Bad News for Whales at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission

By Heather Rockwell, CSI Representative

With both excitement and apprehension, I flew to Adelaide, Australia in late June for two weeks of political maneuvering and negotiating at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC). I was familiar with the infamous IWC and its role as a governing and regulating body for worldwide whaling policy. However, this was my first time actually attending the meeting as an official NGO (Non-Governmental Organization) representative for Cetacean Society International.

Over 35 countries and 89 NGOs were represented at IWC~52. CSI, which has a long history with the International Whaling Commission, is a well-known and respected conservation NGO, and this established credibility made it easier for me to speak with government delegates and other international representatives.

The first week in Adelaide involved a series of working group and subcommittee meetings (a smaller gathering of government delegates and NGO’s) that dealt with the key issues of aboriginal subsistence hunting, humane whale killing methods and scientific/research whaling.

The second week began the full meeting of the International Whaling Commission known as the Plenary. The first thing that strikes a novice NGO is that the IWC Plenary is a formal negotiating session of an international treaty comprised of member nations (very similar to treaty negotiations dealing with nuclear weapons or global warming).

The most controversial and complicated issue at this year’s meeting was the continued development of the Revised Management Scheme (RMS). It was shocking to me to personally watch as international governmental representatives actual worked on detailed legal language that will be used to manage commercial whaling when, not if, it resumes. This legal language would be the RMS.

A moratorium on commercial whaling was adopted by the Whaling Commission back in 1982. However, as we all know, Norway has continued to kill whales in defiance of the moratorium and Japan has disguised their killing of whales under the banner of “scientific” whaling. I was surprised to learn that the moratorium was established with the purpose of stopping whaling until such time as there was an accepted management scheme in place to conduct commercial whaling. A number of NGOs hoped or believed the moratorium would spell the end of commercial whaling. Evidently, the celebration was a bit premature. Japan, Norway and a number of other countries have stayed the course and have never
abandoned their desire to resume commercial whaling.

Over the past two decades, member countries that originally voted for the moratorium have since dropped out of the Commission or have stopped attending IWC Annual Meetings. And to make things worse, since 1982, a number of new countries have joined the IWC (thanks to Japanese financial aid) specifically to support Japan and Norway in their push for the resumption of whaling. After eighteen years of negotiations, the International Whaling Commission is now on the verge of establishing a so-called conservative plan for managing whaling that will supposedly allow for a limited number of whales to be “harvested.”

Just prior to this year’s meeting in Australia, I noted that many NGOs felt the RMS rule-making process still had a long way to go before being completed and adopted. However, after I attended the formal two-day RMS Working Group session and heard the extended RMS floor debate during Plenary, it was painfully clear that Japan, Norway, their pro-whaling allies and several European countries came to make progress on the adoption of the RMS. Most of the NGOs and some countries protested, but many draft regulations were finalized and subtle differences were listed for future deliberations.

Japan circulated their version of the RMS (an extremely weak set of regulations). Fortunately, these were soundly rejected. However, the “better version” of the RMS progressed further than had been anticipated. In the end, a Resolution was adopted that established a frightening, fast track process to finalize and adopt the RMS within one to two years. As a save-the-whale advocate and CSI representative, I was sickened to find out that a formal resumption of commercial whaling was so close. Equally as shocking was the fact that though the RMS Resolution was supported by Japan and Norway (and the six Caribbean pro-Japanese countries), the Resolution itself was actually drafted and proposed by China, Oman, Korea, Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark and Mexico. Those opposed to the Resolution were the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Netherlands, Monaco, Austria and Brazil. As you can see, many countries support what is said to be a form of limited, highly controlled commercial whaling. As I write this report, I sincerely feel the best we NGOs can do is to continue our fight for the strictest RMS possible and to promote commercial whale watching as a long-term replacement for the killing of whales.

The high profile issue at this year’s IWC meeting was the drive by Australia and New Zealand to create a South Pacific Whale Sanctuary. The concept had a tremendous amount of support from many countries, however a three-quarters majority vote was needed to pass the formal sanctuary proposal. Unfortunately, a vote of 19 yeas to 11 nays and four abstentions all fell far short of the total majority needed. As the CSI representative, I helped more experienced advocates lobby for passage of the Sanctuary. However, we not only faced Japan, Norway and their six Caribbean “friends,” but the following also voted AGAINST the South Pacific Whale Sanctuary: China, Denmark, and Guinea (a new IWC Member Nation financially supported by Japan). Abstentions were registered by Ireland, Korea, Oman and Russia. Australia and New Zealand vow to propose the South Pacific Sanctuary again at the 2001 IWC Annual Meeting (scheduled for London in July next year).

Just prior to this year’s meeting in Australia, I noted that many NGOs felt the RMS rule-making process still had a long way to go before being completed and adopted. However, after I attended the formal two-day RMS Working Group session and heard the extended RMS floor debate during Plenary, it was painfully clear that Japan, Norway, their pro-whaling allies and several European countries came to make progress on the adoption of the RMS. Most of the NGOs and some countries protested, but many draft regulations were finalized and subtle differences were listed for future deliberations.

Japan circulated their version of the RMS (an extremely weak set of regulations). Fortunately, these were soundly rejected. However, the “better version” of the RMS progressed further than had been anticipated. In the end, a Resolution was adopted that established a frightening, fast track process to finalize and adopt the RMS within one to two years. As a save-the-whale advocate and CSI representative, I was sickened to find out that a formal resumption of commercial whaling was so close. Equally as shocking was
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Ocean Sanctuary and in their coastal seas in the North Pacific. Japan, unsuccessfully, tried once again to have the Southern Ocean Sanctuary dissolved, which is where they do the majority of their scientific whaling. Luckily, this move was so soundly rejected that it didn’t even come up for a formal vote. All this has become a controversial subject and many resolutions have been adopted calling on Japan to stop whaling. Regrettably, these past resolutions do not carry enough legal weight to force compliance; Japan has blatantly ignored all of them.

This year, Japan gave formal notice that it intends to expand scientific whaling by harpooning more minke whales, as well as adding Bryde’s and sperm whales to their kill quotas. I witnessed “diplomacy in action” as various countries urged Japan to give up. Very strong opposition was also voiced against the expansion of scientific whaling. Two resolutions challenging scientific permit whaling in the Southern Ocean Sanctuary and the North Pacific easily passed. Unlike past resolutions, national delegates within Japan will face high-level pressure to withdraw their proposal.

Another important issue at this year’s meeting was the tracking of whale meat in the marketplace using cellular DNA analysis. By tracking the whale meat, specialists and inspectors would follow smuggling and the illegal trade of whale meat. A significant blow to these efforts to monitor illegal whale meat in markets of Japan and Norway occurred when a “DNA in the Marketplace” Resolution was soundly defeated. This one resolution demonstrated just how precarious the situation is with regards to European countries now being willing to accept some form of commercial whaling. Joining Japan, Norway and their seven pro-whaling allies (Guinea now aligned with the Caribbean six) in voting AGAINST were: China, Denmark, Korea, and Russia. And adding to the shock of it all, Chile, Ireland, Mexico, Oman, South Africa, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland all ABSTAINED from voting on this important whale protection initiative.

I sincerely regret to inform CSI members that Japan and Norway now clearly enjoy the consistent (rock-solid) support of Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Guinea (all bought and paid for thanks to Japan). AND there are the new friends of China, Denmark, Korea and Russia. These twelve commercial whaling votes can block any substantive change to or challenge of the commercial whaling debate. And when you add in the sympathetic abstentions of Chile, Ireland, Mexico, Oman, South Africa, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland, even simple-majority resolutions drafted to curb the advancement of commercial whaling don’t stand a chance.

An issue of extreme importance to CSI and all our members is the killing of gray whales by the Makah tribe of Washington State. Unfortunately, this was a non-issue on the floor of the IWC meeting this year. Although five opponents of Makah whaling, including Makah elder Alberta “Binki” Thompson, came to Adelaide, they could find no country willing to challenge (and embarrass) the United States delegation. The US still strongly supports Makah whaling and it appears they will continue to do so in the future. Two Makah tribe members were part of the official U.S. government delegation. The Makah’s quota to kill gray whales has to be renegotiated in 2002, so Alberta and her supporters vow to come back next year and continue their
Two resolutions were adopted at IWC~52 that will help two highly endangered species of whales. The eastern Arctic bowhead whale, thanks in great part to Annelise Sorg of British Columbia and a willing U.S. government, was given some much needed support. A resolution was adopted protesting the Canadian government’s repeated intentions to allow Canadian Eskimos to kill one bowhead whale from the highly endangered stock of eastern Arctic bowhead whales. Due to efforts by the World Wildlife Fund and the willingness of many member nations, a resolution was passed calling upon Canada and the United States to further protect the rare North Atlantic right whale. Specifically mentioned was the need to do something about ship strikes and stationary fishing gear, including lobster trap lines and bottom fishing gill nets. Both of the above mentioned resolutions were adopted by overwhelming consensus.

A subject of significant importance to CSI (and to me) is whale watching. I paid particular attention to the continuing development of this issue at this year’s meeting. The Commission’s Scientific Committee, attended by Brazilian researcher Marcia Engle (thanks to the generous support of CSI), held a two-day workshop on whale watching. The issue of whale watching was satisfactorily advanced at IWC~52. Regrettably, the concept of substantially replacing whale killing with whale watching is not strongly endorsed by many of the member countries of IWC.

The meeting ended on a very sad tone due to the fact that the adoption of the RMS is perhaps only one to two years away; that Japan still intends to continue with expanded scientific whaling; and that Norway intends to continue whaling in the North Atlantic. Overpowering was the fact that Japan is openly buying votes of the six Caribbean countries and other impoverished nations like the Solomon Islands and Guinea. Member dues and transportation costs for delegates from these nations to attend the IWC Annual Meetings are all covered by Japan. Clearly, if the Caribbean islands and the other smaller nations didn’t support Japan, the South Pacific Sanctuary would have passed. Many NGOs, but not many nations, are still working to challenge this vote-buying scandal.

And if matters aren’t bad enough, there is to be an “intersessional” IWC meeting specifically to further the progress with the completion, adoption and implementation of the RMS. This meeting is to take place in February of 2001 in Japan (that’s less than six months from now!). And adding to our injuries, New Zealand and Japan both were vying to be the host country of the IWC Annual Meeting in 2002. In a secret ballot many of our anti-whaling friends must have crossed over, as the vote was won by Japan. Holding IWC meetings in the extremely costly nation of Japan reduces the capability of CSI and other pro-whale NGOs to attend and lobby on behalf of the gentle giants we have all vowed to protect.

Heather Rockwell is Assistant Director of the International Wildlife Coalition. Photographs by Dan Morast, courtesy of the International Wildlife Coalition.

24 U.S. Senators Condemn Japan’s Renewed Whaling

By Dr. Robbins Barstow, CSI Director Emeritus

In a strong and unprecedented letter to President Clinton, a bipartisan coalition of 24 United States Senators, on June 12, 2000, rebuked Japan for its continued defiance of a worldwide moratorium on whaling and urged the Administration to “strongly oppose Japan’s proposal to expand their scientific whale hunts to include Bryde’s and sperm whales.”

Initiated and organized by Connecticut Senator Joe Lieberman (D), the letter affirmed the Senators’ belief that if this issue was not resolved at this year’s meeting of the International Whaling Commission in July, at Adelaide, Australia, it is serious enough to warrant joining other nations in “contacting the Japanese government at the highest levels.”

Japanese whalers acting under “scientific research” permits currently kill approximately 400 minke whales each year. Despite consistent IWC opposition to scientific whale hunts, Japan this year announced a radical expansion of its “research,” adding two new species, sperm and Bryde’s whales, which have been protected from killing since 1986.

The sperm whale is Connecticut’s official state animal, and Senator Lieberman has long been a staunch supporter of whale protection. On May 3, 1990, Lieberman was the first national political figure to speak out publicly, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, declaring that he wanted to see not just a moratorium on the commercial killing of whales, but “a ban, an end, period; no more killing of the world’s whales.”

Early in May, CSI Director Emeritus Dr. Robbins Barstow alerted Senator Lieberman to Japan’s plan to start
killing sperm whales again. Senator Lieberman then asked his staff to review the matter and to communicate with other Senators’ offices to build widespread support for a strong U.S. position in opposition to Japan’s plan to increase whale killing.

The resulting June 12 letter to the President was signed by 19 Democrats and 5 Republicans, constituting nearly one fourth of the entire United States Senate. Two days later, on June 14, an identical letter was sent to President Clinton signed by all 6 Congressional Representatives (4 Democrats and 2 Republicans) from the “sperm whale state” of Connecticut.

The impact of these Senatorial and Congressional communications is reflected in the action taken by the United States and other countries at the July 2000 IWC meeting in Australia. Japan’s new research proposals were roundly criticized by many nations, and two very strongly worded resolutions condemning them were passed by wide majorities.

CSI thanks Lieberman and the other senators and representatives for their effective stand. It may have helped lead Vice-President Al Gore to issue on June 30 the strongest anti-whaling statement ever made by a major presidential candidate. (See copy of Gore’s statement below.)

We must continue now, working with governmental agencies and other global Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s), to carry on the most powerful and unrelenting international crusade we can possibly muster to persuade the Japanese government to give up its unjustifiable scientific whale research program.

Following are the names of the United States Senators and Representatives who signed the letter to President Clinton condemning Japan’s renewed whale killing. Please write and commend them, in this election year.

Joe Lieberman (D-CT), Chris Dodd (D-CT), Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY), Ted Kennedy (D-MA), Charles Robb (D-VA), Patty Murray (D-WA), Patrick Leahy (D-VT), Ernest Hollings (D-SC), Susan Collins (R-ME), Jack Reed (D-RN), Charles Schumer (D-NY), Olympia Snowe (R-ME), Harry Reid (D-NV), Bob Graham (D-FL), Barbara Boxer (D-CA), Daniel Akaka (D-HI), Jim Jeffords (R-VT), Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), Tom Harkin (D-IA), Lincoln Chafee (R-RI), Bob Smith (R-NH), Carl Levin (D-MI), John F. Kerry (D-MA), Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ).

Connecticut Representatives: John Larson (D), Sam Gejdenson (D), Rosa DeLauro (D), Chris Shays (R), James Maloney (D), Nancy Johnson (R).

The following Statement on Whaling was issued by Al Gore’s national campaign headquarters (Nashville, TN 37203) on June 30, 2000:

**Gore 2000**

**AL Gore**

**Statement on Whaling**

I strongly support the international ban on commercial whaling in the IWC. I am pleased that, thanks in part to the leadership of the Clinton-Gore Administration, we were able to defeat "back door" efforts by other nations (e.g. Norway and Japan) at the April 10-20, 2000 meeting of the Convention for International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) to resume commercial whaling by removing protections for whales in the CITES. You have my commitment that, as President, I will fight to maintain the ban on commercial whaling, and to block any effort to decrease protections for whale species protected by the CITES. I will also continue to fight against any efforts by Japan and others to expand "lethal research" whaling under the scientific research loophole in the IWC.

I would also point out that I was a leading advocate in the creation of landmark sanctuary protections for whales under the IWC. As President, I will continue to advocate new sanctuary protections under that body.
As readers of *Whales Alive!* will recall from the last issue, CSI, along with hundreds of other conservation organizations, was gearing up for the April CITES meeting in Kenya. Held at the United Nations Environment Programme headquarters in Gigiri, just outside the capital of Nairobi, the CITES meeting proved as contentious and difficult as had been feared, as whaling advocates attempted to remove protection from various species of whales in order to circumvent the IWC moratorium on whaling and to reopen commercial trade in whale products. Norway and Japan had launched a major offensive in the year preceding the CITES meeting, visiting dozens of nations, and attempting to link foreign aid packages to votes in their favor.

For two weeks, delegates and environmental observers debated the merits of various proposals to list some sixty species of plants and animals, but it was clear from the beginning that the marine species - and whales in particular - were destined to dominate the often heated discussions in the various CITES committees. As compared to an average of forty-five minutes of discussions on most species, the whale debate dominated an entire day of proceedings, and much of the “in the hallways” lobbying efforts. As delegates entered the meeting on the day of voting, they were met by Norwegian lobbyists, dressed in traditional costumes, while anti-whaling groups invited delegates to join them at the giant inflatable whale that Greenpeace had set up on the front lawn of the UNEP complex (and that Japan had tried to get removed, along with Greenpeace!).

Pro-whaling interventions were of such a confrontational nature that Willem Wijnstekers, CITES Secretary-General, expressed his fears that the divisive political discussion found in IWC be exported to CITES; he then went on to give technical reasons why the whale delisting proposals from Japan and Norway conflict with past CITES resolutions designed to conserve whales, and recognize IWC efforts.

Japan had introduced several proposals to downlist from Appendix I (no trade) to Appendix II (limited trade) the Eastern North Pacific stock of the Gray Whale (Prop. 11.15), the Southern Hemisphere stock of the Minke Whale (Prop. 11.16), and the Okhotsk Sea-West Pacific stock of the Minke Whale (Prop. 11.17). Fiji, Vanuatu, Sierra Leone, the US, Australia, Brasil, Mexico and the European Union were among several delegations that expressed their support for the International Whaling Commission's primacy, and opposed downlisting any species subject to the IWC moratorium, showing a strong level of international support for the whaling ban. The US made particular note of the gray whale, saying that the Western stock is endangered, and that downlisting the Eastern North Pacific stock, as Japan requested, would further endanger the Western stock as it could encourage trade in gray whale products.

Michael Canny, Chairman of the International Whaling Commission (IWC), stated that a management scheme must be developed before commercial whaling can resume. Australia in particular fielded a strong team, and stressed that no management scheme for whaling has been agreed to by the IWC. CSI members will be pleased to note that Australia and Vanuatu both mentioned the “non-consumptive uses” of whales such as tourism; as readers will know, CSI has been one of the leading proponents of this concept, and has managed to actively engage the IWC in discussions of whale watching as a better “use” of whale resources.

While Japan received support from its fellow whaler, Norway, as well as from Iceland and certain Caribbean nations such as Antigua and Barbuda and Suriname, it was clearly on the defensive, and lashed out at the World Conservation Union (IUCN), whose scientists had presented the CITES delegates with an analysis of the status of global whale stocks, that called into question the numbers that Japan had used in its presentation. In addition to the downlisting proposals, there was additional discussion over just how many species of minke whales (the main target of downlisting proposals, there was additional discussion over just how many species of minke whales (the main target of Japan's contention that there are “more than 700,000 minkes in the Southern Ocean”. IUCN stuck to its scientific guns, and stood by the integrity of its population estimates; IUCN analyses have a major impact on the voting of many delegates who rely on their scientific expertise for guidance in determining species listings.

Suriname proposed an amendment to Japan’s proposal to transfer the stock to Appendix II maintaining a zero quota until COP-12, assuming that the IWC will have taken a decision on its Revised Management Scheme (RMS) by then and will have set a quota that could be applicable to CITES. Several delegations noted points of order with Suriname’s amendment, as the Japanese proposal had been defeated. Some felt consideration of the amendment violated the rules of procedure, and sought clarity on what would happen if the IWC has not made a decision by COP-12.

Norway introduced a proposal to downlist the Northeast Atlantic and the North Atlantic Central stocks of the Minke Whale (Prop. 11.18); their delegate highlighted do-
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mestic monitoring mechanisms, including DNA testing. However, as many anti-whaling delegates noted, the IWC has not agreed to an international mechanism or registry of DNA samples that would allow for a transparent and open way to track whale meat and products through markets.

As can be seen by the ballot results, the whaling nations’ attempts to overturn the CITES ban on trade in whale products failed dramatically. The Japanese gained no more than 49 votes in support of the various downlisting proposals they had put forth, compared to an average of 66 votes against them; they obviously fell far short of the required 2/3 majority needed to change a species’ listing, and didn’t even get a simple majority of support. The Norwegians’ first attempt also failed, by a vote of 52 in favor and 57 against. On the final day of the CITES meeting, Norway tried to revisit its proposal, and called on the Plenary session to reopen the debate on the Minke Whale (Prop. 11.18); it amended its initial proposal to limit trade to products from animals taken within national jurisdiction with countries where DNA-based identification systems for trade control are implemented.

Several delegations opposed the second Norwegian attempt, noting that downlisting would signal the resumption of commercial whaling, and contradict the decision that CITES had taken on consolidating various resolutions on the relationship between the IWC and CITES. This second proposal also failed by a vote of 53 in favor, 52 against. It should be noted that both the Japanese and Norwegian proposals were voted on by secret ballot, a move that conservation groups and many governments (including the US and the UK) oppose because of a lack of transparency. However, the secret ballot did not help the whalers, and their proposals fared worse than they had done at the last CITES meeting in 1997.

Norway and Japan were also roundly defeated on their proposed resolution on the “RELATIONSHIP WITH THE IWC”, which would have withdrawn CITES support for IWC management decisions. Norway called for a secret ballot on this draft resolution, and it was rejected by a wide margin. The US, in the spirit of supporting CITES work, and to not take more time on whaling issues, then withdrew its resolution on the “SYNERGY BETWEEN CITES AND THE IWC”, noting that it was clear from the vote on the Norwegian/Japanese proposal that delegates did in fact support the IWC.

In addition to the large whale issues, enviro delegates had expressed concern on the status of the Black Sea bottlenose dolphin; the government of Georgia, with the US as cosponsor had moved to try and list this dolphin on Appendix I. The Black Sea bottlenose has been captured for use in aquaria, and with increasing concerns about the status of the dolphin in the wild, it was hoped that such a listing attempt would draw attention to the plight of this dolphin. While the CITES Conference failed to place the Black Sea bottlenose on Appendix I, it did issue an extremely strong resolution on the subject, calling on member nations to refuse to allow the import or export of these dolphins “without evidence from the CITES Management Authority at the destination that the animals will be received and maintained in proper facilities”, as well as calling on all nations in whose waters the dolphins are found to provide updated information on the conservation and trade in the species. This is an important first step that will help in the efforts to get trade in this species banned.

On the whole, cetaceans fared extremely well at CITES. Our thanks to all of our CSI members and friends for their support of the Society’s campaign efforts at the meeting. Additional and special thanks to the government of Kenya, whose hospitality and logistic support were matched by the beauty of their country and warmth of its people. Their conservation efforts on elephants are to be applauded, along with the strong opposition to the whale downlisting proposals. As is said in Swahili ... ASANTE SANA!!! (many thanks!!!)

Caribbean Conservation
By Kate O’Connell, CSI Board

On May 25th, 2000, the Government of St. Lucia became the ninth government to ratify the SPAW Protocol of the Cartagena Convention, making the Protocol international law. St. Lucia joins Colombia, Venezuela, the Netherlands, Cuba, Trinidad and Tobago, the Dominican Republic, Panama and St. Vincent and the Grenadines; the Protocol is now legally binding on all of those nations which have ratified it. This Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife Protocol (SPAW) is considered to be one of the most comprehensive environmental treaties ever developed. SPAW is one of several protocols of the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (the Cartagena Convention). The Cartagena Convention and its Protocols represent a commitment by the participating governments to protect, conserve and manage their common marine re-
sources.

SPAW is designed to protect rare and fragile ecosystems and habitats and the endangered and threatened species residing in those habitats. SPAW is the only regional environmental agreement addressing biodiversity conservation issues of the Wider Caribbean. Given that SPAW was developed by the governments of the region and for the region, it is more appropriate and specific to the environmental needs of the Wider Caribbean than other treaties.

The SPAW Protocol is made up of different Annexes, the first of which provides strong protection to species of flora, and the second of which provides protection to endangered and threatened species of fauna found in the region. As currently constituted, cetaceans, manatees, sea turtles, various parrot species, and certain crocodiles are listed in Annex II. By listing these species on this Annex, the governments that have ratified the treaty “shall ensure total protection and recovery to the species of fauna ... by prohibiting:

i. the taking, possession or killing (including, to the extent possible, the incidental taking, possession or killing) or commercial trade in such species, their eggs, parts or products;

ii. to the extent possible, the disturbance of such species, particularly during periods of breeding, incubation or migration, as well as other periods of biological stress.”

However, several key governments have yet to ratify SPAW, among them the United States. In order for the SPAW Protocol to be able to function regionally, as many countries as possible from the Wider Caribbean need to agree to and abide by the terms of the Protocol. CSI urges our members to help us by writing to the US State Department, urging that they ratify the SPAW Protocol as soon as possible, and without taking reservations to any of the terms of the treaty.

Please write to:

David B. Sandelow
Assistant Secretary of State,
Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs
US Department of State
Washington, DC 20520

Update on Tuna/Dolphin

By Kate O’Connell, CSI Board

In April, as noted in the last edition of Whales Alive!, several US groups won a court case that they had filed against the US government, arguing that recent changes in the definition of the dolphin safe label were illegal; the groups contend that the government is unable to conclusively prove that the act of encircling dolphins with tuna nets has had no negative impact on dolphin populations in the eastern Pacific. On May 17th, the US government appealed this decision, and the dolphin safe definition remains a hotly contested issue.

However, one of the biggest concerns raised by the various groups, that of the potential mixing of dolphin-safe and dolphin-unsafe tuna in boat wells has now been put to rest. At its annual meeting in June, the member nations of the Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program (AIDCP) passed a resolution, unanimously agreeing to end the possible mixing of tuna in wells.

The same meeting also heard evidence that the number of dolphin deaths in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) tuna fishery continues to fall; current tallies put the annual mortality figure at less than 1500 animals for 1999. Additional concerns that had been raised by environmental groups revolved around the fact that under the AIDCP, governments are allowed to field up to 50% national observer coverage on board their purse seine vessels, as opposed to using international observers from the IATTC (Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission).

Certain groups questioned the fact that the national and international programmes could be being managed in different ways, thus leading to different statistical results on dolphin protections. The meeting, held in San Jose, Costa Rica, agreed to an analysis of the different observer programmes, with an aim to ensuring that the same methodologies in data collection and reporting are used.

The IATTC also passed a strong resolution on bycatch of other species in the EPO, requiring fishermen on purse seine vessels to promptly release unharmed, to the extent practicable, all sea turtles, sharks, billfishes, rays, mahimahi and other non-target species. The resolution is particularly strong for sea turtles, in that it mandates fishers to “develop and use techniques and equipment to facilitate the rapid and safe release of any such animals” and, if a sea turtle is sighted in their nets, to stop “net roll ... as soon as the sea turtle comes out of the water and ... not start again until the turtle has been disentangled and released.” If a turtle is brought aboard the vessel, the new resolution re-
quires that it should, if necessary, be resuscitated before being returned to the water.

The resolution also put in place strong language calling on the governments fishing in the EPO to reduce “to the maximum extent practicable” the bycatch of juvenile tunas and other non-target species.

As a proponent of an open and transparent process in international decision making having to do with environmental issues (having opposed secret ballots at both the IWC and CITES and having worked for increased participation by environmental groups in international treaties), CSI is pleased to note the IATTC made strong steps forward in dealing with attempts to enforce its management and conservation measures.

The IATTC has now established a Permanent Working Group on Compliance that is fully open to environmental delegates. NGO observers can attend the meetings of the Working Group, can have timely access to all information provided to the group, and can speak out on issues of concern to them. Such a decision makes the IATTC one of the most ground-breaking international fisheries organizations in the world, and should serve as a precedent for other international marine resource management fora.

---

**Navy Noise Policies: Bad Mistake Or Worse Strategy?**

*By William Rossiter, CSI President*

This update on Navy noises focuses on a communications problem that has resulted in delays, cancellations and an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust, complicating the Navy’s mission, the government’s responsibilities, and the public’s awareness. It has become harder for everyone concerned with acoustical issues to learn enough about a project or experiment in a timely manner to make a valid judgment about its effects. Either because of multiple mistakes or a directed strategy, the Navy mottos seem to be “tell them little and tell them late” and “trust us”. For example, the next LFA test in Hawaii was announced in a very limited way without a 30 day public comment period. Even the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is finding out about tests just before they are to start, if at all. This has left all concerned with no choice but to argue for delays.

The Navy had made a distinct effort to “go green” with the LFA Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process, but only after questioning by the Natural Resources Defense Council in 1995. When the LFA DEIS was criticized strongly the Navy seemed stung with the scientific, official, and public rebuke to what they perceived as an unusually open, cooperative and expensive effort.

Problems with the LFA DEIS continue to appear long after its debauched debut. For example, it had concluded from the associated Scientific Research Program (SRP) that there were no significant biological impacts in Hawaii. In contrast a recent article in the scientific journal *Nature*, by Dr. Patrick Miller of Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, concluded that humpback whales’ songs changed in response to noises from the LFA projectors used in the 1998 SRP tests off Maui. He suggested that sonar transmissions by the U.S. Navy could disrupt whale breeding and cause other behavioral changes.

In mid-March several cetacean species were part of a mass stranding in the Bahamas, coinciding with Littoral Warfare Advanced Development test (LWAD) 00-1 and many other naval operations. Both the Navy and NMFS have declared that the LWAD 00-1 was not the culprit, based on time and distance. Although officials and scientists have been unable to link the biological damage to a specific source of acoustic energy or pressure the coincidental transit by a task force using tactical sonars is considered a probable cause. The bombshell conclusion, still preliminary, is that certain complex combinations of naval operations and local characteristics cause whales and dolphins to strand.

Correcting CSI’s initial report in April, this was not a unique event. Since 1838, 49 mass strandings have been recorded of beaked whales. Only seven were mixed species mass strandings, all of which occurred only within the past 30 years on the islands of Corsica, the Canary Islands, and most recently the Bahamas. All had naval maneuvers being conducted in the area of the strandings.

Several other recent events in the Caribbean have similarities to the Bahamas strandings but their remote locations prevented useful determinations. An ongoing Navy and NOAA investigation into the Bahamas stranding pooled data from biologists, officials and the Navy at workshops in June and July. All six beaked whales studied had some evidence of trauma to tissue associated with hearing or sound production, caused by a distant explosion or an intense acoustic event; the animals may have lost their equilibrium or ability to orient. Other species stranded too, but it is not clear if conclusions will be extended to them. Results may not be final until early in 2001. CSI is very grate-
ful for all the dedicated expertise directed to this problem. We look to NMFS to maintain their authority over such destructive operations, extreme harassment by any definition. We look to the Navy to meet their regulatory obligations and stated goals regarding marine mammals. The Navy has acknowledged the priority need to define potential impacts from combinations of tactical sonars in certain environments, but has not indicated that operational constraints are in effect pending the investigation.

As if the open LFA DEIS process was an experiment that had failed, the Navy in April became more closed and formal, opting for last minute, minimal compliance with requirements to get on with the mission. Communications became more guarded, by procedure as well as by a breakdown of trust and confidence. Even stereotypes and personalities got in the way of logic and communications.

The furor over the Bahamas stranding and LWAD 00-1 uncovered a pattern of the Navy pushing the envelope for minimal permit and authorization processes with NMFS. Environmental Assessments (EAs) are supposed to describe projects in a timely manner, with enough information to justify official authorizations, and to allow concerned people to judge potential impacts. The public did not review the EA for LWAD 00-1 until after the test. The EA for the LWAD 00-2 Naval test scheduled for late May off New Jersey was requested by many, but for unrelated reasons was very late; CSI never got one. Many people complained to NMFS about the situation. NMFS balked at the increasing Navy pressures for official approval with minimal compliance. In a strong letter NMFS declared that a more cooperative, open and compliant process was required. The test was cancelled.

Environmental groups became frustrated and suspicious of anything to do with the Navy and noise; some reacted as if every active acoustical test was an immediate threat. Unrelated projects were affected. For example, the Delaware Bay High-Frequency Acoustic Experiment was disapproved in July by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection for concerns with commercial fisheries. But perhaps the DEP had given the project an extra-hard look after being besieged by letters of justified concern from environmental groups that had been unable to get information on the project as the start date loomed. Most groups were concerned with bottlenose dolphins with young calves that forage the area this time of year. It seemed prudent for qualified experts to assess possible impacts and implications. CSI could not take a position on the test without some information, and we assumed that responsible officials knew as little as we did. We now believe that the University of Delaware had been contracted by ONR to operate a 90-day project to study the physics of underwater sound from three acoustical sources in Delaware Bay as a possible monitor of the Bay’s health. Poor communications caused an indefinite delay and considerable inconvenience to what may be a worthy project. We cannot tell; we will not get an EA for some time.

Another example of collateral damage is a project to test the reactions of sperm whales and beaked whales in the Azores to low frequency sounds. The Principle Investigators are Dr. Peter Tyack of Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and Dr. Jonathan Gordon of Oxford University. This project also illustrates the basic dilemma inherent in understanding and regulating potential harm to marine organisms from human noise. CSI and many others advocate emphatically that regulating and managing human noise must start at the threshold where significant behaviors are changed, not the threshold of deafness as advocated by the Navy. If cetaceans avoid or flee an area critical for feeding, reproducing or migrating, because of human noise such as an LFA operation or a fleet in motion, the behavioral impacts alone may be severe. The Bahamas stranding proved also that “normal” fleet noises could destroy cetaceans; these were the whales and dolphins that could not get away. There is some evidence for noise levels that initiate negative behaviors, but not enough to allow officials to make and enforce regulations. In fact, there is considerable concern that regulations are being considered that will limit noise only at the physical impact levels, by default as high as 180 decibels, because the scientific evidence to support lower maximum levels, where behaviors are impacted, is not sufficient. But how do you test cetacean reactions to noise without causing harm? Some environmentalists do not think that is possible, and argue against all noise tests.

What if the tests were done by scientists with specific expertise, scientific integrity and extraordinary concern for whales? Can the right people do the tests without causing harm? We need to know the facts; without the data from such tests no one will ever have a clue about when human noises create significant behavioral impacts, or the ammunition to make enforceable policies and laws to constrain our damaging noise. On a personal note, having known Peter Tyack and Jonathan Gordon for many years, I consider them among the very best people to do the job. By supporting their scientific research we urge all scientists and officials to move beyond inhumane tests that measure deafness, to help us all understand the only meaningful threshold that must become the regulatory limit: when do our noises cause significant negative behaviors? Tyack and Gordon will not harm whales; they will help us to know when our noises might do harm.

The Azores project became mired in LFA politics because a loaned U.S. Navy LFA projector had been considered as the transmitter early on. Because the LFA DEIS was
considered to be grossly deficient by many, including CSI, in part for a lack of data on toothed whales, the use of a Navy LFA projector in the Azores implied that the Navy was seeking more data. In Hawaii a case against the LFA had been dismissed because the Navy had stated in court that no further tests on whales were required. The implication that an LFA projector was to be included in the Azores experiment became the basis of a legal appeal in Hawaii, which was denied.

However, the Navy and LFA are back in Hawaii. Without even a 30 day comment period, on 8 July the State of Hawaii Office of Environmental Quality Control publication, “The Environmental Notice” reported: “The U.S. Navy is proposing the potential use of the SURTASS LFA in waters surrounding the state of Hawaii, excluding ocean areas necessary to prevent exposure of 180 decibels within 22 kilometers / 12 nautical miles of land and 145 decibels within known recreational and commercial dive sites. SURTASS LFA sonar is intended to provide improved submarine detection capabilities, thereby sustaining its antisubmarine warfare mission”. Notice that this does not specify tests on whales, but it will certainly be heard by many. Comments were due by 31 July.

Overall, the Navy’s attitude appears arrogant, aggressive, and not in tune with the Navy’s public statements. Almost all Navy and ONR projects’ EAs use very similar language and conclusions. Outdated references are repeated and relied upon. Several reputable sources less supportive of the Navy’s intent remain excluded. The EAs and requests were presented to NMFS at a local level unreasonably close to test start dates, pressuring officials with the cost and difficulty of last minute cancellations, for which NMFS is not responsible. Specific NMFS agents who might not even be well qualified for the issue would be pushed to sign off on a Navy test or operation with minimal time and inadequate information.

The clamor over LWAD 00-1 also briefly uncovered LWAD 00-3. Rumored for late summer in the Gulf of Maine, this test may have totally unknown effects, even to the Navy. Many scientific centers are concerned for the potential effects in their home regions. CSI’s letter of 9 June requesting an EA on this project to Rear Admiral Gaffney, Chief, Office of Naval Research, has received no response. Other organizations have had similar experiences.

And yes, ATOC is back. A DEIS for the project, now referred to as the North Pacific Acoustic Laboratory Project, is out for comment on the plan to continue using the Hawaii cable and broadcast system for an additional five years. Public meetings were held in Kauai, Hawaii in early July. Please keep in mind that we are not dealing with the larger problem of broad scale and deep ocean impacts from commercial shipping, which are still beyond any hint of a solution. And our collective noises are only some of the ways we are polluting the seas. The evidence is clear that we are causing significant and accelerating changes. What to do about it all is still beyond us.

Makah Whaling: Appeal Wins

By William Rossiter, CSI President

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on 9 June suspended by a 2-1 decision federal approval of the Makah whale hunt, ordering a new study of environmental risks. The full text of the ruling on the “Metcalf v. Daley” suit can be found on the court’s website (http://www.ce9.uscourts.gov/). In the majority opinion, the court said the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) had violated the law by failing to conduct a review that was timely, objective and “in good faith, not an exercise in form over substance”. A new Environmental Assessment (EA) was ordered “under circumstances that ensure an objective evaluation free of the previous taint”. The court found that NMFS had promised the Makah help to gain approval for the hunt from the International Whaling Commission (IWC). The judges said that commitment to the tribe biased the agency, which began the environmental review with a foregone conclusion. The court asked that the hunt be suspended while the NMFS reviews its environmental consequences. The ruling is a statement about the importance of unbiased, vigorous governmental review.

The Northwest regional office of the NMFS will conduct a new EA, which will face intense scrutiny in part because for many months an increasing number of gray whales have stranded from Mexico to Alaska. Evidence continues to build that global warming may have altered the prey availability or distribution in the gray whales’ summer feeding areas, with the potential that more whales are undernourished and candidates for immune suppression, reproductive failures, and disease. The whales’ benthic feeding habits may place them under greater risk of ingestion of toxins and pollutants. A new EA should take these factors into account.

This spring, before the court ruling, the Makah went on nine hunts and threw seven harpoons. Although at least
one harpoon hit a whale it was officially not considered a strike; just another example of the back bending by the government. Another far more astonishing example was the excessive zeal and near deadly force used by the U.S. Coast Guard. Having declared an exclusionary zone around the whalers for reasons of public safety the USCG seriously injured some protesters and confiscated boats that tried, illegally, to protect the whales. Only luck kept people from dying. Although budget cuts curtailed USCG operations in many parts of the U.S., the Makah protection fleet just grew. Meanwhile, a report from Citizens Against Government Waste found that the Administration has spent 4.7 million dollars of U.S. taxpayers’ money to support Makah whaling.

Humans Versus Dolphins: Paracas National Reserve, Peru

*By William Rossiter, CSI President*

Supporting international conservation research directed by local scientists has been a remarkably productive effort by CSI for over two decades. It has been an investment in significant scientific knowledge, the futures of good and talented people, and for potential solutions to problems. A recent, excellent example of where some of your contribution to CSI goes is the “Photoidentification Study of Bottlenose Dolphins at the Paracas National Reserve, Peru”. This project compels us to consider a sobering dilemma undoubtedly common in many of the world’s poorer coastal regions where all available resources are vital to human survival. Julio C. Reyes, Mónica Echegaray S., and Nelly de Paz C. of ACOREMA (Areas Costeras y Recursos Marinos) in Pisco, Peru, completed a 13 month project in January that documented two bottlenose dolphin groups. One ranged over 50 km into waters where they were threatened by directed takes for human consumption and pollution. The other dolphin group was restricted to the Reserve, with a range of only about 11 km, but threatened by dynamite fishing. All species of dolphins suffered habitat encroachment by uncontrolled development of shellfish farming. El Niño destroyed many people’s livelihood, worsened impoverished conditions, and forced many changes. In Paracas Bay some fishermen turned to scallop farming. Today 48 legal and perhaps 75 illegal farms have filled Paracas Bay with buoys, nylon lines and special gear that often entangle marine life.

Including the bottlenose dolphins, eight species of cetaceans were recorded during the study, including Burmeister’s porpoise, dusky dolphin, long-snouted common dolphin, melon-headed whale, rough-toothed dolphin, pygmy killer whale, and humpback whale. The smaller species are often targets of a continual informal trade in dolphin meat, in this region sold door to door as human food. Open displays of dolphin meat in markets is unlikely because the capture of small cetaceans is banned in Peru, but a lack of official will and limited resources makes controls more unlikely. The potential exists for significant impacts on a local cetacean population, but must be balanced against the need for people to survive in difficult times. Quantifying, much less monitoring, the take is extraordinarily difficult, and requires incredible initiative, tact and perseverance. ACOREMA’s Julio Reyes has excelled at this difficult work since CSI first helped to support his efforts in the 1980’s. His international reputation belies the fact that Julio and ACOREMA operate with very limited resources, unable to afford what many graduate students in Europe and North America consider basic needs.

Congratulations to UNEP Global 500 Award Winner Abbi Bjorgvinsson!

*By William Rossiter, CSI President*

CSI heartily congratulates Asbjorn (Abbi) Bjorgvinsson, Director of the Husavik Whale Center in Iceland, for being awarded the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) Global 500 Roll of Honour, in June, during World Environment Day ceremonies in Adelaide, Australia. Klaus Toepfer, UNEP Executive Director said, “As a defender of the environment, you are an active partner in the struggle for environmental protection. You do not seek rewards, but your achievements richly deserve to be recognized. UNEP is indeed honoured to pay tribute to your commitment and we hope that this recognition will encourage you to continue your work. I hope that, as a
new laureate, you will become part of a growing global network of allies assisting UNEP in its responsibilities for the care of our planet.” CSI has supported the Center for many years and we are thrilled that Abbi has again been recognized for his work. Abbi is the first winner from CSI’s nominations over the years, our benefit from CSI’s own 1988 Global 500 award.

Last November Abbi was awarded the Netherlands’ “Knight of The Golden Ark” medal by H.R.H. Prince Bernhard. This award is given to people dedicated to promote conservation and education on wildlife. (See Whales Alive!, January 2000.)

Abbi’s goal with his work for the Husavik Whale Center and Iceland’s whale watching business is to change the public’s attitude toward whales and whale watching within Iceland. Early this year he organized a whale watch workshop, with support from the International Fund for Animal Welfare. The workshop demonstrated to Icelandic operators that close cooperation could result in better service to the tourists, better whale watching and greater public awareness regarding the whales. Guidelines on whale watching are conscientiously applied and great care is taken not to disturb the wildlife. Abbi recently reported that 20,000 tourists have gone on whale watching tours from Husavik and 12,000 guests visited the Whale Center this year. The total number of whale watchers in Iceland this summer is estimated to have been close to 35,000. Whale watching is now considered one of the most promising sectors for Iceland’s future tourism.

---

**News Notes**

*By William Rossiter, CSI President*

**Over 300 Gray Whale Strandings This Year**

More than 300 beached or floating dead gray whales have been reported so far in 2000, along with a dramatic drop in births, from a high of 1,520 in 1997 to just 282 this year. Many experts have explained the event as an indicator that the whale’s numbers have reached the point where the habitat can’t support the population, and that the food source has diminished because of changes in the Bering and Chukchi seas. Gray whales were removed from the U.S. endangered species list in 1994. In March 1999, federal biologists concluded a five-year study to assess the whale’s progress since being taken off the list, concluding that everything was wonderful. Mortalities began to rise after El Niño. A new federal study adds chemical contaminants, natural toxins, entanglements and ship strikes to the pressures on the gray whales’ population. Concern will turn to alarm if the decline continues.

**Eating Whales Is Dangerous To Your Health**

The IWC Commissioner from Monaco made the following statement in the Plenary Session on 4 July: “There is mounting evidence from the scientific front that a diet based substantially on the meat and organs of cetaceans acts as a vector for various contaminants, particularly the organics and heavy metals such as mercury and cadmium. We do welcome the attention placed by the Scientific Committee on these matters, particularly since we know from recent studies that these compounds, PCBs, dioxins, methyl mercury and cadmium, bioaccumulate in the fatty tissues of cetaceans in much greater concentrations than in fish. In other words, to paraphrase a famous label found on cigarette packs, it is fair to say at this stage that consuming whale products may be dangerous to your health. For instance, recent toxicological studies have revealed unacceptable dioxin and mercury levels in many cetacean products that are found in markets. Mercury levels have been found to exceed the toxic threshold by 1600 times in whale meat sold in Japan, particularly as bacon blubber, and dioxin levels exceed the acceptable level by 170 times. Now, Mr. Chairman, who in his or her right mind would wish to get poisoned? Surely not the aboriginal whalers, their wives, children, babies, surely not the innocent consumers who may not be aware of the risk.”

**Whales Eat Fish?**

The preposterous Japanese allegation that whales needed to be killed because whales eat too many fish, as reported in April’s Whales Alive!, have stimulated excellent studies on declining fish stocks. CSI recommends highly “The Facts About Whales and Fish Stocks”. In graphic and objective form this NOAA booklet demonstrates that fish eat fish, whales usually eat species humans don’t eat, and most important, humans are the major causes of fisheries collapses. The booklet is in English, French and Spanish, and is available from NOAA, Office of Public & Constituent Affairs, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC
20230-0001, 202-482-6090, (http://www.noaa.gov). Why wasn’t it also translated to Japanese? The horrific drive fisheries continue in coastal Japan, fed by local frustrations with fisheries collapsing one after the other. Aided by the government, local fishermen kill hundreds of small cetaceans in hopes of recovering the livelihood they themselves are destroying. Meanwhile the Japanese people are responding to reality in many positive ways, in spite of government propaganda, and are certainly ready to accept the truth presented in the NOAA booklet.

Lost Fishing Gear Found

The International Fund for Animal Welfare (http://www.ifaw.org) does many excellent things. CSI congratulates IFAW for coordinating a spring cleanup of “ghost” fishing gear such as nets, ropes, and lobster pots and buoys, from areas in Cape Cod Bay needed by right whales. The cleanup will expand considerably next year.

Price Of A Stamp

The Endangered Species Act is a very good law, which is why it’s the constant target of “wise use” interests who slip under public apathy to weaken the law. An educated and concerned public is the best defense. The Endangered Species Coalition (ESC) is our best weapon to prevent public apathy. CSI is proud and relieved to be one of many organizations in the ESC, esc@stopextinction.org, http://www.stopextinction.org. According to the ESC less than 32 cents of each American’s taxes goes to endangered species conservation, less than the price of an endangered species stamp.


NMFS announced in June that it would not list Cook Inlet beluga whales as endangered under the Endangered Species Act. The Center for Marine Conservation announced that they intended to sue NMFS to force an endangered listing. NMFS is currently investigating two cases of possible illegal hunting of Cook Inlet beluga whales.

The American Cetacean Society will host its Seventh International Conference from 17-19 November, in Monterey, California. This unique event will bring people together from the full spectrum of our collective relationship with whales. It will be educational and fun, a celebration that should not be missed. For more details see http://www.acsonline.org, or call 310-548-6279.

Jay Leventhal Saves Whales

By William Rossiter, CSI President

Need a truly inspirational story? Seven-year-old Jay Leventhal of Pennsylvania wrote CSI to ask for suggestions of how to “save whales”. After several suggestions from CSI President Bill Rossiter, Jay wrote back to describe his Whale-a-thon, a run/walk-a-thon which enabled him to raise six hundred dollars. After further consultation with Bill, Jay decided to give the money to the Whale Disentanglement Team from the Center for Coastal Studies (http://www.coastalstudies.org).

In June Jay and his Mom drove from Pennsylvania to Provincetown, Massachusetts, to deliver Jay’s check to the Center, and have some fun. With a small hero’s welcome he met many of the Center’s dedicated people, learned all about the rescue gear from Dr. “Stormy” Mayo, one of the key people on the core disentanglement team, and went on a world famous Dolphin Fleet whale watch.

“Dear Bill, My mom and I had tons of fun and I saw a lot of of great whales. Thank you also for recommending to send the money to the Center for Coastal studies. I saw three Fin Whales and 5 Humpback Whales. One whale kept on breaching. A few other whales put their backs up and then their flukes and then dove down deep. Peter the scientist on the boat let me stand on the front highest level on the ship for the whole ride. It was so much fun. Stormy Mayo showed me baleen from Staccato. Then he explained to us his therie on why right whales are disappearing. He explained his therie about why the whales aren’t having babies. He also showed me whale food and let me keep some. We looked at the whale food under a microscope. Stormy also showed me his files on the 1200 Humpback whales that they are tracking. I really liked my visit. The people at the Center were really nice to. Your friend Peter Borelli [Executive Director] was very nice too. I took a picture with Stormy and Peter when I gave them the check.
Also, my mom took some great pictures of the Humpbacks breaching. In one of them, you can really see the white markings on the flukes. She is going to blow it up for me and put it on my wall. I saw tons of seagulls during the whale watch and Peter [Peter Trull, Center scientist and whale watch naturalist] knew tons about whales and seagulls. Thank you again. My mom and I had so much fun. I will never forget our trip. I told her we should plan to go back every year. Your friend, Jay”

Book Review

Meeting Dolphins: My Adventures In The Sea
Review by Jean Rioux, CSI Board and Marine Mammal Conservation Program, Nantucket.

Meeting Dolphins: My Adventures in the Sea by Kathleen Dudzinski is a wonderfully simple book that tells a great deal about dolphins! The text is remarkably concise, with each page featuring a whole new and interesting aspect of Dudzinski’s work and experiences. Yet she still manages to keep it personal enough so that the reader is interested and intrigued. And, this National Geographic book lives up to the magazine’s reputation for spectacular photography. In just 61 beautiful pages, Dudzinski covers her beginnings in New England and what made her choose marine biology as a profession, with a speciality in dolphin communication in the wild. Interlaced with this are the many things she had to learn about her subjects, both by scientific investigation and by accident, giving the reader an insider’s view of what science is really all about. Then there are the skills she had to master to move about underwater gathering data from some of the most agile swimmers in the sea, which makes the book a tale of adventure, as well as discovery.

All of the above add up to making Meeting Dolphins an outstanding choice for readers of any age. You will learn a lot about dolphins and the author in a very short, enjoyable read!

Notes

• To all CSI members: There is a CSI membership application on the back page of every Whales Alive! When you have finished reading each issue, please pass it along to a friend, who might be interested in becoming a member of CSI!

• Please contact the editor of Whales Alive! (Brent Hall, 460 Wallingford Road, Cheshire, CT 06410 USA, bshall@home.com) if you can read and translate Japanese, and would be willing to help us understand newsletters that we receive from Japanese organizations such as the ELSA Nature Conservancy (see Whales Alive! April 2000).

• It took us a long time to get with the rest of the world, but CSI can now accept credit card payments (Mastercard and Visa) for memberships and purchases, and payments in non-US currency. Because of concern for Internet security of credit card numbers, transactions will not be handled by email, but by mailed or faxed membership forms or purchase requests that we will process securely. This serves our international members’ needs better.

• CSI is pleased to offer the very attractive 5x7 inch note cards produced by the Nantucket Historical Association. The graphite cover drawings are by CSI’s own gifted artist, shantyman, historical whaling expert and Past President, Don Sineti! At Don’s insistence, in lieu of compensation to Don the Association has sent these sets to CSI as fund-raisers! Anyone familiar with Don’s professional work will agree that his portrayals of the humpback, finback, right, sperm and orca whales are superb, and with a short description on each card’s back applicable to New England’s history, and in support of CSI’s hard work, these cards should be on everyone’s list. Each set of twenty cards is $10.00 plus $3.00 shipping. Send your order to: CSI, P.O. Box 953, Georgetown, CT 06829 U.S.A.

• Current and previous issues of Whales Alive! can be found on CSI’s World Wide Web site at:

http://elfi.com/csihome.html
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Benefits of Cetacean Society International membership include:

* **Whales Alive!, a quarterly newsletter** with updates on local, national and global issues, PLUS
* **Membership meetings** let you meet, interact, and learn from whale experts from around the globe, PLUS
* **Access to CSI's unmatched lending library** of books and videos about cetaceans, PLUS
* **The satisfaction** of supporting a small but effective organization that has earned the respect and support of scientists and conservationists around the world.
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Please mail this form to: **Cetacean Society International**, c/o Brent Hall, 460 Wallingford Road, Cheshire, CT 06410 USA. Note: Amounts over the regular membership cost of $15 constitute tax deductible contributions as provided by law. If your employer has a matching grant program, please enclose the application form; this will double your donation to CSI.