chairman should consult with the Chairman of the Commission to develop further guidelines concerning the tasks, terms of reference and composition of such a working group on management

procedures, and attempt to reach an agreement concerning the chairperson, membership and time schedule.

7. Timetable and working procedure

The Scientific Committee had experienced difficulties in giving the items referred to it an adequate treatment at this meeting. It was felt that at least one full day ahead of the next Commission Meeting was needed for the Scientific Committee to fulfil its tasks, even if all relevant material is distributed prior to the meeting. When working group reports or other major issues are tabled in future, more than one day will evidently be necessary.

Concerning the timing of meetings, the Scientific Committee noted that the next meeting of the Commission was tentatively scheduled to be held in Reykjavik in mid-June 1993. Several members pointed out that this might make it difficult for them to attend because of field activities; in fact, the entire period between late May and late August is generally inconvenient for future meetings due to its coinciding with plans for field work, other meetings (eg. IWC) and/or holidays.

The Committee discussed briefly the need for annual national progress reports and the formal status of documents presented and discussed at future meetings. It was agreed that the annual Reports of Activities presented to ICES would be a convenient format to reflect national research activities sufficiently. Further, it was noted that a standardized record-keeping system for Scientific Committee documents was needed as soon as possible.

It was agreed that the report of this first Scientific Committee meeting should be adopted by correspondence. This procedure was completed on February 9, 1993.

**Scientific Committee members present at the 1st Meeting,
Tromsø, Norway, 19-29 January 1993**

Arnoldus Schytte Blix, Norway

Dorete Bloch, Faroe Islands

Tore Haug, Norway

Finn O. Kapel, Greenland

Jóhann Sigurjónsson, Iceland (convener)

Gísli A. Víkingsson, Iceland

AGENDA

Scientific Committee of NAMMCO
1st Meeting, Tromsø, Norway
19-20 January 1993

1. OPENING/WELCOME
2. APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEUR
3. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN
4. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
5. LIST OF SPECIES
6. PRIORITY TASKS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF WORKING GROUPS
7. TIMETABLE AND WORKING PROCEDURE

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Third meeting of the Council, Reykjavik 1-2 July 1993

Report of the Second Meeting of the Management Committee

The Chairman of the Management Committee, Kjartan Hoydal, welcomed representatives from all member countries to the second meeting of the Management Committee on 1 July in Reykjavik.

1. Rules of Procedure

Einar Lemche (Greenland) presented Draft Rules of Procedure for the Management Committee, which Greenland had agreed to prepare and circulate prior to the meeting. He explained that in preparing the draft, he had drawn closely on the model used in NASCO, eliminating those elements not considered appropriate for use in NAMMCO, where consensus-based decisions do not require such complicated rules.

After a brief discussion amongst delegates, the Rules of Procedure for the Management Committee were adopted by the Committee without amendments to the draft text. The Rules of Procedure are included with this report.

2. Inspection and Observation Working Group

The Management Committee decided to establish a Working Group to analyze the elements of possible inspection and observation schemes. The Working Group would report back to the Management Committee. Einar Lemche (Greenland) would chair the Working Group.

3. The Scientific Committee Working Group on Management Procedures

The Management Committee discussed certain elements of the mandate given to the Scientific Committee's Working Group on Management Procedures pursuant to a decision of the Management Committee at its Tromsø meeting on 19-20 January 1993. With respect to the general aspects of the Working Group's mandate, it was agreed that its task would be to review management procedures in general, including to review the main systems that are developed in various fora and provide an assessment of their parameters on the basis of how they would be applied in individual cases.

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Rules of Procedure for the Management Committee

I Representation

1. Each member of the Committee shall be represented by not more than three representatives who may be accompanied by experts and advisers.

II Taking of Decisions

2. Each member of the Committee shall have one vote.
3. Decisions of the Committee shall be taken by the unanimous vote of those members present and casting an affirmative vote.
4. Between meetings of the Committee and in case of special necessity to be determined by the Chairman, votes may be taken by mail or by other means of textual communication. The Secretary shall immediately notify the members of the Committee of the results of such votes.

III Chairman and Vice-Chairman

5. The Committee shall elect from among its members a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman, each of whom shall serve for a term of two years and shall be eligible for re-election provided that they do not serve for more than four years in succession in each office. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall not be representatives of the same Party.
6. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall take office at the conclusion of the meeting at which they have been elected.
7. The Chairman shall have the following powers and responsibilities:
 - a) to preside at each meeting of the Committee;
 - b) to sign, on behalf of the Committee, the reports of each meeting of the Committee; and
 - c) to exercise other powers and responsibilities as provided in these Rules and make such decisions and give such directions to the Secretary as will ensure that the business of the Committee is carried out effectively and in accordance with its decisions.

8. Whenever the Chairman is unable to act, the Vice-Chairman shall assume the powers and responsibilities of the Chairman.

IV Preparation for Meetings

9.

a) The Secretary shall prepare, in consultation with the Chairman, a provisional agenda for each meeting of the Committee and transmit it to all members of the Committee no later than 60 days before the meeting.

b) Any member of the Committee may propose supplementary items by informing the Secretary thereof no later than 45 days before the meeting.

c) The Secretary shall prepare the draft agenda for the meeting, including the supplementary items, and transmit it to all members of the Committee no later than 30 days before the meeting along with related explanatory memoranda or reports.

10. The Secretary shall make all necessary arrangements for meetings of the Committee.

V Observers

11. The Committee may decide to invite observers to participate in its meetings and may establish the terms and conditions for that participation.

VI Reports

12. A report of each meeting of the Committee shall be prepared by the Secretary as required by the Committee and shall include any regulatory measures proposed by it, all decisions and recommendations adopted by it and references to all scientific information used or presented at the meeting. A draft report shall be considered by the Committee before the end of the meeting. The Secretary shall transmit the final report to all members of the Council as soon as possible after the meeting.

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Report of the ad hoc Working Group on Information

July 2, 1993

Members:

Kate Sanderson, Faroe Islands (convener)
Jens Paulsen, Greenland
Arnór Halldórsson, Iceland
Halvard P. Johansen, Norway

1. Working Group schedule:

A circular was distributed by the convener to the other WG members for comments in February, after which a telephone meeting was held at the beginning of April. WG members met in person in Copenhagen on April 30 to discuss outstanding questions and the formulation of the final report to the 3rd meeting of NAMMCO, to be compiled by Kate Sanderson.

2. Terms of Reference

The report of the Second meeting of NAMMCO in January 1993 reads:

"It was agreed to set up an ad hoc Working Group on Information to be convened by Kate Sanderson, Faroe Islands. The Working Group will present a report to the Council at the next meeting of NAMMCO. The Working Group would make suggestions for the kinds of projects which required extra funding, gather and compare information material from respective NAMMCO member countries, and consider points raised during the meeting by representatives from High North Alliance and the European Bureau for Conservation and Development" (Report of 2nd NAMMCO Meeting 1993, p.7).

Discussions in Tromsø referred to item 17 at the inaugural meeting in Tórshavn in September 1992, where a proposal was put forward by the Faroe Islands. This was, in turn, the result of discussions in Glasgow in 1992, when an earlier ad hoc information working group met to discuss information strategies.

3. Working Group discussions and recommendations

The present ad hoc working group divided discussions on information into two categories:

3.1. Information on NAMMCO

3.2 General information on the management and utilization of marine mammals - The NAMMCO Fund

3.1 Information on NAMMCO

3.1.1 - Information work of the Secretariat

The Working Group discussed the importance of formulating general information about the organisation NAMMCO. Providing information about the form and functions of the Commission was seen to be crucial to a greater understanding of not only the regime itself, but also the principles on which it is based.

This would naturally be a part of the work of the Secretariat. The Working Group discussed some specific ideas for the kind of information material which could be produced, such as a general informative brochure explaining the aims and functions of NAMMCO, a NAMMCO directory of contacts, as well as a reference directory of scientific and other publications relevant to the areas of interest of NAMMCO. These could be regularly updated and reissued. At a later stage, a regular NAMMCO newsletter could also be produced. The need for a NAMMCO symbol or logo was discussed, and it was also agreed that this should be produced as soon as possible, perhaps by announcing a design competition.

3.1.2 - Exchange of information between NAMMCO members

The Working Group was asked to gather and compare the kinds of general information on marine mammal utilization produced by NAMMCO members. The Working Group did not actively compare this material as such, but discussed the possibility of using the NAMMCO Secretariat as a gathering point for such information. The Working Group agreed that the NAMMCO Secretariat should aim to be kept up-to-date on the latest information produced by NAMMCO member governments, as well as functioning as intermediary for enquiries relating to marine mammal issues in respective NAMMCO member countries.

3.1.3 - External relations

This point was not discussed in detail by the Working Group, although it was agreed there was a need for clear policy guidelines from the Council. The suggestion made by the representative from EBCD at the 2nd Meeting of NAMMCO of establishing contact with IUCN's newly formed Commission on Environmental Strategy and Planning was pursued by the WG convener, although without a response so far.

3.1.4 - Need for guidelines

Working Group members agreed that there was a need for clear policy and procedural guidelines from the Council and its Committees to the Secretariat on the questions of information policy and data availability.

3.2 General information on the management and utilization of marine mammals

3.2.1 The NAMMCO Fund

Enclosed as Appendix 1 is a proposal for a general statute for the NAMMCO Fund.

Working Group members agreed that it would be desirable for the Council of NAMMCO to formally establish the Fund at the next meeting (ie Reykjavik 1-2 July 1993). The idea has been discussed for some time now, and given the general acceptance of the idea among NAMMCO members, the Working Group felt there was no need to delay the process any further. Arnór Halldórsson, Iceland agreed to draft a proposal for a statute to be presented to the Council in the report of the Working Group at the Third Meeting in Reykjavik.

The following general comments on the draft proposal reflect the discussions of the Working Group concerning the aims and operation of the Fund and the kinds of projects it could support.

Article 1:

It was agreed to define the aims of the Fund in as general way as possible so as not to define its scope too rigidly. The granting of support for specific projects, as decided by the Board, would be subject to the perceived needs and preferences of NAMMCO members at any given time.

Article 2:

The kinds of projects the Fund could support, as discussed by the Working Group, included the following:

- International conferences relevant to the interests of NAMMCO, including for example the funding of organisation, participation and publication of proceedings;
- Publications, such as books designed for a general readership, textbooks and educational material etc;
- Film projects which aim to portray in a serious way issues relevant to the management and rational utilization of marine mammals;
- Research funding for projects relevant to the interests of NAMMCO, with an emphasis on the field of social, as opposed to natural, science.
- Cultural events with an application to the interests of NAMMCO, such as one recent idea for a travelling exhibition of whales and whaling in Nordic Art.

Specific examples of projects under these categories were mentioned and discussed by the Working Group, and it was clear that there was a great range of ideas for the kinds of projects the Fund could support.

The Working Group also discussed the preference for funding of projects which help to explain the social and cultural relationship between people and the marine mammal resources from which they live in the North Atlantic. Although the NAMMCO Fund could conceivably also help fund projects of a scientific nature (biological sciences), it

was felt that this area was sufficiently funded from other sources, and that the real needs are in other areas (cf. comments on Article 1).

Article 3:

It is proposed that the initial capital for the establishment of the Fund be taken from the 1993 NAMMCO budget. Due to the fact that the Secretariat has not yet been operating in a formal way, there should be a significant surplus of funds from the annual payments already earmarked for 1993. This sum may in fact exceed the 500,000 proposed for the Fund, and the Council may also decide to include whatever remains in the Fund. The level of future contributions is a matter for the Council to decide, but the suggestion already made of an additional 25% of annual fees could be kept in mind for the following financial year. There is also the possibility for funding from external sources.

Articles 4 - 8:

The Board consists of one representative from each NAMMCO member country. The Secretariat is responsible for the administration of the Fund.

The Working Group agreed to recommend to the Council that the NAMMCO Fund be formally established at the Third Meeting of the Council in Reykjavik, July 1-2, 1993.

3.2.2 - CRUMM - The International Conference on the Rational Utilization of Marine Mammals

The Working Group noted that this forum had not been maintained in 1993 and agreed that it would be desirable to keep the Conference active, not least as it allows a greater degree of interaction between NAMMCO members and other parties with similar interests who are nevertheless outside the immediate regional scope of NAMMCO. The Working Group agreed to raise this point with the Council at the forthcoming meeting in Reykjavik.

Appendix 1 - Rep/Info WG/NAMMCO-3-1993
Draft Statute
for the
The NAMMCO Fund

Article 1

The aim of the NAMMCO Fund is to contribute to the knowledge and understanding of the rational utilization of marine mammals.

Article 2

The Fund may provide financial support for projects which agree with the aim of the Fund, as outlined in Article 1.

Article 3

The initial capital of the Fund will be the sum of DKR 500,000, to be provided from the annual budget of NAMMCO for the year 1993.

The Council of NAMMCO shall thereafter decide on an annual basis the level and percentage of contributions to be made to the Fund by NAMMCO member countries. This shall be done at the first NAMMCO Council meeting of the year, for the same financial year. The financial year is the calendar year.

The Fund may also receive contributions from sources other than NAMMCO member countries. Such contributions must be used in accordance with the aims of the Fund, as stated in Article 1.

Money paid into the Fund cannot be retrieved. If contributions for any financial year remain unused, they will be transferred to the following financial year.

Article 4

Each member country of NAMMCO elects one representative to the Board of the Fund. Decisions of the Board must be made by consensus of all members of the Board. The Secretariat of NAMMCO is responsible for the administration of the Fund, according to the directions of the Board. At the first meeting of the Council in the calendar year, the Secretariat reports on the administration of the Fund over the past year and plans for the forthcoming year.

Article 5

The Board adopts its own working guidelines and makes further decisions on the application and operation of the Fund.

Article 6

The Fund is situated in the same location as the Secretariat of NAMMCO.

Article 7

The administrative expenses of the Fund shall not be deducted from the capital of the Fund.

Article 8

The auditing of the Fund shall be done in connection with, and in the same manner as, the auditing of NAMMCO.

North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission

Third Meeting of the Council - Reykjavik, Iceland, 1-2 July 1993

- Press Release -

The Council of the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission held its third meeting in Reykjavik, Iceland, 1-2 July 1993. The Commission is established by an international agreement between the Faroe Islands, Greenland, Iceland and Norway, having as its objective to contribute through regional consultation and cooperation to the conservation, rational management and study of marine mammals in the North Atlantic.

The third meeting of the Council was attended by delegations from the member countries. Observers from Canada, Denmark, Japan and the Russian Federation were present. In addition, observers from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), the International Whaling Commission (IWC) and the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) participated at the meeting, along with observers from a number of non-governmental organizations.

The Council established the NAMMCO Fund, the aim of which is to support projects which will contribute to the increase of knowledge and understanding of the rational and sustainable utilization of marine mammals.

The Council established a working group to consider inspection and observation schemes, in order to harmonize national regulations and thereby inter alia ensure that the data collected will be compatible.

The Council agreed to convene an international conference on the impact of marine pollution on marine mammals in the North Atlantic. The conference is to be held in 1994, and experts on the topic will be invited to address the conference.

The Council further asked its Scientific Committee to co-ordinate a North Atlantic Sighting Survey of marine mammals in 1994 or 1995. The survey will provide valuable data on the status of a number of marine mammal species and stocks in the North Atlantic area.

This survey would provide an update of information derived from the North Atlantic Sighting Surveys in 1987 and 1989. The Scientific Committee is continuing its work on matters referred to it by the Council, including the review of management procedures and the status of stocks.

The Council reaffirmed the view that the concept of sustainable use should provide the basis of its future work related to the management of marine mammals and agreed to participate in the elaboration of this concept in other international fora.

The Council agreed to continue its effort to establish working relations with a number of other international organizations and with several non-governmental organizations.

The Chairman of the Council, Kjartan Hoydal of the Faroe Islands, expressed his satisfaction with the progress made in the fields of concern to NAMMCO. The NAMMCO secretariat in Tromsø will be operative from September 1993. A meeting of the Scientific Committee will be held in November 1993. The next meeting of the NAMMCO Council will be held in January or February 1994.