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Abstract

In this study, the conflict between pro-whaling Japan and anti-whaling Australia is scrutinised. The political structure system, the economic and the cultural explanatory factors are examined from how the conflict has emerged out of the 1986 International Whaling Commission’s moratorium (Little, 2008: 308). Further to this, Japan and Australia are examined to point out different environmental perspectives, these being anthropocentrism and biocentrism (Huxham et al, 2000: 142-169). This combined with the traditional policy paradigm and the policy of sustainable development can explain how Japan and Australia’s whaling policies differ (Carter, 2007: 174-180). Our conclusion is that Japan has an anthropocentric approach towards whaling and is following the path of traditional policy paradigm. Australia on the other hand has a biocentric approach towards whaling and is following the policy path of sustainable development (Carter, 2007: 174-180). A political structure difference can therefore be used to explain these different outcomes.
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1 Introduction and Problem Formulation

In 2009, a non-governmental activist organisation called Sea Shepherd lost one of its ships, the Ady Gil, in a conflict with Japanese whalers. The Japanese whaling ship, The Shonan Maru 2 was involved in the skirmish in which the captain of the Ady Gil, Pete Bethune, was taken as a prisoner by the Japanese and was escorted to Japan (Gross, 2010: 256-257).

Meanwhile, Australian officials are threatening to take Japan’s whaling actions in the Southern Ocean to the International Court of Justice (ICJ), and further to this have started to keep an eye on Japanese whalers, yet without interference. This conflict has witnessed growing media attention along with increased resources being committed to the cause (ibid).

One might ask following questions: Why two free democracies such as Japan and Australia involve and take high stakes on this issue? Why does no sophisticated treaty exist concerning the matter and why is this seemingly difficult to obtain?

Therefore it is interesting to explore this conflict to gain understanding why this policy area creates such disturbances in the diplomatic relationship between Australia and Japan. The conflict mentioned above illustrates only one extreme part of this political iceberg and is truly a fruit of the anti-whaling and pro-whaling policy conflict (Gross, 2010: 256-257).

1.1 Two Nations, Two Different Policies

The catch of whaling has been count and measured since 1946, with the creation of the International Whaling Commission (IWC). A country that has always been pro-whaling and has used this for a fact is Japan (Lynch, 2010). A country which has the ambition of anti whaling, and which has been fighting pro-whaling for the last 20 years is Australia (Anton, 2009: 325-332).

Year 1986 a moratorium within the IWC was formed (Lynch, 2010). With this moratorium, all commercial whaling was prohibited by the IWC and new regulated quotas were set up on scientific and aboriginal whaling. These quotas were based on scientific research of how many whales can be caught and killed without being extinct (Andresen, 2002: 383-389).

Japan is one of the biggest whale meat consuming countries in the world (WDCS). The state, which is pro-whaling, is striving towards a regulated whaling quota, where states ought to be able to capture whales on international agreed premises (Little, 2008: 308). Japan reluctantly accepted the total moratorium on commercial whaling in 1986 (WDCS). However in 1988 Japan
switched from commercial to scientific whaling, because the state claimed and claims that the catches is used for scientific purposes (ibid). Japan argues that the regulation demands from the anti-whaling countries lack scientific proof and are mainly motivated by humane compassion towards the whales (Anton, 2009: 327). The state means as well, according to Anton, that cetaceans are not near extinction today, but were around the 1960-1970’s (Anton, 2009: 324). Japan is continuing whaling and the Japanese government argues, according to Morikawa, that to stop practicing whaling would damage ancient Japanese traditions (Morikawa, 2009: 3).

Australia is an anti-whaling nation and considers whales as an unsustainable natural resource and an irrelevant food source. Nevertheless, the whaling practise is seen as brutal and inhumane (Anton, 2009: 337). The conflict between pro Japan and anti whaling Australia has turned into, according to Anton - a power struggle, with the two states in focus and neither of them willing to give up their opinion. Australia was as Japan, a pro-whaling nation up till 1979 and was transformed into a strong anti-whaling state in 1986 to 1989 and wanted then, to protect and reserve all whales. Although before 1986, Anton argues, the 1978 to 1979’s transformation of whaling policy regulation in Australia started the state’s anti involvement towards whaling (Anton, 2009: 332-335). However the act of 1986 Australian goal, combined with the goal of the IWC and most of its members, was to work towards the protection and conservation of all whales (ibid: 325-326).

It is a fact that whaling can affect the biodiversity and the ecosystem in the ocean. To practice whaling over the required IWC quotas can lead ‘over whaling’ and consequently extinction of many whale species, which cannot be brought back. According to the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and Species Survival Commission’s (SSC) red list, Fin whale is an endangered species (Anton, 2009: 322). Anton argues for Japan’s disrespect towards Fin whales and means that Japanese fishermen catch these whales all the time through Japanese scientific whaling (ibid).

This is possible because of the quotas Japan forced into being accepted by the IWC and for the reason that sometimes ‘the wrong sort of whales’, that is endangered whales, can be caught during whaling (ibid: 321-322). Either way whaling can become a problem for the biodiversity of endangered species, and is with that, an environmental problem. Nevertheless, the problems occurring from the loss of biodiversity are highly difficult to predict and therefore consequences might be risky if effective conservations is not maintained.

As a result of the formulation of problem, the question this study will examine is:

*Why do Australia and Japan have different ambitions on whaling policies and which are the explanatory factors?*

1.2 Theory and Analysis

1.2.1 The Environmental Theory of Huxham - From Anthropocentric to Biocentric
The ambition of this study is to stress the significant differences that Japan and Australia have, combined with explaining these through relevant theories.

In using *environmental political perspectives* the concept concerning whaling may be apprehend, since whaling is affecting the biological diversity and the ecosystem. Hence Huxham’s theory and Carter’s approach towards environmental politics will be studied (Carter, 2007: Chapter 7).

In Huxham’s environmental perspectives it is discussed whether or not the conservation of wild species ought to be held (Huxham *et al.*, 2000: 142-169). The theory has three central arguments: *theocentric*, *anthropocentric* and *biocentric* (ibid: 144-150). This study will include the anthropocentric and biocentric perspectives, considering the theocentric perspective has its foundation in God, which is not relevant for this area of study. Huxham’s environmental perspectives can be interpreted to be a sort of topology and in this specific case of whaling; it is possible to expound this topology into a theory of environmental perspectives (ibid).

The *anthropocentric* perspective lays its focus on man, the human being. (ibid: 144-149). Wild species and plants are used to aid the human being from disease and more clearly, whales would according to the anthropocentric perspective be conserved if they would be able to save human beings. That is if their bodies or what they can produce, will cure human beings from for diseases. Therefore their value is measured in relation to man (ibid).

The *biocentric* perspective lies its focus in values, (ibid: 144-149) more specific in intrinsic values and hence life itself (ibid). If whales are killed, this can affect every other life with intrinsic value on earth: all humans, species and everything that is affecting the ecosystem (ibid). According to Huxham, ecologists like to maintain this thought of intrinsic value in desire to seek a stabilised balance of species, in order to create the best form of biological diversity (ibid: 144-149).

Further the biodiversity and the ecosystem discussion refers to *hypothesis* of the different views of whether to conserve, or not to conserve wild species like whales (ibid: 150-151).

Huxham’s approach to the anthropocentric perspective is combined with the *idiosyncratic response hypothesis*, where some species are more important than others. Some species are not as helpful for human beings and therefore these non-important species can be extinct. The knowledge about species, concerning which ones are important is unknown (ibid).

The second hypothesis, the *redundant species hypothesis* is connected with the biocentric perspective. A balance of the ecosystem is required but the focus does not lie within how many whales there are, but in that they cannot all go lost, hence a stable ecosystem is desirable (ibid: 150-151).

With using Huxham’s environmental theory, Japan and Australia can be examined in order to distinguish the states different approaches on whaling (Huxham *et al.*, 2000: 142-169).
1.2.2 The Environmental Approach of Carter

Like Huxham, the philosophical foundations of environmental politics are mainly understood through anthropocentric and ecocentric (biocentric) perspectives. Carter uses the concept ecocentric instead of Huxham’s biocentric but the content is the same (Huxham et al, 2000: 142-169).

Environmental politics have followed two general theoretical patterns throughout the history according to Carter. The prevailing pattern in the history of environmental politics has been the traditional policy paradigm, which can be considered as a problematic form of policy-making in environmental terms. A new kind of approach has been developed to match up the contradictions within the traditional paradigm. The Sustainable development is a modern effort to match capitalistic economic system and environmental-friendly policies together (ibid).

1.2.3 The Traditional Policy Paradigm

Environmental government policies were earlier reactive, unsystematic and tactical. It was also seen as a discrete unit, which was usually taken care by a specialised agency such as the environmental ministry. One of the biggest reasons was that economic growth was often taking the priority in governmental policy hierarchy, leaving environmental interests outside (Carter 2007: 181-182).

Because the government’s institutional system consisted of separate interest ministries and agencies, environmental issues where not included in all levels of decision-making. The result was often end of pipe solutions where the problem had already taken place and significant consequences had occurred (ibid).

Traditional policy paradigm faces two obstacles: the power of producers and administrative fragmentation. Interest of the state and the policy-makers is usually connected with the interest of the local producers. Governmental policy sectors usually seek consultancy from the producers in the decision-making process, acting against the producers will, would harm the well being and development of the state. This power used by the producers can be divided in three dimensions (ibid: 182-184).

The first is direct power, meaning that A gets B to do such things B would not normally do. In other words, first dimension is a direct influence on the object. The second dimension is the power of suppression where some actors are systematically left out from the decision-making. The third dimension of power can be described as invisible power. Meaning the individual does not notice that something is in control, nor has it the opportunity to resist. Producers can be seen to possess each and every of these power dimensions (Carter, 2007: 182-184).

Administrative fragmentation is connected with the third dimension of power. Producer groups use the institutional system of the government on their advantage. Hence, pluralistic policy making might be problematic if such structures only allow power to certain groups, this problem is being enforced through a traditional political decision making practice called the policy community. The structures of the governmental institutions amplify the power of producers meanwhile cutting out other actors from the policy area (ibid: 186-187).
Traditionally policy communities have been the standpoint for producers to make their effort on decision-making. For instance the ministry of fisheries may speak on behalf of the local fishing industry rather than putting its priority on the conservation of fish stocks or put effort to the development of more environmental friendly fishing methods. Other alternative decision making body is the open issue network where the composition of the body is more plural and open for variable interest groups. Actors are changing constantly rather than favoring a closed membership. The Government’s role can be considered more consultant-like for different competing groups whereas it focuses more on bargaining in close policy communities (Carter 2007: 186-187).

1.2.4 The Policy of Sustainable Development

Whereas traditional policy paradigm faces a conflict between economic and environmental objectives, the concept of sustainable development is an effort to break the tug of war between these two policy areas (Carter 2007: 212). The core elements of the sustainable development are:

1. To satisfy basic human needs and reasonable standards of welfare for all living beings. (Development)
2. To achieve more equitable standards of living both within and among global populations. (Development)
3. To be pursued with great caution as to their actual or potential disruption of biodiversity and the regenerative capacity of nature, both locally and globally. (Sustainability)
4. To be achieved without undermining the possibility for future generations to attain similar standards of living and similar or improved standards of equity. (Sustainability)
   (Carter 2007:213)

The concept of sustainable development used is not an effort to make any universal version of the concept. Sustainable development has numerous different meanings and alterations and no universally central concept exists. However, the ratio of the sustainable development can be measured through the actions and politics used by the designated state (Carter, 2007: 213).

The ideal form of sustainable development does include some core principles. Ideal form emphasizes the philosophy of biocentrism as well. The more anthropocentric the development is, the weaker the level of sustainable development gets (Carter 2007: 214-215). The ideal concept of sustainable development share the following principles:

1. Equity - Because the TPP creates winner and loser, sustainable development promotes global equity amongst nations, the rich and the poor. All should have common but differentiated responsibilities. One of the main tools to achieve environmental goals in every nation regardless of the nation’s development level is to have sustainable consumption. Consumption has to be shared, strengthening, socially responsible and sustainable (Carter 2007: 218-224).
2. **Democracy and participation** - Intergenerational equity and the possibility for the citizens and others affected by the decision to take part in the policy process. Strengthening of the local interests and participation. Transparency and information about the environmental decision-making should be available for everyone in the society (ibid).

3. **Precautionary principle** - Precautionary and secure actions should be taken rather than despise a threat that has no fully scientific proof. Actions should be measured in cost-benefit analysis where external and internal costs are measured as well. Measures taken by the companies should be taken as a “guilty until proven innocent” approach so that the weight is put on the producers before the harm is done (ibid).

4. **Policy integration** - Nature of the environmental problems challenges the governmental institutions because they were established on narrower preoccupations and compartmentalised concerns. More integrated sectorial objectives have to be implemented to reduce fragmentation of the institutional segments (ibid).

5. **Planning** - Like in almost everything, planning has to be made if something is to be accomplished effectively. Right policy instruments are needed to co-ordinate and regulate sustainable development. Governments and non-state actors need to have discourse with each other and all sorts of actions from market intervention to government expenditure should be used to tackle environmental problems (ibid).

As one might think directly, no ideal exists in the real world. As what comes to this paper is to find how near or how far Japan and Australia actually are to reaching this ideals, if at all. With the help of these theory concepts we wish to position these two countries into the theoretical scale presented in the following.

### 1.2.5 Limitations Concerning the Theory of Huxham and the Approach of Carter

Considering Huxham and Carter both lay focuses in environmental political theory, the differentiation must be clarified. This study will use Huxham’s theory with focus on Japan and Australia and to place them onto anthropocentric and biocentric sphere (Huxham *et al*, 2000: 142-169). Out of Carter’s approach, the patterns of traditional policy paradigm and the policy of sustainable development will be used, in order to explain the governmental environmental policy (Carter, 2007: 186-188, 213).

The traditional policy paradigm can be seen as an anthropocentric end where environmental policy making is considered rather insignificant, whilst the policy of sustainable development can as well be implemented through anthropocentric principles (Carter, 2007: 213).
The chart explains how this study will prove the theory of Huxham (Huxham et al, 2000) and the approach of Carter (Carter, 2007) placements onto Japan and Australia. This theory reasoning will be explained further throughout the study.

### 1.3 Method

In attempt to examine Japanese and Australian ambitions in whaling, and to find the ‘key explanatory factors of what differs in the states’ whaling ambitions, this study is comparative in nature, using what Landman would refer to as ‘Most Similar System Design (MSSD)’ (Landman, 2008: 70-71). The policy outcome of Japan and Australia will be y and the explanatory factors will be x.

The ambition of this study is to compare the cultural, the economic and the political factors within the chosen countries in order to find the differences between Japanese and Australian stances on whaling (Landman, 2008: 71).

To some extent, Japan and Australia can be described as similar countries. They both have democratically elected governments and both are among the richest countries in the world. Their economies are competition based free market economies and overall, both can be considered as industrial states. One considerable similarity is also that both have a strong whaling history. Taking these common variables into account, the interesting part is why these two share totally different whaling policies (Little, 2008: 308). Hence, when using a MSSD method, the similarities are neutralised, and the focus lays on the possible explanatory factors, which may differ between countries (Landman, 2008: 71).

In aspiration of using MSSD and Landman’s method, variables such as area studies and political similarities are necessary for a comparative study (Landman, 2008: 6-7, 68-78).
This study will not include statistical data in the form of graphs or diagrams. It will instead focus in describing the causal connection in a qualitative way through text. (ibid: 78-81).

Assuming the policies differ in Australia and Japan, the explanatory factors are chosen out of the awareness of what we would think could explain two different stances on whaling. Therefore the explanatory factors are wide in their areas, but aids us in examining how Japan’s and Australia’s policies on whaling differ, and if it is the cultural, the economic or the political factor that separates the countries’ different opinions on whaling.

Whaling can be considered as an environmental issue, which made us wonder why Japan would continue whaling if it was not for the economic profit or for the cultural factor. Therefore in ambition to understand the different policies, this leads to examining all of these three factors in order to explain the possible influence of the outcome. The following factors are analysed and discussed more explicitly in the discussion and conclusion chapters.

The chart explains how this study will use the MSSD of Landman and how the explanatory factors will be x, and policy outcome in Japan and Australia y. In order to find which x-factor that is the most appropriate explanatory factor, this study will examine both of the chosen countries policies on whaling (Landman, 2008: 71). When finding which x-factor(s) makes the states policies differ, the causal connection between the x and the y will be clear. With this, we can answer why Japan and Australia’s policies on whaling differ and which is/are the explanatory factors.

1.4 Disposition

The theory of Huxham and the approach of Carter will be used in this study to examine the relevant key explanatory factors of the political structure, the
economic system and the culture. These will answer the question of whaling ambitions; hence this study is theory consuming (Bergström et al., 2007: 42).

Of most importance is linking together the method of MSSD as a comparative study, with the chosen theories, in ambition to solve the problem and answer the question.

The purpose of this study is to examine and explain the policy outcome through political structure, economic profitability and the cultural heritage of Japan and Australia (Esaisson, 2007: 20). The purpose is not to analyse which actors have the most influence in the political decision-making process. Our study is focusing on the political structure, the economic and the cultural differences and we do not include other post-research, such as how much influence environmental groups have on the decision-making.

The primary material consist of official scientifical, organisational and governmental publications, whilst the secondary material is scholars’ research concerning whaling (Esaisson, 2007).

With just having one pro-whaling country and one anti-whaling country in the study, it makes it clear that this study is not trying to find the key explanatory factors for pro-whaling and anti-whaling for all the 88 member states within the IWC. The desire is rather to give a ‘thick description’ of Japan and Australia and to illustrate how deeper system differences affect the policy outcome (Landman, 2008: 47). Other significant whaling countries such as Norway and Iceland are left out from the analysis, because these are not involved in the international conflict of the pro versus anti whaling as much as Australia and Japan. Nevertheless, these countries do not disturb any other country’s integrity by practicing whaling on foreign waters (WDCS).
2 Background of Whaling

2.1 The International Whaling Commission

The International Whaling Commission (IWC) is a forum created in 1946, which aspires towards regulating the whaling industry internationally. The current 88 member states have different regional goals and want to legitimise their whaling practices via the IWC (Little, 2008: 308). Nowadays, the IWC has been divided into anti whaling and pro whaling factions. One of the fundamental problems affecting the decision-making within the IWC, is the existence of contradicting goals within its membership. Anti-whalers want to abolish whaling once and for all, whilst pro-whalers want to set quotas on whaling to secure sustainable development within the whaling industry. This study is presenting two of the most influential IWC member countries from both sides of the camps, Japan and Australia (ibid: 308).

In combination with the 1986 IWC moratorium, whaling was divided in three categories: commercial, scientific and aboriginal whaling (WDCS). When a state is practicing commercial whaling, it is allowed to catch whales and use them for its own state purposes. The countries, which have caught and are still catching whales through commercial whaling, are Norway, Iceland and Japan (1986-1988) (ibid).

2.2 Scientific, Commercial and Aboriginal Whaling

Japan stopped commercial whaling in 1988 and began, instead, claiming to catch whales for scientific research using scientific whaling quotas (Andresen, 2002: 388). Before Japan switched from commercial to scientific whaling, the total catch of whales worldwide from the year 1986 to 1987 was over 3000 commercial catches, of which over 2600 of these were Japanese caught (WDCS). After Japan’s withdrawal from commercial whaling to scientific whaling, the commercial catches never exceeded 1000 catches per year (ibid).

Scientific whaling is designed to be used solely for scientific research, which Japan claims their catch is used for (Andresen, 2002: 388). The scientific quotas are different to the commercial quotas. Whilst scientific quotas allow countries that are pro-whaling within the IWC to be more involved in setting these scientific quotas, the commercial quotas do not allow such involvement (WDCS).

The purpose of commercial and scientific quotas in the 1986 IWC moratorium was to make an intense reduction of whaling (WDCS). Since 1994,
Japan alone has caught over 300 ‘scientific whales’ each year, with over 1200 whales in 2005 (ibid).

Aboriginal whaling determines whaling quotas for native groups of people, who are living off whales in order to survive and maintain their primitive and traditional way of life. Native tribes exist in Greenland, Russia, St Vincent, Canada and USA. Since 1985, their catches are all together less than 500 each year (ibid).

During Japan’s transformation in 1987, from commercial to scientific whaling, the state needed some type of plan for the transition. This plan, which the IWC had to accept, was given the name JARPA (Anton, 2009: 321). According to Anton, in 2005 JARPA II was created and “It is widely reported that much of the whale meat generated by JARPA (and now JARPA II) winds up in fish markets and on dinner plates, or even as pet food” (Anton, 2009: 321). This contradicts the goal of IWC’s criteria of scientific whaling and, according to Anton, it seems like Japan use their scientific catch for inaccurate purposes. The catch that ought to be used for scientific research is used for human consumption, which Japan allows to flood through their free market economy (Anton, 2009: 321).

Australia sees whale meat as an unnecessary food resource (Anton, 2009: 337). The fact that Japan uses their scientific catch for commercial profit through the JARPA programme makes the conflict between the two states more powerful and complicated (ibid).

Anton refers to the Exclusive Economic Zone declaration of Australia (EEZ), which was created in 1994 (Anton, 2009: 330). With this act, Australia had the power to regulate this specific exclusive economic ocean zone and protect it from whaling exercised by pro-whaling nations, such as Japan (ibid: 328-329). The only piece of ocean Australia could not and cannot control fully, is the small part of ocean around the Northern Territory (ibid: 329-331).

In 1996 the National Task Force on Whaling was formed (ibid). This act was one more step in the direction of Australia’s advocating anti-whaling, and with that the conflict of pro versus anti whaling tightened (ibid). According to Anton, the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC) formed in 1999 was built up of latter declarations and acts, in ambition to protect the wildlife of nature and the conservation of wild species and whales and to stretch this protection even further than earlier acts and declarations (ibid: 330-332).

2.3 Whaling and Its Effect on the Environment

To understand whaling as an environmental problem, some main characteristics about environmental problems must be explained in general. The following characteristics also illustrate the importance why whaling should be treated as a serious environmental problem. (Carter 2007: 174-180).

Common-pool resources such as whales and fish are open for everybody to exploit especially the area of the high seas that is considered as no mans land. Whales are wild animals owned by nobody and therefore possible for every man to take advantage of the common pool. Main problems such resources faces are over-exploitation and free riding, if no efficient regulative is being created (ibid).
Other problematic characteristics about the whales are *transboundary problems*. Whale stocks move across oceans and national boundaries constantly and therefore create problems in various countries. Regulations and quotas have a direct and indirect influence on the sovereignty of the state that also creates a policy problem (ibid). In other words, no nation can fully control the problem by itself without collaboration with the other states and stakeholders.

The use of whale stocks also creates a problem of *complexity and uncertainty*. Shift in whale population may ignite other unpredictable incidents in other parts of the ecosystem. Nevertheless all whales are different and have their unique diet, which means that some species may be very sensitive on food source alterations such as blue whales are on krill. Other complexity and uncertainty problem is the difficulty to monitor whale population and their interaction with the ecosystem. Because being wild animals having an enormous territory, it is problematic to make any accurate statements or prognosis about their population change. Moreover, whales are facing new environmental challenges such as climate change, pollution and drop in fish populations (ibid).

Because of the complexity of the ecosystem, *irreversibility* is becoming a problem in scarce resource policy. Whales can be over-exploited to the point of extinction where the loss cannot be reversed anymore. Therefore an efficient conservation policy should be implemented to maintain this great natural resource (Carter, 2007: 174-180).
3 Japan

In this part of the study the political structure, the economic and cultural factors will be examined in desire to explain if these might be contributing reasons for why the whaling question differs between Japan and Australia (Landman, 2008: 71).

3.1 The Political Structure of Japan

The Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries of Japan (FA) has since the 1980’s become more and more involved in the diplomatic policy concerning the whaling question (Morikawa, 2009: 56-57). The MAFF controls the daily Japanese whaling agenda within the IWC and the MAFF aided the Japanese government to formulate why the state will continue to be a pro-whaling nation (ibid). These pro-arguments according to the MAFF and the Japanese government are that whales are an important food resource for Japan and that the state wishes to keep its cultural whaling traditions intact (Morikawa, 2009: 56-57). The Japanese government, the MAFF, the Fisheries Agency which is an external arm of the MAFF (ibid: 5-6), the Institute of Cetacean Research (ICR) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) are in unanimous agreement when it comes to their support of whaling. The power lies within the Japanese government and its governmental bodies that regulate what will happen to the future whaling activities of Japan (ibid: 5-6). The MAFF, the FA, the ICR and the MOFA are all governmental cooperatives and they do not let any other interest group of whaling into the political system (ibid: 73-74). The interconnectedness of the Japanese governmental and partly governmental organisations is illustrated down below. However, due to the time and space limitations, we have only represented FA and ICR, which are the biggest tentacles in the MAFF.

Since Japan is a superpower when it comes to economy and industry, it is not remarkable that the state’s impact on the conservation of whales is affecting all the whales, pushing them closer to extinction (Morikawa, 2009: 11-13). Japan wants to increase their political influence in the world but may have a future problem with this; by having such a strong pro opinion to not preserve the conservation of whales; they potentially run the risk of losing respect and credibility in the international arena (ibid: 11-14).
Japan wants to reestablish the commercial whaling within the IWC and work towards no restriction on the commercial quotas (ibid: 82). During the 1986 moratorium, the anti-whaling members within the IWC were in control. This naturally made Japan indecisive in how to act (ibid). The state decided to strengthen their relations with both Norway and Iceland. Despite this, Japan needed more assistance in order to provide the state the ‘freedom’ it once had to practice whaling (ibid). Hence Japan chose to recruit a large amount of new members into the IWC, in order to make these new IWC members to indirect be able to help them with their ‘problem’ by voting pro whaling (ibid). In 2006 Japan created the St Kitts and Nevis Declaration with 29 sponsors states. The purpose of the declaration was and is to reinforce commercial whaling without regulated quotas (ibid). Since 2000, 27 pro member states have joined the IWC on behalf of the indirect effectiveness of Japanese government recruitment. An example of this, which Morikawa pays attention to, is Laos (ibid: 88).

“The People’s Republic of Laos has supported Japan’s quest for a permanent and non permanent seat on the UN Security Council. Also at the IWC, we are participating and are helping support Japan’s deepening relations with the countries of ASEAN [...] [T]he government and people of Japan have continued to aid Laos with aid representing 26 percent of the aid we receive from overseas, thus becoming our republic’s largest aid donor nation” (Morikawa, 2009: 88).

Although Japan would probably deny any sort of involvement in ‘bribing’ Laos to become a pro-member state within the IWC, the quote speaks for itself of what intentions Japan has with supporting Laos with financial aid. This financial aid support from Japan also seems to have occurred with many of the new pro-members within the IWC (ibid). Hence, it proves how strongly Japan feels for whaling and how the state will not give up its pro-whaling ambitions in present time (Morikawa, 2009: 88).
3.2 The Main Argument for Pro-Whaling Japan – The Cultural Aspect

According to Morikawa, whales are not the only species that Japan is inconsiderate with using for various purposes (Morikawa, 2009: 11-13). The state has as late as the 1980’s imported a huge amount of elephant ivory into the country, with numbers exceeding nearly 500 tons (ibid: 12). As Morikawa points out, from the 1970’s to around 1988 the numbers of elephants in the world was cut in half, from 1.3 million to 620,000 (ibid: 12). As well as elephants, Japan is known for using turtle shells and tiger parts for various purposes such as pharmaceuticals and food supplements (ibid). The fact that Japan does not consider the conservation of species, and consequently whales, resounds in anti-whaling states, IGO’s and NGO’s willingness to make the state stop whaling (ibid: 11-13).

It is clear that Japan wants to do whatever it takes to keep their cultural traditions (ibid: 13). Morikawa enlightens by informing us that the whaling tradition in Japan arose in the beginning of the 17th century (ibid: 19). During this era in time, when neither proper technology or proper transportation vehicles to export the whales or ships to catch the whales from existed, whaling was held near the shore line in limited regions and only the whales that did not sink were caught. These ‘floating whales’ were the only possible catch, considering the right equipment for bringing in ‘sinking whales’ into land was non-existent (ibid: 19-20). According to Morikawa, during this period of time, whaling could not make any big impact on the ecosystem, since the catch of whales was simply too small (ibid). Morikawa explains that even though there were regions that were practicing whaling, including Mikawa Bay, Ise, Kishu, Tosa, Kitakyushu, Taiji and Nagato, these regions did not cover a very big part of Japan (ibid). The fact that Japan is claiming the state is whaling because of their supposed strong and national cultural ties with a whaling tradition can be questioned. As a matter of fact, some of the traditional fishing villages and regions opposed the presence of the modern whaling companies because they produced lots of water pollution and the marine resources were depleted nearby the traditional fishing and whaling grounds (ibid: 20-22).

The ICR, created in 1947, is administrated and authorized by the MAFF (ibid: 37). As stated by Morikawa, the ICR’s purpose is “to carry out experiments, research and surveys on cetaceans [...] in order to contribute to the proper management and use of marine resources” (Morikawa, 2009: 38). While this is the ICR’s purpose, the institute receives financial support from its members in forms of member fees that are confidential (ibid). The members are chosen by the board of the ICR on the specific premises of the Japanese governments requirements (ibid). With this, Morikawa underlines that the ICR is indeed not neutral, and the institute’s research and activities are mainly sponsored by the whale meat industry (ibid: 41). Considering the whale meat supply is today, and has been larger than the demand since 2005, the ICR will have trouble surviving if it does not come up with a solution to this financial problem (ibid). Their solution is to sell whale meat to schools all over Japan in order to maintain the existence of the ICR and other actors involved with whaling (ibid: 42-43). This
clearly demonstrates that the ICR and the MAFF are blatantly contradicting the stated purpose of what the Japanese government claims to be their reason for continuing whaling (ibid: 42-43).

A possible solution could be for Japan would be to use the aboriginal quotas of the IWC in the villages that actually have this cultural heritage: Mikawa Bay, Ise, Kishu, Tosa, Kitakyushu, Taiji and Nagato are examples of where this could be justifiably installed (ibid: 19-20). By agreeing to this system of regulation, Japan could avoid in some part, the environmental conflict with the biocentric Australia (Huxham et al, 2000).

3.3 The Economic Explanatory Factor

Morikawa relates to us that the whale meat consumption in Japan has decreased since 2005, with over 4,800 tons left in stock that very same year (Morikawa, 2009: 41). The sale of whale meat is providing financial support mainly for the Japanese government, MAFF and ICR (ibid). Considering the cultural aspect is excluded in this area of the study, the question remains, if the supply is bigger than the demand, why is Japan continuing with whaling?

The Japanese government has been working politically with pro whaling campaigns since 1987. Despite this, the interest of purchasing whale meat has decreased for the past few years (Morikawa, 2009: 121-127). Morikawa implies that the younger generations are not interested in whale meat. They do not have the degree of exposure to such choices as previous generations, which experienced the whale meat school lunch programme comments after 1945 (ibid: 121). This is why the Japanese government, the MAFF and the ICR would like to reintroduce whale meat on the school lunch market, in ambition to enforce the younger generation to be pro-whaling (ibid: 120-123). By doing so Japan can keep claiming that the state is pro-whaling because of their cultural heritage, since the whale meat is being purchased, in spite of who is buying it. If the school lunch plan succeeds in Japan, the state can continue to claim that their pro-whaling actions are legitimised within the IWC, the demand will increase and meet the supply (Morikawa, 2009: 121-127). Therefore the price of the whale meat could be more affordable for public as well. Younger generations in Japan are today not interested in whale meat; they are more affected via various instruments to be informed of the whaling issue. Internet is one of these channels, as well as the growing knowledge of the ecosystem, biodiversity and sustainable development (ibid: 121).
4 Australia

4.1 The Australian Role in the Conflict

Contemporary events between Australia and Japan in whaling wars have gathered broad attention amongst spectators and media across the world for several decades. Even if no armed conflict has occurred between Australian and Japanese authorities, this small policy part of the governmental decision-making erodes countries’ diplomatic relationships (Anton, 2009: 319-330).

These two countries just do not seem to be able to find any temporal or long-term solution on their dispute. Their recent efforts can be described as two pigeons trying to play chess. Both knock over the pieces, poop on the board and go to their pals to brag about their victory. In other words, no collective understanding of the problem exists, nor common goal. After the Second World War both nations however, were active whaling countries (Anton 2009: 325). The question is, what made Japan to hold on whaling and Australia to change itself from a pro whaler to the flagship country of the anti-whalers? This chapter will focus on the Australian part of the coin and tries to illuminate some important political, economic and cultural factors that may have an influence on Australia’s whaling policy.

4.2 From Pro to Anti-Whaling

As stated before, Australia was a whaling nation till 1979, when the total outlawing of the whales within Australia’s national territories was set up by the former prime minister Malcolm Fraser (Epstein 2008: 150). Whaling started in Australia in the eighteenth century and had its peak in the late nineteenth century when steam powered ships and explosive harpoons where invented. At that time, whaling was actually the primary industry in Australia. Due to the technological development the whale stocks where effectively over exploited and finally nearly depleted. Supply of the whales had its negative impact on the whaling industry and therefore the first regulative national laws were applied (DSEWPC, 2010).
4.3 The Environmental Resistance of Pro-Whaling

In the 1970’s only one whaling station was left in Australia. As public concerns about the whales grew and the whale stocks kept decreasing, environmental movements started to flourish and effected the Australian government’s whaling policies between 1960 and 1970. Environmental movement groups such as Project Jonah and Friends of the Earth were mainly focusing on public opinions instead of directly lobbying the government officials. This may have resulted as a momentum for overall pressure from the Australian public to stop whaling (Fraser, 2010: 570).

In the end of the 1970’s, almost 70% of the Australians were against whaling and later on the Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser implemented a national inquiry on whaling. As a result, the ban on whaling received scientific reliability instead of only humane sympathies (Epstein, 2008: 149-150). Within couple of years Australian whaling policies were changed totally and the nation was in favour to save the whales instead of hunting them. Thereafter the nation has moved towards more intensive conservation policies and started to take the role of the leading anti-whaling country in the international stage (ibid).

With making anti whaling declarations such as the EEZ 1994, the National Task Force on Whaling 1996, and the EPBC 1999 Australia’s government is clear with that the country is just not anti whaling, Australia wants, as well, to put an end to this inconsiderate non conservation of species, which has no concern for the intrinsic values of the whales (Anton, 2009: 330-335). How come this change in policies happened so fast and why did Australia take such strong standpoints against whaling?

4.4 The Political Explanatory Factor

Japan’s political power is concentrated in the national government and Australia has deployed a constitutional ‘federal’ state system after the unification of the six British colonial states. The political power is shared between the state governments and the Commonwealth Government also known as the Australian Government (AG, 2010).

The decision making process in Australia takes place on both vertical and horizontal axis. The federal system allows states and local governments to have more sovereign role in environmental decision-making (Ross 2008: 150-160). The decentralised system may also be reason for why other stakeholders possess a significant influence in different problem areas and interest groups have better access to consult administrative bodies in policies affecting the environment (ibid).
Distinguished from the Japanese tradition, whale issues are mainly administered by The Australian Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (DSEWPC). That might be explained because Japan still has an active whaling industry where MAFF is the representative of the producers whereas Australia has no other industry around whales than whale watching. Although the Australian government is the defining body of the political system, other actors play a big role in the political arena concerning the whaling question, such as the Local Governments, NGO’s as Greenpeace (Japan) and the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society (SSCS, 2010).
5 Discussion

5.1 The Explanatory Factors

Out of the three explanatory factors concerning the area of study, one of these proved to be the main reason for why the whaling policies between Japan and Australia differ. After examining how whaling is approached in both states, the most relevant explanatory factor for this study turned out to be the political structure system (Landman, 2008: 68-78).

5.2 The Cultural Factor

The cultural explanatory factor which Japan claims as its main argument for pro-whaling, has exposed its lack of substance. Morikawa states that only a few fishing villages in Japan have been whaling since the 17th century using traditional practices and therefore the cultural factor is excluded. The fact that whale meat has not been purchased on a regular basis since 2005 with large surplus stock proves that the Japanese citizens have got a falsely inflated request for the whale meat (Morikawa, 2009: 11-20).

Compared to Japan, Australia’s whaling culture has been very different. Whale meat has never obtained a great foothold in Australian cuisine or economy that is likely due to the unstable seasonal catches in times of modern whaling. The scarcity of the whale stocks were also denoted quite clearly around Australian waters which perhaps made the public more aware of the real vulnerability of whale population. Australia’s whale meat eating culture was even more non-existant than Japan’s. Maybe the primary reason to hunt whales was whale oil and other substances used in various industrial manufacturing. Therefore, no cultural factors affected Australia’s change in whaling policies (Ross, 2008: 254-257).

5.3 The Economic Factor

The fact that the supply of whale meat exceeds the demand in Japan allows us to discuss the economic factor. The Japanese government is attempting to enforce the whale meat on to school lunch programmes, in order to increase the demand
(Morikawa, 2009: 41). If the school lunch’s programme would increase the demand for whale meat, Japan can keep claiming that the state is pro-whaling for their cultural heritage and their whaling practices can be more legitimised within the IWC. It is possible that the Japanese government wants to make money from whaling, however the economic factor is not enough to answer the area of study and therefore is a weak explanatory factor (Morikawa, 2009: 41, 121-127).

Australia’s whaling has differed from the Japanese in purpose as well. Whale meat has never been a significant good on the food market. As whaling stocks were being severely depleted in the beginning of the 20th century and the demand for the whale goods decreased, it did not prove economically feasible to sustain the whaling industry. The remaining whaling industry in Australia lacked economic and political influence and power, it was a relatively easy task for other interest groups and policies to paint as outdated (Ross, 2008: 251-257).

5.4 The Political Factor

Japan is pro-whaling and any involvement of anti-whaling within the political system is not accepted. The MAFF, FA, ICR and MOFA of Japan, are all working under the Japanese government and no other organisations, activists or citizens can exercise power in the whaling issue (Morikawa, 2009: 73-74). Australia’s political power is shared within the state’s structure, the local governments and the NGO’s that can influence the state government and the Commonwealth Government (Ross, 2008: 251-257).

Whilst Japan’s system is more centralised, Australia’s political structure is decentralised, hence it is federal. Japan has one governmental decisive body, which controls the whaling in their direction; this is not the case for Australia considering the political power is divided. Therefore even if one of Australia’s state governments would choose to be pro-whaling, there is a good chance that the rest of the governmental institutions would not accept it. If Japan would decide to be pro-whaling, this process would be easy for the Japanese government to push through, considering the government obtains sole political power (Morikawa, 2009: 5-6, 56-57).

The political systems differ between the two states and the whaling policies have a tendency to differ as well. Having a system like Japan, where simply one is in charge of power is different than having a federal system like Australia, where many have a possibility to affect the whaling policy and the power within the country. Therefore the political system structure is most appropriate for explaining why the whaling policies differ between Japan and Australia (Ross, 2008: 251-257).

5.5 The Anthropocentric Japan

Through Huxham’s environmental perspective, Japan is non considerate towards the intrinsic value of the whales, but rather for human beings itself (Huxham et al, 2000: 142-169). Hence Japan as a state can be identified with the
anthropocentric perspective, where the state through Huxham’s idiosyncratic response hypothesis argues that: Japan does not need whales for any ‘specific’ reason such as medical care, not today and not in the coming future (ibid). The Japanese government argues that whales are not a threatened species anymore and has not been since the 1970’s and if Japan could not practice whaling, the Japanese traditions would go lost (Anton, 2009: 142-169). This was established in 1987 when Japan changed from commercial, to scientific whaling, since the state wanted to affect the scientific quotas, something it was unable to do in commercial whaling (WDCS).

“In Japan, Norway and Iceland, people can enjoy both watching whale and eating whale. Again, the purpose of Japanese whaling is not to extinct whale resources but to achieve the sustainable use of the ocean resources. We recognize that we have to encourage conserving whales, and we have been doing it for many years. Actually, Japan has been the leading country in terms of the conservation of whales.” (The Fisheries Agency of Japan, 2009).

The lack of intrinsic value in whales, is also proved in JARPA I and II, where the Japanese demonstrate a lack of consideration toward the whale catch, meaning, the whales that Japan catches can become endangered species which already lie near extinction, like fin whales (Anton, 2009: 319-330). The rest of the Japanese official statements can be considered as anthropocentric and the relation with the whales might be difficult to understand for westernised cultures (Huxham et al, 2000: 142-169).

5.6 The Biocentric Australia

On the other hand, the state of Australia cares about whales and want to protect them from being extinct, therefore Australia theoretically opine that whales have an intrinsic value (ibid). The redundant species hypothesis fits into Australia’s government’s reasoning of conserving the whales, in their ambition to not lose any whale species (ibid). The state argues, with Japan’s impact of severe damages to biodiversity and the ecosystem, that it is instead trying to prevent whaling, implemented through different declarations and acts such as the EEZ (1994), the National Task Force on Whaling (1996) and the EPBC (1999) (Anton, 2009: 330-332). Hence Australia can be referred to be following the biocentric environmental perspective and the redundant species hypothesis where the stabilisation of the ecosystem is desirable (Huxham et al, 2000: 150-151).

“Since industrial whaling emerged in the 17th century, over a million whales have been killed globally. This scale of whaling has severely impacted most whale populations and significantly changed their ecological role within the broader marine environment. Whales are key species within an ecosystem, playing an important role in nutrient cycling and are often viewed as an indicator of ecosystem health.” (DSEWPC, 2010).

It can be confusing to draw conclusions on which philosophy Australia represents. Official government statements emphasize the economic value of the whale watching and, at the same time the intrinsic value of the whales within the ecosystem (DSEWPC, 2010).
5.7 The Traditional Policy Paradigm and The Policy of Sustainable Development

Japan and Australia do differ when it comes to policy; the former is following mainly the path of the traditional policy paradigm, whilst the latter is following the policy of sustainable development (Carter, 2007: 186-187, 213). Although Japan argues on behalf of sustainable use of whale stocks their political institutions are mainly constructions of traditional policy paradigm. In the following the discussions of how these different paradigms are appeared, in Japan and Australia.

Firstly, there are two challenges, which have a significant impact on the result of whaling policies stated in the theory chapter; administrative fragmentation and the power of the producers. These two challenges are presented on to the traditional policy paradigm and sustainable development. The difference is how these obstacles are taken cared of. It might be difficult to say how the causality works between these two challenges because administrative fragmentation can be the cause for overly strong power of the producer and the other way around (Carter, 2007: 182-184).

5.8 The Japanese Traditional Policy Paradigm

In Japan, it is clear that whaling policies are performed through static and closed policy communities. The Governmental agencies, the non-governmental agencies and the whaling industry are sharing the same interests and employees. The healthier the industry is, the more importance and supportive the MAFF and other agencies such as the FA and the ICR receive. The Japanese Amakudari can be considered as one of the main reasons why such nepotism and power elite exists amongst organisations, considering they are all having close relationships with the official government (Morikawa, 2009: 67-68).

The Amakudari (descend from heaven) is a retirement system where government officials take extended careers after the retirement in non-governmental or partly governmental organisations. The old government bureaucrats are usually taking high directorial positions and enjoy great respect in their tasks. The former government officials have great significance and influence in their tasks and can therefore secure larger subsidies and attention from the government (Kagawa-Fox, 2009).

This system allows a very static and closed political system where certain elites steer the direction of the decisions. Another factor, which affects the closed Japanese community system, is how the information and influence is moved within the government agencies and ministries. This phenomenon occurs through cross posting. When the whaling issue is on the table, the FA sends its staff to the MOFA and therefore secures its control on the whaling issue. Because MAFF and FA hold the greatest intelligence on whaling issues, other ministries do not have the opportunity to make they speak their mind. In other words, the interest of the FA prevails because its staff in the end makes decisions
in other governmental institutions, or at least has the greatest influence (Morikawa, 2009: 7-9).

Another obstacle for environmental policy making in Japan is the power of producers. As stated before, the administrative fragmentation allows the producers to gain hegemony interest within the decision-making bodies in Japan. When the Japanese governmental and partly governmental organisations are dependent on the whaling industry’s health, and the whaling industry is dependent on the whole sale and subsidies, the interests between these two parties are in harmonious disposition. They have become reinforcing and therefore it is hard to break their cooperation by other internal or external actors. The administrative system of Japan favors the status quo in decision-making and thus makes the political change difficult (Carter, 2007:187).

The three dimensions of power from the traditional policy paradigm are used by producers and bureaucrats in Japanese whaling policies:

1. Japanese whaling institutions and industry use direct power to influence Japan’s public policy on whaling.

2. Institutions and the industry possess the second dimension of power as well when the decisions are made in a closed policy community. The government will not accept any anti-whaling influence and the anti-actors within the country feel that the pro-whaling government is too powerful to beat.

3. Japanese closed policy paradigm can be argued to possess invisible power towards the Japanese public in way they manipulate their perspectives on whale meat. In fact, the institutions themselves are mainly following the traditional system and enforcing the status quo if the decisions represent only the interest of the political elite and the industry (Carter, 2007: 183-184).

5.9 The Australian Policy of Sustainable Development

In Australia’s case the fundamental factor that varies from Japan is its federal system, as mentioned. It could be speculated that it is impetus why strong policy communities does not exist in whaling matters in Australia and the decision-making process is relatively plural compared with Japan. The more open political structure is allowed, the more public interests rise and influence the whole commonwealth policy. When it comes to Australia’s whaling policies, the question is how high up it is positioned on the sustainable development ladder. As stated in the theory chapter, sustainable development does have certain common principles: Equity, Democracy and Participation, Precaution, Policy Integration and Planning.

It is important to view the Australian environmental policy mechanism, considering whaling has been a part of the environmental decision making process. It follows the same pattern as other policies made concerning biodiversity and conservation. In Australia, the environmental policymaking takes place in a vertical dimension between Commonwealth/State/Territory
governments. The Commonwealth Government has no direct intervention power on the environmental policy making of State Governments but an agreement on common environmental principles (Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment) is compromised between the commonwealth and State/Territory governments. In other words, putting the principles in practice is left for the State and Territories. Therefore the existence of the common principles does affect the mutual policies made in the states and territories (Ross, 2008: 145-160).

Australian policy making mechanism on environmental issues is comparable with Carters open issue network, which is operated by the ad hoc principle. The government’s role is mainly to consult stakeholders and other interest groups (Ross, 2008: 145-160). There has been criticism that producers still possess relatively more power in policymaking process, and the economic interests have higher priority, although this was not the case in whaling. Some confrontation did occur from the producer’s side but due to the open issue network no such self-enforcing dynamic what happens in Japan took place (ibid).

Australia’s level of sustainability in whaling policies is eminently placed. It does allow greater equity, democracy and participation due to a more open and federal system where the turnover of the administrative officials is presumably better than in the Japanese Amakudari system. The decision to stop whaling was also following the principle of precaution. Even though the scientific proof was not “comprehensive” concerning the whale population, Australia was decisive to stop it. The mentality was clearly “Better safe than sorry”. The planning of the conservation policies in Australia has had its positive impact. What is left to criticise the system, is that it might lack long-term certainty because of the rapidly changing policy elite (Ross, 2008: 145-160).
6 Conclusion

We have now compared the different factors between Japan and Australia and discussed the differences that can be used for the explanation for the different policy outcomes. The ambition has been to explain why Japan and Australia have become juxtaposed with one another and what could be the best explanation to this. Three explanatory factors have been studied: cultural, economic and political. For Australia, the approach on whaling has become strictly opposed and the government has taken serious efforts to conserve whale species domestically and internationally. Nevertheless, some environmental activist organisations, such as the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society are allowed to take rather harsh measures against Japanese whalers on Australian territorial waters. Japan on the other hand has become the leader of the ‘pro-whaling club’ and is vigourously trying to convince other nations to join their side of the playground. Japan’s whaling practices are also getting the most attention and criticism from the international community.

We have concluded that Australia never had a strong national culture concerning whaling. Although it was an important industry centuries ago, it still did not acquire any significant role among the Australian people. The economic profit from the whale products faded during the industrialisation and the depletion of the whale stocks cut down the once so mighty industry. The absence of the economic profit and strong whaling culture surely has been a lubricant for Australia to change their policies to more intensive conservation policies. However, the policy change and the contemporary conservation policies are yet to be explained through the political structure of the Australian administrative bodies. The Federal system has allowed more plural and fluctuating governance where open issue networks have been created. Strong policy integration has been implemented on the vertical and horizontal axis and environmental conservation policies have gained a more important role within various policy areas. Therefore, the political structure has allowed Australia to follow a stronger sustainable development policy and the state can give an intrinsic value on the environment, as well as on the intrinsic values of whales.

Japan on the other hand has used cultural and economic arguments to legitimise their whaling actions. As we have discovered, whaling cannot be considered as a cultural heritage in Japan, nor has it any economic advantage for the whole nation. In fact, the industry is heavily subsidised and supports only its employees and small groups of people involved with whaling. As in Australia, the most significant factor to explain Japanese policy outcome is through the state’s political structure. The closed policy communities are giving impetus to traditional policy paradigm and vice versa combined with the Amakudari system giving the allowance to the whaling industry and government officials to have a comfortable relationship with each other. Japan’s perspective on whales is fiercely kept and marketed as anthropocentric.

To answer our question, Australia and Japan has different whaling policies mostly because their political structure is different. With exploring cultural,
economic and political factors, we can come to the conclusion that the political structure of the government is the most fundamental factor to explain the policy differences. The political systems in both states allow and restrict different actors and stakeholders to hold and execute their influence over issues concerning whales.
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