

# Constructing the Northern Sea (*Hokuyo*): Rhetoric of Fishery Problems in Japan of the 1920s and 1930s.

KAMINAGA Eisuke \*

## Summary

What is the Northern Sea (*Hokuyo* in Japanese) for the Japanese people? The question is how the Japanese people had narrated the Northern Sea fishery. We make an analysis of the rhetorical idioms in discourses on the Northern Sea fishery, making use of the articles in several Japanese fishery journals and Japanese fishery cooperatives' history on the Northern Sea fishery from the late 1920s to the early 1930s as the source texts.

We classify rhetorical idioms into two: rhetorical idioms for "justification" and rhetorical idioms for "accusation." Idioms for justification connote a responsibility for the contemporary Japanese towards the past Japanese, claiming legitimacy in history, whereas idioms for accusation imply the existence of a special nation-to-nation relationship. The idioms soon spread as linguistic resources by political campaigns for defense of "the Northern Sea fishery" in the early 1930s.

We study the structure of the Northern Sea fishery narrative. Narratives on the 1930s' Northern Sea fishery share the same plot-development with narratives on the Northern Sea fishery prior to 1905. We regard this development as the structure, specific to the Northern Sea fishery Narrative.

Key words: Japanese history, Narrative studies, Russo-Japanese relations, 1920s and 1930s, Japanese fishery

## 1. Introduction

### 1. 1. Motivation

What is the Northern Sea (*Hokuyo* in Japanese) for Japanese people<sup>1</sup>? Which area of the sea do Japanese people call the Northern Sea?

Japanese people usually call the sea "*Hokuyo*." The "*Hokuyo*" is a very popular term among the Japanese people. The term "*Hokuyo*" literally means Northern (*Hoku* in Japanese) Sea (*Yo*) in general (henceforth, "the Northern Sea" means this "*Hokuyo*").

However, we find it extremely difficult to answer this question: What is the Northern Sea in detail? Some people will probably answer: "It lies to the north of Japan, isn't it?" Others would probably opine something similar. "Right from the beginning, there was no accurate definition." On the other hand, some experts on the Northern Sea fishery will answer

---

\* KAMINAGA Eisuke [国際文化学科]

definitely, defining the range of the Northern Sea fishery during a certain period<sup>2</sup>.

The experts are probably right, but their answers are merely definitions of the Northern Sea fishery during a certain period. It is the general definition of the Northern Sea (or the Northern Sea fishery) that we bring into question. Generally, the Japanese people have shared and continue to share a certain understanding of the Northern Sea. We wish to know about this general understanding. What is the Northern Sea in general?

Some experts on the Northern Sea fishery themselves admit that they have difficulties in answering this question<sup>3</sup>. They can only supply a temporary definition of the Northern Sea fishery pertaining to a certain period. There are no comprehensive answers. It was no different in the past. It is only in the late 1920s that we first find this term in Journals on Fishery. Even in those days, some experts had difficulties in answering this question and there were no comprehensive answers.

In short, the Japanese people have shared from the 1920s and continue to share a certain understanding of the Northern Sea. We wish to know about this understanding. Certainly, people in general have a common understanding of the Northern Sea, but the contents of this understanding appear to be extremely difficult to answer<sup>4</sup>. In reality, there have been no comprehensive answers.

We may highlight some definite assumptions on the Northern Sea. The first assumption is that Japanese people have always referred to the Northern Sea in relation to the Northern Sea fishery. In reality, we have found very few examples of how Japanese people used the term “the Northern Sea” out of context concerning fishery<sup>5</sup>. Therefore, we will ask not about the Northern Sea, but about the Northern Sea fishery below. The second assumption is that the term “the Northern Sea” (or the Northern Sea fishery) was rarely used before the 1920s. This term was popular with the Japanese before the 1920s in such a manner and meaning as is accepted nowadays. We must therefore conclude that the general use of this term began in the late 1920s and early 1930s based on the research conducted on several fishery journals.

## 1. 2. How to Approach

Hereupon, it is necessary to redefine the way of questioning in order to approach the question effectively. We begin by asking how the Japanese people acquired a certain common understanding on the Northern Sea fishery. In addition, we ask what the common understanding is. In other words, the question is, how had the Japanese people narrated the Northern Sea fishery. It is impossible that the Japanese people share an understanding on the Northern Sea fishery without prior exchanges of their own views<sup>6</sup>.

We will raise an interesting issue regarding the definition of the Northern Sea. Generally speaking, events related to the Japanese Southern Sakhalin fishery of the 1930s' are not regarded as part of the Northern Sea fishery history, but surprisingly events related to the late 19th centuries' Japanese Sakhalin fishery are<sup>7</sup>. Where do the differences lie? On what do we base our choice for the History of the Northern Sea fishery?

To answer these questions helps us approach the general understanding on the Northern

Sea fishery. As stated above, the Northern Sea fishery as a term had not appeared prior to the 1920s. Therefore, we assume that the history of the Northern Sea fishery as a concept did not exist prior to the 1920s, either. We will approach the process of constructing the history of the Northern Sea fishery by analyzing the first discourses of the late 1920s and the early 1930s concerning the history of the Northern Sea fishery.

There were many articles in the fishery journals regarding Japanese fishery in the Soviet Far East waters in the late 1920s prior to which the Northern Sea fishery as a term hardly appeared in them. Most of these articles pointed out that Japanese fishery in the Soviet Far East waters faced a crisis and encouraged persons involved to take effective measures. The Northern Sea fishery as a term had appeared in these heated debates<sup>8</sup>.

In the present research, considering these circumstances, we will use as source texts the articles of several Japanese fishery journals and Japanese fishery cooperatives' history on the Northern Sea fishery<sup>9</sup>. Both of them were published between the late 1920s to the 1930s.

We will make an analysis of the rhetorical idioms in discourses regarding the Northern Sea fishery in order to answer the above questions. We take the view that people use rhetorical idioms as linguistic resources for persuasion<sup>10</sup>. From this point of view, the present research attempts to make a detailed analysis of the meaning-construction process regarding the Northern Sea fishery.

## 2. Rhetorical Idioms in Fishery Journals

In this section, we will make an analysis of the rhetorical idioms on the Northern Sea fishery in several articles of the Japanese fishery journals from the late 1920s to the early 1930s. As mentioned before, the present research focuses on an analysis of the rhetorical idioms, which Japanese people utilize as linguistic resources for persuasion. We will show you how the rhetorical idioms used in these articles had motivated an understanding on the Northern Sea fishery.

### 2. 1. Rhetoric for Justification

We classify the rhetorical idioms into two: rhetorical idioms for 'justification' and rhetorical idioms for 'accusation.' Let us first refer to the rhetoric for justifying the Northern Sea fishery. We further divide these rhetorical idioms for 'justification' into two groups: idioms claiming legitimacy in history and idioms emphasizing contribution to the present-day world, namely the 1930s' world.

Most of the articles of the fishery journals concerning the Northern Sea fishery contain several idioms justifying the Northern Sea fishery. Most of the writers of these articles unanimously insisted upon the defense of the Northern Sea fishery, in particular claiming legitimacy in history.

These writers claimed it using various rhetorical idioms. According to one writer, the Northern Sea fishery owed its origin to "concessions acquired as a result of the victory in 1905 of the Russo-Japanese War<sup>11</sup>." On the other hand, another writer derived its origin from

“a compensation for Sakhalin in 1875 of the Treaty of Saint Petersburg<sup>12</sup>.” Another writer regretted that the national seclusion from the 17th century had prevented exploitation of the Northern Sea<sup>13</sup>, while another admired great achievement as a fruit of Japanese fishery’s labors after 1905<sup>14</sup>. Some writers definitely asserted that the Japanese, as a maritime nation were doomed to dominate the Northern Sea<sup>15</sup>. In addition, their claims were full of those idioms and similar to each other.

Almost all of the writers claimed legitimacy in history and eventually warned against the loss of concessions. It is of significance that these rhetorical idioms relatively stressed not on their benefit, but on the responsibility to their ancestors<sup>16</sup>. It is certain that most of these articles did not neglect the benefit, but they primarily underlined the responsibility of the present Japanese towards the past Japanese.

Compared to the rhetorical idioms that claim the legitimacy in history, we have found some idioms; albeit less that emphasize contributions to the present-day world. We classify these idioms into three categories: contributing to the Japanese society, to the whole world and surprisingly, to the Soviet people.

We have frequently found several idioms stressing on contributions to the Japanese society. For example, the Northern Sea fishery contributed towards the meeting of the international trade<sup>17</sup>, creating employment<sup>18</sup>, resolving food and population problems<sup>19</sup>, enforcing the national power<sup>20</sup> and so forth.

We have come across a few idioms that emphasize contributions to the whole world or to the Soviet people. Ethnocentric arrogance characterized these rhetorical idioms, asserting that the Japanese had pioneered the Northern Sea and contributed to not only the regional Russian and Native population’s welfare<sup>21</sup>, but to all the human beings’ welfare<sup>22</sup>.

Idioms claiming the legitimacy in history constitute the majority of rhetoric for justification, which we have found in several of the fishery journals. It is certain that writers at least, preferred these idioms as a resource for persuasion. The writers satisfy readers of the legitimacy in history, referring to a historical sequence of events that progress from the past to the present.

## 2. 2. Rhetoric for Accusation

Let us now turn to the rhetorical idioms for ‘accusation.’ There are varieties of anti-Soviet idioms for accusing the Soviet authorities’ injustice in the articles of the fishery journals. We have found that the other type of idioms, chronicling the slump of the early 1930s Northern Sea fishery on grounds like the Great Depression or the suspension of exportation to China<sup>23</sup>. However, the idioms that accuse the Soviet injustices are in greater magnitude than the other idioms.

We divide these idioms for ‘accusation’ into three groups. The first group typifies accusations of the unnecessary procedures of the Soviet authorities regarding Japanese inshore salmon fishery in Kamchatka. The second group refers to the issue of Japanese crab fishery close to the Soviet waters. The third group includes some idioms on the rest of the

issues, for instance, accusations on the Soviet “dumping exportation<sup>24</sup>.”

There are varieties of idioms that blame the unnecessary procedure of the Soviet authorities. We can select some reasons for the accusations in articles of the journals: a rise of rent for fisheries<sup>25</sup>, additional taxes<sup>26</sup>, an unreasonable exchange rate<sup>27</sup>, several rigid restrictions<sup>28</sup>, unjust bids on fisheries<sup>29</sup>. In spite of these various reasons, rhetorical idioms for ‘accusation’ are not numerous. Most of the writers unanimously blamed the Soviet authorities for “violating the Treaty of Portsmouth<sup>30</sup>” or “negligence of international obligation<sup>31</sup>.”

With regard to the issues on Japanese crab fishery, we have frequently discovered self-centered views. Writers sometimes have termed the actions of the Soviet Border Guards or Soviet crab-fishing boats as piracy<sup>32</sup>, while remaining silent on the issue of many Japanese crab-poachers in the Soviet waters.

The point is that these idioms for ‘accusation’ invariably lay stress on the Soviet violation of international treaties or negligence of an international obligation. They denounce the Soviet authorities from an “international” point of view, though, to be accurate, its point of view is merely “bilateral.”

This “international” point of view easily enables both the salmon and crab fishery to accuse the Soviets in the same way as if people involved in both the fisheries ensured a monolithic unity. In reality, the Japanese salmon fishery in Soviet waters and the Japanese crab fishery close to Soviet waters hardly shared any interests in the late 1920s. The former was inshore fishery, far from the latter fishing mainly on the high seas. As previously mentioned, the hottest topic in the salmon fishery was the accusation of Soviet authorities’ unnecessary procedure; on the other hand, the hottest topic in crab fishery referred to the Soviet border guards.

In a case such as this, “an international point of view” assumes that Japan had a lot of trouble with the Soviets. It is not that the fishery industry, but Japan itself that had trouble<sup>33</sup>. This idiom, “an international point of view,” demands readers to consider this situation as literally a nation-to-nation relationship. These idioms also effectively stress that the Soviets are blamed: “they are blamed universally,” so to speak.

We have found it easy to select idioms connoting the “Soviet’s intrigue” against Japanese fishery; for example, “Russia’s ambition,” “Superficial attitudes” and so on<sup>34</sup>. At the same time, we have often found articles that insist on the ultimate solution of problems<sup>35</sup>. What do these rhetorical idioms mean?

A sentence in a journal: “these problems are merely a trifle<sup>36</sup>” implies the answer. According to the writer of the article, “troubles are derived from historical relationship between two nations.” Hereupon readers are demanded to imagine a definite sequence of historical events, which may be termed, a narrative.

Just recall from the above that idioms claiming legitimacy in history frequently underlined a responsibility towards the past Japanese. Idioms claiming legitimacy and idioms connoting the “Soviet’s intrigue” bring about the same effect in respect that these idioms are used, while referring to an aspect of historical significance.

We must conclude that the idioms connoting a particular sequential pattern of historical events, from a national (-centered) point of view were popularly used in articles concerning the Northern Sea fishery of the late 1920s and the early 1930s.

### **2. 3. Linguistic Resources for Political Campaign**

It is not too much to say that these rhetorical idioms led readers to an understanding of discourses on the Northern Sea fishery in a definite manner. Idioms for justification connote a responsibility for the contemporary Japanese towards the past Japanese, claiming legitimacy in history, whereas idioms for accusation imply the existence of a special nation-to-nation relationship.

The idioms that had been accumulated through debates over “the crisis of Japanese fishery in Soviet waters<sup>37</sup>” in fishery journals were soon applied as linguistic resources by political campaigns for defense of “the Northern Sea fishery” in the early 1930s. In addition, this appliance was a mutual process, that is, people often used idioms produced through the campaigns in the journals<sup>38</sup>.

Idioms concerning the Northern Sea fishery were repeatedly and collectively reconstructed through the campaign. In our view, as a result, a certain pattern of narrating “the Northern Sea fishery” was formed in the process. That is merely a hypothesis, but we have certainly found a definite pattern of narrating the Northern Sea fishery in the late 1930s. We will enter into particulars of the situation below.

## **3. Constructing the Northern Sea Narrative**

In this section, we will dwell on the structure of the Northern Sea fishery narrative. We will pay attention mainly to histories of some fishery cooperatives<sup>39</sup> and booklets of the political campaigns concerning the Northern Sea fishery<sup>40</sup>. As mentioned earlier, we find it difficult to select examples of how Japanese people used the concept “the Northern Sea fishery” prior to the 1920s. We also have difficulty in finding any discourses described as the history of the Northern Sea fishery prior to the 1920s.

### **3. 1. The First Historical Narrative on the Northern Sea Fishery**

In the early 1930s, some fishery cooperatives involved in the Northern Sea fishery had reorganized and consolidated themselves. In addition, they had compiled and published their own histories over the past years. They regarded their own histories as an indivisible part of the Northern Sea fishery History. We will examine the structure of this Northern Sea Narrative through an analysis of the rhetorical idioms used in their histories, which is the first historical narrative of the Northern Sea fishery.

Here we come across the issue of the definition of the Northern Sea fishery again. In histories published in the 1930s, the authors considered events in the late 19th century southern Sakhalin fishery as an integral part of the Northern Sea fishery history. At the same time, many of the articles in the fishery journals in the late 1920s and the early 1930s had not

regarded contemporary fishery in this region as part of the Northern Sea fishery<sup>41</sup>. Why were there variations for these fisheries in the same region? What is it that makes the difference between the Sakhalin fishery of 1890s and that of 1930s? Does it matter that Sakhalin in the 1930s was Japanese territory? We will answer these questions in this section.

To conclude in advance, it is the same plot-development of a historical narrative that both the late 19th century Sakhalin Japanese fishery and one on the 1920-30s' Northern Sea fishery share. We take a view that this structure is common to both and features the narratives themselves. Both had also adopted very similar and common rhetorical idioms. We will give a circumstantial explanation of the reasoning below.

### 3. 2. Rhetoric and Plot in Common

We begin with an analysis of the rhetorical idioms. We quote several characteristic idioms from histories composed by the fishery cooperatives. The 1930s' authors presented a very passionate description of Japanese fishery in the late 19th century Sakhalin. They had fiercely accused the Russian Imperial authorities of their roughness or cunning, while they greatly admired the Japanese fisherpersons' bravery under the oppression of the Russian authorities'<sup>42</sup>.

Idioms like insolence (*Obo*<sup>43</sup> in Japanese) and oppression (*Appaku*<sup>44</sup> or *Boatsu*<sup>45</sup>) frequently highlights the Russian authorities' attitudes and typifies the authors' preference. The Japanese word "*bo*" common to both idioms means roughness. As a result, these idioms give impressions of the Russian authorities' "roughness," which is also accented by highlighting the unexpectedness of the Russian authorities' administrative measures<sup>46</sup>. On the other hand, several idioms meaning solidarity and bond (*Kessoku*<sup>47</sup> or *Danketsu*<sup>48</sup>) repeatedly emphasize the solidarity of Japanese fisherpersons in Sakhalin.

Texts on the 1930s' Northern Sea fishery described as a part of the cooperatives' histories are filled with many and diverse idioms featuring the Soviet authorities' "roughness" or "cunning." The Soviet authorities' "roughness" is characterized by the idioms like oppression (*Appaku*<sup>49</sup>) and unreasonableness (*Boret*<sup>50</sup>), whereas "cunning" is emphasized by idioms like craft (*Kansaku*<sup>51</sup>) and so forth.

Authors of the cooperatives' histories had constructed meanings of their own discourses on the 1930's Northern Sea fishery with help of these idioms. Consequently, we are impressed as if there were no differences in appearance between the narratives on the late 19th century Sakhalin and narratives on the 1930s' Northern Sea fishery for all the great temporal changes in political and economic conditions of fishery.

The authors additionally lay stress on consistency in the Russian (and Soviet) authorities' attitudes<sup>52</sup>. Hereupon we might assimilate the plot-building process, for consistency implies sequential occurrence of historical events with meaning-construction. We will also look to this plot-building process.

Let us first summarize the histories on Japanese fishery in the late 19th century Sakhalin. "Once upon a time inshore fishery in Sakhalin," the author says, "had been exploited by

brave Japanese fisherpersons<sup>53</sup>. After the Russian Empire had occupied the island, Russian authorities had continuously oppressed Japanese fishery. However, the skillful Japanese fisherpersons did not abandon their fishery enterprises and in spite of difficulties expanded their business<sup>54</sup>. They finally acquired the Japanese government's strong support, uniting each other and appealed to public opinion for help<sup>55</sup>."

Secondly, we will abstract the histories on the 1930s' Northern Sea fishery. "Once upon a time the Northern fishery," the author says, "had been exploited by brave Japanese fisherpersons. The fishery conflict between two empires over the Northern Sea had made the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-05 inevitably<sup>56</sup>. The Imperial Japan had obliged Russia to confirm existing Japanese fishery concessions in the Northern Sea as a result in the victory of the War. Thereafter skillful Japanese fisherpersons had never abandoned their fishery enterprises and had expanded their business despite the disorder of the Russian Revolution. The Imperial Japan had established relationships with the Soviets in 1925, making certain of the concessions. The Soviets, nonetheless, has continuously oppressed Japanese Northern Sea fishery in various illegal ways. Japanese fishery cooperatives have been successful to acquire the Japanese government's support, uniting each other and appealing to public opinion for help<sup>57</sup>."

While comparing the two narratives it seems obvious that there is an indisputable similarity in their plot. Various rhetorical idioms equally motivate and enforce the cause of historical events in these narratives. For instance, "the Imperial Japan has legitimate rights to the Northern Sea fishery because it had been originally exploited by the brave Japanese (or as a result of the victory in war ;)" "Japanese fisherpersons had never abandoned and instead expanded their business in difficulties thanks to their skillfulness;" "the Soviets (or the Russian Empire) have invaded these legitimate rights owing to their cunning or roughness;" "Japanese fishery cooperatives have been successful to acquire the Japanese government's support by virtue of their solidarity."

A variety of idioms used in narratives on the Northern Sea fishery principally characterizes the plot common to these narratives. To be accurate, this plot-development itself characterizes these "Northern Sea fishery narratives." Moreover, the plot structure of these narratives itself allows an understanding of one definite meaning. We will enlarge on the process, focusing on the structure of these narratives.

### 3. 3. Structure of the Northern Sea Narrative

The narratives describe two events, which are distant from one another in chronological order and then explains the relationship of events as cause and effect<sup>58</sup>. We will clearly reveal this cause-and-effect structure in the Northern Sea fishery Narrative. In general, a historical narrative organizes the past as a whole in one point of view<sup>59</sup>. We will also disclose this point of view on the Northern Sea fishery Narrative. Firstly, we will take note of the several discourses on "the Northern Sea fishery before 1905<sup>60</sup>."

As previously stated, the plot of this narrative describes itself as follows; "the Northern

Sea fishery had been pioneered by brave Japanese (hence, we, Japanese have the legitimate rights to the fishery ;)” “The Russian Empire had roughly oppressed Japanese fishery after the cession of Sakhalin in 1875 despite the confirmation of these rights by the Treaty of Saint Petersburg (hence, the Russian Empire invaded our legitimate rights ;)” “Japanese fisherpersons had never given up (because they were skillful and because they were firmly united for the sake of our national interest ;)” “The victory of war had finally resolved all the problems (consequently the concession, as it were, our legitimate rights had been officially confirmed.)”

In short, we can consider that the plot comprises three periods in sequence: the pioneer days, the dark days and these days. According to the 1930s’ authors, “in the pioneering days we, the Japanese, had opened the Northern Sea fishery (accurately, the inshore fishery in Sakhalin). The Japanese acquired the rights to fishery; in the following dark days the Russian Empire had roughly and illegally oppressed our rights; in consequence of the Russo-Japanese War the Imperial Japan had eventually made a successful confirmation of them.” Time goes around. The dark days had superseded the good old days, but eventually the good days have come again.

Secondly, we will refer to several discourses on the 1930s’ Northern Sea fishery<sup>61</sup>. The narrative goes as follows: “We, Japanese, had originally pioneered the Northern Sea fishery, had obliged the Russian Empire to approve of the concessions in 1905, and had expanded it in spite of the Revolution and the Intervention disorder. After the recovery of the relationship with the Soviets, they, however, illegally oppressed our fishery. We have finally overcome difficulties, having consolidated ourselves (cooperatives or public opinions) and having obtained our government’s support.” There is no need to dwell on anything more. The plot-development is obviously common to both of the discourses as if history repeated itself.

We can conclude that a narrative on the 1930s’ Northern Sea fishery shares the same plot-development with a narrative on the Northern Sea fishery prior to 1905. We regard this development as the structure, specific to the Northern Sea fishery Narrative.

Hereupon we can persuasively explain why the 1930s’ authors regarded not the 1930s’ southern Sakhalin fishery, but the southern Sakhalin fishery before 1905 as a part of the Northern Sea fishery. It is possible to describe the sequence of events in southern Sakhalin fishery before 1905 by this plot-development. On the other hand, it is impossible to describe the 1930s’ southern Sakhalin fishery with this plot-development, for there is no room for a sequence of events on the 1930s’ southern Sakhalin fishery in this plot-development.

Precisely, what are the grounds for considering a sequence of several events as history of the Northern Sea fishery? Indeed, we can provide various reasons for it, but there are no absolute grounds, which anyone accepts at any time. These grounds mean merely a temporary understanding of the Northern Sea fishery. We must therefore conclude that the grounds in this case are this plot-development, featuring two Northern Sea fishery narratives.

#### 4. Conclusion

As stated above, it appears that the frequent use of idioms featuring the Northern Sea fishery in the late 1920s' journals preceded the establishment of the Northern Sea fishery Narrative in the 1930s' fishery cooperatives' histories. We, however, consider a sequence of events not as a cause-and-effect one, but as merely a sequential and referential one.<sup>62</sup> We must conclude as follows; in the late 1920s' in the Japanese fishery journals there were more and more frequent use of idioms concerning the Japanese fishery in the Soviet waters. Subsequently, these rhetorical idioms effectively enabled the legitimacy in history or a national interest perspective to impress the readers. Later on Japanese people repeatedly used particular idioms and the narratives on the Northern Sea fishery filled with the idioms that had emerged in the 1930s.

This is the process of constructing the Northern Sea Fishery Narrative. We term the product in the process as the Northern Sea fishery Narrative. This is simply hindsight. Nevertheless, is there anything else that we can do for the history?

After the establishment of the Northern Sea fishery Narrative in the 1930s, the Japanese regarded the narrative's point of view not as a temporarily agreed way of narrating, but as an undoubted assumption. As a result, we had looked on it as if it were a timeless geographical concept. There are many variants of the narrative, not a little of which are excellent fruits of research without dispute. Nevertheless, there appear to be some discourses worthy to counter-narratives.

We have explained above the constructing processes of these narratives. We take a view that there exists is a possibility for other types of narratives, that is, the Northern Sea fishery Narrative can be essentially reconstructed. The significance of the present research lies there.

We have not suggested which types of narratives were most desirable in the present research. We consider that the relatively desirable narratives are a good possibility, but in order to present a more convincing argument we need to make a comprehensive review of many more discourses concerning the Northern Sea fishery.

---

<sup>1</sup> For some discussion on this issue, see Kaminaga Eisuke, *Hokuyo no tanjo: ba to hito to monogatari* (Yokohama: Seibunsha, 2014).

<sup>2</sup> Nakai Akira, *Hokuyo gyogyo no kouzo henka* (Tokyo: Seizandoshoten, 1988), p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Kudou Isao, "Hokuyo gyogyo to ha" in Mochizuki Kiichi, ed., *Shiberia kaihatsu to hokuyo gyogyo* (Sapporo: Hokkaido Shinbunsha, 1982), pp. 202-204.

<sup>4</sup> Hokkaido-cho, ed., *Kita Chishima shigen chosa sho: fu hokuyo gyogyo gaisetsu* (Sapporo, 1932), p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> For a rare exception, some experts called lumber produced in Southern Sakhalin "Hokuyo wood" in Japan before the 1940s.

<sup>6</sup> Katagiri Masataka, *Kako to kioku no shakaigaku: Jikoron kara no tenkai* (Kyoto: Sekaishisousha, 2003), p. 18.

<sup>7</sup> For example, see Hokkaido ed., *Shin Hokkaido shi: vol.4* (Sapporo, 1973), p. 1004.

<sup>8</sup> Bruno Latour inspires our view on this process. See Latour, *Kagaku ga tsukurareru toki* (Tokyo: Sangyotosho, 1999); originally published as *Science in Action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1987), p. 69.

- <sup>9</sup> These journals are *Suisankai* (1915-), *Suisan* (1912-1933) continued by *Suisan koron* (1934-), *Teisui* (1922-1943), and *Suisei* (1926-1937).
- <sup>10</sup> Nakagawa Nobutoshi, *Shakaimondai no shakaigaku: Kouchikushugi Approach no shintenkaï* (Kyoto: Sekaishisousha, 1999), p.162. Vivien Burr, *Shakaiteki kochikushugi he no shotai: gensetsu bunseki to ha nani ka* (Tokyo: Kawashima shoten, 1997); originally published as *An Introduction to Social Constructionism* (London, New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 254-256.
- <sup>11</sup> *Suisankai* 547 (1928), p. 321, *Suisankai* 548 (1928), p. 375, *Suisankai* 565 (1929), p. 1, *Suisankai* 565 (1929), p. 63, *Suisankai* 581 (1931), p. 59, *Suisankai* 578 (1931), p. 42. *Teisui* 6, no. 2 (1927), p. 49, *Teisui* 8, no. 5 (1929), p. 2.
- <sup>12</sup> *Teisui* 10, no. 4 (1931), pp. 18-19.
- <sup>13</sup> *Suisei* 2 (1927), p. 51, *Suisei* 8 (1931), pp. 73-77.
- <sup>14</sup> *Suisankai* 548 (1928), p. 375. *Teisui* 5, no. 4 (1926), p. 52.
- <sup>15</sup> *Suisei* 2 (1927), *Suisan* 19, no. 3 (1931), p. 14.
- <sup>16</sup> *Suisankai* 547 (1928), p. 321, *Suisankai* 592 (1932), p. 27. *Suisan* 14, no. 9 (1926), p. 31, *Suisan* 15, no. 1 (1927), p. 2, *Suisan* 17, no.11 (1929), p. 2, *Suisan* 18, no.8 (1930), p. 1.
- <sup>17</sup> *Suisan* 15, no. 1 (1927), p. 15, *Suisan* 18, no. 8 (1930), p. 1. *Teisui* 9, no. 6 (1930), pp. 1-2, *Teisui* 10, no. 3 (1931), p. 1. *Suisankai* 574 (1930), p. 49.
- <sup>18</sup> *Suisan* 18, no. 8 (1930), p. 1.
- <sup>19</sup> *Teisui* 3, no. 2 (1924), pp. 27-31, *Teisui* 4, no. 9 (1925), p. 4, *Teisui* 9, no. 6 (1930), p. 1. *Suisan* 18, no. 8 (1930), p. 1.
- <sup>20</sup> *Suisei* 2 (1927), p. 14.
- <sup>21</sup> *Suisan* 15, no. 1 (1927), pp. 2-3. *Suisankai* 572 (1930), p. 45.
- <sup>22</sup> *Suisankai* 565 (1929), pp. 1-2. *Suisan* 19, no. 3 (1931), p. 1.
- <sup>23</sup> *Suisankai* 578 (1931), p. 42.
- <sup>24</sup> *Teisui* 7, no. 10 (1928), p. 52, *Teisui* 9, no. 10 (1930), p. 46, *Teisui* 9, no. 11 (1930), p. 39. *Suisankai* 578 (1931), p. 42.
- <sup>25</sup> *Teisui* 3, no. 8 (1924), p. 51, *Teisui* 9, no. 12 (1930), p. 42. *Suisan* 19, no. 3 (1931), pp. 2-3.
- <sup>26</sup> *Teisui* 3, no. 8 (1924), p. 51; *Teisui* 10, no. 4 (1931), pp. 2-3.
- <sup>27</sup> *Teisui* 9, no. 12 (1930), p. 48, *Teisui* 10, no. 3 (1931), p. 41-43. *Suisankai* 580 (1931), p. 4.
- <sup>28</sup> *Teisui* 9, no. 10 (1930), pp. 45-46.
- <sup>29</sup> *Suisan* 18, no. 12 (1930), pp. 2-3. *Teisui* 10, no. 4 (1931), pp. 2-3.
- <sup>30</sup> *Suisan* 14, no.10 (1926), p. 30, *Suisan* 17, no. 11 (1929), p. 2, *Suisan* 18, no. 8 (1930), p. 1, *Suisan* 19, no. 3 (1931), p. 1. *Teisui* 10, no. 3 (1931), p. 46, *Teisui* 10, no. 4 (1931), pp. 4-6. *Suisankai* 580 (1931), pp. 2-3.
- <sup>31</sup> *Teisui* 5, no. 4 (1926), p. 52, *Teisui* 10, no. 3 (1931), p. 46, *Teisui* 10, no.4 (1931), pp. 4-6. *Suisankai* 565 (1929), p. 63, *Suisankai* 580 (1931), pp. 2-3, *Suisankai* 581 (1931), p. 59. *Suisan* 17, no. 11 (1929), p. 2, *Suisan* 18, no. 8 (1930), p. 1, *Suisan* 18, no. 12 (1930), p. 2, *Suisan* 19, no. 3 (1931), p. 1.
- <sup>32</sup> *Suisan* 12, no.1 (1924), pp. 18-19, *Suisan* 14, no. 9 (1926), pp. 5-7, *Suisan* 18, no. 8 (1930), p.1. *Teisui* 8, no. 12 (1929), pp. 33-35, *Teisui* 9, no. 3 (1930), pp. 3-6.
- <sup>33</sup> *Suisan* 14, no. 9 (1926), pp. 5-7. *Suisankai* 588 (1931), p.16, *Suisankai* 592 (1932), p. 27.
- <sup>34</sup> *Teisui* 7, no. 10 (1928), p. 52, *Teisui* 8, no. 4 (1929), p. 40.
- <sup>35</sup> *Teisui* 10, no. 3 (1931), p. 1, *Teisui* 10, no. 4 (1931), p. 7.
- <sup>36</sup> *Suisankai* 580 (1931), p. 4. *Teisui* 10, no. 3 (1931), p. 42.
- <sup>37</sup> *Suisankai* 573 (1930), p. 32, *Suisankai* 580 (1931), p. 3. *Teisui* 9, no. 4 (1931), p. 43.
- <sup>38</sup> Some of the journal articles quoted above were very involved in these campaigns. These journals were also important hubs of these campaigns.
- <sup>39</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, ed., *Karafuto to gyogyo* (Toyohara, 1931). Roryo gyogyo godo kinen shi kanko kai, ed., *Roryo gyogyo godo kinen shi*, (Tokyo, 1932). Roryo suisan kumiai, ed., *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo* (Tokyo, 1938).
- <sup>40</sup> Hokkaido kyokai, ed., *Chishima to hokuyo: Hokuyo fugen kaihatu saku* (Sapporo, 1931). Hokkaido cho, *Kita Chishima shigen chosa sho*. Hokkaido kyokai, ed., *Manmou to hokuyo* (Sapporo, 1933). Okamoto Shouichi, *Hokuyo gyogyo no dai kakumei* (Tokyo: Suisan Tsuushinsha, 1933). Okamoto Shoichi, *Hokuyo gyogyo ronso* (Tokyo: Suisan shuhosha, 1936).
- <sup>41</sup> Hokkaido cho, *Kita Chishima shigen chosa sho*, p.1. *Hokkai no suisan* 73 (1935), p. 17, *Hokkai no suisan* 84 (1936), p. 10.
- <sup>42</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, pp. 169-194. Okamoto, *Hokuyo gyogyo no dai kakumei*, pp. 141-145. Hokkaido cho, *Shinsen Hokkaido shi* 4 (Sapporo, 1937), pp. 592-593. Roryo suisan

kumiai, *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo*, pp. 4-11, pp. 15-19.

<sup>43</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, p. 171.

<sup>44</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, p. 177, p. 179. Okamoto, *Hokuyo gyogyo no dai kakumei*, p. 143. Hokkaido cho. *Shinsen Hokkaido shi*, p. 592, p. 593. Roryo suisan kumiai, *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo*, p.5, p.8.

<sup>45</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, p. 174, p. 175.

<sup>46</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, p. 173.

<sup>47</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, p. 171. Roryo suisan kumiai, *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo*, p. 15.

<sup>48</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, p. 173.

<sup>49</sup> Hokkaido kyokai, *Chishima to hokuyo*, Introduction. Okamoto Shouichi, *Hokuyo gyogyo ronso*, p. 158, p. 159.

<sup>50</sup> *Suisan* 18, no. 8 (1930), p. 1, *Suisan* 18, no. 12 (1930), p. 2, *Suisan*19, no. 3 (1931), p. 1.

<sup>51</sup> *Teisui* 8, no. 4 (1929), p. 40.

<sup>52</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, p. 177, p. 179. Roryo suisan kumiai, *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo*, p. 5, p.10. *Teisui* 10, no. 3 (1931), p. 1.

<sup>53</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, p. 169. Roryo suisan kumiai, *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo*, p.4.

<sup>54</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, p. 172. Roryo suisan kumiai, *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo*, p. 6, p. 18.

<sup>55</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, p. 174.

<sup>56</sup> Roryo suisan kumiai, *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo*, p. 18.

<sup>57</sup> *Hokkai no suisan*, 73 (1935), pp. 16-21. Roryo suisan kumiai, *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo*, pp. 71-73.

<sup>58</sup> Noe Keiichi, *Monogatari no tetsugaku: Yanagita Kunio to rekishi no hakken* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1996), p. 163.

<sup>59</sup> Noe, *Monogatari no tetsugaku*, p. 162.

<sup>60</sup> Karafuto teichi gyogyo suisan kumiai, *Karafuto to gyogyo*, pp. 169-196. Roryo suisan kumiai, *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo*, pp. 4-19.

<sup>61</sup> *Hokkai no suisan* 73 (1935), pp. 16-21. Roryo suisan kumiai, *Roryo gyogyo no enkaku to genjo*, pp. 71-73.

<sup>62</sup> For some discussion on this "sequential development", see Nakagawa, *Shakaimondai no shakaigaku*, pp. 37-39.