

Taiji and Dolphins: Cultural Relativism or Moral Realism?

著者	オバーク・ アンドリュー
著者別名	Andrew OBERG
journal or publication title	Journal of Regional Development Studies
number	19
page range	57-68
year	2016-03
URL	http://id.nii.ac.jp/1060/00008250/



Taiji and Dolphins: Cultural Relativism or Moral Realism?

Andrew OBERG*

Abstract:

The decision by the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA) to expel its Japanese member institutions that continued to support the dolphin drive hunts that take place within Japanese waters was presented by the domestic press as an external group misunderstanding a local practice and forcing its own outside values on others. The dolphin drive hunts themselves have been defended by the Wakayama prefectural government on a number of grounds. The following considers the justifications employed for the practice in the light of WAZA and other groups' objections and finds the strongest of these defenses to be the claim to cultural relativism. This is then analyzed against the idea of moral realism – that there are standards that exist outside of any cultural group – and it is found that whether moral realism is accurate or not there are very compelling reasons to stop the drive hunts currently taking place.

Keywords: cultural relativism; dolphin drive hunts; JAZA; mercury poisoning; moral realism; Taiji, Wakayama; WAZA

I. WAZA, JAZA, dolphins, and confused editorials

Japan's treatment of dolphins is unfortunately in the news again. The World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA) recently informed its Japanese counterpart (the Japan Association of Zoos and Aquariums (JAZA)) that it would be expelled from the group if it continued to patronize the Taiji, Wakayama dolphin drive hunts.¹⁾ This would be detrimental to JAZA members as WAZA provides many important zoo-related services and activities, such as animal exchanges, and so it was that the JAZA members voted in the majority to stop supporting the Taiji dolphin hunters, a decision that was not presented as happily made. It was, in fact, presented largely as an outside group bullying a poor, misunderstood local one by the mainstream domestic media. Both the *Asahi Shimbun* and the *Mainichi Shimbun* ran editorials stating that the Taiji dolphin drive methods are not cruel and that Japan –

* 東洋大学国際地域学部 : Faculty of Regional Development Studies, Toyo University

as a nation, it seems – must do more to convince the outside world of the legitimacy of this ‘tradition’, also lumping the affair in with the wider issue of Japan’s killing of whales.²⁾ There are numerous logical problems with the approach these two newspapers decided to take in their articles but it is not my intention to dwell here on media outlets’ poor critical thinking, as important as that topic may be. WAZA advocates that animals in zoos and aquariums should be born and bred in captivity, not stolen from the wild and forced into a way of life completely foreign to them;³⁾ the *Asahi* and *Mainichi* papers missed that point entirely but what they did focus on is instructive, and it signals where our attention is due. The real problem lies, as I see it, not only in the Taiji dolphin drive’s methods, which are part and parcel of the annual dolphin hunts that take place using the same techniques, but more so in the mentality that is at the root of authorities’ attempts to justify both the drive and the slaughter. Before we begin our analysis though, let me be clear that I do not wish to vilify Japan nor its many noteworthy cultural practices; I wish rather to object to the idea that a cultural practice is justified merely because it is cultural, and that there are no applicable outside standards by which we may judge such practices. What I wish to argue against in the following is the idea of cultural relativism, that what is right for one group of people is right *for* them, and that anyone who is not one of them should have nothing whatsoever to say about the topic. This line of thinking is sometimes even extended to quell internal dissent, such that any person who is a member of the recognized group but disagrees with the majority should likewise be silenced; black sheep cannot be allowed to go ‘baa’. To do this I will take issue with the common trope one hears repeated by those in government and the media in relation to Taiji and its dolphin related practices about their being misunderstood and unjustly criticized, a mantra that is born out of a mentality of victimhood. The topic is a very large one, however, and so to make it manageable we will limit ourselves to concentrating on an aspect of the question of moral realism – namely, are there substantive outside values that should be applied regardless of culture? – as it relates to the way those involved in the drive hunts treat dolphins. If moral realism is legitimate, how should we judge what those in Taiji and other areas do? If moral realism is not legitimate, what should be our response to the differing judgments about the drive hunts? These are the themes that will engage us.

II. Taiji

In order to understand the broader context in which the above conflict has arisen we will need first to review what is involved in the dolphin drives and subsequent slaughter, why such are thought to be cruel by those who oppose them, and what defense the community authorities in the prefecture give of the practice. The drives themselves consist of locating pods of dolphins at sea and, using a number of boats working in tandem, corralling them into a narrow cove where a net is then drawn across the width between the two shorelines, blocking any of the dolphins from escaping. The procedure is indiscriminate, and so any number of very young individuals will be trapped along with their parents and the other members of the group. Some of the trapped individuals will be selected for sale to zoos and

aquariums (hence WAZA's decision), while the others will be killed by harpoon, sometimes taking up to thirty minutes to slowly bleed to death. Even being chosen for future entertainment purposes does not guarantee an individual dolphin's survival though as some of those selected for sale will die of shock before being loaded for transport. The official figures for the 2011-2012 season (the latest given at the time of writing; the season lasts from September to April) show that just in Taiji 899 dolphins were killed and 247 were removed for captivity while the nationwide quota for such drive hunts for the various dolphin species and small whales was set at 16,497 for the 2013-2014 season.⁴⁾ Objectors note that dolphins are highly intelligent, have rich emotional lives, use a complex communicative system that includes signature whistles specifying each individual (in other words, personal names), that death by harpoon is extremely painful and can be a very lengthy process as indicated above, that in their natural habitats dolphins can live into their forties or fifties but that more than 80% of captured dolphins die before turning twenty,⁵⁾ and finally that dolphins are known to save human lives in the wild (e.g. from attacking sharks or from drowning). Moreover, those doing the killing in Taiji actually employ large curtains to shield what happens in the cove from the view of the public, indicating that even they acknowledge the practice would not be met with approval when it ceases being an abstract idea and becomes a blood-soaked butchery done before one's eyes. Dolphin meat that is sold in Japan (often labeled as whale) does not indicate the levels of mercury, methyl mercury, cadmium, DDT, and/or PCB present, making the practice not only tragic for the dolphin individuals themselves but highly dangerous for any human individuals that consume the meat – particularly children.⁶⁾

How is this justified by the local authorities? The Wakayama prefectural government's website has a helpful question and answer page listing their reasons in support of continuing the practice.⁷⁾ Primary among the arguments made is that Taiji is a small town of about 3,500 people and relies on the industry to economically support itself. The approximately 400 year history of the practice is also stressed and it is asserted that to think that cetaceans are not food (unlike cows and pigs) is a mistake; in Japan they provide an important source of protein just like the catch of other fisheries. It is pointed out that dolphin hunting was not banned by the 1986 International Whaling Commission moratorium on whale hunting and a comparison is made to religious practices that proscribe the eating of certain foods but whose adherents do not insist that other people cease eating what their faiths stop them from eating. Another reason given is that cows and pigs have feelings too but in order to eat meat we must kill, and to the objection of mercury being found in dolphins' bodies it is responded that unlike that which is industrially generated naturally occurring mercury can be eaten within certain limits without one's health being adversely affected.

All of these arguments can be very easily refuted save one, and we will briefly look at each of them in turn. Taiji is certainly not the first, nor will it be the last, small town whose local industry finds itself in need of updating, transforming, or being abandoned altogether. If the town wishes it could shift its focus to eco-tourism, promoting dolphin and whale watching rather than murdering or what amounts

to a dolphin slave trade. It could also take advantage of national economic revival schemes and use the grant money to set up any number of ocean related businesses and practices that do not cause international outrage, protestations, and petitions to immediately halt ongoing activities. I admit that the area probably does have a long history of spearing dolphins from vessels and from the shore, but I do not think the current practice of using motorized boats to corral entire pods into a tight cove, netting it off, and then stabbing each individual to death or binding him or her for sale to an aquarium has much of a lengthy tradition behind it. The question of scale enters here too; were Taiji fishermen to limit themselves to spearing dolphins from the shoreline the practice would still arguably be cruel but it would not come anywhere near the numbers we're seeing now (I would still think it should be stopped, though). The repeated comparisons to cows and pigs I think are actually somewhat reasonable but for a conclusion that the Wakayama authorities would surely not draw: in my view we should stop eating them too, as I have argued elsewhere.⁸⁾ Nevertheless, dolphins are not raised on farms in set numbers and fed regularly, nor are cows and pigs torn out of their natural habitats and made into performers, forced into a way of life for which they have not adapted. Moreover, it is hardly accurate to state that dolphin meat is an important source of protein in the Japanese diet just like 'other fish' are; to do so is dishonest as dolphin meat is rarely, if ever, consumed by the vast majority of Japanese people⁹⁾ and it is to imply that a dolphin is just a fish and therefore not worthy of any more concern than the rows of packaged cuttings we see in the supermarket (for which, incidentally, we should also feel concern at least because of sustainability problems, but potentially other issues as well). It is true that dolphin hunting was not banned by the mentioned moratorium and that certain religions do have taboos on some foods, but both arguments are disingenuous and false comparisons; the 1986 ban was on whales, not all cetaceans, and the continued way the two are lumped together in Japan (see the above editorials by the *Asahi* and *Mainichi* newspapers) seems to seek to create domestic support for dolphin hunting by casting Japan as being bullied at all turns and in need of circling the wagons. Additionally, the tiny amount of Japanese people who do consume dolphin meat do not do so for religious reasons, nor are those who protest the drive hunts doing so in order to force religious values on the hunters. This does raise the important question of values though, and we will return to it in a moment. As for the levels of mercury being 'natural' and 'safe' (it is found in dolphins' bodies largely thanks to our pollution after all), aside from the challenge to the Wakayama government spokesperson to feed your own child such meat and put them at such risk and see how you feel it could be replied that actual tests found the amount of mercury present to be between ten to one hundred parts per million, much higher than the national government's advisory of 0.4 parts per million.¹⁰⁾ The one good argument that I see here that cannot be so easily refuted is the one referenced, albeit poorly and inappropriately, by the religion comment. Is this simply a case of outsiders forcing their values on others? And if so, is that not a conflict between modes of thought and manners of life? In short, isn't this an instance of cultural differences and therefore by asserting cultural relativism the case should be closed? That is the question that will occupy the remainder of our study.

III. *Moral realism?*

The idea that there may be standards that exist outside of all cultures and that are species-wide moral principles can strike the modern ear as being quite strange; it seems to have an anachronistic ring to it, to belong to a bygone era when people really *believed* in things and mostly stayed put in their countries of birth, long before any of the messy globalization that characterizes our era began. Thomas Nagel defines moral realism as moral or evaluative judgments being able to be explained by ‘general or basic evaluative truths’ and the facts that are related to them; that evaluation, however, cannot in turn be explained by something else, it is instead similar to ‘physical truths, psychological truths, and arithmetical and geometrical truths.’¹¹⁾ These are truths that we recognize as being valid in an ultimate sense without being able to pin down exactly why or how they are valid except by reference to their operation within the system in which we are employing them. (It may be recalled that even something like the basic principles of physics, which we typically consider to be fully understood, break down at the quantum level and a whole new set of rules must be introduced. Likewise Gödel’s incompleteness theorem tells us that any mathematical system contains statements that are true but unprovable within their own system,¹²⁾ yet we nevertheless consider both physics and mathematics to provide wholly true, reliable, and useful guides for our lives.) That we may find such judgments to be true in this way could be (must be?) related to our ability to reason, which almost certainly developed biologically out of our consciousness but which has now taken on collective cultural aspects as well, going from the ‘perspectival form contained in the lives of particular creatures to an objective, world-encompassing form that exists both individually and intersubjectively.’¹³⁾ We use our reason to work out what these truths are, reflecting on values like pleasure and pain (which have clear biological origins and applications) and, starting from the determination that they are good and bad in themselves, we build up governing systems and moral principles.¹⁴⁾ The process could be likened to discovering a material out of which a better house can be built; the material was there with us all along, we just didn’t know what to do with it.

The Wakayama prefectural government site claims that asking those in Taiji involved in the industry to stop hunting dolphins is the same as asking them to throw away their way of life and that no one has the right to do that.¹⁵⁾ This is clearly a cry for relativist values; must we really accept as valid the way of life that each individual person pursues? Are we powerless to judge one another or do our judgments carry no more weight than a mere private opinion? Given the above (admittedly brief and rough) picture of moral realism, which can be said to be the more accurate: the idea that behaviorally anything goes or some form of objective morality? Let’s turn to our reasoning and intuitive reactions and examine some hypothetical situations to see if we can find out.

Imagine that we read about a militant terrorist who poses no immediate threat to us on a personal level but who wishes to continue murdering and pillaging his enemies – whose very humanity he de-

nies –; would we not feel justified in judging his actions to be heinous? Would we not think it good to sign a petition or donate money for a cause that aims to halt such activities? Could we really say that no one has the right to tell him how to live? What if we now happen to meet him in person and he asks us in all sincerity whether or not he should keep at it? He's having doubts about the path he's on in life and would like to hear what we honestly think. I'm certain that whether our terrorist is repentant or not nearly all of us would judge his actions in the same way and most definitely think that he should abandon his way of life.

Similarly, what about a woman dealing heroin on the streets? Again, repentant or not we would judge that she too should give up her way of life. Moving out of the exclusively human realm, what about a poacher? Killing endangered rhinoceros and elephants for the sake of their horns and tusks only, leaving the rest of the body to rot in the afternoon sun? Or what about a gangster who breeds dogs in the most cramped and insanitary conditions imaginable, turning around and selling them to pet shops for a quick and tidy profit, the cost of which is passed on to the customers? It may be objected that these are all criminal examples, involving crime directly or people involved in illegal activities or ways of life; yet why is it that we object to them? Merely because these things are against the law? Is there not a 'something else' involved? Not a 'legal stuff but also something else' but a simple 'something else'? We respond to these situations from a place that stands outside of cultural considerations. If these modes of being were legalized, if it were considered within the bounds of law to murder and pillage one's declared enemies, or to sell heroin, or to slaughter endangered species for their natural outgrowths, or to treat future family pets as unfeeling breeding machines, what would our reasoning and intuitions tell us? The answer is clear. These are activities that cause pain to sentient creatures, and it is pain of the order of being needless and gratuitous, and this has nothing to do with legal statuses. We don't have anything near the same intuitive reactions to traffic misdemeanors, despite their equal illegality. So what is it about the dolphin drive hunts that upsets nearly everyone that learns of them (a great many Japanese people but of course non-Japanese people too)? It is their indiscriminate nature, brutal killing method, the abuse of stealing an animal from a natural way of being and turning him or her into a prop for the profit of aquarium owners, but not least for the blatant disregard for public health by preparing and selling meat with mercury levels far above what the national government has determined to be safe for consumption. (And, despite what may be considered 'safe', who of us would want to eat a piece of meat with *any* levels of mercury in it at all?)

There is a common response to all this, to the idea that there exist morals in a real sense, an objective sense, that are not determined by us, and this comes from Darwinian modes of thought. A (somewhat crude) example can serve to introduce this idea: When talking with students about their ethical ideas regarding clothing (place of manufacture, worker conditions, cost, etc.) I like to bring up the example of fur. Nearly everyone says that we shouldn't kill animals to produce an item like a fur coat especially considering that synthetic materials will do just as well, but once a student said that it was

fine because human beings are stronger. I asked him if he would still think so if there were a race of aliens who enjoyed wearing human skin and for this reason kept people crammed together in tight cages until they reached a certain age, killed them, stripped them of their skin, and made the piece of clothing. To my surprise he replied that such would be completely acceptable if the aliens were strong enough to do that. Although I credited that student with consistency I found his line of thought very disturbing, as I'm sure many readers will as well (perhaps even those familiar with the Nietzschean variant of this thought). Such arguments are not without antecedents though, for if there is a Darwinian explanation for why we have the judgments that we have, *viz.* our moral faculties have a biological underpinning based on beneficial evolutionary influences, then there is no reason to think of them as being true independent of our judgments.¹⁶⁾ If we are simply talking about survival of the fittest, or likewise flourishing of the fittest, then the only considerations that enter into something like the Taiji dolphin drive hunts are sustainable management issues; how many dolphins can we capture and kill each year and not run out?

However, the Darwinian view represented here misunderstands what is meant by moral realism, and may also be conflating *human* – species specific – moral realism with *universal* – non-species specific – moral realism. Nagel writes that realist value 'should not be construed in terms of an extra metaphysical component of the world, which exercises a causal influence on us. The features of the world that confer value and provide reasons are ordinary facts about the experiences of people, their relations to one another, and the implications for people's and other creatures' lives of different possible courses of action...it is through being recognized as reasons by a value-sensitive agent that they affect behavior.'¹⁷⁾ This is to consider what ought to be (be it a moral judgment, appropriate action, proper perspective, etc.) as a fact about what is, but a special kind of one.¹⁸⁾ As we go through life we grow more aware of the best ways to live through our sensitivity to our world and those in it; yet the values that we learn are human values for humans and they are also pluralist in a species-specific sense. Being pluralist is not to say that they are relativist, however, it is instead to say that they are tied to a certain biological way of life,¹⁹⁾ that these moral values we learn or discover involve a – in the fitting words of Peter Railton – 'relational rather than absolute notion of goodness...[yet] the relevant facts about humans and their world are objective in the same sense that such non-relational entities as stones are: they do not depend for their existence or nature merely upon our conceptions of them.'²⁰⁾ These values exist because we do, but they still exist outside of us. Nevertheless, even if a Darwinian account were thought to be more accurate and moral realism nonexistent, the dolphin drive hunts would still be objectionable for the reasons already stated: their cruelty, indiscriminate nature, the fact that dolphins in zoos and aquariums can be (and should be, allowing that such should be continued at all (something I would also argue against)) bred in captivity, the lack of demand for dolphin meat and the obvious health hazards for the tiny number of people who actually do consume it.

What, though, are we to do in cases where our moral judgments conflict, as in the present instance

where our conclusion about the Taiji dolphin drive hunts is at odds with the stated response by the Wakayama prefectural government? Philippa Foot has written that we should accept incommensurability in some cases where moral judgments are found to be competing or even contradictory. There are times when we can say nothing or there is nothing to be said, and we need not always affirm all judgments or try to interpret them in a special way so that they come in line one with the other. In cases where multiple appraisals are found such instances are not evidence against moral realism,²¹⁾ they are simply one aspect of human life. Do we therefore find ourselves with nothing to say about this case? We do not, for as already shown above all of the prefecture's arguments for continuing the practice are either faulty, mistaken, or simply misleading. The one argument that seemed to show some promise, that of cultural relativism, has now also been shown to be deficient. There may be reasons for continuing the dolphin drive hunts but they are immoral reasons, and will be recognized as such by thinking individuals who care to examine the full facts of the situation. There may also be kneejerk nationalist reactions that insist the practice should continue, but such are not what Foot was referring to. Rather she appears to mean instances where all options have been determined to be at least potentially morally valid (in the sense of what one ought to do) by each of the parties involved,²²⁾ such as whether it is more correct to arrive five minutes early for a meeting or exactly on time, whether men should hold the door open for women or, perhaps in the spirit of equality, whomever arrives first should hold the door for the other regardless of gender, and the like. Such cases are bound up with cultural practices and can be said to be relative; they are also clearly not worth arguing about. We do not need to insist that cultural relativism does not occur in any facet of human life and behavior, all we need to do is to show that the argument for cultural relativism is not a robust defense of the dolphin drive hunts currently being undertaken. It is not even a decent defense of the practice, as the above has attempted to demonstrate. Again, there may be some who continue to insist on arguing that what goes on in Taiji should continue *ad infinitum* but such arguments will not be based on sound reasoning and will serve only to continue immoral acts, demeaning to those who engage in them and tragic for their innocent victims.

IV. It's high time to stop

This is not the place to undertake a full accounting of moral realism, nor is the above meant to be one, but its principles do help us understand why the dolphin drive hunts are so clearly wrong to a great, great many of us – Japanese and non-Japanese alike. Those participating in the herding and killing, and they are not to be found only in Taiji, likely recognize this truth themselves and hence the efforts involved to conceal the practice (or at least the details of it) from the public, such as using large curtains to block the view from the shore of what is going on in the cove as described above. Yet people will often do what they themselves consider to be morally wrong, especially if they think that it can be hidden, or if it has been established over time, or if vested interests are involved, or some com-

bination of all of the above. That we can ignore our moral judgments does not mean that they aren't there, however, and if moral realism is correct then standards exist beyond our mere individual or cultural assessments, and they exist in a way that is both bound up with our humanity and outside it. We should not be surprised that Japan's treatment of dolphins garners such objections as those raised by WAZA and other groups, for on this issue the official Japanese position (even if it is not a popularly supported one) is far out of sync with international norms, based as they are on concrete moral judgments. The drive hunts simply ought not to be, and no amount of appealing to cultural relativism can change that.

[Notes]

- 1) Philip Brasor, 'A circus surrounds Japan's animal acts', *The Japan Times: On Sunday*, 31 May 2015, p. 18.
- 2) *ibid.*
- 3) *ibid.*
- 4) For more information, see 'Dolphin Hunts – Focus on Taiji, Japan', *WDC*. <<http://us.whales.org/issues/dolphin-hunts-focus-on-taiji-japan>>; '11 Facts About Dolphin Hunts', *Do Something*. <<https://www.dosomething.org/facts/11-facts-about-dolphin-hunts>>; and the 2009 documentary film *The Cove* (directed by Louie Psihoyos, Participant Media). The film won an Academy Award for Best Documentary Feature in 2010, and is available in Japan with Japanese subtitles.
- 5) While it is true that the average lifespan of a dolphin in its natural habitat is seventeen years, the short lifespan of most dolphins in captivity should not be taken as being in line with that average for the simple reason that in captivity dolphins are not subject to predators and other dangers of the wild. It would appear that the emotional and physical stress of living in captivity and being forced to perform for audiences plays a part in the shortening of dolphin lives in aquariums and zoos, and this must be especially so for those individuals who were born and raised in the wild and then suddenly captured and placed in captivity. On lifespan information and other facts, see 'Dolphin Facts', *Dolphins-World*. <<http://www.dolphins-world.com/>>.
- 6) 'Dolphin Hunts – Focus on Taiji, Japan', *op. cit.*; '11 Facts About Dolphin Hunts', *op. cit.*; 'Dolphins and Humans', *Dolphins-World*. <<http://www.dolphins-world.com/dolphins-and-humans/>>; and *The Cove*, *op. cit.*; on dolphins' use of personal names see Brandon Keim, 'Researchers Find More Evidence That Dolphins Use Names', *Wired*. 23 July 2013. <<http://www.wired.com/2013/07/dolphin-signature-whistles>>.
- 7) 'Wakayama Prefecture's View Regarding Dolphin Fishing and Other Matters (Itemized Postscript)', *Wakayama Prefecture*. <<http://www.pref.wakayama.lg.jp/prefg/071500/iruka/>>; the page is in Japanese only, all translations were done by the author.
- 8) Andrew Oberg, *Tomorrow, as the Crow Flies* (Charleston, SC, USA: Drugstore Books with CreateSpace Press, 2011 (appended 2012)); on the related issue of speciesism sometimes raised in these matters, see Andrew Oberg, 'All too human?: Speciesism, racism, and sexism', *Think* (forthcoming).
- 9) Karen Dawn, 'Is Japan's Dolphin Slaughter Really for Food?', *The Huffington Post: Green*. 24 January 2014. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/karen-dawn/is-japans-dolphin-slaughter-really-for-food_b_4656345.html>.
- 10) *ibid.* The data referred to in Dawn's piece were originally found in a *New York Times* report from Taiji on the local fallout of recently done mercury tests on the dolphin meat being sold. It will be noted that the report is

from 2008, seven years ago at the time of writing, and that despite the undeniable knowledge of the health risks involved in consuming dolphin meat that these tests revealed nothing has been done in the meantime. I do not know if the levels of mercury present in the dolphin meat now being sold is higher or lower than the levels were at the time of the report, but I see little reason to think that they would be significantly different one way or the other. The report can be found here: Martin Fackler, 'Mercury risk poses threat to Japanese dolphin hunt', *The New York Times: Asia Pacific*. 20 February 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/20/world/asia/20iht-dolphin.1.10223011.html?_r=0>.

- 11) Thomas Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 102.
- 12) Ernest Nagel and James R. Newman, *Gödel's Proof* (Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge, 1958, 2005).
- 13) Nagel, *op. cit.*
- 14) *ibid.*
- 15) 'Wakayama Prefecture's View Regarding Dolphin Fishing and Other Matters (Itemized Postscript)', *op. cit.*
- 16) Nagel, *op. cit.*; see also Sharon Street, 'A Darwinian Dilemma for Realist Theories of Value', *Philosophical Studies*, 127:1 (2006), 109-166.
- 17) Nagel, *ibid.*, p. 113.
- 18) Peter Railton, 'Moral Realism', *The Philosophical Review*, 95:2 (1986), 163-207.
- 19) Nagel, *op. cit.*
- 20) Railton, *op. cit.*, p. 183.
- 21) Philippa Foot, 'Moral Realism and Moral Dilemma', *The Journal of Philosophy*, 80:7 (1983), 379-398.
- 22) Foot's piece is primarily a response to two earlier essays by Bernard Williams ('Ethical Consistency' and 'Consistency and Realism') and does not give a great amount of concrete examples but she does mention cases involving the 'undecidability in small moral matters, or where the choice is between goods rather than evils', *ibid.*, p. 395; the examples listed in the text are my own. Williams' works can be found in *Problems of the Self* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

[Bibliography]

Brasor, Philip, 'A circus surrounds Japan's animal acts', *The Japan Times: On Sunday*, 31 May 2015, 18

Keim, Brandon, 'Researchers Find More Evidence That Dolphins Use Names', *Wired*. 23 July 2013. <<http://www.wired.com/2013/07/dolphin-signature-whistles>>. Accessed 09 July 2015

Dawn, Karen 'Is Japan's Dolphin Slaughter Really for Food?', *The Huffington Post: Green*. 24 January 2014. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/karen-dawn/is-japans-dolphin-slaughter-really-for-food_b_4656345.html>. Accessed 09 July 2015

Martin Fackler, 'Mercury risk poses threat to Japanese dolphin hunt', *The New York Times: Asia Pacific*. 20 February 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/20/world/asia/20iht-dolphin.1.10223011.html?_r=0>. Accessed 16 July 2015

Foot, Philippa, 'Moral Realism and Moral Dilemma', *The Journal of Philosophy*, 80:7 (1983), 379-398

Nagel, Ernest, and Newman, James R., *Gödel's Proof* (Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge, 1958, 2005)

Nagel, Thomas, *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Oberg, Andrew, 'All too human?: Speciesism, racism, and sexism', *Think* (forthcoming)

Oberg, Andrew, *Tomorrow, as the Crow Flies* (Charleston, SC, USA: Drugstore Books with CreateSpace Press, 2011 (appended 2012))

Railton, Peter, 'Moral Realism', *The Philosophical Review*, 95:2 (1986), 163-207

Street, Sharon, 'A Darwinian Dilemma for Realist Theories of Value', *Philosophical Studies*, 127:1 (2006), 109-166

Williams, Bernard, *Problems of the Self* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973)

'11 Facts About Dolphin Hunts', *Do Something*. <<https://www.dosomething.org/facts/11-facts-about-dolphin-hunts>>. Accessed 09 July 2015

The Cove. Dir. Louie Psihoyos. Participant Media, 2009. Film

'Dolphin Facts', *Dolphins-World*. <<http://www.dolphins-world.com/>>. Accessed 13 July 2015

'Dolphins and Humans', *Dolphins-World*. <<http://www.dolphins-world.com/dolphins-and-humans/>>. Accessed 09 July 2015

'Dolphin Hunts – Focus on Taiji, Japan', *WDC*. <<http://us.whales.org/issues/dolphin-hunts-focus-on-taiji-japan>>. Accessed 09 July 2015

'Wakayama Prefecture's View Regarding Dolphin Fishing and Other Matters (Itemized Postscript)', *Wakayama Prefecture*. <<http://www.pref.wakayama.lg.jp/prefg/071500/iruka/>>. Accessed 09 July 2015

太地町とイルカ漁問題：文化相対主義か道徳的实在論か

オバーゲ・アンドリュウ

イルカ追い込み漁の継続を理由とした、WAZA（世界動物園水族館協会）による日本動物園水族館協会（JAZA）追放の決定は、地域の慣習に対する外部団体の誤解と異なる価値観の押し付けであると日本国内メディアによって報じられた。イルカの追い込み漁は様々な理由に基づき地元和歌山県によって保護されてきた。本稿ではその慣習の正当化を WAZA や他の団体の観点から考察し、最強の擁護は文化的相対主義の主張であると論じている。また、道徳的現実主義が正確なものであろうがなかろうが、追い込み漁を中止させるに十分な理由があるとするものである。

キーワード：文化的相対主義、イルカの追い込み漁、JAZA、水銀汚染、道徳的現実主義、和歌山県太地町、WAZA