

Chapter 5

HUNTING AND THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF ABORIGINAL SUBSISTENCE WHALING

The remote communities of the circumpolar north face challenges in finding forms of sustainability that are possible within local and regional diversified economies. By emphasising the importance of indigenous knowledge attempts are made to establish small-scale locally-based economies as a way of escaping cycles of boom and bust, to overcome constraints to self-determination and seize opportunities for local empowerment. Both this and the following chapter provide examples from Greenland and Alaska that contribute to discussion about the enhancement of political, economic and cultural sustainability in the circumpolar north through expansion of informal economic activities. This chapter examines aspects of the aboriginal subsistence whaling issue as an example of co-management and how the development of renewable resources is seen as a way of constituting a sustainable economic base, while Chapter 6 focuses on the involvement of indigenous peoples in tourism.

The hunting of seals, whales and other sea mammals provides the mainstay for many Inuit coastal communities in Greenland, Canada, Alaska and Chukotka. Sea mammals are not only a vital source of meat necessary for satisfying dietary, nutritional and economic needs. Like all other forms of subsistence activity vital to the production and reproduction of Inuit culture, sea mammal hunting also has powerful ideological and symbolic value (Nuttall 1992, Wenzel 1991). And as Caulfield (1997) and (Dahl 1990) have observed of whaling in Greenland, its significance lies in the contribution it makes for the continuity and cultural viability of local communities. But for all its obvious cultural importance as a subsistence activity, indigenous peoples are looking to the hunting of marine mammals as a way to enhance opportunities for economic development. It is this which has placed aboriginal subsistence whaling at the very centre of debate over appropriate approaches to conservation and renewable resource harvesting in the Arctic. On the one hand, indigenous peoples claim the right both to continue whaling and to develop domestic and international markets for whale products. On the other hand, environmentalists and animal-rights groups express concern over depleting whale stocks and abhorrence at the commercial nature of whaling.

In recent decades, owing to intensive commercial whaling by non-Native peoples, many Arctic whale species have become seriously endangered or

threatened. Whaling has become one of the most potent symbols for conservationists of the negative aspects of the human exploitation of the natural world. But just as commercial whaling has declined as an economic activity, so Inuit subsistence whaling has attracted more attention over the last few years from the International Whaling Commission (IWC) and environmental organisations concerned with whale conservation. As a consequence, aboriginal subsistence whaling faces increased regulation, while the very meanings of aboriginality and subsistence are undergoing critical re-evaluation and rethinking.

By way of response Inuit themselves have acted to counter the extent of management by the IWC and currently exercise a degree of control over the regulation and management of subsistence whaling. Inuit have formed their own organisations concerned specifically with the importance of subsistence activities for the survival of Inuit culture, or co-operate with other whaling communities in marginal areas to produce community-based strategies for whale management. These organisations, namely the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC), the Greenland Association of Fishermen and Hunters (KNAPK), the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC), and the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO) work to ensure that subsistence whaling in the Arctic is monitored and controlled by and for the communities that depend on it, thereby safeguarding its future. This work has set a precedent for the management of marine resources by and for indigenous peoples elsewhere, for example Inuit in Chukotka, and demonstrates how indigenous knowledge may be used to feed into political action. Whales and whaling have assumed symbolic potency as indigenous peoples claim the right to hunt marine mammals in a sustainable way.

After outlining the main issues, I examine subsistence whaling in Greenland as a specific case study. Because of the complexity of cultural and political meanings associated with marine mammal hunting in Greenland, and because the country is undergoing tremendous political, cultural and economic transformation, local and national understandings of resource use, and of traditional and culture are diverse and often contested. In turn these changes influence how whale management bodies, conservationists and environmental organisations perceive and interpret the contemporary nature of subsistence hunting.

PARTICIPATION AND CO-MANAGEMENT

Since Brokensha *et al's* (1980) seminal volume on indigenous knowledge, a steadily expanding literature on the sociology and anthropology of development argues and stresses the need for the increased participation of local

people and the incorporation of their knowledge in the defining, working out and implementation of resource management programmes that affect their communities and their ways of life (for examples of recent work see Agrawal 1995, Chokor 1994, Dewalt 1994, Osunade 1994a, 1994b, Warren *et al.*, 1995). Rejecting a simplistic distinction between human settlement and the natural environment, and critical of the dominance of scientific management, supporters of participatory approaches tackle questions of how human knowledge of the environment is actually constructed, and demonstrate how it used as a foundation upon which decisions relating to the effective local management of natural resources are made.

In many parts of the Arctic, Africa and India, for example, it has been demonstrated by anthropologists and development economists that environmental and development projects are more likely to succeed if a participatory approach is adopted, and indeed when a degree of decision-making power is given to local communities (e.g. Drijver 1992, Freeman and Carbyn 1988). Anthropologists have shown how local communities have their own pest-control methods or forest regeneration strategies, their own effective systems of soil classification and fertility management, or have pointed out that religion and ritual is important for conserving the environment. Explicit in much of the literature is the suggestion that local economic practices are environmentally benign. As Wolfe (n.d.: 12) has observed of seal and sea lion hunting in Alaska,

we find that only a small number of potential hunters actually hunted seals and sea lions; that harvest levels were intentionally limited, substantially below production potentials; that many hunters chose not to hunt sea lion at all; that many hunters intentionally selected for adult seals and adolescent sea lions and chose to protect pups and pregnant females; and that hunter-seal interactions resulted in the selection of males over females. All these practices may have good conservation effects.

Furthermore, as Wolfe (1989: 18) has also argued,

Most subsistence communities have customary rules for treating the land and the ecosystem. These rules have been passed on through the generations: "Do not waste," "Take only what is needed," "Treat the animals with respect," "Do not damage the land without cause", among others. It is believed that if the rules are followed, then the land will continue to provide. Subsistence peoples are the original conservationists, although they may not use the word, because their very lives depend on it.

The claim then, and as was discussed in Chapter 4, is that indigenous peoples have first-hand knowledge of ecological relationships and are good managers of common-property resources. Ideally, when a participatory approach is adopted, officials of environmental and development agencies

act as catalysts, intermediaries and advisers (Drijver *ibid.* 133), aiming to let local people define and work out projects, plans and sustainable management schemes that would best meet their own needs and incorporate local systems of management. The incorporation of indigenous knowledge into resource management regimes allows managers to gain more insight into patterns of change in local production systems, whether those changes are the result of climatic factors, technological innovations, or fluctuations in the population dynamics and ecosystem interactions of the resource.

In many cases the inclusion of indigenous communities in Arctic resource management has met with a remarkable degree of success, despite the difficulties of incorporating indigenous knowledge into co-management systems (see Chapter 7). For example, co-operative wildlife management schemes have been effective for several years in Canada and Alaska (e.g. Berkes 1982, Freeman 1989), ensuring the continuity of local subsistence activities. Usher (1995: 197) defines co-management as

institutional arrangements whereby governments and aboriginal entities (and sometimes other parties) enter into formal agreements specifying their respective rights, powers and obligations with respect to the management and allocation of resources in a particular area. Co-management is a form of power sharing, although the relative balance and the means of implementation vary from case to case.

The argument put forward for the co-management of wildlife is that by integrating indigenous knowledge and Western scientific knowledge, the resulting resource management system is better informed and suited to the resource, the people who rely on it, and to the needs of scientists and conservationists (e.g. Berkes *et al.* 1991). Much of this has been based on principles of power-sharing, with the creation of wildlife commissions and boards made up of representatives from indigenous communities and state, federal and provincial agencies. Success stories include the co-management of caribou herds in Canada's Northwest Territories, waterfowl management schemes in southwest Alaska, and indigenous whaling in northern Alaska and Greenland. Co-management programmes have also transcended national boundaries, such as a polar bear management agreement between the United States and Russia which involves both governments as well as indigenous associations in Alaska and Chukotka.

Despite the success of some participatory approaches to the management of subsistence hunting in the Arctic, community-based approaches to environmental management and the use of indigenous knowledge are not without their problems. As Usher (1995) points out, co-management arrangements are more likely to succeed and further the local community interest if they

are central features of comprehensive land claims agreements, rather than ad hoc, or temporary co-management arrangements. Co-management does not necessarily mean that local user groups are involved in the planning process from the beginning and wildlife management is still often considered to be the primary responsibility of the state, with regimes and systems defined and implemented according to scientific advice.

Any form of co-management, however, will only work if there is a shared understanding in a community of what management is and if efforts are made to include gender and generational aspects of indigenous knowledge (see Chapter 7). Whatever the institutional arrangement, conservation and management remain concepts and approaches defined and shrouded in technical and scientific language, which are often difficult to translate to an aboriginal context. Similarly, it is also often a problem to translate aboriginal concepts so that they make sense in terms of a Western scientific paradigm. Co-management is, as Usher (*ibid.*: 205) points out a compromise, 'much less than self-determination or self-regulation, which is what many aboriginal harvesters actually want'. For indigenous peoples the success of co-management regimes will be measured in terms of how far they not only conserve the resource and at the same time allow continued harvesting, but how far they will allow expansion and development of the mixed economies of Arctic communities, as will be explored in the rest of this chapter.

INTERNATIONAL REGULATION OF WHALING

World-wide, during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, intensification of commercial whaling by nations such as Great Britain, Holland, the United States, and Norway, together with developments in whaling technology, resulted in the depletion of whale stocks. This over exploitation occurred at a time when whale oil was required for a variety of industrial purposes. Traditionally, commercial whaling was unregulated and no quotas were imposed on the numbers of whales to be taken. The method involved exhausting the whaling grounds and then moving on to new areas. While the Atlantic Gray is believed to have become the only species of whale to have become extinct because of this kind of intensive exploitation (Freeman 1990), the management of commercial whaling became a necessity, in order to protect both whales and the industry.

The International Whaling Commission (IWC) was set up in 1946, at a time of expansion in the whaling industry, as a regulatory body to ensure against the mismanagement of whaling and the depletion of whale stocks.

Its remit was to serve the interests of commercial whaling and ensure its continuity by managing the resource. However, in the 1970s and 1980s increased international opposition from environmentalists and non-whaling nations towards whaling politicised the issue of whale management and led to the IWC imposing a moratorium on commercial whaling from 1986. At its annual meeting in 1993 in Kyoto, Japan, the IWC decided to extend the moratorium for a further year, although Norway defied the ban and claimed the right to resume hunting for minke whales and to set its own national catch limits for its coastal whaling operations. This again precipitated opposition from environmental organisations and from animal-rights and animal welfare groups who argue that killing whales is immoral and offensive and a threat to the natural world.

So far, the moratorium on commercial whaling has not been lifted at subsequent IWC meetings and small-type coastal whaling has come to dominate much of the organisation's deliberations. At the annual meeting in Aberdeen in 1996, the IWC agreed to hold a workshop to consider the importance in commercial and socio-economic terms of community-based whaling in Japan's four coastal whaling communities, an issue that looks likely to remain unresolved for some time. Significantly, the IWC delegates could not reach a consensus on a proposal submitted by the Makah Indian Tribe of the north-western United States to allow them to hunt five gray whales, nor on a request by indigenous peoples from Chukotka to take five bowhead whales. Russia withdrew its request for a quota of five bowheads when it became clear that it would not achieve a clear majority and later announced that, regardless of IWC recommendations, it would allow indigenous communities in Chukotka to catch two bowhead whales.

At the 1997 meeting in Monaco the IWC allowed the Makah to kill four whales during the 1998 whaling season, a decision that was not without some controversy. The Makah had not hunted whales for over seventy years and argued for a resumption of whaling on cultural grounds. Tribal leaders had argued that hunting whales once more would help Makah communities reclaim part of their heritage, rediscover aspects of cultural identity and strengthen tribal ties in order to offset social problems caused by alcoholism, unemployment, violence and crime. Opposition to the Makah resuming whaling came from conservationists who claim that the Makah do not, unlike Inuit communities, need to hunt whales to provide for subsistence needs and fear that the meat will be sold to Japanese restaurants. Critics also say that the decision breaks the IWC provisions for aboriginal subsistence whaling and has set a precedent for Canadian tribes from the Pacific coast who also wish to resume whaling and will now seek a similar 'cultural quota'.

Whatever the moral and ethical arguments over species survival and environmental damage, many coastal communities in the Arctic depend on whaling and hunting of other marine mammals for subsistence. Indeed, for the Inuit, subsistence hunting of marine mammals such as seals and whales provides the only, or sole means of survival in some areas. Recognising this, the IWC has, since its foundation, authorised aboriginal subsistence whaling and has so far exempted it from any moratorium (with one exception, as will be discussed below). The IWC (IWC 1981: 83) defines aboriginal subsistence whaling as

whaling for the purposes of local aboriginal consumption carried out by or on behalf of aboriginal, indigenous or native peoples who share strong community, familial, social and cultural ties related to a continuing traditional dependence on whaling and the use of whales.

Local aboriginal consumption means the traditional uses of whale products by local aboriginal, indigenous or native communities in meeting their nutritional, subsistence and cultural requirements. The term includes trade in items which are by-products of subsistence catches....Subsistence catches are catches of whales by aboriginal subsistence whaling operations.

When coming up with this definition, the IWC Ad Hoc Technical Committee Working Group on the development of management principles for aboriginal subsistence whaling was divided over the application of separate management guidelines that would apply to aboriginal subsistence whaling and commercial whaling. Because both types of whaling involve the same kind of interaction between humans and whales, and as it could be argued that commercial whaling is deep-rooted in the history of whaling nations just as subsistence whaling is embedded within the cultural life of indigenous peoples, some members of the Committee argued that the same principles and management objectives should apply to both forms (IWC 1981). Other Committee members argued that there was a qualitative as well as quantitative difference between the two types of whaling. Put simply, commercial whaling is intensive, large-scale, and potentially unsustainable if mismanaged. Commercial whaling also aims to maximise profits. Subsistence whaling, on the other hand, is considered to be small-scale, sustainable and aimed at satisfying local needs. Furthermore, there is no profit incentive that drives subsistence whaling—it is inextricably linked to and underpins the culture and economy of aboriginal peoples.

The IWC definition of subsistence fails to take account of the complex interplay between informal and formal economic activities. A more encompassing definition of subsistence would be Ellen's view that it is 'all the uses to which a species may be put' (1982: 175), while a mode of subsistence

would be, again following Ellen (1988: 133), 'the aggregate of extractive processes characterising a particular population'. In this sense, subsistence is a way of life bound up with the harvesting of renewable resources. Subsistence encapsulates an intricate web of human-environmental relations, irrespective of what kinds of technology are used, or whether the food that is produced is consumed by the hunters and his household directly, or whether it is shared, traded or sold beyond the local community.

However, while acknowledging the importance of whaling for Inuit, the IWC has not allowed it to continue unregulated. In particular, the IWC has been concerned in recent years with the exploitation of the humpback whale by Greenlanders, the Beaufort Sea bowhead whale by Alaskan Inupiat and Yup'ik Eskimos, and the Eastern Pacific gray whale hunted by Siberian Inuit. Since 1985 the IWC has not allocated any quota for humpback whaling in Greenland, but the hunting of both fin and minke whales by Greenlanders is subject to a quota system. Canada withdrew from the IWC in 1982 and bowhead whaling was resumed by Inuvialuit in the western Canadian Arctic in 1991 (Freeman *et al.* 1992). Inuvialuit hunters landed a male bowhead whale off the eastern Beaufort Sea, and the meat was distributed to all six Inuvialuit communities within the region. The hunting of beluga whales and narwhals, which takes place mainly in Greenland and the Canadian East Arctic, is not currently regulated, but a real possibility exists that a quota system may be imposed in the future, despite doubts cast on the IWC that it has the expertise to manage hunting of small cetaceans. Problems may also arise because Canada is not a member of the IWC. The West Greenland wintering population of beluga has declined by 30 percent over the last decade, with Baffin Bay stocks declining by 60 percent over the same period (Mikkelsen 1996). The threat of the imposition of quotas for belugas and narwhals rests on a 'rational' science-based management approach that does not consider the hunting of whales by Inuit to be self-regulatory. Regardless of any possible IWC interest in beluga hunting, the Greenland Home Rule authorities intend to impose quotas for belugas on the recommendation of a Joint Greenland-Canada Commission on Beluga and Narwhal report, reducing the numbers taken from about 769 a year to 250 a year. It has been suggested that IWC interest in aboriginal subsistence whaling has increased precisely because the IWC's role in regulating commercial whaling has diminished since the moratorium was imposed in 1986 (Faegteborg 1990: 124-125). Faced with the demise of commercial whaling, or with the refusal of whaling nations such as Iceland and Norway to comply with its recommendations and management procedures, the IWC is casting around for a new role as a regulatory body.

The IWC affected Inuit subsistence whaling directly in 1977, when it removed the hunting of the bowhead whale by Alaskan Eskimos from its exemption for aboriginal whaling and imposed a moratorium. This resulted from IWC concern over scientific evidence which suggested declining numbers of bowhead whales in the Beaufort Sea, together with pressure from North American and European conservationist organisations. The response of the nine Inupiat and Yup'ik Eskimo villages dependent on the bowhead was swift, and led to the formation of an indigenous organisation, the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC), to fight to have the moratorium lifted. Essentially, the AEWC disagreed with the IWC estimate of less than one thousand bowheads and, determined that whaling should continue, undertook its own biological studies and census projects.

Based on these studies, and combining indigenous knowledge of whales and whaling, the AEWC argued that the Beaufort Sea bowhead population probably numbered over ten thousand, and that continued hunting could not possibly harm stocks (Chance 1990: 177). Immediately, the AEWC drew up its own management plan, in collaboration with the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and in 1978 the IWC agreed to lift the moratorium and allowed the Alaskan whaling communities a kill of twelve whales annually, or a strike of eighteen whales. While annual quotas are still set by the IWC, the AEWC are responsible for observing and actually managing the quota, and for providing the NOAA with information on each whaling venture collected from the whaling captains. The result has been regarded as a successful co-management programme because, here at least, indigenous environmental knowledge and traditional resource management has been taken seriously by advocates of rational science-based systems (Freeman 1989a). By integrating indigenous knowledge and western science the resulting resource management system for Alaskan bowhead whaling is better informed and better suited to the protection of the whale stocks, the needs of Alaska's Eskimos and to the needs of scientists and conservationists.

The success of the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission and its politically advanced view of indigenous knowledge has an additional twist. Alaska's Inupiaq Eskimos see themselves in the vanguard of the politics of aboriginal whaling. In the mid-1990s Alaska's North Slope Borough set up a project, together with the American-Russian Centre of the University of Alaska Anchorage, to help Inuit in Chukotka who had appealed to Alaskan whalers for assistance in obtaining appropriate whaling technology and training in how to go whaling. Marine mammal hunting has become vital to the coastal communities of the Russian Far East to remedy extreme food shortages and

the crisis affecting the regional economy. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the resulting tenuous links between Chukotka and the rest of Russia, Native peoples in Chukotka have found themselves needing to rely more on traditional subsistence hunting techniques. However, knowledge and skills surrounding whaling have almost disappeared in the small communities in Chukotka. Until 1993 a specialised Russian whaling vessel fitted with a harpoon gun was responsible for catching the Russian quota of gray whales and distributed part of the quota to each village in Chukotka. Although the IWC were aware that much of the meat was used to supply fox farms, gray whale quotas were allocated on the basis of calculating the nutritional needs of the marine mammal hunting communities in the region. Economic reforms and problems in supplying spare parts and equipment to the whaling vessel ended its operations. Local hunters who had not harvested whales for many years had no other choice but to resume hunting. However, they did so with inadequate equipment and many of them had lost the knowledge required for successful and safe hunting. Early landings of gray whales were at a price—lives have been lost and boats and equipment damaged.

The 'Alaska-Chukotka Program for Encouragement of Native Involvement in Policy and Decision Processes' aims to strengthen Native organisations in Chukotka, encourage Native hunters to engage and participate in wildlife management policy-making processes, and to document local knowledge in Chukotka about the use of marine mammals so that Native people in Chukotka can use it to empower themselves and to carry out successful whale hunts. The North Slope Borough is currently carrying out this work with the Eskimo Society of Chukotka and the Naukan Native Company. Funds from the project have been used to establish Native whale observer posts along the coast of Chukotka, and local hunters are relearning long-forgotten hunting skills from Alaskan whalers. Yet while the aim is to empower the Native people of Chukotka, there are also advantages for Alaska's Eskimo communities.

The initial reason for the project stemmed from the North Slope Borough's need to know more about the bowhead whale population that migrates into Russian waters and is therefore unknown to the observers at the whale census station at Point Barrow. Both the AEWG and the North Slope Borough have long claimed that not all the bowhead whales migrating to the Bering Straits during spring have been counted. These claims are based on the observations made by hunters on St. Lawrence Island that some bowheads move towards the coast of Chukotka. Local hunters are observers in situ: they are better placed than scientists to monitor the migratory habits of whales. Since the IWC bases its quota largely upon the AEWG estimate, and

since Eskimos in Chukotka and the Inuvialuit of Canada's western Arctic wish to resume hunting bowheads, the North Slope Borough's argument that there are more bowheads than current estimates suggest is an astute political and cultural move, one that aims to increase the number of bowheads allowed by existing quotas.¹

In Greenland, the allocation of IWC quotas to specific municipalities is the responsibility of the Home Rule Authorities after consultation with KNAPK (Kalaallit Nunaat Aalisartut Piniartullu Kattufiat; the Greenland Association of Fishermen and Hunters), an organisation which represents the interests of all those dependent on hunting and fishing for a living. The municipal authorities are then responsible for distributing their share of the quota to individual whaling vessels. The municipal authorities must inform the Home Rule Authorities about the numbers of whales caught as well as struck but not killed, and about any infringements of the whaling regulations. In turn, the Home Rule Authorities are responsible for providing the IWC with an annual report on all whaling activities in Greenland, and this forms the basis for the working out of the quota for the following year. KNAPK presents the case for aboriginal subsistence whaling in Greenland at the annual meetings of the IWC. It challenges the scientific knowledge that the IWC uses to work out its regulatory policies as inadequate, and carries out its own whale counts, as well as participating with scientists from the IWC. The Greenland Fisheries Survey initiated the first aerial surveys of minke and fin whales off the Greenland coast in 1988. Studies of the population and distribution of minke whales have been carried out off the coasts of west and east Greenland, while aerial surveys have been made of fin and humpback whales in west and south Greenland (Greenland Home Rule 1989).

Both the IWC and Inuit agree that sound management programmes cannot be implemented without sufficient knowledge about the size and distribution of whale populations, together with a greater understanding of their exploitation. In fact, some biologists would even agree that there is insufficient knowledge about the biology and dynamics of whale stocks to implement satisfactory management plans based on scientific information alone (e.g. Heide-Jørgensen 1990). Yet scientists would also argue that owing to demographic transitions in Inuit communities, changes in hunting technology and methods, and transformations in the economic infrastructure of indigenous societies, with its associated reconfiguration of human-environmental relations, the self-regulation of whaling by Inuit communities themselves is not an option. A compromise needs to be reached and agreed upon. To ensure a participatory approach to the management of subsistence whaling and that IWC decisions take into account the subsistence,

nutritional and cultural needs of local communities, Inuit organisations stress the importance of undertaking more user-based research. Much of this is currently carried out across the Inuit area with the support and co-operation of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference. The ICC aims to defend Inuit subsistence whaling and has had observer status at IWC meetings since 1980. The attitude of individual IWC member countries towards Inuit hunting is not always clear and the ICC position is that many member countries do not understand fully the nutritional and cultural significance of whaling for the Inuit. The ICC argues in the Inuit defence that the contemporary threat to whales comes not from hunting, but from other environmental problems, such as marine pollution, which are harming the biological reproductivity of whales and the health of whale populations as a whole.

The Inuit are challenging what they regard as insufficient scientific data with indigenous knowledge, claiming that local resource harvesters who involve themselves with the environment on a daily basis are more likely than scientists to have reliable knowledge of the resource based on regular observation over long periods. At the same time they recognise that both indigenous knowledge and science are complementary and vital to successful whale management. But to be effective in the international arena, Inuit have to demonstrate to the IWC and environmental groups concerned with marine mammal conservation exactly what that indigenous knowledge is, what it is founded upon, and how it can be used to inform subsistence whaling management programmes. Recognising this, the ICC has established a data bank on renewable resources and gives priority to the collection of information from scientific sources and from hunters and fishermen. This work requires the participation of Inuit communities and organisations throughout the Arctic.

Of particular concern is that research projects should focus on both scientific and local knowledge of wildlife and ecological conditions. This kind of research programme has been under way in Greenland for several years, where the Inuit population has a greater degree of decision-making power concerning environmental management than elsewhere in the Arctic (Nuttall 1994). The Home Rule Authorities have implemented (sometimes unpopular) legislation to restrict hunting and fishing, have given protected status to certain areas, aim to gather as much information as possible on the human use of natural resources, both in historical and contemporary times, and invest heavily in projects to monitor hunting and assess the population status of key species. Greenlandic and foreign researchers work in close collaboration with local people and while recent anthropological research on subsistence hunting, for example, has concentrated on traditional and modern hunting

techniques, and on cultural factors and social relations in local communities (e.g. Caulfield 1991, Nuttall 1992), more research is required on changing distribution patterns, the internal trade of hunting products, the ideology of subsistence and changing human-environmental relations.

WHALING IN GREENLAND: SUBSISTENCE OR COMMERCIAL?

In recent years, scientists and environmentalists have claimed that the distinction between commercial and subsistence whaling has blurred, with the unsurprising result that definitions are now contested. Whaling in Norway, Japan and the Faroes, while defined by the IWC as commercial, is considered by some commentators as having a subsistence element as well as being a fundamental part of culture at both local and national levels (e.g. Kalland 1990, Sanderson 1990), while there have also been recent arguments from animal-rights groups that subsistence hunting of whales and seals has become commoditised and 'non-traditional'. For example, in Greenland subsistence whaling is now not only said to have a commercial element, which has removed it from a purely subsistence context. It is also doubtful whether whaling in Greenland can really be defined as aboriginal. This is because Greenlanders are the only population of Inuit origin to have achieved Home Rule, and it is no longer tenable to construct for them (or for Greenlanders to construct for themselves) an identity as an oppressed minority in relation to a dominant nation-state (Nuttall 1994). The Greenland Inuit have embarked on a course of nation-building and, because of the extensive system of self-government that has developed under Home Rule, they have more constitutionally-protected rights than many other indigenous peoples (Nuttall *ibid.*: 1).

Greenland Inuit are permitted to hunt minke and fin whales because the IWC recognises them as aboriginal people. Yet much of the meat is sold and finds its way into supermarket freezers, which makes Greenlanders vulnerable to accusations that their form of whaling is commercial. There is already a market for Greenlandic foods within Greenland, mainly in the large west coast towns where many people do not have the time, means or ability to hunt, yet value and rely on Greenlandic meat and fish products as the basis of their diet, or look upon Greenlandic foods as delicacies. The Greenland Home Rule Authorities wish to see the expansion of this market and the corresponding increase in production necessary to meet demand. The increase in the production, distribution and exchange of hunting and fishing products is also a central aspect of the Home Rule government's policy for creating sustainable conditions in the settlements, and in the process easing the subsidies that make it possible for many villages to survive. Supporters and

representatives of Japanese, Norwegian and Icelandic whaling have highlighted this and ask repeatedly at IWC meetings why their type of whaling should be regarded as any different from Greenlandic whaling, especially when most of the distribution and sale of whalemeat is confined to specific localised regions and hunting is carried out by relatively small-scale fisheries.

Greenland's whaling communities

Subsistence hunting underpins the social and economic life of people in small communities in Greenland's hunting districts of Upernavik, Uummannaq, Avanersuaq, Ammassalik and Ittoqqortoormiit, despite the development of capital-intensive fishing along the west coast. In these areas hunting households remain primarily units of production and consumption and people rely on hunting marine mammals, especially seals, as the sole or principal occupation. Ringed seals, harp seals, hooded seals and bearded seals are hunted. In addition, beluga, minke and fin whales, narwhals, walrus and certain species of small cetacean and seabirds are also harvested. The latter include guillemots, eider ducks, little auks, barnacle geese and kittiwakes. Subsistence fishing is also of vital importance. Apart from those districts where hunting remains the principal mode of occupation, subsistence activities are carried out by a significant number of people who live elsewhere in Greenland. While commercial fishing is dominant from Disko Bay in central west Greenland, down to the Nanortalik area in the far south, the hunting of seals and other sea mammals is important all along the west coast either as a full-time occupation or as a supplement to wage labour. Currently, over three thousand people hold licences which entitle them to make a living from subsistence hunting and fishing, while over four thousand hold recreational or part-time licences (Greenland Home Rule Government 1995).²

Hunting settlements in Greenland enjoy a localisation of resources and the continued use of a particular area means that each community has its own recognised territory, known as the *piniarfik*, or *piniariartarfik* ('the hunting place'). The use of a specific area by a community is reflected in the place names given to features in the landscape which contain information about hunting, other subsistence activities and about mythical and real past events (Kleivan 1986, Nuttall 1992, 1993a). Place names not only refer to physical features and are geographically descriptive, they tell of the use of both land and sea resources. Other place names in the landscape hint of religious beliefs and practices in pre-Christian times. But the *piniarfik* is also a personalised landscape, having significance for individual and family history, and descriptions of places are shaped and framed by human purpose, values and meanings. Greenlandic place names are mnemonic devices, triggering

recollection of events that happened at those places, even though the name may not reflect those events (e.g. 'Kangeq [meaning headland] is the place where I once caught a polar bear', or 'Saattut ['thin flat stone islands'] is the place where my father was once stormbound', or 'Ulua is a frightening place because ghosts steal from hunters who camp there'). People talk about places in this way, and regularly tell stories that are associated with those places, whether they are travelling on long hunting journeys by boat in summer, or dog sledge in winter, when living in summer camps, or when they are confined to the warmth of their houses during the long dark winter. Places are part of a well-defined trajectory along which a person travels. People use place names to think their way across both the landscape and chronological time, and places are as much a part of daily discourse as they are a key component of a sense of identity.

Access to the resources of local hunting and fishing grounds usually depends on affiliation to the local community. In Greenland there is a conflict between, on the one hand, an individual's right to hunt where he chooses, and on the other the right to hunt in an area as regulated by the community and where membership or affiliation to the community is a prerequisite. While there is extensive individual appropriation of resources and even individual custodianship rights to seal, beluga whale and salmon netting sites and to campsites, this is grounded within and dependent upon notions of collective appropriation and communal rights. The allocation of netting sites, campsites and storage sites to individuals is done so on a communal basis. Individuals then have rights to exclusive tenure only so long as they continue to use those sites. In this way, sites can be inherited by the relatives of previous users, but the rights to tenure can be allocated to another person if use is discontinued by the present custodian. In customary Inuit tradition, and also enshrined in the modern legal system, no-one in Greenland owns land.

Collective appropriation of the *piniarfik* is also reflected in patterns of sharing and distribution, in particular by communal claims to catch-shares from large sea mammals such as walrus, whales, narwhals and bearded seals harvested by an individual hunter. Just as the use of both sea and land does not entail any exclusive individual ownership rights, so no one individual hunter can claim ownership and control over the means of production (Dahl 1989). The sharing and distribution of meat is guided by an obligation to give which is central to the customary ideology of subsistence. Because animals are believed to give themselves up to hunters it is incumbent on the hunter to give them in return to other people. As well as providing food necessary for survival, the sharing and distribution of meat from the hunt defines, expresses and sustains social relationships, as well as reaffirming fundamental

values that guide attitudes towards animals and the environment (Nuttall 1992).

Rather than describing hunting communities in Greenland as whaling communities, it is more accurate to see them as communities that hunt whales at certain times of the year. In the far north and on the east coast, people hunt beluga whales and narwhals in spring and early autumn. Elsewhere, in the south and west, hunting for minke and fin whales is important during summer and autumn. Whaling is not only confined to the villages and small settlements, it is also an activity in which people from the towns engage themselves. For example, in the town of Qerqertarsuaq on Disko Island, Inuit continue to hunt for minke whales (Caulfield 1991), while narwhals and beluga are hunted from Sisimiut northwards. For most of the year, communities that whale are engaged in other economic activities and other forms of subsistence. People hunt seals, they fish or work in paid employment. Fishing and casual labour in fish processing plants or for the municipal authorities are often seen as activities necessary for supplementing the subsistence economy. For example, in more than two thirds of families dependent on subsistence hunting and fishing, at least one partner is a wage-earner, while in less than one third of hunting families, both husband and wife work in hunting and fishing activities (Greenland Home Rule Government 1995). Most families derive little income from hunting. The market value of sealskin prices has dropped considerably over the last few years, partly as a result of the activities of animal-rights groups, and the trade in sealskins is only made possible because it is subsidised by the Home Rule government.

In most communities including the larger towns, whales provide a vital supply of meat for many people and although whaling is a seasonal activity its social and economic significance should not be underestimated. While people like to enjoy fresh whale steaks, much of what is caught is prepared for the winter. People make *nikkut*, by hanging strips of whalemeat outside their homes to dry, or *mattak*, the skin of the whale, is frozen for winter consumption. With the imposition of quotas for minke and fin whales, whaling has become a strategically-planned activity, although Caulfield (1991: 76) has observed that in Qerqertarsuaq in central west Greenland minke whaling is more opportunistic. As I was able to observe in Nanortalik in south Greenland in 1991 and 1996, and in east Greenland in 1992, hunters meet to discuss when and where they will hunt their quota for that year. Several hunters will travel out in open boats to identify pods of migrating whales. One whale will be singled out and its movements will be then be tracked. A decision is made when to hunt the whale and plans are made for the hunt. Fin whale hunting must be done from larger fishing vessels (which are often owned by members

of the same family) mounted with a harpoon cannon, while several hunters go out in small skiffs to hunt minke whales. Minke whales will be surrounded by these boats and the hunters shoot the animal with rifles before harpooning it.

Catch-shares are divided out among the hunters who participate in catching the whale. Whaling crews are often members of the same household or family (the *ilaqutariit*). Families, especially in the smaller villages, are usually independent units based on subsistence, at least in terms of production for the household economy. Hunting, together with the preparation of meat and skins, is the exclusive preserve of each household, with daily tasks the concern of individual members carrying out their allotted roles within local systems of the division of labour. In many villages in north, south and east Greenland, as I have observed on numerous occasions, whale meat is often shared and given away as gifts to people who do not participate in the hunt as well as being given to unrelated households. Meat from seals, whales and other marine mammals is not regarded as a commodity but as something inalienable, containing an element of the giver when it is shared or given away as a gift. When meat from the hunt is shared it expresses the relationships people share with one another and helps to strengthen ties of kinship and community (Nuttall 1992).

Whales, meat and cash

While whale meat is shared between the hunters and their families, or given away as gifts to people who may not have participated in the hunt, a large proportion of it is also sold, which goes against the IWC provisions for aboriginal subsistence whaling. So far the IWC has turned a blind eye to this. Hunters need to pay for the running costs of their boats, they need money to buy imported foodstuffs and clothes for their families, as well as having to pay for essential amenities such as electricity and fuel. In short, they need to earn money in an increasingly market-oriented economy. During summer 1996, for example, hunters from Nanortalik landed a minke whale. It was butchered and divided down at the harbour and the choicest cuts were shared between the hunters who had participated in the hunt. Their wives and other relatives crowded the harbour, armed with plastic bags and plastic tubs and buckets, which were quickly filled with meat. Once the meat had been divided and shared in this way, individual hunters discussed with their wives what meat they should keep for themselves and what cuts they should sell. Some hunters and their families had more need to keep as much meat as they could, while others preferred to sell a larger share. Some hunters put meat on sale at the *kalaaliaraq* that same day, others turned up with meat for sale the following day (Nuttall 1996).

The *kalaaliaraq* (lit. 'the little Greenlander') is a small market comprising one or two stalls which can be found near the harbour in most Greenlandic towns, where hunters and fishermen sell the day's catch. Depending on the area and according to seasonal availability, one can purchase seal meat, caribou meat, seabirds such as guillemots and eider ducks, and fish such as salmon, halibut, catfish and Arctic char. While Greenlandic foods (*kalaalimernit*) such as seal meat and seal blubber, frozen *mattak*, and frozen whale meat are available in supermarkets, the food put on sale at the *kalaaliaraq* always sells well. Prices are fixed by the local hunter's and fishermen's association and usually undercut the price of Greenlandic foods which can be purchased in the supermarkets—sometimes it may cost slightly more than the supermarket price, but there is a ready demand and people are prepared to pay the price. The hunters prefer to sell their catch in this way, rather than to Royal Greenland (see below), because they receive immediate payment and can avoid paying tax. People prefer to buy their meat and fish at the *kalaaliaraq* because it is often cheaper and fresher than buying it from the supermarket. If they are early enough to get down to the harbour soon after a hunter has brought in his catch, people can also choose which cuts they want. The *kalaaliaraq* is also a place of active social interaction, where hunters and fishermen discuss the day's hunting and fishing, the availability of seals and fish, the migration routes of whales, and the weather.

The sale of hunting products in Greenland has brought criticism from anti-sealing and anti-whaling groups which claim that this illustrates how hunting has undergone a transition from a purely subsistence activity to something that has more of a commercial rationale. However, when people sell seal and whale meat and fish at the *kalaaliaraq* they are participating in forms of exchange which have long been part of the subsistence economy, as several writers have remarked (Caulfield 1997, Dahl 1989, Marquadt and Caulfield 1996, Nuttall 1992, Petersen 1989). Animal-rights groups consider money to sit uneasily within the context of traditional subsistence whaling. To some extent, this is in keeping with a negative attitude to the corroding power of money generally (see Parry and Bloch 1989). But, as Lynge (1992: 48) sees it, marine mammals are caught and landed by Inuit 'to be eaten and sold to whoever wants the meat, but not with the aim of earning money'. In Greenland, for example, where subsistence sealing and whaling are considered to be activities integral to a modern and rapidly industrialising society (Dahl 1989, Lynge *ibid.*), money is a supplement to the subsistence economy generally and is part of a symbolically constructed framework that emphasises cultural continuity rather than being based on large-scale profit (Nuttall 1992). And if money is a necessary part of subsistence hunting, replacing customary

practices of sharing in some places, then it has been argued that new distribution systems are not disruptive, but allow continuity (Petersen 1989).

Nonetheless these kinds of changes are grist to the environmentalist's mill. Animal-rights opposition to subsistence whaling and sealing is fuelled partly by claims that the incentive to hunt has become monetarised, and that the introduction of modern technology has removed subsistence activities away from a previously 'traditional' context. Greenpeace, despite having made a public apology to Greenlandic hunters for its anti-sealing campaigns, is still opposed to indigenous hunting if it is commercial. Here, the definition of 'traditional' is tenuous, invoking images of a romantic idealised past before the days of Euro-American contact. While accepting Inuit hunting of sea mammals if there is minimal outside influence in technology, the animal-rights position rejects contemporary whaling and sealing for two main reasons. Firstly, hunters now use motorboats and larger whaling vessels, high-powered rifles and harpoon guns. Secondly, because the Inuit trade whale meat (at least in Greenland) and sell sealskins, they are seen as being implicated and involved in commercial hunting as part of their participation in a capitalist cash economy: their need for meat is considered secondary to their need for money. Conservationists express alarm that the participation of hunters in the cash economy is contributing to overharvesting of marine mammals and seabirds. The WWF position, for example, is that the decline in the population of key animal species 'is principally the result of local hunting. Increased exploitation of belugas and narwhals is due to the spread of a cash economy to even remote areas of the country' (Mikkelsen (1996: 17).

While falling back on arguments to do with conservation and endangered species, environmental and animal-rights groups have turned Inuit whaling into an ethical issue. They question the necessity of whaling for Inuit in the modern world, arguing that traditional hunting and the ideology of subsistence have become secularised and that Inuit no longer care about the animals they hunt. Furthermore, they point to how whaling by aboriginal peoples is unacceptable when modernity and technological change strains the definition of what is and what is not 'aboriginal' (e.g. because Alaskan Eskimos have been made rich by oil money, they have no need to hunt whales). Recently, the activities of Yup'ik and Chuckchi whalers in the Russian Far East have come under intense scrutiny from the Humane Society, which questions whether they can claim to practice what the IWC regards as aboriginal whaling. The society presented a report to the 1997 IWC meeting in Monaco detailing how Yup'ik and Chuckchi were defying IWC rules by using inappropriate hunting technology when hunting gray whales, such as Second World War rifles and traditional harpoons that did not kill the whales swiftly

and humanely. The society's report also claimed that the Siberians were in defiance of the IWC provisions for aboriginal subsistence whaling by hunting more whales than they actually need (including female whales nursing calves) in order to provide feed for fur farms.

The activities of animal welfare groups have provoked passionate and forceful response from Inuit themselves, who consider such organisations as cultural imperialists '... who have slid off the road and settled in sentimental animal protection postures that have little or nothing to do with species survival or ecological balance' (Lyngé 1988: 18). Inuit have been forced to defend and redefine subsistence activities in accordance with contemporary perspectives. Lyngé, a Greenlandic and indigenous rights activist, has argued that the Inuit world view regarding the sustainable use of marine resources is consistent with the views of international environmental organisations, believing it to be an urban arrogance stemming from alienation from nature on the part of those who would have it otherwise:

when the hunter respects the ancient rules and taboos, he is led to an attachment and reverence for the prey that can best be likened to the sentiments a man feels for his beloved. Just as, in a human relationship, love can wither, so can the hunter become insensitive to the animals upon which he feeds; his feelings can die away, and with them, alas, his own self-esteem as well. But love between man and woman can also thrive, and among the true leaders of the small hunting community one can always find those whose ways and sentiments are dictated by respect for the prey and the rules of the hunt. Those hunters' families will never go hungry: the animals will seek them out as if asking to be taken.

(Lyngé 1992: 39-40)

Such poetics are multi-layered. On one level, Lyngé acknowledges that not all hunters carry the mantle of Green primitivism, yet on another, there are still *real* and *genuine* hunters who know how to act in relation to nature, who know how to set out on the hunt observing all the rules and taboos necessary so that the hunted animal recognises the skill and prowess of the hunter, deferring eventually to his superiority by giving itself up. By slaking the thirst of the dead animal's spirit, that spirit will be free to find a new body, only to return eventually to the *same* hunter and give itself freely once more. In this way, the hunter is the embodiment of wise, responsible, sustainable resource-use. And the message is clear: marine mammals really are renewable resources if their souls are respected and recycled.

Criticisms levelled at the nature of whaling in Greenland are perhaps unjust, and demonstrate a profound misunderstanding of the way of life of Inuit in the modern world. For the most part, in those communities dependent on hunting today, changes in technology or the mixing of informal and formal

economic activities have not altered the cultural, emotional and spiritual interplay between the human and animal worlds (Nuttall 1992). Opponents of whaling by indigenous peoples in the modern world see informal and formal economic activities as non-complementary and view a subsistence-based society as simple, primitive and traditional, isolated from the rest of the world and unaffected by modernity. Further controversy was generated recently by the Danish economist Martin Paldam (1994) who has asked if subsidising the costs of small settlements in Greenland is justified. Paldam and other critics of small-scale hunting fail to understand the cultural and economic importance of domestic production. As Wenzel (1991: 98) argues 'the socio-economic "closure" that defines Inuit subsistence requires that we reconsider our ideas about formal and informal economic behaviour as forming two distinct and exclusive functional categories'. Although money is very much a vital part of the subsistence economy it is not necessarily inconsistent with it. Indeed, money and the commercial sale of marine mammal products has long been incorporated into an already flexible and variable range of subsistence techniques. Money is necessary for subsistence-based activities in the remote communities of Greenland—communities with no alternatives to hunting and fishing—and indeed makes the subsistence economy possible.

THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT

The sale of whale meat and other Greenlandic foods, such as seal and fish, is also being encouraged by the Greenlandic Home Rule Authorities, although on a larger scale beyond the local level economy. Although the Home Rule Authorities aspire to greater political, financial and economic independence from Denmark based on the exploitation of natural resources, Greenland remains in an economically vulnerable position because it relies to a considerable extent on imports. Greenland is heavily dependent on other countries for trade and, excepting hunting and fishing products and a few private and public services, all goods used by private households, private and public institutions and businesses are imported. The country has only twice had a positive balance of external trade since 1980 (in 1989 and 1990), and this almost permanent deficit is only made possible because Greenland is supported by block grants from Denmark.

As well as other goods, Greenland relies to a great extent on imported foodstuffs, mainly from Denmark. To ease this reliance, hunters are being encouraged to sell part or most of what they catch to Royal Greenland, the country's meat and fish processing and marketing company. The Home Rule Authorities consider the production, distribution and exchange of food and

products from hunting and fishing as vital to the development of local, small-scale sustainable community development (Greenland Home Rule Government 1995, Marquadt and Caulfield 1996).

As Marquadt and Caulfield (*ibid.*:115) point out, the promotion of this system by the Home Rule government 'reduces the need for imports, promotes indigenous hunting practices, offsets the need for government subsidies to smaller settlements, and encourages consumption of nutritious and culturally valued foods'. There is no doubt that extensive research on the viability of this system is essential. An increase in the internal trade in hunting and fishing products will also benefit Royal Greenland, the Home Rule-owned company responsible for Greenland's fishing, production and export business. Royal Greenland owns the majority of land-based production facilities, as well as owning 16 large and more than 40 smaller processing plants, and employs almost 3000 people world-wide as a consequence of its global processing and operating offices. Royal Greenland's activities are becoming increasingly globalised. But the company's role in the commercial trade of hunting and fishing products highlights a fundamental clash between the culture of the market economy, which has come to define and shape the course of development in Greenland, and the small-scale, kinship-oriented subsistence culture that persists despite widespread social change, upheaval and economic restructuring.

In many parts of Greenland there is local opposition, or reluctance, to sell seal and whale meat to the Royal Greenland processing plants which are to be found in many villages. For example, the Home Rule government has already invested 12.6 million Danish kroner in a new processing plant in Kuummiut, a village in east Greenland, where there is a lot of active hunting of sea mammals. It was hoped that hunters and fishers from settlements throughout the district would travel to Kuummiut and sell their catch to the plant. However, as of summer 1996 hunters were not doing as Royal Greenland had forecast. An article in the national newspaper *Sermitsiak* reported how hunters were failing to sell meat from narwhal and seal hunting, as well as the meat from successful polar bear hunts. The thrust of the article, and the response of the manager of the processing plant, was that Royal Greenland had been let down by local hunters and that the plant was threatened with closure as a result, thus placing 100 jobs at risk.³ Hunters in east Greenland, like their counterparts on the west coast, sell part of what they catch at the *kalaaliaraq*. They keep the rest for themselves and their families. Royal Greenland has failed to recognise the essence of sharing as a fundamental part of the hunting culture, as well as understanding the immediate gains for a hunter who sells meat privately rather than to the Royal Greenland processing plant.

Royal Greenland not only caters for demand for hunting and fishing products, its marketing and development strategies may possibly increase demand for seal and whale meat and other Greenlandic foods. Pressure on the local resource base of hunting communities may be a direct consequence of ensuring a regular supply of hunting and fishing products for an internal country-wide market. Increased hunting may threaten beluga and narwhal stocks leading to management guidelines imposed by the IWC. But the production, distribution and exchange of hunting products on a larger scale may also threaten to conflict with the traditional or customary ideology of subsistence. In many parts of Greenland today, much of the meat which is sold is surplus and the money earned is essential for the economic viability of the hunter's household. Although some hunters do see the incentive to earn money as overriding other concerns such as sharing, for the most part when hunting is done to satisfy a market demand beyond the household, local community or regional economy, then the customary ideology of subsistence is disrupted and threatened (Nuttall 1992).

Despite the difficulties of supply, Greenlanders are looking to open up new markets outside the country for marine mammal meat and sealskin clothing. But such plans are further hampered by how international organisations perceive Greenlanders as aboriginal people in the modern world. As Chapter 7 explores Arctic peoples use terms such as 'tradition', 'aboriginality' and 'indigenous' politically and rhetorically. These terms can also be used against them in negative ways. In recent years it has been argued that the IWC category of aboriginal subsistence whaling is a static category, implying that indigenous cultures are traditional and unchanging. Kalland (1994) has criticised the concept of aboriginal subsistence whaling for its imperialist associations, arguing that it not only excludes whalers in Japan, Norway and Iceland, but imposes strict definitional criteria on indigenous peoples and allows outsiders to say how indigenous peoples are to be defined, and indeed how they are to act and behave. In this case, it seeks to define and perpetuate an image of true 'aboriginal' peoples as those who continue to live within a non-commercial economy and utilise simple technologies. As long as Greenlanders and other indigenous peoples conform to this image, then they are seen as having a legitimate right to continue whaling.

At a whaling seminar held in Greenland in early 1995 the chairman of KNAPK said that while Greenland's domestic market for whale meat had been met it was time to consider exporting it. The KNAPK position is clear: Greenlanders, as indigenous peoples, have an indisputable right to exploit resources including whalemeat, on a commercial scale.⁴ Following Kalland, the definition of Greenland whaling as aboriginal subsistence whaling has

actually proved to be an imposition. It restricts Greenlanders from developing their resources in ways that seem appropriate and defined in terms of their own cultural and economic needs. Furthermore, the concept of aboriginal subsistence whaling allows a policy consensus to be imposed on ethnic minorities and keeps them in a position of subordination and dependency (Kalland 1994). Meat and other products from marine mammals cannot be exported. The U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) of 1972, for example, provides a trade barrier for Greenlandic hunting products. The ICC and KNAPK have been persistent in their efforts to persuade the American authorities to lift the ban on importing marine mammal products imposed under the Act, arguing that it is a contravention of the international trade agreement GATT. Greenlanders argue that the MMPA restricts the rights of Inuit to develop sustainable and equitable economic conditions in Arctic communities:

US policy is violating the basic human rights of the Inuit peoples. It is unacceptable because the local Arctic people are not allowed to develop their own economic base and in this way secure the development of their own culture.

(Jakobsen 1994: 55)

It is notable that Norwegian whalers, who wish to export whale blubber to Japan, also find this ban on trade morally unacceptable. Such sentiments are reactions to globalist models of environmental management based on 'the perceived need to assess and sanction the environmental activities of others' (Milton 1996: 186). Far from preserving the environment and conserving resources, Milton argues that globalist models promote unsustainable development, allow wealthy developed states to further their own interests, and replace indigenous perspectives on resource use with environmentally-destructive practices. In this way, as far as the hunting of whales by Arctic coastal communities is concerned, by defining modern whaling as practised by indigenous peoples as environmentally-unsustainable and unnecessary environmentalists and whale management organisations seek to extend their own power and influence over the lives of people who acquire environmental knowledge and develop local systems of resource management by living and acting in the environment.

Economic activity is, in essence, the production, distribution, exchange and consumption of the material necessities that make human survival possible. For Arctic peoples it is embedded within, and cannot be separated from, the social bases of survival. For this reason, co-management and small-scale community based development has aimed to integrate the values, perspectives, opinions and environmental knowledge of indigenous peoples with sci-

entific approaches to resource management. In the past seals, whales, caribou and other animals may have come to the hunter who observed the correct rituals before the hunt, and who not only respected the animals he hunted, but who shared what came freely to him. If ritual was not observed or the taboos were broken, then the animals would not give themselves to him. Today, hunters are not only obliged to observe customary rituals and taboos, but modern regulations and quotas imposed by outside agencies as well. If these regulations are flouted then wildlife boards and international commissions will withhold or tighten the quotas. Hunters have never before had so many interests to appease and placate. And although animals may still reveal themselves to hunters in dreams, knowledge of where to find them is now also based on aerial surveys, census counts and computerised maps.

This chapter has pointed to some of the difficulties of basing small-scale community development on the commercialisation of marine mammal products. As the example from Greenland shows, there is a fundamental clash between two cultures: one small-scale, emphasising kinship, reciprocity and cultural identity; the other market-oriented within a context of nation-building. There are also concerns within Greenland that development based on marine mammal products would be uneven and contribute to the process of social differentiation that is currently underway in the country as a consequence of modernisation. Some hunters and communities claim that the Home Rule Authorities do not give them a fair share of the IWC quota, while others feel that even when they do participate in whale hunts then they do not always get a proper share of the meat. Tensions also arise when larger fishing vessels compete with locally-based hunts for beluga whales. Local people in Upernavik in northwest Greenland, for example, feel that the annual visits by boats from further south and with no affiliation to local communities in the district is a form of trespassing (Nuttall 1992; 142). While recognising that beluga hunting is economically lucrative, they nonetheless mistrust the changing attitudes that prompt beluga hunting on a commercial scale and mistrust those hunters who wish for a financial return from the hunt, rather than sharing meat and *mattak*.

This situation is arising elsewhere in Greenland. For example, Dahl (1990) has noted the intrusion of fishing vessels from the larger towns of Disko Bay in the beluga hunt at the small community of Saqqaq. Dahl calls beluga hunting in Saqqaq a 'well-defined communal or collective activity' and local hunters are aggrieved when other hunters interfere with a community event of economic, cultural and symbolic importance. These are by no means isolated episodes, and they point to an increasing competition for resources. This competition not only threatens to deprive local communities of their

resource base, it also threatens the customary ideology of subsistence and disrupts notions of sharing and giving (Nuttall 1997). Dybbroe (1991: 14) argues that this competition 'is symptomatic of the kinds of oppositions evolving in Greenland today, which are not between local communities but between interested groups on a national scale'. At the same time, these tensions are heightened when both domestic and international markets fluctuate. This volatility makes development based on the commercial sales of renewable resources precarious (cf Young 1992).

Although this chapter has focused specifically on whaling in Greenland, it illustrates Arctic-wide concerns relating to development and cultural survival and the clash between indigenous and non-indigenous attitudes towards the environment and resource use. It seems that the exploitation of marine mammals will continue to be at the forefront of environmental debate concerning the importance of hunting and its role in providing a sustainable economic base for Arctic coastal communities (Nuttall 1993b, 1994: 26). The animal-rights campaign, for example, shows no sign of relenting and is bound to continue to undermine the subsistence economy. Furthermore, the IWC itself has been accused of moving towards an explicit anti-whaling stance, rather than maintaining its original role as a regulatory body (Freeman 1990). Scientists and environmentalists fear that increased hunting by indigenous peoples will threaten whale stocks unless appropriate forms of management are put in place. From the perspective of indigenous peoples current co-management practices only offer a compromise by regulating access to resources and do not hold the promise of allowing greater self-regulation in the near future.

Faced with such threats to cultural survival from environmentalist action and globalist models of environmental management, Inuit communities are under increasing pressure to defend subsistence hunting. This defence relies on the ability to increase international awareness of the effectiveness of indigenous systems of resource use as regulatory and management mechanisms, rather than allowing conventional science-based management to determine what Inuit can and cannot hunt. But the future of subsistence hunting, especially whaling, is also dependent on working out appropriate definitions which will allow hunting activities to exist within the framework of the market economies that characterise the modern Arctic. When environmental organisations such as Greenpeace say that they are not opposed to subsistence hunting if the meat and by-products of the catch are utilised by the family, household and community, but are vehemently against commercial hunting, they fall into the trap of reifying subsistence hunters as traditional peoples. Likewise the IWC category of aboriginal subsistence whaling is not based on any real substantive definitions of what the IWC understands

by 'aboriginal' and 'subsistence'. Indigenous peoples are represented as 'traditional' if they only hunt for their own consumption, yet 'modern' if they wish to sell the products of the catch.

Worldwide, resource agencies need to take into account the environmental values of local people and adopt a participatory approach to resource management. In the Arctic, the Inuit have found themselves a new role as resource conservationists and have initiated user-based research. As such they provide a model for the inclusion of indigenous values and environmental knowledge. Although it is not without its problems, so far a participatory approach to the management of subsistence whale hunting has tended to work in the Arctic, in the sense that Greenlanders and other indigenous peoples are still able to hunt whales. In Greenland and elsewhere, indigenous peoples would rather have self-management than co-management and the power to decide on the quotas that they feel they should be able to set themselves. The future of whaling and other forms of subsistence hunting, however, relies on reconciling the interests of those local communities dependent on hunting, and those environmental and conservationist organisations that express a sincere concern for wildlife and the environment, yet do not understand fully the cultural dynamics of the mixed economies of Arctic settlements, the interconnectedness of hunting peoples and the environment, nor their rights to self-determination, to define their own future and to develop renewable resources in a sustainable way.

- 1 Delegates at the IWC meeting in Aberdeen in 1996 could not reach a consensus on Russia's request to allow indigenous peoples in Chukotka a kill of five bowhead whales annually under the IWC provisions for aboriginal subsistence whaling. A kill of one bowhead whale in the Canadian Arctic was also voted against.
- 2 Since January 1993 hunters in Greenland must be in possession of a formal hunting licence. There are two kinds of hunting licence: one for people who hunt full-time in order to make a living (i.e. occupational hunters whose sole or principal occupation is subsistence hunting and fishing), and one for those who wish to hunt part-time, but who make a living from other forms of employment. These are people who live in the towns rather than the villages, have salaried employment, and do most of their hunting and fishing at weekends or during holidays. This category of hunter also includes Danes living and working in Greenland. The allocation of quotas and issuing of licences takes place in Nuuk, Greenland's capital.
- 3 'Fangere svigte Royal Greenland' ('Hunters let down Royal Greenland'—my translation) *Sermitsiak* 23 August 1996, p.7. The article described how in August a hunter had caught five narwhals and three polar bears, while two other hunters had together hunted eight narwhals, but none of the meat was sold to the factory in Kuummiut. The manager of the Royal Greenland factory was reported to complain how, despite hunters coming home with several tons of meat, he could not satisfy orders for whale and seal meat from several shops in west Greenland.
- 4 *High North News* No. 10, May 15, 1995.