

Science or Slaughter? Two Opposing Views on Japanese Whaling: A Critical Discourse Analysis.

Jason Peppard

**An assignment for Master of Arts
in
Applied Linguistics
Module 1 - Written Discourse
March 2007**

Centre for English Language Studies
Department of English
UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM
Birmingham B15 2TT
United Kingdom

WD/06/04

Choose two news / current affairs texts, one from English-speaking media (e.g. a British or American TV news report, an Australian newspaper, etc) and the other from a media outlet in another country / language, but both dealing with the same 'global' events (e.g. the war in Iraq, the Asian Tsunami...). Critically discuss the two texts with reference to CDA (see Written Discourse unit 7). What differences in the representation of events, and in relations with the intended audience, can be identified? How might any such differences be related to underlying cultural and/or ideological issues?

Estimated word count: 4445

1.0 Introduction

This paper aims to identify and discuss cultural and/or ideological differences concerning the same 'global' event in media texts from two different countries, one from an English media outlet and the other from a non-English country. The texts will be analyzed from a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective. The topic to be discussed in this critical analysis is Japanese whaling.

Japanese whaling, and whaling in general, has become an increasingly controversial topic over the years. Although only a handful of countries actively hunt whales, a great deal of media coverage and ensuing controversy resurfaces each time a new hunting season begins. Those opposed to whaling make arguments on ecological and moral grounds: Some species of whales are considered endangered which creates ecological debate while others claim that it is morally wrong to kill and eat whales since they are generally considered to be highly intelligent and sentient creatures. Pro-whaling groups counter that they have the right to hunt whales and argue that whaling is both ecologically and morally sound. Japan in particular gets the majority of media attention due to the extent of its whaling that it says is for scientific research.

Fairclough's (2001) Critical Discourse Analysis framework, consisting of ten main questions and some sub-questions, was used in the analysis and comparison of the following two media texts:

- 1) *Japan's Whale Hunters Set Sail for Slaughter in International Whale Sanctuary* (U.S. Newswire, America)
- 2) *Japan's Antarctic Research Is Legal Activity* (JWA News, Japan)

As can be predicted from the headlines alone, the representation of Japanese whaling in the texts was found to be both ideologically and culturally opposed: anti-whaling (American) written for an anti-whaling audience, versus pro-whaling (Japanese) written for a pro-whaling audience. Further analysis of the vocabulary, grammar and textual structures showed these ideological differences to be pervasive and imbedded throughout the respective texts. Interestingly, both texts used many of the same linguistic techniques and styles to push their ideologically opposing agendas. That the articles are arguing from opposing ideologies is quite obvious from the vocabulary choices and stated very clearly in the texts. What I found surprising however, is the more subtle bias found throughout the grammatical and textual structures of both texts. As a newcomer to Critical Discourse Analysis, I found it to be extremely eye opening – a very useful and powerful tool for identifying bias that is not as well known and utilized as it should be. Admittedly, I had not heard of CDA until I started studying Applied Linguistics.

2.0 Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis is a relatively new branch within the multidisciplinary field of Discourse Analysis. Stubbs (1983) defines discourse analysis as:

the linguistic analysis of naturally occurring connected spoken and written discourse. Roughly speaking, it refers to attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts. It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with language in use in social contexts (p. 1).

Where Discourse Analysis studies language in a social context, Critical Discourse Analysis takes the analysis a step further, attempting “to show how discourse is shaped

by relations of power and ideologies” (Coulthard et al, 2000: 117-118). Fairclough (2001), an influential advocate of CDA, gives this definition:

[CDA] analyses social interactions in a way which focuses upon their linguistic elements, and which sets out to show up their generally hidden determinants in the system of social relationships, as well as hidden effects they may have upon the system (p. 4).

Critical Discourse Analysis therefore seeks to bring about change by exposing inequalities and biases in society that are embedded in discourse. Fowler (1995: 4) elaborates on the purpose of CDA, asserting that it challenges common sense by showing that information can be presented in various ways with very different results. In *Language and the News: discourse and ideology in the press* (1991), Fowler examines the pervasive bias in the press, arguing that the ‘content’ of newspapers is not based on facts, but on ideas, beliefs, values, theories, propositions and ideology (p. 1). Other issues of inequality and ideology that CDA has been used to investigate are racism (see Wodak, 1995; Krishnamurthy, 1995), sexism (see Caldas-Coulthard, 1999) and sexuality (see Gough and Talbot, 1995).

The methods of Critical Discourse Analysis are as diverse as the disciplines they have been drawn from. Fairclough (2001) includes linguistics proper, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, cognitive psychology and discourse analysis in his list of contributors to the discipline. What each of these approaches lacks however, is an adequate way of critically relating discourse to social practice, which is the main concern of CDA.

In *Language and Power* (2001: 92-93), Fairclough presents a framework consisting of ten main questions and sub-questions that can be used to critically analyze a text, stressing

that it is meant as a “guide and not a blueprint” (p. 92). The questions are divided into three main categories: vocabulary, grammar and textual structures:

A. Vocabulary

1. What experiential values do words have?

What classification schemes are drawn upon?

Are there words that are ideologically contested?

Is there *rewording* or *overwording*?

What ideologically significant meaning relations (*synonymy*, *hyponymy*, *antonymy*) are there between words?

2. What relational values do words have?

Are there euphemistic expressions?

Are there markedly formal or informal words?

3. What expressive values do words have?

4. What metaphors are used?

B. Grammar

5. What experiential values do grammatical features have?

What types of *process* and *participant* predominate?

Is agency unclear?

Are processes what they seem?

Are *nominalizations* used?

Are sentences active or passive?

Are sentences positive or negative?

6. What relational values do grammatical features have?

What *modes* (*declarative*, *grammatical question*, *imperative*) are used?

Are there important features of *relational modality*?

Are the pronouns *we* and *you* used, and if so, how?

7. What expressive values do grammatical features have?

Are there important features of *expressive modality*?

8. How are (simple) sentences linked together?

What logical connectors are used?

Are complex sentences characterized by *coordination* or *subordination*?

What means are used for referring inside and outside the text?

C. Textual structures

9. What interactional conventions are used?

Are there ways in which one participant controls the turns of others?

10. What larger-scale structures does the text have?

The framework is constructed around three values: *experiential*, *relational* and *expressive*. Text with *experiential* value is connected to the worldview of the text producer; it gives clues to how he or she sees and experiences the environment. Text with *relational* value shows what social relationships are being mediated through the production and interpretation of the text. Finally, the *expressive* value of a text shows how the producer of the text evaluates what is being discussed. Fairclough emphasizes that any formal feature can have two or three of these values at one time (ibid: 93).

Fairclough's CDA framework was used to do the following analysis for two reasons: First, he is "one of the most active proponents of the critical orientation to language studies" (Coulthard et al., 2001: 121); he is referenced heavily and his work was found to be the most readily accessible. Secondly, his framework is easy to use and the step-by-step layout is very helpful for people who are new to language study and discourse analysis in particular.

3.0 Critical Discourse Analysis of the texts

In this section, Fairclough's CDA framework will be applied to the two texts in order to expose their ideological and cultural differences concerning Japanese whaling. The

analysis will clearly demonstrate that “there are always different ways of saying the same thing, and they are not accidental alternatives. Differences in expression carry ideological distinction (and thus differences in representation) (Fowler, 1991: 4). The first text, *Japan’s Whale Hunters Set Sail for Slaughter in International Whale Sanctuary* (see Appendix 1) will be referred to as Text A; the second text, *Japan’s Antarctic Research Is Legal Activity* (see Appendix 2) will be referred to as Text B. Only those questions from Fairclough’s framework that are deemed relevant will be addressed: Neither text makes use of metaphor (Question 4) while Question 9 is primarily meant for analyzing dialogue.

3.1 Contextual analysis

The *context of culture* refers to the unique environment of a text, which in turn contains a *context of situation* (Malinowski, 1935; cited in Coulthard et al., 2000: 121). The *context of situation* can be broken down further into the Hallidayan terms of *field, tenor and mode*. *Field* refers to what is happening and what is being discussed. *Tenor* refers to who is taking part in the discourse and their social roles. *Mode* refers to how the text is organized and the channel of communication (Richards and Schmidt, 2002: 491).

3.1.1 Context of culture

Both of the texts in question are written in a global culture with very polarized and opposing views on whaling, whether it be commercial or scientific. Although relatively few countries are still involved in whaling, it is without a doubt, a global issue – nearly everyone and every nation has a strong opinion either for or against it. Whaling has become highly politicized both within nations and on the international stage. Anti-

whaling groups such as Greenpeace, the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) and the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) argue that whaling affects conservation of endangered whale species, the methods of killing are cruel, and that whaling hurts the now booming whale watching industry (*Whalewatch*, 2006). Pro-whaling groups such as the High North Alliance (HNA), the Japanese Whaling Association (JWA) and the Institute of Cetacean Research (ICR) counter that the endangered status of some species is questionable and that the policies of anti-whaling countries are inconsistent and hypocritical. Additionally, these groups argue that there are communities that depend on whaling for economic survival, and that whaling helps the fishing industry since whales consume massive amounts of fish stock (*Japan Whaling Association*, 2006).

3.1.2 Context of situation

Text A:

Field A persuasive piece of journalism meant to alert readers of ‘an impending tragedy’, of ‘cruel’ and ‘illegal’ whaling practices to be carried out by Japanese whalers (anti-whaling).

Tenor Three contributors are named in the article, two of which work for Rosen Communication Group LLC, a public relations firm. The third contributor is the Deputy Director, U.S. Operations of the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW). Looking into the background of those quoted in the article clearly exposes their anti-whaling stance, as they are representing an anti-whaling

organization. It also seems evident that the IFAW hired the public relations firm to write and release the article as factual news.

Mode Mass media on the World Wide Web, accessed from the Google News site (world news), which is one of the most popular news sources on the World Wide Web and read by millions of people. The text was released on the *U.S. Newswire* website on November 14th 2006. This is public discourse on a global scale.

Text B:

Field A persuasive article from the Japanese Whaling Association's (JWA) newsletter defending the scientific research (whaling) of JARPA (Japan's Antarctic Research Program) (Obviously pro-whaling).

Tenor No author is listed; the newsletter names only the editor and editorial assistance: Yoshinari & Associates Inc. Most of the quotes and content in the text are from the director general of the Institute of Cetacean Research (ICR). The ICR is a privately owned, non-profit Japanese cetacean research institute subsidized by the Japanese government. Anti-whaling groups accuse it of being a cover for commercial whaling in Japan. Again, the ideology of the contributors to the text is identifiable from the pro-whaling stance of the organizations they represent: The JWA and the ICR.

Mode Mass media on the World Wide Web. The text is included in the *JWA News*, Issue No. 13, March 2006. The JWA started publishing the newsletter in July 2002; it is released periodically on the JWA website as a defensive response to anti-whaling rhetoric. A search using the Google search engine of the keyword

‘whaling’ lists the website as the ninth result. The keywords ‘Japanese whaling’ list the website as the first two results. The newsletter is also global public discourse intended to persuade the public, but was less accessible than Text A.

3.2 Vocabulary analysis

3.2.1 What experiential values do words have?

“The aspect of experiential value of most interest” according to Fairclough, “is how ideological differences between texts in their representations of the world are coded in their vocabulary” (2001: 94). The most obvious ideological difference between the two texts is the not so subtle choice of vocabulary for the headlines. The choices of words here instantly cue the critical reader to the opposing standpoints of the authors:

Text A *Japan’s Whale Hunters Set Sail for Slaughter in International Whale Sanctuary*

Text B *Japan’s Antarctic Research Is Legal Activity*

The underlined words in both Text A and Text B are referring to whaling. ‘Slaughter’ is an extremely negative word, and although it does mean the killing of animals for food, it also means the cruel and unfair killing of many people (Cambridge Dictionaries Online, 2007). Is this an attempt to personify the whales in order to attract more attention and compassion? On the other hand, from an anti-whaling viewpoint, the vocabulary choice of ‘research’ in Text B is clearly an attempt to divert the reader’s attention away from the fact that it is the hunting of whales that is being referred to by using a euphemism.

‘Research’ is not often associated with killing. Additionally, the use of ‘slaughter in international waters’ in Text A implies that the activity is illegal, whereas ‘legal activity’ in Text B is a self-explanatory oppositional term. The ideological wording of the

headlines is further elaborated in the opposing classification schemes of their respective texts. Text A uses a morbid classification of killing and death whereas Text B is a complete *rewording* with the focus on science and research.

A complete list of vocabulary with experiential value in the two texts is shown in the following table:

Text A		Text B	
Word / Phrase	# Of Occurrences	Word / Phrase	# Of Occurrences
commercial fishing	1	anti-whaling opponents	1
commercial whaling	2	commercial whaling	2
conservation threat	1	conserve	1
cruelty	1	freedom of fishing	1
death	1	international law	2
death rates	1	kill	1
died	1	killing	1
dying	1	legal	3
endangered	3	legality	1
horrific injures	1	management of whale resources	1
hunted	1	permit (noun)	2
hunting	1	permits (noun)	1
hunts (verb)	1	protect	1
kill	2	research	9
killed	2	research activities	1
killing	3	research program	1
killing method	1	scientific research	1
near threatened	1	scientifically necessary	1
no blood needs to be shed	1	sustainable resource management	1
'scientific' whaling	1	take	1
slaughter	1	taking	1
suffer	1	the law	1
tragedy	1	treat (verb)	1
whale hunt	1	treating	1
whale hunting	2	whale stocks	1
whalers	1	whaling	1
whaling	6		

Table 1 – Experiential Value

The texts further show their respective ideologies through *overwording*, which signals “intense preoccupation” with a point of ideological interest (Fairclough, 1992: 193). In Text A, ‘whaling’ appears nine times, various forms of ‘kill’ occur eight times, ‘death’ and ‘die’ four times and ‘endangered’ three times. Other words and phrases used to portray Japanese whaling in a negative way are: ‘cruelty’, ‘horrific injuries’, ‘suffer’ and ‘tragedy’. Finally, Text A ideologically contests the use of the term ‘scientific’ when used by pro-whaling Japan, claiming it to be

a misnomer that allows it to continue whaling despite a global ban on commercial whaling...

Text B contains extensive *overwording* of ‘research’, which appears 12 times. The text overtly stresses that the whaling is legal and legitimate scientific research, not commercial whaling. ‘Scientific’ and ‘scientifically’ each occur one time; references to ‘the law’ and ‘legality’ appear five times and legal ‘permits’ are mentioned three times. The term ‘Australian Antarctic Sanctuary’ is ideologically contested, challenging Australia’s claim to the Antarctic territorial claim. Text B uses forms of ‘kill’ significantly less often than Text A; ‘kill’ and ‘killing’ each appear only once. It should also be noted that both texts use the more neutral terms ‘commercial whaling’ and ‘commercial fishing’ minimally. This data reinforces the opposing ideologies presented in the vocabulary of the headlines: Text A is anti-whaling; Text B is pro-whaling.

3.2.2 What relational values do words have?

This question looks at how social relationships are formed between participants by using specific word choices. It is common for words with relational value to overlap with other

values in the text (Fairclough, 2001: 97). This is evident in Text B, with the positive sounding word ‘research’ replacing the more negative words ‘whaling’, ‘hunting’ or ‘killing’. This usage has both experiential and relational value. Experientially, it is signaling a pro-whaling stance but relationally, it is used as an avoidance strategy (of an expressive value) to ease any cognitive dissonance the producer (pro-whaling) and interpreter (potentially pro-whaling) may have regarding the killing of whales.

Text A contains a quote that attempts to persuade the anti-whaling reader to make a stand with the producers of the text:

- It’s time for the United States to use its leverage to prevent this unfolding tragedy.

For American readers, the quote seems to include all Americans within a culturally anti-whaling ideology. Conversely, the first paragraph of Text B includes words that immediately place the author(s) in an ‘us versus them’ position that would likely force the reader to choose a side:

- Our research is perfectly legal in every aspect referred to by anti-whaling opponents and scientifically necessary to ensure the best decisions can be made for sustainable resource management.

Both texts make use of formality in their vocabulary choices and style. When concerning relations, formal discourse is utilized to mark position, status and ‘face’ (ibid: 55). Text A is interdiscursive, switching back and forth between formal, scientific language and a more informal style:

- An IFAW analysis of Japanese whaling video footage obtained by Greenpeace concluded that the killing methods for Antarctic minke whales are inefficient and raise serious welfare issues concerning low instantaneous death rates, protracted times to death and the occurrence of asphyxiation as a secondary killing method.

- Rather than killing whales, governments should focus instead on the tremendous global growth in whale watching – no blood needs to be shed.

Text B on the other hand, is almost entirely formal, relying extensively on scientific and legal terminology:

- Notwithstanding anything contained in this Convention any Contracting government [including Japan] may grant to any of its nationals a special permit authorizing that national to kill, take and treat whales for purposes of scientific research...
- The legality of Japan's research in the Antarctic has been discussed ad infinitum at the IWC and other fora.

In both texts, most of the formal language is quoted from 'experts' to demonstrate authority and facts over opinion. The formal scientific language in Text A shows the status and authority of the scientists being quoted while the informal language is used to form a more equal relationship with the average reader. The very formal terminology of Text B makes no attempt to form an equal relationship with the reader, attempting instead to portray authority through legal and scientific jargon.

3.2.3 What expressive values do words have?

“The expressive value of words has always been a central concern for those interested in persuasive language” (ibid: 99). The following table lists the words and phrases in the texts with expressive value - vocabulary that either positively or negatively evaluates the practices being described:

Text A Negative Evaluation of Whaling	Text B Positive Evaluation of Whaling
unfolding tragedy	perfectly legal (two occurrences)
the last thing they need	scientifically necessary
no blood needs to be shed	no legal basis on which to stop this research
the guise of “scientific” whaling	research will help
no humane way to kill	meeting its obligations
sustain horrific injuries	nothing...is violated
suffer for a long time	legal basis is very clear
killing methods...are inefficient	environmental basis is even clearer
serious welfare issues	
opposes whaling on the grounds of cruelty	

Table 2 – Expressive Value

As would be expected, Table 2 clearly demonstrates that the authors of Text A portray Japanese whaling in a truly negative way while the author(s) of Text B evaluate whaling in a positive way using defensive legal vocabulary.

3.3 Grammatical Analysis

3.3.1 What experiential values do grammatical features have?

Different choices of grammatical process and participant types can be ideologically significant when the text’s producer wishes to represent a real or imaginary action, event or situation (ibid: 100). This is evident in both Text A and Text B as they attempt to draw the reader into their respective anti-whaling and pro-whaling stances.

Agency is very clear in Text A with a high level of material processes that signify doing things (Halliday, 1985: ch.5 cited in Coulthard et al., 2000). Agency in most of the declarative sentences relates to Japan: *Japan’s whale hunters, the Japanese Government,*

Japan's self-allocated whaling quota, Japan. Nominalizations and agentless passive sentences are only used to avoid redundancy; agency in these cases is still apparent within the context. Finally, the majority of the sentences are positive. The message is clear: This is what Japan is doing and it is wrong:

- ...the Japanese government will launch a fleet of six boats from Arukaport, commencing a new season of whale hunting.
- Japan hunts under the guise of 'scientific whaling'...

The relational processes of Text B consist mainly of attribution sentences (subject-verb-complement) to describe Japanese whaling, thus avoiding agency altogether. The purpose here is to defend Japan for hunting whales, which the text consistently nominalizes as 'research'. The sentences are positive when describing the legality of the research and negative when refuting claims by anti-whaling opponents as the following examples show:

- Our research is perfectly legal...
- The Antarctic Treaty does not apply to the research activities conducted on the high seas.

3.3.2 What relational values do grammatical features have?

The declarative mode of both Texts A and B almost exclusively contain unmodalised polar statements. There is no explicit subjective modality in either text; this further establishes the authors of both texts as 'knower' / 'authority' (Coulthard et al., 2000: 131) and reinforces Fairclough's (1992) observation that "the use of objective modality often implies some form of power" (p. 159).

3.3.3 What expressive values do grammatical features have?

Much of section 3.3.2 is also relevant here concerning expressive values of grammatical features since the modal auxiliaries, or lack of them, which denote relational modality and expressive modality overlap (Fairclough, 2001: p. 107). The almost total lack of intermediate modalities in Texts A and B is common in news reports where opinions and reported information are often represented as facts (ibid). Each text does however contain some instances of expressive modality:

Text A:

- It's time for the United States to use its leverage to prevent this unfolding tragedy.

'It's time...' is in the present tense and is expressing finality and truth.

- Next year, Japan may also start hunting endangered humpback whales, with a self-allocated quota of 50.

'May' is signaling a possibility and a warning, prompting the reader to take action.

Text B:

- ...the marine resources in the Southern Ocean must be utilized in a sustainable manner in order to protect and conserve them for future generations...

The use of 'must' is extreme and also expresses finality and truth.

- Some media coverage alleges that Japan is conducting its research in an area called the 'Australian Antarctic Sanctuary'.

'Alleges' is a non-modal present tense verb chosen to cast doubt on the statements made by anti-whaling opponents. The examples above show that both texts are using the same discursive techniques to demonstrate authority in their ideologically opposing arguments.

3.3.4 How are (simple) sentences linked together?

Logical connectors can signal ideological assumptions portraying ideological

commonsense as commonsense (ibid: 109); they are used several times in Text A:

- Despite a global moratorium and international outcry against commercial whaling, Japan's self-allocated whaling quota permits its whalers to kill up to 935 minke and 10 endangered fin whales.
- Rather than killing whales, governments should focus instead on the tremendous global growth in whale watching – no blood needs to be shed.
- Japan hunts under the guise of 'scientific' whaling, a misnomer that allows it to continue whaling despite a global ban on commercial whaling imposed by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) in 1986.

Each of these examples make assumptions that Japan is doing something illegal and wrong, much to the dismay of the rest of the world.

Text B mostly uses *coordination* to combine clauses, placing equal emphasis on every point made. This seems to make the pro-whaling argument very clear and consistent.

There are also instances where pro-whaling ideology is implied and reinforced by juxtaposing two sentences illustrating that “whatever two [sentences] occur next to one another, [readers] will attempt to relate them: to use the first as a discourse frame for the second” (Stubbs, 1983: 93):

- ...Japan was also meeting its obligations under the 1959 Antarctic Treaty. The Antarctic Treaty does not apply to the research activities conducted on the high seas.
- Some media coverage in Australia alleges that Japan is conducting its research in an area called the 'Australian Antarctic Sanctuary'. Article IV of the Antarctic Treaty freezes all claims to the Antarctic.

This is an effective way to link claims and counter-claims that are presented as solid facts rather than ideological stances.

3.4 Textual structure analysis

What larger-scale structures does the text have?

“Ordering in [news] articles is based upon importance or newsworthiness, with the headline and first paragraph in particular giving what are regarded as the most important parts, and the gist, of the story” (Fairclough, 2001: 115). This brings the focus once again back to the headlines of the text:

Text A *Japan’s Whale Hunters Set Sail for Slaughter in International Whale Sanctuary*

Text B *Japan’s Antarctic Research Is Legal Activity*

The headlines contain the most important information, summing up the whole of their respective texts and contain many of the ideological elements that have been discussed in this paper. They are both referring to Japanese whaling from opposing ideological viewpoints.

Since the texts were accessed from the World Wide Web it is noteworthy to take a step back and view them within the greater context of the WebPages from which they were viewed. Text A contains external links to ideologically relevant WebPages:

- FAW reports available online: Japan's and Iceland's "scientific" whaling:
http://www.ifaw.org/ifaw/dimages/custom/2_Publications/Whales/IWC/In_the_name_of_science.pdf
- Cruelty of Japanese whaling methods:
<http://www.ifaw.org/ifaw/general/default.aspx?oid=169345>
<http://www.usnewswire.com/>

Text B was taken from the Japanese Whaling Association newsletter (No. 13, March 2006), which also included the following pro-whaling articles:

- JWA Condemns Ill-intentioned Harassment by Greenpeace and Sea Shepherd in the Antarctic
- Greenpeace's Harassment Beyond Ordinary Protest —Pro-use NGO Rebutts Greenpeace's Criticism—
- THE GREENPEACE MOVEMENT AS A TYPICAL EXAMPLE OF A COERCIVE MOVEMENT FOR CULTURAL DOMINATION DESCRIBED IN THE 2004 UNDP REPORT
- FEWER NATIONS ANTI-WHALING JWA responds to 17-nation anti-whaling demarche
- WHALE MEAT IS FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION ALMOST IN ITS ENTIRETY
--Only a minuscule portion is used as pet food--

4.0 Summary of analysis

The comparative Critical Discourse Analysis of Texts A and B clearly shows the opposing ideology and motives of the authors. The most notable and easily recognizable feature of both texts is the choice of vocabulary, which often has overlapping experiential, relational and expressive value. This is immediately apparent in the wording of the headlines. The grammatical features of the texts also expose the opinions of the text producers; this is less obvious however. Finally, the context and content of the WebPages from which the news articles were accessed reinforce the respective ideologies with additional information and links to other ideologically motivated sites.

The opposing ideologies and cultural differences between the texts are overt and clearly obvious. What may be less obvious to the average reader is that both of the texts were commissioned by organizations with political agendas. These texts were produced to either persuade readers without strong opinions or to reinforce and defend the pro- and anti-whaling ideologies of readers who already agree with the respective articles and their stances.

5.0 Conclusion

Fairclough's (2001) CDA framework has proved to be a useful tool for identifying the underlying ideological and cultural differences of the two texts examined in this paper. The two representations of Japanese whaling are shown to be completely opposed to each other. Text A is attempting to convince or reaffirm to the reader that Japanese whaling is illegal, morally wrong and should be stopped by using emotionally charged language. Text B on the other hand, is basically a defensive rebuttal to this type of anti-whaling discourse, arguing against every point made in Text A and other similar texts using logic and legal jargon. These overt differences in representation are of course the products of the two opposing ideologies of both the text producers and their respective organizations: anti-whaling versus pro-whaling. Furthermore, the apparent ideologies are embedded within the cultural differences of the countries from which the texts originate: The majority of Americans are opposed to whaling while most Japanese are either in favour of whaling or at least, are not opposed to it. These opinions are reflected on the international stage of global politics where most Western countries are essentially anti-whaling while Japan is officially pro-whaling (Freeman, 1996). Considering the level of intensity and passion on both sides of this debate, it appears that the controversy surrounding Japanese whaling will not be resolved anytime soon.

As a Canadian from the Maritimes now living in Japan, whaling is a topic that I can relate to from both sides of the argument. The east coast of Canada has traditionally depended on commercial fishing for economic survival just as many coastal communities in Japan

have depended on whaling. I was born and raised in Nova Scotia within a fairly liberal family and society where I was often informed that whales need to be saved and killing them is wrong. I now live in Japan and am married to a Japanese woman, but despite having a good understanding and respect of Japan and its culture, I still have a culturally produced anti-whaling bias.

Fairclough acknowledges those who criticize critical social research for its partiality and agrees “committing oneself to an emancipatory knowledge interest does mean taking sides”. He adds that, “illusions about the neutrality of academic research should have been shattered by now” (2001: 216). I remained conscious of my personal bias while writing this paper and tried to critique both articles as objectively as possible. However, if one were to examine this paper from a CDA perspective, I’m sure my bias could be identified long before being declared here.

A pressing problem with CDA is that it is fairly new and relatively unknown outside the academic world of language study. Proponents of CDA are working to increase its awareness to other domains of society such as education, healthcare, social work, political and trade union activism, and other social movements, because “consciousness is the first step towards emancipation” (ibid: 193). Critical Discourse Analysis would also prove to be valuable in the ESL/EFL classroom. Many second language learners live and work abroad, or deal with their second language for important matters where they are in subordinate positions. An awareness of CDA and the methods used in this analysis would

be invaluable for exposing instances where people or organizations may be attempting to take advantage of them.

The new global mass media, which has been forever changed by the emergence of the World Wide Web, is full of discourse embedded with agendas and ideologies such as the pro- and anti-whaling articles analyzed in this paper. Critical Discourse Analysis can provide cautious listeners and readers, both native and second language speakers, with the methods and ability to identify the hidden messages and propaganda. Thus empowering them with more awareness and freedom to make up their own minds on important issues – the truth can often be found hidden somewhere between two opposing ideologies.

Appendix 1: Text A

U.S. Newswire

A PR Newswire Company

Japan's Whale Hunters Set Sail for Slaughter in International Whale Sanctuary

11/14/2006 3:41:00 PM

To: National and International Desk

Contact: Shawna Seldon, 212-255-8455 ext. 12 or shawna@rosengrouppr.com
Alyson Mazzarelli, 212-255-8455 ext. 36 or alyson@rosengrouppr.com
Monica Medina of IFAW-US, 202-296-3860 or mmedina@ifaw.org

SHIMONOSEKI, Japan, Nov. 14 /U.S. Newswire/ --

On Wednesday, November 15, the Japanese Government will launch a fleet of six boats from Arukaport, commencing a new season of whale hunting. Despite a global moratorium and international outcry against commercial whaling, Japan's self-allocated whaling quota permits its whalers to kill up to 935 minke and 10 endangered fin whales.

Japan's whale hunt starts just weeks after Iceland resumed commercial whaling for the first time in 20 years. Seven fin whales and one minke whale have been killed in Iceland since October 17. Much of this whale meat has been frozen due to saturation in the market.

"It's time for the United States to use its leverage to prevent this unfolding tragedy. Whales are already under threat not only from those countries that still allow commercial whaling, but also by a variety of manmade threats including pollution, ocean noise, ship strikes and global warming," said Monica Medina, Deputy Director, U.S. Operations, International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW). "The last thing they need is the return of commercial fishing to the seas. Intentionally killing these animals for food has no place in the 21st century. Rather than killing whales, governments should focus instead on the tremendous global growth in whale watching - no blood needs to be shed."

Japan hunts under the guise of "scientific" whaling, a misnomer that allows it to continue whaling despite a global ban on commercial whaling imposed by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) in 1986. In the 2005/2006 season Japan's whalers killed 853 minke and 10 fin whales from the Antarctic. Next year, Japan may also start hunting endangered humpback whales, with a self-allocated quota of 50.

An IFAW-sponsored study found that over 100,000 people went whale watching in Japan in 1998, up from 10,992 in 1991. More than 95 percent of the whale and dolphin watchers in Japan were Japanese. Total expenditures for whale watching in Japan in 1998 were estimated at \$32,984,000.

Regional communities in Japan have profited from the whale watching industry, providing new jobs and businesses in hotels, restaurants, museums, and shops. Ogata reached its 100,000th whale watcher in 2000, representing over 10 years of whale watching. In Ogasawara, Japan, where whale watching began in 1988, 1999 saw a new high with 12,000 whale watchers.

Fin whales are listed as "endangered" by the World Conservation Union (IUCN), and are second only to the blue whale in terms of size – growing to average lengths of 18-22 meters and weights of 30-80 tons. They were hunted in significant numbers by whalers in the past, and their population figures are currently unknown. Minke whales are classified as "near threatened" by the IUCN, which cites numerous conservation threats including bycatch and whaling.

"There really is no humane way to kill a whale," said IFAW scientist and whale expert Vassili Papastavrou. "Many harpooned whales sustain horrific injuries and suffer for a long time before eventually dying." An IFAW analysis of Japanese whaling video footage obtained by Greenpeace concluded that the killing methods for Antarctic minke whales are inefficient and raise serious welfare issues concerning low instantaneous death rates, protracted times to death and the occurrence of asphyxiation as a secondary killing method. Fewer than one in five of the filmed whales were estimated to have died instantaneously.

IFAW opposes whaling on the grounds of cruelty and encourages responsible whale watching around the world as a humane and sustainable alternative to whale hunting.

To learn more, visit <http://www.ifaw.org> today.

Editors: Broadcast quality archive video and still images of Japanese whaling are available at <http://www.thenewsmarket.com/ifaw>

Note to editors:

IFAW reports available online: Japan's and Iceland's "scientific" whaling:
http://www.ifaw.org/ifaw/dimages/custom/2_Publications/Whales/IWC/In_the_name_of_science.pdf

Cruelty of Japanese whaling methods:
<http://www.ifaw.org/ifaw/general/default.aspx?oid=169345>

<http://www.usnewswire.com/>

/© 2006 U.S. Newswire 202-347-2770/ 61.199.185.200

Copyright © 2006 PR Newswire Association LLC. All rights reserved. A United Business Media Company

Appendix 2: Text B

JAPAN'S ANTARCTIC RESEARCH IS LEGAL ACTIVITY

On January 16, the Institute of Cetacean Research (ICR) responded to calls in both New Zealand and Australia for legal action to be taken against its research program in the Antarctic.

ICR Director General Dr. Hiroshi Hatanaka said: "Our research is perfectly legal in every aspect referred to by antiwhaling opponents and scientifically necessary to ensure the best decisions can be made for sustainable resource management."

The ICR research is conducted under a special permit issued by Japanese Government based on its right under Article VIII of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW), which reads that: "Notwithstanding anything contained in this Convention any Contracting Government [including Japan] may grant to any of its nationals a special permit authorizing that national to kill, take and treat whales for purposes of scientific research subject to such restrictions as to number and subject to such other conditions as the Contracting Government thinks fit, and the killing, taking, and treating of whales in accordance with the provisions of this Article shall be exempt from the operation of this Convention."

"The fact that Article VIII begins and ends by categorically stating absolutely nothing in the ICRW or its Schedule affects research carried out under this provision. This means that the current moratorium on commercial whaling, which in our view expired in 1990, and the Southern Ocean Sanctuary provide no legal basis on which to stop this research."

Dr. Hatanaka added that while Japan's Antarctic research was perfectly legal, the data obtained would ensure the proper management of whale resources under a future commercial whaling regime.

"While we have one eye on the law, the other is on the need to ensure that whale stocks are utilized sustainably for future generations and our research will help us achieve that."

He added that Japan was also meeting its obligations under the 1959 Antarctic Treaty. "The Antarctic Treaty does not apply to the research activities conducted on the high seas."

Some media coverage in Australia alleges that Japan is conducting its research in an area called the "Australian Antarctic Sanctuary". "Article IV of the Antarctic

Treaty freezes all claims to the Antarctic. Japan, like most other nations in the world, does not recognize Australia's territorial claim: the Antarctic is for everyone," Dr. Hatanaka said.

Furthermore, Article VI of the Antarctic Treaty says: "...nothing in the present Treaty shall prejudice or in any way affect the rights, or the exercise of the rights, of any State under international law with regard to the high seas within that area."

"The 'rights' of any State under international law with regard to the high seas include freedom of fishing," Dr. Hatanaka said.

References

- Caldas-Coulthard, C. R. (1999) 'Women who pay for sex. And enjoy it: transgression versus morality in women's magazines', in Jaworski, A. and Coupland, N. (eds.) *The Discourse Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cambridge Dictionaries Online (2007) *Slaughter* (www) <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=74364&dict=CALD> (January 11, 2007).
- Coulthard, M.; Moon, R.; Johnson, A.; Caldas-Coulthard, C. M. and Holland, B. (2000) *Written Discourse*. Birmingham: The University of Birmingham.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and Power* (2nd edition). London: Longman.
- Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1995) 'On critical linguistics', in Caldas-Coulthard, C. R. and Coulthard, M. (eds.) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Freeman, M. (1994) Gallup on Public Attitudes to Whales and Whaling (www) <http://www.highnorth.no/Library/Opinion/ga-on-pu.htm> (December 19, 2006).
- Goulth, V. and Talbot, M. (1995) 'Guilt over games boys play: coherence as a focus for examining the constitution of heterosexual subjectivity on a problem page', in Coulthard, M. (ed.) *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Japanese Whaling Association (2006) *Questions and Answers* (www) <http://www.whaling.jp/english/qa.html> (November 25, 2006).
- JWA News. No.13, March 2006 (2006) Japan's Antarctic Research is Legal Activity (www) http://www.whaling.jp/english/news/jwa_news_13.pdf (November 18, 2006).
- Krishnamurthy, R. (1995) 'Ethnic, racial and tribal: the language of racism?', in Coulthard, M. (ed.) *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Richards, C. and Schmidt, R. (2002) *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics* (3rd edition). London: Longman.

Seldon, S.; Mazzealli, A. and Medina, M. (1996) Japan's Whale Hunters Set Sail for Slaughter in International Waters. *U.S. Newswire* (www) <http://www.usnewswire.com/index.html> (November 14, 2006).

Stubbs, M. (1983) *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Whalewatch. (2006) *FAQs on Whaling and Welfare* (www) <http://www.whalewatch.org/en/default.asp?pageid=5> (November 25, 2006).

Wodak, R. (1995) 'The genesis of racist discourse in Austria since 1989', in Coulthard, M. (ed.) *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.