

# Japan's "vote consolidation operation"

in the International Whaling Commission



**"Charity is a good investment"**

Japanese proverb, cited by Minister of Foreign Affairs Taro Aso,  
January 2006 in support of Japan's programme of Overseas Development Assistance (ODA)



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction.</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Recent developments</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Further considerations regarding Japan’s overseas development assistance (ODA)</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Changing the membership of the IWC: from blocking vote to majority</b> .....	<b>11</b>
	The campaign for a majority .....	12
<b>5.</b>	<b>The “whales-eat-fish” campaign.</b> .....	<b>16</b>
	A tool for lobbying .....	17
	Justifying scientific whaling and its expansion .....	19
	Laying the grounds for future unsustainable whaling .....	19
	“Whales-eat-fish” in the international arena .....	20
	- FAO and the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) .....	21
	- Ministerial Conference on Fisheries Cooperation among African States Bordering on the Atlantic Ocean .....	26
<b>6.</b>	<b>Whaling and public relations.</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Conclusions and questions.</b> .....	<b>31</b>
	<b>APPENDIX 1: Japan’s Fisheries Grant Aid Agreements FY 1994-2004.</b> .....	<b>32</b>
	<b>APPENDIX 2: Tables of Japanese Grant Aid (all categories) and Technical Cooperation to the six Eastern Caribbean countries that are members of the IWC.</b> ..	<b>45</b>

## **1. Introduction.**

This report updates and expands the Third Millennium Foundation's (3MF) 2002 "Briefing on Japan's 'Vote-Buying' strategy in the International Whaling Commission (IWC)", which looked at Japan's use of Official Development Assistance (ODA) to obtain the support of aid-recipient countries in the IWC. In doing so it reviews the origins and development of the current Japanese campaign, launched in the late 1990s, explicitly to recruit enough new member countries into the IWC to obtain a majority in support of Japan's whaling agenda.

**As this report goes to print on the eve of the IWC's 57<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting in Ulsan, Republic of Korea, it appears that Japan might finally have achieved its goal. Four new member countries, expected to support Japan, have joined the Commission in the days immediately prior to the start of the Commission meeting. If all delegates are present, with their credentials in order and their membership dues paid, then Japan will have a simple (51%) majority on its side.**

With a simple majority, Japan would not be able actually to overturn binding decisions such as the 1982 moratorium decision or the 1994 Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary, but it would be able to inflict severe damage on two decades of conservation achievements by the IWC. With a simple majority in its favour at the Ulsan meeting, for example, it could:

- delete from the agenda on the opening day items supported by a great many member states but not to Japan's liking. Agenda items that Japan has indicated that it would seek to delete in Ulsan include new whale sanctuaries (the Argentina-Brazil proposal for a South Atlantic whale sanctuary), humane killing methods, whale-watching, and the Conservation Committee, effectively abolishing it;
- pass resolutions favourable to its expanding Antarctic and North Pacific scientific whaling programmes, including to the likely proposed future take of protected Antarctic fin and humpback whales, and furthering the concept of whales as competitors with humans for fish; the IWC has so far passed more than 20 resolutions calling on Japan to cease the lethal component of its research activities;
- together with the other commercial whaling countries, Norway and Iceland, change, by resolution, the conservative objectives and specifications of the Catch Limit Algorithm and the Revised Management Procedure to ones favouring development of their whaling industries to profitable levels with very much higher future catch limits;
- force through a Revised Management Scheme without the safeguards proposed by the conservation-minded countries;
- modify the rules of procedure, including instigating a secret ballot voting procedure; votes at present are taken by roll call and so the positions of individual countries are a matter of public record.

That there has been a concerted, organised effort by Japan to bring new members into the IWC is no secret; there is ample evidence in the public record to support this. What is under question is whether the new members have been "won over" by Japan's apparent altruism and persuasive arguments, as Japan maintains, or did the aid received, or other inducements, oblige them, and were arguments constructed to provide a justification that otherwise wouldn't have existed?

This report looks at what the recruited countries are actually supporting at the IWC: not only the resumption and expansion of commercial whaling by Japan, Norway and Iceland (with one exception<sup>1</sup> none of the recruited countries hunt whale species regulated by the IWC), but to have that resumption occur in a context wherein whales are viewed as serious competitors with humans

---

<sup>1</sup> St Vincent and the Grenadines in the Eastern Caribbean, which is allowed an annual take of humpback whales under the IWC's "aboriginal subsistence" whaling provisions.

for fish resources, therefore justifying a rejection of the precautionary management of any future whaling called for by existing international norms and by the ruinous history of commercial whaling itself.

## **2. Recent Developments.**

So far, nineteen states have been recruited by Japan into the Commission since the start of the current campaign, more than half of them from West Africa. It is possible that more will do so before the IWC's 57<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting begins in Ulsan, Republic of Korea on 20 June 2005. These 19 states have joined eight existing members: the six countries of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) **Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St Kitts and Nevis<sup>2</sup>, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines**, the **Solomon Islands** in the Pacific, and **Senegal<sup>3</sup>** in West Africa, bringing the total number of developing states expected to support Japan's position to 27.

The ten North and West African countries, where one of Japan's most intensive recruitment drives is concentrated, are: **Republic of Guinea** (2000), **Morocco** (2001), **Benin** and **Gabon** (2002), **Mauritania** (2003) and **Cote d'Ivoire** (2004). The Governments of **Mali, Cameroon, Gambia** (the only non-francophone) and **Togo** have all joined the IWC in the intersessional period between the 2004 and 2005 Annual Meetings and so have not yet participated in an IWC meeting. However, they are expected to have joined at Japan's instigation and therefore to support Japan's position at the 2005 Meeting. **Solomon Islands**, for years the only Pacific island state in the IWC, supporting Japan's position since it re-joined the IWC in 1993, has been joined in the past few years by **Palau** (2002) and **Tuvalu** (2004). **Kiribati** became a member in December 2004 so has not yet participated in an IWC Annual Meeting, but statements by its Prime Minister in the press have indicated that his government will support Japan. **Nauru** joined the IWC in the days before the start of the 2005 meeting. Having locked in the six OECS countries, Japan's lobby has more recently recruited other countries from the Central American and Western Caribbean: **Panama** (2001), **Belize** and **Nicaragua** (2003) and **Suriname** (2004). **Mongolia** became a member state in 2002.

The IWC's 2002 Annual Meeting in Shimonoseki saw the approval of an interim financial structure reducing the annual membership dues of developing countries by 50%, from £21,000 to £10,500. For 2005 they have been reduced further, to just over £7,000. To the Japan Whaling Association, the reduction of the dues was one of the "bright signs" of the Shimonoseki meeting, the lower rate "paving the way for broader participation by countries interested in the sustainable use of wildlife resources."<sup>4</sup> Even so, these yearly payments are still substantial, and common sense dictates that many of these countries, including ten<sup>5</sup> currently classified as "Least Developed Countries" by the United Nations<sup>6</sup>, would not be able to fund their own participation in the IWC, despite the reduction in fees. In the face of limited resources, one must ask whether, as non-whaling countries, they would otherwise make participation in the IWC a priority. And although the fees are now lower, many

---

<sup>2</sup> Although a member since 1992, St Kitts and Nevis did not actually participate in an IWC meeting until 1998.

<sup>3</sup> Senegal has been an IWC member since 1982, originally supporting conservation measures. It fell into arrears with its annual dues and for many years did not participate in meetings. With changes to the IWC's system of calculating annual fees Senegal negotiated a pay-back schedule with the IWC in 2003 and began voting again in 2004, aligned with Japan.

<sup>4</sup> *JWA News*, No. 1, July 2002.

<sup>5</sup> Benin, Gambia, Rep. of Guinea, Kiribati, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Togo, Tuvalu; Comoros, registered in 2004 as an observer state, is also classified as an LDC.

<sup>6</sup> The LDCs are states recognized by the United Nations as amongst the most vulnerable of the international community, facing "structural handicaps". Three basic criteria are used to determine whether a country is to be classified as an LDC, one of which is a three-year average gross domestic product per capita of less than US \$750.

countries, such as the six members from the Eastern Caribbean, were regularly paying the much higher fees for years.

Former Fisheries and Environment Minister of Dominica, Atherton Martin, who resigned over his country's vote against the South Pacific Whale Sanctuary proposal in 2000 on the grounds that it contravened a Cabinet decision to abstain, wrote in 2001: "membership in the IWC involves an annual fee of 21,567.00 Pounds Sterling (approximately EC\$85,000.00) [US\$30,000] at a time when we are in arrears on payments to several important sub-Regional, Regional and International organizations more directly linked with economic prospects for the people of Dominica."<sup>7</sup> At times this has included the United Nations itself, where for periods in recent years Dominica has lost its right to vote in the General Assembly for non-payment of approximately US\$17,000 in annual dues.

The 2002 3MF report reported how the smaller Caribbean states, including the OECS countries, are "deterred from joining ICCAT [International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas] by the expenses associated with membership fees and attending meetings" and as a result "little attention has been given to the most important species and stocks for WECAFC<sup>8</sup> countries."<sup>9</sup> Yet membership fees in ICCAT would be on the order of US\$ 6-7,000, less than current IWC membership and considerably less than IWC membership used to be.

While all the parties concerned continue to deny that "vote-buying" takes place, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that made these allegations at the IWC's 2004 Annual Meeting face censure, evidence continues to mount. In one member state, Grenada, a final hearing is pending in a fraud case brought by the Government against former Minister of Fisheries Michael Baptiste in connection to money transferred into his personal account from a foreign source intended to cover Grenada's participation in the IWC. In March 2003 the former minister was charged with three counts of fraudulent breach of trust relating to the three years 1997-99 when he served as Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries in the current Administration; in that capacity he also represented Grenada at meetings of the IWC. According to a year-long investigation carried out by *Caribupdate*<sup>10</sup>, Baptiste was accused of keeping for himself three separate payments of GBP 24,400 (sent 7<sup>th</sup> May 1998, a few weeks before the start of the IWC Annual Meeting), GBP 21,000 (sent 17<sup>th</sup> February 1999, a few months before that year's Annual Meeting, which was held in Grenada), and a further USD 3,000 sent on 25<sup>th</sup> February that year. The two large sums closely correspond to what were then Grenada's annual dues to the IWC (approximately GBP 21,000). No one seems to contest that the funds were sent; a central question in the case revolves around whether Baptiste received the funds with the knowledge of the Government (as he contends) or whether he pocketed the money instead of turning it over to the Government. The funds were reported to have come from a Houston, Texas-based Japanese-American businessman, Hideuki "Harry" Wakasa, who is described in *Grenada Today* as "believed to be the person who provided the bulk of funds for Grenada to attend meetings of the IWC and to support Japan's position on whaling."<sup>11</sup> According to the *Caribupdate*

---

<sup>7</sup> Atherton Martin, *Statement on IWC*, 2001.

<sup>8</sup> Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission, of which the OECS countries are members.

<sup>9</sup> *Report of the Ninth Session of the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) and the Sixth Session of the Lesser Antilles Fisheries Committee*, Castries, St Lucia, 27-30 September 1999. State of the Fishery Resources in the WECAFC Region, FAO Doc. WECAFC/IX/99/2E.

<sup>10</sup> [www.caribupdate.com](http://www.caribupdate.com) as reported on [www.grenadianconnection.com](http://www.grenadianconnection.com).

<sup>11</sup> *Grenada Today*, 31 January 2004.

investigation, “Baptiste himself is reported as saying that the money ‘is sent by persons or agents<sup>12</sup> who are looking for governments who support their views at the International Whaling Commission.” It is also reported that in a press conference “Baptiste confessed that ‘normally he and other government representatives sometimes collected money from ‘a man’ on airports when they were on their way to represent the country. No accounts were to be given either to the government or donors about how these sums, allegedly ‘expense related’, were spent.” In a 1993 interview for an Australian documentary, then-Fisheries Minister, later Prime Minister, the Hon. George Brizan was asked who pays Grenada’s participation at the IWC and responded by saying “it was financed by private sector people” – then after a pause adds, “and by the Government of Grenada” and refused to clarify who the private sector people might be.<sup>13</sup>

As reported in the 2002 3MF report, “Atherton Martin reported that repeated successive governments have failed to answer requests for information as to who pays Dominica’s fees at the IWC.”<sup>14</sup> Anthony Browne of *The Observer* (U.K.) reported [in 2001] that “Japan also pays Dominica’s...annual IWC membership fee. Japan denies it, but a Dominican Minister confirmed: ‘Put it like this, we make no allocation for it in our national budget.’”<sup>15</sup>

In her 1998 analysis of Japan’s “fisheries aid diplomacy”, Dr Sandra Tarte, senior lecturer in history and politics at the University of the South Pacific in Fiji, wrote that “Japan’s ability to project power through aid depends on a complex set of factors, not least the convergence of political interests in Japan, with policy actors working together rather than at odds.”<sup>16</sup> This seems to be the case in the current IWC recruitment drive. While led by the Fisheries Agency of Japan and the Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Foundation (OFCF) with backing from the fishing industry and a singular contribution from the Tokyo-based Institute for Cetacean Research (ICR) [See section 5], the campaign is fully supported by a powerful bloc of Parliamentarians [see Section 4] and by the Foreign Ministry and its Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) as well.

In the year between the 2004 and 2005 IWC Meetings alone, for example, three official trips have been undertaken to Africa by Parliamentary Secretaries for Foreign Affairs to discuss cooperation in international bodies including the IWC. Parliamentary Secretary Kazunori Tanaka traveled to Madagascar, Malawi and Uganda 29 August-9 September 2004 in part to “try to promote cooperative relations in the international arena on such issues as obtaining a non-permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council [a short-term goal for Japan for the 2005-2006 period], Security Council reform [the longer term goal of obtaining a permanent seat as part of an overall reform of the Security Council structure] and the International Whaling Commission.”<sup>17</sup> He was followed in January 2005 by Parliamentary Secretary Itsunori Onodera who called on Cameroon, Gabon and Senegal; in all countries he discussed “cooperation in the international arena”, and in Gabon paid a visit to the Owendo Communal Fisheries Centre, a project run by the Overseas Fisheries

---

<sup>12</sup> The use of “agents” was emerged from investigations surrounding alleged ‘vote-buying’ by Japan to secure the 1998 Winter Olympics for the city of Nagano. A report by the bidding committee, released by the *Mainichi Shimbun*, showed that nearly US\$18 million was spent on Nagano’s bid to host the Games. More than half apparently went into “public relations efforts”, including entertainment, payment to agents, air and hotel fees for visiting officials from the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and for trips of Nagano officials to IOC meetings abroad. Investigations were crippled when main accounting records were destroyed. Stories reported on [http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/olympics/news/1999/01/17/nagano\\_report/](http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/olympics/news/1999/01/17/nagano_report/) and ...1999/01/15/nagano\_records.

<sup>13</sup> Interview with the Hon. George Brizan, *The Last Whale*, Youngheart Productions. The film was released in 1994; the interview took place in late 1993, the same year that Grenada joined the IWC with the stated position to oppose the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary.

<sup>14</sup> Transcript of *The World Today* broadcast 12:10 AEST on local radio, Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 25 July 2001, [www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/s335317.htm](http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/s335317.htm).

<sup>15</sup> *The Observer* (U.K.), 13 May 2001, “Save the whales? Not if Japan’s bribes pay off”, by Anthony Browne.

<sup>16</sup> Tarte, Sandra. *Japan’s Aid Diplomacy and the Pacific Islands*, jointly published by the National Centre for Development Studies (Australian National University) and the Institute of Pacific Studies (University of the South Pacific), 1998.

<sup>17</sup> [www.mofa.go.jp](http://www.mofa.go.jp) News Archive.

Cooperation Foundation (OFCF). (Cameroon joined the IWC five months later just before the 2005 Annual Meeting. It received its first fisheries grant aid project, 400 million Yen for development of an artisanal fisheries centre, on 15 March 2005.) In February 2005 Parliamentary Secretary Katsuyuki Kawai, on a visit to the Republic of Guinea, met the President, the Foreign Minister and Minister of Fisheries and Aquaculture Ibrahima Sory Toure (also Guinea's IWC Commissioner) who "expressed his gratitude for Japan's cooperation...[and] the two then exchanged opinions on cooperation regarding the International Whaling Commission."<sup>18</sup> Another indication of the extent of the Foreign Ministry's and JICA's involvement in the recruitment drive comes from the recent membership of land-locked Mongolia, since 2002. Mongolia, having no fisheries, does not receive fisheries grant aid, but Japan has been the largest overall aid donor to Mongolia since 1991 and its economic cooperation and aid accounts for "approximately one-third of total aid for Mongolia by foreign countries and international organizations".<sup>19</sup>

Sandra Tarte notes that "Of the Pacific island countries, Kiribati is one of the most dependent on access fees and related fisheries activities. It also receives the highest level of fisheries aid in the region. The perception among I-Kiribati officials is that the bilateral fisheries agreement is crucial to maintaining the aid relationship with Japan... **It is notable that in the case of Kiribati, where the state depends so much on fisheries and on aid from Japan, officials tend to view both fisheries and non-fisheries aid as linked to their access relationship with Japan.**"<sup>20</sup>

The issue is effectively backed by high enough level interests frequently to make it onto the agenda of heads of state meetings involving Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi. At a summit meeting on 17 June 2004 between PM Koizumi and Mr Enrique Bolanos Geyer, President of the Republic of Nicaragua, for example, Koizumi's office reported that "At the meeting, Prime Minister Koizumi expressed his appreciation for Nicaragua's support for the position of Japan over the issue of whaling. In response, President Bolanos took note of the recent Japan-North Korea meeting and gave his support for the stance taken by Japan on the abduction issue....Further, President Bolanos requested for Japan to expand its investment into Central American countries."<sup>21</sup> Nicaragua supported Japan on every issue at the 2004 IWC meeting one month after the summit meeting; a week later, Japan announced the cancellation of US\$118.4 million of Nicaragua's debt.<sup>22</sup> Japan was committed to providing debt relief to Nicaragua anyway through its participation in the World Bank's Enhanced HIPC Initiative.<sup>23</sup> Under this scheme Nicaragua reached its "completion point" in January 2004, the point at which creditors participating in the Initiative "commit irrevocably to debt relief"<sup>24</sup>; but with strategic timing by Tokyo the debt relief decision appeared linked to Nicaragua's performance at the IWC, and this is how it was portrayed in the Nicaraguan press.

In early April 2005 it was reported that an agreement had been signed with JICA for construction of a fish trade and storage centre in Southern San Juan, Nicaragua for USD 12 million, pending confirmation by the Japanese Government.<sup>25</sup> Construction is likely to begin in October 2005. The

---

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> Information from the Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs website: [www.mofa.go.jp](http://www.mofa.go.jp).

<sup>20</sup> Dr Sandra Tarte in *Turning the Tide: Towards a Pacific Solution to Conditional Aid*, Greenpeace 2002.

<sup>21</sup> [www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/06/17nicaragua\\_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/06/17nicaragua_e.html)

<sup>22</sup> [www.laprensa.com.ni/archivio/2004/julio/24/nacionales/nacionales-20040724-16.html](http://www.laprensa.com.ni/archivio/2004/julio/24/nacionales/nacionales-20040724-16.html) "Japón perdona deuda tras apoyo ballenero" by Luis Felipe Palacios y Maria José Moncada.

<sup>23</sup> Heavily Indebted Poor Countries.

<sup>24</sup> [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org).

<sup>25</sup> Reported by Fish Information Services, [www.fis.com/fis/worldnews](http://www.fis.com/fis/worldnews). The actual amount finally agreed was approximately 12 million Yen.

agreement was announced by Nicaragua's IWC Commissioner, Miguel Marengo, director of the Nicaraguan Ministry of Promotion, Industry and Commerce's (MIFIC) National Fisheries and Aquaculture Management Division (ADPESCA). "According to Marengo, the experience of the Southern San Juan terminal could pave the way for the construction of a shellfish market in Managua as well." The official Exchange of Notes for nearly 12 million Yen of grant aid for the San Juan project was signed 4 June 2005.<sup>26</sup>

The industry's role in recruiting new member states was referred to in the Japanese press during Japan's campaign against the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary in the early 1990s. Following the visit of Dominica's then IWC Commissioner in March 1993 to the whaling town of Oshika in Miyagi Prefecture, for example, where he expressed his country's support for Japanese whaling, the *Yomiuri Shimbun* reported: "This is a product, also, of the 'vote consolidation operation' by government and industry circles together."<sup>27</sup> Sandra Tarte wrote: "The OFCF has long been used to bypass bureaucratic red tape and facilitate various special regional projects....Other channels include Japanese companies operating in the region. For example, when funding Solomon Islands' membership of the International Whaling Commission, financial support was allegedly channeled through the Japanese joint venture partner Maruha, formerly Taiyo Gyogyo, which had operated a fish cannery in Solomon Islands since 1973."<sup>28</sup>

### **3. Further considerations regarding Japan's overseas development assistance (ODA).**

*The 2002 report looked at Japan's fisheries grant aid programme, the role of the Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Foundation (OFCF) and the assistance it provides to the Fisheries Agency's recruitment efforts. It reported that while the Foreign Ministry has overall authority over ODA, the Fisheries Agency has preserved much of its control over the disbursement of fisheries grant aid, both through inter-ministerial staff postings as well as through the technical cooperation provided by its own Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Foundation (OFCF). One OFCF programme, "Promotion of exchange visits of key fishery personnel" is that used most frequently to bring fisheries officials to Japan for lobbying and training. This is referred to also in Section 6. Most recruited states have been recipients of fisheries grant aid and technical cooperation through JICA and the OFCF. [See tables of Japanese fisheries grant aid FY1994-2004, Appendix 1.] As explained in the 2002 report, the correlation between aid and votes for Japan in the IWC is nowhere clearer than in the six OECS countries, where aid, almost exclusively in the fisheries sector, began to flow as these countries, one by one, began actively supporting Japan in the IWC. See tables of aid to the OECS countries, Appendix 2.*

Tarte, in her analysis of Japan's fisheries "aid diplomacy", described "the tendency among some policymakers and fisheries industry officials...simply to pressure countries to support Japan in international fora, using aid as a negative sanction."<sup>29</sup> She further reports that "Pacific Island countries have...experienced the negative effects of political intervention in Japan's aid decision-making. On one level this refers to the use of aid to threaten, punish or cajole states. All countries in the region, from the largest (Papua New Guinea) to the smallest (Tuvalu), have at times experienced these pressures, especially in respect to fisheries access agreements." In Papua New Guinea, for example, in 1987 negotiations between the Japanese and PNG on renewal of access agreements broke down. As it was reported in a 2001 article, "The two sides at that time were unable to resolve issues, particularly the level of access fees. Mr Ganarafo [then Minister of Fisheries and Marine

---

<sup>26</sup> [www.mofa.go.jp](http://www.mofa.go.jp), ODA grant aid statistics for FY2005.

<sup>27</sup> *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 13 April 1993

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> Tarte, *Op. Cit.*, 1998.

Resources] said, as a result, PNG had foregone considerable revenue from access fees **as well as Japanese aid to the fisheries sector**, during the past 13 years.”<sup>30</sup>

The 2002 3MF report looked at examples of the extortionary nature of the Japanese fisheries aid and whether it comes with certain obligations. The Caribbean Media Corporation reported on 21 November 2001, in a story headlined “Antigua gets 17m dollars [U.S.] in aid from Japan thanks to support for whaling”, that when asked if Antigua’s vote for Japan’s position at the International Whaling Commission was a factor in the country receiving the grant aid, then Planning Minister Gaston Browne replied: **‘If we were to antagonize them I imagine that they would not be so anxious to assist us’**.”<sup>31</sup> Indeed, although the fisheries complexes began to appear in other OECS states in the mid-1980s, no fisheries aid was granted to Antigua and Barbuda, a member of the IWC since 1981, until it had changed positions and delegations and began supporting Japan in 1996. [ See aid tables in Appendix 2.]

Antigua and Barbuda obviously had learned from its experience; as recounted in the 2002 3MF report, Japanese whaling advocate Senator Daven Joseph of Antigua and Barbuda told Dominicans in a 2001 town meeting in Portsmouth “Dominicans **will lose an opportunity for development** if you go there and vote for that whale sanctuary or sit on the fence.”<sup>32</sup>

JICA itself now describes the benefits of the Fisheries Grant Aid programme as such: **“Grant aid for fisheries has also contributed to a global increase in the number of countries understanding Japan’s position...**An example of this can be seen with the Caribbean island countries where the provision of grant aid for fisheries has enabled these countries, surrounded by sea, to use fishing as a large source of income in addition to tourism and banana production. **As a result, these countries understood and promoted for international cooperation for sustainable use and conservation of marine living resources.**”<sup>33</sup>

As explained by Tarte, “[i]n the early 1970s, a special category of grant aid for fisheries was introduced to secure access for Japanese fleets to developing country fishing zones, as well as to support the operations of Japanese firms in fisheries-related joint ventures with developing countries.”<sup>34</sup> But Japanese fisheries aid has evolved over the years and recently has acquired a new objective. Writes Dr Tarte:

Fisheries or marine sector aid acquired a new role, beginning in the 1990s, of building support for Japan in environmental areas. This was in the face of growing pressure on Japan’s fishing operations, beginning with the drift-net fishing controversy in 1989. Using aid to build diplomatic support for Japan in fisheries (and related) areas has come to rival the traditional role of aid, which was to facilitate access for fishing operations in coastal states’ EEZs.

It is no secret that a key political objective of Japan’s aid to the Pacific island region is to secure support for Japan’s position in international forums on those issues of national importance. The island states form a valuable cluster of votes, especially at the United Nations, and the region is regularly lobbied to support Japan’s candidature for such things as a seat on the UN Security Council.”<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.postcourier.com.pg/20010719/news09>

<sup>31</sup> Caribbean Media Corporation, Bridgetown, 21 November 2001.

<sup>32</sup> AP Worldstream, 3 June 2001: “Dominica’s leader under pressure to reject whale sanctuary”.

<sup>33</sup> <http://www.jica.go.jp/english/activities/jicaaid/0112.html>.

<sup>34</sup> Tarte 1998.

<sup>35</sup> Tarte 2002.

The same can be said of the Caribbean, where Japan (through the Foreign Ministry) has held annual consultations with the now 15-member Caribbean Community (CARICOM, including all six OECS countries, Belize and Suriname) since 1993. The report of the Fourth Consultation, held in September 1996 in Barbados, concluded that “Japan...clearly recognize[s] the importance of thirteen votes [CARICOM had 13 members at the time] cast *en bloc* in international organizations and are determined to court that vote, especially in relation to their long-term goal of securing permanent membership of the UN Security Council.” At the Seventh CARICOM-Japan Consultation, which took place 8-9 November 1999 in Georgetown, Guyana, “the Japanese Side mentioned the importance of closer cooperation with CARICOM Member States in international fora such as the International Whaling Commission (IWC)”, as well as encouraging CARICOM members to support Japan for the Security Council seat. That meeting occurred as Japan’s latest recruitment drive was in full swing. Within a few years Belize and Suriname were to have joined the IWC, and efforts were underway in Guyana and Jamaica.

In September 2003 it was reported that a “high-level delegation” from JICA “... paid a courtesy call on Minister of Fisheries, Crops and Livestock and acting Minister of Agriculture Mr Satyadeow Sawh [of Guyana]. During the meeting, Sawh alluded to the strengthening of relations between Japan and CARICOM, and asserted that the present visit would help to cement those relations even further. The team is on the Guyana leg of a tour to member states of the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM) to formulate a programme of assistance for the fisheries sector in the region....Following a brief analysis of the fisheries sector in CARICOM countries to identify issues of sustainable development and examine requests for JICA’s technical cooperation, JICA and the Region would sign a Memorandum of Understanding thus paving the way for the implementation of a technical assistance programme.”<sup>36</sup>

In March 2005 CARICOM Directors of Fisheries/Chief Fisheries Officers (most of whom, from the OECS countries, represent their countries at the IWC) met with officials from the Government of Japan and Study Team from JICA “for the development of a master plan for fisheries and aquaculture development in the Caribbean.”<sup>37</sup>

The Japanese aid to the six OECS countries was subject to an NGO-sponsored review in 2002 by a Martinique-based economist, Bernard Petitjean-Roget.<sup>38</sup> “What makes the Japanese aid exceptional,” wrote Petitjean Roget, “is the fact that it has been concentrated on one single sector, with 22 [now more] fisheries’ infrastructure projects being financed in these islands using these funds.” He continues, “The fishing industry in these islands...is one of the most traditional industries of these island societies. It is often more a safe sector for full-time work. According to the islands, this sector represents between 1% and 2% of the GDP. The effects of this massive aid should, therefore, be spectacular in terms of the development achieved.” But in the course of his investigation, he found that “the results of this aid package on the fishing industry of these islands are far from convincing.”

The analysis reveals that “even though a specialized company, OAFIC<sup>39</sup>, was entrusted with the task of conducting a global strategic study, no sociological study was ever carried out on the populations concerned from the fishing industry, on their needs, their behaviour and their capacity to adapt to the

---

<sup>36</sup> “Japanese delegation calls on Agriculture Minister”, *Guyana Chronicle On-Line*, 13 September 2003.

<sup>37</sup> Press release 60/2005, 4 March 2005, “CARICOM and Japan hold talks on major fisheries project”, [www.caricom.org](http://www.caricom.org).

<sup>38</sup> *Socio-Economic and Political Aspects of the Aid Provided by Japan to the Fishing Industry in the Small Independent Islands in the Eastern Caribbean*, by Bernard Petitjean Roget, October 2002. Published by the Eastern Caribbean Coalition for Environmental Awareness (ECCEA) and the Swiss Coalition for the Protection of Whales (SCPW). Copies of the report are available on the websites of both organizations: [www.eccea.org](http://www.eccea.org) and [www.asms-swiss.org](http://www.asms-swiss.org).

<sup>39</sup> The Overseas Agro-Fisheries Consultants Co., based in Tokyo.

change. As a result the failure of the policy was easily predictable. So we are then left with the effects of these large investments on the economies of these islands. Given the manner in which these aid packages have been managed, it is unlikely that the 'local added value' financed by the aid exceeds 38-40% of the declared amount of that aid. Indeed, this figure is probably less, as there is, unfortunately, every reason to believe that part of the aid includes a special budget intended to 'reward the laudable efforts of those who give their support to the project' and to silence those whose consciences are opposed to such practices."

A 2003 World Bank "Country Financial Accountability Assessment" of the six OECS countries noted that: "Large amounts of aid are not brought to account in the main public accounts, due to a failure of donors and project directors to report aid receipts and expenditures promptly to the Accountant General."<sup>40</sup>

Petitjean Roget also reported that "[t]he Japanese aid to the fishing industry shows markedly different characteristics from the aid granted by the EU [the largest donor to the region]. Whereas the Japanese aid was negotiated bilaterally on an ad hoc basis between an economic superpower and each of these small countries, the EU is a multilateral package negotiated as part of a general convention linking the EU to all of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP). Consequently the Japanese aid package is targeted exclusively not merely at the fishing industry as a whole, but more especially at the financing of infrastructure for the fishing ports."<sup>41</sup>

The 2002 3MF report refers to instances, too, of island officials seeking to broaden the base of Japan's support beyond the single-minded pursuit of construction of fisheries complexes that has characterized Japan's grant aid to date. In a recent example, where the two heads of government seem to be talking at cross-purposes, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Prime Minister Ralph Gonsalves, at a Summit Meeting with Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi in Tokyo on 2 March 2004, "expressed his gratitude for the economic cooperation provided by Japan in areas including marine products, and his wish to further broaden bilateral relations." But Koizumi's reply merely indicated that St Vincent and the Grenadines should expect only more fisheries aid: "Both of our countries have beautiful nature and are blessed with marine resources. Japan would like to cooperate with Saint Vincent and the Grenadines in areas including sustainable utilization of living marine resources" – Japan's euphemistic term that refers to the whaling issue.<sup>42</sup>

In the OECD's Development Assistance Committee's (DAC) peer review of Japan's ODA, published in December 2003, Japan was cautioned that: "[i]n implementing the ODA Charter, Japan should highlight that the primary objective of ODA is for the development of the recipient country and should ensure that narrower national interests do not over-ride this objective."<sup>43</sup>

Under Japan's ODA programme, in order to be eligible for grant aid, a recipient country's per capita income level must not exceed a certain upper limit. Several of the fisheries grant aid recipients in the IWC, including Eastern Caribbean countries and some of the West African states such as Gabon and Morocco, are well above that limit and yet Japan is prepared to make exceptions for them; why? Explains Dr Tarte, "**Countries that receive grant aid even though they exceed the per capita income level are a special case and political arguments tend to be important. These may**

---

<sup>40</sup> World Bank Report: *Country Financial Accountability Assessment – Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St Kitts and Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines*, April 30, 2003.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> From the website of the PM of Japan, [www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/03/02st\\_vincent\\_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumiphoto/2004/03/02st_vincent_e.html).

<sup>43</sup> OECD, "Japan: DAC Peer Review – Main Findings and Recommendations", 19 December 2003.

**include diplomatic benefits (such as votes in international fora) and the value to Japan of resources such as fisheries (aid to acquire access).<sup>44</sup>**

The same is reported by Petitjean Roget in his analysis of the OECS states. “Caribbean islands substantially exceed the upper limit in terms of per capita GDP for countries eligible for aid... However the use of the aid fund for fishing-related purposes allows more flexible criteria, where the upper limits can be substantially exceeded. This can easily be seen with the example of an allocation of aid to three complexes in Antigua, where the per capita GDP is way above the stipulated upper limit.”<sup>45</sup> In fact, when the new Director of the Caribbean Division of Japan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs Yasuo Minemura and Assistant Director Midori Yamashita met the new Antiguan Prime Minister the Hon. Baldwin Spencer in August 2004, “it was pointed out by the Antiguan leader that the country’s per capita income should not become an obstacle to deeper cooperation.”<sup>46</sup> The Antiguan government’s release reporting on the meeting also noted that “the officials also looked at how they can cooperate in various international fora, concentrating on how Japan and Antigua and Barbuda can give mutual support on key issues.”

In an analysis of Gabon’s fisheries sector, the IZF, created in 1998 by the Commission de l’Union Economique et Monetaire Ouest Africaine (UEMOA) and by the Secretariat Executif de la Communauté Economique et Monetaire de l’Afrique Centrale (CEMAC) on the initiative of all the Finance and Economy Ministries of the Zone Franc CFA (14 countries), refers to the fisheries agreement concluded in 2000 between Gabon and the Federation of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Associations and states that “This accord (which is little used but has been made law) and above all Gabon’s involvement towards Japan in various marine resource agreements justified the provision by Japan of significant grant aid to Gabon to which it could not normally lay claim in that it is a country with an intermediate level of income.”<sup>47</sup>

#### **4. Changing the membership of the IWC: from blocking vote to majority.**

Japan worked actively, and with considerable but not total success, to change the policies and delegations of several developing countries that had joined the IWC in the late 1970s/early 1980s to support the worldwide moratorium on commercial whaling that was eventually adopted in 1982.<sup>48</sup>

But the first serious recruitment drive began in the early 1990s, with the objective to create a ¼ minority blocking vote to stop France’s proposal for creation of a Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary, first deliberated by the IWC at its 1992 Annual Meeting. After the 1993 Annual Meeting in Kyoto, where the Sanctuary proposal had received the support of a simple majority of members (not enough for formal adoption), Japan’s then Minister of Fisheries Masami Tanabu was reported in the Japanese press two weeks after the meeting as saying “Now it is appreciated that to block things like the Antarctic sanctuary we need to increase our friends in the IWC.”<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Tarte 1998.

<sup>45</sup> Petitjean Roget, *op. cit.*

<sup>46</sup> “Japan and Antigua and Barbuda discuss areas of Cooperation”, 29 August 2004, [www.antigua.gov.ag/news/news0829042.htm](http://www.antigua.gov.ag/news/news0829042.htm)

<sup>47</sup> [www.izf.net](http://www.izf.net); information provided to IZF in November 2003.

<sup>48</sup> See 2002 3MF Report, p. 9, for an exchange of letters between Japan’s Ambassador in Kenya, Senkuro Saiki, and Seychelles’ Minister of Planning and Development, Dr. M.J. Ferrari, in November 1980, in which the Ambassador wrote “... all I can say at this time is that if in future your Government should change its attitude at IWC towards Japan, there would be a possibility of my Government extending the grant to Seychelles.” Seychelles had joined the IWC in 1979 with a strong conservation agenda, proposing creation of the Indian Ocean Whale Sanctuary and a global moratorium on commercial whaling. Seychelles resisted Japanese pressure and maintained its pro-conservation stance until it withdrew from the IWC in 1994.

<sup>49</sup> *Kanagawa Shimbun*, 25 May 1993

Three more Eastern Caribbean island states joined the IWC in this period, the Commonwealth of Dominica and St Kitts and Nevis in 1992 and Grenada in 1993; also in 1993 Solomon Islands returned to the IWC after a hiatus of several years and has supported Japan's position ever since. While Dominica and Grenada participated actively to oppose the Sanctuary and support Japan on other issues, St Kitts and Nevis had a delegate at the 1992 meeting but he did not participate in the voting and it wasn't until 1998 that St Kitts and Nevis was again represented at the IWC. Despite its non-participation, this small island state of around 40,000 inhabitants maintained its annual payments of up to GBP 21,000 through all the years that it was inactive. Like Antigua and Barbuda, it did not begin to receive fisheries grant aid from Japan until after its change of position, with the first grant, for construction of a fisheries complex at Basseterre, arriving in 2000.

In St Kitts and Nevis, proponents of Nevisian secession from St Kitts (as Anguilla 30 years earlier) cite as the most serious grievance against the central government the failure to share aid monies more equitably with Nevis. As a prime example, they refer to Japan's fisheries aid to St Kitts. As a leading proponent of Nevisian secession, Dr Everson Hull, PhD., a Professor of Economics at Howard University in Washington, D.C., wrote in the *St Kitts and Nevis Democrat* in February 2004: "What is more than a little troubling is that there appears to be an unwillingness to come to grips with, and acknowledge, the reasons why Anguillans, then, and Nevisians, now, have said that they do not wish to be governed by a central government in Basseterre [capital city of St Kitts]...no one of the opponents to Independence for Nevis was willing to face up to, and denounce, a political system that allows St Kitts **to grab all \$25 million of a Japanese pay-off for a whaling vote that was jointly offered by both St Kitts and Nevis.**"

In the end, the blocking vote did not hold together and a modified Southern Ocean Sanctuary, jointly presented by France, Mexico and Chile, was adopted with an overwhelming majority by the IWC's 1994 Annual Meeting; only Japan voted against the proposal. St Lucia left the meeting before the vote was taken and the others abstained.

From 1994 to 1998 no new developing countries joined the IWC in support of Japan, although after 15 years of championing marine conservation issues, and whale conservation in particular, Antigua and Barbuda changed policy and Commissioner in time for the 1996 Annual Meeting; the country received its first ever Japanese fisheries grant aid project in 1997.

### **The campaign for a majority.**

Already in the early 1990s there were clearly those within the fisheries administration of Japan that had in mind a goal larger than simply holding on to a blocking minority of votes. Four days after the end of the 1992 meeting, the Director of the JFA "revealed an initiative to urge the participation of developing countries in order to reform the management of the IWC."<sup>50</sup> During a visit by a Norwegian delegation in June 1993, for example, an official of the Fisheries Agency of Japan, Takanori Ohashi, reportedly told his guests that Japan was organizing an "offensive demarche...in order to change the composition of the IWC." "We need nine more votes," he continued, and named six target countries: Kiribati, Papua New Guinea and Tonga<sup>51</sup> in the Pacific, and Philippines, Indonesia and Thailand in Asia. Ohashi went on to state his expectation that "in three years the

<sup>50</sup> *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 8 July 1992.

<sup>51</sup> In May 1995 a Tongan citizen, Mr Tasi Afeaki, living in Japan and acting in the name of his company, MACA Pacific, submitted a proposal to the Tongan Government calling for an annual catch of 50 humpback, 200 sperm and 100 minke whales; "modern whaling equipment including harpoons, and whaling grenades", was to be imported. The proposal was rejected. Tonga hunted humpback whales until 1979, when the King decreed a moratorium. [Source: New Zealand *Herald*, 24 May 1995].

situation within the IWC would have become better and for that reason there was no basis for Norway or Japan to leave the IWC.”<sup>52</sup>

The project is taking far longer to happen than Ohashi outlined, but whatever were the internal obstacles to its coming into force obviously were lifted about five years later when the composition of the IWC began to change with the activation of St Kitts and Nevis’ idle membership and a steady influx of developing countries thereafter, joining the IWC to oppose the creation of whale sanctuaries in waters other than their own, and to support a resumption of Japanese commercial whaling and a continuation of Japanese scientific whaling. This influx has coincided with the formulation and diffusion of the “whales-eat-fish” argument by the ICR and the Government of Japan, and was accompanied by indications of new-found optimism within Japan’s whaling circles.

In 1998, the IWC had 35 active member states, with 11-12 voting with Japan and 22-23 opposed. With the IWC’s  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority rule for the adoption of binding decisions, in which each “no” vote effectively cancels three “yes” votes, Japan would have needed to aim for another 55 or so new members, if the numbers of conservation-minded countries did not also increase, in order to obtain a  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority in its favour. From a logistical point of view alone that task would have been daunting. It was clearly more feasible to aim for a simple majority, 51%, requiring, at the time, approximately 13 more states to join on Japan’s side. That number has increased as conservation-minded states have also joined the Commission in the meantime.

In October 1998, the “first new vessel in 26 years commissioned as a whale catcher”, the 720-ton *Yushin Maru*, was launched. The President of Kyodo Senpaku Ltd, the vessel’s owner, commented that the *Yushin Maru* “will be able to contribute to **‘eco-harmonized whaling’**”, which he described as “a concept for a new era of whaling combined with resource and ecosystem monitoring.”<sup>53</sup>

The then Director of the Institute for Cetacean Research (ICR), Dr Seiji Ohsumi, spoke in similar terms at a press conference held on 27 January 1999, referring to a number of developments that in his view were indications of “bold new concept of whaling for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.”<sup>54</sup> He also made a first reference to cetaceans consuming “five times” more fish than humans; this was obviously a reference to a paper he and ICR colleague T. Tamura were to circulate at the IWC Scientific Committee meeting four months later and which was to become the foundation of the “whales-eat-fish” campaign. [See section 5]

One unmistakable feature of the campaign has been the very active though little publicized involvement of an influential group of pro-whaling Parliamentarians, from both Houses of Japan’s Diet. Their role began to emerge around the time of the IWC’s 51<sup>st</sup> Annual Meeting in May 1999 in Grenada, the first time the IWC had met in the Caribbean region. The Japanese delegation that year had five Parliamentarians among its members, an unusually high number for an international meeting of this status. The presence of the MPs on the Japanese delegation was significant enough to lead outgoing Japanese Ambassador, Yasuhiko Tanaka, signing an agreement in Grenada in July 1999 for a US\$2.9 million grant for the Melville Street Municipal Fish Market, to remark that “the most memorable thing for him in recent times was Grenada’s hosting of the 51<sup>st</sup> session of the International Whaling Commission in May which was attended by 5 members of Japan’s House of

---

<sup>52</sup> *Aftenposten*, 15 June 1993: “Japan wants to expand the IWC” by Gunnar Filseth.

<sup>53</sup> *INWR Digest*, 1998, n. 16, available at: [www.ualberta.ca/~inwr/DIGEST/digest16.html](http://www.ualberta.ca/~inwr/DIGEST/digest16.html).

<sup>54</sup> *Minato Shimbun*, 29.01.1999. Dr Ohsumi referred in particular to two regional initiatives, the “epoch-making” October 1998 informal consultation among the IWC representatives of China, Japan Republic of Korea and Russia (at OFCF headquarters) and the July 1998 Japan-sponsored meeting in St Lucia to prepare an Eastern Caribbean “cetacean research and management system”, the organization now known as ECCO – the Eastern Caribbean Cetacean Commission.

Representatives”.<sup>55</sup> Since then Japan’s IWC delegations have regularly included significant numbers of MPs; at the 2004 Annual Meeting in Sorrento there were eight as well as Vice Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Eiko Kanata.<sup>56</sup> President of the Liberal Democratic Party’s Parliamentary League for the Promotion of Whaling, Shunichi Suzuki, told a visiting Korean delegation in October 2004 that “the League places emphasis on diplomatic efforts by its members. ‘Whenever the members of the League visit overseas, they try to seize the opportunity to promote understanding of sustainable use of marine living resources, including whales.’”<sup>57</sup>

As of April 2002 the “Sustainable Use Parliamentarians Union” (SUPU), founded in 2000, has a Japanese chapter, described as a “supra-partisan” group now chaired by the leader of the LDP in the House of Councilors, Yutaka Takeyama. On its founding, one month before the IWC meeting in Shimonoseki, Japan, SUPU Japan was reported to have 118 members.<sup>58</sup> A more recent account puts the number at 94.<sup>59</sup> SUPU-Japan, like the LDP Whaling League, takes advantage of international conferences in Japan and meetings with officials and Parliamentarians of other countries to press its pro-whaling message. The Third Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD), which brought together heads of state and government, ministers and officials from all African countries in Tokyo 29 September – 1 October 2003 in Tokyo, was one such occasion. SUPU-Japan organised a side meeting with African delegates to “exchange views on sustainable use of natural resources...at a welcome reception held in a Tokyo hotel on October 1....The reception... was attended by seven members of SUPU-Japan, including its chairman... and representatives from 20 African countries. In his welcome speech, Takeyama...called on African delegates to join SUPU, stressing the need for parliamentarians throughout the world to unite to promote the concept of sustainable use of the resources.”<sup>60</sup>

One MP on the delegation to the 1999 Grenada IWC meeting, Tokuichiro Tamazawa, at the time President of the LDP’s Whaling League, told a press conference a few weeks after that meeting that support for Japan’s position from the six OECS countries “[was the]result of Diet Members’ diplomatic efforts for many years. **From now on we will work on Morocco and many countries by practical use of ODA.**”<sup>61</sup> In October 1999 Tamazawa was appointed Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) where he served until the following year.

Another MP appointed to a senior position in the Ministry in the same period, Hiroaki Kameya, an LDP member of the Upper House, the House of Councilors, from Miyagi Prefecture (location of Ayukawa and other coastal whaling towns) became a Vice Minister in July 1998. He was to use his position actively in pursuit of more voting support for Japan in the IWC, and unusually, recounted his efforts on several occasions to the Japanese press.<sup>62</sup>

Immediately after the Grenada meeting Vice-Minister Kameya traveled to Trinidad and Tobago, already identified within Japan as a possible candidate for IWC membership, as well as to allies St

---

<sup>55</sup> *Grenada Today*, week ending 17 July 1999.

<sup>56</sup> *JWA News*, No. 10, September 2004.

<sup>57</sup> *JWA News*, No. 11, January 2005.

<sup>58</sup> *International Herald Tribune/Asahi Shimbun*, 3 May 2002.

<sup>59</sup> *JWA News* (Japan Whaling Association), No. 8, December 2003.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>61</sup> *Suisan Keizai and Minato Shimbun*, 11 June 1999.

<sup>62</sup> See [http://whales.greenpeace.org/reports/Briefing\\_rigging.PDF](http://whales.greenpeace.org/reports/Briefing_rigging.PDF).

Lucia and St Vincent and the Grenadines.<sup>63</sup> A week later Kameya returned to Japan and gave a press conference on June 2nd, at which it was reported that he “**revealed a plan for Japan to use its official development assistance (ODA) program as measures to promote fisheries, for example, increasing of the number of countries that favor whaling.**” The vice minister is reported as saying, “There are at least 10 countries, including countries in the Caribbean Sea, which would support our position.’ He thus indicated,” continues the article, “that the government would ask aid-recipient countries to support Japan's views [in the IWC].”<sup>64</sup> In a story carried on the Kyodo wire service the same day, Kameya was also reported as saying: “Because anti-whaling countries' attitudes are stubborn, it is judged that it is more advantageous for future negotiations to dig up supporting votes by increasing member countries than by trying to split opposing votes.”

On June 11<sup>th</sup> a fisheries newspaper reported that Kameya, in a meeting with pro-whaling parliamentarians from the LDP's Whaling League the previous day (the same meeting addressed by Tamazawa), had set a target of an additional 13 countries joining and named Morocco as a possible new member, also Trinidad and Tobago, Fiji, Zimbabwe and South Pacific countries. The Democratic Party's whaling league also met around the same time and it, too, “confirmed to expand pro-whaling countries.”<sup>65</sup>

On August 17<sup>th</sup> it was reported in the fisheries press that Kameya had departed for Zimbabwe, Namibia and the Republic of Guinea to “explain Japan's position of whaling and the IWC and CITES and appeal to them to take united steps”. On August 30, he was quoted in the same paper on his return from Africa, saying: “I requested the three nations to join the IWC from a perspective of sustainable use of marine resources including whales. All agreed. The Prime Minister of Guinea showed his will to join by the next year's meeting.” Guinea's Foreign Minister and its Fisheries Minister (Sidibe), in turn, also made an official trip to Tokyo that same month.<sup>66</sup>

In October that year, Japan turned up with large observer delegation to 4<sup>th</sup> session of a relatively new African regional fisheries body, the Ministerial Conference for Fisheries Cooperation among African States Bordering the Atlantic Ocean (ATLAFCO, COMHAFAT in French). The delegation was led by Minoru Morimoto, Japan's IWC Commissioner and Deputy Director General of the Fisheries Agency, who in his address to the meeting informed the assembled fisheries ministers and officials that he had “specially undertaken this long voyage” to participate in this conference based on information from Minister Kameya following his August 1999 trip to Guinea. As reported in the 2002 3MF report, he appealed to the West Africans, and specifically the francophone West Africans, to join Japan “to rectify, above all at the heart of international organizations, all thoughts that are wrong or lacking a scientific basis and that risk to distort the benefits of development.” He emphasised the importance of Japan's market for the ATLAFCO member states and reminded the delegates that “this leads me to tell you that the Japanese market for maritime products is extremely important and indispensable for you all.” [*More is said about this organization in Section 5.*]

Guinea joined the IWC in time for the 2000 meeting and cast the same vote as Japan every time it voted. Guinea had received fisheries aid in 1998; following its decision to join the IWC it has received two more fisheries grant aid projects, in FY 2001 and 2002. It has maintained a tuna long-line fisheries agreement with the Japanese Tuna and Bonito Association since 1995. Morocco joined in 2001 and voted with Japan except for some tactical abstentions. Zimbabwe attended as an observer

---

<sup>63</sup> Trinidad & Tobago has long been a target of the Japanese recruitment drive. It is the seat of the Japanese Embassy representing all of the Eastern Caribbean island states that are now in the IWC, and for years Japan has funded the Caribbean Fisheries Training Centre in Chaguaramas.

<sup>64</sup> *Nihon Keizai*, page 7, 3 June 1999.

<sup>65</sup> Combined extracts from *Suisan Keizai* and *Minato Shimibun*, 11 June 1999.

<sup>66</sup> Information from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan-Republic of Guinea Relations, [www.mofa.go.jp](http://www.mofa.go.jp).

in 2000 but never joined the IWC. Namibia attended as an observer in 2001 but has not returned to the IWC since.

In its 2 August 2001 edition, the *St Lucia Star* reported that “It is expected that more African countries will join the IWC by the time the organization holds its 2002 annual meeting in Japan.”

This was indeed the case. Two more francophone West African states, Benin and Gabon, joined the IWC just before the IWC’s 2002 Annual Meeting in Shimonoseki, Japan, where they participated in the Japanese-led bloc that stymied adoption of a quota for bowhead whales for the indigenous peoples of Alaska and Siberia. Two months after the Shimonoseki meeting, the Vice President of the OFCF, Matsuyoshi Moriya, was in Gabon to sign a 70-million Yen agreement with that country’s newly appointed Fisheries Minister, Emile Doumba, leader of the Gabonese delegation to Shimonoseki, for the rehabilitation of the fisheries center of Owendo. Being an OFCF arrangement, the grant is not included in the grant aid statistics published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but rather is part of the OFCF technical cooperation programme and is not made public. Said Matsuyoshi, “Our Foundation continues to carry out projects in the field of fisheries, **but only in those countries with which Japan maintains particularly close relations**. Two months ago, in an international conference, thanks to the cooperation of your country, Japan was able to obtain un hoped for results”, in a clear reference to the Shimonoseki IWC meeting and the blocking of the bowhead quota.<sup>67</sup>

In November 2002 an 8-person Japanese delegation, including JICA representatives and private consultants, led by a Mr Katoh of the Fisheries Agency visited the Regional Support Union in Benin of the Sustainable Fisheries Livelihood Programme in that country. The delegation spent more than a month in the country (6 Nov.- 11 Dec.) to draw up a proposal to improve the fisheries port of Cotonou.<sup>68</sup> An Exchange of Notes for a 287 million Yen grant for the Cotonou project was eventually signed between the Japanese and Beninois governments on 14 January 2005.

---

<sup>67</sup> *Journal de l’Union*, 17.07.2002 at: [www.internetafrica.com/gabon/actu/actu\\_17072002d.htm](http://www.internetafrica.com/gabon/actu/actu_17072002d.htm)

<sup>68</sup> “Info-Flash le PMEDP...en action...” number 24, November 2002. [http://www.sflp.org/ftp/dloadinff/inff\\_nov2002eng.doc](http://www.sflp.org/ftp/dloadinff/inff_nov2002eng.doc)

## 5. The “Whales-eat-fish” campaign.

Coinciding with the influx of developing countries into the IWC to build a majority for Japan has been the development of the “whales-eat-fish” argument and the whaling lobby’s efforts to introduce it into other international and regional bodies, at times aided by many of these same countries. The argument is inextricably linked to the recruitment drive, providing an important lobbying tool in approaching the countries being recruited, especially fishing nations, as well as a justification for many of them to participate in an otherwise costly and perhaps low-priority organization. Within Japan itself it helps to maintain the political support and levels of funding to sustain the recruitment drive and is used in attempt to increase an otherwise flagging domestic public support for whaling and for the consumption of whale meat.

As the whaling lobby within the Japanese Government launched its drive to recruit a majority, the ICR played its part by drafting two papers, one a global review (“Estimation of total food consumption by cetaceans in the world’s oceans” by T. Tamura and Seiji Ohsumi, circulated to the IWC Scientific Committee in 1999) the other a regional review (“Regional Assessments of Prey Consumption by marine cetaceans in the world”, also by Tamura and Ohsumi, submitted to the IWC Scientific Committee in 2000). The main conclusion of the global review, that “approximately three to five hundred million tons of marine food resources are consumed annually by cetaceans, some 3 to 6 times more than are fished for human consumption”, has become one of the main sound-bites of the entire campaign, being repeated over and over again by the delegates from Japan and from the recruited countries, and reproduced in government briefing material sent to all countries approached by Japan. While the argument makes good PR its simplicity does not stand up to scientific scrutiny.

The two ICR papers on which the campaign rests in fact have never been published in a scientific journal nor have they been subject to an independent peer review. The first paper, the “global review” wasn’t even formally submitted to the IWC Scientific Committee for discussion; it was only made available as an information paper and thus was not considered by the meeting. At the 2001 IWC meeting, on the initiative of Japan and the U.S., the Commission agreed by resolution that the Scientific Committee should convene an intersessional workshop to consider the question of whale-fisheries interactions; St Lucia offered to host the meeting, sometime before the 2002 Annual Meeting. St Lucia also reported this fact to the October 2001 meeting of the Western Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission (WECAFC), a regional fisheries body set up under FAO. Yet by the time of the 2002 Annual Meeting, St Lucia had withdrawn its proposal to host the meeting and Japan, despite having been one of the initiators, refused to participate in it. Thus the Modelling Workshop on Cetacean-Fishery Competition went ahead, in La Jolla, California, in June 2002 without Japan and with none of the Caribbean IWC members. Among its main conclusions was that “the reality is that for no system at present are we in a position, in terms of data availability and model development, to be able to provide quantitatively predictive management advice on the impact of cetaceans on fisheries or fisheries on cetaceans.”<sup>69</sup>

The whales-eat-fish argument is also important in that it now provides the main justification for the continuation and expansion (in species and numbers killed) of Japan’s two scientific whaling programmes, something that the recruited countries most faithfully support, as well as for the scientific whaling programme of Iceland, which started in 2003 with a two-year feasibility study. Perhaps most importantly of all for Japan and its whaling allies, if the argument that cetaceans are competing with fisheries and thus with “food security” in the world is accepted internationally, then there is no need to respect precautionary management of whale stocks as the objective of whaling will be to reduce their numbers. Already it has been the principal argument used by Norwegian

---

<sup>69</sup> *Report of the IWC’s Modelling Workshop on Cetacean-Fishery Competition*, IWC/SC/55/Rep.1.

fisheries authorities and Parliament in calling, in 2004, for dramatic increases in Norway's annual minke whale catches, regardless of what a precautionary procedure for sustainable management would allow.

Japan's fisheries lobby, still stung by the closure of the high seas driftnet fishery more than a decade ago and concerned by more recent developments (such as efforts within the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) to list fish species on its appendices), is also using this argument to build a bloc of support to defend its fisheries, including but not limited to whaling, against the "environmental agenda". For years, together especially with Norway and Iceland, it has pressed its view of marine mammals, and cetaceans in particular, as harvestable resources to be incorporated into "multispecies management". They are taking this further now by seeking to distort the international development of the "ecosystem approach to fisheries management" (EAFM), already a part of recent agreements such as the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and specifically called for in the Plan of Implementation of the 2002 World Summit for Sustainable Development, which "encourage[s] the application by 2010 of the ecosystem approach". Their objective is to win international acceptance that culling whales and other predators in the hopes of improving fish catches not only is acceptable but is a primary component of ecosystem-based fisheries management, as opposed to the dominant view of EAFM as managing fisheries in a way to ensure that healthy marine ecosystems will be restored and maintained. As will be seen below, Japan's efforts to do so in the context of the one fisheries-related body with global membership, the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI), is supported only by Norway, Iceland and a group of developing countries that for the most part are among those that have joined the IWC to support Japan's agenda there. A former Director General of the Fisheries Agency, in a 1993 interview with Dr Sandra Tarte, put it this way:

The current situation is one where Japan is targeted by environmentalists. My feelings are that we have to defend our interest and the general principle of sustainable utilization of renewable resources. In order to achieve this objective we want to see as many nations as possible take the position...that sustainable utilization does not deplete resources. Economic cooperation in the field of fisheries should be extended to many countries so that they benefit from this position.<sup>70</sup>

#### A tool for lobbying.

As a lobbying tool to convince or provide a justification for aid-recipient countries to join the IWC, the campaign has been used extensively in countries where fisheries are important, and no more so than in the Pacific island states. As reported in the 2002 3MF report, it was the primary argument used by Japan, largely unsuccessfully, in its efforts to undermine support for the Australian and New Zealand proposal for a South Pacific Whale Sanctuary at the 29<sup>th</sup> South Pacific Forum<sup>71</sup> meeting in 1998 to which the proposal had been submitted to allow regional consultation and endorsement prior to its presentation to the IWC.

One Pacific island state that seems to have been influenced by the arguments, however, is Kiribati, which joined the IWC in December 2004. As an example of how the whales-eat-fish lobby work is done, scientists onboard a private research vessel, the *Odysey*, on a cruise of the Pacific in 2001, reported the following:

At a recent Fisheries meeting in Japan (JARN II-in August and September 2000) the Japanese Fisheries Agency gave delegates from all nations written material and pictures depicting whales as serious food competitors of squid and blue-fin tuna. The information was compiled by the Fisheries Agency of the Government of Japan, and included

---

<sup>70</sup> Tarte, 1998.

<sup>71</sup> Now the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF).

photographs of the stomach contents of a dead sperm whale, containing a large quantity of squid.

From our discussions with members of the fisheries department in Kiribati, it is clear that Kiribati is trying to start a commercial squid fishery in its territorial waters. A Kiribati Fisheries officer who was present at the meeting in Japan, (JARPN II) implied that he is concerned that Kiribati's potentially profitable squid fishery may be threatened by the presence of sperm whales. During our time in Kiribati, both Government Officials and Fisheries employees made reference to whales competing with humans for fish, as well as to the potential Japanese interest in whaling in their territorial waters. This is a direct result of the propaganda by whaling nations. It is disturbing because it is so misleading. The annual production of squid on which sperm whales are known to feed, has been estimated to be roughly equal to the total weight of all fish caught by human fishers each year. However, there are many species of squid, and people have yet to succeed in making a viable commercial catch of the squid species on which the whales principally feed. In fact, we cannot even sample those species, except by removing them from the stomachs of whales. It would be hard, therefore, to imagine a major predator that competes less with humans for the squid species that interest us than sperm whales do.<sup>72</sup>

The argument is also promoted widely at home by the IWC delegates from the OECS countries. A BBC documentary produced in 2002 gave a rare glimpse into one of the Japanese-funded media briefings hosted each year in one of the OECS countries.<sup>73</sup> [See Section 6] The ICR's glossy photos of fish taken from whale stomachs in the course of its scientific whaling activities were at the centre of presentations by Dr Dan Goodman, an adviser to the ICR, and OECS whaling advocates. Dr Horace Walters, former IWC Commissioner for St Lucia, now head of the Eastern Caribbean Conservation Commission (ECCO), a Japanese-funded pro-whaling organisation, told the assembled reporters "The whale is the biggest consumer of our fish. The fish we want to feed our people, the whales are eating them." No evidence is given, nor could it be. There is none. What there is is a dearth of knowledge about the status of fish stocks in the region, with all the consequences that this has for fisheries management in the area. According to an FAO/WECAFC report, "The Status of Fisheries Resources in the Western Central Atlantic Region" (including the Caribbean Sea), prepared for the WECAFC session in October 2003, "...there is very high uncertainty about the status of even the more important fisheries resources of the region. The situation puts many of the resources, and the fisheries dependent upon them, at risk through over-exploitation."

The BBC film also shows how the argument is used for domestic purposes in Japan, where the whaling lobby at the Fisheries Agency and the ICR is concerned to promote whale meat sales and an interest in "whaling culture", especially among young people in Japan. Dr Ohsumi himself tells the interviewer, shortly before the 2002 Shimonoseki meeting, that "having the meeting in Japan is a great PR opportunity to gain the Japanese people's understanding of the whaling issue." In the month before the 2002 meeting, three campaigning vans were dispatched by the Fisheries Agency offices in Tokyo to spread the pro-whaling message throughout Japan and collect signatures for a petition supporting whaling; the main message they broadcast again and again through their loud-speakers was "Recently competition between the fishing industry and whales has become serious in many places. We believe the culling of whales is necessary to protect the Japanese fishing industry." T-shirts and posters bearing the slogan "Whales increase, Fishes decrease – People are in trouble!!" were also widely distributed.

#### Justifying scientific whaling and its expansion.

The report from Kiribati in the previous section refers to the presentation of "JARPN II" at a fisheries meeting in Japan. JARPN II is the second of Japan's scientific whaling programmes in the

---

<sup>72</sup> [http://www.pbs.org/odyssey/odyssey/20010217\\_log\\_transcript.html](http://www.pbs.org/odyssey/odyssey/20010217_log_transcript.html), report by Drs Genevieve Johnson and Roger Payne.

<sup>73</sup> *Whale Hunters*, written and produced by Jeremy Bristow, BBC, 2002.

North Pacific, and, like the first JARPN and the long-running Antarctic programme (JARPA), is one of the items supported absolutely unwaveringly by the Japanese-recruited countries in the IWC.

JARPN began in 1994 with a feasibility study for annual catches of 100 minke whales ( $\pm 10\%$ ) and one objective: “to clarify the stock structure of minke whales in the northwestern North Pacific.” By 1999, in its final year, an additional objective had been added: “to determine the feeding ecology of minke whales in the North Pacific.” In 2000, Japan came to the IWC with a proposal for a two-year feasibility study for a new North Pacific programme, JARPN II, expanded to include an annual take of 50 Bryde’s whales and 10 sperm whales. In this new programme, the study of feeding ecology had become the highest priority. With the feasibility study concluded, to no one’s surprise Japan confirmed that the proposed research programme was, indeed, “feasible” and the full proposal was presented to the IWC in 2002, with an increase in the annual take of minke whales (from 100 to 150), 50 Bryde’s, 10 sperm whales, and the addition of catches of 50 sei whales, for an indefinite period. In 2004 Japan raised the catch limit for minke whales to 220.

JARPN II was harshly criticized within the IWC Scientific Committee that year. Some months later, an unprecedented letter signed by seventeen members of the Scientific Committee was published in the journal of the American Institute of Biological Sciences, *Bioscience*, criticizing the design, structure and content of the JARPN II programme. The scientists wrote that “Overall, JARPN II presumes, on an almost *a priori* basis, that whales (not humans) are primarily responsible for worldwide declines in fish stocks and ignores the immense complexities inherent in marine ecosystems. In short, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that JARPN II exists to ‘demonstrate’ – all data to the contrary notwithstanding – that whales eat too much fish and therefore should be culled by more whaling.”<sup>74</sup>

Japan’s other, long-term scientific whaling programme, JARPA, ended with the 2004/2005 Antarctic whaling season. According to the MAFF *Update*, and various reports in the Japanese media, a new Antarctic programme “is under consideration” and will be discussed at the Scientific Committee meeting in Ulsan prior to the main Commission meeting; current catches of minke whales are expected to be doubled, and catches of protected fin and humpback whales are also foreseen. “The purpose of the new research would be to study the Antarctic ecosystem with a central focus on whales, and to develop more appropriate whale management schemes.”<sup>75</sup> More “appropriate” than what? The only management scheme so far under consideration is that developed by the IWC Scientific Committee and accepted by the Commission (the Revised Management Procedure) and the elements of the Revised Management Scheme that are still under development and discussion.

#### Laying the grounds for future unsustainable whaling.

In fact, what has emerged most clearly in the IWC is that the whaling countries, Japan and Norway in particular, are intent on dismantling the conservative management regime that has been under development by the IWC since adoption of the moratorium, should there ever be a decision by the IWC to authorize a resumption of commercial whaling. But they will only be able to do that if they have a simple majority of support behind them. Now that that goal appears within reach, both countries are becoming more open about their intentions, and both made explicit statements to this effect at the 2004 IWC meeting in Sorrento.

Their interest centers on the Catch Limit Algorithm, the mathematical formula for calculating catch limits that lies at the heart of the Revised Management Procedure (RMP). The RMP, including the CLA, was accepted and endorsed by the Commission in a 1994 resolution, but because it was not adopted as binding with a  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority (a majority of countries preferring to wait until completion of the RMS in order to adopt the entire package) it could be changed by another simple-majority-backed resolution in future. When the CLA was under development by the IWC, the Commission was asked by the Scientific Committee to decide to which of three, sometimes conflicting objectives it wanted to give the priority. The three objectives were: (1) maximizing cumulative catches throughout the

---

<sup>74</sup> *Bioscience*, journal of the American Institute of Biological Sciences, March 2003, Vol. 53, no. 3.

<sup>75</sup> MAFF *Update*, 22 April 2005, n. 583.

management period, (2) preventing the risk of depletion, and (3) providing stable catches over time. The Commission chose objective two – preventing depletion – as its priority, with the consequence that the most conservative parameter values of those offered by the Scientific Committee and other features were agreed, contrary to the wishes of the whaling countries which favoured the other management objectives.

At the 2004 Annual Meeting of the Scientific Committee, Norway announced that it intended to develop and propose a change to the RMP's CLA for minke whales in the North Atlantic. As Norway later explained to the Commission, there were two reasons for its decision:

- (1) the current CLA “gives inappropriately small catch limits”<sup>76</sup> and
- (2) “when the RMP was developed in the 1980s, the precautionary principle was interpreted ‘one-sidedly’. It was important to ensure against over exploitation of whale resources. **Under a future ecosystem-based management, the precautionary principle must be interpreted ‘two-sidedly’ in the sense that it is important to avoid not only to harvest too many whales, but also not to harvest too few, given the plausible resultant impacts on sustainable fishery yields.**”<sup>77</sup>

Also in Sorrento, under the agenda item “Future Sustainable Whaling” included at the request of Japan, Japan also signaled its intention to seek revision of the RMP. In a presentation entitled “The centennial of Antarctic whaling – from the history of over-harvesting to the creation of new sustainable whaling”, Japan noted that “**it might be necessary to improve the RMP to enhance these three factors** [the three management objectives] **in order to achieve optimum utilization of whale resources.**” The Japanese presentation went on to say: “**Using whale management as a core to the ecosystem approach to the management of ocean resources, the potential for optimum utilization of whales and other marine living resources can be enhanced.**”

A January 2005 article in the *JWA News*, reporting on the results of the JARPN II programme in 2004, gave a further indication of Japan's intentions: “Based on the findings both in the offshore and coastal areas, **the Japanese Government intends to develop a new management scheme** (ecosystem-based comprehensive management scheme) envisaging not only cetacean resources but all fishery resources in the future.”<sup>78</sup>

#### “Whales-eat-fish” in the international arena.

The whaling group within the Fisheries Agency, comprised at the time most noticeably of Masayuki Komatsu, for years its Chief International Negotiator, and Minoru Morimoto, its Deputy Director General, began to spread the argument internationally as an integral part of the campaign to build a simple majority in the IWC, with the ICR providing the paper work. While individuals such as Mr Komatsu might claim, as he did during the IWC meeting in 2000, that “the question of cetacean-fishery interactions has become a major issue throughout the world” and is now “...an important issue in the context of food security,” this is simply not true.<sup>79</sup> When the whales-eat-fish issue has been raised in international and regional bodies it is because it has been put there by the whaling lobby from within the Fisheries Agency – and by these two advocates in particular – with such

---

<sup>76</sup> In fact, Norway has been applying a modified version of the CLA for years to calculate its self-imposed catch limits for minke whaling under objection to the moratorium, begun in 1993. Its modification has never been put to the same rigorous implementation testing by the Scientific Committee as the accepted version.

<sup>77</sup> IWC Chair's Report of the 56th Annual Meeting, 19-22 July 2004, Sorrento, Italy.

<sup>78</sup> *JWA News*, No. 11, January 2005.

<sup>79</sup> *IWC Chairman's Report*, 52nd Annual Meeting, 2000.

predictability that one need only look at a participants' list to know whether or not the issue would be on the agenda in any particular body.<sup>80</sup>

They have brought it into specific regional fisheries agreements, in particular:

- the Convention for the Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea during the years Komatsu led the Japanese delegation,
- the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) during the years Komatsu served as Chairman,
- the Ministerial Conference on Fisheries Cooperation among African States Bordering the Atlantic Ocean (ATLAFCO, COMHAFAT in French) with Morimoto leading the Japanese observer delegation,
- through the Caribbean IWC Commissioners, into the Western Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission (WECAFC), the latter as part of the general effort to engage the
- UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and its Committee on Fisheries (COFI, chaired by Komatsu in 2001) in this issue.

#### FAO and the Committee on Fisheries (COFI).

Of all of these organisations, success in FAO is what matters most to Japan. While FAO projects funded by donors might bear that donor's own agenda, they come with the *imprimatur* of FAO and thus appear all the more credible and objective. Japan holds an influential position in the FAO Fisheries Department as a major bilateral donor to FAO's fisheries programme. It has created two trust funds run under FAO's Government Cooperation Programme: the first of these, GCP/INT/643/JPN "Sustainable Contribution of Fisheries to Food Security", was initially intended to run for three years from July 1996, then extended to December 2002 though still seems to be active. It was created to address concerns such as "economic, social and cultural aspects of fisheries and fish consumption", and "multi-species fisheries management". This trust fund was put into effect the year following the 1995 Kyoto Summit on the Sustainable Contribution of Fisheries to Food Security, an initiative of the Government of Japan with the support of FAO.

The other is GCP/INT/823/JPN "Responsible Fisheries for Small Island Developing States". Reports Dr Sandra Tarte, "[i]n a more recent move (allegedly at the instigation of negotiator and senior Fisheries Agency bureaucrat Komatsu), Japan has established a special Small Island Developing States fund with the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) worth U.S. \$1.5 million. Ostensibly, this is to be used to assist small island states in the implementation of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. But according to FAO sources, this is really a 'slush fund' to be used by Japan for certain purposes that its aid system cannot accommodate. This includes funding participation of island state delegations at international meetings."<sup>81</sup>

The Food and Agriculture Organisation's Committee on Fisheries (COFI) meets every two years at FAO headquarters in Rome. More than 100 states members of FAO and observers participate in the sessions. According to FAO, "the Committee presently constitutes the only global inter-governmental forum where major international fisheries and aquaculture problems and issues are examined and recommendations addressed to governments, regional fishery bodies, NGOs, fishworkers, FAO and international community, periodically on a world-wide basis."<sup>82</sup> Under the auspices of COFI two major international fisheries agreements were negotiated, the voluntary Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (1995) and the UN Agreement on Straddling Stocks.

---

<sup>80</sup> The "whales-eat-fish" argument refers to the propaganda campaign run by the Government of Japan as based on the two ICR papers. There have been serious investigations underway for years in other bodies, such as the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) looking at predator-prey relations generally but they are still very far from being able to put these studies into practical management schemes, partly because they are controversial and give inconclusive or even contradictory results.

<sup>81</sup> Tarte (2002).

<sup>82</sup> [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)

The marine mammal-fisheries interaction discussion in COFI falls within COFI's consideration of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM). This arose from various articles of the Code of Conduct and has been the subject of various conferences and declarations since. In October 2001 the Government of Iceland, supported by FAO and the Government of Norway, hosted the Reykjavik Conference on Responsible Fisheries, particularly in support of Article 6 of the Code ("General Principles"). The Government of Japan abstained when the conference adopted the "Reykjavik Declaration" because the text "did not specifically mention the interrelationship between fisheries and marine mammals."<sup>83</sup> The Plan of Implementation agreed at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg "encourage[d] the application by 2010 of the ecosystem approach" in fisheries, as well as inviting states to ratify or accede to and implement UNCLOS "which provides the overall legal framework for ocean activities" and to promote the implementation of Chapter 17 of *Agenda 21*.<sup>84</sup>

UNCLOS and *Agenda 21* both contain important provisions regarding the conservation of whales and management of whaling, whales being given special status both as highly migratory species (UNCLOS Article 64) and as marine mammals (Articles 65 and 120) under which a state or international organisation may "prohibit, limit or regulate the exploitation of marine mammals more strictly than provided for in this Part" (that is, more strictly than "optimum utilization"). UNCLOS paragraphs 61(4) and 119(1)(b) require fisheries for prey species to be regulated "with a view to maintaining or restoring populations of such associated or dependent species [that is, predators on the harvested species] above levels at which their reproduction may become seriously threatened." This principle is strongly supported also in various articles of the Code of Conduct.<sup>85</sup> The Japanese and Norwegian insistence on the idea of "ecosystem manipulation", that is, removal of the predators in the hope of increasing fisheries yields by commercial fisheries has not only never been shown to be practicable but is also contrary to these principles of international law.

Japan made a first effort at the 23<sup>rd</sup> session of COFI, 15-19 February 1999, at which Morimoto was elected First Vice Chairman, and Komatsu was on the Japanese delegation together with representatives of the OFCF, the ICR and the wise use NGO Global Guardian Trust. At that meeting COFI "noted the progress in the application of the Kyoto Declaration and Plan of Action"<sup>86</sup> and expressed the need to assess better the cultural and socio-economic aspects of fisheries in relation to food security. The Committee agreed that greater consideration should be given to the development of more appropriate ecosystem approaches to fisheries development and management, optimally in collaboration with both FAO and non-FAO regional fisheries bodies.<sup>87</sup>

While that recommendation advanced the ecosystem approach generally it did so with nothing specific to boost the whaling lobby's agenda. They tried again at FAO a month later, this time through Vice-Minister Kameya, who led the Japanese delegation to the FAO Ministerial-level meeting on the Implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries Practices, which met in Rome on 10-11 March 1999. The fisheries meeting was attended by ministers and representatives from 129 countries. Vice-Minister Kameya emphasized four points during the fisheries meeting, one of which was: "the importance of comprehensive management of the marine ecosystem, including cetaceans and other marine mammals." On the last day of the meeting the Rome Declaration on the Implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries was adopted. Among its points was that "Comprehensive management of the marine ecosystem should be taken into account in

---

<sup>83</sup> Fish Information Service, "Fishery Agency discusses FAO Convention", 15 October 2001.

<sup>84</sup> Plan of Implementation, WSSD, 2002, articles 30 (a), (b) and (d).

<sup>85</sup> See, for example, Code of Conduct Articles 6.2, 6.6, 7.5.2 and 7.6.9.

<sup>86</sup> The Declaration was agreed at the December 1995 Kyoto Summit on the Sustainable Contribution of Fisheries to Food Security, an initiative of the Government of Japan with support from FAO.

<sup>87</sup> *Report of the 23<sup>rd</sup> session*, COFI, 15-19 February 1999, paragraph 71.

conservation and management of fisheries resources”, but Kameya’s specific reference to “cetaceans or other marine mammals” was not included<sup>88</sup>

As noted in the 2002 3MF report, at COFI’s 24<sup>th</sup> session in 2001, the whaling lobby finally scored a coup when Mr Komatsu was elected chairman of the session and was able to force through a contentious, and not fully supported, recommendation to FAO to “conduct studies on the relationship between marine mammals and fisheries.”<sup>89</sup> But during that same discussion, the COFI report shows that “Other Members, however, commented on the issues and complexity of ecosystem-based fisheries management, urging that caution be exercised in drawing definitive conclusions with respect to the impact of predator/prey relationships on fisheries as a number of environmental and human factors also contributed to the status of particular fisheries.”

This outcome from the COFI meeting, an apparent endorsement by FAO/COFI of Japan’s thesis that whales compete with human fish consumption, is frequently referred to in Japanese government and industry briefing material and reports to give legitimacy to their claims. In a briefing paper entitled “The Facts about Whales and Fish Stocks”, Japan’s Institute for Cetacean Research, for example, notes that “the matter of competition between marine mammals and fisheries is now of serious concern for nations dependent on fisheries as well as for a number of global and regional fisheries management organizations including the United Nations’ Food and Agriculture Organisation”. FAO’s apparent support has also been cited as a justification for Japan’s newest scientific whaling programme in the North Pacific, JARPN II.<sup>90</sup>

Determined to press the matter even further, Japan arrived at the 25<sup>th</sup> session of COFI in February 2003, this time without Komatsu but armed with its PR material regarding JARPN II and the photographs of fish spilling out of the stomachs of harpooned whales, which it presented to delegates the day before EAFM was to be discussed. More importantly, Japan arrived with a well-organised group of mostly Caribbean and African countries, almost all from the Japan-supporting bloc in the IWC, to back it up, fresh from a secret strategy session only two weeks earlier in Tokyo to which, reportedly, representatives of some 40 developing countries had been invited to discuss COFI, CITES and the IWC.<sup>91</sup>

A common theme of these interventions was that whales and marine mammals generally pose a threat to the “food security” of these nations by their consumption of fish. Trinidad and Tobago’s delegate, William Benjamin, an adviser to the Ministry of Food Production and Marine Resources (who was to play another role in a year’s time – *see section 6*), was the first to speak, not only informing the meeting that whales are threatening the food security of Trinidad and Tobago but also thanking Japan for its “generosity and genuine concern for the peoples of the Caribbean”. Supporting statements were made by Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, Cameroon, Dominica, Republic of Guinea, Mauritania, St Kitts and Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines and Seychelles, with one exception a familiar roster from the IWC. Many of these gave their full endorsement to the continuation of studies and to FAO’s continuing involvement in the issue.

The COFI discussion also brought to light two Japanese-funded regional studies of cetacean-fisheries interactions. The first, in the Lesser Antilles of the Eastern Caribbean, had already been alluded to at the 10<sup>th</sup> Session of WECAFC in October 2001, though no details were given at that time. As one of FAO’s Government Cooperation Projects, GCP/RLA/140/JPN the “Scientific Basis for Ecosystem-based Management in the Lesser Antilles including Interactions with Marine

---

<sup>88</sup> MAFF Update, 2 April 1999. <http://www.maff.go.jp/mud/303.html>.

<sup>89</sup> This recommendation emerged from a session of the Drafting Committee. When discussed by the full meeting, a number of countries objected as they did not support the recommendation, but Komatsu as Chair would not allow any changes to be made.

<sup>90</sup> “Given the increasing importance of and interest in competition between marine mammals and fisheries with strong support from international organizations, including the ...FAO, JARPN II focuses on feeding ecology and ecosystem studies.” MAFF Update, n. 479, 22 November 2002.

<sup>91</sup> This meeting was reportedly sponsored by the OFCF; delegates’ travel expenses and accommodation would have been handled through that organisation.

Mammals and other Top Predators (June 2002-June 2007) is currently underway in the region. States participating are IWC members Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, Japan, St Kitts and Nevis, St Lucia, and St Vincent and the Grenadines; it was reported at a Japanese-sponsored media symposium in Trinidad and Tobago in April 2004 [see section 6] that that country's Cabinet had also decided to adhere to the effort.

This project first came to WECAFC's attention at its 10<sup>th</sup> session in October 2001, when the project was still in the planning phase. The first discussions about it apparently took place earlier that year or in late 2000 at meetings at FAO and with representatives of the Government of Japan in Rome over plans to extend to other islands the cetacean sightings surveys that had been carried out in Dominica, St Lucia and St Vincent and the Grenadines in early 2000 with the help of the ICR. Investigations into cetacean-fisheries interactions were to be part of the extended programme.<sup>92</sup>

The project was finalized in 2002 following meetings in the Eastern Caribbean states between fisheries officials of the participating countries and Japanese scientists. A reference to the project was included in a background document prepared for the 25<sup>th</sup> Session of FAO's Committee for Fisheries (COFI, Rome, 24-28 February 2003) and some of the participating states referred to it in their statements to the COFI meeting. According to the COFI information document COFI/2003/10<sup>93</sup> the project was launched in October 2002.

St Lucia's Chief Fisheries Officer, Vaughn Charles, informed journalists at a pre-IWC media symposium in St Kitts in May 2005 that the data being collected under this project "will play a critical role in solidifying the Caribbean's position at international fora such as ...CITES and the ...IWC."<sup>94</sup> Since the OECS position at CITES and IWC is by now well-known, this statement can only be an indication that it has been pre-determined that the outcome of this study will further Japan's OECS-supported agenda. In fact, one of the concerns regarding this project is that marine mammals (cetaceans) have been singled out in advance in accordance with the political agenda of Japan, the main donor. There is therefore a danger that this unbalanced coverage of the ecosystem will lead to inappropriate management strategies caused by exclusive focus on one factor that may not be one of the key factors affecting fisheries in the ecosystem.

The representative from Guinea, also the IWC delegate, supported Japan's presentation and called attention to research into marine mammal-fisheries interactions along the West African coastlines of Guinea, Senegal, Guinea Bissau, Benin, Cape Verde and Gabon, funded by Japan in December 2002. Japan coordinates the cetacean work through the Conakry-based *Centre National des Sciences Halieutiques de Boussoira* in the Republic of Guinea.<sup>95</sup> From 1 August to 28 September 2001, the ICR hosted a training workshop in Japan for representatives from six West African states (Cape Verde, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Republic of Guinea and Senegal) in the practice and theory of cetacean sightings and identification. Participants spent time at the ICR headquarters in Tokyo, on board the research vessel Kyo-Maru No. 1, and at the National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries, in Shimizu. This was in preparation for a sightings cruise that took place, under the auspices of the Government of Guinea and the ICR, in the Gulf of Guinea in December 2002.

But despite the obvious prior preparation and organization of these coordinated interventions, the Japanese attempt to hijack the EAFM debate did not entirely succeed. Strong opposition came from the delegations of Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the USA; the EU commented that predator-prey relations are only a "very small part" of what is meant by an ecosystem approach to management. Objections were made to the various references made in FAO's Draft Guidelines on

---

<sup>92</sup> International Network for Whaling Research, *INWR Digest*, No. 21, May 2001.

<sup>93</sup> Implementation of Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management to Achieve Responsible Fisheries and to Restore Fisheries Resources and Marine Environments

<sup>94</sup> "Regional Media further Sensitize to Sustainable Use of Marine Resources", release issued by the Government of St Lucia, 23 May 2005, [www.stlucia.gov.lc](http://www.stlucia.gov.lc).

<sup>95</sup> [www.cnshb.org.gn](http://www.cnshb.org.gn)

EAFM to “ecosystem manipulation”, the culling of top predators, and to the language used in the Draft Guidelines regarding the precautionary approach which, it was argued, was not consistent with the precautionary approach language used in the Code of Conduct. South Africa also argued that the ecosystem approach “goes well beyond” predator-prey relations and possible impacts of predation by mammals. Other interventions, for example by Argentina, India, Indonesia, Malaysia and Peru, did not address the “whales-eat-fish” issue at all, but instead called attention to a variety of other issues such as problems associated with coral reefs, mangroves and the effects on the marine ecosystem of climate change.

The Report of the COFI meeting said:

91. Many Members reconfirmed their strong support for paragraph 39 of the report of the Twenty-fourth Session of COFI. Researches on the subject of interactions between marine mammals and fisheries were described. Many members supported the need for continuing research and the further development of ecosystem models while other Members noted that EAF was wider than just predator/prey relations and possible mammal impacts. Some Members expressed the view that low priority be given to predator/prey relations, and their impact on fish resources, as opposed to other aspects of relevance, such as reduced bycatch, habitat protection, land-based impacts, climatic changes, etc. Some Members noted the primacy of the International Whaling Commission with respect to the role of whales in the marine environment and the strongly held view that discussions on whales in COFI detracted from the more important fisheries issues such as IUU [Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated] fishing.

At COFI’s 26<sup>th</sup> session, held in Rome 7-11 March 2005, the EAFM was not on the agenda (although its further development is foreseen in FAO’s two-year work programme). The delegate of Japan raised the matter in Japan’s Opening Statement, saying that it was not satisfied with the way the agenda had been put together and indicating that it would raise EAFM under Any Other Business. Japan’s eventual intervention, citing again the estimations from the ICR papers, was supported by the delegates (also IWC Commissioners and delegates) from Nicaragua, St Kitts (Senator Daven Joseph of Antigua and Barbuda), Grenada, Dominica, Morocco, St Lucia and Iceland, most of whom said little else during the week. Japan gave notice that it wanted the item to be placed on the agenda for the next COFI session, in early 2007. Grenada called on FAO to hold a technical consultation on this matter with a report to be made to the 2007 session, though there was no agreement on this. The St Lucian delegate thanked FAO for the study now underway in Caribbean region, but commented that there was a problem with certain approaches being taken within that project “which we hope to resolve with the project coordinator”. Other delegates disagreed with Japan’s statements regarding the putative impact of whales on fish stocks and reiterated their belief that this was a matter for the IWC to address, not COFI. Interventions by two NGOs drew further attention to the weaknesses in Japan’s arguments.

Another forum where Japan has brought the whales-eat-fish issue is the Ministerial Conference on Fisheries Cooperation Among African States Bordering the Atlantic Ocean (ATLAFCO). Given that more than half of the new IWC members recruited in the past several years are West African states and members of this organisation, it deserves a closer look.

Japan works at a bilateral level in West Africa, particularly with those states with which it has fisheries agreements. These include Gabon, Guinea, Gambia, Mauritania, Morocco and Senegal. Because of the fisheries agreements the OFCF can also be active in these countries, and it is the OFCF’s Director of International Relations, Yoshihiro Takagi, who is seen most closely following the African IWC delegates at IWC Annual Meetings.

But Japan is also setting up a wider base through its involvement in ATLAFCO. France and Japan are by far the most important individual donors to the organisation which also receives support from FAO, UNIDO and various multilateral development banks, but Japan has a much larger presence in the organization than France. Currently the Ministerial Conference benefits from three tripartite fisheries cooperation programmes, the parties being Japan, Morocco (home of the ATLAFCO headquarters) and Other African states (francophone only). These programmes have been expanded

to include Algeria and Tunisia which are not members of ATLAFCO. While the Cooperation Française is an official partner of ATLAFCO, three Japanese agencies/institutions are also partners: the Japan Fisheries Agency, the OFCF and JICA. France is represented at the ATLAFCO's sessions by one observer, Japan sent 8 observers spread among four delegations to the 4<sup>th</sup> session in Guinea in 1999; at the 5<sup>th</sup> session in Gabon in October 2001 there were 10 Japanese observers representing seven delegations, including the Fisheries Agency (represented by IWC Commissioner Morimoto), the OFCF, the Japan Fisheries Association, JICA and the ICR.

Surprisingly, Daven Joseph, then IWC Commissioner for Antigua and Barbuda, and Horace Walters of St Lucia, head of ECCO, also appeared as observers at the 2001 session and the Bureau meeting that preceded it, in May 2001 in Rabat.<sup>96</sup> The report of the Bureau session records that “the representatives of guest countries (Japan, St Lucia, Antigua and Barbuda) presented the meeting with their concerns relative to the negotiations within the International Whaling Commission (IWC) and the International Agreement on the Trade in Threatened Species” (i.e. CITES)

In this same Bureau meeting, the West African organization was invited “to take part in the Ministerial Meeting scheduled for 2002 in the Caribbean,” and the Bureau recommended that this be accepted by the full Conference. No details of the proposed meeting were given. In the report of the October 2001 5<sup>th</sup> Ministerial session, it was noted that “[t]he Conference accepts the invitation to the Conference to participate in the meeting on the sustainable use of resources to be held in the Caribbean in 2002.” This could possibly be a reference to the media symposium held in April 2002 in Antigua and Barbuda organized by Tele-Press Associates, but if so no African delegates were reported as being at that gathering.

At its May meeting the Bureau also “took note of the initiative to establish trilateral cooperation between Member States of the Conference, Japan and Caribbean states,” but it is not known what might have come of this initiative.

Lastly, the Bureau “asked Japan to make presentations on the results of its scientific research during the next Ministerial Meeting.” This was a reference to the ICR's investigations of whale-fisheries interactions through its scientific whaling programmes and a scientist from the ICR made such a presentation to the 5<sup>th</sup> session later that year.

The final report of the 5<sup>th</sup> Ministerial Conference does not openly endorse Japan's position but does not reject it either. It states:

The Conference considers the issue of competition between cetaceans and the other commercially interesting fish stocks must be treated with objectivity, while highlighting the necessity for the sustainable use of living marine resources based on scientific evidence and economic and social considerations.

The organisation's 6<sup>th</sup> session was originally scheduled for late 2003 in Cote d'Ivoire but did not take place. A Bureau meeting was held in January 2004 in Dakar, Senegal, with JICA and OFCF present as observers. According to the report of the ICCAT observer, the meeting “urged the member states to adhere to and to participate actively in the work of international organizations where the principles and rules for the utilization of the living marine resources are discussed...”<sup>97</sup>

What is striking is that in other West African fisheries organisations, such as the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission (SRFC/CSRP in French) based in Senegal and FAO's Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF), in which many of the member states of ATLAFCO, and the IWC, participate, whales-fisheries interactions are given no priority at all; in fact, they are not even discussed. Japan is a member of CECAF but does not participate in the meetings; it is not a member

---

<sup>96</sup> Daven Joseph, now an Opposition Senator in Antigua and Barbuda but a representative on the delegation of St Kitts and Nevis to the IWC, to COFI and perhaps elsewhere, was identified in an article by Caribbean journalist Tony Best reporting on the 2004 IWC meeting in Sorrento as “scientific adviser to Caribbean **and African** nations.” [www.ctenews.com/tbest\\_news\\_07152004a.html](http://www.ctenews.com/tbest_news_07152004a.html).

<sup>97</sup> ICCAT (International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas), *Report for the biennial period, 2004-05*, Part 1 (2004), Vol. 1, Madrid, 2005.

of the SRFC. Representatives from the OECS also do not appear at the meetings of these organisations. Instead, the participants discuss issues such as cooperation in fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance; regulation of access to the fishing zones; management of fishing capacity; data collection and monitoring of high seas resources.

It is also worth recalling that most of the West African IWC members are also Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), some for many more years than they have been members of the IWC. These include: Cameroon (1983), Benin and Senegal (1986), Mali (1987), Morocco (1993), Togo (1996), Mauritania (1998), Gambia (2001) and Ivory Coast (2003). As Parties they are committed to “endeavour to provide immediate protection for migratory species included in Appendix 1”: these include sperm, humpback, blue, fin and sei whales. Migratory species “that have an unfavourable conservation status or would benefit significantly from international cooperation organized by tailored agreements are listed in Appendix II.” These include many species of dolphins and porpoises, Baird’s beaked whale, minke and Bryde’s whales. The Seventh Conference of Parties to the CMS, meeting in Bonn 18-24 September 2002, adopted a recommendation concerning Regional Coordination for Small Cetaceans and Sirenians of Central and West Africa. This recommendation, aimed at creating a regional memorandum of understanding, notes that “coastal communities of the Atlantic Ocean and those living along inland waters value these small cetaceans and sirenians for their heritage, economic, scientific, tourism and educational value as a significant component of the world’s biodiversity” and is “aware that threats to these species, notably destruction or modification of habitats by the development of coastal areas and of riverbanks of inland waters, pollution, agriculture, increasing mortality and by-catch could if not properly managed, lead to further decline in their populations.”

## **6. Whaling and public relations.**

*The 2002 IMF report noted that “the recruitment drive is...facilitated by a relentless and very well funded propaganda campaign.” One journalist, Peter Espuet, writing in the Jamaica Gleaner in 1999, reported that in the run-up to the Grenada IWC meeting that year, “they held a ‘Media Symposium’ for some 40 journalists they had flown to Grenada...where only the pro-whaling point-of-view was put forward, mostly with OECS speakers. The Caribbean position was made out to be the same as the OECS position, and the journalists were misled, and then quickly flown home before they could attend the IWC meeting or talk to anyone else. This was expensive, but it paid off, for at least in The Gleaner, two prowhaling stories were run and no anti-whaling ones.”<sup>98</sup>*

The recruitment campaign has run for the longest in the OECS countries, and there it is distinguished by a significant emphasis on public relations work. It is no accident that the main “handler” of the Caribbean delegates at IWC meetings is, in fact, Alan Macnow, director of the PR firm Tele-Press Associates of New York.

The hallmarks of the PR campaign are the annual media briefings purporting to be objective briefings on issues related to the IWC to which journalists are invited, usually by the host government, with all expenses paid. In fact, as a number of journalists have found over the years, the meetings serve only to promote the propaganda offered by Japanese and OECS whaling advocates. For the media symposium held in Antigua and Barbuda in 2002 and partially recorded by the BBC, “all flights, food accommodation and incidental expenses [were] paid by the Japan Whaling Association.”<sup>99</sup>

The latest of the annual briefings – each tends to have a “theme” – took place near the end of May 2005 in St Kitts, host of the 2006 IWC meeting, and was devoted to “media sensitisation”. An account of the briefing was published on the website of the Government of St Lucia. *PR Watch*,

---

<sup>98</sup> Peter Espuet, *The Gleaner* (Jamaica), 2 June 1999.

<sup>99</sup> BBC, 2002.

reporting on the activities of Tele-Press Associates in 2001, identifies the Government of St Lucia as a client of TPA, along with, of course, the JFA, the OFCF and various other fisheries industry-related bodies in Japan.<sup>100</sup>

The 2005 press briefing was a lower level affair than the one in 2004, hosted by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and ECCO, and even involving the President of the country. The 2004 conference was clearly aimed at recruiting Trinidad and Tobago into the IWC<sup>101</sup>; Guyana and Jamaica were also singled out as targets. Its driving force and organizer in Trinidad and Tobago was William Benjamin, who had informed the FAO's COFI meeting one year earlier on behalf of his Government that whales were a threat to his country's "food security" and also thanked the Government of Japan for its "generosity" to the region.

In his column in the *Trinidad Express*, Professor Julian Kenny, for 30 years Professor of Zoology at the St Augustine (Trinidad) campus of the University of the West Indies and a former Chairman of the Board of Management of Trinidad and Tobago's Institute of Marine Affairs, wrote: "I was in fact at the last minute invited to make a 15-minute presentation at the second afternoon session but once I saw the programme and the persona, I realized what it was all about, getting Trinidad and Tobago to join the International Whaling Commission, obviously to vote for the country that funded the symposium. It was not about science and I declined."<sup>102</sup>

He later explained: "Sustainable development is the thing these days. Not so long ago there was a two-day symposium organised by the Japanese funded whaling lobby in CARICOM entitled "Sustainable use of renewable resources". The symposium involved in part the President of the country, two ministers of government responsible for agriculture and the environment and various other public officials. **Actually the symposium was really a manipulation of the political processes of the country by the international whaling lobby that wants to return to the past.** But sustainable development is not just a buzz word-it is adopted in the laws of this country."<sup>103</sup>

Despite the pro-whaling theme of the symposium, Ann-Marie Jobity, Trinidad and Tobago's Director of Fisheries, when addressing the meeting said that it was not her country's policy to join the IWC.

**For Caribbean countries, it may be argued the focus of whaling is not food security or to satisfy nutritional needs, and only in a few cases is it cultural. Seven CARICOM states are members of the IWC. Donor funding, in particular to the fisheries sector, is linked to this membership and support of a particular position. Aid from proponents for the resumption of commercial whaling may many times compel a country to make decisions that are not in their national interest.**

**Trinidad and Tobago is not a whaling country and hence, at this time, we would be interested in the work of the IWC mainly from a conservation standpoint and the promotion of non-consumptive use. Membership of the IWC is therefore not considered a priority at this time. Membership can be revisited if this country has sufficient reason to be concerned that the IWC requires additional support in respect of achieving its mandate.**<sup>104</sup>

It emerged during the symposium that the Cabinet had approved Trinidad and Tobago's participation in the Japanese-funded FAO project on marine mammal-fisheries interactions in the Lesser Antilles [see FAO section]. Journalist Mark Meredith wrote: "A senior Fisheries source told me the project

---

<sup>100</sup> *PR WATCH*, Public Interest Reporting on the PR/Public Affairs Industry, Vol. 8, Number 1, First Quarter 2001.

<sup>101</sup> Mark Meredith, "Whale of a Tale": T&T and the International Whaling Commission", *Trinidad Express*, 11 April 2004. See [www.trinidadexpress.com](http://www.trinidadexpress.com).

<sup>102</sup> Julian Kenny, "A whale of a symposium!", *Trinidad Express*, 25 May 2004.

<sup>103</sup> Julian Kenny, "Sustainable sustainability", *Trinidad Express*, 22 June 2004.

<sup>104</sup> Meredith, *op. cit.*

would be executed by the United Nations FAO..., but that there was no budgetary allocation from Government. Funding would come from Japan.”<sup>105</sup>

The PR work takes another form as well, in the training and preparation of delegates for their performances at the IWC, and in COFI and CITES as well. Individual officials are regularly brought to Japan under the OFCF “exchange” programme, as was reported earlier. But through the OFCF larger organizational meetings are also held in Japan, usually in great secrecy. One of these was the meeting held in February 2003 to prepare for the COFI session and upcoming IWC meeting. Unconfirmed reports say that the meeting was attended by representatives of 40 developing countries.

Another coordination meeting took place 15-16 May 2003. A news release from the Government of Grenada, dated 14 May 2003, reported the participation of Grenada’s then Minister for Agriculture, Lands, Forestry and Fisheries, Claris Charles, in what was billed as a “Symposium on Sustainable Use of Marine Resources” but could more appropriately have been called a training session. The news release listed the benefits that would come from Grenada’s participation in this symposium, including to “strengthen the capacity of Grenada to better negotiate and represent its interest regionally and internationally in the management and development of its resources”, to “allow countries promoting sustainable use of marine resources to formulate a common strategy” and to “allow countries to enhance their capacity to represent themselves at the upcoming International Whaling Commission meeting.”

Minister Charles’ successor at the Fisheries Ministry, Gregory Bowen, attended a similar meeting in Tokyo 3-5 June 2004, a month before the 56<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting in Sorrento. Grenada’s Government Information Service reported at the time that Bowen had just departed for Japan where he would represent Grenada at a “Pre-IWC Symposium on Sustainable Use of Living Marine Resources” in Tokyo, 3-5 June and would also attend a “sustainable use meeting” sponsored by the wise use organization Global Guardian Trust, to be held in Nagato City, 5-6 June.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>106</sup> Grenada Government Information Service, 1 June 2004, Government of Grenada website.

## 7. Conclusion and questions.

Mr Komatsu and others in the whaling group of Japan have said on many occasions, as he did to the BBC in 2002, that “reason is on our side and science is demonstrating that what Japan is asserting is the right thing.”<sup>107</sup> They also assert that the developing countries that have joined the IWC have done so because they have been persuaded by Japan’s arguments. In short, they have been convinced.

If this is so, one wonders then why Japan’s extraordinary attention and cost devoted to rehearsing and training delegates of other countries prior to international meetings?

If there is no financial assistance coming from Japan to pay these countries’ ways to the IWC and their membership fees, why then do some of these governments stay out of organisations of direct relevance to their economic development, such as ICCAT in the case of the OECS, on the grounds that membership is too expensive, and yet participate actively in the IWC which costs more, only to support the resumption and expansion of an economic activity pursued not by their own nationals but by three developed countries, Japan, Norway and Iceland?

If Japan’s “whales-eat-fish” argument is so convincing, why has the work on which it is based never been subject to independent scientific review and debate? Why is the “whales-eat-fish” issue only raised at fisheries meetings when members of the Japanese whaling lobby are present? Why would one of the world’s largest fishing nations like Japan, with its fleets spread all over the world, want to see the “whales as competitors” argument prevail in international discussions of “ecosystem based fisheries management” and how to curtail the over-fishing that is now plaguing the world’s fishing industry?

Is it really in the interest of the recruited countries to be convinced to take a stand against the principles contained in international legal instruments to which they adhere, such as UNCLOS, and international agreements such as *Agenda 21* and the Code of Conduct with regard to the conservation of whales and the management of whaling?

Would an economic superpower like Japan, in one-on-one negotiations with economically vulnerable countries to which it is a major donor, really never use its aid or promises of aid to pressure or coerce to obtain a *quid pro quo*?

Perhaps the most important question of all, asked by Jamaican environmentalist and journalist Peter Espuet, “**If the Japanese case is so strong, why do they have to resort to these means to gain support?**”<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> BBC, 2002, *Whale Hunters op. cit.*

<sup>108</sup> “Votes for Sale!!” Peter Espuet, *The Gleaner* (Jamaica), 10 March 1999.

## **APPENDIX 1: Japan's fisheries grant aid agreements, 1994-2004.**

All information is taken from the official statistics of Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Japan's fiscal year runs from 1 April to 31 March. Details of the fisheries grant aid projects below are in the tables on the following pages. *Current IWC member or observer countries are shown in italics.*

### **FY 2004 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

8 countries Total amount 4,696 million Yen (average grant size 587 million Yen)  
*Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, Cameroon, Fiji, Kiribati, Senegal, Solomon Islands.*

### **FY 2003 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

5 countries Total amount 2,371 million Yen (average grant size 474 million Yen)  
*Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, Gabon, Morocco, St Vincent & the Grenadines.*

### **FY 2002 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

8 countries + 1 organisation Total amount 8,015 million Yen (average grant size 890 million Yen)  
*Cape Verde, Dominica, Grenada, Guinea, Mauritius, Morocco, Panama, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC), Vietnam.*

### **FY 2001 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

12 countries Total amount 10,252 million Yen (average grant size 854 million Yen)  
*Antigua and Barbuda, Cape Verde, Dominica, Gambia, Guinea, Mauritania, Morocco, Palau, St Kitts, St Lucia, Senegal, Tunisia.*

### **FY 2000 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

14 countries Total amount 9,455 million Yen (average grant size 675 million Yen)  
*Antigua and Barbuda, Dominican Republic, Gabon, Indonesia, Madagascar, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia, Oman, St Kitts, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Tanzania.*

### **FY 1999 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

11 countries Total amount 7,995 million Yen (average grant size 726 million Yen)  
*Cape Verde, Gambia, Grenada, Kiribati, Mauritania, Micronesia, Morocco, Mozambique, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tanzania.*

### **FY 1998 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

13 countries Total amount: 8,117 million Yen (average grant 624 million Yen)  
*Cape Verde, Dominica, Egypt, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Mauritania, Micronesia, Morocco, Mozambique, Palau, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines.*

### **FY 1997 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

11 Countries Total amount 1,867 million Yen (average grant 970 million Yen)  
*Antigua and Barbuda, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, India, Jamaica, Malawi, Morocco, Mozambique, St Lucia, Tunisia.*

### **FY 1996 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

10 countries Total amount 8,759 million Yen (average grant 875 million)  
*Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Honduras, Micronesia, Morocco, Palau, Peru, Tonga, Viet Nam.*

**FY 1995 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

19 countries Total amount 9,326 million Yen (average grant 490 million Yen)

*Chile, Dominica, Eritrea, Grenada, Ivory Coast, Kiribati, Madagascar, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia, Morocco, Palau, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Tuvalu, Vietnam,*

**FY 1994 Fisheries Grant Aid recipients:**

22 countries Total amount 10148 million Yen (average grant 461 million Yen)

*Benin, Chile, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Kiribati, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia, Morocco, Nicaragua, St Lucia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Vietnam.*

## FY 1994 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
BENIN	Procurement of material and Equipment for Fishing (Phase II)	382 million	3.89 million
CHILE	Construction of Marine Product Market in the Metropolitan Area	471 million	4.8 million
DOMINICA	Coastal Fisheries Development Project	559 million	5.69 million
ECUADOR	Construction of Papallacta National Andes Fish Farming Center	459 million	4.67 million
EL SALVADOR	Promotion of Fisheries Complex Project	327 million	3.33 million
GHANA	Rehabilitation of Tema Outer Fishing Harbour	691 million	7.04 million
GRENADA	St George's Artisanal Fisheries Complex	299 million	3.04 million
GUINEA, REPUBLIC OF	Development of Small-scale Fisheries	465 million	4.74 million
GUINEA-BISSAU	Development of Small-scale Fisheries	441 million	4.5 million
IVORY COAST	Renovation of San Pedro Fishing Port	752 million	7.66 million
KIRIBATI	Outer Island Artisanal Fisheries Development	224 million	2.28 million
MADAGASCAR	Development of Shrimp Culture	717 million	7.3 million
MAURITANIA	Construction of Nouakchott Fish Market	865 million	8.8 million
MAURITIUS	Extension of the Albion Fisheries Research Center	714 million	7.27 million
MICRONESIA	Development of Artisanal Fisheries in Chuuk State	116 million	1.18 million
MOROCCO	Construction of Coastal Fisheries Training Vessel	864 million	8.8 million
NICARAGUA	Internal Development of Artisanal Fisheries in the Northern Atlantic Autonomous Region	398 million	4.05 million
SEYCHELLES	Coastal Fisheries Development	201 million	2.05 million
SOLOMON ISLANDS	Development of Fisheries in Noro	224 million	2.28 million
SRI LANKA	Rehabilitation of Kirinda Fisheries Harbor	212 million	2.16 million
ST LUCIA	Project for Fisheries Development	388 million	3.95 million
VIET NAM	Construction of Fishing Port Facilities at Vung Tan	379 million	3.86 million

## FY 1995 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
CHILE	Construction of Fisheries Terminal of the Metropolitan Region	696 million	7.94 million
DOMINICA	Coastal Fisheries Development Project	570 million	6.5 million
ERITREA	Artisanal Fisheries Development Project in the Southeast Region	303 million	3.45 million
GRENADA	St George's Artisanal Fisheries Complex Project	502 million	5.7 million
IVORY COAST	Renovation of San Pedro Fishing Port	478 million	5.45 million
KIRIBATI	Outer Island Artisanal Fisheries Project (III)	209 million	2.38 million
MADAGASCAR	Development of Shrimp Culture	335 million	3.82 million
MARSHALL ISLANDS	Improvement of the Fish Marketing System in the Outer Islands (II)	453 million	5.16 million
MAURITANIA	Construction of Fisheries Research Vessel	1146 million	13.07 million
MICRONESIA	Development of Small-scale Fisheries in Yap	216 million	2.46 million
MOROCCO	Project for Development of Two Fishing Villages	755 million	8.61 million
PALAU	Development of Small-scale Fisheries in the Northern State	190 million	2.16 million
ST LUCIA	Construction of the Fisheries Development Center	527 million	6.0 million
ST VINCENT & THE GRENADINES	Fishing Complex Construction Project	731 million	8.3 million
SEYCHELLES	Coastal Fisheries Development	262 million	2.98 million
SOLOMON ISLANDS	Honiara Fish Market Development	785 million	8.95 million
SURINAME	Improvement of Fishing Gear & Equipment for Artisanal Fisheries	294 million	3.35 million
TUVALU	Reconstruction of Fisheries Harbor at Vaitupu	543 million	6.195 million
VIET NAM	Construction of Fishing Port Facilities at Vung Tan	331 million	3.7 million

## FY 1996 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
EGYPT	Development of Maadia Fishing Port	1256 million	11.36 million
ERITREA	Artisanal Fisheries Development Project in the Southeast Region	935 million	8.46 million
GHANA	Project for Construction of Sekondi Fishing Port	65 million	588,000
HONDURAS	Modernization of the Artisanal Fisheries of the North Coast	576 million	5.21 million
MICRONESIA	Construction of Inter-Island Vessel for Fishing Villages	1258 million	11.38 million
MOROCCO	Development of Two Fishing Villages	671 million	6.07 million
PALAU	Improvement of facilities for Fishing Village in Northern States	303 million	2.74 million
PERU	Construction of Vessel for the Investigation of Fisheries and Oceanography	1379 million	12.47 million
TONGA	Construction of Tuna Fishing Research and Training Vessel	700 million	6.3 million
VIET NAM	Construction of Fishing Port Facilities at Vung Tan	1616 million	14.62 million

## FY 1997 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
ANTIGUA & BARBUDA	Construction of Fish Landing & Distributing Facilities in St John's	1280 million	11.19 million
EGYPT	Project for development of Maadia Fishing Port	582 million	5.08 million
GHANA	Construction of Sekondi Fishing Port	806 million	7.04 million
GUINEA-BISSAU	Construction of Small-scale Fisheries Facilities	731 million	6.39 million
INDIA	Project for Construction of Dredger for Fishing Ports	1248 million	10.91 million
JAMAICA	Development of Small-scale Fisheries	364 million	3.18 million
MALAWI	Construction of the Dept. of Aquaculture & Fisheries Science, Bunda College of Agriculture	767 million	6.70 million
MOROCCO	Construction of Ocean Fisheries training Center in Larache	1086 million	9.49 million
MOZAMBIQUE	Improvement of Facilities for Repair and Maintenance of Fishing Vessels	770 million	6.73 million
ST LUCIA	Construction of Vieux Fort Fishery Complex	1015 million	8.87 million
SENEGAL	Improvement of the Central Fish Market in Dakar	728 million	6.36 million
SEYCHELLES	Improvement of Victoria Artisanal Fishing Port	452 million	3.95 million
TUNISIA	Construction of Fisheries Research Vessel	841 million	7.35 million

## FY 1998 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
CAPE VERDE	Construction of Mindelo Fishing Port	705 million	5.01 million
DOMINICA	Rehabilitation of Roseau Fishery Facility	510 million	3.62 million
EGYPT	Project for Improvement of Maadia Fishing Port	544 million	3.86 million
GHANA	Construction of Sekondi Fishing Port	892 million	6.34 million
GRENADA	Construction of Fish Market of Melville Street	605 million	4.3 million
GUINEA, REPUBLIC OF	Development of Artisanal Fishery	899 million	6.39 million
MAURITANIA	Development of Artisanal Fishery Villages	608 million	4.32 million
MICRONESIA	Improvement of the Facilities for Artisanal Fisheries Support Stations in Kosrae State	230 million	1.63 million
MOROCCO	Development of Fishing Village of Souira Kdima	549 million	3.90 million
MOZAMBIQUE	Rehabilitation of Maputo Fishing Port	423 million	3.0 million
PALAU	Development of Fishing Community in Peleliu State	368 million	2.61 million
ST LUCIA	Construction of Vieux Fort Fisheries Complex	1008 million	7.16 million
ST VINCENT & THE GRENADINES	Construction of Fishery Center	776 million	5.51 million

## FY 1999 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
CAPE VERDE	Project for Construction of Mindelo Fishing Port	671 million	6.39 million
GAMBIA	Improvement of Fisheries products distribution center	398 million	3.79 million
GRENADA	Construction of Melville Street Fish Market	356 million	3.39 million
KIRIBATI	Construction of fisheries complex	648 million	6.18 million
MAURITANIA	Expansion of Nouadhibou Fishing Port	688 million	6.56 million
MICRONESIA	Construction of Takatik Fishing Port in Pohnpei State	746 million	7.11 million
MOROCCO	Fisheries project at Souira Kdima	1114 million	10.62 million
MOZAMBIQUE	Rehabilitation of Maputo Fishing Port (Phase II)	1133 million	10.8 million
SENEGAL	Construction of Fisheries Research Vessel	1012 million	9.65 million
SRI LANKA	Improvement of Tangara Fisheries Facilities	389 million	3.71 million
TANZANIA	Dar Es Salaam Fish Market (Phase I of II)	840 million	8.01 million

## FY 2000 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
ANTIGUA & BARBUDA	Promotion of small-scale fisheries	857 million	7.92 million
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	Development of Coastal Fisheries	594 million	5.49 million
GABON	Rehabilitation of Fisheries Center	721 million	6.66 million
INDONESIA	Expansion of Sumarang Fisheries training	632 million	5.84 million
MADAGASCAR	Rehabilitation of Majunga Fish Market	702 million	6.49 million
MARSHALL ISLANDS	Development of Jaluit Atoll Fishing Village	407 million	3.76 million
MAURITANIA	Project for the Extension of the National School of Maritime and Fisheries Studies	973 million	9.0 million
MICRONESIA	Construction of Takatik Fishing Port in Pohnpei State	59 million	545,796
OMAN	Construction of Fisheries Products Quality Control Center	683 million	6.31 million
ST KITTS & NEVIS	Construction of Basseterre Fisheries Complex	381 million	3.52 million
SENEGAL	Construction of Fisheries Complex at Kayar	1209 million	11.18 million
SEYCHELLES	Coastal Fisheries Development	576 million	5.32 million
SRI LANKA	Tangara Fisheries Complex	472 million	4.36 million
TANZANIA	Construction of Dar es Salaam Fish Market	789 million	7.29 million
TUVALU	Construction of Inter-Island Vessel for Outer Island Fisheries Development	901 million	8.33 million

## FY 2001 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
ANTIGUA & BARBUDA	Rehabilitation of Artisanal Fishery	798 million	6.14 million
CAPE VERDE	Extension of Praia Fisheries Port	980 million	7.08 million
DOMINICA	Rehabilitation of Roseau fisheries complex	1114 million	8.57 million
GAMBIA	Improvement of Artisanal Coastal Fisheries in the Kombo South District	882 million	6.78 million
GUINEA, REPUBLIC OF	Construction of Fisheries Research Vessel	881 million	6.78 million
MAURITANIA	Extension of National School of Maritime and Fisheries Studies	603 million	4.64 million
MOROCCO	Construction of Specialised Center for Seafood Products	1121 million	8.62 million
PALAU	Improvement of Fishery Infrastructure in Kayangel State	487 million	3.75 million
ST KITTS & NEVIS	Construction of Basseterre Fisheries Complex	567 million	4.36 million
ST LUCIA	Improvement of Coastal Fisheries Development	1318 million	10.14 million
SENEGAL	Construction of Kapolack Central Fish Market	712 million	5.48 million
TUNISIA	Professional training center for fisheries of Mahadia	789 million	6.07 million

## FY 2002 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
CAPE VERDE	Extension of Praia Fisheries Port	513 million	4.09 million
DOMINICA	Improvement of Marigot Fish Landing Facilities	1663 million	13.27 million
GRENADA	Improvement of Fish Marketing for Grenville	1401 million	11.18 million
GUINEA, REPUBLIC OF	Construction of K nien fish market Conakry	810 million	6.55 million
MAURITIUS	Upgrading and Renovation of the Management and Training Facilities for Artisanal Fisheries	779 million	6.47 million
MOROCCO	Development of Sidi Hsaine Fisheries Village	515 million	4.33 million
PANAMA	Project for Small-Scale Fisheries Development	449 million	3.78 million
SOUTHEAST ASIAN FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT CENTER (SEAFDEC)*	Construction of a Fisheries Research and Training Vessel	1012 million	8.42 million
VIETNAM	Construction of Marine Culture Research and Development Center in Nha Trang	873 million	6.99 million

\* The Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC), is “an autonomous intergovernmental body established as a regional treaty organization in 1967 to promote fisheries development in Southeast Asia.” Japan and 9 other countries (Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam) are members. In December 2003 Japan hosted in Tokyo the “Seminar on Japan-ASEAN Cooperation to Promote Sustainable Fisheries through SEAFDEC”. The Seminar was, the Japan Whaling Association reports, “attended by over 70 high-ranking fisheries officials of Japan and ASEAN, including Fisheries Ministers from Malaysia and Indonesia.” Also according to the JWA, Kyoichi Kawaguchi, at the time Deputy Director General of the JFA, told reporters: “It was a great achievement that we could gain understanding on the whaling issue after our efforts to convince them over the past years. Now the whaling issue has entered the framework of SEAFDEC. In the future, we would like to invite them to join the International Whaling Commission.”<sup>109</sup>

On March 31<sup>st</sup> 2004 a 3.5 billion Yen (USD 33 million) loan was granted to Indonesia for the “rehabilitation and improvement of Jakarta’s fishing port project”, one of the very few occasions that loan aid, rather than grant aid, has gone to a fisheries-related project.

<sup>109</sup> *JWA News*, No. 9, April 2004.

## FY 2003 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
ANTIGUA & BARBUDA	Construction of Fisheries Center	168 million	1.52 million
BENIN	Development of Fishing Port	762 million	6.5 million
GABON	Development of Artisanal Fisheries Center at Lambarene	467 million	4.2 million
MOROCCO	Development of Fisheries Village at Sidi Hsaine	219 million	1.85 million
ST VINCENT & THE GRENADINES	Re-modelling of New Kingstown Fish Market	755 million	6.45 million

## FY 2004 FISHERIES GRANT AID AGREEMENTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT NAME	YEN AMOUNT	USD EQUIVALENT
ANTIGUA & BARBUDA	Construction of Fisheries Center	753 million	6.97 million
BENIN	Development of Fisheries Port at Cotonou	287 million	2.80 million
CAMEROON	Development of Artisanal Fisheries Center	400 million	3.81 million
FIJI	Redevelopment of Fisheries Lami Jetty	577 million	5.61 million
GABON	Development of Artisanal Fisheries Center at Lambarené	315 million	2.84 million
KIRIBATI	Kritimati Island coastal fisheries development	739 million	7.18 million
SENEGAL	Construction of Fisheries Center at Lompoul	652 million	6.18 million
SOLOMON ISLANDS	Rehabilitation of the domestic tuna fishery	973 million	9.24 million

## **APPENDIX 2**

Tables of Japanese Grant Aid (all categories) and Technical Cooperation to the six Eastern Caribbean countries that are members of the IWC:

Antigua and Barbuda  
Commonwealth of Dominica  
Grenada  
St Kitts and Nevis  
St Lucia  
St Vincent and the Grenadines

All figures are from official ODA statistics published by the Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Technical Cooperation figures are not identified by category so it is not possible to know what portion of these sums is fisheries-related.

The shaded area in each table represents the years in which each country has supported Japan's position in the IWC. This is determined by the voting record of each Annual Meeting of the IWC.

SUMMARY OF JAPANESE GRANT AID (ALL CATEGORIES)  
AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION TO  
**ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA 1985-2004**

All figures shown in millions of Yen.

YEAR	GRANT AID	TECHNICAL COOPERATION
1985	--	?
1986	--	?
1987	--	8
1988	--	3
1989	Emergency relief (hurricane) 6	2
1990	--	3
1991	--	3
1992	--	3
1993	--	--
1994	--	--
1995	--	--
1996	--	7
1997	Project for Construction of Fish Landing and Distributing Facilities in St John's 1280	52
1998	--	24
1999	--	?
2000	Promotion of small-scale fisheries 857	?
2001	Project for Rehabilitation of Artisanal Fishery 798	?
2002	--	?
2003	Project for Construction of Fisheries Center 168	?
2004	Project for Construction of Fisheries Center 753	?
		?
<i>TOTAL FISHERIES</i>	<i>3856 MILLION YEN</i>	<i>not known</i>
<i>% of total = fisheries</i>	<i>99.8%</i>	<i>not known</i>

SUMMARY OF JAPANESE GRANT AID (ALL CATEGORIES)  
AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION TO  
**COMMONWEALTH OF DOMINICA 1985-2004**

All figures shown in millions of Yen.

YEAR	GRANT AID	TECHNICAL COOPERATION
1985	?	?
1986	--	7
1987	--	12
1988	--	18
1989	Emergency relief (hurricane) 6	11
1990	--	31
1991	--	6
1992	--	11
1993	Coastal Fisheries Development Project 617	70
1994	Coastal fisheries development project 559 Audio-visual and lighting equipment to Arawak House of Culture 44	16
1995	Coastal fisheries development project 579	47
1996	--	50
1997	--	56
1998	Project for Rehabilitation of Roseau Fishery Facility 510 Emergency relief 12	157
1999	--	89
2000	--	98
2001	Project for Rehabilitation of Roseau Fishery Complex 1114	?
2002	Project for Improvement of Marigot Fish Landing Facilities 1663	?
2003	--	?
2004	--	?
<i>OVERALL TOTAL</i>	<i>5104 MILLION YEN</i>	?
<i>TOTAL FISHERIES</i>	<i>5042 MILLION YEN</i>	<i>Not known</i>
<i>% of total = fisheries</i>	<i>98.7%</i>	<i>Not known</i>

SUMMARY OF JAPANESE GRANT AID (ALL CATEGORIES)  
AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION TO  
**GRENADA 1985-2004**

All figures shown in millions of Yen.

YEAR	GRANT AID	TECHNICAL COOPERATION
1985	--	17
1986	--	5
1987	--	9
1988	--	31
1989	Coastal fisheries development project 216	9
1990	Coastal fisheries development project 461	38
1991	--	56
1992	--	55
1993	--	108
1994	St George's Artisanal Fisheries Complex Project 299	30
1995	St George's Artisanal Fisheries Complex Project 502	22
1996	--	71
1997	Supply of Musical instruments to the Ministry of Youth, Sports, Culture and Community Development 47 Grassroots project (1 project) 7	163
1998	Project for Construction of Fish Market of Melville Street 605	84
1999	Melville Street Fish Market Project 356	37
2000	--	46
2001	--	?
2002	Project for Improvement of Fish Marketing for Grenville 1401	?
2003	--	?
2004	--	?
<i>OVERALL TOTAL</i>	<i>3894 MILLION YEN</i>	<i>?</i>
<i>TOTAL FISHERIES</i>	<i>3840 MILLION YEN</i>	<i>Not known</i>
<i>% of total = fisheries</i>	<i>98.6%</i>	<i>Not known</i>

SUMMARY OF JAPANESE GRANT AID (ALL CATEGORIES)  
AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION TO  
**ST KITTS AND NEVIS 1985-2004**

All figures shown in millions of Yen.

YEAR	GRANT AID	TECHNICAL COOPERATION
1985	--	--
1986	--	--
1987	--	9
1988	--	12
1989	Emergency relief 6	6
1990	--	--
1991	--	--
1992	Teaching materials for science education to the national secondary schools 23	3
1993	--	6
1994	--	2
1995	--	--
1996	--	12
1997	Grassroots projects (1 project) 10	12
1998	--	11
1999	--	17
2000	Project for Construction of Basseterre Fisheries Complex 381	45
2001	Project for Construction of Basseterre Fisheries Complex 567	?
2002	--	?
2003	--	?
2004	--	?
<i>OVERALL TOTAL</i>	<i>981 MILLION YEN</i>	<i>?</i>
<i>TOTAL FISHERIES</i>	<i>948 MILLION YEN</i>	<i>Not known</i>
<i>% of total = fisheries</i>	<i>96.6%</i>	<i>Not known</i>

SUMMARY OF JAPANESE GRANT AID (ALL CATEGORIES)  
AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION TO  
**ST LUCIA 1985-2004**

All figures shown in millions of Yen.

YEAR	GRANT AID	TECHNICAL COOPERATION
1985	--	--
1986	--	12
1987	Fisheries development project 290	11
1988	Fisheries development project 360	6
1989	--	4
1990	Sound and lighting system and musical instruments for National Cultural Center 26	10
1991	--	25
1992	Project for construction of fish- landing base in Dennery 738	74
1993	--	35
1994	Project for fisheries development 388	81
1995	Project for construction of fisheries development center 527	30
1996	Supply of sound and lighting equipment to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Labour and Broadcasting 38	58
1997	Construction of Vieux Fort Fisheries Complex 1008	128
1998	Construction of Vieux Fort Fisheries Complex 1008	97
1999	Grassroots Projects (2 projects) 16	136
2000	--	210
2001	Project for Improvement of Coastal Fisheries Development 1318	?
2002	--	?
2003	--	?
2004	--	?
<i>OVERALL TOTAL</i>	<i>5724 MILLION YEN</i>	<i>?</i>
<i>TOTAL FISHERIES</i>	<i>5644 MILLION YEN</i>	<i>Not known</i>
<i>% of total = fisheries</i>	<i>98.6%</i>	<i>Not known</i>

SUMMARY OF JAPANESE GRANT AID (ALL CATEGORIES)  
AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION TO  
**ST VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES 1985-2004**

All figures shown in millions of Yen.

YEAR	GRANT AID	TECHNICAL COOPERATION
1985	--	3
1986	--	20
1987	Kingstown Fisheries Market Construction Project 292	23
1988	Kingstown Fisheries Market Construction Project 351	16
1989	--	11
1990	Fisheries development project 273	7
1991	Musical Instruments to Royal St Vincent & the Grenadines Police Force Band 36	11
1992	--	31
1993	Coastal Fisheries Development Project 720	61
1994	--	62
1995	Fishery Complex Construction Project 731	110
1996	--	70
1997	--	92
1998	Construction of Fishery Center 776 Grassroots Project (1 project) 10	59
1999	--	?
2000	--	?
2001	--	?
2002	--	?
2003	Re-modelling of New Kingstown Fish Market 755	?
2004	--	?
<i>OVERALL TOTAL</i>	<i>3944 MILLION YEN</i>	<i>?</i>
<i>TOTAL FISHERIES</i>	<i>3898 MILLION YEN</i>	<i>Not known</i>
<i>% of total = fisheries</i>	<i>98.8 %</i>	<i>Not known</i>