Local Measures to Global Pressure

Local Measures to Global Pressure

The Anti-Whaling Campaigns in the Faroe Islands

by Arnbjørn Mortensen

ISBN 978-99972-55-01-3

NORÐURLENDSKT UMHVØRVISMERKI
Svanamerktur prentlutur 541 705

fróðskapur

Faroe University Press
Tórshavn 2022

We do not see nature or intelligence or human motivation or ideology as "it" is, but only as our languages are. And our languages are our media. Our media are our metaphors. Our metaphors create the content of our culture.

Neil Postman (2005) *Amusing Ourselves to Death*, 15.

Table of Contents

Preface

In September 2021, Faroese whaling once again landed in front-page news around the globe. A hunt, in which 1428 dolphins were slaughtered, caused outrage and heated debate both inside and outside the Faroe Islands. Due to the strong condemnation from people within the Faroes, the Prime Minister Bárður á Steig Nielsen felt compelled to exclaim that his administration would revisit the regulations surrounding the whaling practice. Government discussions on the future of dolphin whaling began in February 2022, on the same day as the Prime Minister was handed 1,3 million signatures from various marine NGOs condemning the practice.

A curious detail about the most recent controversy is the internal divide within the Faroe Islands that has been brought to light. In the wake of the dolphin hunt in 2021, a poll from 2018 by spyr.fo resurfaced. The poll questioned 400 people on their approval of the pilot whale and dolphin hunts. Unsurprisingly, 85% of the respondents agreed with continuing the pilot whaling. However, when questioned on the merit of the dolphin hunt, only 35% of the respondents approved of the practice, while 47% wanted the dolphin hunt banned. While the rest of this text will hardly deal with the practice of whaling dolphins in the Faroes, it may be insightful to briefly reflect on this opinionated disparity.

As will be shown in the first chapter herein, opinions about whaling underwent a transformation in the twentieth century, and in this transformation, dolphins came to occupy a special place in our hearts and minds. Whether due to their playful spirit, their intelligence, their likeness to humans, media exposure of them, or a combination of all, most people have a particular association with dolphins that is rarely shared with other mammals.

However, this difference in opinion among the Faroese stems not necessarily from a pop-cultural or intellectual connection to the animals, but could be more grounded in fear. No nation is an island, and in present-day's society the economy and the values of the Faroese are evermore connected with the surrounding world. As boycotts loom, they pose as an existential threat to a certain standard of living. Under such circumstances, a measure

to the global pressure could be to ban the dolphin hunt in the hope that the concession restores reputation, and as a result, pilot whaling continues unabated. On the other hand, global pressures need not be this direct, but could be perceived as an invisible force not caused by any particular agent. Sentiments are always historically situated, and they are influenced by the *Zeitgeist* or the spirit of the times. As the globalized world becomes more interconnected, values become more universalized, resulting in sentiments that are seemingly standardized.

I have attempted to be as objective as possible in my analysis without passing value judgements. Nontheless, any assertion of social analysis as objective reality is fiction. All individuals possess an identity acquired from a variety of social and political factors. This identity invariably influences our understandings and biases of the world. In the social sciences, this is referred to as positionality.

My goal is not to condone or condemn whaling practices nor their opposition. Rather, my hope is that this text can inspire a better recognition of the positionalities and perceptions that separate us. Hopefully, such a perspective can lend basis for a more productive dialogue and mutual understanding.

This book deals with dichotomies, local traditions and global movements, meaures to pressure, and the semiotic systems that underlie the debate about how people interact with their surrounding environment. Traditions and social movements are two sides of the same coin. On the one side are traditions, which are rooted in the past. In the present, they continue to shape our societal values and cultural forms. On the other side are social movements, often novel creations. Whereas traditions retain values, social movements exist to transform them. There is nothing innately 'good' or 'bad' about either, but both form an important part of identity politics, shaping who we are. Aptly put by Spanish sociologist, Manuel Castells:

> "Since there is no sense of history other than the history we sense, *from an analytical perspective* there are no "good" or "bad", progressive and regressive social movements. They are all symptoms of who we are, and avenues of our transformation, since transformation may equally lead to a whole range of heavens, hells, or heavenly hells. This is not an incidental remark, since processes in our world often take forms of fanaticism and violence that we do not usually associate with positive social change. And yet, this is our world, this is us, in our contradictory plurality, and this is what we have to understand, if necessarily to face it, and to overcome it."[1]

This project has benefited from the help of more people than can be mentioned in this short text. In particular, I want to extend my gratitude to Jóan Pauli Joensen, Kate Sanderson, Heri Joensen, Hans Jakob Hermansen, Rúni Nielsen, and Pál Weihe for fruitful conversations and fascinating insights. To Cherry Allison and Stella Duff at the IWC Secretariat, who have been a tremendous help in locating documents. To Annika Sølvará and the rest at Faroe University Press, who made this publication possible. To Guglielmo Tognon and Carlos Paez for giving valuable feedback to earlier drafts. To Antonio Castello for designing the beautiful cover. To my fiancée, Halgerð, who has been a cornerstone of love and support throughout this process. And finally, to my parents, Lis and Andras, who have read and commented on every thing I ever wrote. Thanks for all you taught me.

1 Castells (2010b), 4.

Introduction

On February 28, 2020 the Faroese G! Festival announced that Robert Plant, former lead singer from Led Zeppelin, had cancelled his July-scheduled performance in protest against the whaling for pilot whales that occurs on the Faroe Islands.[2] The year before, at the behest of the environmental non-governmental organization (NGO) *Blue Planet Society*, Fatboy Slim donated all the proceedings from his G!-appearance to marine conservation.[3] In response to Plant's cancellation, the festival's managing director was disappointed by the lack of "attempt at constructive dialogue, which might have allowed us to address the artists' concerns."[4]

Whales underwent a cultural revolution in the second half of the twentieth century. From the establishment of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) in 1946 to the global moratorium on commercial whaling in 1982, whales were transformed from an overharvested economic resource to an icon of the global environmental movement. Protests against the non-commercial whaling in the Faroe Islands began in 1985, as official and media attention focused on it at the annual conference of the IWC.

The following study questions what the effects of this paradigm shift in commercial whaling were on the local non-commercial whaling in the Faroe Islands. To answer this question, I divided it into four sub-questions which serve as principal objectives, that will be answered throughout this text. These objectives are: 1) what were the structural factors that contributed to the ontological shift of whales from resource to icon? 2) What was the symbolic and pragmatic value of whaling for the Faroese? 3) How did the anti-whaling campaign in the Faroe Islands begin, and why did it evolve as it did? 4) What

2 "Saving Grace feat. Robert Plant & Suzi Dian cancel," *G! Festival* 28. Feb, 2020. https://gfestival.fo/news/518?_l=en

3 "Fatboy Slim joins protest against Faroe whale slaughter," *Blue Planet Society*, 18. July, 2019. https://blueplanetsociety.org/2019/07/fatboy-slim-joins-protest-against-faroe-whale-slaughter/

4 "Saving Grace feat. Robert Plant & Suzi Dian cancel." *G! Festival*

were the immediate impacts of the anti-whaling movement on the Faroese society? Underlying these objectives is a fifth goal of methodological nature, where I hope to make a convincing case that the anti-whaling conflict in the Faroe Islands is best understood as an ontological issue about competing and diverging views on the human-nature relationship.

I argue that the protests to stop pilot whaling have been characterized by a lack of constructive dialogue, which has resulted in a continuous loop of antagonism. The lack of dialogue ultimately stems from irreconcilable principles on which the respective cultures are founded on. The initial strategy of the campaign was too confrontational for the Faroese, in whom it elicited a defensive, almost isolationist response. The result was that the Faroese listened to part of the criticism and reformed the institution around the hunt to conform with their societal values. After that, they worked toward rectifying the misinformation through a broad information campaign, and a stronger cooperational framework was established with other whaling nations in the region through governmental and non-governmental structures. However, more fundamentally, I also argue that the issue, in essence, is not about whales, but rather about what the human-nature relationship *should be*. For the Faroese, the issue is grounded in a right to exploit local resources, and foreign attempts to infringe on that right are perceived by many Faroese as cultural imperialism. On the other hand, in a world seemingly bent on self-destruction, for the protesting anti-whaling activist, the issue is about transforming people's relationship with nature. In this discourse, whales have occupied an important symbolic dimension where, to many people, they illuminate an ideal that humans can strive for.

In the following, I may fall into the trap of homogenous categorization or stereotyping. This is not to imply that environmentalists, anti-whaling activists, nor the Faroese are homogenous entities. The broad categories are composed of individuals, who may each hold widely different opinions and views on the world. However, the uniformity stems from my focus, which is on hegemonic discourses. My focus is on how a hegemonic discourse shifts according to its paradigm or episteme. The concept of episteme, coined by French philosopher Michel Foucault, means, "In any given culture and at any given moment, there is always one *episteme* that defines the conditions of possibility of all knowledge, whether expressed in a theory or silently invested in a practice."[5] It follows then, in Epstein's words, that "Discourse confers meaning to social and physical realities. It is through discourse that individuals, societies, and states make sense of themselves, of their ways of living, and of the world around them. A *discourse* is a cohesive ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categorizations about a specific object that frame that object in a certain way and, therefore, delimit the possibilities for action in relation to it."[6] A hegemonic discourse is simply put, one that is dominant in any given paradigm or episteme. Thus, while I may generalize on Faroese or environmentalist attitudes, this is because the hegemonic discourse in many ways silences the lesser voices of resistance.

The normative change in popular perceptions about whales has been well studied in academic circles. This change can be observed with the creation of what Norwegian anthropologist Arne Kalland has termed the *superwhale*: a metaphysical creature which embodies all the major characteristics of cetaceans in one being.[7] The appropriation of the *superwhale* encompasses an anthropomorphism of whales, where whales become metaphors of a utopian society and metonymic of the entire nature.[8] Scholars attribute different causes to this change. Frank Zelko argues that the developments of the modern entertainment complex of cinema, television, aquaparks, as well as the 1960s counterculture in the United States were the primary drivers for the creation of the *superwhale*.[9] Television and aquaparks had a great influence in the dissemination and anthropomorphism of whales' qualities. These qualities fit well into the countercultural intellectual climate, which offered a model of nature that emphasized interconnectedness and holism.[10] Charlotte Epstein is similarly interested in the metaphysical *superwhale* and its power.[11] In *The Power of Words in International Relations*, she links the power of the *superwhale* to the use of the NGOs who appropriated it and successfully implemented this metonymy into the dominant discourse on environmentalism. She argues that by the process of turning the focus of the environmental discourse onto whaling, a channel opened up in corporate mainstream media through which they could get the message out and accumulate mass support.[12]

A gap in the current literature is the direct effects of the Save-the-Whales movement on the Faroe Islands. While others have studied the effects and influence of the movement for instance in Australia, Japan, Iceland and

5 Foucault (1989), 183.

6 Epstein (2008), 2.
7 Kalland (2012); Kalland (1993).
8 Kalland (2012), 2.
9 Zelko (2012).
10 Zelko (2012), 98.
11 Epstein (2008).
12 Epstein (2008), 98-103.

Norway,[13] the direct results of the mid-1980s protests against pilot whaling in the Faroe Islands have received relatively little academic attention. There are a few noteworthy examples, however. Tom Nauerby's *No Nation is an Island* from 1996 focuses on the construction of a Faroese national identity, where he puts special emphasis on the reproduction and reinterpretation of cultural artifacts, such as language or symbols, in the maintenance of a national identity. As the book's title suggests, a central argument for Nauerby is on the external recognition and interaction that is inherently necessary in nationalism and nation-building projects. While most of his book focuses on the role of language, his fourth and final chapter is on pilot whaling as a national symbol and how, in the course of the 1980s, it turned into an object of international stigma. He concludes that the internal discourse on pilot whaling experienced a radical change as a result of the international protests. Partly, he argues, this was due to a new hegemonic discourse on nature, which conflicted with the established national romantic discourse, and to which the Faroese had to adapt.[14]

A second notable mention is Kate Sanderson, who began working for the Faroese Prime Minister's Office in 1985, where she became the main reference to facilitate the official response to the protests against whaling. One of her first observations was that many of the post cards and protest letters were directly informed by campaign material, which was highly biased and often factually misinformed.[15] In two articles in the early 1990s, Sanderson sought to explain the rapid development of the protests and the causes for their controversy.[16] She identifies three main factors for the activism: firstly, the openness of the slaughter; secondly, the symbolic value of whales; and thirdly, the well-established media tradition of the Save-the-Whales movement.[17] A controversial feature of the protests, which aggravated the Faroese population and fostered antagonism, was the widespread misinformation. Sanderson argues that a source of the misinformation can be attributed to the anomalous nature of the pilot whale hunt. Relating her analysis to Mary Douglas' anthropological survey of taboos, who states that "cultural intolerance of ambiguity is expressed by avoidance, by discrimination, and by pressure to conform",[18]

13 See for instance: Kato (2015); Riese (2017); Blok (2011); Brydon (1990).
14 Nauerby (1996), 167-169.
15 Sanderson (1994), 187, 196.
16 Sanderson (1990); Sanderson (1994).
17 Sanderson (1990): 199.
18 Douglas (1975), 53.

Sanderson argues that the misinformation stems from a psychological trait to make sense of the seemingly senseless, implying that the factual inaccuracies stem not from mischievous motives but rather from alternative interpretations. In this way, aspects such as the unpredictability of *when* a pilot whale hunt occurs becomes transformed into claims about uncontrolled and unregulated whaling, and the subsistence whaling, which is unfitting in a modernized technological society, transforms the perception that it is done for entertainment and is inherently anachronistic and cruel.[19] Sanderson acknowledges that the conflict is an ontological problem, when she states, "prevailing urbanized perceptions of the human/nature relationship in western societies, most clearly manifested in, and accentuated by wildlife protection and animal welfare discourse, cannot accommodate congruence between the 'social' and 'wild'."[20] However, her motive, most clearly reflected by her positionality as the government's face in public relations, comes out in her final statement: "Pilot whaling represents a meeting and merging of the boundaries between land and sea, between the social and the wild, between culture and nature, between the pre-modern and the post-modern, between the historical continuity and modern function of a traditional form of food production and prevailing perceptions of modern society. As a result it also challenges us to rethink our all too rigid definition of what it is to be modern and civilised, and our increasingly artificial relationship with nature. Pilot whaling in the Faroe Islands provides Faroe Islanders with food; for others, it may also provide some food for thought."[21] Sanderson's analysis is a challenge to outsiders to reconsider their preconceptions about what is modern or civilized, offering a perspective that there are alternative directions to modernity.

I consider my work as building on to the analyses from Nauerby and Sanderson. As Nauerby's focus lies in the construction and maintenance of a national identity, particularly how it is influenced from external forces, he fails to adequately acknowledge the resilience of the local discourse. Sanderson, on the other hand, explains well the pressure that the Faroese faced, but does not adequately explain the local response. Thus, my own work could contribute to a different perspective that would supplement the abovementioned authors. Focusing on the issue as an ontological problem begins with the assumption that there exist alternative ways to interpret the world. The issue in the conflict

19 Sanderson (1994), 197-199.
20 Sanderson (1994), 195.
21 Sanderson (1994), 199.

in the Faroe Islands is that there has been a reluctance from both sides of the spectrum to acknowledge the legitimacy in the opponent's interpretation.

A key theoretical point of departure is Bruno Latour's assertion that the most crucial aspect to define in any dispute is the nature of what is under discussion.[22] To make his point, Latour evoked the famous Valladolid dispute. When the sixteenth century's Catholic clergy in Spain debated whether Amerindians had souls that were susceptible to being saved through Christianity, the Amerindians were in a similar debate. The American Natives, however, did not dispute that Spaniards had souls. In their animist worldview, they believed all beings had souls, languages, culture, that were modeled on the human. Rather, it was their bodies that differed and gave them the various perspectives on nature. To make their point, the Amerindians conducted experiments, whereby they subsumed Conquistador prisoners under water to see, first, if they would drown, and second, if their flesh would rot. If it did, the matter was settled, and the Spaniards had bodies. To Latour, the Amerindians were as scientific as the Spanish in their inquiry. However, in their respective debates, neither side even considered that they might not be discussing the same issue. There was a fundamental disagreement on a baseline principle about what constitutes nature.[23]

An analogy can be drawn to the whaling dispute. My central argument is that the conflict over pilot whaling has been characterized by a lack of mutual understanding because the involved parties disagree on a baseline principle. This baseline principle is reflected in their opposing constructions of nature. This is illuminated by their diverging realities on the human-nature relationship. In other words, the conflict can be understood as an ontological clash.

An ontology is defined as "any way of understanding the world must make assumptions (which may be implicit or explicit) about what kinds of things do or can exist, and what might be their conditions of existence, relations of dependency, and so on. Such an inventory of kinds of beings and their relations is an ontology."[24] In other words, ontologies are our understanding of *what is*. Thus, ontologies and worlds can be understood as synonyms.[25] In continuation to this, we can outline the concept of culture as "a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitude

22 Latour (2004), 450; Singleton (2016), 26.
23 Latour (2004), 451-453.
24 Blaser (2009), 877.
25 Blaser (2009), 877.

toward life."[26] We may then posit that our understanding of the world, and our perceptions of ourselves and our surroundings, is founded on our ontology, which is formed from our cultural background. In other words, the function of culture is to impose meaning on the world and make it understandable by adding content to our ontological assumptions. Therefore, by examining our cultural values, norms, and rules, we might gain an insight into a people's world.[27] Worlds and ontologies are elusive concepts, difficult to pinpoint, contextualize, and actualize. Faroese folklorist, Eyðun Andreasen, has argued that "The world view is a frame of reference controlling man's orientation in the world – and thus becomes an important reality. But as a phenomenon it is hidden in the unconscious structures. So a phenomenon like world view cannot be described in concrete terms."[28] However, Blaser suggests, "ontologies also manifest as 'stories' in which assumptions of what kinds of things and relations make up a given world readily graspable".[29] Stories can be the window to understand ontologies. How they are verbalized, embodied, and enacted is key to understanding how people make sense of their world. It has been argued that "stories are articulations of our perceptions and legitimate and inspire our actions, so that the stories we re-tell, and the language we use to do so, shape our view of the world and become the stories-we-live-by, establishing the frames of reference through which we make sense of the roles, structures and relationships in the world... Importantly, such stories also include the ones told by scientists."[30]

In order to better understand the perceived realities of the pro-whaling Faroese and the anti-whaling environmental activist, we need to take a closer look at the stories they tell about whales, nature, humans, and the interrelationship between these. Let us begin with the environmental movement, which has been described as the most successful social movement in human history, along with the feminist and human rights movements, simply because it is virtually impossible today to take an anti-environmental stance.[31] A social movement is defined by Manuel Castells as "purposive collective actions whose outcome, in victory as in defeat, transforms the values and institutions of society."[32] Environmentalism is primarily a science-based movement, in

26 Geertz (1973), 89.
27 Andreasen (1992), 300.
28 Andreasen (1993), 303.
29 Blaser (2009), 877.
30 Coscieme et.al. (2020), 38.
31 Young et.al. (2011), 3.
32 Castells (2010b), 3.

which "there is an implicit, coherent ecological discourse which cuts across various political orientations and social origins within the movement, and which provides the framework from which different themes are emphasized at different moments and for different purposes."[33] The environmental movement is a heterogeneous movement with issues spanning across national, political, and social boundaries, wherein the Save-the-Whales movement is but one issue in the larger project of transforming the values and institutions of society. As a social movement, its overarching goal is to influence and transform the normative relationship that people have with their environment. This can be both implicit, as in the global dissemination of information about the dangers facing the environment, or explicit, as with the calls from individuals and organizations for a consciousness revolution. Petra Kelly, a co-founder of the German *Green* political party, defined environmentalism's goal as "We must learn to think and act from our hearts, to recognize the interconnectedness of all living creatures, and to respect the value of each thread in the vast web of life. This is a spiritual perspective, and it is the foundation of all Green politics."[34] In the words of Manuel Castells, the ultimate objective of environmentalism is to create a new cultural identity, which is a "culture of the human species as a component of nature... It is the only global identity put forward on behalf of all human beings, regardless of their specific social, historical or gender attachments, or of their religious faith."[35] However, as contingent upon its ecological perspective and unity of all life, its "objective enemy is state nationalism. This is because the nation-state, by definition, is bound to assert its power over a given territory [which undermines] the sharing of our global ecosystem."[36]

Sociologists Manuel Castells and Ulrich Beck have placed the environmental movement at the root of the transformation in the relationship between economy, society and nature during the second half of the twentieth century, which has been termed postmodernity.[37] Adrian Franklin has proposed that human-animal relations have been transformed during the late twentieth century by three practices that characterize the postmodern turn: ontological insecurity, misanthropy and risk-reflexivity. First, ontological insecurity caused by the decline of local ties and the stretching of social networks over greater

33 Castells (2010b), 180.
34 Quoted in Castells (2010b), 185.
35 Castells (2010b), 184-185.
36 Castells (2010b), 184-185.
37 Castells (2010b), 169; Beck (1992), 72.

spaces precipitated a closer relationship with animals as emotional compensation.[38] Second, the destruction of habitats and ecosystems caused by industrialism extended feelings of misanthropy, where the essentially good, sane, and healthy was to be found in animals and nature, and humans were perceived as deranged and dangerous. In a sense, this was a direct critique of modernity, which saw not progress but regression in the course of human development.[39] Thirdly, as human control was extended over entire nature along the course of the century, the survival of animals became recognized as a human moral responsibility. As humans acted reflexively on improving sources of information, creating anxiety and responsibility for previously untouched areas, they extended the responsibility for animals on a global scale.[40] As transformations in public attitudes and moral responsibilities toward animals changed, social movements emerged that highlighted particular issues.

The anti-whaling storyline has been highly shaped by the postmodern paradigm. The stories about whales told by adherents of the anti-whaling movement often entail Disneyesque depictions of the whales' innocent and harmonious qualities coupled with doomsday prophesies highlighting their level of endangeredness and the urgency to act to save them. According to Charlotte Epstein, whales are portrayed as "magnificent, mysterious creatures who, with few predators in their natural habitat, peacefully wallow in blissful ignorance of the greedy voraciousness that preys over them. They are the perfect icon of paradisal innocence or indeed of the state of nature before it was torn apart by the irruption of evil (paradise) or corrupt civilization (the state of nature)."[41] Novel scientific evidence about the inherent cognitive and social complexities of whales are emphasized to reduce the emotional distance between whales and humans. At the same time, a misanthropic depiction of humans surfaces, wherein they are perceived as greedy and destructive. Epstein continues, "Whaling, on the other hand, represents all the excesses of a dysfunctional, modern society – a society that, in its obsession with 'growth,' knows only to plunder and destroy nature and, eventually, itself."[42] Thus, "the anti-whaling story-line pinned whaling as the issue that encapsulated the fundamental choice facing us as modern political subjects: to continue on this insidious path of fraying democratic controls and waning political transpar-

38 Franklin (1999), 56.
39 Franklin (1999), 55.
40 Franklin (1999), 58-60.
41 Epstein (2008), 96.
42 Epstein (2008), 96.

ency or to reclaim citizen power and face the need for a fundamental social change so as to evolve toward a more sustainable, harmonious relationship with our environment."[43] The end picture is one that aims to eradicate the sharp human-animal divide, which is achieved through the ecological vision of holism and interconnectedness of organic matter.[44]

Contemporary Faroese society has been described by anthropologist Firouz Gaini as "a society between tradition and (late) modernity, between local and global culture in the so-called 'age of globalization'."[45] A reason for this view lies in the pattern of development that society has undergone in its course to contemporary modern society. Faroese historiography generally periodizes society into three succeeding epochs of economic production: the agrarian peasant society, the era of smack-fishing, and modern society.[46] The peasant society was a relatively self-sufficient natural economy, in which people sustained themselves and their kin through subsistence practices such as fowling, sheep rearing, agriculture, cow pasturing, shore-based fishing, and pilot whaling. An industrialization process began in the mid-19th century that slowly transformed the society into a nascent fisheries nation based on a monetary economy and international trade. The industrialization process, commonly referred to as the era of smack-fishing, slowly began with the abolition of the Royal Trade Monopoly and the repeal of the bonded system of production, called *Bátsbandið* (boat bond), in 1856 and 1865 respectively, which paved the way for a monetary economy.[47] In 1872 smacks, which could venture further out to sea, began to replace the small traditional boats. During this period, a social transformation happened, whereby the new fishing villages grew in economic importance, while the older agricultural villages remained consistent with the old ways of the subsistence system. During the smack-fishing period, which lasted until the Second World War, the two systems of natural and monetary economy coexisted. However, smack-fishing contributed to break down the framework around the traditional self-sufficient peasant society,

43 Epstein (2008), 96.
44 Castells (2010b), 181.
45 Gaini (2011), 135.
46 Sedal (1989), 252-256; Andreasen (1992), 56.
47 Bogadóttir and Olsen (2017), 510. A recent dissertation from Isholm (2020) contests this periodization and argues that the modernization process began as early as the 1830s by Danish officials, when the County Governors (especially C.F. Pløyen) began a political reform to transform society around the fishing industry. The reforms were contested by the Faroese Parliament in the 1850s, who represented the peasant society's interests. For an English summary of his argument see: Isholm (2020), 606-607.

where agriculture and multifaceted resource exploitation were in focus.[48] The Second World War accelerated the societal transition. During the war, British soldiers improved the infrastructural network between the villages and also expanded the cultural experience of the Faroese; fish exported during and after the war led to a period of economic prosperity; the Marshall Plan added to this prosperity; following the war, the infrastructural network was further improved, in addition to the introduction of radio and television, respectively in 1957 and 1984, which further minimized the regional distanciation and cultural distinctions. By 1970 many aspects of society were unrecognizable from three decades earlier. However, the traditional practices of subsistence living remained, if not for economical then for cultural reasons.[49]

To better understand why these traditional aspects of life have persisted beyond their practical and economical value, it is useful to examine the creation of a Faroese national identity in the 19th century. A national identity is defined by Anthony D. Smith as "the continuous reproduction and reinterpretation of the pattern of values, symbols, memories, myths, and traditions that compose the distinctive heritage of nations, and the identification of individuals with that pattern and heritage."[50] *Tradition* and *traditional* are commonplace terms that are seldom spelled out or given much thought. A common view in anthropology is that "traditions represent a core set of practices and beliefs based on a connection with past practices and beliefs and that these are accepted by the group and fulfill a specific role in group identity."[51] Thus, it appears that traditions reverberate a past and have a symbolic function in building and maintaining group identity. Like a national identity, traditions are not rigidly fixed, but continuously contested and reinterpreted in the present. According to Smith, nations and national identities can be understood as secular religions. While the emergence of nations is preconditioned by a particular set of modern processes, such as industrialization or mass printing,[52] their durability and persistence can be ascribed to the process of sanctification, by which certain key social and symbolic elements are carefully selected and canonized to represent the nation.[53] An important criterion here is the 'cult of authenticity' or the cult of tradition, where "in order to reconstruct the

48 Sedal (1989), 266.
49 Olafsson (1990), 133.
50 Smith (2008), 19.
51 Allison (2011): 1201-1202.
52 See for instance Anderson (2006), and Gellner (2006).
53 Smith (2008), 39.

community as a pure, original nation, it becomes necessary to discover and use cultural features [traditions] that are felt to be genuine and strictly indigenous, untainted by foreign accretions or influence, and which represent the community 'at its best'".[54] These cultural artifacts, which are often associated with natural pre-industrial village life, are carefully selected and preserved in a revival process, through which a lineage to a historic past can be drawn.

In his dissertation, *Literature, Imagining, and Memory in the Formation of a Nation*, Kim Simonsen argues for the origins of a Faroese self-image to be found in the exoticizing tropes of romanticist travel writings, which were later reappropriated in a process of auto-exotification by the Faroese themselves, particularly in the seminal "Faroese Anthology" (*Færøsk Anthologi*) by pastor and philologist V.U. Hammershaimb.[55] Around the same time as the social transformation from agrarian to industrial society was taking place, a national romantic intellectual current inspired authors to search for the aspects of folk culture that could symbolize the nation. National Romanticism in the Faroe Islands was largely inspired by the philosophy of Johann Gottfried Herder, who believed that "It is part of God's plan that we experience the world in organic groups, that 'the people' are the natural repository of 'authentic' experience, and that vernacular culture and language are the expressions of our collective identity."[56] Herder drew a large following all over continental Europe. According to Isaiah Berlin, "Herder is really the father and the ancestor of all those travelers, all those amateurs, who go around the world ferreting out all kinds of forgotten forms of life, delighted in everything that is peculiar, everything that is odd, everything that is native, everything that is untouched."[57]

According to Simonsen, it was principally these foreign writers, who, inspired by Herder, initially drew notice of the peculiarities that could symbolize a historic and heroic past, not just for Faroese, but also in a larger Scandinavian context. Romanticism was to some extent a rebellion against the industrial revolution.[58] The backwardness of the Faroese, not yet affected by the advancing modernity to the same extent as their neighbors, was viewed positively and the pastoral scenes of peasant life were exoticized.[59]

54 Smith (2008), 21.
55 Simonsen (2012), 152-180; Hammershaimb (1891).
56 Smith (2000), 29.
57 Berlin (1965), 45:45-46:55.
58 Berlin (2013), 442.
59 Simonsen (2011), 155, 172-175.

Simonsen views Hammershaimb's "Faroese Anthology" as the grand finale in the construction of a national self-image, or identity.[60] As the creator of the Faroese orthography in 1846, Hammershaimb has been canonized as a pillar of Faroese culture. Between 1886 and 1891, he published his seminal anthology, which contained a section on descriptions of folk life.[61] Among his descriptions included work in the in- and outfields, storytelling after a day's work, fishing, *whaling*, dancing, and housebuilding. All the activities were thus representations of an idealized historic era, the peasant society, which was slowly disappearing in the industrialization process.[62] These cultural artifacts, the language, ballads, dancing, whaling, and the peasant lifestyle, were the emblems that came to have a crucial symbolic role in the construction of a national identity. In later depictions in art, travel writings, tourist literature and other media targeted toward a foreign audience, pilot whaling was usually portrayed as a quintessential aspect of Faroese culture and of the Faroese struggle for survival.[63]

For many Faroese today, nature is perceived as existing for the benefit of humans, or put another way, they see themselves as a part of the natural pattern of predation. With this relationship has followed a consistent and regulated responsibility of stewardship. The subsistence hunting practices were an existential necessity prior to the economic expansion in the latter part of the twentieth century. While the economic necessity has dwindled, these practices have persisted, as they reflect the continuation of a lifestyle that provides ontological security through cultural continuity. When international criticism against the pilot whaling practice began in the 1980s, it was often associated with rhetoric of uncivilized barbarism and cruelty. These attacks were experienced and perceived by many as attacks on the culture, identity and sovereignty of the Faroese, who in turn took a defensive stance in response.

The first part of this study will be about the rise of the global anti-whaling movement. First, I will trace the origins of popular compassionate sentiments toward whales as a reaction against the environmentally destructive impact of the global whaling industry and the inability of IWC, its managerial organ, to contain it. Then I will explain how the research and influence from one

60 Simonsen (2011), 177.
61 See: "Folkelivsbilleder" in Hammershaimb (1891).
62 Marnersdóttir and Sigurðardóttir (2011), 295.
63 Olsen (2019). Olsen explains how the artist Sámal Joensen Mikines imagined the whale hunt as the epitimozation of the Faroese struggle for survival.

scientist, John C. Lilly, laid the groundwork for an anthropomorphized image of whales that became the emblem for a budding environmental movement. In this movement, the symbolic image of whales was harnessed to accumulate sentiments and support for the environment as a whole. This was particularly achieved through a global cooperative framework of non-governmental organizations that wielded popular and political influence through various channels, including lobbying, direct action, and media output, through which a worldwide moratorium on commercial whaling was achieved in 1982.

The second chapter deals with the engagement of various NGOs, particularly EIA and Sea Shepherd, in stopping pilot whaling in the Faroe Islands in 1985. Here I will first illuminate the historical, cultural and symbolic significance of whaling in the Faroe Islands, where I argue that pilot whaling was an important element in the nation-building project of the 19th century. Second, I will analyze the anti-whaling protests from the first arrival of Greenpeace in 1981 until the mass movement which climaxed in the Summer of 1985.

In the third part I will closely examine the arguments of both sides in the conflict. Here the aim is to juxtapose the arguments with their respective counterparts, which will reveal their similarities and differences. In this way, it will be possible to discern the ontological foundations for the various groups, and hopefully it will illuminate reasons to why people say or think what they do.

The fourth and final part will examine the local measures enacted in the Faroe Islands in response to the global pressure of the anti-whaling campaign. I will focus on changes in legislation, scientific knowledge production, communication, and international relations. It will be argued that the measures taken were dictated by the ontological framework, and were designed to conform with the societal values.

Chapter 1

Forming Global Pressures

In August 1966, Scott McVay published an article in the popular science magazine *Scientific American*, titled "The Last of the Great Whales". The article, which came at the heels of several notable and popular publications on environmental decline in the 1960s, marked the first time that the American public was made aware of the plight of the whales.[64] The whales' plight had been a concern for scientists for years and was widely acknowledged as being caused by commercial hunting.

McVay's article was a sharp critique of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) and its reputation as a club of whalers. The IWC had been the only marine mammal management organization since its founding in 1946. 17 nations, most of them whaling nations, met in Washington, D.C. in December 1946 to sign the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW). The preamble of the Convention revealed the paradoxical goal of the Commission: "to provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks and thus make possible the orderly development of the whaling industry."[65] The history of modern whaling proved the oxymoronic reconciliation between industrialism and conservation to be a near impossible task.

In the following pages, I aim to identify the main factors contributing to the ontological transformation of whales from highly valued raw material resources to cultural icons of the budding environmental movement, typified by the metaphysical *superwhale*. After a brief history of the IWC, I will investigate the structural contingencies that preconditioned the emergence of a new view toward whales. The second half of this chapter will be about how the newly constructed image was utilized to accrue support and wield political influence.

64 Ellis (1991), 435.

65 International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (1946).

The Club of Whalers

From its beginning in the mid-19th century, modern whaling was driven by industrial demand, and the conservation of whale stocks was managed by industry-invested individuals. The sought-after product was blubber, which was refined into oil to be used for high-grade lubricant, lamp fuel or soap and margarine. The baleens were formerly used for making corsets and umbrellas but became a redundant resource after the development of plastic. Whale meat was utilized to a much lesser extent – primarily used for animal feed and fertilizer. When the oil prices fluctuated in the 1930s due to the Great Depression, the whaling giants in the United Kingdom and Norway collaborated to establish the Blue Whale Unit (BWU) as a system of measurement, and the BWU subsequently became the standard for establishing quotas in the IWC. The BWU equaled the total amount of oil extracted from a blue whale, meaning the smaller species of whales were accounted for in terms of their oil yield comparable to the blue whale. Thus, one BWU equaled one blue whale, two finback whales, two-and-a-half humpback whales, or six sei whales, etc.[66] Quotas were only given in terms of BWU, and this meant that it was more economical for whalers to target the largest species. The tragic outcome was that those largest species were quickly hunted to commercial extinction.

According to Arne Kalland, the history of the IWC can be divided into three partly overlapping phases, each dominated by a particular group and set of issues, and the division between each phase is marked by two significant changes to the management procedure of the IWC.[67] The first phase, from 1946 to the late 1960s, marked the deeply troublesome period that McVay criticized in his *Scientific American* article in 1966. This period can be categorized as management based on industrial demand and was characterized by unsustainable overexploitation of the whale stocks, leading a few species, notably the blue whale and humpback whale, to commercial extinction. The Commission provided a Total Allowable Catch quota (TAC) measured in BWU. The total quota was provided by the IWC and when the season opened, all the whaling companies were encouraged to hunt quickly and effectively in order to capture as large a share of the total quota as possible.[68] This period has been aptly termed the 'Whaling Olympics'. The IWC's Scientific Committee (SC) was already aware of the declining Antarctic whale stocks in the early 1950s, but due to injections of scientific uncertainty from a few members of the SC, especially the Dutch cetologist Dr. Slijper, the warnings went unheeded.[69] The allocation of quotas was too high for long-term sustainable harvesting, and since the BWU targeted the largest species of whales, the stocks were being depleted before the naked eye. McVay showed in *Scientific American* that in the 1950-51 season, 7000 blue whales were killed in the Antarctic. In 1951-52, blue whale kills totaled about 5000. In the 1958-59 season, the number was down to 1200.[70] The trend was self-evident and disturbing.

The second phase in IWC management was in the period from the 1960s until the late 1970s, which marked a shift toward management based on science. In 1960, a special committee of population biologists was assigned to evaluate the sustainability of the management scheme. The Committee of Three (the Committee of Four after 1961)[71] reported a comprehensive assessment to the Commission in 1963, where they recommended abandoning the BWU in favor of national and species-specific quotas, drastic reductions to the quotas given, and a partial moratorium on humpbacks and blue whales, which were protected in 1963 and 1965, respectively.[72] National quotas were introduced in 1962, but the BWU remained until 1972, when it was replaced by a new management procedure (NMP). The NMP allocated quotas for each species, abandoned the TAC, thereby ending the 'Whaling Olympics', and implemented the concept of maximum sustainable yield, which protected endangered species and only allowed hunting if the stock levels were high enough for optimal, sustainable and long-term utilization. During this period, the Antarctic whale stocks had become so depleted that by the late 1960s Norway and Australia ceased their Antarctic whaling operations and the Netherlands and United Kingdom stopped whaling altogether due to oper-

66 Epstein (2008), 78.
67 Kalland (2012), 115.
68 Kalland (2012), 115.
69 Heazle (2004); Schweder (1992). The Dutch cetologist Dr. Slijper has been blamed as a central actor in undermining the influence of scientists and to advance industrial interest. In 1992, Tore Schweder wrote a critique for the Scientific Committee, where he drew similarities between Slijper's politicization of science and the actions of the dominant anti-whaling assemblage of the late 1980s. This turned into a heated exchange between Sidney Holt of the SC and Schweder, where the former threatened with libel action and the latter's paper was subsequently withdrawn.
70 McVay (1966): 16-17.
71 The Committee of Three consisted of Kenneth R. Allen, Douglas G. Chapman, and Sidney Holt. In 1961 they were joined by John Gulland, making it the Committee of Four.
72 McVay (1966): 17.

ational unprofitability.[73] After withdrawing from the hunt, most of these nations switched their policies toward conservation, thus strengthening the Scientific Committee's influence and consensus.[74] However, all these changes were targeted toward and first implemented in the Antarctic, only reaching the other oceans later. The Antarctic whale fishery had by this time already collapsed, and the whalers were unable to fill their quotas.[75]

The third and final stage in IWC's development began in 1972, culminating in the moratorium in 1982, which came into effect in 1986. This period was marked by a higher presence of environmental NGOs, who gained increasing influence in the SC's meetings, the setting of the Commission's agenda, and relaying information externally through the media outlets. In 1972, a moratorium was proposed, but rejected due to the necessary ¾ majority needed to amend the Schedule, which is the set of rules that are stated in the ICRW. Environmentalists then set in motion a broad campaign to win the IWC majority. This was done through what scholars have termed the 'recruitment drive', whereby multiple new countries became members of the IWC as a result of lobbying efforts by environmental NGOs. From 1972 to 1982, the number of IWC member states went from 14 to 39.[76] In 1982, the majority was reached and a proposal from the U.S. delegation for a moratorium on commercial whaling was passed. It is still in place. The moratorium was based on ecological arguments, and a period of 10 years was determined with no whaling, so that the IWC could make a comprehensive assessment and research into stock populations. However, during the early 1990s, the Scientific Committee had worked on a revised management procedure (RMP) and recommended that certain stocks and species could sustain tightly controlled harvest. Due to the ¾ majority needed to amend the Schedule, it is unlikely that the pro-whaling nations will be able to overturn the moratorium in the future. The anti-whaling majority in the IWC was reluctant to consider the RMP, resulting in a deep rift inside the institution, which they have been unable to bridge. In 1993 Philip Hammond, chairman of the SC, resigned. Upon his resignation, Hammond wrote, "What is the point of having a Scientific Committee if its unanimous recommendations are treated with such contempt?... The reasons for this were nothing to do with science."[77] Since the recommendations by the

73 Peterson (1992): 162.
74 Kalland (2012), 115.
75 McVay (1966), 21.
76 Epstein (2008), 117.
77 Quoted in Epstein (2008), 135.

SC to allow sustainable hunting of certain species, notably of the minke whale, the arguments against whaling in the IWC have increasingly turned toward opposition on moral and ethical grounds.

The Rise of Global Environmentalism

The presence of environmentalists in the IWC reflected the broader political environment which had emerged since the early 1960s. In his book on *The Global Environmental Movement*, John McCormick argues that environmentalism should be seen as part of a reactionary response against industrialism resulting in a cumulative, broad-ranging, and long-term change in public attitudes.[78] This long-term change in attitudes could be traced to the late nineteenth century, although McCormick interprets the period of 1962 to 1972 as the environmental revolution. During the decade from Rachel Carson's critically acclaimed *Silent Spring* in 1962 to Earth Day in April 1970 and the Stockholm Conference in 1972, environmentalism was transformed. "If in 1962 there was growing unease about the state of the environment, by 1970 there was a new insistence on change in a global society seemingly bent on self-destruction."[79] The whaling industry epitomized this self-destructive society that was causing irreversible damage to the planet. To the environmentally anxious and aware public, the whaling industry's greed and self-destruction became symbolic of the entire human-nature relationship. The New Environmentalism of the 1960s fundamentally transformed the way that we view the environment and our relationship to it. In other words, New Environmentalism became the basis for a new and predominant worldview. Young et.al. state, "environmentalism as a set of ideas about the natural world has profoundly shaped the worldview of what we now call late modernity."[80] Three important shifts in the 1960s have been determined as catalysts for establishing the environmental worldview: the emergence of a global consciousness, a heightened concern with apocalyptic environmental change, and the emergence of the new science of ecology.[81] These shifts are intrinsically connected to technological advancements in transportation, media and communication.

78 McCormick (1995): xiv.
79 McCormick (1995), 55-56.
80 Young et.al. (2011): 3.
81 Young et.al (2011): 4.

The emergence of a global consciousness in the 1960s was linked to the mass-production and mass-consumption of television. By the mid-1960s, television had become a staple household commodity, and was undoubtedly the primary influencer of public opinion in Western societies.[82] Television assisted in bringing about a global consciousness, as it allowed people to experience the entire human world beyond their traditional public sphere. In 1962, Marshall McLuhan conceptualized this process as the world becoming a global village.[83] McLuhan argued that mass media connected the disparate edges of the world through mass consumption of images, making everyone a member of the global public. Huber and Osterhammel define a global public as "a very large group, dispersed transnationally and, mostly, transcontinentally. Its members are, as a general rule, unknown to each other, but share a common focus of attention... lacking physical coherence but united, in Tönnies's terminology, by a shared 'will' and 'capacity to judge.'"[84]

While the emergence of television offered the structural basis for a global village and a global public to emerge, it also gave the public its content – their *common focus of attention*. During the 1960s, environmental degradation seemed to be everywhere. Televisions in the households brought the catastrophic environmental damage closer to home than ever before. The napalmed forests and cratered rice fields in Vietnam brought accusations of ecocide onto the U.S. government. Smog-filled air from over-populated cities, the dangers of nuclear fallout from atomic testing, and devastating oil-spill catastrophes from energy industrialists were ever present in the living rooms of suburbia. Baby-boomers growing up in the arms race lived in a constant state of ontological insecurity, as the dangers of nuclear annihilation never loomed too far away in the consciousness. McCormick writes, "the debate over fallout unquestionably alerted public opinion for the first time to the idea that modern technology could cause unlimited environmental contamination, and that *everyone* could be affected; the global environment was seen as a whole for the first time."[85]

The decay of the Earth's nature and depletion of its resources attracted millions of people to the environmental cause. It especially attracted critics of the dominant cultural and political institutions. "For many rebels against the soul-deadening artificiality of consumer culture, nature became a source

82 Castells (2010a), 356.
83 McLuhan (1962); McLuhan (1964).
84 Huber and Osterhammel (2020), 17.
85 McCormick (1995), 65.

of authentic value."[86] Many of these countercultural social critics in the U.S. moved away from the industrial cityscapes and into countryside hippie communes, where a minimalist lifestyle coupled with hallucinogenic drugs brought feelings of being in touch with nature. Rome writes, "The hippies hoped to feel the flow of the seasons, to grow things, to enjoy the sunrise, to walk naked. Drugs helped. Indeed, the desire to return to nature was a driving force in the drug culture of the 1960s."[87] The hippies, although their golden age was short-lived, were influential. They, as well as their arguments about finding new ways to live in a more environmentally friendly manner, received considerable media attention.

The philosophy of the hippies and others in the countercultural environmental milieu was gaining ground since the early 1960s. The holistic view that all organisms are connected in a system of ecosystems is a focal point in the science of ecology. Manuel Castells defines ecology as, "a set of beliefs, theories, and projects that consider humankind as a component of a broader ecosystem and wish to maintain the system's balance in a dynamic, evolutionary perspective." In Castell's view, "environmentalism is ecology in practice, and ecology is environmentalism in theory."[88] In the 1960s, the science of ecology was experiencing a transformation toward more political content. As the focus of the studies came to increasingly revolve around the human interference of the biophysical world, ecology proclaimed a new political and philosophical dimension.[89] Its overarching goal was to illustrate the connectiveness of humans and other species, and in the process, criticize humanity's operations within the ecosystem, thus, ideally, offering a political way to solve the issue and a philosophical way to circumvent it.[90]

A major actor in this shift was marine biologist Rachel Carson, who in 1962 employed an ecological approach to the study on the effects of pesticides. Carson's book, *Silent Spring*, was a part of several publications from the late-1950s by so-called 'prophets of doom', who warned about the imminent dangers that humanity faced due to technology and modernity. Other influential authors in this genre were John Galbraith (1958 *The Affluent Society*), Garrett Hardin (1968 *Tragedy of the Commons*), Paul Ehrlich (1968 *The Population Bomb*). Like many of the other prophecies of doom, *Silent Spring*

86 Rome (2003): 542.
87 Rome (2003), 543.
88 Castells (2010b), 170.
89 Young et.al. (2011), 4-5.
90 Forsyth (2003), 4-5.

became an immediate sensation, staying on the *New York Times*' best-seller list for 31 consecutive weeks.[91] *Silent Spring* was also influential in the radicalization of ecology, as Carson advocated for a consciousness revolution to transform people's worldviews toward nature. Arne Naess, who coined the term *Deep Ecology*, has stated, "It is important to note that Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* (from which we can date the beginnings of the international deep ecology movement) insisted that *everything*, not just politics, would have to be changed."[92] The adherents of deep ecology believed that the only way to save the planet from imminent destruction "was to think the radical thought that there must be limits to growth in three areas – limits to population, limits to technology, and limits to appetite and greed. Underlying this insight was a growing awareness that the progressive, secular materialist philosophy on which modern life rests, indeed on which Western civilization has rested for the past three hundred years, is deeply flawed and ultimately destructive to ourselves and the whole fabric of life on the planet."[93] The only way to solve the conundrum was to find a lifestyle and worldview based on material simplicity and spiritual richness.[94]

Meanwhile, the political discourse was taking a swift turn toward the preservation of wildlife. The discourse followed a pattern delineating 'endangered species protection' as a synecdoche for the global environment, "such that acting to protect them served to address the broader problem of environmental destruction."[95] According to Epstein, the synecdoche developed on two levels: the national level in the U.S. and the international level. On the national level, this took the form of policies being formulated around endangered species protection as the paradigm for addressing the environmental issue. During the 1960s and early 1970s, a series of policies were enacted on the domestic level that focused on preservation of wildlife and endangered species. The first one was the Humane Slaughter Act of 1958, followed by the Wilderness Act of 1964 and the Animal Welfare Act of 1966. After some general animal welfare laws, Congress began to focus on endangered species with the Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966, which requested a list of all endangered species on U.S. soil to be drawn. The list was extended

91 Epstein (2008), 100.
92 Naess (1995): 445.
93 Worster (1995): 417.
94 Worster (1995): 418.
95 Epstein (2008), 102. A synecdoche is rhetorical figure and a form of metonymy, whereby a part is used to signify the whole; f.x. wheels=car.

to the globe with the Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969. Eight of the largest species of whales eventually ended up on the list, and in 1968 the U.S. placed a nationwide ban on whaling. While only the largest species of whales were on the endangered species list, in 1972 the U.S. enacted the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), which barred all trade and killing of marine mammals with the exception of aboriginal hunting.[96] The MMPA created the Marine Mammal Commission, which had the power to institute embargoes against countries conducting activities harmful to marine mammals. Thus, the U.S. domestic policies determined which species were endangered globally with the 1969 Conservation Act and had the power to punish infractions with the 1972 MMPA. According to Epstein, "At that point, marine mammals, and whales in particular, became the flagship species with which the United States took the lead in the global protection of endangered species."[97] Two important national legislations emerged from the U.S. during the period under investigation that would have international repercussions for the IWC's ability to manage whaling. The first was the Pelly Amendment to the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, and the second was the Packwood-Magnuson Amendment of 1979. The former law requires the Secretary of Commerce to certify a foreign country that diminishes the effectiveness of an international fishery conservation program, upon which the President may direct the Secretary of Treasury to prohibit the importation of fish products from the offending nation for a determined period. The latter law calls for an automatic fifty-percent reduction in the amount of fish that a nation may take from the 200-mile U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), if it is found to be acting against an international fisheries conservation agreement.[98] These two laws, the Pelly and Packwood-Magnuson Amendments, would be the most powerful enforcement mechanism of the IWC.[99]

On the international level, the most significant development to international cooperation on environmental issues occurred at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (UNCHE) in Stockholm in 1972. The Stockholm Conference was the first instance where world leaders met to discuss the problems of the global environment with a view to actually taking corrective action.[100] Leaders from more than 113 countries attended along

96 Epstein (2008), 106-107.
97 Epstein (2008), 108.
98 Epstein (2008), 146.
99 Dorsey (2014), 699.
100 McCormick (1995), 107.

with representatives from 19 intergovernmental agencies and more than 400 NGOs. The wide turnout, the high presence of NGOs, the creation of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the long list of conservation conventions that followed in the aftermath have led McCormick to state that "The Stockholm Conference was the single most influential event in the history of the global environmental movement, and of a global consciousness."[101] A contemporary wrote in 1972 that the UNCHE was "an event of historic proportions. It marked the beginning of a transition in the attitudes of the human race toward the future uses of the environment."[102] Charlotte Epstein has shown that, similarly to the domestic developments in the U.S., endangered species protection became the lasting legacy of the conference, stating "The only *global* consensus to emerge in the aftermath of Stockholm concerned endangered species protection."[103] This was realized by a variety of conventions on wildlife preservation on a global scale, the largest of which was the 1973 Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and the 1979 Bonn Convention.

A remarkable feature for the Stockholm Conference was the prominent presence of NGOs. A tradition begun at Stockholm, which has stayed for every major environmental conference since, including every annual conference of the IWC, was the establishment of the conference magazine *Eco* by the founders of *Friends of Earth* and the *Ecologist*, David Brower and Ed Goldsmith. *Eco* would prove to wield considerable influence on the discourse, as it became a required reading for all the national delegates. The first issue featured whaling as the main topic.[104] Whaling featured as a recurring topic, especially among the Anglo-American observers, where one commentator wrote "The whales have become a symbol of the world's endangered life, and of the success of this Conference in being able to deal effectively with that part of our objectives."[105] The issue of whaling was brought to the forefront by two main parties: The U.S. delegation who proposed a moratorium on commercial whaling, and the hippie commune *Hog Farm*, who organized a publicized demonstration.

The demonstration was organized by *Friends of Earth* activist Joan McIntyre, who would later establish the NGO *Project Jonah*, the first NGO

101 McCormick (1995), 127.
102 Stephen (1972), 16
103 Epstein (2008), 105.
104 Björk (1996): 18.
105 Jacobsen (1972), 23.

dedicated solely to saving whales. McIntyre later stated, "I realized that the press was the greatest resource there and they had nothing to write about. So I organized a big outdoor rally and a whale walk."[106] The rally began at the *Hog Farm* tent city and the demonstrators marched to the main conference hall while playing *Songs of the Humpback Whale* on the loudspeakers. U.S. delegate Russell Train and UNCHE Secretary General Maurice Strong attended the demonstration. Strong was symbolically presented with a call for a 10-year moratorium on whaling, and to loud acclaim, Strong declared whales as the symbol of the conference.[107]

The day before, the U.S. delegation had presented a moratorium to halt commercial whaling. The vote was unanimously passed by all the delegates. It was a symbolic event that showed unanimous global support on cooperation to agree on environmental issues and to protect global wildlife. However, as commentators noted at the time, the UN call for a moratorium was only expected to exert pressure on the IWC, which was the only institution that was mandated to manage whaling.[108] When the moratorium went for a vote in the IWC a month later, some countries switched their vote, so the anti-whaling assemblage was unable to secure a ¾ majority to implement the policy change. Thus began the period that has since been termed as the 'recruitment drive' – the organized effort of NGOs to win the majority vote in the IWC. The victory came in 1982, when the moratorium on commercial whaling was passed.

In the last two sections, I have focused on the structural preconditions that paved the way for the emerging anti-whaling movement. Let us now focus our attention to the creation of their symbol, the *superwhale*.

The Making of the Whale

How did the whales move so quickly from an inconsequential raw material resource to cultural icons and totems of the world's most powerful social movement in the 1970s? The most significant factor that revolutionized, romanticized, and popularized people's mindset about whales was renewed knowledge about their intelligence and social structure. In his exhaustive study on cetacean research during the twentieth century, Burnett notes that very few would regard whales as possessing remarkable 'beauty' or 'intelligence' prior

106 Epstein (2008), 140.
107 Björk (1996): 18-19.
108 Jacobsen (1972), 23.

to the 1960s.[109] However, Burnett argues, "the most important change in the way a significant number of politically engaged people in Europe and North America thought of the large whales between 1960 and 1975 involved a shift to a view of these creatures as possessed of 'intelligence' – defined loosely as cognitive and affective abilities recognizable to human beings as sufficiently like our own (or unlike our own but in an interesting and important manner) to disqualify them as prey species."[110] The higher intelligence of whales was disseminated by adherents of the Save the Whales movement as parallel to their human counterpart through an anthropomorphized view of whales, their social lives and cultures, resulting in ideas of utopia under the sea to countervail the dystopia on land accentuated by the doomsday prophecies.

The discoveries and popularization of cetacean intelligence, complex social lives, and language began with research on dolphins. The first time that the general U.S. American public could see dolphins in close proximity was at Marine Studios in Florida (later *Marineland*), the first oceanarium in the world opened in 1938. While it was both an entertainment park and a research facility, the first curator Arthur McBride was not shy to use anthropomorphism as a marketing tool to attract customers. Writing about his dolphins in an article in *Natural History Magazine* in January 1940 titled "Meet Mr. Porpoise", McBride introduced the readers to "one of their most 'human' deep-sea relatives... reveal an appealing and playful water mammal who remembers his friends and shows a strong propensity for jealousy and grief."[111] In the same month, cetologist Remington Kellogg, who had played a central role in the establishment of IWC, wrote in *National Geographic* about "Whales, Giants of the Sea", an article with 31 paintings of whales, dolphins and porpoises. The article included the subhead "Wonder Mammals, Biggest Creatures of All Time, Show Tender Affection for Young, But Can Maim or Swallow Hunters."[112] Kellogg's article illuminates that the view from Herman Melville's *Moby Dick*, about the monstrous white whale and the adventurous whalers battling the forces of nature, was still common around the 1940s. While popular literature was slowly emerging popularizing whales and dolphins, still scant was known about them.

While the earlier research from Kellogg and McBride leaned more toward observable behavioral characteristics of dolphins, more extravagant hypotheses on the intelligence were being developed from the research conducted by neurophysiologist Dr. John C. Lilly, working at *Marineland* in the mid-1950s and early 1960s. Lilly's method involved potentially lethal invasive cortical research of dolphin brains, where he would probe the brains with electrodes and visualize the frequencies into a spectrogram. Funded by the U.S. military, it was hoped that this research could be used in the Cold War bio-scientific research on brainwashing and 'operant control'.[113] However, on one such experiment, as a dolphin was breathing its last breath in the name of science, it emitted a sound which, to Lilly, sounded like human speech. Lilly was convinced that the dolphin tried to communicate with him, and he completely switched his research focus to investigate the possibilities of inter-species communication.[114] Lilly's research, his revelation, and his speculations on the higher intelligence of dolphins was published in his 1961 book *Man and Dolphin*. The first sentence of *Man and Dolphin* is revealing about his avant-garde speculations: "Within the next decade or two, the human species will establish communication with another species: nonhuman, alien, possibly extraterrestrial, more probably marine, but definitely highly intelligent, perhaps even intellectual."[115] It was especially, in Lilly's view, the large brains of the dolphins that allowed for such high intelligence. Lilly's hypotheses outlined in *Man and Dolphin* attracted many in the countercultural milieu. His ideas on dolphin intelligence, the correlation between brain size and intellect, and the complex inner lives of dolphins were quickly transcended to other species of large-brained whales. In his mystical, bordering on spiritual and religious, monologue on the dolphin's brain and inner life, Lilly wondered what this could mean for the multiple-times larger brain of the sperm whale. Lilly wrote, "His huge computer [brain] gives him a reliving, as if with a three-dimensional sound-color-taste-emotion-re-experiencing motion picture. He can imagine changing it to do a better job next time he encounters such an experience... The sperm whale has gone so far into philosophical studies that he sees the Golden Rule as only a special case of a much larger ethic,... he probably has abilities here that are truly godlike."[116] Lilly even claimed to have empirical data to back up his claims, which included reviewing 19th century whalers' logbooks to determine sperm whales' pacifism, despite the violence inflicted upon them by human

109 Burnett (2012), 522.
110 Burnett (2012), 530.
111 Ellis (1991), 435.
112 Ellis (1991), 434.
113 Burnett (2012), 575; Zelko (2013), 185.
114 Burnett (2012), 571.
115 Lilly (1961), 1.
116 Lilly (1961), 56-57; Burnett (2012), 623.

hunters.[117] Lilly's reductionist speculations on the relationship between brain size and cognitive capabilities laid the groundwork to the construction of a new mammalian construct, which was received with open arms by the countercultural environmentalist community. Frank Zelko speculates that if Lilly had named it, it would be *Cetaceus Intelligentus*.[118]

In 1971, two Swedish zoologists, Karl-Erik Fichtelius and Sverre Sjölander, published a book on the sperm whale titled *Smarter than Man? Intelligence in Whales, Dolphins and Humans*.[119] While stripped of most of Lilly's extravagance, it showed many references to Lilly's claims. Lilly's assertion on the sperm whales' avoidance of violence formed part of the basis of Fichtelius and Sj*ölander*'s argument. Their book was a critique of humanity's co-existential crisis due to the political circumstances and violence of the time. They proposed a new way to overcome these issues by discarding the anthropocentric mindset that humans are the most marvelous creatures created by God. By understanding the biology and the brain of dolphins and whales, they argued, we can realize that some of these problems can be overcome by looking beyond the established Cartesian philosophical basis. Man's self-destructive lifestyle and violent nature was to be overcome through a self-reflective perception of whales' pacifism.[120] Fichtelius and Sjölander's solution to establish a dominant bio-centric, as opposed to an anthropocentric, worldview was a recurring theme in the environmentalist discourse, as we shall see.

Lilly's influence on American pop culture, counterculture and the Save-the-Whales movement can hardly be overstated. In his early days, Lilly invented the sensory deprivation tank – a specialized tank filled with water to block the senses. Today mostly used by athletes, Lilly used the sensory deprivation tank to experiment with understanding the consciousness, often while under the influence of LSD. Lilly worked as scientific advisor on the commercially successful film *Flipper* from 1963 about the eponymous bottlenose dolphin, 'aquatic Lassie', who befriends a boy and saves his human friends from trouble. Lilly's research was the inspiration for the novel and subsequent film, *The Day of the Dolphin*, respectively from 1967 and 1973 about dolphins trained to speak, who warn about an imminent nuclear threat. The 1980 sci-fi film *Altered States*, about a scientist experimenting with drugs while inside a sensory deprivation tank, was a fictional rendering of him. Farley Mowat's readings of Lilly's *Man and Dolphin* were also an inspiration for his 1972 best-seller *A Whale for the Killing*. Lilly's ideas were widespread among anti-whaling activists in the mid-1980s, as evidenced by assertions from e.g., Paul Watson and Jennifer Gibson during their campaigns to stop whaling in the Faroe Islands.[121] However, Lilly's perhaps most influential legacy came from his work with Scott McVay, who worked as an assistant to Lilly in the mid-1960s.

In 1961 Lilly had a lecture in Princeton to promote his new book. McVay, who had read *Man and Dolphin* brought a long list of questions to Lilly. So impressed by his intrigue, Lilly invited McVay and his family to live and work at his Communications Research Facility in the Virgin Islands from 1963 to 1965. McVay, as assistant to Lilly, spent most of the time analyzing spectrograms of the dolphin phonations.[122] After McVay returned to Princeton, he wrote the groundbreaking article about the plight of the whales in *Scientific American,* mentioned at the start of this chapter. However, his most revolutionizing contribution to the Save-the-Whales campaign came, when he was approached by Roger Payne in 1968 with a set of tapes of humpback whale sounds. Using the equipment and expertise that he had received from Lilly, McVay put the tapes through a vibralyzer to create spectrograms, which, after careful study, revealed repeating patterns and a definite structure in the sound which fit the definition of song. Payne and McVay took the tapes to a record company, and in 1970 they released *Songs of the Humpback Whale*.[123] The album immediately became a massive sensation. At a time when the destruction of the Earth was ever apparent in the media and the public consciousness, the *Songs of the Humpback Whale* showed a glimpse of the natural wonder of whales. It had a tremendous impact in popularizing the beauty of whales, and it inspired millions of people to the cause of saving the whales. In 1979 National Geographic pressed 10 million copies which were included in the January edition of the popular magazine. Undoubtedly its most glorious achievement came in 1977, when the *Songs of the Humpback*

117 Burnett (2012), 624.

118 Zelko (2013), 188. Kalland terms this mammalian construct the *superwhale*. Kalland (2012).

119 Originally published as Fichtelius, Sjölander (1971), *Människan, kaskelothvalen och kunskapens träd*" (Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand).

120 Fichtelius and Sjölander (1971), ch. 7.

121 See chapter 3. Gibson and Thornton (1986); Goodman (1988). It was particularly the hopefulness about interspecies communication, as well as speculations about whales' inner lives that were prominent in activists' rhetoric.

122 Burnett (2012), 635.

123 For the production process and the eventual credit only given to Payne, see interviews with McVay in: Rothenberg (2008), 11-24; esp. 17.

Whale was included on the Golden Record, which went with the Voyager into deep space as a greeting from Earth to extra-terrestrial life.

One of the people that felt inspired by the *Songs of the Humpback Whale* was Joan McIntyre. An environmental activist and early member of Friends of Earth, McIntyre was reportedly convinced by the release of the album to focus her effort on saving whales.[124] As mentioned earlier, in 1972 McIntyre organized the 'celebration of the whale' at UNCHE at which Maurice Strong famously declared whales to be the symbol of the UN environmental conference. In 1974, she published an anthology with the title "Mind in the Waters: A Book to Celebrate the Consciousness of Whales and Dolphins". It was an homage to Lilly's *cetaceus intelligentus* with a variety of who's-who authors from the Save-the-Whales movement. Some of the notable contributors include Farley Mowat, Victor Scheffer, Carl Sagan, Pablo Neruda, Paul Spong, Scott McVay, and John C. Lilly himself. All the contributions were to some extent reverberations of the conceptual *superwhale*.

The most heartfelt and romantic picture of whales, however, was drawn by McIntyre. She wrote several essays in the anthology, but the titular essay "Mind in the Waters" showed a glimpse of a perspective, which, according to Manuel Castells, has epitomized the environmental movement, namely "to reconstruct nature as an ideal cultural form."[125] McIntyre's heartfelt depiction of the holistic culture of whales, living harmoniously together in tight knit communities, was contrasted with the individualistic nature of humanity, which was seen as a product of modernity. McIntyre's relationship with dolphins and whales could be summed up by a paragraph in her conclusion: "There was a time in our culture, not long ago, when the essential role of men and women was to nurture and protect each other, to be the caretakers of life and earth. At that time, when the sun sparkled on the sea of our imagination as freshly as it sparkled on the sea herself, we thought of our world and each other in ways which were life-venerating and death-respecting. The porpoise school that weaves its history protectively around its common existence, the whales that tune body and mind in a continuous awareness of life, are not symbols of an alien mythology – they are evocative of what was once the core of human relationships."[126] McIntyre's quote illustrates a common theme in the anti-whaling discourse, namely that the culture of whales is idolized as an ideal cultural form; a way of life that humans have lost touch with since the dawn of industrialism and modernity, which breed materialism and individualism.

The paragraph above epitomizes the anti-whaling story. Recall from the introduction that the central issue in the conflict in the Faroe Islands would revolve around diverging constructions of nature. The *superwhale*, as brought to life by McIntyre and others, was a construct with a metaphoric dimension, which illuminated the predominant environmentalist perception on the human-nature relationship. Next, we will see how this image was used by individuals and organizations to accrue sympathies and support from a global public. Especially important was the now well-established media tradition of the environmental movement, and the vision of the individuals who understood how to use it in their goal toward a consciousness revolution.

The Influence of the Whale

The contributor to McIntyre's anthology that would have the greatest influence on the development of the Save-the-Whales movement was Paul Spong. Spong had landed his first job out of university as a neuroscientist working at the Vancouver Aquarium in the late 1960s. At the aquarium, Spong oversaw the behavioral and sensory research done on the captive orcas. In his essay "The Whale Show", Spong described his own transition from a scientist approaching the whales like a mammalian life-form akin to the laboratory rat, to his revelation about the orca as a highly intelligent species closer to a person than a rat. Partly this revelation came from experiments that a young female orca, Skana, was conducting on him.[127] He wrote, "Many of us who have worked with whales and dolphins have come to the realization that at the same time we were attempting to manipulate their behavior, they were manipulating ours. At the same time we were studying them and performing experiments on them, they were studying us and performing experiments on us."[128] As he came to realize that the whale used its hearing to sense its surrounding, life in captivity was essentially a life in a sensory deprivation tank. After voicing his opinion that the whale wanted to be free, Spong was fired from the aquarium and set up his own laboratory on Hanson Island in British Columbia by the Blackfish Sound, an area famous for its abundance in whales, where he could

124 Burnett (2012), 626n195.
125 Castells (2010a), 508.
126 McIntyre (1974), 221.
127 Zelko (2013), 164-165.
128 Spong (1974), 173.

study whales in their natural habitat. His experiments included playing live concerts for the free whales, which, according to him, were well received.

Spong became involved in activism in 1972, after being introduced to Joan McIntyre by Farley Mowat. Spong joined McIntyre's newly formed NGO *Project Jonah*. McIntyre encouraged him to expand his whale show throughout Canada, as she was in the process of developing 'whale celebrations' throughout the UK and USA, akin to her Stockholm demonstration.[129] In an attempt to gain media and public support, Spong contacted Robert Hunter at the Vancouver Sun. The previous year, Hunter had organized a highly publicized and popular protest against U.S. nuclear testing in Amchitka, one of the Aleutian Islands, with his NGO *Greenpeace*. Hunter and Spong met in the Autumn of 1973.[130] Spong explained his theory about cetacean intelligence. His explanations retained traces of Lilly's claims about a higher intelligence, stating "I realized that the animal I was working with was as intelligent as and in some ways quite possibly *more* intelligent than I was." He was talking about the sophistication of their brains, how they had evolved far more than humans to process auditory information.[131] Hunter's response echoed Rachel Carson's call for an ecological consciousness revolution and McIntyre's biocentric ideas that whales possess the harmonious connection that humans have lost as a result of modernity. Hunter said, "The industrial nations, blind to the laws of ecology, are coming up against their karmic debts, having ripped off the resources to the point that the machines are starting to grind to a halt. Industrial economies are in trouble, and a more ecological, coevolutionary paradigm is emerging. If what you say about whales is true – and I believe it is – then the whales are ahead of us. They seem to have already learned how to live harmoniously within their surrounds, to control their populations, to live ecologically within their environment, and to manage their societies without aggression and violence. It sounds like the whales have a more *gestalten* language, not really a language at all as we know it, but a way of communicating about relationship. They intuitively understand systems theory. This puts them way ahead of human intellect."[132]

Greenpeace began as a small anti-nuclear organization called the *Don't Make a Wave Committee* (DMWC). It changed its name to *Greenpeace* shortly

129 Zelko (2013), 171.
130 The conversation has been reproduced by Rex Weyler in: Weyler (1986), 135-140. Cf. Zelko (2013), 171-174.
131 Zelko (2013), 172.
132 Zelko (2013), 172-173.

after its first campaign, organized against the United States underground nuclear testing on the Alaskan island of Amchitka in 1971. The DMWC was mostly composed of environmentally minded journalists, Bob Hunter included. Hunter had long expressed ideas about the consciousness revolution that he talked about with Spong in 1973. A close reader of McLuhan's communications theory, Hunter had written a book in 1971,[133] where he wrote about the new consciousness focused on ecological awareness that had emerged in the post-war period. The revolution, he theorized, would be enacted by dropping mind bombs – "powerful new images delivered via the media – changing the mass consciousness."[134] Hunter and the *Greenpeacers* were deeply influenced by the *Quaker* anti-war activism of the early 1960s. Irving Stowe, co-founder of *Greenpeace*, was a *Quaker* convert. In particular, it was the protest strategies and cultural values of the *Quakers* that appealed to and helped shape the *Greenpeace* cause. The *Quaker*'s insistence on pacifism shaped the protest strategy of 'bearing witness'.[135] The strategy of *Greenpeace*, influenced by Hunter's theory of mind bombs and McLuhan's theory on the global village, was that the mass media could shape public attitude by exposing disturbing images that would incite an emotional response. Hunter wrote, "Most of the thinkers on Earth hold firmly to the belief that history is shaped by swarms, by the colossal momentum of numbers and bulk... Who but a megalomaniac can dream of actually changing the consciousness of humanity? The answer is simply the existence of a planet-wide mass communications system, something that had never existed before. Its development was the most radical change to have happened since the planet was created, for at its ultimate point it gives access to the collective mind of the species that now controls the planet's fate. One man can now command the attention of the world. One group – such as Greenpeace – could do the same. In my own mind, it seemed crystal clear that awareness itself is the cure... Mass media is a way of making millions bear witness at a time."[136] To Hunter, it was clear. As the world was becoming an increasingly global village, mass media was the key to trigger the revolutionary change in ecological awareness in humanity's consciousness. By firing mind bomb messages, the public would become aware, and thus, through protest, the public would become a participatory agent in politics.

133 Hunter (1971).
134 Hunter (2011), 76.
135 Zelko (2013), 20-21.
136 Hunter (2011), 258-259.

The conversation between Spong and Hunter in the autumn of 1973 turned out to be a revolutionizing moment in the history of environmentalism. After Hunter had explained to Spong the consciousness revolution and his theory about mind bombs, Spong, eager to bring the whaling issue to *Greenpeace*, inquired, "What if we took a boat out and blockaded the whalers. Sailed right between them and the whales and didn't let them shoot their harpoons! Do you think the media networks would cover that?"[137] Impressed by the idea, Hunter agreed to persuade the rest of the *Greenpeace* board to focus on whaling. Despite initial reluctance from some in the *Greenpeace* administration, they agreed to establish the *Stop Ahab Committee*, named after the infamous captain in Melville's *Moby Dick*. Their plan came to actuality in 1975, when *Greenpeacers* on zodiac inflatable rubber boats placed themselves between a Soviet whaler and a group of hunted sperm whales. In front of rolling cameras, the world watched as a Soviet harpoon was shot meters above the *Greenpeace* zodiac and into a bull sperm. The powerful image of a few vulnerable activists in a rubber dinghy floating between a dying whale and the massive Soviet whaling vessel were shown on Walter Cronkite's CBS TV News and subsequently circulated the worldwide media.[138] It cemented a self-description that *Greenpeace* had used to identify themselves since their Amchitka campaign, namely the image of David against Goliath.

The mind bomb was dropped, and it was powerful. *Greenpeace* entered the Save-the-Whales movement at precisely the right moment. The decade from the Stockholm Conference leading up to the IWC moratorium was marked by a slow process of acquiring mass support on the ground- and state-level. On the ground, this was actualized by the strategy of turning everyone into passive activist by making them bear witness to the cruelty of the killing. The graphic images of the bloody and lifeless whale in the ocean provoked a strong sense of outrage and disgust in the observers, who witnessed the spectacle from their living rooms. At the state-level, the main goal was to win governments' support in order to secure an anti-whaling majority in the IWC.

Killing the Club of Whalers

According to Epstein (2008), the Save-the-Whales campaign in the 1970s can be divided into two stages – first to influence a sympathetic view of whales on the ground and second to win the majority vote in the IWC. In the first stage, Epstein writes, the focus "was the globe as a whole, as the aim was to win over the hearts and minds of the entire world."[139] This slow process had already begun with McVay's 1966 article on "The Last of the Great Whales", the melodic "Songs of the Humpback Whale" in 1970, and McIntyre's romantic "Mind in the Waters" in 1974. As I have shown, the emotional distance to the animals was reduced through anthropomorphizing metaphors of whales' harmonious state of existence. However, coupled with mass media's influence on public opinion through the direct-action campaigns by groups such as Greenpeace, the graphic images of the brutality of whaling arrived into everyday life. This was key to establishing a dominant discourse on the ground.[140] With Greenpeace's mind bombs, disseminated to the global village through mass media, the ordinary consumer of television was turned into an eyewitness of the horrors, thus creating passive activists. Some of these ordinary consumers of images participated in the activism through letter protesting, which flooded into the whaling countries' governments, aimed both at putting pressure to reform and overloading the bureaucracy. Often these letters were written by children as representatives of the 'voices of the future'.[141]

The second stage of the campaign focused on accumulating national governments' support and to transform the internal dynamic in the IWC. Scholars have termed this period, spanning from the later 1970s to the early/mid 1980s, as the 'recruitment drive'. This process took place on several levels and was often, but not always, a direct influence of NGOs. The global discourse on anti-whaling had become entrenched as hegemonic during the better part of the 1970s. The discourse was linked to the greening paradigm and the global agenda on international cooperation on environmental protection outlined at the Stockholm Conference, and for most countries that joined in the recruitment drive, an anti-whaling position was a relatively inexpensive way for a country to polish its green credentials. In this way, states' motivation to join the anti-whaling cause was not about material payoff, but about fitting in with the society of states. Epstein shows how many of the new states from the Global South, mainly African states, who joined the IWC in the late 1970s, did so from an implicit external expectation rather than internal national or public interest. "They were catering not to their own domestic public opinion but to the perceived expectations of other, more powerful states at a particu-

137 Zelko (2013), 173.
138 Day (1992), 12.
139 Epstein (2008), 139.
140 Epstein (2008), 142.
141 Epstein (2008), 142.

larly difficult juncture in the international political economy of North-South relations."[142] The implicit desire to belong to the society of 'good' 'anti-whaling' states was certainly a motivating factor for the recruitment drive. This was contingent on a global hegemonic discourse that established the structures which allowed these tendencies to emerge. However, in many cases, a state's turn to the anti-whaling cause was facilitated by the protests of NGOs which were reproduced in the mass media.

The case of Australian termination of whaling and swift turn to a staunch anti-whaling position is a good example of the dual strategy of the Save-the-Whales movement of targeting the public on the ground while lobbying government reform on the top. During the 1970s, Australia's whaling industry was still in function, as the *Cheynes Beach Whaling Company* operated from the land-based station in Albany in Western Australia. In 1976 *Project Jonah* began a powerful media and lobbying campaign that was joined to a lesser degree by *Greenpeace*, *Friends of Earth*, the *Whale and Dolphin Coalition*, and others. The media attention focusing on the whaling activities in Albany peaked in 1977, when Australia hosted the IWC annual conference in Canberra. Portrayed in the media as "the last English-speaking whaling country", Australia was an important pawn for the anti-whaling coalition to get as an ally.[143] At the conference, Joan McIntyre's *Project Jonah* organized a large demonstration similar to the UNCHE protest. A large inflatable whale – Willie the Whale – was flying above the demonstrators. Willie has since become a staple attendee at the IWC conferences.[144] Following the conference, media attention on the Albany whaling station intensified, while at the same time, NGOs lobbied the government to ban whaling. Graphic images of whaling circulated the news channels, inciting anger and disgust among the public.[145] An opinion poll in late 1977 revealed that 70% of Australians opposed whaling under any circumstances.[146] The dominant public sentiment was that killing whales was morally, philosophically and economically unacceptable.[147] The campaign and the IWC meeting coincided with the Australian federal election, and the issue became a rallying cry for the re-election of Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser. During his political campaign, Fraser's

142 Epstein (2008), 160.
143 Kato (2015): 486
144 Day (1992), 16.
145 Kato (2015): 489.
146 Epstein (2008), 150.
147 Kato (2015): 488.

11-year-old daughter wore a Save-the-Whales badge, and Fraser jokingly commented that he was "coming under pressure from home to stop the killing of whales."[148] The Albany whaling station closed down quietly in 1978 due to economical unviability, and in 1979 Australia outlawed whaling.[149] In his statement to Australia's termination of whaling, Prime Minister Fraser stated, "The harpooning of these animals is offensive to many people who regard killing these special and intelligent animals as inconsistent with the ideals of mankind, and without any valid economic purpose in mitigation."[150] Within less than 5 years, Australia took a swift transformation from a pro-whaling country to being the first country that publicly condemned whaling on moral and ethical grounds.

In some cases, the NGO influence was more direct in IWC affairs. NGO dominance in IWC policymaking began especially after 1979, when the IWC plenary opened for media and non-governmental observers. Two years prior, the Scientific Committee had allowed for a similar process of transparency. Opening the meetings for the press and NGOs "unleashed a media blitzkrieg upon it",[151] whereby the narrative that was told through the press relayed "the story-lines fed to it by an activist literature made widely available throughout IWC meetings, both in the form of targeted pamphlets and as a collective daily newsletter, Eco."[152] As NGO observers were granted increased leeway into the annual conferences, they also began to infiltrate several national delegations, thus wielding direct influence on the policy-making process. Writing for Forbes in 1991, Leslie Spencer wrote, "According to Francisco Palacio, a former Greenpeace consultant on marine mammals, he and McTaggart [leader of Greenpeace], working with their friends, came up with a way to bend the commission to the Greenpeace view that there should be an outright ban on whaling. The whale savers targeted poor nations plus some small, newly independent ones like Antigua and St. Lucia. They drafted the required membership documents for submission to the U.S. State Department. They assigned themselves or their friends as scientists and commissioners to represent these nations at the whaling commission... Between 1978 and 1982, Palacio says, the operation added at least half a dozen new member countries to the commission's membership to achieve the three-fourths majority necessary for

148 Day (1992), 16.
149 Epstein (2008), 150.
150 Day (1992), 17.
151 Epstein (2008), 157.
152 Epstein (2008), 157.

a moratorium on commercial whaling, which passed in 1982."[153] Accusations of vote-buying were not unique to the anti-whaling coalition. Japan received similar accusations of vote-buying and coercive influence to acquire votes from developing countries to vote against the moratorium. In 1980, Japan unsuccessfully attempted to bribe the Seychelles commission by offering to purchase a fishing vessel and 40 million dollars in foreign aid in return for a particular position on the issue. Japan's coercion of Jamaica, Costa Rica and the Philippines was more successful, as they suddenly switched from a pro- to anti-moratorium vote after promises of Japanese foreign investment in their respective countries.[154]

As I have shown, the effort to transform the internal dynamics in the IWC from the scorn "club of whalers" to a preservationist organization intent on saving whales was a lengthy process that involved national policies that had international repercussions, a substantial NGO-led campaign to highlight the whaling conducted, and a global mass media infrastructure that relayed the information from the NGOs to the global public. Through coercion and bribery, states were forced to enter the IWC and to take certain positions. A central player in this was the United States, who, as we saw earlier in this chapter, took a leading role in the 1970s as a protector of endangered species. The national laws that followed would become the main enforcer of IWC policies, as infractions on the IWC's rules of engagement would have repercussions for admission into U.S. domestic markets.

The moratorium, which passed in 1982 and came into effect in 1986, did not stop all whaling altogether, however. Provisions in the Convention allowed 'Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling', through which indigenous people could be given quotas from their national governments. The whaling in Greenland, Alaska and parts of Canada and the Caribbean are conducted under this allowance. The IWC's Convention also allowed for whaling for scientific purposes, which Japan, Iceland, and, to some extent, the Faroe Islands, utilized. In addition to these exceptions to hunt large whales, small cetaceans were never covered in the IWC's Schedule. The hunt for pilot whales in the Faroe Islands thus falls outside IWC's jurisdiction. After securing an end to commercial whaling, the Save-the-Whales movement turned its attention to the Faroe Islands.

153 Spencer et.al. (1991), 2.
154 DeSombre (2001), 188.

Chapter 2

Whaling and Anti-Whaling in the Faroe Islands

In the mid-1980s, a flurry of international organizations and angry European citizens focused their attention on the *grindadráp*, the slaughter of pilot whales in the Faroe Islands. During the next decade, hundreds of thousands of protest letters were sent to the Faroese government and to Danish embassies around the world.[155] During the same period, representatives from international environmental organizations, such as the *Environmental Investigation Agency* (EIA), the *Sea Shepherd Conservation Society*, and *Greenpeace*, traveled to the Faroe Islands to partake in direct action against the hunt and to persuade the Faroese government to ban it. The criticism focused particularly on the perceived barbarity of the hunt, which was seen as an anachronism in a modern, civilized society. The critical attention was a shock to many Faroese people, who had heralded the hunt as a quintessential aspect of their culture. As threats of boycotts on the nation's fishing exports loomed large, the Faroese found themselves in an ontological crisis to which they had to take action.

The last chapter focused on the creation of a new image of 'the Whale', which had a crucial impact on the development of the environmental movement and helped shift its focus toward saving whales as endangered species. The current chapter has two central objectives. First I will investigate a different image of whales by examining the pragmatic and symbolic values of pilot whaling for the Faroese people. Following this, I will provide a short history of commercial whaling in the Faroes, which was the catalyst for critical international attention. My second objective in this chapter will focus on how

155 More than 140,000 letters and post cards were sent to the Faroese government between 1985 and 1997. This number is in all likelihood an underestimation, as many letters were probably discarded. The current number is the amount that is stored at the Faroese National Archive. It is currently unknown how much protest mail embassies around the world received.

the anti-whaling campaign in the Faroes took shape and why it evolved as it did. The first NGO attention came in 1981 as an investigation into commercial and scientific whaling, but the focus quickly shifted toward pilot whaling, against which a wide campaign was launched in 1985.

Whaling Toward a Nation

In the following section, I will provide a short description of how a whale hunt is conducted, with special emphasis on the changes that have been implemented in the last 200 years. As I describe the hunt, I include the Faroese terms in parentheses and italics. Then I will explain the practical and symbolic importance of pilot whales to Faroese society, followed by an evaluation of how pilot whaling came to occupy an important role in the nation-building project of the late nineteenth century.

The Faroese pilot whale hunt is an opportunistic and communal hunt for subsistence. The occurrence of a catch is sporadic, unplanned, and determined by the prey's movement around the islands.[156] It is an opportunistic hunt, as whales are not actively searched for, but are only hunted when they are spotted by chance by people, either on land or sea. The target species is long-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala melas*; Faroese: *grindahvalur* or simply *grind*), although white-sided dolphins (*Lagenorhynchus acutus*; Faroese: *springari*) are sometimes included in the catch. Pilot whales have traditionally been hunted by other coastal communities in the North Atlantic, although today the practice is unique to the Faroe Islands.[157] The hunt has evolved through time as technology and modes of communication have improved, but the practice still maintains the ancient principles, of which a high degree of social organization is paramount.[158] A pilot whale hunt has four stages: the sighting and messaging (*grindaboð*), the drive (*grindarakstur*), the killing (*grindadráp*), and the assessment and distribution of the catch (*grindabýti*). The entire process and the killing itself are referred to in Faroese as *grindadráp*. The procedure, from sighting to clean-up and prescribed equipment,

156 Sanderson (1994), 195.

157 Nauerby (1996), 197n6; Joensen (2009), 61-64. Pilot whales have previously also been hunted by people in Iceland, the Hebrides, the Shetland Isles, the Orkneys, Iceland, and Newfoundland. The prevalence of the practice has resulted in speculations about the connection with the Scandinavian expansion of the 9th and 10th centuries. Joensen (2009), 65.

158 Joensen (2009), 121.

has been entirely codified in the government's whaling regulations, which are periodically updated.[159] The most significant changes as a result of technological improvements have occurred with the first three stages. Before the introduction of radio, and later telephone, an elaborate system of bonfires, runners, and shouters was used to get the word around the islands that a pod had been spotted. From 1957 until 1985, the *grindaboð* message was called in the national radio. However, this practice ceased when protests began, and today the message is normally relayed through cell phone. When the message for a drive is given, able-bodied and interested men (and a few women) hurry to their boats to partake. The drive has also become more efficient since motorboats replaced the traditional rowboats. Following weather conditions and prevailing tidal currents, the boats drive the whales into an approved whale bay (*hvalvág*), as prescribed by the whaling foreman on site, who also decides when to begin the kill. Colloquially hunters distinguish between an ugly and a beautiful kill (*ljótt* or *pent dráp*). A beautiful kill is achieved by making the whales beach themselves (*landgongd*). The kill begins when the whaling foreman throws a harpoon into a rear-whale, causing the entire pod to swim forward in such a fury that they create a large wave, and then lie high and dry when the wave recedes.[160] The whales are greeted by land-based hunters, who execute the whales with a long deep cut through the neck, using a gaff to grip the whale and a whale knife to sever its spinal cord and carotid arteries. However, at times and in places, it is not possible to make the whales beach themselves. In such circumstances, the whales would be killed from the boats, using gaffs and long spears, causing several cuts until the whale bleeds out. The situation here is often more chaotic, causing much suffering to whales (and danger to whalers), and lessening the quality of the meat due to sand grains entering the many wounds. Such killings are referred to as 'ugly killings'. The use of harpoons and spears has been severely restricted since the regulations of 1986, the gaff was gradually replaced by a blunt hook in the 1990s, and since the regulations of 2015 the only allowed equipment to kill a whale is a recently invented spinal lance, whale knife, and blunt hook. When all the whales are dead, any person present may sign their name up for a share. An intricate system is used to divide the shares between the killer's shares, home shares, hospitals and elderly homes, percentages to officials and overseers, and the largest whale, the so-called "finder's fish" (*finningarfiskur*) is given to the person who first spotted the pod. The various rules of distri-

159 The first official regulations were written in 1832. The most recent is from 2017.

160 Joensen (2009), 117-118.

bution have also changed through time, but while space does not allow for a more detailed discussion of these aspects, Wylie and Margolin have noted that "the rules for distributing the grind provide a kind of Faroese social history in miniature."[161] After everything has been assessed, and the shares declared, the shareholders must butcher their allocated whale themselves and divide it equally among them.[162]

Some historians believe that the practice is as old as the people.[163] Archaeological excavations from Viking burials have included whale bones, suggesting that whale meat formed part of the Norse settlers' diet. However, as Russel Fielding has noted, "the mere presence of whalebones in a midden does not indicate active hunting of whales. Many coastal peoples have made use of whales that strand themselves on the shore, including the Faroese."[164] The oldest written evidence of whaling can be found in the Sheep Letter from 1298, an amended version of the Norwegian Younger Gulathinglaw, which covered the Faroe Islands. The legal document determined, among other things, the ownership of whale strandings and catches. Authorities have kept detailed records of the catch since 1584, except during the years 1648 to 1708 during the so-called Gabel-era. Unbroken records exist from 1709 until the present, making it the best-documented catch of any wild animal in the world. Literary accounts from the seventeenth century's Lucas Debes to the eighteenth century's J.C. Svabo attest to the important subsistence value of pilot whaling, when a good catch could mean a matter of life and death during the dark winters.[165] The 19th century transformation from a peasant society to a fishing society gradually changed the traditional subsistence economy into a modern economy based on participation in the international market.[166] The population grew as the socio-economic conditions improved. During this period, official interest began to awaken for the real value that the whale product could have for the subsistence economy and the growing population. Pilot whaling was institutionalized in 1832, when the first pilot whaling regulations codified every aspect of the hunt into written law.

161 Wylie and Margolin (1981), 120.

162 For a more detailed description of the process from sighting to butcher, see: Wylie and Margolin (1981), 95-125; and Joensen (2009), chapters 4-6. For an interpretation of the distribution process as a central feature of Faroese egalitarianism and public culture, see Mortensen (2005).

163 Thorsteinsson (1986), 66.

164 Fielding (2010), 193.

165 Sanderson (2010), 72.

166 Olafsson (1990): 130.

During the 19th century, whaling also became closely intertwined with the construction of a national identity. During the course of the century, "a more clearly defined national cultural awareness was also created in parts of the population, who started to consider themselves Faroese."[167] This concept of 'Faroeseness' slowly emerged in the early part of the century, but was most manifest in the late 19th and early 20th century.[168] In his dissertation, *Literature, Imagining and Memory in the formation of a Nation*, Kim Simonsen argues that the foundations for a national self-definition were constructed by intellectuals from the mainland. These intellectuals, subscribing to a transnational discourse of national romanticism, reconstructed the North Atlantic, and the Faroe Islands in particular, as a utopia with images of primitivism, exoticism, and sublime landscapes, different from their homeland.[169] To the mainland Romantics, the isolated Faroes were "a veritable Eldorado for specialists and travellers in their search for the original folk culture that had been eroded elsewhere by the triumphal progress of the industrial revolution."[170] One of the first to introduce pilot whaling into the Romantic discourse was the Danish bailiff (later resident governor from 1837-1848) Christian Pløyen, who in 1832 had overseen the institutionalization of the pilot whaling practice by royal decree. In 1835, he composed the whaling ballad, *Grindavísan*, which romanticized the Faroes and the killing of pilot whales with the refrain "Hardy Lads, to kill a herd of pilot whales, that is our desire."[171] According to Joensen (2009), the ballad elevated the hunt "to something other than trying to get food to put in the pot and on the plate."[172] Implicitly, the ballad connected whaling to its ancient ancestry. The ballad tradition had a long history and is still practiced today, as the heroic ballads are sung and danced to the national ring dance or chain dance, usually at large and festive gatherings. It is important to point out that the ballad had a functional and social value besides its artistic value. When men travelled across villages and islands to join the hunt, it would last hours until their share of the meat and blubber were back in their boat on the way home. Therefore, in their soaking clothes, it was a common way to stay warm. Joensen (2009) states that this was common in many aspects of society: "At many places in the Faroes, for

167 Joensen (2009), 190.

168 Joensen (2009), 202.

169 Simonsen (2012), 255-256.

170 Nauerby (1996), 146.

171 Simonsen (2012), 153. Original lyrics: "Raske drenge, grind at dræbe, det er vor lyst."

172 Joensen (2009), 203.

example, in the old days when people went to church where it was ice cold during the winter, they would traditionally dance themselves warm when the church service was over." In addition, Joensen continues, "the whale hunt gave the otherwise isolated population a chance to meet."[173] However due to the improvements in infrastructure, the tradition of dancing after the hunt has died, as its practical significance dwindled. Today it is easy to drive home, change clothes and wait until the distribution of the catch.

Although Pløyen could speak Faroese perfectly, the whaling ballad was composed in Danish, because a Faroese orthography had not yet been invented. Interestingly, with Pløyen's *Grindavísan*, a new tradition was slowly invented, which became an integrated part of the whale hunt. It has been assumed, although with little contemporary evidence, that along the course of the 19th century, it became customary to dance after a successful kill, and *Grindavísan* was a definite inclusion in the repertoire of the post-hunt celebration.[174] Offering no substantive evidence, historian John F. West wrote in the 1970s, "*Grindevisen* has been sung at every whale-killing for over a century."[175] Several accounts from the latter half of the 19th century describe ballad dancing after the hunt, although they make no explicit mention of Pløyen's whaling ballad. However, by 1892, a Faroese, and more nationalistic, version of the ballad was composed but was poorly received, indicating that the Danish version had won favor by this time.[176] "*Grindavísan* served to define, and in turn be defined by, the dance in which it was performed. Indeed many accounts of *grindadráp* written for foreign readers point out that the dance either begins with *grindavísan,* or has the ballad as its high point."[177] Sanderson, evaluating the ballad's value, concludes, "The real significance of *Grindavísan* was that it was the first narrative of the hunt to be expressed in a popular genre for a local audience, composed in written (Danish) form but received into an oral repertoire of ballads performed in the context of the traditional Faroese dance. It also succeeded in incorporating various didactic elements concerned with presenting a reformist ideal of an orderly and organised hunt, an ideal which was frequently reinforced through its repetition in the dance."[178]

173 Joensen (2009), 209.
174 Sanderson (1992), 95.
175 West (1972), 81.
176 Sanderson (1992), 96. The Faroese 'whaling ballad' was composed by Dr. Jakob Jakobsen and Billa Hansen in 1892 to the tune of *La Marseillaise*. See also: Joensen (2009), 211.
177 Sanderson (1992), 96.
178 Sanderson (1992), 95.

The romantic discourse about pilot whaling, and the Faroe Islands in general, slowly became appropriated by a new class of Faroese intellectuals. The first example of Faroese prose was V.U. Hammershaimb's *Faroese Anthology*, originally published as pamphlets between 1886 and 1891. Hammershaimb continued the romantic narrative about rural folk life in his *Folkebilleder* (Folk pictures), where he included a description of a fictional pilot whale hunt. The aspects of folk life that Hammershaimb depicted, from weddings and harvest festival to sheep driving, fishing and haymaking, signified the essential images of what would constitute an 'authentic' culture and national identity based in everyday life. Hammershaimb, who had written the Faroese orthography earlier in the century, is remembered today as a founder of the pillars of Faroese national culture.[179] His inclusion of the pilot whale hunt in the anthology signified the important and symbolic place that it had as one of several quintessential features of a Faroese national identity. Over the next century, virtually every descriptive account of the Faroe Islands by foreigner and Faroese alike has included at least a chapter on the hunt.[180] Going from a simple, yet essential, source of food, as pilot whaling entered the nationalist discourse, "it was moved up to a major, symbolic, natural cultural level in which the practice and drama of the whale kill became an element of how the Faroese saw themselves, and in due course became imbued in them as an element of their cultural identity."[181]

Commercial and Scientific Whaling in the Faroe Islands

Whaling for the great whales took place in the Faroe Islands during the twentieth century, although it was not imbued with the same symbolic and social significance as the pilot whaling. Commercial whaling began as a Norwegian enterprise in 1894. Over the next decade, an additional six stations were established by Norwegian or Danish companies. The whaling was ruthlessly unsustainable, as in most other places around the globe. Whalers hunted the breeding grounds to economical extinction, before moving on to the next. As was the case with the Antarctic fishery, the largest species were preferred. From 1894 to 1914, 259 blue whales were killed in the waters around the Faroes. From 1915 to 1938, only 60 blue whales were killed – indicating that

179 Simonsen (2012), 243.
180 Nauerby (1996), 149.
181 Joensen (2009), 198.

stocks were quickly exhausted.[182] Industrial whaling was at its height in the first two decades of the century, and the most profitable year was 1909 when 773 whales were killed.[183] While the government could levy some income from the export, Jacobsen (2007) argues in his vivid study on commercial whaling in the Faroes that the foremost contribution of whaling was for the household economy, as people could purchase whale meat at very modest prices.[184] When the Norwegians left in the 1920s, Faroese whalers took up business at the two remaining whaling stations left standing. Whaling was halted during the Second World War, and the immediate post-war period saw some very active whaling years. However, by this time the stocks had significantly dwindled. The industry had become highly unprofitable, oil was not in demand, and the meat was sold too cheaply to sustain the business.

The end of commercial whaling in the Faroe Islands has been largely devoid of scholarly attention. Joensen states, "Operations from the whaling station in Lopra ceased from 1953, while the Við Áir whaling station continued until around 1968. In practice this form of whaling had now stopped, although there was some activity until 1986."[185] Journalist Helgi Jacobsen has written the only book in Faroese dedicated solely to commercial whaling. He also abruptly ends the story in the 1960s.[186] While commercial whaling as an export-oriented business ended in 1968, hunting for the great whales continued.

Through the 1970s, a small-scale venture was in operation, which only targeted minke whales for local consumption. From 1970 to 1977, 27 whales were shot. At this time, whalers reported that they could observe increasing numbers of the larger fin whales. In 1978 a local decision was made that these could sustain harvest. They shot seven fin whales in 1978 and eleven in 1979. These takings were diligently monitored and discussed in the IWC, because in 1976 the Commission had marked the West Norway-Faroe Islands fin whale stock as protected with a zero-quota. At the IWC's annual conference in 1979, the issue was assumed to be solved, citing "a breakdown in communication of IWC regulations to fishermen, which has now been rectified."[187] No whaling occurred in 1980, presumably as they could not get quotas. In 1981, whaling resumed under a special permit for scientific whaling. The special permit,

182 Statistics provided to the author by the Secretariat of the IWC.
183 Olafsson (1990), 132.
184 Jacobsen (2007), 273.
185 Joensen (2009), 226.
186 Jacobsen (2009), 273.
187 Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 30. (1980), 29.

issued by the Faroese Home Rule Government, allowed the taking of nine fin whales per year indefinitely, as part of a scientific survey on the biology and stock size of fin whales.[188] A heated issue followed in the IWC.

Whaling for scientific purposes had been a part of the international whaling regime since its founding. Article VIII of the ICRW (International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling) states that each contracting government may issue special permits for scientific whaling, and that government is responsible for sharing takings and findings with the IWC. An issue arises, as Denmark is representative on behalf of the Faroe Islands in the IWC. As Denmark was the contracting government, the logic of the Whaling Commission was that they should issue the permit. However, the Home Rule Law of 1948 stated that hunting and fishing of marine life were special Faroese issues, which mandated Faroese management. Moreover, in 1976 the Faroes were granted a 200 nautical mile fishery zone as their Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). This meant that the Faroese authorities had full jurisdiction over all exploitation of living resources in the surrounding area.[189]

The scientific whaling in the Faroe Islands was conducted from 1981 to 1984. During these years, a total of thirteen fin whales were killed, processed, scientifically analyzed, and the meat was sold locally.[190] The scientific results were reported to the Scientific Committee of the IWC, which argued that the findings were insignificant, and the Committee could not endorse the permit. The Scientific Committee determined that the number of whales taken was too small to reveal any significant information about stock size or biology. This view was protested by the Faroese Fisheries Laboratory conducting the surveys, who determined that they needed at least 10 years in order to finish data collection.[191] In 1984, the IWC determined that nothing could be done about stopping the hunt, as the Faroese acted within the limits of IWC legislation and regulations.[192]

The drama brought much attention to the Faroe Islands in the IWC. Despite explicit opposition from the Danish government, the Faroese authorities renewed the permit until 1985. However, it appears that pressures from the IWC, Denmark and from various protesting NGOs loomed too large. In

188 Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 36 (1986)., 31.
189 Hoydal (1993): 6.; Decree no. 598 of December 21 1976 (The Fishing Territory of the Faroe Islands).
190 Statistics provided to the author by the Secretariat of the IWC.
191 Dagblaðið, 4. Sep 1985, 7.
192 Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 35 (1985), 12.

1985, ahead of the IWC annual conference, the Faroese government decided not to renew the scientific whaling license.[193] Moreover, in March 1984, a whaling law was implemented by the Home Rule Government, which stated that all Cetacea are protected species. According to the law, the government may grant exceptions to species. The whaling ban was a direct consequence from the pressure exacted by the Danish government and the IWC. According to a comment in the legal register, "The proposal was put forward to settle the dispute between the Home Rule Government and the Danish Government regarding who has the competency to regulate whaling by the Faroes."[194]

The Anti-Whaling Campaign in the Faroe Islands

Protests against pilot whaling have come in different waves since the 1980s. Often the protests have started due to international attention being raised abroad, thus drawing public awareness to the hunt. The most widespread protests occurred in 1985-86, 1992-93, 2000, and 2010-2015. In the following, I will focus on the first wave of protests, which occurred in 1985-86, and its aftermath. It began as an organized campaign in the wake of the IWC meeting in 1985, but the groundwork for a campaign had already been established at least a year prior.

The 37th annual conference of the IWC was held in Bournemouth, UK on 15-19 July in 1985. At the IWC meeting, worldwide attention was focused on the Faroe Islands. The British and Dutch delegations posed particularly strong criticism about the use of gaffs and spears in the pilot whale hunt, and the IWC agreed to establish a Humane Killing Working Group to evaluate the killing method. The Commission adopted a proposal, in which "the Commission urges the Danish Government to encourage the Faroese Government to make every effort to minimise the use of gaff, spear and the killing from boats, and to further reduce the number of authorised bays as to limit the hunt to those bays where the whales may be killed in a more humane manner.[195] The issue of Faroese pilot whaling was a hot topic in the UK during the month of July, and it helped to bring pilot whaling to the agenda of several environmental organizations that were present at the conference.

193 From the minute book of the Faroese Government (*Landsstýrisins gerðabók*), (J.nr. 1611-2-1).

194 Løgtingstíðindi, 1983-01-01, 495. Author's translation.

195 Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 37 (1987), 21.

The build-up to get pilot whaling addressed in the 37th IWC conference had been a long process, which culminated in a series of coverages that coincided with the conference. On the third day of the five-day-conference in Bournemouth, the London-based tabloid *Daily Express* published a double-page story titled "Blood on the beaches". With colorful photographs, the daily paper wrote an "exclusive on a horrifying mass slaughter" with the "full, horrific story and pictures" on the center pages. Detailing the barbarity, the author wrote about how the mass slaughter eviscerates entire families, including the pregnant and old, and how the young Faroese boys, too young to partake in the hunt, must practice with fetuses after the slaughter. The article ended with stating that the Faroese have a higher standard of living than both the Danes and Brits, and that most of the meat would go to waste. While the article was not discussed in the plenary, it is clear that the aim was to incite discussions and disgust about the hunt. In the Faroe Islands, the article was widely reported in opinion pieces and letters from the editor, and a complete translation was published in Faroese papers in September that year.[196] It incited deep anger among many Faroese people, especially due to the many examples of exaggeration and misinformation. The Faroese news media's role in reproducing these stories contributed significantly to the antagonistic sentiments that the Faroese had toward protesters.

Another coverage that coincided with the meeting in Bournemouth was a documentary about pilot whaling that was produced by the Danish national television, *Danmarks Radio* (DR), and filmed by Faroese television, *Sjónvarp Føroya* (SVF).[197] The documentary, which originally aired in Faroese and Danish television in January 1985, showed a rather poorly executed slaughter of 349 whales that occurred in Tórshavn capital on May 10, 1984. Viewers witnessed a seemingly chaotic atmosphere, where whales thrashed in the sea as men hacked them with spears and gaffs from the boats. People were horrified by the film, both domestically and internationally. In the Faroes, the film started an intense debate in the newspapers, where opinion pieces called for tighter regulations and purported fears about the inevitable reputational backlash that would come from the bad publicity.[198] The documentary proved

196 Norðlýsið 27.09.1985, 4

197 Sanderson (1990), 198.

198 Sosialurin, 29.1.85, 6. (The newspaper articles cited in this paper can be found in the compendium, "Grindatjakið í føroysku bløðunum summarið og heystið 1985", compiled by the Faroese National Library. The newspapers included are the following: 14. September, Dagblaðið, Dimmalætting, Fiskitíðindi, Fríu Føroyar, Havnarblaðið, Norðlýsi, Oyggjatíðindi, Sosialurin, Suðuroyartíðindi, Tingakrossur).

to many people that the hunt, especially as it occurred in the capital of Tórshavn, was cruel toward the animals, and if it were to continue, improvements to the killing method were imperative.[199] Following the original screening, the footage became available to environmental groups. In July, a fifteen-minute excerpt from the film was shown at the IWC conference. According to an article by *The Times*, "some delegates were reduced to tears when a Danish TV film showed hundreds of inexperienced hunters repeatedly stabbing and hacking at a herd of struggling whales. Yet so far, the Faroese themselves remain unmoved."[200]

While the media's exposure of the pilot whale hunt contributed to bringing light on the pilot whale hunt during the IWC meeting in 1985, the groundwork for the campaign that followed had been established beforehand. The first attention of the Save-the-Whales movement in the Faroe Islands came in 1981, when representatives from *Greenpeace UK* arrived to investigate and report about the scientific whaling, which had begun that year. The goal was to report infractions to the IWC. However, on their visit, *Greenpeace* witnessed three slaughters of pilot whales that occurred during the summer of 1981. Their final report focused mostly on the pilot whaling, and in the report, the author concluded that the pilot whale hunt "has become irresponsible and displays a total disregard for caution, the urgent need for scientific assessment or for changing moral values."[201] Following the spectacle witnessed in the Faroe Islands, the *Greenpeace UK* director, Allan Thornton, set up a new NGO called the *Environmental Investigation Agency* (EIA). In an interview in 1986, Thornton stated that a primary motivation for establishing the EIA was to confront the Faroese pilot whale slaughter.[202] Two of the founding members of EIA, Jennifer Gibson and Dave Currey, spent the summer of 1984 in the Faroes, and they wrote a lengthy critical report about the hunt, published in July 1985 in advance of the IWC meeting.

The EIA published three reports in total during the years 1985 to 1987. Their first report, published in July 1985, focused on portraying the hunt as a cruel and unnecessary indulgence inherently anachronistic in a modern, wealthy society. The comprehensive report analyzed every aspect of society from economic structures, costs and standards of living to politics and religion, along with detailed descriptions of the pilot whale hunt in history, practice and legislation. They concluded that "Pilot whaling is an integral part of Faroese

199 14. September, 30.01.85, 10; Dagblaðið, 30.1.85, 2.
200 Quoted in Joensen (2009), 239.
201 Glover (1981), quoted in Sanderson (1990): 198.
202 Sanderson (1990), 198.

social culture and legal structure. The Faroese believe that they still maintain an innate contact with nature and their environment even though they enjoy the benefits of an affluent society and the modern world. Pilot whaling is cruel by its very nature. There is no longer a need for the pilot whale meat as the people can afford to pay for their food."[203] According to the authors, "Pilot whaling is no longer an aboriginal hunt", as evidenced by the luxuries available and the technological advancement of society.[204] The incongruity of a traditional subsistence lifestyle in a modern technological society were prevalent views among others in the movement. Sean Whyte, director of the *Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society*, stated at a later point, "And if they want to kill whales in the traditional way, that's fine by us, *if* nothing else about their way of life, significantly anyway, has changed."[205] The EIA's first report on the pilot whaling was the first of its kind. It was rigorously researched, widely distributed to other environmental organizations, and it formed an organizational backbone in the subsequent campaigns, which began in the summer of 1985.

Direct Action Campaigning

The anti-whaling campaign in the Faroes began as a coordinated effort in the wake of the meeting in Bournemouth. As has been touched on in the previous chapter, the global Save-the-Whales movement focused on three spheres of influence. The first aim was to influence world opinion, primarily through mass media coverage. Images from the media would both produce a sympathetic view of whales and a grim view of the whalers. The second sphere of influence focused on the IWC. As has been previously stated, environmentalist dominance had become cemented during the 'recruitment drive' in the preceding years. By infiltrating national delegations, committees and in lobbying through general attendance, environmental NGOs had come to wield considerable influence in drafting proposals and setting the agenda in the IWC. The third sphere of influence was local pressure to reform. The pressure on the national level focused on a three-pronged approach. First, the organization's representatives were sent to negotiate with government authorities to persuade them to implement restrictions on the hunt. Secondly, these

203 Gibson and Currey (1985), 24.
204 Gibson and Currey (1985), 1.
205 Quoted in Sanderson (1992), 105.

groups would also be present to 'bear witness' on the hunt and report it abroad. If hunts did occur, they would attempt to disrupt it and drive the whales back out to sea. Thirdly, those groups that did not have resources to send teams directly, encouraged their members to pressure government reform through protest letters and boycotts on Faroese fish-exports.

Negotiations between environmental organizations and government officials occurred during the weeks directly after the IWC meeting. In July and August, the Faroese Prime Minister, Atli P. Dam, met with representatives from the EIA, *Sea Shepherd* and *Greenpeace* in separate meetings. All three groups entered the meetings with a series of demands. The EIA and *Greenpeace* reiterated the proposal from the Dutch delegation at IWC about reducing authorized whale bays, restricting the use of spears and gaffs, and a closer cooperation with the IWC to estimate the stocks and improve on the resource management. Moreover, the EIA and *Greenpeace* demanded the implementation of a quota system, in which no more than 880 whales could be killed per year. According to Thornton, they had calculated 880 whales to mean a weekly consumption of 200 grams of meat and blubber for every citizen.[206] Were these demands not met, they threatened, the Faroese could expect economic boycotts. Discussing the urgency to act, Tom Garret, *Greenpeace* representative and former IWC commissioner for the USA, warned the Prime Minister, "Our strategy is simple. We will stop whaling the same way we stopped the Vietnam War. Simply put, by letting the blood flow into people's living rooms through television. If the Faroese do not adhere to our demands, then our organization has enough power over the global media that by filling the blood into every television, the Faroese will soon feel the repercussions."[207] They also warned that if nothing was done, they could expect the presence of more fundamentalist organizations that were more reluctant to negotiate these terms.

A week after the EIA's meeting with the Prime Minister, they seized a chance to enact direct action against the hunt. On 27 July, a whale hunt took place in the village of Vestmanna, neighboring the village of Kvívík where the EIA had rented a cottage. This was the first incident of clashes between the activists and the locals. When the EIA attempted to reach Vestmanna, they found that the local villagers had blocked the road, preventing their exit out of the village. EIA quickly dispatched their dinghy into the bay in Kvívík, hoping to reach the kill site by sea. However, a villager with a crane

206 Dagblaðið, 24.7.85, 11.
207 Dagblaðið, 21.8.85, 8. Author's translation.

blocked their passage out of the harbor. When they were able to maneuver out of the harbor and reach the herd of whales, they tried to drive them out to sea again, prompting intervention from the whaling foreman, who hauled their boat to the shore where they were apprehended by the police. Meanwhile, on the beach, an EIA photographer was attacked by locals. They took his camera, which was later returned by the police without the film.[208] Local news reports applauded the effort of the police and vilified the protesters for breaking the pilot whaling law. In an interview, police officer Marius Jóanesarson countered the narrative that protesters were attacked by locals. He confirmed that villagers had blocked the road, but said, "nobody attacked any protesters. Some of the whalers took a camera from them, but they got that back the next day."[209] The protester's actions disrupted the society's law and order, and they would find no sympathy among the locals.

Another clash occurred two weeks later, when *Sea Shepherd* arrived in the Faroe Islands with their ship, the Sea Shepherd. News reports do not discuss the meeting they had with the government, except stating that their leader, Paul Watson, had requested a written confirmation that the government would follow all requirements given by the IWC.[210] However, after the meeting, as the Sea Shepherd's vessel was lying outside the Tórshavn harbor, a group of local youths vandalized the ship. The boys rowed out to the Sea Shepherd and threw rotten eggs at the ship. The attack allegedly ended, when a crewmember threatened the boys with a rifle.[211] Let these examples suffice to say that the tensions between the Faroese and the anti-whaling activists were very high when the campaigns climaxed in the summer of 1985. Local news reports had riled the people up in anger by reproducing inflammatory writings from abroad.

The third strategy of protesting took aim against the bureaucratic structures of government. Hoping to pressure for new legislation, anti-whaling organizations urged their disgruntled members to write letters to the Faroese government expressing their dissatisfaction. Newsletters from the organizations' founders detailed the atrocities committed against the 'gentle giants', urging members to support through monetary donations or by writing letters to the prime minister. Often the newsletters were accompanied with a pre-written post card, which only needed to be stamped and sent. From

208 Gibson and Thornton (1986), 6-7.
209 Dagblaðið 2.8.85, 15. Author's translation.
210 Sosialurin 22.8.85, 1
211 Oyggjatíðindi, 21.8.85, 16.

1985 until 1997, the government of the Faroe Islands received more than 140,000 protest letters and 'cold-mail' post cards. Some of these letters were as gruesome as the acts they condemned. Sanderson, for instance, quotes a letter from England: "I have just seen on television your murderous killing of the whales. I and all my workmates agree that your [sic] just shit. I am a grown man and I cried to see your inhuman acts. I would love to hear you scream the way the whales did. I hope you and your family die by drowning and when you meet god [sic] he sends you back as a pilot whale so you can feel the pain the whale does and die in agony. If the atomic bomb is dropped, I hope it is on the Faroe Islands, the rest of the civilized world won't miss you. The worst of health may you all die soon, (signed) A normally quiet nonviolent Englishman."[212] While an extreme example, other letters expressed the same sentiment. Whaling was seen by many as an act against humanity.

In the present chapter, I have sought to explain the symbolic and pragmatic values of pilot whaling. This was followed by an analysis of the Save-the-Whales movement in the Faroe Islands. As I have shown, during the era of national romanticism, pilot whaling was imbued with a symbolic dimension, whereby it was constructed as a key feature of identity. This narrative has persisted as it has been reproduced by countless travelers and local practitioners of letters searching to define Faroese cultural identity. When the Save-the-Whales movement began, it was targeted toward specific elements of the hunt that were perceived to cause the most stress and suffering on the whales. However, partly due to the confrontational tactics and partly due to the complexities of identity politics, the protests incited a defensive response in local people and the government, which aimed to restrict unwanted access and shut down dialogue. In the next chapter, I will turn my attention to the discourse, where particular attention will be on deconstructing the patterns of argument made by pro- and anti-whalers in order to provide a glimpse into how their different ontological conceptualizations illuminate diverging perceptions of their respective realities.

212 Sanderson (1992), 104.

Chapter 3

Patterns of Argument

The patterns of argument expressed both by the Faroese and the protesters provide an insightful perspective into their respective conceptions of the human-nature relationship. In the following, I will juxtapose the different arguments to their counterparts, which will discern some of the different ontological conceptualizations of the parties. Sanderson has argued that the many anomalies associated with the pilot whale hunt are source to ambiguity – to different interpretations – around which meaning is constructed to concur with the recipient's ontological setting. The difference in interpretation between Faroese and environmentalist reasoning around the nature of the pilot whale hunt and its place in contemporary society can be ascribed to this anomalous nature.[213]

The patterns of argument among the pro- and anti-whaling factions differed remarkably in their medium. While the EIA had a more nuanced approach and pattern of criticism, the letters that the government received turned toward the extreme. In the campaign materials, letters, and newspaper articles, the environmentalist point of view was overwhelmingly focused on rhetoric such as 'cruelty', 'barbarity', 'sport' and 'tradition'. Meanwhile, the Faroese patterns of argument leaned more toward a closer human-nature relationship, and a criticism of their critics as alienated metropolitans.

A central argument in the anti-whaling coalition against pilot whaling was against the perceived element of sport. A 1985 signature petition from the *World Animal Welfare Group* read, "The inhabitants of these islands are among the wealthiest in Europe and with this wealth they have no reason to kill these poor whales. We believe that the people of these islands carry out this massacre because they enjoy it, and is one of their bloodsports."[214] In similar vein, the EIA wrote in their second report about the hunt, as part of their section 'from subsistence to sport', "The sporting element inherent in the pilot whale hunt has increased dramatically in the past few decades. As the

213 Sanderson (1994), 196-199.

214 Pilot whale Slaughter petition from WAWG.

living standards of the Faroes increased, the need for the whale meat declined and the tradition of the hunt became more of a sporting event to many of the men taking part."[215] If we follow Sanderson's reasoning, it seems this line of criticism was constructed to concur with the ontological setting of the environmentalist. The general wealth of society took away the survivalist need of the whale meat, and as such, it must be for recreational purposes. The *International Wildlife Coalition*, in one of their newsletters urging members to write protest letters, wrote, "Now it is a sport, and if you too feel that the fun and games must be stopped, I hope you'll support this emergency campaign."[216]

The sporting element was not new to descriptions of the pilot whale hunt. One of the first narratives about pilot whaling written by a Faroese and targeted toward a foreign audience was a tourist-book by Jørgen-Frantz Jacobsen. In *Færøerne – Natur og Folk*, published in 1936, Jacobsen described pilot whaling as "an ancient national sport, an awesome electrifying folk amusement. But it cannot be denied that it takes place in a way that can often seem barbaric. If this catch at the same time had not been an occupation of importance to the poor population, it would have been justified to classify it with the bullfights of the southern countries."[217] Jacobsen continued, "It is curious that the Faroese, who are ignorant of murder, love to kill pilot whales. They find the drama irresistible. It must be a kind of atavism. The Viking spirit comes suddenly alive once again."[218] Despite his dramatic depictions of barbarity and sport, Jacobsen could not be said to have been a critic of pilot whaling. Rather, his description was aimed to draw out the exoticism in this otherwise peaceful people. The account was written at a time when the national romantic discourse was still hegemonic. However, in the 1980s, a new discourse of environmentalism and ecological romanticism had become hegemonic. In this new environment, some aspects of the hunt, such as 'sport', had become indefensible. The Faroese were not ignorant or isolated from this discourse. Rather, they adapted to it, as did their patterns of argumentation. Therefore, when the German *Hamburger Abendblatt* published an article titled "Sie töten Wale und nennen es Sport", a Faroese journalist was quick to inject that "the less Germans have written about the pilot whale hunt, the more they have misunderstood this part of our way of life."[219] It is important to underline,

215 Gibson (1986), 11.
216 International Wildlife Coalition newsletter (1985).
217 Jacobsen (1936), 70. Author's translation.
218 Jacobsen (1936), 73. Translated by Nauerby in: Nauerby (1996), 151.
219 14. September, 27.7.85, 8. Author's translation.

however, that it was not the 'sport' in and of itself that was criticized, but the connotations of recreation that accompanied it.

The sporting argument followed the line of reasoning about the islands' relative wealth, and therefore, how it was an unnecessary source of food. In their first report from 1985, the EIA included a long list of grocery store products and concluded that they were not considerably more expensive than in the neighboring countries.[220] The dichotomy of a strong subsistence economy and a regulated market economy was evidently an anomaly that many people did not grasp. For instance, in an *I KARE* newsletter, it is stated, "It is a cruel irony indeed that although more whales are now killed, the prosperous Faroese do no longer need the meat. In fact, it is given away for free on the beach."[221] In similar vein, Jennifer Gibson wrote in her concluding remarks in the EIA's first report, "The government and the people say that there is a need for 'free food'. But elsewhere in the world where there is great poverty, people do not receive free food."[222] Clearly, free food distribution was something that occured in places with extreme poverty, not in a modern European society. Pilot whaling was considered an unnecessary source of food, as "the shops are full of locally caught fish, imported meat and fresh vegetables."[223] The affluence of society made subsistence whaling an anachronistic feature in modern times.

In the olden days it was customary to refer to the pilot whale as a gift from God (*várharrasa grind*). Joensen states, "According to the traditional Faroese way of thinking, it would be regarded not only as laziness, but also as a sin not to make every effort to accept the gift."[224] While the spiritual associations have dwindled in the later years, a comment by Prime Minister Atli P. Dam shows that it was not uncommon in 1985: "It [pilot whaling] used to be called 'the *Grind* from the Lord', and I believe 95% of Faroese still consider it the Lord's pilot whale that we should be grateful for, rather than a bloodthirsty 'desire' that one wishes to partake in."[225] This arrogance, as being provided for by the Lord himself, was also a source of tension from activists, as revealed in several campaign publications and protest letters. Joensen quotes the following letter: "Who are they to think the whales are a gift to them from God. God would

220 Gibson and Currey (1985), 6-7.
221 I KARE Newsletter (1985).
222 Gibson and Currey (1985), 28.
223 IFAW Letter to Friends (1985).
224 Joensen (2009), 76.
225 Sosialurin 25.7.85, 3. Author's translation.

not wish this on his most insignificant creatures."[226] Kalland has shown that a spiritual association with whales is common in many whaling societies from Japan to Greenlandic Inuits. In Western whaling societies, such as Norway and the Faroe Islands, the belief is rooted in a Judeo-Christian belief of dominance, where mastery over nature is provided as a gift from God for the benefit of humanity. Kalland argues, "Today marine mammals are seen as natural resources, and many whalers subscribe to the Judaeo-Christian notion that they were created for people to utilize... The animals are seen as beings that can suffer, and for this reason they should be killed as quickly and painlessly as possible."[227] However, while the environmentalist discourse locates this hierarchical relationship at the root of most environmental problems, it ignores the fact that the 'gift' also entails a duty of responsible stewardship.[228] The stewardship can take many forms across cultures. In the Faroes this has primarily included culturally embedded conservation strategies that ensure both that whales are only taken as they are needed, regulated by institutional structures that shut down whaling bays when there is a surplus, and ensure that less meat goes to waste through an extensive system of allotment and distribution.

Implicit in the Faroese ontological setting, which dictated their line of argumentation, was the place of humans in the natural order. Some Faroese argued for their place in the natural life-cycle of the whales, as a Faroese commentator wrote in the Danish newspaper *Information*, "The majority of the North Atlantic pilot whale stock does not die as a result of human hunting, but as a result of age and disease, while others are killed by the killer whales, who with their sharp teeth tear out pieces of the still-living animal."[229] It was evidently seen by some as a more merciful death to encounter the Faroese than any other predator in the sea. This was also a central tenet in the ontological setting of the Faroese, who saw their place as wholly dependent on the sea for survival, that they therefore should be allowed to sustainably harvest from it. This human-nature relationship was a fundamental aspect that separated the anti-whaler from the Faroese pro-whaler, as Russel Fielding has noted, "The main difference, the only real difference, between those who hate whaling and those who love it is that the latter see themselves as part of the cycle of

226 Quoted in Joensen (2009), 239.
227 Kalland (2012), 151-152.
228 Kalland (2012), 146.
229 Sosialurin, 15.8.85, 15. Author's translation.

natural predation, while the former exclude themselves, along with all other humans, from this role."[230]

Continuing with this line of argument, the criticism against pilot whaling was seen as hypocritical, as the Faroese saw no fundamental difference between marine mammals, such as pilot whales, and terrestrial mammals that are common to eat. In an article called 'Grindadráp – food or animal cruelty', the author wrote, "It was certainly not the bad Faroese conscience, which called for such a broadcast [DR's documentary about pilot whaling]. Rather, it was pressure from outside, which accuses us of killing highly intelligent animals. Pressure from the Western metropolitan man who, in the gleam of the neon lights, picks up a finely wrapped cellophane package from the refrigerated counter. Pressure from people whose lifestyle prevents them from seeing the relationship between the cellophane package and the living animal it originated from. The question is what is more morally reprehensible, to eat pilot whale, which has lived its entire life in the ocean and who had plenty of opportunities not to end up in a Faroese stew, or to keep pigs and cattle locked up their entire lives and who only have one purpose in their lives: to become food for humans."[231] This argument was repeatedly brought up. Eating local wildlife was perceived as a morally preferable than relying on industrially farmed and imported animals, which had no more existence than the steak they eventually would become. Árni Olafsson, the advisor on Faroese affairs at the Danish Foreign Ministry, argued that "only vegetarians could rightly criticize the pilot whale hunt."[232] In an official reply to the *EIA's* first report, Olafsson stated, "If the pilot whaling is stopped the Faroese population will have to find alternative food, partly by increasing their already very high fish consumption and partly by importing meat. The authors make no effort whatsoever to prove the probability that the imported meat would represent less accumulated man-induced animal suffering than the pilot whale meat does."[233]

Another ethical consideration in this regard was the increasingly prevalent issue of pollution. In 1977 Faroese scientists began the first research into pilot whale meat, blubber, liver and kidneys. They found that the pilot whales had significant amounts of mercury, PCB, DDT, and other persistent organic pollutants (POPs), due to their high position in the food chain. As a result of

230 Fielding (2018), 284.
231 14. September 30.1.85, 10. Author's translation.
232 14. September, 20.7.85, 20. Author's translation.
233 Olafsson (1985), 5.

these examinations, the Faroese Department of Hygiene published a public advisory in the early 1980s, which warned against the consumption of kidney and liver, and advised that people eat no more than one meal of meat and blubber per week.[234] Such arguments were appropriated by the activists as proof of either the wastefulness of whaling or that the Faroese would not listen to scientific reasoning. In the EIA's report, they stated "a year's supply [of meat and blubber] should in fact take 121 weeks to consume if the Hygiene Department's recommendations are heeded."[235] In a later press release, Gibson stated, "The Faroese government is ignoring the terrifying health warnings of its own Chief Medical Officer. Allowing around 85 tonnes of toxic meat and blubber to be consumed by the islanders is astoundingly irresponsible."[236]

The inclusion of pollution into the discourse had a paradoxical effect on Faroese society. On the one hand, it strengthened the us vs. them mentality that had developed as the antagonistic tensions increased. In the pattern of argumentation, it shifted the focus away from the pilot whale hunt and on to the larger issue of all life being threatened by the human-induced pollution of the environment. The Faroese saw their treatment in the international community as unfair, because the threat to the whales' existence was not over-hunting, but the degradation of their habitat, caused by industrial pollution. And this pollution did not originate with the Faroese, but it came mostly from the industrial Western countries that hosted the protesting organizations. Árni Olafsson said in an interview, "It is not the Faroese who exterminate the pilot whales, but those who poison the sea... In the end, it will probably end with the pilot whale dying along with us who live off the meat and blubber."[237] Olafsson expressed here a linked destiny between pilot whales and the Faroese. The expression also supported the type of argument he was making, which had a sort of unifying effect as it embraced a tribalistic attitude of the Faroese existence being threatened by the rest. On the other hand, this tribalistic attitude also created discord in some parts of society. Any mention of 'limited consumption' entailed connotations resembling the activist rhetoric. Therefore, when the Department of Hygiene published their advisory to limit whale consumption to once per week, a disgruntled citizen chose to react. In an article praising the high nutritional value in pilot whales, Sigrið Dalsgaard, former chairman of the consumers' association, concluded, "I find it strange

234 Dagblaðið 20.9.85, 13.
235 Gibson and Currey (1985), 23.
236 Quoted in Fielding (2018), 267.
237 14. September, 18.9.85, 3-4. Author's translation.

that the Department of Hygiene should want to help the environmentalists in their subversive activities with such statements."[238]

The special and mystical status of whales that had become popularized in the preceding decade, as explained in the first chapter, was not seriously contemplated by most Faroese. While arguments about special rights for whales were generally absent from the more balanced rhetoric of the *EIA,* the influence of John C. Lilly and especially Joan McIntyre did appear sporadically. In an article on the brain structure and behavior of pilot whales in the *EIA*'s Second Report, Professor G. Pilleri argued for a method to calculate the centralization of whale and dolphin brains, which concluded that that the pilot whales' brain was considerably more centralized than any primate species, including homo sapiens. While one could only speculate what a higher degree of centralization could mean for an animal's existence, the article finished with the lines: "Man has his use of hands in his terrestrial environment to thank for his current level of culture. With the brain alone, without hands and tools, humans would never have reached such a level."[239] These lines were clearly inspired from McIntyre's "Mind Play", where she wrote, "what is in the mind world of a creature with a brain bigger and possibly more complex than ours, who cannot act out its will to change the world, if only for the simple reason that it hasn't any hands?"[240] McIntyre, in turn, had borrowed the same hand-analogy from Lilly's *Man and Dolphin*.[241]

Lilly's influence also echoed in expressions from the *Sea Shepherd* founder, Paul Watson. In 1986, when *Sea Shepherd* filmed the documentary *Black Harvest* in the Faroe Islands, Watson stated, "I'm very concerned about the fact that whales may not be able to survive until the next century or beyond. Whales are fascinating creatures, very intelligent. And the one species that we have a real possibility to establish communications with. And just as we're on the threshold of some very exciting discoveries into the possibilities of inter-species communication, the darker side of humanity is intent upon destroying them and robbing future generations of exploring that possibility completely."[242] Watson evokes here elements of the metaphysical whale that Arne Kalland has termed the *superwhale* – the conceptual being that embodies the accumulated and favorable attributes in all whale-species. The romantic

238 Sosialurin, 1.8.85, 3. Author's translation.
239 Gibson and Thornton (1986), 8-10.
240 McIntyre (1974), 94.
241 See: Burnett (2012), 613n164.
242 Goodman (1988).

philosophy of Joan McIntyre and the eccentric science of John C. Lilly were still used as arguments for speciesism. Whether pilot whales *actually* were endangered or not was another matter, but in the rhetoric they certainly were. These words were not unique to Watson, as a newsletter from IFAW shows, "The whales are not citizens of the Faroes. They are free beings living in what should be a caring world. They are not there to be hacked down like ears of corn... they are not there for a few islanders' sport. These animals have a right to live... and civilized people have a duty to protect them from sadists."[243] McIntyre's anthropomorphizing words about the innocence and free-spirited nature of whales who need child-like nurture echoed in several letters such as this.

This chapter has juxtaposed the patterns of arguments in the opposing parties and explored what this can reveal about their ontological differences. During the 1980s, a new episteme arrived in the Faroes – the episteme of an ecologically romantic view on nature. The Faroese had to adapt to the shifting paradigm, as the framework of national romanticism, within which they had hitherto conceptualized the role of pilot whaling in society, was crumbling. A way they reappropriated the hegemonic global discourse of environmentalism was to use it to discredit their critics for coming from industrial countries that have a greater impact on the environment than the Faroese. However, while they could utilize the same language of science and pollution, a key difference was their philosophical approach to the world. The previous quote from Fielding encapsulates this key ontological difference.[244] When he argues that the difference between those who love whaling and those who hate it is centered on the role of humans in the natural pattern of predation, he encapsulates the fundamental ontological difference on *how* people *should* interact with their environment. The activists, who mostly followed deep ecological teachings, valued the interconnectedness of all life, and perceived human interaction with their environment in pacifist and spiritual terms of avoidance. The Faroese had a more utilitarian worldview, where nature was God's gift to humans to benefit from. However, with such a gift came the responsibility of stewardship. While the religious dimension was typically more common among older generations, the principles of utilitarianism and stewardship remained widespread and formed a basis for many policies and institutions that were established in the wake of the mid-1980s protests.

It was not the inherently fundamental differences in philosophy that separated the parties and broke down dialogue. Rather, it was slandering rhetoric and confrontational methods from both sides that contributed to the split in communications before any type of relationship could form. Misinformation from international media was widely re-published in Faroese media, which fueled anger and antagonism. Hunters became distrustful of foreigners, especially those with a camera. The attacks against the *EIA* photographer in July and the vandalism on the *Sea Shepherd's* vessel can be seen as symptoms of the attitudes that were held toward activists in general. These events were jokingly referred to and brushed aside in the Faroese media. The government's response showed signs of simply shutting down dialogue, since, in the words of Prime Minister Atli P. Dam, "they are radical fanatics, and it is extremely dreadful to discuss with such people. They use all kinds of methods to advance their narrow views, so there is nothing else for us to do than to fight."[245] The confrontational method made the Faroese government shut down any chance of constructive dialogue with the environmentalists, and in a futile attempt to save face, prevented any progress or hope of mutual understanding. Árni Olafsson concluded his comments on the first report from the *EIA* by saying, "They have chosen to present an inaccurate and biased report which is bound to be met with displeasure by the Faroese authorities. They seem to seek confrontation instead of cooperation, an attitude which may prove highly counterproductive, as it may force the authorities to postpone contemplated reforms in order to avoid the impression of giving in to threats from abroad."[246] Thus, the attempts to establish dialogue in the early stages of the anti-whaling campaign can at best be called disingenuous.

243 IFAW Letter to Friends (1985).
244 See note 230 or Fielding (2018), 284.
245 Sosialurin, 20.7.85, 10. Author's translation.
246 Olafsson (1985), 7.

Chapter 4

Local Measures

In the previous chapter, we analyzed the pro- and anti-whaling arguments and how the discourse reflected the shifting paradigm. While the protests did not end in the 1980s, it is useful to investigate some of the legacies of the anti-whaling actions. In the current chapter, we will examine the main changes to policies and practices that occurred in the immediate aftermath of the protests.

A part of the initial response to the anti-whaling campaign was to limit the international exposure. This was done primarily in two ways. Firstly, bookstores stopped selling post cards depicting the whale slaughter. At least since the 1950s, when tourism became an increasingly important sector, the Faroese proudly displayed the pilot whale hunt on post cards that were offered to tourists. However, by 1986 these same post cards could scarcely be seen, as they were perceived only to contribute to the international drama. Secondly, since the advent of a national radio channel in 1957, it had been customary to announce an active pilot whale hunt. This had been important in bringing the word around, as it would otherwise be done by telephone or other more traditional means. The practice of radio announcement ceased in 1985, as it was seen to contribute to bringing it to the attention of meddling environmentalists.

Changes in tourism merchandise and radio broadcasts were immediate and noticeable. However, more subtle changes to policies and practices can be observed in the reforms that were initiated on several layers of society that had a lasting impact on Faroese attitudes toward anti-whaling activism. These changes can be observed in national legislation, scientific production of knowledge, a governmental information campaign, and in a reconfiguration of the interaction with the international community.

Legislative Reforms

Several legislative changes occurred in the mid-1980s, which improved the practice surrounding the killing and organization of the whale hunt. At first glance, it would appear as the improvements occurred due to the international

critique. However, while the changes certainly met some of the demands set in 1985, I would argue that it did not occur *because* of it. Rather the protest campaigns accelerated a process that was already underway in Faroese society.

From the public debate that was initiated at the onset of the first international outcry against the hunt, it was generally agreed that improvements to the practical aspects of the hunt were called for. In the mid-1980s, several new legislations were passed in parliament, which took the pilot whale hunt into account. In 1984 a general whaling ban was placed in effect, although it stated that certain exceptions could be made by the government. The pilot whale hunt was one such exception. In 1985 an animal welfare law was passed, which, among other things, specifically stipulated that pilot whales had to be killed as painlessly as possible. Finally in 1986, the pilot whaling regulations received a comprehensive reform by executive order, where the harpoon and spear were partially banned, and it was stated that every effort should be made to make the whales beach themselves, thus impending a death from shore-based killers.

The first mention I could find about the pilot whaling reform was from parliamentary case no. 104/1982. The case, which called for a new pilot whaling law, was approved for parliamentary discussions on May 9, 1983. The law was passed unanimously.[247] In the proposal's report, urgency was placed on formulating a modern animal welfare law. The need for a new pilot whaling law was specifically cited in order to "avoid the animal cruelty that often occurs in a pilot whale slaughter."[248] In January 1984, discussions began to draft the animal welfare law, which passed in September 1984 and came into effect in March 1985. Thus, it is evident from the timeline that legislative reform to the pilot whale hunt and animal welfare in general was not a direct cause of the protests that began in 1985.

However, a more causal link can be observed with regards to the commercial whaling ban, which was initiated in 1984. As was stated earlier, the Faroese government came under intense pressure from the Danish government and the IWC due to its breach of the zero-catch quota on fin whales. The scientific whaling was called illegal by the Danish Prime Minister, Poul Schlüter.[249] It was only after all the pressure from international institutions and the Danish

247 "Supplement to Parliamentary Proposal nr. 104". Landsstýrið 16/2-8-3.

248 Ove Mikkelsen (1983), "Uppskot til samtyktar (Proposal for Parliamentary Resolution)" Álit í løgtingsmál nr. 104/1982.

249 Margrete Auken to Poul Schlüter, Spørgsmål til statsministeren; 14/3/84, *Folketingstidende 1983/1984 (2. Samling),* 1912-1914.

government that the Faroese began to discuss a whaling ban. Even then, they kept the option open to resume hunting. While the new law stipulated that all whale species were protected, it included an exception clause that certain species' status could be changed.

At the IWC meeting in July 1985, it was agreed that the Faroese pilot whale hunt would be evaluated by the *Humane Killing Working Group* subcommittee. In this regard, a transnational team of veterinarians were asked to evaluate the killing method of the pilot whale slaughter and to estimate possibilities on how to make it more humane. The Pilot Whaling Executive Order no. 50 from 1986 prescribed that attempts should be made as far as possible to ensure that the whales are beached. Only in cases where the whales could not be beached, was it allowed to kill them from the boats using spears and gaffs. While this progress was condemned by activists and the IWC as not enough, it was largely agreed by the Faroese that it was the best method available. The transnational team of veterinarians, which was headed by the Faroese Chief Veterinary Officer, Jústines Olsen, made several attempts to find alternative killing methods, including gas and electric stunning techniques and shooting. However, after a consideration of the circumstances, where in most cases many people in close proximity would be involved, it was generally agreed that the traditional method of a deep knife cut to the carotid arteries and spine was the most practical method.[250]

Improvements seem to have occurred from the grassroots level, however. It was generally agreed that for legislative reform to be successful, it had to be accepted and practiced by the people. A documentary from the Faroese broadcasting station SVF from late 1985, months before the 1986 pilot whaling regulations were passed, showed that the hunters had taken steps to minimize the killings from boats. It was reported that the vast majority of killings occurred after the whales had been beached.[251] Inventions from local people have contributed to making the killing more humane. In the early 1990s, a local blacksmith invented the blunt hook, which gradually came to replace the gaff. Whereas the gaff would be penetrated through the blubber, the blunt hook would be placed inside the blowhole, and thus the whale could be dragged ashore without sustaining external damage. The gaff was outlawed in 2015, but photographic evidence shows that before this time, the blunt hook had gained considerable favor.

250 "Summary of discussions with Mr. J. Olsen, Veterinarian at the Faroe Islands", by A.W. Van Foreest, veterinarian, Doorwerth, Netherlands. (1611-4-3/80).

251 Winthereig (1985).

Scientific Reform

Because of the increased attention to the pilot whale hunt, the urgent need for improved scientific knowledge was internationally recognized. A central issue that had sustained considerable criticism was the lack of scientific data to indicate the stock size of pilot whales. In 1986, although lacking scientific data, Kjartan Hoydal, Faroese Director of Fisheries, submitted an article to the IWC's Scientific Committee at its 38th meeting. Using the catch records dating back to 1709, Hoydal attempted to calculate an estimate of the stock. His conclusion was that no evidence suggested a decrease in stock levels due to human involvement, and a long-term sustainability could be observed. Rather, Hoydal suggested, environmental changes, which affected the migratory patterns of the whales' source of food, mainly squid, were a more likely cause for the availability in different years.[252] While it lacked the sophistication of a modern scientific survey, this was the first estimate of the stock size of pilot whales in the North Atlantic. At the IWC's meeting in 1986, Hoydal presented a proposal for a more comprehensive scientific survey about the pilot whale stocks. It was applauded by the IWC and UNEP, although they did not provide financial support. Funding came primarily from the Faroese government.[253]

The project, which lasted from 1986 to 1988, was directed by Dorete Bloch of the Faroese Natural History Museum, and who was assisted by a transnational team of scientists from Europe. The scientists examined all aspects of the biology surrounding the pilot whales in the North Atlantic, including age and reproductive biology, feeding, pollution, and social organization. At the same time as the surveys took place on the Faroe Islands, a large-scale sighting survey was conducted as a coordinated effort by national agencies in Denmark, Faroe Islands, Iceland, Norway, and Spain. These surveys, which have been called the NASS surveys (*North Atlantic Sighting Surveys*), took place in 1987 and 1989. The studies conducted between 1986 and 1989 remain the largest study of any species of small cetaceans.[254] All the results from the research surveys were published in the comprehensive special issues series by the IWC in 1993, titled "Biology of Northern Hemisphere Pilot Whales". The sighting surveys estimated that the total population of pilot whales amounted to 778,000 in the North Atlantic and 100,000 in the Faroe Islands-Iceland area.[255] In the introduction

252 Hoydal (1986).
253 E-mail correspondence with Bjarni Mikkelsen.
254 Bloch (2012), 4.
255 Buckland et.al. (1993), 33.

to the series, the Scientific Committee commented that "there is no detectable evidence that the stock size of pilot whales appearing in the Faroese area has been affected by the drive fishery."[256] The special issues series contributed to remove the topic of Faroese pilot whaling from the IWC's annual conference's agenda after nearly a decade on it. In 1995, at the 46th annual conference, several countries, including the UK and the Netherlands, commended the Faroes for the positive developments that have been done since 1985.[257]

Information Campaign

Part of the government's response was to shut down dialogue with the activists. They were perceived as fanatics, who could not be reasoned with and whose views would not be influenced by Faroese arguments or facts. On the other side, the influence of these organizations over global public opinion was acknowledged and feared. It was generally the NGOs power to influence the media, which in turn influenced public opinion, that was recognized by the Faroese as a source of anxiety. It was also believed that the international reporting on the pilot whaling issue was heavily biased and misinformed. The misinformation was recognized as a source of the contempt that was expressed in protest letters and elsewhere. The global public, which produced these letters, received their information directly from NGOs or from media outlets that reproduced the NGOs' anti-whaling narrative. Therefore, early on the Faroese government agreed that their most useful countermeasure would be an informational campaign targeted toward the same public that the environmental NGOs targeted.

The informational campaign slowly began in 1986, when Kate Sanderson was asked to reply to all incoming protest mail. All letters received a standard reply, which expressed the Faroese official point of view to pilot whaling.[258] Meanwhile, they worked on producing more comprehensive material that could be sent abroad. In 1991, at the IWC meeting in Reykjavík, Iceland, the booklet "Whales and Whaling in the Faroe Islands" was handed out to all participants. The booklet was subsequently sent to all the Danish embassies that received the most protest mail, and it was also sent as part of the government's standard reply to letters. The booklet, which was 28 pages long, was a

256 Donovan et.al. (1993), vii.
257 Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 46 (1996), 16.
258 Kate Sanderson, interview with author (14.05.2020).

detailed description of the pilot whale hunt from start to finish, the scientific research that had been conducted, and special attention was also put into framing the Faroese society as a place between tradition and modernity. It stated, "It is impossible for the Faroese to be self-sufficient in food production, and most staple food products have to be imported to meet the needs of the population. This makes the cost of living very high. This is also why traditional forms of farming, fishing, fowling, and hunting continue to be a way of life in the Faroes, together with most features of modern technology found in other Western societies."[259] The inclusion of children in the butchering of the animals, which had been highly criticized by activists, was explained "to be a natural part of their education and understanding of the source of their food.".[260]

International Re-Organization

The unbalanced reporting and perceived environmentalist dominance on the global theater also led to organizational reform on the international level. Two important developments can be observed in the Faroe Islands in this regard. The first was the establishment of a pro-whaling NGO, *Grindamannafelagið*, and the other was the formation of an intergovernmental management regime, *NAMMCO*, to contrast the IWC.

As previously stated, the Faroese government was reluctant to discuss with environmental NGOs regarding the management and future of pilot whaling. According to Hans Jákup Hermansen, he was approached by Kate Sanderson in 1992 who conferred about the need for a pro-whaling NGO, which could discuss the Faroese position on pilot whaling with environmental NGOs and international news outlets.[261] From the government's perspective, they could not negotiate with environmental NGOs, because that would legitimize their presence and behavior. Instead, Sanderson saw the *Grindamannafelagið,* or Pilot Whaling Association (PWA), as an organ that could engage directly with the protesting organizations and provide factual information to news outlets abroad. PWA was formally established in 1993 and was closely connected with the Norwegian NGO *High North Alliance* (HNA), which was founded on a similar premise. The HNA lobbies for relaxation of the IWC moratorium and promotes research into humane killing methods. PWA sends one member to the steering committee of the HNA. PWA was founded on four principal questions, which govern the taking of any species of wildlife. These principles are: 1) The species or stock must not be endangered. 2) The hunt must be for food and not for sport. 3) It must be legal according to national and international law. And 4) The killing method must be dignified, meaning that it does not cause unnecessary suffering. PWA believes that all these conditions are sufficiently met in the Faroese pilot whale drive.[262]

The IWC's turn toward politics based on emotion rather than scientific principle had been a common criticism of the whaling nations since the resolution for a moratorium in 1982. The moratorium was originally intended to last ten years, which would take effect after a three-year phasing-out period, in order to allow for a comprehensive assessment of whale stocks.[263] As explained in the first chapter, the Scientific Committee was tasked to develop a new management procedure during this period. In 1993, the Scientific Committee presented their Revised Management Procedure (RMP) to the Commission, which recommended that whaling for certain species could be resumed on a limited scale. After it was rejected by the Commission, Iceland resigned in protest and Norway and Japan threatened to do the same. Norway resumed commercial whaling in 1993 in formal objection of the moratorium. Despite unanimous support from the Scientific Committee, the Commission declined to implement the RMP. According to Hardy (2006), "It was clear that the IWC favored political pressure to protect whales rather than the scientific evidence supporting the sustainable harvest of whales."[264] In 1993, the chairman of the SC resigned in protest, citing the politicization of IWC and its divergence from management based on scientific principle as the reason.[265]

Three years earlier, in 1990, a panel discussion was held at Aarhus University. The panel consisted of IWC affiliated persons from Canada, UK, Greenland, the Faroe Islands, Denmark and Sweden, where they discussed various issues around whaling and the competency of the IWC to adequately address these issues. A Greenlandic panelist, Pavia Nielsen, noted the emotional politics that had come to dominate the IWC: "in the IWC the key issue is placed on the agenda and decided on due to strictly political considerations and not from

259 Sanderson (1991), 5.
260 Sanderson (1991), 19.
261 Hans J. Hermansen, interview with author (17.09.2020).
262 Hans J. Hermansen, interview with author (17.09.2020).
263 Epstein (2008), 132, 162.
264 Hardy (2006), 177.
265 Epstein (2008), 135.

the point of view of efficient whale management."[266] The global approach of the IWC was seen to have been too affected by the membership of "too many states with no direct interests in and understanding of the *interdependence* of man and whale [which] have let the animal welfare organisations getting too much influence in the IWC."[267] Kjartan Hoydal, the Faroese panelist, reacted to a question whether the idea of a North Atlantic Whale Commission was to be understood as a threat to leave IWC: "A holistic approach of whale management including all marine resources and pollution is needed regionally, and the IWC is just not the right forum in that connection. So the Faroe Islands might reconsider its position toward the IWC."[268] Following the conference in Aarhus, Greenland, Faroe Islands, Norway and Iceland formed the North Atlantic Committee on Cooperation on Marine Mammal Resources. This paved the way for the NAMMCO Agreement[269] and the formal establishment of its body, the *North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission*, in 1992.[270] Its first General Secretary was Kate Sanderson. At the inaugural meeting in 1992, Gudmundur Eiriksson of the Icelandic delegation stated that "the organization was born out of dissatisfaction with the IWC's zero-catch quota, lack of IWC competence to deal with small cetaceans, and the need for an organization to deal with other marine mammals such as seals."[271]

Considering the above statements from Hoydal, Eiriksson, and Nielsen, a question arises whether the establishment of NAMMCO has threatened the legitimacy and competency of IWC. This was a valid fear for many observers, who witnessed NAMMCO's creation concurrent with Iceland's resignation from IWC and Norway's resumption of commercial whaling in formal objection to the moratorium.[272] Of particular interest, when considering IWC's role as the hegemonic whaling organization, and NAMMCO's possible challenge to that, is Article 65 of the *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea* (UNCLOS). The complementary coexistence or subversive challenge to the status as the hegemonic whaling organization rests on differing interpretations of UNCLOS's Article 65, which reads, "States shall cooperate with a

266 Wåhlin (1990), 209.
267 Wåhlin (1990), 212.
268 Wåhlin (1990), 212.
269 Formally called the Agreement on the Cooperation in Research, Conservation, and Management of Marine Mammals in the North Atlantic. Signed in Nuuk, Greenland in April 1992.
270 Sanderson (1997), 68.
271 Caron (1995), 164.
272 Caron (1995), 155.

view to the conservation of marine mammals and in the case of cetaceans shall in particular work through the appropriate international organizations for their conservation, management, and study."[273] One interpretation of the clause, supported for instance by the government of Canada, focuses on the word 'organizations' in the plural, indicating that there may be other whaling organizations equally or more competent than the IWC. Such interpretations challenge IWC's exclusive role in the area and have implications for the relationship between IWC and other international organizations, such as NAMMCO. However, a more widely accepted interpretation of the clause, as indicated by Gillespie and Hardy for instance, grants IWC the highest authority on the matter, as it has historical precedence in the area.[274] This interpretation was largely cemented already in 1992, as chapter 17 in *Agenda 21* from the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro explicitly mentioned IWC as the responsible body for the conservation and management of whale stocks.[275]

NAMMCO differed most significantly from the IWC, as it attended to a regional rather than global approach to conservation, "motivated by a desire to reduce the distance between resource managers and resource users, and ensure an effective consultation process so that local communities are involved in conservation and management decisions which may ultimately affect their lives and livelihoods.[276] While its original intention *may* have been to act as a replacement institution for the IWC, and to allow pro-whaling states to operate while complying with international law, its development and complementary approach have not threatened the hegemony of IWC. The deadlock between pro- and anti-whaling states that has characterized the IWC in the decades since the moratorium persists, but NAMMCO has continued to act as a supplementary body to IWC, providing scientific advice and consensus on management. However, unlike IWC, NAMMCO chooses who is allowed to participate, and has thus developed into a relatively closed forum for likeminded states. Its meetings are open to its members from Norway, Faroe Islands, Greenland and Iceland, and observed by delegates from Japan, Denmark, Russia, and Saint Lucia, but non-governmental organizations have thus far not been granted observer status.[277]

273 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) Article 65, 48.
274 Hardy (2006), 190; Gillespie (2005), 325.
275 United Nations, "Agenda 21", 17.61.
276 Sanderson (1997), 69.
277 Interview with Bjarni Mikkelsen from NAMMCO's Scientific Committee, by Heri Joensen. Published on youtube on August 2, 2018. https://www.youtube.

In this chapter, I have examined the political and scientific developments that occurred in the immediate aftermath of the 1980s protests against pilot whaling. The changes to policies and practices that emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s reflect the ontological conceptualizations as outlined in chapter three. The legislative reform to pilot whaling policies could not be determined to be a direct cause of the protests, although the criticism accelerated a process that was already underway. The efforts to minimize the animals' suffering remain consistent with the conceptualization of the pilot whale as 'gift from God', as this type of stewardship entails respect for the prey's life and death. The scientific reforms reflect modern society's demand for scientific data and assessment. The surveys, conducted as a direct result of the protests, have been a cornerstone for Faroese management and policy-making since. The contents in the information campaign, targeted toward the critics who sent personal letters to the government, expressed the Faroese self-description in the hope that it would inspire sympathy for the Faroese point of view. It was also an effort to balance the status quo in the media reports, as they could offer their critics a more nuanced narrative of the practice. The efforts to establish a status quo also led to the creation of the pro-whaling NGO, *Pilot Whaling Association*, and the intergovernmental organization NAMMCO. Together, these organizations have strengthened the structural basis for continued cooperation between whaling states and improved practical methods and productions of knowledge.

IWC has been deadlocked since the last three or four decades between two opposing and seemingly irreconcilable camps: those (pro-whaling) states that see whales as resources susceptible to sustainable harvest, and those (anti-whaling) states that see whales as individuals to be afforded special rights and entitled to protection. The pro-whaling states, not all of whom are actively whaling, generally acknowledge that international agreements on environmental issues and resource management should be based on principles and scientific advice. Meanwhile, they lament the anti-whaling states for exercising emotive politics, which replace these principles with a contest of species popularity and public sentiment.[278]

The lack of mutual understanding fosters antagonism. And the central feature that separates the camps is a difference in the ontological conceptualization of man's place in nature. Since the early 1970s, whales have occupied a symbolic role in our conceptualization of nature, where, due to their anthropomorphic characteristics and endangered status, they have become metaphoric of society and metonymic of nature as a whole.[279] To those who believe that the core of all our environmental issues stem from the industrialist and capitalist tendencies of modern society and modern man, whales have become a flagship issue to resolve our unhealthy relationship with nature. Others, however, believe humans to have a natural place in the order of predation, and they remain hopeful that with the right management tools it is possible to sustainably harvest Earth's resources without impacting the ecosystem.

com/watch?v=dFlOWkr5Adg&t=435s&ab_channel=HeriJoensen (last accessed 28/06/2021).

278 Blichfeldt (1994), 3.

279 Kalland (2012), 2.

Conclusion

In late 2019 Edward Fuglø unveiled his latest art installation at the Faroese National Gallery. The mixed-media artwork in question, titled "Whale War", was a life-size pilot whale sculpture composed of 32.000 plastic toy soldiers. Emanating from the front of the statue were faint voices of pro- and anti-whaling proponents exclaiming the old arguments of special species protection, tradition, bloodlust, and the pollution of the oceans. From the back of the statue, one could hear the pilot whale's song and Pløyen's pilot whaling ballad superimposed over one another, signifying the contrasting discourses of 19th century's romanticism and 20th century environmentalism clashing in the 21st century. Fuglø's "Whale War" attempts to capture the diverging realities of whalers and anti-whalers, and aims to reach a more nuanced and constructive critique of the tradition and the protests against it.[280]

This study has examined what the effects of the paradigm shift in commercial whaling were on the local, non-commercial whaling in the Faroe Islands. In order to adequately answer this question, I have divided it into five central objectives.

The first objective, answered in chapter one, identified the main factors contributing to the ontological shift of whales from a resource to an icon. The structural contingencies for a budding global environmental movement in the 1960s were precipitated by the science of ecology, an increased awareness on human-induced environmental damage, a global media network, and a greening paradigm of international cooperation. The science of ecology provided a new language to criticize the damaging effects of industrialism and modernity, and many authors professed the need for an ecologial consciousness revolution to re-evaluate human interaction with the natural world.[281]

280 Listasavn Føroya (2019), "A Pilot Whale Made Out of 32000 Toy Soldiers," https://art.fo/news/49/a-pilot-whale-made-out-of-32000-toy-soldiers?_l=fo. (Last Accessed 31. July, 2021).

281 Young et.al. (2011), 4.

These topics were highly popular in the 1960s, when television became increasingly common, and its contents showing devastating loss of natural habitats provoked a public reaction against industrialism and the progress of modernity. The anti-whaling movement emerged as a branch of the wider environmental movement, when new scientific knowledge about whales' intelligence became accessible to a broader public. Discoveries about the intelligence, biology, and social structure of whales led to anthropomorphized mental images of whales that served a useful purpose in the environmentalist agenda. The new conceptualization about whales evoked a metaphor that united all the perceived issues of environmentalism that dealt with the destructive capabilities of industrialism. The new symbolic image, commonly referred to as the *superwhale*, became metonymic of nature and metaphoric of society. To many, the metaphysical creature became a model for an idealized society after the consciousness revolution, professed by e.g. Robert Hunter and Rachel Carson, was achieved. Founding member of Greenpeace, Robert Hunter, epitomized the idealization when he told Paul Spong that whales "have already learned how to live harmoniously within their surrounds, to control their populations, to live ecologically within their environment, and to manage their societies without aggression and violence."[282]

As the anti-whaling movement was mainly composed of non-governmental organizations, a crucial contingency for the success of the anti-whaling movement was the coterminous international paradigm on environmental cooperation. When endangered species protection became paradigmatic for international cooperation in the 1970s, an anti-whaling stance was a popular and inexpensive way for a country to "green" itself, i.e. show its willingness for cooperation on environmental issues. As NGOs emerged that highlighted particular issues, the geopolitical climate offered NGOs more capacity for political influence. Herein lay perhaps the most important precondition for the wide spread and success of the anti-whaling movement, which was the technological advancements in communication. Instantaneous in momentum and global in outreach, the mass media of news dissemination allowed the ideas from the anti-whaling movement to induce an environmental awareness in the broader global public. These images came to have a crucial impact as their publications were timed to coincide with important international conferences, thereby influencing agendas and topics of discussion.

The second chapter, 'Whaling and Anti-Whaling in the Faroe Islands', tackled my second and third objectives. Here I first examined the symbolic and pragmatic values of pilot whaling for the Faroese. As was shown, pilot whaling developed early on as a hunting practice among a people that lived off its local resources in a subsistence economy. During the course of the 19th century, as a transnational romantic current arrived on the islands, the whaling practice began to take on a symbolic dimension beyond its nutritional value. Traditions were invented that strengthened its historic past through song and dance. Literature emerged which drew on its peculiarities and exoticism. As these were continuously reproduced, they served as identifier for the Faroese to describe themselves, and whaling became established as an informal identifier of a national identity. It was during this time that a Faroese nation began to be conceptualized, and through literary depictions and folk song, it emerged as a symbolic and archetypical Faroese tradition. The lifestyle of living from the local resources in an otherwise modernizing society became depicted and experienced as a quintessential aspect of a Faroese cultural identity.

The third objective focused on how the anti-whaling campaign in the mid-1980s took shape and why it evolved as it did. The initial outcry was wholly contingent on the media dominance of environmentalism. The 37th annual conference of the IWC in July 1985 coincided with several media publications about the pilot whale hunt, which helped to bring the issue to the center of the conference's agenda. The local campaign that was launched in the Faroe Islands in the wake of the conference followed the same patterned strategy as the global campaign had done. Globally, the goal was to disseminate photographs and videos in the media, which would incite an emotional response in the audience. Meanwhile, pressure groups lobbied for influence in the IWC, which could pressure local practices to conform to prevailing global values. The local campaign in the Faroes reinforced the global strategy as it focused on three spheres of local influence. First, the protesting groups were present to bear witness to the world by documenting the whaling tradition. In the event of a hunt, activists would attempt to disrupt the activity. Visual material was then published abroad, inciting further outrage and gathering support for the environmentalist cause. Second, lobbying efforts targeted toward local governments aimed to influence institutional reform. However, the negotiations were perceived as demanding by the local authorities, who responded defensively. The third sphere of local influence focused on the bureaucratic structures, where a general international audience voiced its displeasure through protest mail and consumer boycotts. The protest mail showed a general pattern in the opinions and arguments, which were analyzed in depth in the third chapter.

282 Zelko (2013), 173.

The third chapter, 'Patterns of Argument', tackled my most central objective. The main argument in this book is that the conflict is best understood as an ontological clash about competing and diverging views on the human-nature relationship. In the third chapter, I juxtaposed the various arguments of the local and international pro- and anti-whaling coalitions to illuminate the diverging ontological conceptualizations. It was argued that the key disagreement between the parties was a baseline difference in the conceptualization of how people should interact with their environment. The Faroese ontological framework, formed from the cultural background of a traditional, localized, and multi-faceted resource exploitation, conceptualized a utilitarian relationship with nature, which entailed traces of an anthropocentric and Cartesian ethic of dominance, while inspired by a Christian ethic of stewardship. Meanwhile, the environmentalist framework, which originally emerged as a reaction against industrialism, was inspired by a romanticized ecological worldview. It perceived human exploitation of nature in exclusively negative terms, preferring instead an idealized spiritually pacifist approach of harmonious cohabitation.

The central conclusion from the third chapter was that the Faroese world view was determined by a utilitarian perspective on man's place in nature. The fourth chapter, which examined the main changes in policies and practices in the wake of the protests, argued that the principles of utilitarianism and responsible stewardship formed a basis for many of the political and institutional changes that were enacted in the 1980s and 1990s. The areas I examined were legislative, scientific, public relations and international relations. The measures taken, which account for the legal and scientific management of whaling focused on minimizing suffering, maximizing organization, and researching migration patterns, neural anatomy, stock size, and more. These measures are consistent with the ontological conceptualization of responsible stewardship. In the area of public relations, the Faroese began an extensive information campaign, where particular focus was placed on the portrayal of the Faroes as a place between tradition and modernity, where people have a utilitarian and personal view toward the fruits that nature provides. In similar vein, the international relations sector was marked by a closer cooperation between states and peoples that share a like-minded view to the utility of marine resources. The establishment of NAMMCO can be observed as the final straw in a long process of urban values being imposed on hunting societies.

Since the anti-whaling protests began, it has been difficult for many Faroese to be openly and publicly against pilot whaling. It is tough to determine whether the lack of internal opposition stems from societal pressure or individual subconscious pressure. However, what is clear is that the external tensions from the protests strengthened a tribalistic attitude, where the local 'us' needed to stick together against the foreign 'them'. We saw in chapter three that some Faroese associated the pollution discourse and pleas for limited consumption with the anti-whaler's agenda. Internal opposition in the Faroe Islands against pilot whaling has, however, increased in later years due to the high degree of pollution of the seas and the whales. Interestingly, internal opposition against pilot whaling distances itself from the global anti-whaling movement, as it continues to adhere to the baseline principles of the Faroese ontological setting, particularly about how people should live from the resources in their environment.

The Faroese pro-whaling NGO, the Pilot Whaling Association or *Grindamannafelagið*, which was founded in the wake of the protests, argued that the taking of any wildlife has to adhere to four principles: the stock must not be endangered; the hunt needs to be legal according to international law; the killing method must be humane; and the hunt must be for food. In later years, much doubt has been sowed around whether pilot whales are fit for human consumption. In 1987 Chief Physician Pál Weihe began a long-term research project on the cognitive effects of pilot whale consumption on child-bearing mothers and children. As a result of their findings, Weihe and Chief Medical Officer Høgni Debes Joensen issued a public advisory in 2008, which recommended that pilot whale no longer be used for human consumption. In their statement, Weihe and Joensen wrote, "It is with great regret that this recommendation is issued. The pilot whale has served the Faroese for many hundreds of years, and it is likely that it has kept many Faroese alive down the centuries. But the times and the environment are changing, and we therefore believe that this recommendation is necessary from a human health perspective."[283] Weihe told the author sympathetically during an interview, "I also have a Faroese identity, our tradition and all that. It is a part of me to kill and eat pilot whale. It was hard for me to issue this recommendation, because I felt that I encroached on our culture. But on the other hand, I was put into this world as a doctor to communicate this conclusion to the people. Of course, I immediately entered into a crossfire, because it could be assumed that I was a Sea Shepherd in disguise. It was said that I was doing their business. I was once asked by Paul Watson if we could join forces. I told him no, because I

283 Weihe and Joensen (2008), 4.

am not against pilot whaling as such. I only think it is not suited for human consumption."[284]

Since the 2008 recommendation to stop the consumption of pilot whale, it has become more acceptable to take an open position against whaling. One of the people who turned to anti-whaling activism following the recommendation was food consultant Rúni Nielsen. Nielsen runs the website www.grindahvalur.org, which is targeted toward Faroese people and aims to educate people on the pollution of pilot whale meat and blubber. In a conversation with the author, Nielsen pointed out that he looks more favorably at the minke whaling conducted in Norway, as minke whales do not have the high degree of POPs and mercury as pilot whales, because they eat species lower in the marine food chain.[285] Like Pál Weihe, Nielsen is opposed to whaling for health reasons.

There is little doubt that the international protests have improved the practice of pilot whaling. As was shown in chapter four, parliamentary discussions were already underway to reform the hunt when protests began. However, were it not for the protests, the reforms would likely be less extensive and the process would take longer to pass into law. Moreover, it is doubtful whether the scientific surveys between 1986 and 1989 would even have begun were it not for the international demands for more knowledge about the stock size of pilot whales.

While the practical aspects have improved, the polarization between pro- and anti-whaling proponents has continued to increase. Rúni Nielsen referred to Sea Shepherd's Paul Watson as 'the godfather of the Faroese Renaissance'. The assumption held by Nielsen is that the protests have elicited a nationalistic response in many Faroese that has pressured them to take a stronger hold on their traditions to ensure that they live on. Pál Weihe reverberated the claim, when he told me that "If it wasn't for the protests, then pilot whaling would have been a distant ceremony for old men. They [Sea Shepherd] were able to mobilize the youth in a classical manner. When the borders to a country are under threat, then it is up to the young men to stand up and defend the tradition. Our men have also done this. They have signed up en masse to killing courses. And now an ideal of manliness is blooming, the ideal of being a good whaler. This would not have happened if Sea Shepherd and Greenpeace didn't lecture us. If it didn't happen, then our drying sheds would look more like the supermarkets."[286]

284 Pál Weihe, interview with the author (17.09.2020).
285 Rúni Nielsen, telephone conversation (10.09.2020).
286 Pál Weihe, interview with the author (17.09.2020).

The most crucial aspect to define in any dispute is the nature of what is under discussion. It is important to engage in fruitful discussion in order to understand other's frames of reference. However, when there is a lack of dialogue between the disputing parties, they are unable to agree on fundamental baseline principles, which may serve as a basis for constructive discussion. Countless ways exist to interpret the world we inhabit. Our interpretation ultimately stems from our sociocultural background. And to inhabit a common world, it is paramount to have a common frame of reference and an arbiter to help solve conflicts as they arise. In the local setting in the Faroe Islands, this point was reached in 2008 when an authoritative and scientific voice has gradually allowed it to become more acceptable to be against whaling. However, in a culture ingrained with a sense of duty for sustainable resource exploitation for personal consumption, a hard anti-whaling stance has shown to be socially unacceptable. Therefore, it was prudent that it was framed as a health risk and not against the culture as such. This is where Sea Shepherd, Greenpeace, EIA, and other international activists have failed in their approach. Since the 1980s, both anti- and pro-whalers have consistently flung facts against each other, which have fallen on deaf ears. The Faroese have decried fanaticism and lack of dialogue for nearly four decades without much constructive progress to the debate. International organizations continue to document the 'atrocities' and shout words of barbarism and cruelty to no avail.

The continuing legacy of the whaling debate has been that neither side has really listened to the other. Both sides have consistently laid their facts on the table. While this is a useful tool in any debate, it is also important to take their ontological framework into account and consider where they come from and why they think as they do. If not, the debate ultimately continues in a loop of antagonism where everyone talks across each other.

Works Cited

Published Sources:

Allison, Randal S. 2011. "Tradition." In *Folklore: An Encyclopedia of Beliefs, Customs, Tales, Music and Art*, edited by Charlie T. McCormick and Kim Kennedy White: 1198-1202. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Andreasen, Eyðun. 1992. *Folkelig Offentlighed: En undersøgelse af kulturelle former på Færøerne i 100 år.* Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanums Forlag.

Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: SAGE Publications.

Berlin, Isaiah. 1965. "The True Fathers of Romanticism." National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC. Youtube. (Last accessed: 16. June, 2021).

Berlin, Isaiah. 2013. *Three Critics of the Enlightenment: Vico, Hamann, Herder*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Björk, Tord. "The Emergence of Popular Participation in World Politics – United Nations Conference on Human Environment 1972." Unpublished seminar paper, Department of Political Science, University of Stockholm.

Blaser, Mario. 2009. "Political Ontology: Cultural Studies without 'cultures'?" *Cultural Studies* 23, no. 5-6: 873-896.

Blichfeldt, Georg. 1994. "Bigger than Whales." In *11 Essays on Whales and Man*, edited by Georg Blichfeldt: 3-4. Bodø: High North Alliance.

Bloch, Dorete. 2012. *Grind og Grindahvalur*. Tórshavn: Føroya Náttúrugripasavn.

Blok, Anders. 2011. "War of the Whales: Post-Sovereign Science and Agonistic Cosmopolitics in Japanese-Global Whaling Assemblages." *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 36, no. 1: 55-81.

Brydon, Anne. 1990. "Icelandic Nationalism and the Whaling Issue." *North Atlantic Studies* 2, no. 1-2: 185-191.

Bulbeck, Chilla, and Sandra Bowdler. 2008. "The Faroes Grindadráp or Pilot Whale Hunt: The Importance of Its 'Traditional' Status in Debates with Conservationists." *Australian Archaeology*, no. 67: 53-60.

Bulliet, Richard W. 2005. *Hunters, Herders, and Hamburgers: The Past and Future of Human-Animal Relationships.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Burnett, D. Graham. 2012. *The Sounding of the Whale: Science and Cetaceans in the Twentieth Century*. Chicaco and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Caron, David. 1995. "The International Whaling Commission and the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission: The Institutional Risks of Coercion in Consensual Structures." *The American Journal of International Law* 89: 154-174.

Castells, Manuel. 2010a. *The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture – Volume I.* Oxford: Wylie-Blackwell.

Castells, Manuel. 2010b. *The Power of Identity: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture – Volume II*. Oxford: Wylie-Blackwell.

Coscieme, Luca, et.al. 2020. "Multiple Conceptualizations of Nature are Key to Inclusivity and Legitimacy in Global Environmental Governance." *Environmental Science and Policy* 104: 36-42.

D'Amato, Anthony, and Sudhir K. Chopra. 1991. "Whales – Their Emerging Right to Life." *American Journal of International Law* 85: 21-62.

Day, David. 1992. *The Whale War*. London: Grafton.

DeSombre, Elizabeth. 2001. "Distorting Global Governance: Membership, Voting, and the IWC." In *Toward a Sustainable Whaling Regime*, edited by Robert L. Friedheim. Seattle, London and Edmonton: University of Washington Press and Canadian Circumpolar Institute (CCI) Press.

Dorsey, Kurk. 2014. "Crossing Boundaries: The Environment in International Relations." In *The Oxford Handbook of Environmental History*, edited by Andrew C. Isenberg: 688-715. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Douglas, Mary. 1975. *Implicit Meanings: Selected Essays in Anthropology*. London and New York: Routledge.

Einarsson, Niels. 1993. "All animals are equal but some are cetaceans: Conservation and culture conflict." In *Environmentalism: The View from Anthropology*, edited by Kay Milton: 71-82. London and New York: Routledge.

Ellis, Richard. 1991. *Men and Whales*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Epstein, Charlotte. 2003. "WorldWideWhale.Globalisation/Dialogue of Cultures?" *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 16, no. 2: 309-322.

Epstein, Charlotte. 2008. *The Power of Words in International Relations: Birth of an Anti-Whaling Discourse*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press.

"Fatboy Slim Joins Protest Against Faroe Whale Slaughter." Blue Planet Society. Published 18. July, 2019. https://blueplanetsociety.org/2019/07/fatboy-slim-joins-protest-against-faroe-whale-slaughter/ (Last Accessed 3. August, 2021).

Fichtelius, Karl Erik, and Sverre Sjölander. 1971. "Människan, Kaskelothvalen och Kunskapens Träd." Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand.

Fielding, Russell. 2010. "Artisanal Whaling in the Atlantic: Comparative Study of Culture, Conflict, and Conservation in St. Vincent and the Faroe Islands." Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Fielding, Russell. 2018. *The Wake of the Whale: Hunter Societies in the Caribbean and North Atlantic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fitzmaurice, Malgosia. 2015. "The IWC and its Interaction with Other Organisations and Conventions." In *Whaling and International Law*, 184-233. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forsyth, Tim. 2003. *Critical Political Ecology: The Politics of Environmental Science*. London and New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. 1989. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London and New York: Routledge.

Franklin, Adrian. 1999. *Animals and Modern Cultures: A Sociology of Human-Animal Relations in Modernity*. London: SAGE Publications.

Freeman, Milton M.F. 1990. "A Commentary on Political Issues with Regard to Contemporary Whaling." *North Atlantic Studies* 2, no. 1-2: 106-116.

Gaini, Firouz. 2011. "Cultural Rhapsody in Shift: Faroese Culture and Identity in the Age of Globalization." In *Among the Islanders of the North*, edited by Firouz Gaini, 132-162. Tórshavn: Fróðskapur – Faroe University Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Gellner, Ernest. 2006. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Gibson, Jennifer, and Dave Currey. 1985. "Pilot Whaling in the Faroe Islands: A Report by the Environmental Investigation Agency." *Environmental Investigation Agency*: 1-30.

Gibson, Jennifer, and Allan Thornton. 1986. "Pilot Whaling in the Faroe Islands: A Second Report by the Environmental Investigation Agency." *Environmental Investigation Agency*: 1-36.

Gibson, Jennifer, Allan Thornton, Dave Currey, and Dr. Rosalind Reeve. 1987. "Pilot Whaling in the Faroe Islands: A Third Report by the Environmental Investigation Agency." *Environmental Investigation Agency*: 1-25.

Gillespie, Alexander. 2005. *Whaling Diplomacy: Defining Issues in International Environmental Law*. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Glover, M. 1981. "Faroese Fin Whale Campaign – 1981." *Greenpeace Report*, London.

Goodman, Jeff, dir. 1988. *Black Harvest – The Fight for the Pilot Whale*. South & West Plymouth: BBC. Youtube. (Last accessed: 16. June, 2021).

Grindatjakið í føroysku bløðunum summarið og heystið 1985. Tórshavn: Føroya Landsbókasavn.

Grindedrab. Directed by Preben Heide. 1985; Copenhagen: Denmark Radio. MP4.

Hammershaimb, V.U. 1891. *Færøsk Anthologi bd. I-II*. Copenhagen: S.L. Møllers Bogtrykkeri.

Handler, Richard, and Jocelyn Linnekin. 1984. "Tradition, Genuine or Spurious." *The Journal of American Folklore* 97, no. 385: 273-290.

Hardy, Brettny. 2006. "A Regional Approach to Whaling: How the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission is Shifting the Tides for Whale Management." *Duke Journal of Comparative and International Law* 17, no. 169: 169-198.

Heazle, Michael. 2004. "Scientific Uncertainty and the International Whaling Commission: an alternative perspective on the use of science in policy making." *Marine Policy* 28: 361-374.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hoydal, Kjartan. 1986. "Data on the Long Finned Pilot Whale in the Faroe Waters and an Attempt to Use the 274 Years Time Series of Catches to Assess the State of the Stock." Unpublished article sent to Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 37, 1987. File number (SC/38/SM7).

Hoydal, Kjartan. 1993. "Marine Resources and the Future of the Faroe Islands Community." *North Atlantic Studies* 3, no. 2: 5-16.

Huber, Valeska, and Jürgen Osterhammel. 2020. "Introduction: Global Publics." In *Global Publics: Their Power and their Limits, 1870-1990*, edited by Valeska Huber and Jürgen Osterhammel, 1-60. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunter, Robert. 1971. *The Storming of the Mind: Inside the Consciousness Revolution*. Garden City: Doubleday.

Hunter, Robert. 2011. *Warriors of the Rainbow: A Chronicle of the Greenpeace Movement from 1971 to 1979*. Amsterdam: Greenepeace International and Freemantle Press.

Isholm, Erling. 2020. *Fiskivinnan sum Broytingaramboð hjá Amtmanninum*. Tórshavn: Fróðskapur – Faroe University Press.

Jacobsen, Helgi. 2007. *Hvalurin er Mín*. Tórshavn: Forlagið Ritstarv.

Jacobsen, Jørgen-Frantz. 1936. *Færøerne: Natur og Folk*. Tórshavn: H.N. Jacobsens Bókahandils Forlag.

Jacobsen, Sally. 1972. "II. A Call to Environmental Order." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 28, no. 7: 21-25.

Jamieson, Dale, and Tom Regan. 1984. "Whales Are Not Cetacean Resources." In *Advances in Animal Welfare Science 1984/1985*, edited by M.W. Fox and L.D. Mickley: 101-111. Washington, DC: The Humane Society of the United States.

Joensen, Jóan Pauli. 2009. *Pilot Whaling in the Faroe Islands*. Tórshavn: Fróðskapur – Faroe University Press.

Kalland, Arne. 1993. "Management by Totemization: Whale Symbolism and the Anti-Whaling Campaign." *Arctic* 46: 124-133.

Kalland, Arne. 2012. *Unveiling the Whale: Discourses on Whales and Whaling*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Kato, Kumi. 2015. "Australia's Whaling Discourse: Global Norm, Green Consciousness and Identity." *Journal of Australian Studies* 39, no. 4: 477-493.

Latour, Bruno. 2004. "Whose Cosmos, Which Cosmopolitics?" *Common Knowledge* 10, no. 3: 450-462.

Lilly, John C. 1961. *Man and Dolphin: Adventures of a New Scientific Frontier*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Lilly, John C. 1967. *The Mind of the Dolphin: A Nonhuman Intelligence*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Lilly, John C. 1974. "A Feeling of Weirdness." In *Mind in the Waters: A Book to Celebrate the Consciousness of Whales and Dolphins*, edited by Joan McIntyre, 71-77. New York and San Francisco: Charles Scribner's Sons and Sierra Club Books.

Listasavn Føroya. 2019. "A Pilot Whale Made Out of 32000 Toy Soldiers." *Listasavn Føroya – National Gallery of the Faroe Islands*. Published 13. December, 2019. https://art.fo/news/49/a-pilot-whale-made-out-of-32000-toy-soldiers?_Search=whale%20war (Last Accessed 3. August, 2021).

Mamzer, Hanna Maria. 2021. "Ritual Slaughter: The Tradition of Pilot Whale Hunting on the Faroe Islands. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science* 8, 552465: 1-13.

Marnersdóttir, Malan, and Turið Sigurðardóttir. 2011. *Føroysk Bókmentasøga 1*. Tórshavn: Nám.

McCormick, John. 1995. *The Global Environmental Movement: Reclaiming Paradise*. Chichester: John Wylie & Sons.

McIntyre, Joan, comp. 1974. *Mind in the Waters: A Book to Celebrate the Consciousness of Whales and Dolphins*. New York and San Francisco: Charles Scribner's Sons and Sierra Book Club.

McIntyre, Joan. 1974. “Mind in the Waters.” In *Mind in the Waters: A Book to Celebrate the Consciousness of Whales and Dolphins*, edited by Joan McIntyre, 217-223. New York and San Francisco: Charles Scribner’s Sons and Sierra Club Books.

McIntyre, Joan. 1974. “Mind Play.” In *Mind in the Waters: A Book to Celebrate the Consciousness of Whales and Dolphins*, edited by Joan McIntyre, 94-95. New York and San Franscisco: Charles Scribner’s Sons and Sierra Club Books.

McLuhan, Marshall. 1962. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of the Typographic Man*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.

McLuhan, Marshall. 1964. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

McVay, Scott. 1966. “The Last of the Great Whales.” *Scientific American* 215, no. 2: 13-21.

Mortensen, Andras. 2005. “Fólkaleiki í Stovnsfestum Grindabýti.” In *Fólkaleikur. Heiðursrit til Jóan Paula Joensen*, edited by Andras Mortensen. Tórshavn: Føroya Fróðskaparfelag.

Naess, Arne. 1995. “Politics and the Ecological Crisis: An Introductory Note.” In *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by George Sessions, 445-453. Boston and London: Shambhala.

Nagtzaam, Gerry. 2014. “Gaia’s Navy: The Sea Shepherd Conservation Society’s Battle to Stay Afloat and International Law.” *William and Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review* 38, no, 613: 613-694.

Nauerby, Tom. 1996. *No Nation is an Islands: Language, Culture, and National Identity in the Faroe Islands*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Nielsen, Michael Gylling. 1987. “Havets Mennesker.” *Greenpeace Magasinet* no. 1: 10-11.

Olafsson, Árni. 1985. “Concerning report by Jennifer Gibson and Dave Currey on pilot whaling in the Faroe Islands for the Environmental Investigation Agency.” Copenhagen: 1-7. (F st. smpr. 1985-37)

Olafsson, Árni. 1990. “Faroese Whale and Whaling Policy.” *North Atlantic Studies* 2, no. 1-2: 130-137.

Olsen, Solveig Hanusardóttir. 2019. “A Bloody Practice: Pilot whale hunt in the National Gallery of the Faroe Islands.” In *Difficult Issues: Proceedings of the ICOM International Conference 2017*, edited by ICOM Deutschland: 133-143. Heidelberg: arthistoricum.net.

Ólavsstovu, Vár í. 2010. “Mellem Tradition og Modernitet: Færøskfaget og den færøskfaglige kontekst i national diskurs. En redegørelse og analyse af fagets idé, praksis og reception i det almene gymnasium.” Ph.D. dissertation, Syddansk Universitet.

Oslund, Karen. 2011. *Iceland Imagined: Nature, Culture, and Storytelling in the North Atlantic*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.

Peterson, M.J. 1992. “Whalers, Cetologists, Environmentalists, and the International Management of Whaling.” *International Organization* 46, no. 1: 147-186.

Riese, Juliane. 2017. *Hairy Hippies and Bloody Butchers: The Greenpeace Anti-Whaling Campaign in Norway*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Rome, Adam. 2003. “‘Give Earth a Chance’: The Environmental Movement and the Sixties.” *The Journal of American History* 90, no. 2: 525-554.

Rothenberg, David. 2008. *Thousand Mile Song: Whale Music in a Sea of Sound*. New York: Basic Books.

Said, Edward. 2003. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.

Sanderson, Kate. 1990. “Grindadráp: The Discourse of Drama.” *North Atlantic Studies* 2, no. 1-2: 196-204.

Sanderson, Kate. 1991. *Whales and Whaling in the Faroe Islands*. Tórshavn: The Department of Fisheries.

Sanderson, Kate. 1992. "Grindadráp: A textual history of whaling traditions in the Faroes to 1900." Thesis in Master of Philosophy, University of Sydney.

Sanderson, Kate 1994. "*Grind* – Ambiguity and Pressure to Conform: Faroese Whaling and the Anti-Whaling Protest." In *Elephants and Whales: Resources for Whom?,* edited by Milton M. R. Freeman and Urs P. Kreuter, 187-202. Basel: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.

Sanderson, Kate. 1997. "The North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission – in principle and practice." In *Whaling in the North Atlantic: Economic and political perspectives – Proceedings of a Conference held in Reykjavík on March 1st 1997*, edited by Guðrún Pétursdóttir: 67-74. Reykjavík: Fisheries Research Institute.

Sanderson, Kate. 2010. "Whales and Whaling in Lucas Debes' Færoæ & Færoæ Rserata from 1763." In *Dorete – Her Book*, edited by S.A. Bengtson et.al., 69-81. Tórshavn: Faroe University Press.

"Saving Grace feat. Robert Plant & Suzi Dian cancel." G! Festival. Published 28. February, 2020. https://gfestival.fo/news/518?_l=en (Last Accessed 3. August, 2021).

Schweder, Tore. 1992. "Intransigence, Incompetence or Political Expediency? Dutch Scientists in the International Whaling Commission in the 1950's: injection of uncertainty." Cambridge: SC/44/O 13 (withdrawn rebuttal): 1-25.

Sedal, Karsten. 1989. "Færøerne og den kulturhistoriske forskning – en oversigt." *Fortid og Nutid* 36, no. 1: 252-270.

Simonsen, Kim. 2012. "Literature, Imagining and Memory in the Formation of a Nation: Travel writing, canonisation and the formation of a national self-image in the Faroe Islands." Ph.D. dissertation, Roskilde University.

Singleton, Benedict. 2016. "Love-iathan, the Meat Whale and Hidden People: Ordering Faroese Pilot Whaling." *Journal of Political Ecology* 23: 26-48.

Spencer, Leslie, Jan Bollwerk, and Richard C. Morais. 1991. "The Not So Peaceful World of Greenpeace." *Forbes*: 1-5.

Spong, Paul. 1974. "The Whale Show." In *Mind in the Waters: A Book to Celebrate the Consciousness of Whales and Dolphins*, edited by Joan McIntyre, 170-184. New York and San Francisco: Charles Scribner's Sons and Sierra Club Books.

Smith, Anthony D. 2000. *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Smith, Anthony D. 2008. *The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant, and Republic.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Stephen, Barry R. 1972. "What Happened at Stockholm?" *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 28, no. 7: 16.

Taylor, Elizabeth. 1997. *The Far Islands and Other Cold Places: Travel Essays of a Victorian Lady*. Saint Paul: Pogo Press.

Thorsteinsson, Arne. 1986. "Hvussu gamalt er grindadrápið?" *Varðin*: 65-66.

Weihe, Pál, and Høgni Debes Joensen. 2008. "Recommendation for the discontinuation of the use of pilot whale meat for human consumption." *Journal Bulletin*. Case no: 9-30-2/1. Tórshavn: Landslæknin, Chief Medical Officer. http://grindahvalur.org/Medical_Recom_Whale2008.pdf (Last accessed 25/7/2021).

West, John F. 1972. *Faroe: The Emergence of a Nation*. London: C. Hurst & Company.

Weyler, Rex. 1986. *Song of the Whale*. Garden City, NY: Double Day.

Weyler, Rex. 2004. *Greenpeace: How a Group of Ecologists, Journalists and Visionaries Changed the World*. Vancouver: Raincoast Books.

Winthereig, Øssur. 1985. "Á Sýnini. Tórshavn: SVF, released 9.11.1985. MP4.

Winthereig, Øssur. 1989. "Á Sýnini." Tórshavn: SVF, released 21.09.1989. MP4.

Worster, Donald. 1995. "The Shaky Ground of Sustainability." In *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by George Sessions, 417-427. Boston and London: Shambhala.

Wylie, Jonathan, and David Margolin. 1981. *The Ring of Dancers: Images of Faroese Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Wåhlin, Vagn. 1990. "Panel Discussion – North Atlantic whales and whaling: policy, management, utilisation, protection. Excerpts." *North Atlantic Studies* 2, no. 1-2: 205-213.

Young, Nathan, Victor M.P. Da Rosa, and Jean Lapointe. 2011. "On the Origins of Late Modernity: Environmentalism and the construction of a critical global consciousness. *Antropologicas* no. 12: 2-8.

Zelko, Frank. 2012. "From Blubber and Baleen to Buddha of the Deep: The Rise of the Metaphysical Whale." *Society & Animals* 20: 91-108.

Zelko, Frank. 2013. *Make it a Green Peace! The Rise of Countercultural Environmentalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zelko, Frank. 2017. "Scaling Greenpeace: From Local Activism to Global Governance." *Historical Social Research* 42, no. 2: 318-342.

Archival Sources

Føroya Tjóðskjalasavn (National Archive of the Faroe Islands):

„Mótmæliskort móti grindadrápi í goymslu á Fiskimálaráðnum" ("Protest cards against pilot whaling in storage at the Ministry of Fisheries"). Journal Number 200700409/19. (A-2008-13-001 to A-2008-13-119):

- I KARE newsletter, no date (1985).
- International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) "Letter to Friends" newsletter, October (1985).
- I nternational Wildlife Coalition (IWC) newsletter, no date (1985).
- Pilot whale slaughter petition from World Animal Welfare Group (WAWG), no date (1985).

Løgmansskrivsstovan (Archive of the Prime Minister's Office of the Faroe Islands):

„95. Løgtingslóg um hvalaveiðu. Viðmerkingar." *Løgtingstíðindi*. 01.01.1983: 491-497.

Føroya Landsstýri. „Fylgisskjal til Løgtingsmál nr 104/1982 (Supplement to Parliamentary Proposal no. 104/1982)." Journal nr. 16/2-8-3.

Landsstýrisins Gerðabók – Minute Book of the Faroese Government. Journal Number 1611-2-1.

Van Foreest, A.W. 1988. "Summary of discussions with Mr. J. Olsen, Veterinarian at the Faroe Islands." Journal number: 19/2/88. Archive case number: 1611-4-3/80.

Folketingstidende:

Margrete Auken (SF) to Poul Schlüter (Prime Minister) in: "Forhandlingerne", *Folketingstidende 1983/1984 (2. Samling)*: 1912-1914.

International Whaling Commission's Online Archive:

International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling. 1946. Signed in Washington, D.C. https://archive.iwc.int/pages/view.php?ref=3607&k= (Last Accessed 3. August, 2021).

Thirtieth Report of the International Whaling Commission. Approved in London, 1979. (Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 30, 1980).

Thirty-Fifth Report of the International Whaling Commission. Approved in Buenos Aires, 1984. (Rep. Int. Whal. Commn, 1985).

Thirty-Sixth Report of the International Whaling Commission. Approved in Bournemouth, 1985. (Rep. Int. Whal. Commn, 1986).

Thirty-Seventh Report of the International Whaling Commission. Approved in Malm**ö, 1986.** (Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 37, 1987).

Fourty-Sixth Report of the International Whaling Commission. Approved in Dublin, 1995. (Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 46, 1996).

International Agreements:

United Nations. 1976. "Decree no. 598 of 21 December 1976. The Fishing Territory of the Faroe Islands." https://www.un.org/depts/los/LEGISLATIONANDTREATIES/PDFFILES/DNK_1976_Decree.pdf (Last Accessed 3. August, 2021).

United Nations. 1982. "United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea." Montego Bay, Jamaica. https://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf (Last Accessed 3. August, 2021).

United Nations. 1992. "Agenda 21." *United Nations Conference on Environment & Development*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/Agenda21.pdf (Last Accessed 3. August, 2021).

Interviews:

Bjarni Mikkelsen, interview by Heri Joensen. Published on Youtube, 2. August, 2018. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dFlOWkr5Adg&t=435s&ab_channel=HeriJoensen. (Last Accessed 3. August, 2021).

Hans J. Hermansen, interview with the author, 17. September, 2020.

Jóan Pauli Joensen, interview with the author, 16. September, 2020.

Kate Sanderson, interview with the author, 14. May, 2020.

Pál Weihe, interview with the author, 17. September, 2020.

Rúni Nielsen, interview with the author, 10. September, 2020.