

Earth Wars: PETA, Sea Shepherds, Greenpeace and Ethics

Kim Pewitt-Jones, Doctoral Candidate

Texas Tech University

College of Media and Communication

University of Texas at Arlington

Communication Department Senior Lecturer

## Earth Wars: PETA, Sea Shepherds, Greenpeace and Ethics

### Abstract

This paper discusses ethics theories employed by environmental and animal rights organizations such as PETA, The Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, and Greenpeace, in recruiting supporters. These organizations must gain support based on ethics, but what philosophy do they follow in gaining supporters? By examining the ethics theories used by these environmentalists, the research is enhanced concerning how environmental organizations gain support through moral and ethical appeals. Discussing these practices might allow researchers and organizations to examine closer the ethical practices of environmental organizations to gain more understanding of how they attract supporters. It may also provide insight concerning how they could gain more support for their causes through a better understanding of cultural moral values beyond Western moral philosophies.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the ethical practices of environmental organizations. Discussing these practices should encourage organizations to examine their ethical practices in order to foster more support. These practices will be discussed using examples from three environmental and animal conservation organizations: Greenpeace, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), and the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society.

Paul Watson, a former member<sup>1</sup> of Greenpeace, began an extreme campaign to stop the Japanese from killing any type of whales in the South Antarctic Ocean in 2000. The Japanese were mainly targeting pilot whales at the time. He founded a new environmental group to accomplish his goals—The Sea Shepherd Conservation Society ([www.seashepherd.org](http://www.seashepherd.org)). Watson's target area was the Southern Whale Sanctuary located in waters where Australia maintains the fishing rights but was not actively enforcing the ban on whaling, according to the Sea Shepherds<sup>2</sup> (Shapiro, 2010; Caprari, A. M., 2010; Jabour & Iliff, 2009). So, stopping the “illegal” whaling became the major objective of the Society. The activists' goal in the Southern Whale Sanctuary was to prevent the Japanese whaling fleet from continuing its whaling for commercial means. The Japanese said they were whaling “legally” for research<sup>3</sup>, but overwhelming evidence showed they were canning the whale meat on the fleet's factory ship right after one of their harpoon boats killed whales. It was then transported to Japan and sold for profit.

In 2008, Sea Shepherd decided to accelerate their efforts to stop the Japanese. and as part of their new campaign, *Whale Wars* was launched ([www.animal.discovery.com/tv/whale-wars](http://www.animal.discovery.com/tv/whale-wars); [www.seashepherd.org](http://www.seashepherd.org)). *Whale Wars* was a television series aired on Animal Planet, a cable-TV network, which documented the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society's tactics to force the Japanese whalers to stop hunting whales.

Their plan included tactics to prevent the Japanese whaling fleet's factory ship from processing and canning the whale meat. This process began following the transfer of recently harpooned whales to it from a harpoon ship. Another strategy used by the Sea Shepherds was high-powered pressure cannons bolted to their ship's deck to shoot butyric acid (a rancid substance with a putrid odor that spoils meat) onto the deck of the Japanese factory ship. Tactics

such as these were used as evidence to show supporters that the Sea Shepherds use nonviolent measures to hinder the slaughter of whales for commercial purposes. By utilizing these strategies, the Sea Shepherds displayed characteristics of more than one ethics theories—particularly situation, utilitarian, and virtue ethics, which appealed to many of their supporters.

Although their actions are characteristic of situation and virtue ethics, their overarching ethics theory aligns with deontological ethics theory. They believe that killing whales is intrinsically wrong, so in order to stop the Japanese, their strategies are justified. These actions also follow a teleological ethics theory that embraces the idea that the end justifies the means. Another tactic characteristic of these theories that the Sea Shepherd members used was to launch a fouling line that could become tangled in a ship's propellers and bring it to a total stop. Watson and other Society members said employing these types of strategies was necessary to stop the whale slaughter, and Sea Shepherd has a history of using these types of extreme measures. These extreme tactics have brought heavy criticism from many entities, but not from supporters ([www.seashepherd.org](http://www.seashepherd.org); Shapiro, 2010).

Several times during the execution of their campaign tactics, the Japanese would launch counter measures to thwart Sea Shepherd efforts ([www.animal-discovery.com/tv/whale-wars](http://www.animal-discovery.com/tv/whale-wars); Shapiro, 2010). Some of those counter measures included contacting news organizations and accusing the Society's members of using violent tactics that could cause harm to human life. These accusations were unproven and seemed to strengthen the Sea Shepherds resolve to stop the Japanese.

This seemed to work into Paul Watson's plan—to highly publicize the situation. Watson contacted the media with information about each incident, which was aired many times during *Whale Wars* ([www.animal-discovery.com/tv/whale-wars](http://www.animal-discovery.com/tv/whale-wars); Lester, 2011; Naidoo, 2011;

www.seashepherd.org). Watson also planned specific strategies to gain media attention for the Society's cause to encourage more understanding of their mission, which brings more attention to his organization and more supporters. His strategy for media attention seemed also characteristic of egoism theory with attention focused on him but also with the well-being of his Society members and, ultimately the whales.

One of his strategies included sending two crew members on a small outboard motorboat to climb onto one of the Japanese harpoon ships. Once onboard, the crew members were to give an oral message to the Japanese vessel's captain to cease hunting and killing whales. Watson knew the Japanese would not react passively to being boarded, and he prepared his crew for the Japanese whalers' reaction. The Sea Shepherd members who boarded the Japanese ship were not armed, but the Japanese tied them to an outside rail of their ship refusing to allow them to go back to the Sea Shepherd vessel—Watson called the media immediately and provided them with video footage of the incident ([www.animal.discovery.com/tv/whale-wars](http://www.animal.discovery.com/tv/whale-wars)). When news organizations aired the video, the Japanese crew freed the captive Sea Shepherd members and countered with their own oral and video version of the incident, which implied that Sea Shepherd intended to harm the Japanese crew members. This incident produced more attention for the organization as planned by Watson.

Watson's organization is not the only environmental conservation organization that uses what many refer to as "extreme" tactics to reach their goals (Cherry, 2010; Deckha, 2008; Rossiter, 2004). Extreme campaign tactics have raised some questions about the ethics philosophies used by these organizations to foster donors. In order to gain support from a global market, members of these organizations must appeal to their publics from an ethical basis. It is

these ethical theories and how they are incorporated in their strategies that will be discussed in this paper.

## Environmentalism and Ethics

### Activist Language

From the beginning of its existence, environmental conservation organizations' standards and beliefs were considered unethical by many powerful factions. During the rise of environmental conservation in the 1970s-1980s, conservative philosophy viewed its rhetoric as negative, misleading, and deceptive, and thus declared it as unethical in the way its message swayed audiences (Bruner & Oelschlaeger, 1994). Accusations of this movement as an "invention of radical factions" and as opposing the "American way of life" also raised more questions about the ethical standards of those involved with the movement (p. 378).

In their article, Bruner & Oelschlaeger discussed how some politicians and religious groups who opposed the environmental conservation movement dubbed its supporters with derogatory names such as tree-huggers and people-haters. Environmentalists' efforts were referred to negatively through most of the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The movement began to gain more respect from the general American population near the turn of the century as environmentalists focused on changing their tactics to gain more support.

The overarching theory these activists practiced seemed deontological on the surface but in actuality aligned more with other theories such as utilitarian, situational, and virtue ethics.

To foster more support, one of the deontological strategies used by these groups involves making victimization a universal theme. To accomplish this, activists typically link acts of animal abuse and oppression of animals to abusive acts toward humans by using terms such as

“murder” and “slavery” (Cherry, 2010). Activists use linguistics to make these concepts meaningful by expressing it in ways specific to each culture’s understanding of human suffering and then equate it with animal suffering. This strategy, one aligned with the deontological theory, is globally planned to address each specific culture’s understanding of intrinsically right and wrong behavior.

The importance of linguistics to environmental campaigns was discussed by Cantrill & Oravec, (1996) and Harre et al (1999). They argued that understanding the environment involved understanding language usage. Harre et al coined the term “Greenspeak” referring to the linguistic terms and speech used by environmental activist organizations particularly by Greenpeace.

Heinz et al (2007) discussed the usage of linguistic concepts by environmental groups such as Greenpeace as “tools for use in communicational activities, wherein there is joint production of meanings that are always open-ended and embedded in the complex, concrete activities of everyday life” (p. 20). They focused their research on analyzing the textual content of Greenpeace’s website specific to the linguistics used in campaigns that targeted three cultures: German, Chinese, and Japanese.

Heinz et al (2007) said:

The environment is conceptualized in varying, inconsistent and overlapping ways on these web pages. All of the pages construct, linguistically and symbolically, nature and the environment as pure and clean in an ideal and/or ‘natural’ state. In all of the Greenpeace website discourse, humans are simultaneously constructed as agents of environmental protection (saviors) and subjects to environmental dependence (victims). A sense of responsibility

is strongly invoked. All of the discourses link the need to protect the environment to pragmatic human needs such as health or nutrition or survival (p 31).

Among other tactics, Greenpeace typically uses linguistics in many aspects of its nature conservation campaigns. Rossiter (2004) lists three components including linguistic concepts that Greenpeace used in an anti-logging campaign in British Columbia: 1) Representations of nature as majestic and ancient through words and images; 2) A portrayal of the rainforests importance to rural citizens concerning the preservation of native land in all its beauty for future generations; and 3) Promoting ecoscience (which Rossiter sees as a contradiction to No. 2) as a way to understand and properly manage nature.

Rossiter (2004) says that Greenpeace used culturally specific linguistic terms and literary techniques such as metaphors in its publications throughout the campaign. Terms such as “ancient forest under siege” (p. 145); “forests in peril” (p. 146); and the organization used the phrase “The War in the Woods”, the name given to the campaign by media, to further its agenda (p. 142). Greenpeace uses metaphors such as “destroyers” and “deforesters” in reference to who they view as destroying forests in their campaigns to save rainforests and forests throughout the world. They also mount campaigns against oil drilling using words such as “polluters” to describe the targeted oil companies. Another incident that involved a Greenpeace campaign wrought with linguistic terms occurred with food ingredients in food products used in China.

When Greenpeace members learned that the Chinese government was allowing food ingredients “labeled illegally genetically engineered by most European countries and most Western countries”, they used the phrase “People are not Pigs” to convince the Chinese government to stop this unhealthy practice (Heinz et al, 2007, p. 24). In the United States, the

illegally genetically engineered ingredients were only allowed in food for swine, not food for human consumption.

This was an effective linguistic strategy for Greenpeace to use because Chinese cultural tradition equates pigs with stupidity and views them as an animal needing little care. Therefore, pigs are undeserving of pet status and any similarities drawn between swine and humans is considered highly demeaning to the Chinese (Heinz et al, 2007). This is another example of a strategy that aligns with the deontological ethical theory and virtue theory. By inferring that humans are mistreated in this situation and destroying trees threatens human life, they utilize deontology principles of what is intrinsically right and wrong. The same inference lends itself to virtue ethics in that it is an act of benevolence to treat humans with kindness. Utilitarian theory is also employed as these situations call for doing what will be the greatest good for everyone. Greenpeace members' tactics include activities that typically result in arrests such as their protest against the Mattel Company in June, 2011. A group of Greenpeace activists hung a large banner on Mattel's corporate building in El Segundo, California, to protest the company's use of paper products made from Indonesian rainforest lumber in the packaging of Mattel's Barbie and Ken dolls line (Sun Sentinel, 6/8/2011). The banner depicted Ken frowning with the words "Barbie, it's over—I don't date girls that are into deforestation". Several activists were arrested for trespassing and conspiracy. But, Greenpeace isn't the only environmental activist organization to employ linguistics in their campaign strategies.

These tactics are also seen in the *Whale Wars* strategies employed by the Sea Shepherd Society as they used the terms "murder" and "slaughter" concerning the Japanese whalers' actions ([www.seashepherd.org](http://www.seashepherd.org)). Several incidents occurred in which the Society members used extreme measures to reach their goal. When Sea Shepherd located the Japanese whaling ships,

one of their strategies was to position their ships close to the Japanese ships in order to shoot stink bombs and butyric acid bombs through high power cannons onto the deck of the Japanese ships.

During these attacks, a Sea Shepherd crew member who speaks Japanese would send messages to the Japanese ship captains and crews via radio and a megaphone that they need to immediately stop hunting and killing whales. The crew member would also inform the Japanese they are in violation of international law. The Japanese seemed to ignore the oral messages sent by Sea Shepherd and countered these attacks by using high pressure water hoses to keep the Sea Shepherd ships far enough away so they could not shoot the butyric acid bombs from the deck of their ship onto the Japanese whaling ship.

PETA utilizes similar tactics in their depictions of those in the business of leather, goods made from animal byproducts, and the fur business, as well as organizations who use animals in product testing. PETA also uses images as well as words to convey their message. Pace (2005) discussed PETA's representation of women's bodies as objects with the slogan "I'd rather be naked than wear fur" (p. 33). The author discussed how this image usage provided an acceptance of women's bodies as commodities and on a subliminal level conveyed the message that objects are fine to have as long as they are not animals.

Feminist scholars such as Deckha (2008) also discussed the implications on representations of female sexuality in the images and texts used by PETA in its anti-fur campaign. Deckha examined the linguistic choices that PETA activists used in campaigns targeted at meat-eaters and restaurants such as Burger King. Words such as, "Holocaust on your plate" (p. 37) and "End Slavery" (p. 37) were used to gain the support of African Americans and Jewish people globally, but these phrases backfired because those minority groups said it

demeaned the horrific events of slavery and the Holocaust. Although PETA leaders employed deontological principles through these phrases, they did not examine what other theories might be contradicted as well. By using these terms without researching their full ethical implications, PETA seemed to defeat its goal with this campaign rather than further it.

Ric O'Barry, a sea mammal activist, more successfully used images that depicted murder and suffering by using those terms to evoke support from Western cultures. Unlike PETA's meat-eater campaign described above, O'Barry seemed to know more about the ethical sensitivity of his specific audience. O'Barry, a former dolphin trainer and an animal activist for 40 years, discovered a cove on the southeast coast of Japan near Taiji, where Japanese hunters are trapping dolphins, killing them with spears, and then selling the dolphin meat. He mounted a campaign to stop this practice. His campaign included filming *The Cove*, an Emmy-winning documentary that showed in graphic detail the Japanese hunters killing the dolphins trapped in the cove. O'Barry narrated the film and calls the Japanese actions "slaughter" and "murder" ([www.animal.discovery.com/tv/blood-dolphins](http://www.animal.discovery.com/tv/blood-dolphins), 2010).

In order to film the Japanese trapping and killing the dolphins in the cove, O'Barry and his crew illegally (by Japanese law) placed hidden cameras in the hills above the cove. Japanese government officials posted "No Trespassing" signs around the land entrances to the cove area after O'Barry began leading protests concerning the dolphin killings in the cove ([www.animal.discovery.com/tv/blood-dolphins](http://www.animal.discovery.com/tv/blood-dolphins), 2010; Mark, 2010). His actions also align with principles of more than one ethics theory, which includes deontology, utilitarian, virtue ethics and situation ethics.

O'Barry also promoted his cause through the mini-series *Blood Dolphins* aired on Animal Planet television network ([www.animal.discovery.com/tv/blood-dolphins](http://www.animal.discovery.com/tv/blood-dolphins), 2010). The

network aired the documentary and the series with the disclaimer that the opinions expressed were not necessarily those of the Animal Planet, its parent company, or its subsidiary companies.

In the process of promoting his cause, O'Barry has historically engaged in illegal activities that resulted in an arrest (Hu, 2007; Mark, 2010). Although, O'Barry has been arrested many times as a result of "Save the Dolphin" campaigns, he has conducted some aspects of his campaigns quietly and within the boundaries of local laws. One such campaign strategy was to hold a reception for Japanese activists in which he gathered 1.7 million signatures on a petition calling for the Japanese to stop killing the dolphins. He presented the petition to the American ambassador to Japan and U.S. President Barack Obama (Earth Island Journal, 2011). The dolphin hunting and killing has not stopped, but the campaigns to end the Japanese's actions continue. O'Barry and his team utilized ethic theories in their campaigns to bring attention to the dolphin slaughter, and potentially stop this Japanese practice, and considered it successful. Their successes have encouraged them to repeat many of their actions to gain more support for their cause.

#### Ethics Theories and Environmentalists

As environmentalism gained support, activists seemed to embrace nontraditional ethical standards, which Dunlap (2006) called a secular faith. He argued that environmentalism has become a secular faith containing its own ethical standards. Environmentalists sought acceptance in the 1980s through fundamental changes, and it flourished through secular faith—it reached people searching for a faith that traditional religion had failed to provide—that intense need for the sense of being a vital member of a community. For many activists, protecting the environment has become their religion. Dunlap stated:

...despite positions troubling to the American Way of Life, because it gave people a way to understand and attach problems they saw around them, and because it spoke to needs the accepted secular faith ignored. It showed things as diverse as vanishing wilderness and the alienation of modern society as symptoms of a deeper spiritual malaise—our failure to live in right relationship with the world around us. It offered ...warnings of disaster if we followed our sinful ways, directions to the path of righteousness, and the promise of an Earthly Paradise if we reformed our ways—and told us how we should live (p. 325).

Many tenants of traditional religion are based on deontology. This moral philosophy maintains the view that center of a value is in the act itself; certain features in the act have intrinsic value. Strict deontologists focus on the means of an action and not on the end results. They act on principles such as keeping promises and would view the act of dishonesty and murder as intrinsically wrong in all situations (Pojman & Fieser, 2009; Ferrell, Fradedrich, & Ferrell, 2011). Some people who may have found strict deontology too rigid a philosophy would be attracted to the faith of environmentalism as their ethical standard, but modern environmentalism ethics has become a combination of many ethics theories. As detailed earlier in this study, activist organizations operate differently than many individuals who utilize a single ethics theory to guide their decisions. Environmental organizations tend to combine and utilize more than one ethics theory, sometimes within the same campaign, to reach their goals.

Their tactics contain some elements of the teleological ethics philosophy, which holds that the center of value is the consequences of the act. (Pojman & Fieser, 2009; Ferrell, Fradedrich, & Ferrell, 2011). One of the most frequently used teleological moral philosophies is utilitarianism. There is much evidence of the inclusion of this theory in their campaign

strategies. Utilitarians generally assess results of decisions based on what will provide the greatest good for the greatest number of people, (Pojman & Fieser, 2009; Ferrell, Fradedrich, & Ferrell, 2011). This theory holds that the ends justify the means, whereas strict deontological theory maintains the opposite—the ends never justify the means. Evidence of this theory's application is displayed in many of the actions of environmental activists such as displayed by Ric O'Barry when he breaks the Japanese law in his plans to save the dolphins, and The Sea Shepherds' illegal boarding of the Japanese whaling ship to convince them to stop killing whales.

Although, utilitarianism is evident in their strategies, it isn't the only defined moral philosophy displayed by these three groups. As briefly discussed earlier, these organizations' strategies contain elements of other moral philosophies such as relativist ethical theory, situation ethics, virtue ethics, and egoism, a form of teleological ethical theory. Evidence of their usage of many of these theories can also be seen in the televised and otherwise recorded campaign strategies ([www.animal.discovery.com](http://www.animal.discovery.com); Cherry, 2010; CNN, 2010; Shapiro, 2010; Watson, 91).

Strong leaders in these organizations tend to engage in egoism as well as other ethics theories. Egoism focuses on how the results affect the individual(s) involved in the situation. Enlightened Egoism maintains self-interest as a focus but considers the well-being of others more than strict Egoism. Enlightened egoists will usually follow codes of ethics professionally and follow general laws such as tax laws because it benefits them as well as others (Pojman & Fieser, 2009; Ferrell, Fradedrich, & Ferrell, 2011). Some activists may engage in strict egoism in their personal lives but expand that philosophy to Enlightened Egoism when participating in organizational campaign activities.

If activists employ a relativist's perspective, then definitions of ethical behavior are gained subjectively from individual and group experience (Pojman & Fieser, 2009; Ferrell, Fradedrich, & Ferrell, 2011). This involves observation of cultural activities and norms as well as viewing situations from an individual perspective. Paul Watson, founder and president of The Sea Shepherd Society, is one of those strong leaders who appears to practice egoism in his campaign strategies as well as most of the other theories discussed in this study.

Another ethics theory that these three organizations utilize is situation ethics theory.

In theory, situation ethics does have an absolute norm or standard(s); this approach calls for the selection or acknowledgment of an absolute, but a non-legalistic, flexible application of the standard to each individual situation. The goal is to apply the absolute as best as possible in the particular situation rather than to utilize a law that fit different circumstances (Titus, Smith & Nolan, 1995, p. 131). Joseph Fletcher (1966) proposed this theory in what some Christians at the time considered a controversial book, *Situation Ethics*. The controversy surrounded Fletcher's view of Jesus as a situationist, and he explained his definition of a situation as:

The situationist enters into every decision-making situation fully armed with the ethical maxims of his community and its heritage, and he treats them with respect as illuminators of his problems. Just the same, he is prepared in any situation to compromise them or set them aside *in the situation* if love seems better served by doing so (p. 26).

Fletcher's definition of situation ethics describes many of the actions of PETA, The Sea Shepherds, and Green Peace members as they emphasize their care and love for trees, land and sea animals and other elements of nature.

### Conclusion

Paul Watson uses campaign strategies to stop the Japanese whalers that include deception, lying, and potential harm to human life. Strategies such as these and those of the other organizations are not in keeping with the principles of any one ethics theory but instead utilize whichever ethics theories work to achieve their ultimate goals. These are considered acceptable actions among the belief system of their members because they believe these actions will help them reach their stated goals. In Watson's organization, the goal is to preserve sea mammal life; therefore any relatively nonviolent tactics that will accomplish that goal are acceptable among supporters. They have been criticized in international circles because their strategies do not include an appeal to cultures that have different moral values than the American culture. Appealing to a culture's moral values is crucial to conducting a successful campaign for these organizations, which can be seen in The Sea Shepherd's failure to fully stop the Japanese whaling fleet in the South Antarctic Ocean.

The Sea Shepherd Conservation Society's website provides details concerning their beliefs and standards. It includes this statement:

Sea Shepherd cooperates fully with all international law enforcement agencies and its enforcement activities complying with standard practices of law and policing enforcement; Sea Shepherd adheres to the utilization of non-violent principles in the course of all actions and has taken a stand against violence in the protection of the oceans; Sea Shepherd's primary mandate is to assume a law enforcement role as provided by the [United Nations World Charter for Nature](http://www.seashepherd.org) (www.seashepherd.org).

Although Sea Shepherd considers its tactics non-violent, many of its critics say that the extreme tactics used in campaigns are violent. In its mandates, Sea Shepherd outlines that they are providing law enforcement for U.N. laws that govern nature, but they do not detail how they will fulfill their role other than by using non-violent and promoting cooperation among nations toward this goal. By executing some strategies that are considered extreme, Sea Shepherd displays its willingness to embrace ethical standards that fit the situation according to their ethical standards, but they seemingly have not considered an ethics appeal focused on specific cultures outside of the United States and countries with similar moral values. PETA and Greenpeace also employ tactics that many consider as violent and potentially harmful to human life, but the activists maintain that these extreme tactics are vital to the success of their campaigns. As evidenced by their tactics, all three organizations engage in strategies that display a type of situational ethics interpreted by each organization according to the campaign's goals. Among the three organizations--PETA, Greenpeace, and Sea Shepherd—the latter is the only group to include a statement about using non-violent means to accomplish its mission in its mission and mandates sections. But, PETA and Green Peace's lack of attention to specific cultural moral values has prevented them from conducting fully successful campaigns as well.

Cherry (2010) explains that environmental and animal activists' strategies are guided by the overarching need to change “dominant cultural beliefs and...ignorance of animal issues...” (p. 451). This is the foundation that their campaigns are built upon, and they seem to employ ethical standards that align with their tactics, but at the same time, they fail to see the importance of incorporating moral appeals designed to reach more audiences outside of Western moral values. As these organizations continue to seek acceptance and support for their causes, they will

likely continue to use strategies similar to those discussed in this study because these bring attention and more support to their cause. These strategies have worked well mainly with individuals who embrace Western moral philosophies. Watson did not have many Japanese supporters for his campaign in the South Antarctic Ocean and PETA offended African-Americans in their meat-eaters campaign. If these organizations want to communicate their cause successfully to international audiences, it is crucial that they learn use ethics language specific to each culture.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Watson co-founded Greenpeace but fell out of favor with the group following his many extreme campaigns. Most of the Greenpeace members and supporters had a more conservative, less violent attitude toward activism campaigns. Thus, Watson was asked to leave the organization (Shapiro, 2010).

<sup>2</sup> Whether the whaling is illegal was under debate internationally because the Japanese insist they were conducting research by harpooning the whales, and Australia was dealing with it on a diplomatic level only (Jabour, J., & Iliff, M., 2009).

<sup>3</sup> The Japanese whaling crews would show large signs with “Conducting Research” for anyone flying over their whaling ships to “prove” they were not hunting whales for profit ([www.seashepherd.org](http://www.seashepherd.org); [www.animal.discovery.com/tv/whale-wars](http://www.animal.discovery.com/tv/whale-wars)).

## References

- Bruner, M., and Oelschlaeger, M. (1994). Rhetoric, environmentalism, and environmental ethics. *Environmental Ethics*, 16(4), 377-396.
- Cantrill, J. and Oravec, C. (eds.) (1996) *The Symbolic Earth: Discourse and our Creation of the*
- Caprari, A. M. (2010). Loveable pirates? the legal implications of the battle between environmentalists and whalers in the Southern Ocean. *Connecticut Law Review*, 42(5), 1495-1523.
- Casselmann, B., & Gold, R. (2010). BP decisions set stage for disaster. *Current*, (524), 14-16.
- Cherry, E. (2010). Shifting Symbolic Boundaries: Cultural Strategies of the Animal Rights Movement [Abstract]. *Sociological Forum*, 25(3), 450-475.
- CNN. (2010). Willing to die to save whales [Television Series]. In *Larry King Live*.
- Deckha, M. (2008). Disturbing Images: PETA and the feminist ethics of animal advocacy. *Ethics and the Environment*, 13(2), 35-74.
- Discourse. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dunlap, T. (2006). Environmentalism, a secular faith. *Environmental Values*, 15(3). 321-330.
- Environment. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Ferrell, O. C., Fraedrich, J., & Ferrell, L. (2011). *Business ethics: Ethical decision making and cases* (8th ed., Rev.). Mason, Ohio: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Fletcher, J. (1966). *Situation ethics: The new morality*. Philadelphia: Westminster. Hale, M.

(2011, February 18). Whale Wars waits for Japanese government. *The New York Times*, p.2.

Harre', R., Brockmeier, J. and Muhlhausler, P. (1999) *Greenspeak, A Study of Environmental Discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heinz, B., Cheng, H., & Inuzuka, A. (2007). Greenpeace greenspeak: A transcultural discourse analysis. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 7(1), 16-36.

<http://animal.discovery.com/tv/blood-dolphins/>

<http://animal.discovery.com/tv/whale-wars>

Hu, J. (2007, October 1). Unlikely duo dives into Japan's marine massacre. *San Francisco Chronicle*, p.Q22.

Jabour, J., & Iliff, M. (2009). Theatre sports in the Southern Ocean: Engagement options for Australia in whale research project action. [Abstract]. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 63(2), 267-289.

Lester, L. (2011). Species of the month: Anti-whaling, mediated visibility, and the news [Abstract]. *Environmental Communication*, 5(1), 124-139.

Mark, J. (2010). The reluctant warrior. *Earth Island Journal*, 24(4), 40-47.

Naidoo, M. (2011, February 5). Whale Wars boat claims ram attempt. *The Hobart Mercury*, pp.3-3, 1.

Pace, L. (2005). Image events and PETA's anti-fur campaign. *Women & Language*, 28(2), 33-41.

Pojman, L. P., & Fieser, J. (2009). *Ethics: Discovering right and wrong* (6th ed., Rev.). Belmont, WA: Wadsworth.

Rossiter, D. (2004). The nature of protest: Constructing the spaces of British Columbia's rainforests. *Cultural Geographies*, 11, 139-164.

Save Japan Dolphins Goes Global (2011). *Earth Island Journal*, 25(4), 20-20.

Sea Shepherd (2007). *Animals Today*, 15(1), 16-17.

Seung, T. K. (2007). *Kant: A guide for the perplexed*. London, England: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Shapiro, M. (2010). Conversation (Paul Watson). *Earth Island Journal*, 25(3), 51-53.

Sun Sentinel. (2011, June 8). Greenpeace takes on Mattel.p.3D.

The Sea Shepherds Conservation Society (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.seashepherd.org>

Titus, H., Smith, M., and Nolan, R. (1995). *Living issues in philosophy*. (9<sup>th</sup> ed.) New York, N.Y: Oxford University Press.

Watson, P. (1991). Sea Shepherd defense policy. *Earth Island Journal*, 6(4), 41-43.

Wood, A. W. (2005). *Kant*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.