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Deforestation is one of the most significant environmental issues in the world. Although there is no single cause for this issue, the major factor relates to excessive demand from timber importers including Japan. To minimize deforestation caused by Japan's timber trade, Japanese environmental groups initiated projects, aiming to decrease Japan's timber consumption. In these projects, they use certain language to persuade Japanese citizens to believe that deforestation is their own problem and that protection of forests in the world is meaningful for Japan. This paper analyzes deforestation rhetoric employed by two major Japanese environmental groups, emphasizing Japanese cultural beliefs about community and nature. Culture and language are inseparable because people tend to gain knowledge and interpret meanings of events and problems by conceptualizing their experience and thoughts within their cultural framework. The rhetorical analysis aims to reveal how the two environmental groups attempt to frame problems according to their rhetorical purposes, how they gain support from Japanese audiences, and how these strategies are affected by the Japanese cultural beliefs.
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Deforestation and Japan's Timber Trade

Deforestation is one of the most significant environmental issues. International aid organizations, such as the World Bank and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and many environmental groups in the world are discussing deforestation issues in response to the magnitude of their negative impacts on the environment and society. During the past two decades, the world lost 300 million hectares of forests, destroying the habitat of wildlife species and leading to poverty and hunger among various populations. Deforestation is caused by multiple factors, which often interweaving with economic, social, and political aspects of timber export nations. Some argue that vast forest areas are converted for residential and industrial purposes due to population growth and the need for economic development. Others contend that farming also leads to deforestation. Both small-scale migrant shifting farming and large-scale plantations contribute to deforestation (Vandermeer and Perfecto, 1995). However, the main cause of rapid deforestation in the world is commercial logging, resulting in long-time, destructive effects on ecological integrity in forests. Commercial logging aims at producing various wood products, such as woodchips, pulp, plywood, and sawnwood. The international community understands the significance of deforestation, but the meanings of the word deforestation are various. The American Heritage Dictionary (1996) defines the meaning as “to cut down and clear away the trees or forests.” The Food and Agricultural Organization defines deforestation as the conversion of forest to other uses such as cropland and shifting cultivation. Forests that have been logged and
left to regenerate are not included (1995). Edward Newman (2000) of University of Bristol says the meaning of deforestation is that “the vegetation cover of an area changes from forest to something else” (p.180). However, all of the above definitions stress only tree species of forests and do not take into account other significant ecological systems that forests support. Considering all of these systems, I would like to define deforestation as follows: 1) cutting trees of forests in the destructive way that results in long-term modification of the ecological systems beyond the level that allows plant and wildlife species in forest to adapt naturally and thus to keep their minimum variable-population, or 2) converting the vegetation cover to something else for a long time.

Scholars and international environmental groups point out the relationship between deforestation issues and Japan’s wood trade (FoE-J, 2000a). Because of Japan’s massive import of wood products and its irreversibly negative effects on the society and environment, Japan has been criticized by the international community. It has been called a contributor to the “despoiling of tropical forests” (JEI, 1992, p.2), “the World’s greatest contributor to global deforestation” (Forests .org, 2001), and “a major force in the destruction of the world’s forests” (Strieker, 2001).

Eighty percent of Japan’s timber demand is met by imported products, which makes it one of the largest importers in the world (Helten, et al., 1999). For example, Japan imports 32 percent of timber produced in Malaysia (ITTO, 1999), followed by China which imports 13 percent of timber from Malaysia. Japan imports more than 80 percent of lumber produced in Siberia, which makes it the dominant importer of Siberian lumber. Both Malaysia and Siberia suffer from deforestation in relation to commercial logging. Other countries, such as Indonesia and Malaysia, also sell significant amounts of
timber to Japan are facing deforestation resulting from commercial logging. It is clear that Japan's massive wood trade relates to deforestation issues in the world.

Facing the rapid deforestation connected to Japan's wood trade, some Japanese environmental groups attempt to solve this issue. These groups criticize the logging companies that conduct illegal and unsustainable logging practices instead of Japan's excessive timber demand. They refer to the fact that Japan imports great amounts of wood products from those companies to meet domestic timber demands, suggesting the relationship between the rampant commercial logging and Japan's massive consumption of wood products. Japan Tropical Forest Action Network (2001a) says:

In Tasmania (Australia), after clear-cutting old-growth forests, logging companies burn the site and completely remove forest vegetation. This burn prepares for plantation, but it eradicates all wildlife species there….Eighty one percent of the timbers produced in Tasmania is exported to Japan as woodchips (¶8).

JATAN explains the relationship between deforestation and the consumption of wood products by Japanese citizens. JATAN (2001b) mentions, "Japanese paper manufactures import about 7 million tons of woodchip from Australia. Most of these woodchips are consumed in Japan" (¶7).

Even when the Japanese environmental groups criticize Japan, they carefully choose the language they use to make the criticism sound less negative. FoE-J (2000b) says, "(unfortunately), a reputation about Japan has been established in the international community; Japan is viewed as a bad guy concerning preservation of world forests" (chap. 1). When presenting the criticism from the world about Japan's massive wood trade, FoE-J selects the words it uses and how it uses these words. Not referring to the exact phrases of the criticism about Japan, FoE-J prevents the criticism from sounding
too negative and allows it to be more acceptable to Japanese citizens. Japanese culture has a norm against criticizing others, believing it to be rudeness, arrogance, or a sign of lack of consideration for others. If Japanese environmental groups literally translate the criticism such as "rapacious consumer and destroyer of old-growth forests" (Helten et al., 1999, p.1) into Japanese and present it to Japanese citizens, it would make these citizens feel uncomfortable because the criticism sounds too adversarial. With this premise about criticism, it is natural for Japanese environmental groups to avoid using the language that directly blames Japan and to avoid inducing tension in Japanese citizens.

Avoiding direct criticism relates to the goal of Japanese environmental groups to minimize deforestation by gaining support from Japanese citizens to reduce Japan's consumption of wood products. The environmental groups believe that reduction is the best way to address deforestation issues. In fact, FoE-J (2000a) says, "There is no other way except for reducing domestic consumption of wood products to decrease the amount of Japan's import" (chap. 12). To accomplish this goal, Japanese environmental groups have to acquire cooperation from Japanese citizens and maintain the cooperation for a long time. However, both these requirements are challenging. Reducing Japan's massive consumption requires changes in the citizens' ideas and behaviors toward the consumption that has become a part of their lives. Moreover, these changes must last for a long time. Otherwise, deforestation caused by Japan's wood trade would not be prevented.

This motivation would be produced through the use of language. Language helps the Japanese environmental groups to interpret and conceptualize the issue and to influence Japanese citizens to accomplish the environmental goal. Language is crucial
both for these groups and Japanese citizens make sense of deforestation and to motivate collective action. These environmental groups need to choose language carefully based on the cultural assumptions embedded in language. Culture is the basis of knowledge, experience, attitudes, meanings, religion, and role expectations over generations, and it "manifests itself in patterns of language and thought" (Applbaum et al., 1973, p.86). The rhetorical strategies of these groups need to be especially sensitive to two aspects of culture: Japanese cultural beliefs about community and nature.

First, Japanese cultural beliefs about community involve collectivism and the concept of **uchi** (inside) and **soto** (outside). The concept of inside and outside helps Japanese people to locate themselves either inside or outside of the group, knowing whether they have shared interests with someone. With fellow members in the same group, they are strongly encouraged to help each other and maintain harmony within the group. Collectivistic culture values group goals over individual goals and emphasizes harmony within a group. In Japanese society, that is based on the concept of inside and outside supported by collectivism, so making a criticism of others inside the group can be risky. Japanese society believes that making a criticism could upset harmony within a group. In the cultural context of deforestation, criticizing Japan's massive consumption of wood products could just make its citizens feel offended and incline to be defensive about their consumption patterns. With the cultural beliefs about community and negative view of criticism, it is difficult to induce a cooperative action if those groups directly condemn Japanese consumers.

Second, those environmental organizations also have to be sensitive to cultural beliefs about nature if they want to be rhetorically effective. For the last 800 years, these
beliefs have been predominantly affected by the view of nature of Zen Buddhism. According to Zen Buddhism, nature and humans are equal. It says that people should live with nature and live in nature. It does not view nature as an object to conquer but as a friend. It prohibits using nature for selfish purposes. Using these concepts about nature, Japanese environmental groups can make a persuasive argument about deforestation by discussing the biological and cultural values of forests. They can remind Japanese citizens about traditional views of how nature should be and how they ought to address nature. Further, in light of those Zen concepts, unsustainable logging practices such as clear-cutting and complete removal of forest vegetation can be depicted as ethically wrong because these practices are selfish, emphasizing corporate profits and ignoring biological and socio-economic consequences. Using cultural beliefs about nature enables Japanese environmental groups to reconstruct deforestation issues from the traditional ethical points of view that leads Japanese citizens to delineate what is good and what is wrong. This dichotomization is crucial for encouraging collective action in response to deforestation.

In the following section, I will elaborate on these cultural beliefs about community and nature, which affect the rhetorical choices of Japanese environmental groups in public discourse. First, I will discuss collectivism (Donahue, 1998) and the concepts of *uchi* (outside) and *soto* (outside) that are the basis of conceptualizations of society and self in Japan (Bechnik, 1994). Then, I will present cultural beliefs about nature that have been affected by Japanese customs and strengthened by the concepts of nature of Zen Buddhism.
Literature Review

Cultural Beliefs about Community

Japanese cultural beliefs about community originate in the concept of _uchi_ (inside) and _soto_ (outside). The concept of inside-outside helps Japanese people to locate themselves either inside or outside a community, identifying whether they have shared interests with others concerning an issue. Identification of shared interests affirms they are fellow members of a community and leads them to take collective actions supported and emphasized by the beliefs of collectivism that emphasizes group goals over individual goals. For Japanese environmental groups that need collective actions of Japanese citizens, orientation of inside-outside and collectivism are important dimensions to be rhetorically effective in public discourse.

The concepts of _uchi_ (inside) and _soto_ (outside) are taken-for-granted in Japanese everyday life. Charles Quinn, Jr. (1994) explains the inside-outside distinction in terms of how each idea is expressed in language:

_Uchi_ expressions depict a world that is enclosed, concave, indoors, family, lineal, "us," shared, familiar, informal, private, experienced, and known .... _Soto_ expressions, by contrast, see the world as open, convex, out-doors, non-family, extralineal, "them," not shared, unfamiliar, formal, public, and unknown (pp.38).

There are two major elements that influence the concept of _uchi_ (inside). One is sharing experience, which tends to involve shared geographical and social boundaries among the community members. Using this element, the people who belong to _uchi_ (inside) are the ones in the same community, including their family, friends, those who
live in the same village or town, co-workers, and colleagues. In general, Japan's concept of inside is determined by this concept (Nakake, [1974] 1990). Japanese social norms promote harmony inside of the group by encouraging the citizens to help fellow members of the community and discouraging these citizens from criticizing them. The "outsiders" are the rest of the people who do not belong to uchi: the people in the rest of society (Nakae, [1974] 1990). However, the concepts of inside/outside are also used in a much broader sense to situate Japan in relation to the rest of the world. For example, Japanese refer to foreign people as 外国人: Gai (outside - 外) Koku (country - 国) Jin (people - 人), the people who live outside of Japan. The concepts of inside/outside are essential for Japanese people because these orientations function to provide them with a place in the world. Within the inside group, sharing beliefs with other member in the community is important because sharing it helps the members to secure their location inside the group and reaffirm a sense of unity (Nakane, [1974] 1990).

The other element of uchi (inside) is shared interest. Kenneth Burke, an American rhetorical theorist (1950) says that people can identify themselves with someone when their interests are common. Even if their interests are not common, they can still do so by assuming that they are or being persuaded to believe so. When people have shared interests with some, they can identify themselves with, even though he is not their family member, friend, co-worker, or neighbor. According to Burke (1950), identification motivates people to take cooperative action and leads to social unity among them who identify themselves with each other through mutual cooperation. With the concept of inside/outside, Japanese citizens are more likely to recognize shared interests
with other people when they are or will be affected by problems or when they are responsible for the problems.

The concepts of inside/outside are supported by Japan's cultural dimension of collectivism. Cultures can be classified as either collectivist or individualist based on whether or not the articulated or communicated standards, values, and beliefs of a community emphasize the significance of collectivist action or the importance of individual action (Chesebro, 1998). Although individualism and collectivism can be found in all cultures, one is generally dominant over the other (Donahue, 1998). In North America, Western Europe, Australia, and New Zealand, individualism prevails. In other countries including Japan, China, and Korea, collectivism is dominant. Collectivistic cultures value in-groups more than individualistic cultures do (Triandis, 1988). In her analysis of Japanese behavior, Takie Sugiyama Lebra (1976) argues that collectivism involves “cooperation and solidarity and sentimental desire for the warm feeling of oneness with fellow members of one’s group” (p. 25), and the feeling of oneness is shared widely in Japanese society.

Japan’s collectivistic culture and the concepts of *uchi* (inside)/*soto* (outside) are enhanced by Burke’s concept of identification (1950). Both cultural concepts stress cooperation, solidarity, and the feeling of oneness with fellow members as social values. These concepts serve as a basis of how Japanese citizens tend to act in their community, but the concepts are usually determined by geographical and social boundaries (Nakae, [1974] 1990). Burke’s concept of identification explains what motivates people to take cooperative action and how a sense of social unity is fostered. This rhetorical concept helps a rhetor to expand cultural concepts of uchi (inside), leading the audience to apply
the cultural concepts beyond the traditional boundaries. As a person who was born and grew up in Japan, I would view the relation between the concepts of inside/outside and collectivism as follows: Japanese people locate themselves according to the concepts of inside/outside when they interpret reality, seeing how reality is related to them and their community. Then, they are likely to choose an action shared with the majority of other group members, reflecting the belief of inside/outside concepts and their collectivistic culture.

When Japanese people face an environmental issue, they want to see whether it is our problem or their problem first. Our problem means that they will/could be affected by that issue and/or were/are responsible for it. If they live in the affected area or surrounding cities, they would view this as our problem. They may attempt to take a collective action to change the situation, such as asking municipal government to set up higher standards and take tougher measures for those who do not comply with those standards. Meanwhile, people who live far away from the affected areas would feel sorry for their issue, but usually would not take any collective action because it does not seem to affect those people and they are not responsible for it. However, if someone shows a different reality about the issue, more people would think that it relates to them. For example, when making an argument about deforestation in the world, Japanese environmental groups could expand the scope of reality about this issue by explaining its close relationship with Japan. They may discuss the fact that Japan imports great amounts of wood products to meet domestic timber demand, which makes her the largest importer in the world. This will imply that Japanese consumers have some responsibility for the deforestation issue. To make the issue relate to Japan much more closely, these groups
would refer to the potential health risks that Japanese people could face as a result of deforestation and of using imported lumber. Through rhetoric that focuses on shared interests with Japan, Japanese citizens would be able to relate deforestation issues with themselves, finding shared interests in this issue and interpreting it as their issue. Identifying shared interests could encourage collective action as fellow members of the community for solving the issue. By using certain language, the environmental groups can alter the interpretation of reality and expand the scope of those who would share interests about the issue and lead more Japanese people to get involved in the environmental issue. They will be cooperative if they view things as being related to themselves.

The sharing of experience and beliefs occurs in language. When Japanese people situate themselves either inside or outside of one group and choose a certain action according to the social situation, they do so by conceptualizing the reality through the vocabulary of their cultural group and interpreting a relationship between the reality and themselves. Language is the means by which people do this. By using language that encourages audiences to see themselves as inside an affected group, Japanese civil groups can appeal to cultural beliefs about community that are based on the concepts of inside/outside strengthened by collectivism. This helps audiences understand and interpret the relationship between themselves and deforestation.
Cultural Beliefs about Nature

Cultural beliefs about nature are also important for rhetorical discourse on deforestation because they suggest how people ought to act in relation to nature. In Japanese culture, the beliefs have been influenced by the aesthetic view of Zen Buddhism. It respects inherent values of nature as the Japanese term for nature, *shi-zen*, indicates "what-is-so-of-itself" that "unfolds of itself into primordial appearances" (Odin, 1997, p.95).

Zen Buddhism came to Japan from China about 800 years ago. Soon after it was introduced to Japan, Zen became the pervasive religion in the country among warrior leaders who had financial and political power and who admired the simplicity and frugality of Zen. Backed by the support from those leaders, it affected the cultural life of the Japanese people and their view of nature. This school of Buddhism is characterized by the aesthetic concept of nature that can be appreciated only through living with it and in it. In Suzuki (1959)'s words:

> Zen proposes to respect Nature, to love Nature, to live its own life; Zen recognizes that our Nature is one with objective Nature, not in the mathematical sense, but in the sense that Nature lives in us and we in Nature. For this reason, Zen asceticism advocates simplicity, frugality, straightforwardness, virility, making no attempt to utilize Nature for selfish purposes (p. 351-352).

He also argues that the most salient characteristics of Zen asceticism in relation to the Japanese love of nature resides in paying nature the fullest respect. In this sense, Japanese people may treat nature as a friend whose inner being is thoroughly like our own, not as an object to conquer (1959). According to Japanese cultural beliefs, nature should be treated as equal to humans and should not be utilized for selfish purposes. Though Japan
was transformed into an industrial economy that favors mass-production and mass-consumption by using enormous amount of natural resources, the ethical standards of how to treat nature still remain in Japanese society. Based on Zen beliefs about nature, conquering nature and using it for self-interests are ethically wrong.

In discussing deforestation issues, Japanese environmental organizations could usefully appeal to the cultural beliefs about nature based on Zen Buddhism. When they criticize some companies that are doing destructive logging practices only for their own profits, they could encourage Japanese citizens to view these companies as wrong based on their cultural belief that forbids using nature for a selfish purpose. Referring to the biological values of forests would reaffirm that nature has its own values and functions in the world, and would reinforce the meaning of nature as free from human manipulation and intervention. Describing the cultural value of nature reminds Japanese citizens of the ideal relationship with nature: nature lives in us, and we live in nature, meaning nature is part of us and we are part of nature, and we should not attempt to harm it. Appealing to Zen's view of nature would allow Japanese environmental groups to frame the reality of deforestation issues in such a way that promotes the collective action of less consumption of wood products by Japanese people. Considering cultural beliefs about nature is important for Japanese environmental groups to be rhetorically effective.
Research Questions and Method

This paper explores the rhetorical strategies of two Japanese environmental groups to understand how cultural beliefs about community and nature are used to influence audiences about deforestation issues and Japan's wood trade. I will address three research questions: 1) what are the purposes and audiences for deforestation rhetoric produced by Japanese environmental groups, 2) how do these groups appeal to Japanese beliefs about nature and community to influence perception and action, and 3) what are the strengths and limitations of these rhetorical appeals in solving problems of deforestation and Japan's wood trade?

I will analyze the rhetorical strategies of the two Japanese environmental groups whose activities stress deforestation issues in the world caused by Japan's wood trade: Japan Tropical Forest Action Network, and Friends of the Earth Japan. Both groups oppose cutting old-growth forests for timber and woodchips and claim that preventing further deforestation requires a change in Japanese consumers' behavior. JATAN was founded in 1987, and is dedicating to protecting tropical forests in the world. This group emphasizes deforestation issues surrounding logging for timber in Indonesia and Malaysia as well as for woodchip in Australia. FoE-J was established in 1980 as the Japanese chapter of Friends of the Earth International, FoE-I, which was founded in the United States and expanded as an international network with 80,000 members worldwide and more than 500 fulltime staff in 60 countries. FoE-J aims to "build a more sustainable society and a better world in which we live" (FoE-J, 2001, ¶ 5). The group’s activities focus on the conservation of Siberian forests, environmental impacts of international
financial support/aid, climate change and energy, housing and the environment, and social and environmental issues caused by international wood trade.

The texts I will examine are the official Web site of these groups and several booklets on deforestation issue. For the analysis of JATAN's rhetorical strategies, the booklets are *Indonesia no mori kara* (From forests in Indonesia), *Sekaino Sinrin* (World's Forests), and *2001Nen Nettairin no Genjo* (the Situation of Tropical Forests of the year 2001). The first two booklets were published in 1994, and the other was published in 2001. The booklet of FoE-J is *Taiga : Seimeiafurera Kisekino Mori - Sono Hakai* (Taiga: Its Biodiversity and the Destruction) published in 2001. This is the only booklet that FoE-J publishes, but this discrepancy will be compensated for by ample discourse they present in its Web page. When I quote the discourse of those groups in my analysis, I will use their English translations if they have any; otherwise, I will translate it from Japanese literally as much as possible. Literal translation will prevent me from adding my values in the texts, which will help the rhetorical discourse of the two Japanese environmental groups to be as close to the original as possible.

In analyzing the rhetorical strategies of the two Japanese environmental groups, I will focus on Japanese cultural beliefs about community and nature. I will look for how the two environmental groups build an inside group with Japanese citizens surrounding deforestation issues. For instance, I will identify the words that imply shared interest, such as “the destruction of Taiga will eventually affect the lives of Japanese people” (FoE-J, 2000, p.14) or “What problems occur locally to produce paper we use?” (JATAN, 1994, p.2). Exploring this use of language will allow me to find out how these groups attempt to internalize the deforestation issues that are taking place outside of Japan.
When examining the texts of those groups, I will also investigate the language that reaffirms the cultural concepts of nature and beliefs based on Zen Buddhism. For instance, in the words of JATAN (2001):

After complete removal of vegetation by the burning for restoration, seeds of a eucalyptus are dispersed above the areas from helicopters. This kind of eucalyptus grow faster to provide woodchips of a good quality. This is no problem commercially, but the important ecosystems that have existed will be completely lost (¶ 7).

This group stresses the selfish act of humans that values the commercial purpose of forests, ignoring other values of nature including biological and ecological functions. It also refers to ecosystems and calls them important. The above paragraph reminds Japanese people of how they ought to act in relation to nature and how they ought not to. Investigating these uses of language will demonstrate how the environmental groups lead Japanese citizens to distinguish between what is ethically good and what is wrong.

Exploring those rhetorical strategies, I hope to demonstrate how Japanese environmental groups attempt to influence Japanese audiences regarding deforestation and Japan's wood trade. I expect that these groups will use certain language that implies shared interests, helping them to form an inside group with these audiences. I also expect to see that the environmental groups appeal to the views of nature of Zen Buddhism and use these old concepts for Japanese citizens to distinguish what is ethically good and what is bad about the treatment of nature.

Through the findings of my study, I hope to show the significance of how we communicate about an issue surrounding nature and deliver a certain message efficiently regarding the solution of this issue. I also would like to demonstrate the importance in understanding the interrelationship between nature and humans for addressing an
environmental issue. It is my hope that demonstrating these significant aspects about deforestation will show environmental groups and researchers in the world the potential for how to address other environmental issues that relate to Japanese people. I also expect that the demonstration of the aspects will help them solve the issues that often involve diverse interest groups that have diverse cultural values and beliefs as well as different rhetorical patterns.
Friends of the Earth-Japan launched two projects to protect the Russian Taiga located in Siberia, Far Eastern Russia. One project is the Siberia Hotspot Project that aims to identify the areas in Siberia that support the lives of endangered, threatened, or native species, to designate these areas as preserve, and to establish rules that include economic incentives to prevent illegal and destructive logging practices in the Taiga. The other project is the Housing Project that intends to reduce Japan’s consumption of imported lumber. Prior to my analysis of FoE-J’s rhetorical strategies in these projects, I would like to present the audiences and the rhetorical purposes of each project. These concepts will lay a foundation of FoE-J’s rhetoric and will indicate how FoE-J endeavors to direct Japanese audiences to see deforestation in Russia in a certain way and how it attempts to address the protection of the Taiga.

Basic Rhetorical Concepts

Siberia Hotspot Project

In this project, FoE-J has five different audiences that are 1) the general public, 2) those who work for the housing industry that uses Russian lumber, 3) politicians, 4) those who plan to build their own houses, and 5) members of the Diet. Among these multiple
audiences, the primary audience is the general public. FoE-J (2000c) says, “Protection of the Russian Taiga depends on what you think of the Taiga and what you do for it.... It is you who have the real power to save this forest. ....If you, who live an ordinal life, continued to be unaware of the forest, the destruction would never stop” (p. x). With those target audiences in its mind, FoE-J employs rhetoric in a certain way to accomplish the following rhetorical purposes.

FoE-J has three rhetorical purposes. One is to inform its audiences of the significance of the Russian Taiga and destruction. The second purpose is to gain support from Japanese audiences. The last one is to protect the Taiga by establishing rules that “will prevent any problems from occurring when Japan imports lumber from Russian” (FoE-J, 2000c, p. 46). Describing the importance of the Taiga and its destruction intends to explain why the Taiga is important and why it should be protected. By focusing on biodiversity and habitat of endangered species, FoE-J can highlight aspects of the forest as non-renewable biosphere and downplay other aspects as renewable timber resources. FoE-J covers the Taiga’s ecological services that benefit Japan. As FoE-J illustrates the values of the Taiga, it can influence the audiences' views about the forest as well as enhance the viciousness of the destruction. FoE-J also presents the potential effects on Japan if the destruction became worse. These discussions serve as a shared interest between the audiences and FoE-J in protecting the Taiga. Through these interests, FoE-J attempts to gain support from the audiences, which helps it to attain its objective of protecting the forest.


In the Housing Project, FoE-J intends to reach the public “who is aware of the importance of environmental protection but keeps a low posture in taking an action for the protection and tends to be reluctant to sacrifice his life for it” (FoE-J, 2000b, chap. 4). The rhetoric is especially designed to the target housewives “who are in their 30s to their early 40s and who may not be financially affluent but consider about their children's health and thus are interested in building a house that is good for their health” (FoE-J 2000b, chap. 4). In Japan, these groups of people tend to have control of family finances, have “a strong voice when building a house” (FoE-J, 2000b, chap. 4), and have more interest in environmental problems especially in connection with the effects on their children’s health. With these characteristics, FoE-J sees a potential in these audiences for becoming leading supporters of this project. Focusing on them, FoE-J uses certain language to accomplish its rhetorical purposes.

This project has four rhetorical purposes. First, FoE-J intends to inform audiences about problems of imported lumber and contrast these problems with the benefits of domestic lumber. The second purpose is to increase Japan's use of domestic lumber by such information. FoE-J expects that this increase would bring about reduction of Japan's use of imported lumber. The third purpose is to protect Russian Taiga. Because the audience mainly consists of certain group of housewives who have control of family finances and a strong say in building a house and who worry about their children and their health, FoE-J's rhetoric highlights the financial waste and the health risks that result from using imported lumber. FoE-J contrasts those problems with the benefits of
domestic lumber, which helps to draw attention to the benefits and encourages the audiences to use more this lumber.

FoE-J (2000b) says that it needs "techniques" that enable it to "make its message persuasive as to reach people's heart and to motivate them to take actions" (chap. 4). FoE-J uses language differently in the two projects depending on the target audiences and the rhetorical purposes of each project. It employs certain strategies in the use of language to persuade the audiences. In the following discussion, I will analyze FoE-J's deforestation rhetoric used in each project. First, I will examine the rhetoric of the Siberia Hotspot Project that involves discussions about why the Russian Taiga should be protected, who are the victims of destruction of the Taiga, and who causes the destruction. Second, my analysis will cover the rhetoric of the Housing Project. FoE-J describes about the problems caused by the use of imported lumber and the victims, and discusses who causes the problems. The analyses of the deforestation rhetoric in the two projects aim to answer how the rhetoric negotiates cultural beliefs about nature and community in relation to the purposes and audiences as well as how these negotiations of nature and community influence the kinds of solutions that FoE-J proposes.

**FoE-J's Deforestation Rhetoric in Siberia Hotspot Project**

The Siberia Hotspot Project attempts to protect Russian Taiga. The Taiga, or boreal forest, is coniferous dominated forest, mainly located in the Russian Far East and Eastern Siberia (Gordon et al., 2000). Japan is the largest importer of Russian timber, and
eighty percent of this import is lumber. In connection with Japan's import of Russian lumber, the Taiga has been destroyed since the 1970s when Japan started the trade (FoE-J, 2000c). To protect this forest, FoE-J launched this project. It aims to inform the general public about the forest and the destruction that most of the public do not know or can not see. FoE-J focuses on describing what happens in the Russian Taiga, how it relates to Japan, and who causes these problems, aiming to motivate the audiences to cooperate with FoE-J. My discussions begin with an analysis of the contexts that lead audiences to see deforestation in the Taiga as a significant problem. The context involves presentations of values of Russian Taiga and shared interests between the audiences and FoE-J. Then, I will discuss how FoE-J argues about who causes deforestation and analyze how these arguments help FoE-J to gain support from the audiences in protecting the Taiga.

Values of Russian Taiga

FoE-J presents values of Russian Taiga to explain why this forest should be protected, focusing on the biodiversity that it supports and habitat of species that it provides. Discussing these ecological services is an important introduction for Japanese citizens to change their general view about forests as timber resources, affected by the meaning of the letters used in Japanese translations, and Japanese views of ideal nature and Japanese culture.

Many Japanese citizens may tend to forget lives of forests because of the Japanese letter forest. In Japanese kanji, forest is written as 森 (mori), consisting of three kanji
characters that mean a tree (木). Because of the effect of the *kanji* letter showing only trees, this emphasizes the idea of forests as simply a stand of trees and downplays other lives there.

Along with the effect of the letter, Japanese ideal nature and its culture also affect the Japanese views about forests. Nature is a “profoundly human construction” (Cronon, 1996, p.25). Traditionally, the ideal nature of Japanese citizens is garden nature that is man-made with a precise calculation about the combination of colors of flowers and leaves of plants and trees, depending on each season. Forests that look significantly different from Japan's ideal nature are more likely to be seen as timber resources. A change of such cultural views about forests is important for FoE-J to gain support from the audiences in protecting Russian Taiga. In addition, because Japanese culture favors various kinds of wood products, the audiences may think, “Why does FoE-J criticize logging there? The forests are tree-stands to be used,” if they do not know of ecological functions of forests. FoE-J needs to enhance the audiences' assumptions about forests from renewable tree-stands to non-renewable biosphere by explaining why the Russian Taiga should be protected. To fulfill the need, FoE-J presents more values of the Taiga, focusing on two aspects: biodiversity and habitat of species.

**Biodiversity**

FoE-J stresses the importance of biodiversity in Russian Taiga. However, it does not give a clear definition of the meaning. Its ambiguous explanation of the word *biodiversity* seems to be based on two values: intrinsic and instrumental values of nature,
which are competing with other. In the first half of the explanation, FoE-J focuses on the intrinsic value and says (2000c):

Various kinds of species live on the earth, in the world,..., and your garden. Every species is unique.... There is no unnecessary species that can be forced to extinction due to humans' change of the environment. If a species becomes extinct, it will never be restored. (p.35)

FoE-J emphasizes the importance of the lives of each species, implying the intrinsic value that sees each species as valuable of itself. It also blames species extinction on humans including their over-consumption of a species and overuse of natural resources. The above explanation helps to remind Japanese audiences about the lessons of Zen Buddhism such as to pay the fullest respect to nature and to prohibit the use of nature for a selfish purpose.

However, in the latter half of the explanation of the word biodiversity, FoE-J (2000c) highlights instrumental values:

Biodiversity holds unlimited potential (of species) that could further evolve and prosper. Even the lives that do not seem to play important roles now might hold an ability to play such roles when changes occur in the world. Protecting biodiversity means that we believe the potential (of species) and make utmost effort to maintain it (p. 35).

FoE-J refers to the word role, and it says that the purpose of protecting biodiversity is to maintain the possible roles of the species for adapting to the changes. But, FoE-J does not describe what kind of changes could occur. Does FoE-J attempt to imply changes in global climate, changes in regional ecosystems due to biological and chemical pollution, or changes in species' such as genetic drift? FoE-J does not suggest whether the potential changes would affect humans, but the audiences may interpret the change as negative to themselves because people tend to interpret the meaning of a word based on their
experience (Wondolleck et al., 1996). It is natural for the audiences to interpret changes in the world as the changes in their world. Thus, the potential roles of species can mean the roles for helping humans when the changes occur in the world to affect their lives negatively.

In addition, Japanese translation of the word diversity itself supports this implication. The word biodiversity (in Japanese, 生物多様性, seibutu ta yo sei) includes a word 多 (ta) that connotes many, abundance or richness, the values of capitalism in general. The translation also includes a word 様 (yo) that means form. Combined with the word 多 (ta), 多様 (ta yo) can be interpreted as many forms. Based on the implied instrumental values and connotation of the translation, the audiences can interpret the meaning of the word as multiple use for human purposes. Protecting biodiversity can imply protecting the potential of such use. This implication may appeal to the audiences who value nature as commodity.

**Habitat of Species**

FoE-J also stresses that the Russian Taiga is an important habitat for many species, especially for endangered species. It argues, “In (Russian) Taiga, there are places that serve as a basis of ecosystems where diverse kinds of species live” (2000c, p.16). Then, FoE-J (2000c) discusses the relationship between ecological balance and deforestation. “Destruction of Russian Taiga will threaten the livelihood of various species. In a worst case, the destruction could cause species extinction, which will deteriorate the balance of ecosystems” (p.16). FoE-J highlights endangered species that live in The taiga to stress the need for protection. FoE-J (2000c) says, “In the area (Far Eastern Russia), many
kinds of endangered species live” (p. 17). The word endangered suggests scarcity of species populations. Protecting the Taiga is important in relation to the scarcity, but the importance involves two different views. Using the intrinsic values of species, protecting the forest is significant to sustain an endangered species that is important of itself. However, employing the instrumental values, protecting it is essential to maintain the potential use of the species. Because FoE-J indicates multiple use of species, the scarcity implies that the future use of a species would be being diminished. If we lose a species, we will never get it back. When we lose the species, we also lose the potential that we may use it for human purposes. FoE-J suggests that the only way to prevent species extinction is to protect the Russian Taiga that serves as the habitat of such species. Protecting this forest becomes significant and imminent in light of protection of the values residing in the species itself as well as the unlimited potentials for the multiple use of biodiversity in the forest.

In the discussion of the values of Russian Taiga, FoE-J uses the competing values of nature. One is intrinsic, and the other is instrumental. Using intrinsic values, FoE-J attempts to invoke cultural beliefs about nature to indicate how Japanese audiences ought to act toward nature. This sets the ethical standard for audiences to employ as members of Japanese society and to apply in the later discussion about who causes the destruction of the Russian Taiga. Meanwhile, by appealing to instrumental values, FoE-J emphasizes the significance and meaningfulness attached to the protection of the Taiga. Further, by employing these two values, FoE-J can gain more support from Japanese audiences, encompassing different causes and values in the environmental protection in the society. FoE-J (2000c) argues, “Taiga has a lot of important functions other than the role to
provide timber” (p.13). Learning those values leads Japanese audiences to see the forest as more than just a tree stand for harvesting. FoE-J attempts to connect the values to Japanese interest by discussing Japan-oriented benefits of the Taiga and the problems of the destruction to build a community with the audiences.

**Construction of Shared Interests**

After presenting the values of Russian Taiga, FoE-J attempts to construct shared interests with Japanese audiences in protection of this forest. The construction of these interests aims to build a community between them. Shared interests are important to motivate Japanese audiences to support FoE-J. Kenneth Burke (1950) says that people can identify with others when their interests are common. Even if their interests are not really common, they may identify with others by assuming that they share interests or being persuaded to believe so. Identification motivates people to take cooperative actions. As Burke says, to encourage the audiences' cooperative actions, FoE-J needs to show that their interest and FoE-J's are joined in protecting the Taiga.

Shared interests are also important in light of Japanese cultural beliefs about community. If Japanese audiences are persuaded to believe that they have shared interests with FoE-J, they will tend to locate FoE-J inside of their community. The recognition as a fellow member encourages the audience to cooperate with FoE-J because Japanese society tends to emphasize social harmony supported by cooperation within a community. Shared interests with FoE-J can guide the audiences to believe that the destruction of the Russian Taiga as their own problem, "although Russian Taiga is located far from Japan,
and it does not seem to be related to the lives of Japanese citizens” (FoE-J, 2000c, p.8).

To create shared interests, FoE-J attempts to show how Japan and its citizens' lives relate to the taiga. It covers the benefits that Japan enjoys and the potential problems that Japan could suffer as a result of deforestation of the Taiga.

FoE-J highlights the benefits that Japan receives from the Taiga to encourage Japanese audiences to see themselves as the beneficiaries. FoE-J (2000c) asserts, “Healthy Taiga contributes to stabilizing climate in northeastern Asia including Japan and maintaining rich marine products of the Sea of Japan and the Sea of Okhotsk” (p. 14).

FoE-J attempts to enhance the scope of the positive effects in protecting the Taiga by discussing the ecological functions that affects Japan's climate and citizens. Many Japanese know that the fishing spots are famous for quality marine products essential for good su-shi that Japanese citizens love to eat. Referring to marine products works effectively to demonstrate the significance of protecting the Russian Taiga to the audiences.

Then, FoE-J starts the discussion about adverse effects of deforestation on Japan, which guides the audiences to see themselves as the victims of the deforestation. FoE-J (2000c) mentions, “The destruction of the Taiga taking place in Far Eastern Russia gives significant (adverse) impacts on the environment and local populations. The impacts could also environmentally and socially affect neighboring countries. If it happens, Japan will be affected” (p.14). After discussing the interrelationship between the healthy Russian Taiga and quality marine products, the audiences may think that they could lose their favorite rich marine products, even though FoE-J uses the ambiguous word affected
and does not clarify how they will lose them and the scale of the negative effects on Japan.

FoE-J attempts to enhance the sense of crisis by discussing the relationship between deforestation in the Russian Taiga and acceleration of global warming. It argues,

(After discussing that the Russian Taiga grows on permafrost, a type of soil that is frozen for thousands years) Permafrost stores methane, one of the powerful greenhouse gases, and thus this type of soil is sometimes referred to as 'a bomb of global warming.' If the forests on the permafrost are destroyed, the topsoil is exposed to direct sunshine, which causes the frost melting. As a result, the methane stored in the frost would be discharged to air, and global warming would be accelerated (2000c, p.17).

Acceleration of global warming is a serious concern among many Japanese citizens. The concern has been growing as they experience longer summers and warmer winters (JMA 2002). FoE-J further increases a sense of crisis by using the word bomb that helps the audiences know that the adverse effects on Japan can occur anytime and that the scale of impact is enormous. The usage of the word dramatizes the indirect effects by implying that though nobody knows when the effects may occur, it can happen anytime, and when it happens, the impact will be enormous. Then, FoE-J (2000c) attempts to ensure the significance of the adverse indirect effects on Japan by mentioning as follows; “There is a high potential that unprecedented events would take place, though there are no accurate and clear answers for what would really happen as a result of permafrost melting” (p.18). FoE-J also argues that the melting and acceleration of global warming form “the vicious circle” and that this circle would not be stopped once it started. FoE-J indicates such events are just possibilities. But this indication can enhance a sense of crisis among the audiences and impress them about the significance of protecting the Taiga by
highlighting the powerful influence of the permafrost melting and the strong potential of the event.

FoE-J discusses Japan-oriented benefits of the Taiga and the potential problems caused by deforestation there. This discussion aims at construction of shared interests between Japanese audiences and FoE-J and intends to encourage the audiences to see deforestation in the Taiga as their own problems. Framing the problems like this helps to motivate the audiences to cooperate with FoE-J in protecting this forest. Protection can maintain all of the benefits that Japanese citizens enjoy and help them avoid the crisis caused by destruction of the Taiga. The shared interests with Japanese audiences help FoE-J build a community with them. Based on the cultural beliefs about community that promote cooperation with fellow members, FoE-J becomes more likely to gain support from the audiences. FoE-J also attempts to strengthen social unity with the audiences by scapegoating certain groups of people. The next section will outline the scapegoating process, then will cover who are the scapegoats and examine how FoE-J uses each role for achieving the goal.

Social Unity through Scapegoating

What is Scapegoating?

In scapegoating, people select a certain victim and criticize him (Burke, 1945). FoE-J chooses two scapegoats: Forest Service Districts (leskhozy) and Russian logging companies. FoE-J blames these scapegoats for causing deforestation in Russian Taiga, but these blames have three objectives as presented by Kenneth Burke (1945). One is to
separate them from the audiences, which in return, helps to promote association between FoE-J and the audiences. Secondly, it is to deflect attention from Japan's guilt regarding over-consumption of Russian lumber. The last objective is to use scapegoats as sacrifices receptacles for all this guilt. The last objective allows the audience to symbolically purify themselves.

To serve as such a scapegoat, there are several conditions. First, according to Kenneth Burke (1945), it is consubstantial with those who purify themselves by representing “the iniquities of those who would be cured by attacking it” (p.406). Secondly, the scapegoat who is attacked is much closer to those who attack him, and the attack is done by “moral indignation” (p.406). Lastly, the scapegoat also must be proportionally powerful in accordance with the viciousness of the iniquities because Burke (1945) also says, “the scapegoat is a concentration of power” (p. 407). The powerful scapegoat can take all of the crimes of those who blame him to atone for the crimes. All of the three scapegoats that FoE-J chooses comply with the above conditions.

Regarding consubstantiality, the scapegoats represent Japan’s guilt of over-consumption of Russian lumber that causes deforestation in Russian Taiga. FoE-J attempts to indicate it by implying the wasteful harvesting by the scapegoats. According to FoE-J (2000c), the scapegoats focus on economic profits, resulting in clear cut of the trees that tends to be labor-intensive and thus less costly. After clear-cutting a forest area, the loggers choose only the bast logs and leave the rest on the site. In some areas, 50% of cut timber are left lying along roadsides. These actions are symbolically illustrated how the scapegoats waste timber resources. Over-consumption of wood products entails waste of these products, putting pressure on forests. Based on FoE-J's argument, what the
scapegoats are doing and what Japan is doing are equally destructive to the Taiga, causing deforestation. Thus, the scapegoats are consubstantial with the audiences.

The second condition states that the scapegoats are much closer to those who attack them and will ignite moral indignation. The two scapegoats meet this condition as well. Forest Service Districts and Russian logging companies help or sell a huge amount of lumber to Japan, and by doing so, they help Japanese audiences have affordable houses built with Russian lumber. The scapegoats and the audiences are very close because they interrelate with each other by selling and buying the lumber and gaining mutual benefit from the lumber. In terms of closeness, FoE-J chooses appropriate scapegoats. Also, scapegoating must generate moral indignation. FoE-J can stir such indignation among the audiences because of the earlier discussions on values of nature and shared interests between the audiences and FoE-J. These values explained why the Russian Taiga should be protected and helped to establish an ethical standpoint, reminding the audiences about how to act toward nature based on their cultural beliefs about nature. Construction of the shared interests helped to build a community between the audiences and FoE-J and to identify a sense of fellow members among the audiences, which made them delineate who would be fellow members and who would not based on their cultural beliefs about community. Based on these experiences, FoE-J can generate moral indignation if it highlights the acts of the scapegoats that seem to violate the ethical standards and social norms.

The two scapegoats also fulfill the third condition regarding power. The oversight agencies of a country with such a huge land area and logging companies of Japan's largest log exporter in the world (NMS, 1998) look as powerful as Japan does. The
scapegoats can take all of Japan's guilt regarding over-consumption of Russian lumber. Using these scapegoats, FoE-J attempts to strengthen the social unity with the audiences. Attacking the scapegoats encourages the audiences to part from them, while deflecting attention from Japan's guilt of over-consumption that causes destruction of Russian Taiga. By blaming them, FoE-J can also help to atone for the guilt. FoE-J not only diverts attention from the guilt but also purifies Japanese audiences. The division and the atonement thus contribute to consolidating social unity between FoE-J and the audiences.

Social Unity through Division

FoE-J chooses the oversight agencies of the Russian Taiga and lumber companies as scapegoats to separate them from Japanese audiences. Such division helps FoE-J to strengthen the social unity with the audiences. Kenneth Burke (1950) said, "Identification is affirmed with earnestness precisely because there is division. Identification is compensatory to division" (p.22). The process of division is essential for scapegoating because the scapegoat embodies the process of division (Burke, 1950). FoE-J highlights certain acts of the scapegoats that Japanese audiences tend to see as ethically wrong to promote "moral indignation." The scapegoats are portrayed as being selfish, irresponsible, inconsiderate of the environment and greedy. To blame the scapegoats, FoE-J uses Japanese cultural beliefs about community and Japanese cultural beliefs about nature as ethical bases for Japanese audiences to delineate how people ought to act to nature.
The first scapegoat is Forest Service Districts (leskhozy). FoE-J criticizes the oversight agencies that break the law, although they are responsible for local oversight of forest use, management, and protection of particular administrative district. FoE-J (2000c) laments, “Leskhozy (Forest Service Districts) harvest trees under the label of 'sanitary' logging to make profits they need to survive” (p.33). Sanitary or salvage logging is intended to remove ill trees to maintain forest health and/or the trees that pose fire threats (Gordon et al., 2000). However, according to FoE-J (2000c), in many districts of the Russian Far East, the oversight agencies conduct 'salvage logging in forests where no maintenance is actually needed. The agencies abuse salvage logging regulations and violate Russian forestry rules. FoE-J also criticizes the agencies’ focus on making profit; thus, the audiences may think that the agencies are not only irresponsible but also greedy. From the audiences’ point of view, the agencies seem to be striving for gaining profit at the risk of the environment, though they are responsible for forest management. Using Japanese cultural beliefs about nature, the audiences may tend to see the oversight agencies as acting immorally. The audiences may believe that the agencies see forests as an object not as a friend, they are using nature for a selfish purpose, and they do not have an ideal relationship with nature that they should have. Based on the audiences’ ethical standard, such views about the agencies ignite accusations against them. The same criticism can be applied to Japan’s relationship with the Russian Taiga in connection with its over-consumption of Russian lumber. But, by focusing on agencies’ wrong doings, the audiences can deflect attention from it and locate the agencies outside of their community, although the agencies contribute to affordable houses in Japan. Because the agencies represent Japan’s guilt, locating them outside and parting from them also means
separation from the guilt. Consequently, the audiences continue to blame the agencies and attempt to part from the agencies further.

The other scapegoat is Russian lumber companies. FoE-J condemns them for violation of laws, greediness, and selfish use of forest resources. FoE-J (2000c) quotes interviews with foresters in coastal areas. One of the foresters says, "Most of logging companies in the coastal area report the amount of logs less than the actual number in order to alleviate the burden of high tax" (p. 30). FoE-J (2000c) also criticizes, "Few logging companies conduct plantation after logging, although Russian laws requires them to do so" (p.32). By blaming the logging companies for violation of the laws, FoE-J can direct the audiences to believe that the companies should do business legally, and that they fail to do so although they can. Such illegal acts can lead Japanese audiences to locate the companies outside of the society.

FoE-J further attempts to separate the audiences from the logging companies. Along with the violation, FoE-J highlights the acts of these companies that seem greedy and inconsiderate of the environment, giving precedence to their profits over environmental protection. FoE-J argues that the companies log trees in a significantly destructive way, though the requirements prohibit logging that deteriorates the environment. FoE-J (2000c) laments, "Ninety percent of harvesting is done by clear-cutting. It eradicates all of the trees in the area, causing significant destruction of the ecosystems and other forest resources. However, clearcutting remains the preferred practice because it is cheapest" (p.34). This criticism suggests the reason why the companies harvest trees by clear-cutting, not by selective logging, which is less harmful to the ecosystems. FoE-J's criticism implies that it is because they want to maximize the
own profit. This criticism also suggests that they can avoid clear-cutting. The logging companies that violate laws already look wrong. But accusing of the companies' destructive logging practice and discussing why they use it make them look worse in view of cultural beliefs about nature and community.

Based on the cultural belief about nature, the logging companies seem to use forest resources for a selfish purpose (profit). They do not seem to care about the environmental outcome of their acts to the Taiga. The audiences tend to dislike using nature for such a purpose based on Japanese cultural beliefs about nature that prohibits it. Also, the logging companies emphasize gaining more profits through the destructive but the cheapest logging practices. They seem to be greedy and to use nature for the wrong purpose. Because greediness suggests pursuit of self-interest without consideration for others, Japanese citizens tend to see it as an obstacle to a social harmony. FoE-J's focus on the companies' destructive logging practices and pursuit of profit can indicate an apathy toward the environment and adherence to money, which serves as further momentum for the audiences to part from the companies.

FoE-J continues to promote the division between the logging companies and Japanese audiences by highlighting another crime by the companies to indicate their lack of respect to nature. FoE-J (2000c) quotes from a book on Russian forestry to present the crime: waste of forest resources. The book says:

According to the Regional Forest Service Departments of the Russian Far East, 50-million-square-meter coniferous logs are left lying along roadsides for long periods of time: they often rot (or are infested by insects). Another 30 million-square-meter surplus logs from factories are burned or buried under ground. On average, 20-square-meter timber per a hectare is wasted (p. 30).
This quote shows how wastefully the companies cut trees. Huge amounts of timber are just disposed on the roadside or buried under ground, suggesting that logging companies are cutting trees more than necessary without real need. Such waste occurs because loggers choose only the best logs and leave the rest on the sites, and they do not use by-products such as chips and trimmings to make useful products such as fiberboard (Gordon et al., 2000). As blaming the companies, FoE-J produces an assumption that companies can cut trees without waste. Given the assumption, the companies that waste timber seem to neglect their duty, leading Japanese audiences to believe wasting timber is wrong. Further, in light of Japanese cultural beliefs about nature, the companies are ethically wrong. Zen Buddhism encourages seeing nature as a friend "whose inner being is thoroughly like our own" (Suziki, 1950, p.351). With this lesson, wasting logged trees means wasting the lives of their friends. Also, selecting only the logs of higher commercial values goes against other lessons of Zen Buddhism that teaches not to see nature as an object to conquer. Such selection by the companies implies that they violate the lessons and do not pay the fullest respect to nature. Cultural beliefs about nature help to enhance viciousness of wasting logs by the companies and demonize the companies that conduct such a waste. Consequently, the audiences are more likely to see the companies as outsider of their community, further disconnecting them from the audiences. Also, the audiences and the companies are connected in terms of over-use of Russian lumber; Blaming the companies also helps the audiences avoid facing their own guilt. Further, such blame helps to atone for the guilt because the scapegoats take it and serve as a sacrifice.
Atonement for Japan’s Guilt through Scapegoating

FoE-J uses the two scapegoats for purifying Japan’s guilt regarding its over-use of Russian lumber. Such atonement is important for FoE-J to maintain the support from the audiences. Through using the scapegoats as a sacrifice to purify Japan’s guilt, FoE-J can solve the dilemma that it faces in this project. FoE-J wants Japanese audiences to know the relationship between Japan's over-consumption of Russian lumber and destruction of the Taiga. But FoE-J does not want to focus on blaming the audiences because it may lose their support that it needs for the success of its project. Blaming them may violate Japanese social norm that discourages criticizing others. To solve the dilemma, FoE-J uses the scapegoats as a sacrifice to atone for Japan's crime as consumers of Russian lumber.

FoE-J begins the atonement process by showing the connection between Japan's consumption of Russian lumber and deforestation as the result. FoE-J (2000c) says, “Japan has been the largest importer of Russian lumber before the collapse of the Soviet Union” (p.22). FoE-J continues to argue how lucrative the logging business is, suggesting the scale of Japan's import. FoE-J (2000c) points out, “Though timber demand within the Russian Far East has declined since the 1990s, logging companies and the exporters dramatically increased in the area...Harvesting trees in the Taiga to export them to Japan is the fastest and easiest way to make money” (p.22). FoE-J explains that the reasons for such increase are higher prices of lumber that Japanese importers offer and the U.S. dollars used for the settlement of the trade. However, the underlying reason is Japan’s massive consumption. The more FoE-J refers to the profitable nature of the trade, the more it can implicitly stress Japan's over-consumption of Russian lumber that is ethically
wrong, reflecting Japanese cultural beliefs about nature. Because over-use could violate
the Japanese cultural beliefs about nature by lacking the respect to nature and
deteriorating the harmony to live with nature, it is hard for Japanese audiences to keep
focusing on this crime and criticizing themselves.

Though it is paradoxical, FoE-J does not want to emphasize and continue
criticism about Japan's over-consumption of Russian lumber, even through indirect
criticism like the above. The emphasis may hamper FoE-J's effort to gain support from
the audiences because criticizing others is more likely to be seen as a negative attitude by
the Japanese society. FoE-J needs to purify Japan's guilt by blaming the scapegoats that
are proportionally powerful with the degree of the guilt. Russian laws, Forest Service
Districts (leskhozy), and logging companies are as powerful as Japan, which is the largest
importer of Russian lumber. FoE-J highlights ethically wrong acts of the scapegoats
based on Japanese cultural beliefs about nature and criticizes them to atone for Japan's
guilt that is also ethically wrong in light of such beliefs. For instance, FoE-J (2000c) says,
"There is a lot of area that biologists and ecologists think should be protected but not
designated as a preserve, and logging concessions are issued to such areas although they
are vulnerable to logging" (p.32). FoE-J (2000c) also argues, "Fifty percent of logged
trees is not used and left lying along the roadside," and "In Khabarovsk, some logging
companies waste 60 square-meter of logs (due to the lack of commercial values)" (p.30).
Those scapegoats represent wrong acts, such as the selfish use of nature to make profits
and the attitude to conquer nature, which are prohibited by lessons of Zen Buddhism.
Japanese audiences know that their consumption pattern is also ethically wrong in light of
the Zen lessons, but blaming the scapegoats helps the audiences project their guilt onto
the scapegoats and to atone for it. Thus, even though FoE-J implies the connection between Japan's over-consumption of Russian lumber and the destruction of the Taiga, it does not stir any adversary among the audiences and can maintain their support.

FoE-J's scapegoating process promotes division between the scapegoats and Japanese audiences while encouraging them to divert attention from their guilt to the destruction of the Russian Taiga. The process also atones for the guilt by using scapegoats as a sacrifice for the audiences. The process maintains the effectiveness when the audiences continue to oppose the destruction, the greedy and irresponsible acts, and violation of laws. The process helps FoE-J gain more support from the audiences, but it does not contribute to the fundamental solution of deforestation in Russia caused by the Japan's massive consumption. Without changing Japan's behavior and curbing its overall consumption of timber, new deforestation could occur somewhere in the world.

**FoE-J’s Deforestation Rhetoric in Housing Project.**

In the Housing Project, FoE-J slightly shifts attention away from the Russian Taiga to Japan, and aims to increase Japan's use of domestic lumber. FoE-J expects that the increase will lead to a reduction in Japan's consumption of Russian lumber and will ultimately help to protect the Russian Taiga. FoE-J hopes that this project can be a springboard for Japanese audiences to raise their awareness about the Russian Taiga and destruction there. Like the Siberia Hotspot Project, this project targets the general public. But its primary audience is certain group of people in the public: housewives from their
30s to their early 40s (FoE-J, 2000b). According to FoE-J (2000b), the primary audiences have three characteristics. First, they tend to be sensitive about financial waste because most of them are hard-working families. The second characteristic is that they are concerned about their family, especially children, and they tend to be interested in building a house that is good for their children's health. Thirdly, they also tend to have more interest in environmental issues than the older generations, but they are reluctant to make a sacrifice in their lives such as a lifestyle change.

With the target audiences of this project, FoE-J initiates its argument by emphasizing Japan-oriented problems of imported lumber with an aim to construct shared interests with the audiences. Unlike the Siberia Hotspot Project, this project does not address values of nature. The reason for this may be attributed to FoE-J's advocacy of the increase in Japan's use of domestic lumber. This increase and protection of the values of Japan's forests might not contradict with each other if FoE-J introduced sustainable forest management. But the introduction of this concept would complicate FoE-J's argument, requiring long-term plans that involve both of present and future forest management. It may be necessary to discuss some levels of reduction in Japan's use of lumber for sustaining the supply of domestic lumber. Such complicated situation may confuse the audiences. To make the argument simple, it is assumed that FoE-J chose not to discuss values of Japan's forest. After the construction of shared interests, FoE-J endeavors to strengthen the social unity with the audiences built through the shared interests by scapegoating the Japanese housing industry. In following discussion, I will explore how FoE-J constructs the shared interests, focusing on who the victims are and what the benefits of domestic lumber are. Then, I will examine how FoE-J's focus on benefits
diverts attention from problems of sustaining the Japanese forest industry and avoiding
deforestation in Japan's forests. Finally, I will present an analysis of how FoE-J attempts
to consolidate the social unity with an emphasis on who causes the problems.

Construction of Shared Interests

FoE-J highlights certain Japan-oriented problems of using imported lumber,
which are more likely to catch the attention of the target audience. FoE-J presents
financial waste, health risks, and deterioration of Japan's forests. It also discusses benefits
of using domestic lumber and why this lumber can serve as a solution for these problems.
In this section, I will explore how FoE-J discusses each of the problems to encourage the
audiences to see themselves as victims and to construct a shared interest with the
audiences. I will also analyze how such discussions guide the audiences to build a
community with FoE-J.

Financial Waste

First, FoE-J contends that Japanese citizens waste a lot of money in building a
house due to the lack of durability. On average, Japanese houses last for less than 30
years, which is much shorter than houses in other countries. For instance, in U.K., houses
have more than 140 years of durability. FoE-J (2000b) says, “What a short life! Japanese
houses last only for 26 years” (¶11). Japanese citizens are working hard to pay expensive
monthly loans of their house for 25 to 26 years. FoE-J (2000b) continues to argue that
when they finish the repayment, their house has already lost its durability requiring
frequent and expensive maintenance charge. As a result, many of them dispose of their houses and move in flats. Reiterating the waste, FoE-J (2000b) mentions, “It seems that (Japanese citizens) spend a huge amount of money (at least a half to one million U.S. dollars on average) to buy garbage. This is ridiculous” (¶11). Referring to waste of money triggers a lot of attention from Japanese audiences who have been suffering from a stagnant economy for more than 10 years. Since the late 1980s when the myth of lifetime employment was gone with the burst of bubble economy, lay-off can occur at any time. Now Japan's labor market has the highest unemployment rate of 5.7 % since the year of 1953 (Management and Coordination Agency, 2002). Under such a situation, the FoE-J’s words can make the audience feel that they are the victims who are forced to waste a lot of money for nothing. Also, the description of a Japanese house as garbage not only implies waste of money but also deprives the citizens of all the attached values symbolized by a house including social success, long-term hard work, and independence as an adult.

FoE-J continues to say that such a short durability of a Japanese house is caused partly by imported lumber that is vulnerable to decay infested by bacteria and white ants. FoE-J argues that such weak lumber results in financial wastes to residents, increasing scrap heap out of the disposed houses as well. Then, FoE-J provides a solution for the problem. It (2000b) mentions, “Hinoki (Japanese cypress, Chamaecyparis obtusa) is resistant to decay that results from bacteria and insect infection…Some reports say that durability of hinoki peaks in the 200th year after it is logged…Domestic lumber is a huge step to enhance durability of houses” (¶19-20). FoE-J (2000b) also says that by using domestic lumber, it is possible to build a house of over 100 years of durability.
FoE-J contrasts between the problems of imported lumber and the benefits of domestic lumber in light of durability of houses. FoE-J's highlights waste when it discusses imported lumber and benefits when it discusses domestic lumber. Such rhetoric helps to link imported lumber with waste of money and waste of values attached to houses, leading the audiences to see this type of lumber as the cause of these wastes that they could face. The rhetoric also contributes to enhancing the positive image of domestic lumber and to portraying the use of such lumber as the solution. Consequently, the audiences tend to believe that FoE-J’s interest and their interest are common in increasing their use of domestic lumber. According to FoE-J (2000b), such increase will help FoE-J to decrease Japan's over-consumption of imported lumber and thus alleviate the burden on the environment. The increase will also help the audiences avoid all of the problems that occur as a result of using imported lumber. Because the audiences can identify with FoE-J though their shared interests, the audiences can situate FoE-J inside of the community, seeing it as a fellow member whom they should support.

Health Risks

Second, FoE-J focuses on the health risks that use of imported lumber may pose to residents of a house. Like the prior discussion of financial waste, discussion of health risks also involves comparing the problems of imported lumber and benefits of domestic lumber. FoE-J (2000b) contends that the problems (health risks) are caused by the application of chemicals that is necessary for imported lumber to avoid the bacteria and insect infections. The chemicals involve preservatives and pesticides, but they are harmful to human health. FoE-J (2000b) emphasizes the danger of all chemicals by
saying, “Even the chemicals, which are said to be safer, still have high potential to give adverse effects on human health considering that the chemicals kill or weaken organisms” (chap. 9). FoE-J (2000b) argues that some of the chemicals applied to imported lumber contain heavy metals and organic chlorine. Then, it presents potential effects on human health. Preservatives cause skin cancer, and pesticides cause headaches and unusual fatigue and affect our nerve systems (FoE-J, 2000b). Such chemicals also cause chemical sensitivity that occurs in connection with exposure to chemicals.

According to FoE-J (2000b), after exposure to a lot of chemical at a time or exposure to a smaller amount of chemicals for a long period of time, some people become significantly sensitive to chemicals. FoE-J (2000b) says, “In some cases, serious symptoms occur. Blood pressure is suddenly plunged or breathing becomes difficult when people inhale a small amount of chemicals such as remaining smell of detergents and perfumes” (chap. 9). FoE-J also attempts to stress that anybody could suffer from this sickness. FoE-J (2000b) warns, “Chemical sensitivity is not their concern. You or someone in your family can get the symptoms any time” (chap. 9), and “Imported lumber emits dioxin when the lumber is incinerated after a house is destroyed” (chap. 1). These warnings stress the ubiquity of the risks posed by the chemicals, which raises a sense of crisis among Japanese citizens.

After presenting those problems of imported lumber, FoE-J’s argument moves to the benefits of using domestic lumber that serves as a solution for the problem. FoE-J says that domestic lumber is naturally resistant to decay and white ants and does not need any chemicals because domestic lumber such as hinoki (Japanese cypress, Chamaecypris obtusa) contains certain natural substances that prevent these problems. FoE-J (2000b) says, “Considering these natural substances, domestic lumber is a worthy choice” (chap.
9). In addition, FoE-J discusses other benefits of Japanese lumber. It says that according to some research, domestic lumber prevents mold and ticks. This lumber relieves stress, lowers high blood pressure, and helps people to live longer. FoE-J (2000b) mentions, "Domestic lumber is appropriate material when building a 'healthy house' that does not require preservatives and pesticides" (chap. 9).

By focusing on the health risks posed by imported lumber, FoE-J attempts to lead Japanese audiences to feel a sense of crisis, encouraging them to seek a means to avoid becoming the victims of the crisis. Under such circumstance, presenting the benefits of domestic lumber are effective in encouraging the audiences to take the "worthy choice" of using domestic lumber. Like they did in the discussion of waste of money, the audiences again come to believe that what FoE-J wants to do and what the audiences believe that they need to do are joined in light of the increase in their use of domestic lumber. As audiences identify shared interests with FoE-J, they include FoE-J as a fellow member of the community that values cooperation and solidarity. Backed by the cultural beliefs about community, FoE-J gains more support from the audiences.

Destruction of Japan's Forests

The third problem is the destruction of Japan's forest. FoE-J argues that Japan's forests have been destroyed because the influx of imported lumber resulted in sharp reduction of domestic timber demand. This reduction led to the decrease in the personnel who take care of forest, conducting silvicultural treatments. FoE-J (2000b) says, "The sharp increase in Japan's timber import not only causes destruction of world's forest but
also harms Japan's forests as well" (chap. 1). FoE-J provides three incentives for protecting Japan's forests by increasing Japan's use of domestic lumber.

The first incentive is protection of public interest. FoE-J (2000b) argues, "Functions of forest that serve public interest will be decreased in accordance with destruction of forest" (chap. 1). FoE-J stresses the ecological functions that benefit Japanese citizens, linking the forest destruction with the loss of these benefits.

Without the (silvicultural) treatments, trees would decay, and soil flows out from the system. Consequently, ecological functions of forests such as prevention of landslide, absorption of carbon dioxide, and water purification will be adversely affected (FoE-J, 2000b, chap. 1).

FoE-J attempts to draw the audiences' attention to the benefits of forests that they enjoy and make them believe that loss of Japan's forest means loss of these benefits. Then, it says that an increase of Japan's use of domestic lumber will help to save Japan's forests.

Presenting the benefits and the potential of their loss encourages the audiences to perceive shared interests with FoE-J in the increase of Japan's use of domestic lumber, giving it more support.

FoE-J provides another incentive for protecting Japan's forest based on common values and needs. It argues that the increase in Japan's use of domestic lumber will help the Japanese forest industry that has been sluggish for more than 40 years. FoE-J refers to the positive effects of the increase including new jobs in the industry and more harvestable trees. However, for most of the audiences, helping the industry may not directly relate to their lives. Nonetheless, helping the industry would make them feel good because of the two presumptions supported by social values and needs. First, capitalistic societies including Japan, tends to see economic growth as valuable. In Japan,
this growth represents its citizens’ desperate need after having suffered from the sluggish economy for more than a decade without having seen the way out. Because of such value and need, any measures that stimulate Japan’s economy are presumed to be benign and essential. Secondly, as discussed earlier, Japanese society values promotion of cooperation within the community. In view of Japanese cultural beliefs about community, helping Japanese forest industry is valuable because it will help fellow members of Japanese society. Although many of the audiences do not interact with people in this industry, the audiences may feel that they have common interests with the Japanese forest industry based on a broader sense of physical space. Moreover, FoE-J’s rhetoric that highlights economic hardship of the industry encourages the audiences to help the industry. The Japanese cultural value of cooperation is especially stressed when the fellow members have a problem. Hence, many of the audiences would believe that using more domestic lumber to help the forest industry would be a good thing. Further, by focusing on the hardship suffered by the industry, FoE-J creates a social obligation of helping others based on the cultural value. Those who do not help others who face such a hardship can be seen as ethically wrong and can be located outside of the community. Because Japanese society tends to have a preference for belonging in the group, more of the audiences may feel that they need to help Japanese forest industry. Due to the value and the need based on Japanese cultural beliefs about community, helping the forest industry is assumed to be good and essential.

In addition, promotion of the increase in Japan’s use of domestic lumber seems to be an easier solution for the audience because they do not feel that they will have to make self-sacrifice. Because FoE-J emphasizes use of domestic lumber rather than the higher
initial cost of this lumber, and using goods is generally easier than not using or re-using them, the audiences are more likely to believe that FoE-J's solution for saving Japan's forest does not entail any self-sacrifice. This solution fits the characteristics of the target audiences. According to FoE-J, despite the interest in environmental problems, Japanese audiences tend to be reluctant to take an action for protecting the environment, worrying about whether such action would cost them more expenses or force them to make a sacrifice in their lives. For such audiences, FoE-J strives to avoid making them feel that they must sacrifice themselves for the protection of Japan's forests. Due to the shared interest and the solution of seemingly-no-sacrifice, the audiences are more likely to feel inclined to take cooperative actions for FoE-J.

FoE-J's rhetoric attempts to discourage the audiences' use of imported lumber by discussing the negative aspects of the use such as waste of money, health risk, and destruction of Japan's forests and forest industry. It also attempts to encourage their use of domestic lumber by contrasting these problems with the benefits of this use. Because discussing these Japan-oriented problems leads the audiences to see themselves as victims, the audiences tend to prevent these problems from happening to them by using more domestic lumber. Discussing the problems also encourages the audiences to believe that they have shared interests with FoE-J in increasing their use of domestic lumber. As a result, the audiences can identify themselves with FoE-J and build a social unity with it. Then, they locate FoE-J inside of their community, which leads them to support FoE-J in compliance with Japanese cultural beliefs about community.
Social Unity through Scapegoating

FoE-J chooses the Japanese housing industry as the scapegoat of this project. This choice seems to contradict or even violate the Japanese social norm that dislikes criticizing fellow members. However, the seriousness of the Japan-oriented problems helps FoE-J exempt from the potential violation. Waste of money, the health risks posed to their family, and deterioration of Japan's forest appeal to Japanese audiences, especially the target housewives. Japan's current economy makes the waste look more serious. The target audiences’ concerns about their families are stimulated by the health risks. Besides, when discussing the health risks, FoE-J even refers to carcinogens and chemical sensitivity that scare the audiences significantly, thinking of their loved ones. Even if FoE-J blames the Japanese housing industry, the magnitude of the problems leads the audiences to think that it is the industry that violate Japanese social norm, and that it should be blamed. Imported lumber makes Japanese houses more affordable, but FoE-J ignores this benefit. Instead, it focuses on the domestic problems caused by using imported lumber and criticizes the Japanese housing industry for choosing such harmful material.

FoE-J (2000b) says that the reason why such dangerous lumber is used in Japan is that “Japanese housing industry can make more profit with such lumber.” FoE-J (2000b) emphasizes, “The housing industry is devoted itself to cutting cost by using imported lumber” (chap. 1). Because the audiences have learned the problems that could negatively affect them and have certain beliefs about the industry, such phrases can enhance its viciousness and indicate that the industry is greedy and inconsiderate of the
residents. In general, Japanese society dislikes anyone greedy and inconsiderate of others because it sees these people as self-centered by focusing on their profit, and believes that they do not respect social harmony. Additionally, using Japanese cultural beliefs about nature, the industry is ethically wrong because FoE-J frames it as apathetic toward nature by emphasizing its cost-saving attitude at the risk of Japan’s forests. In the discussion of health risks, FoE-J drew attention to potential suffering of Japanese audiences, making the industry look much more blameworthy. Through this process, FoE-J can guide the audiences to part from the industry that provides them affordable houses. The process also leads the audiences to situate the industry outside of the community because its viciousness makes it disqualified as a fellow member. By highlighting certain aspects of the industry and criticizing them, FoE-J can consolidate a social unity with the audiences as it isolates the industry outside of the community.

**Diversion from Concerns and Focus on a Short-term Perspective**

FoE-J’s focus on Japan-oriented problems of using imported lumber helps to persuade Japanese audiences to identify themselves with FoE-J through such interest. In the process of identification, FoE-J also attempts to lead the audiences to pay attention to the benefits of using domestic lumber. However, FoE-J fails to address adequately concerns about sustainability of Japan’s forests. The concerns involve 1) maintaining steady supply of lumber and 2) sustaining ecosystems and biodiversity of Japan’s forests. I will discuss how FoE-J frames these issues, why they are important for the success in
this project, and how their framing encourages audiences to think about short-term goals rather than the long-term health of Japan's forests.

**Steady Supply of Lumber**

FoE-J refers to the current growing stock for Japanese forests and uses this number as a justification for why it would be no problem if Japan uses more domestic lumber to decrease its use of imported lumber. FoE-J (2000b) says, "The trees planted after the end of the World War II are reaching the harvestable age" (chap. 5). However, sustaining domestic lumber supply may be necessary for FoE-J to attain the reduction because of the following two reasons. First, Japan's use of lumber is expected to maintain the current amount for the next 15 years (Sinrin Kihon Keikaku Kenkyuukai 1997).

Secondly, FoE-J encourages the audiences to *use* domestic lumber for the reduction in Japan's use of imported lumber. This means that Japan's behavior toward consumption of lumber would not change. In the long run, durability of Japan's domestic lumber may help to reduce Japan's overall consumption of lumber. But as long as the focus is put on *use*, the amount of lumber that Japan uses would not show a big difference for a while. The forecast of Japan's future use of lumber and emphasis on *use* may require sustainable timber production to maintain domestic timber supply. Such production requires an adequate growth rate of harvestable timber (Newman, 2000). Increase in Japan's consumption of domestic lumber to the level that brings about the decrease of its use of imported lumber is supported by a steady supply of domestic lumber. Unless Japan's forests have an adequate growth rate to meet domestic lumber demand, the lumber supply would be depleted soon, which would lead to a situation where Japan would again seek
lumber in other countries. Instead of addressing the growth rate, FoE-J discusses the amount of Japan's current timber storage, focusing on the present situation. FoE-J (2000c) asserts, "The amount of timber stock in Japan's forests is three times more than the amount of annual domestic lumber consumption" (¶3) and that Japan can decrease its lumber import up to one-half the current amount by the increase of use of domestic lumber.

However, even though there is three times more timber storage than the amount of annual domestic consumption, it does not mean that Japan's man-made forests can continue to meet domestic timber demand. It indicates that the storage may meet the demand only for a short time. FoE-J focuses on a numerical balance between current domestic timber storage and Japan's annual domestic lumber consumption. But the balance between the two is not compatible in terms of the feasibility of FoE-J's project because the first is the number of status quo and the latter is the one that would last for a long time. Because trees need 40 to 50 years before harvest, Japan's current timber storage may be not enough to sustain domestic lumber supply while reducing Japan's consumption of Russian lumber. But, stressing short-term availability and ignoring the long-term perspective enables FoE-J's project to look more attainable and thus promotes little chance in the audiences' use of domestic lumber.

**Ecosystem and Biodiversity of Japan's Forest**

Highlighting the benefits of using domestic lumber also helps to deflect attention from the sustainability of Japanese forestry in view of ecosystems and biodiversity of Japan's forests. Ecosystem balance and biodiversity are essential for sustainable forest
management. Principles on Forest Management of the United Nations on Environment and Development (1992) says that sustainable management of forest resources involves sustaining fragile ecosystems, watersheds, freshwater resources, and forestlands that encompass rich storehouses of biodiversity and biological resources. Regarding the protection of Russian forests, FoE-J emphasizes the importance of ecosystems and biodiversity and harmful logging that destroys them. However, when it comes to Japan’s forest, FoE-J does not refer to adverse effects of logging. Instead, this environmental group focuses on the merits of Japan’s use of domestic lumber to Japanese citizens and forests. Though FoE-J covers ecological functions of Japan’s forests, its emphasis on the use implies that such functions will be maintained by more use of domestic timber. For instance, after mentioning that forests prevent floods and landslides, purify water, and support fish population, FoE-J (2000b) says, “Using domestic lumber would help to endure the lives both of a house and the residents as well as protect the environment (in Japan and Far Eastern Russia)” (chap. 1). FoE-J (2000b) explains the reasons as follows. First, domestic lumber fits to Japan’s climate. Second, this lumber does not need any preservatives and pesticides due to its natural resistance to bacteria and insects. Third, the durability of domestic lumber prevents the current “scrap-and-build” (Gordon et al., 2000, p.30) cycle in which a house becomes garbage in 35 years, and a new house is built. Then, FoE-J discusses that durable houses would contribute to the reduction in Japan’s consumption of Russian lumber and that increase of Japan’s consumption of domestic lumber would contribute to increasing the personnel who take care of the trees in Japan’s man-made forests to keep the forests healthy. FoE-J (2000b) concludes by saying, “With enough consideration, using domestic lumber would help to restore the health of Japan’s
(man-made) forests” (chap. 5). This phrase sounds as if just cutting trees in Japan’s man-made forests and using them would help the unhealthy forests to restore the health and their ecological services.

Cutting a certain amount of trees may be necessary to save the forests from currently excessive harvestable trees. However, cutting them is by no means the solution for restoring the health of Japan’s forest because commercial logging causes more or less adverse effects on the balance of ecosystems. The health of Japan’s forests and all of the ecological services that FoE-J discusses depend on whether these forests can sustain their ecological integrity and biodiversity. Further, if Japan consumes domestic lumber excessively without careful consideration about fragile balance of the ecosystems, deterioration in Japan’s forests could occur. FoE-J downplays this potential, since it would hamper FoE-J’s advocacy for the increase in Japan’s use of domestic lumber.

FoE-J directs the audiences’ attention to certain aspects of its project, while casting directions away from others that could deteriorate the accomplishment of this project. Diversion from those two concerns in terms of sustainability allows FoE-J to guide the audiences to stay in the status quo, focusing on a short-term perspective. Such focus can portray FoE-J’s suggestion for the increase of Japan’s use of domestic lumber as more realistic and achievable, which motivates the audiences to take the cooperative action for FoE-J.
Implications of FoE-J’s Two Projects

The ultimate purpose of the Housing Project is to protect the Russian Taiga by decreasing Japan’s use of Russian lumber. This project has similar rhetorical patterns with the Siberia Hotspot Project that involve construction of shared interests and scapegoating. But these two projects have some differences, including the primary audience, the focus of problems, and points at issue. Unlike the Siberian Hotspot Project whose main audience is the general public, the Housing Project has more focused audiences. These groups of people are the housewives from their 30s to their early 40s who worry about family expenses, their children’s health, and who are interested in environmental problems.

Reflecting these features of the target audiences, FoE-J covers certain Japan-oriented problems that relate to the audiences’ concerns in daily life such as financial waste and health risks. The problems in this project also involve environmental destruction. But in this project, it is Japan’s forest that the audiences may feel are much closer than the Russian Taiga, not necessarily in a geological level, but in a perceptional level that sees the forest inside of Japan.

Presenting Japan-oriented problems and using them to construct shared interest are the same strategies with those used in the Siberia Hotspot Project. But the points at issue in connection with Japan’s lumber trade with Russia show a sharp contrast between the two projects. The Siberia Hotspot Project frames the issue as destruction of the Russian Taiga that happens in Far East Siberia and that could negatively affect Japan. Meanwhile, the Housing project frames the issues as problems of Japanese houses that
happen in Japan and that could seriously harm its citizens' lives. These differences between the two projects are indicative of the focuses in FoE-J's discussion of each project. The Siberian Hotspot Project discusses mainly what happens in the Taiga, its value, and how Japan may affect by the destruction. The scapegoats that FoE-J chooses for the project are Russians. On the other hand, the Housing Project addresses what problems Japan suffers by its use of imported lumber and blames the Japanese housing industry for all of the problems.

By focusing on financial and health concerns of using imported lumber, the Housing Project seems to produce more significant reduction in Japan's use of this lumber than the Siberian Hotspot Project can. Although the Siberian Hotspot Project also discusses Japan-oriented problems, these problems involve global warming and the potential loss of marine products, which are less likely to be the audience's priority. The audiences may think those problems are important, but the potential problems presented in the Hotspot Project seem more important and imminent. The concerns presented in the Housing Project relate to their everyday lives to appeal to the target housewives who control family expense and constantly worry about their children's health. Because of FoE-J's selection of such concerns, the Housing Project can lead the audience to visualize what could happen more easily than the Siberian Hotspot Project that argues about the problems of global warming.

In each project, FoE-J attempts to approach different groups of audiences. Depending on the primary audience, it emphasizes certain features of the problems, and presents different point of issues. It also changes and limits the focus of the discussion to appeal to each of the target audiences. However, despite these differences, the two
projects have a common goal: helping to protect the Russian Taiga, and the projects seem to support each other to optimize the potential of the success in FoE-J's environmental efforts.
Chapter Three
RHETORICAL STRATEGIES
OF JAPAN TROPICAL ACTION NETWORK

Japan Tropical Action Network has two projects, both of which involve prevention of deforestation caused by Japan's timber trade. One project is called "Protection of Tropical Forests" and aims to protect these forests in Southeast Asia, mainly in Indonesia and Malaysia. The other project is "Protection of Old-growth Forest Against Woodchip Production," which addresses problems of logging old-growth forests in Australia. Before my analysis of JATAN's rhetorical strategies in these projects, I will preview the audiences and the purposes of the projects. Then, I will outline similarities and differences in deforestation rhetoric between JATAN and FoE-J.

Basic Rhetorical Concepts

JATAN has multiple audiences in the two projects, but both of these projects have common primary and secondary audiences. The primary audiences are Japanese citizens who use goods produced from the timber imported from the countries where serious destruction of forests occurs. The secondary audiences are Japanese companies that import timber from those countries and/or manufacture goods to sell to Japanese consumers. Protection of Tropical Forests has one more group of audiences: national and local governments that have been closely related to Japan's tropical timber trade. This
trade has occurred as a part of development aid by the Japanese government to countries in Southeast Asia, and the imported timber was used in public constructions procured by local government.

JATAN's projects have three common purposes. One is to inform Japanese audiences about significance of forests in the world and deforestation caused by Japan's timber trade. The second purpose is to protect forests that have deteriorated because of Japan's timber trade. The third purpose is to persuade the audiences to reduce their consumption of imported lumber by raising awareness about the outcome of their consumption behavior.

Major Similarities and Difference in Deforestation Rhetoric between JATAN and FoE-J

Like FoE-J, JATAN also focuses on the general public, informs them about the significance of the forest endangered by Japan's timber trade and attempts to reduce Japan's consumption of imported timber to protect the forest. However, there are differences between JATAN's and FoE-J's rhetoric. These differences include: 1) areas of deforestation and the products and users, 2) focus of problems, 3) categorization of Japanese citizens, and 4) method of reduction in Japan's use of imported lumber. Comparing FoE-J and JATAN shows how general messages about deforestation get adapted to different purposes and audiences. In the next section, I will discuss the basic differences between FoE-J's and JATAN's deforestation campaigns.
Areas of Deforestation, the Products, and the Primary Users

JATAN attempts to protect tropical forests mainly in Indonesia and Malaysia and old-growth forest in Australia. The products that these countries export to Japan include materials for the goods including paper and furniture. Japanese citizens are the primary users of these goods, consume them every day and can get new ones for a reasonable price.

In contrast, the product that FoE-J addresses is Russian lumber whose primary users are Japanese construction companies. Japanese citizens are the secondary users as residents of houses build with this lumber. Lumber is not the product the citizens consume everyday, but the product used for houses that they build or purchase once in a lifetime. Though a social tendency toward over-consumption may be the fundamental cause of Japan’s wasteful use of the lumber, the role of Japanese consumers is not as central to FoE-J’s issues as it is for JATAN.

Difference in the Focus of Problems

In JATAN’s rhetoric, the primary users of imported timber products are Japanese citizens, and they are positioned as catalysts of deforestation that affect forests in timber export countries and the lives of fellow citizens. Such positioning seems to lead JATAN to focus on local problems in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Australia such as how local environment and populations are adversely affected in connection with Japan’s excessive consumption of imported timber products. JATAN attempts to link these problems with consumption and stimulates a sense of guilt among Japanese audiences by portraying them as the agent that causes deforestation.
In FoE-J’s rhetoric, on the other hand, the primary users of the timber products are Japanese construction companies, and the citizens are secondary users who are affected by the choice of the primary users concerning the material for houses. The secondary position is reflected in the position of the citizens in FoE-J’s deforestation rhetoric. They are beneficiaries of the Russian Taiga and the ones who are adversely ‘affected’ by Japan’s timber trade. FoE-J emphasized Japan-oriented problems in connection with deforestation such as climate change in Japan and the problems that result from using imported lumber such as waste of money and health risks. By such emphases, FoE-J attempts to generate a sense of crisis among Japanese citizens by making them see themselves as victims of those adverse effects. FoE-J depicts citizens as passive, while JATAN depicts citizens as active.

**Difference in How Japanese Citizens are Categorized**

As mentioned earlier, the products that JATAN and FoE-J emphasize in their projects have different primary users in Japanese society. In JATAN’s projects, such users are the citizens. In FoE-J’s projects, they are construction companies (housing industry), and the citizens are secondary. These differences are reflected in how each of these environmental groups situates the citizens in its rhetoric. JATAN sees the citizens as consumers who excessively use the goods manufactured from imported timber. JATAN requires them to change the consumption pattern, which it believes puts significant pressure on ecological integrity of forests. JATAN (2001d) says, “We (Japanese citizens) need to change our lifestyle (in which mass-consumption is so deeply embedded) and reduce the amount of our timber consumption” (p.33), locating the
citizens as one of agents that help to cause deforestation. JATAN (1994a) claims, "If Japan did not slow down its pace to consume goods, the pace of tropical deforestation caused by its trade would never be alleviated" (p.67).

FoE-J sees the citizens both as the beneficiaries of healthy Russian Taiga and of using domestic lumber and as the victims of the problems caused by destruction of the Taiga. First, FoE-J attempts to depict the citizens as beneficiaries. FoE-J (2000c) tells the audiences, "The forest (Russian Taiga) has brought us various benefits and helped to make our lives wealthy" (p.8) and "We will feel as if we benefited just by living in a house built with domestic lumber" (chap. 4). Then, FoE-J portrays the citizens as victims who would suffer from deforestation in the Taiga and use of imported lumber. FoE-J (2000c) says, "Destruction of the Taiga would provide negative impacts on the livelihood of Japanese citizens" (p.5), and "Pesticides and preservatives applied to imported lumber could pose health risks to residents of a houses built with such lumber" (chap. 9). By contrasting the benefits with the negative effects, FoE-J can depict these benefits as more important while depicting these effects as more vicious. Consequently, it can direct the audiences to initiate protection of the Taiga and use of more domestic lumber to maintain the important benefits and avoid the vicious effects.

The difference in the position of Japanese citizens as users of certain products affects how JATAN and FoE-J locate them in their rhetoric. JATAN finds the citizens as agents of deforestation whereas FoE-J situates them as the victims who are affected by deforestation and beneficiaries when using domestic lumber. The difference in the location of the citizens results from directs different problems for emphasis selected by JATAN and FoE-J.
Difference in How the Reduction Occurs

JATAN attempts to accomplish the reduction by persuading Japanese audiences to change their consumption pattern. Because the materials are imported to Japan from other countries, Japanese citizens are unlikely to be aware of the effects of their consumption, however disastrous it is to the forests in export countries. They do not perceive the connection between consumption and production, which leads Japanese citizens to be more likely to use wastefully and throw away easily. JATAN expects that presenting Japan’s responsibility can lead the audiences to review how they consume goods to change the patterns. The success that JATAN envisions about the reduction requires self-sacrifice by Japanese citizens.

In contrast, FoE-J expects to attain the reduction by leading Japanese audiences to use more domestic lumber without making them feel that they are sacrificing. Domestic lumber entails higher initial cost, but FoE-J attempts to encourage the audiences to believe that it will be compensated by the benefits of using this lumber. Providing such trade-off for the initial high cost, FoE-J can avoid making the audiences feel that they are sacrificing themselves. FoE-J hopes that Japan's use of more domestic lumber will result in reduction of its consumption of Russian lumber.

Outline of the next discussion

The following discussions will analyze JATAN’s deforestation rhetoric employed in its two projects, Protection of Tropical Forests and Protection of Old-growth Forests. These two projects address deforestation that occurs in different places in the world (the
first focuses on Southeast Asian countries, and the latter involves mainly Australia, South Asia). However, the rhetoric employed in the two projects has the same strategies with the same primary audience and purposes, which is different from FoE-J’s rhetoric that uses different strategies in each of its projects. In analyzing JATAN’s rhetoric, I will examine its two projects together because there are few salient differences between them.

Like FoE-J, JATAN attempts to describe value of forests, construct a shared interest among Japanese audiences regarding deforestation in connection with Japan’s timber import, and criticize the responsible parties for causing deforestation. First, I will show how JATAN explains value of forests, which will be followed by the discussion on what aspects or values it highlights to construct shared interests. Then, I will examine how JATAN attempts to lead Japanese audiences to feel guilty about their consumption of timber products. This shows a sharp contrast to FoE-J’s rhetoric that avoids criticizing Japan’s consumption of lumber. I will also discuss how JATAN uses the effect of blaming others to maintain a sense of guilt among the audience without making them feel angry. Throughout the analyses, I will compare and contrast rhetoric between JATAN and FoE-J to discuss the similarities and the differences.

**Values of Forests**

Like FoE-J, JATAN informs Japanese audiences about the significance of forest with emphases on its biological and ecological significance. As mentioned in the FoE-J’s chapter, a Japanese kan-ji letter that means forest only symbolizes trees, and Japanese
tend to downplay non-commercial values. Discussing biological and ecological values helps to remind the audiences about organisms other than trees and about the lessons of Zen Buddhism that encourages them to pay the fullest respect to nature whose inner being is like ours (Suzuki, 1959). Reminding the audiences of these aspects may be vital for JATAN to gain support from them in protecting forests.

**Biodiversity**

First, JATAN describes biological values by using the word *biodiversity*. Unlike FoE-J, JATAN does not attempt to define the meaning of the word. Without the definition, audiences have to speculate what it means through the connotation of Japanese translation and how and where JATAN uses the word.

As mentioned in FoE-J's chapter, Japanese translation of the word *biodiversity* can connote abundance and multiple use that capitalism tends to emphasize. When the audiences see the translation, they are more likely to understand the meaning by linking it with the implications of the translation. When JATAN attempts to stress the importance of protecting Australia's forests, JATAN compares it with tropical rainforest in terms of *biodiversity* that these forests support. JATAN (2001b) says, “Australia's forests dominated by eucalyptuses have more biodiversity than tropical rainforests in the world” (¶ 15). Many Japanese citizens know of tropical rainforest concerning its destruction and biodiversity through media, but few of them know of Australia's forests at all (JATAN, 2000b). However, the importance of unknown Australian forests is heightened when compared with well-known tropical rainforest based on *biodiversity* that has the positive
connotation. JATAN uses biodiversity to impress the importance of protection of Australia’s forests and to justify the protection effort.

JATAN uses other words that have a positive connotation when discussing biodiversity of forests. For instance, JATAN (2001b) uses the word in a section under the subtitle, “The surprising value of forest” (¶ 14). This section discusses how certain areas of forests support significantly diverse species. JATAN (2001b) concludes the section by saying, “Australia’s forests and its remarkable biodiversity are so important. It would be a significant loss if the forests are destroyed” (¶ 25). After reading this section, the audiences may be persuaded to believe that protecting biodiversity is valuable. First, the subtitle can influence the audiences. Second, the audiences may be influenced to feel that biodiversity is important when JATAN reiterates that biodiversity is “so important” and argues that its loss is “significantly regrettable.” Even though the audiences may not fully be able to comprehend the value of protecting biodiversity without a definition of the meaning, they can speculate that biodiversity may be something important based on how JATAN uses the word.

Habitat of Species

Second, JATAN argues values of forests in light of an ecological service of forest as habitat of wildlife and other species. This service does not directly benefit the audiences, but describing it can help them understand the importance. JATAN refers to endangered and native species that live in forests. People tend to see the things that are unique, scarce, original, and difficult or impossible to reproduce as irreparable, and they
value such things as opposed to something usual or easily replaceable by humans.

Identification of the irreparable affects our perceptions for a decision or action by attracting our attention to the uniqueness, timeliness, and precariousness of a concern (Cox, 1998). JATAN appeals to this value and highlights these three aspects of the irreparable in order to stress the significance of forest and the need for protection.

Regarding the uniqueness, JATAN (2001e) says, "Old-growth forests are so important and unique that the trees in these forests should not be cut just for producing woodchips and charcoal" (¶ 9). JATAN contrasts the value of old-growth forests that are unique and "will never be reproduced" (JATAN, 2001e, ¶4) with woodchips and charcoal that can be easily reproduced. Such dialectical contrast can make "the loss of the unique" (Cox, 1998, p.3) look more intense because the quality of the unique is destroyed in the process. The contrast helps to enhance the value of old-growth forests based on the distinctive and exceptional nature implied by JATAN’s reference to the uniqueness.

JATAN also draws attention to precariousness of the forests, which is stressed as this environmental group refers to the fact that the species in the forests are endangered. JATAN (2001c) mentions, “More than 300 animal and plant species that are enlisted as threatened or endangered live in this region” (¶ 3), and logging old-growth trees means a loss of their habitat. JATAN (2001b) says:

Many large bird-lives and marsupials (indigenous species in Australia) can not live in young afforested areas because they live in a depression of old trees whose ages are more than 100 to 200 years. This indicates a relationship between logging of old-growth forest and endangered species (¶ 20).
JATAN refers to the scarcity of species that lives in the forest in order to emphasize the significance of old-growth forest. The word *endangered* indicates a limit and the existence of the species is fragile. These indications influence understanding of the audiences about protection of the forests because the limited or precarious is important as contrasting with the plentiful and enduring. Through such indications, JATAN can lead the audiences to advocate protection of forests because what is fragile requires protection to maintain its existence (Cox, 1998), and avoiding extinction of endangered species is attained by protection of the forests that serves as its habitat.

Further, JATAN highlights how imminent the situation is. To indicate the need for immediate action, it contends that some species are actually on the brink of "extinction," arguing, "Koala's population is sharply declining because of logging. In some areas, it faces the danger of regional extinction" (2001f, ¶ 5). Such argument indicates seriousness of the present situation, which helps JATAN emphasize the urgency of the forest protection and stress that we are running out of time. JATAN (2001e) says, "There must be something we can do (for protecting the forest). But remember, there is not much time left" (¶ 10). If logging in the forest continued, more endangered species would be forced to the brink of extinction. Stressing the urgency of the situation surrounding old-growth forests, JATAN can alert the audiences and encourage them to believe that the action for the protection is their highest priority.

Appealing to the irreparable leads the audiences to understand the situation of old-growth forests in a certain way. JATAN draws attention to the uniqueness and fragility of these forests as well as the timeliness of the situation. The use of the irreparable value guides the audiences to believe that protection of old-growth forests means protecting the
unique and fragile that reside in these forests and that the unique and fragile needs timely
action. Learning the value of the irreparable about the forests can serve as “a warning, an
opportunity to act in appropriate ways before it is too late” (Cox, 1998, p.5) for the
audiences, and an action for the protection becomes necessary and meaningful.

JATAN’s rhetoric that appeals to the irreparable is also seen in FoE-J’s rhetoric
that attempts to highlight original and fragile nature of Russian Taiga and to stress an
immediate action. But JATAN’s rhetoric has two dominant differences with FoE-J’s
rhetoric. First, JATAN employs dialectical contrast to underscore the importance of old-
growth forest by contrasting uniqueness of the species and the forests with commonality
of the products that humans produce by destroying the forest. FoE-J does not use such a
contrast when discussing originality of the Taiga. Second, JATAN uses objective criteria
when stressing the significance of the original but FoE-J does not. JATAN uses numbers
and refers to how many endangered and original species live in old-growth forest,
describing uniqueness and precariousness in terms of numbers. In contrast, FoE-J tends to
be dependent on audiences’ subjective interpretation of language when stressing the
seriousness of the nature of forest destruction and explaining the uniqueness of the Taiga.
It (2000c) says, “many endangered species” live in the Taiga or “Biodiversity and
uniqueness of the Taiga surpasses any types of temperate forests in the world” (p.17).
Unlike JATAN that attempts to express the magnitude of diversity and uniqueness of the
Taiga with numerical data, FoE-J attempts to make the audiences interpret it by
stimulating their imagination with use of abstract expression.

Despite these differences, both FoE-J and JATAN focus on maintaining the
species that live in the forests when discussing value of nature. Both of them use this
value to remind the audiences about Japanese cultural beliefs about nature based on the lessons of Zen Buddhism that encourage respecting all forms of lives in nature and discourage using nature for a selfish purpose. This rhetorical strategy is important because both of these environmental groups attempt to direct the audiences to recognize shared interests with them in protecting the value of nature according to the cultural beliefs and employ these beliefs as ethical standards in criticizing the responsible parties for causing deforestation.

Construction of Shared Interests

Kenneth Burke (1945) says that people can be identified with someone when they have a shared interest with him or even when they are persuaded to believe that they have it. Shared interest is also essential for Japanese audiences to understand why deforestation should be prevented in view of their cultural beliefs about community that guide them to see and interpret a reality in a certain way. Japanese citizens tend to interpret a problem based on how the problem relates to them. A feeling of being related involves a shared interest that occurs either when they are affected by the event (problem) or when they are responsible for it. In the first case, shared interests involve avoiding or solving the problems to maintain the benefit that Japanese citizens enjoy. In the latter case, such interests relate to solving the problem to alleviating a sense of guilt in causing the problems. In both of those cases, identification of shared interests helps the audiences believe that what is happening is related to them and thus leads them to see it as their
problem. With such recognition, Japanese citizens are more likely to support someone who attempts to solve the problems and follow his words supported by the cultural beliefs about community that value social harmony and cooperation.

This process of recognition involves identification through association and dissociation (Check, 2001). When the audiences locate an advocate group inside of the community, association takes place because they see that their interests are joined. But this action also results in situating other people whose interests are not common outside of the community, which involves dissociation between the audiences and the group. Based on these beliefs and Burke's theory of identification, shared interest helps JATAN promote social unity. Even though this problem is taking place outside Japan and may seem to be unrelated to them, JATAN shows the audiences how the problem is related to them and that it affects all Japanese people.

JATAN endeavors to construct shared interests with the audiences by discussing values of forests and adverse effects of logging as well as by implying Japan's role in causing deforestation. These discussions indicate why forests should be protected and how Japan contributes to deforestation in the world. These arguments can direct the audiences to feel guilty about their actions and simultaneously lead them to seek for a way to alleviate the guilt. Protecting the forests of values and relieving a sense of guilt can serve as shared interests between JATAN and the audiences in the two projects. Both JATAN and FoE-J attempt to show protecting forests as the shared interests with the audiences, but the reason why they need to protect the forests is different. In JATAN's rhetoric, it is to alleviate the sense of guilt about deforestation caused by Japan's timber trade. Meanwhile, in FoE-J's rhetoric, it is to avoid the potential problems that the
audiences could suffer as a result of deforestation in the Russian Taiga. The following section will explore how JATAN attempts to construct shared interests with the audiences in minimizing deforestation in terms of importance of the victims, and Japan's involvement.

**The Victims of Deforestation**

After presenting the values of the forests, JATAN presents adverse effects of logging on the environment and local populations, which serve as the ground for shared interests between JATAN and Japanese audiences. Unlike FoE-J that locates Japanese citizens as the victims of deforestation in Russian Taiga, JATAN locates local populations as the victims and implies that Japanese citizens are the agents of the problems caused by deforestation. Because JATAN wants the citizens to change their consumption pattern to protect forests in the world, it attempts to stimulate a sense of guilt of Japanese audiences as it discusses the problems of deforestation in view of social impacts and delineates who are the victims.

**Implication of Japan's Responsibility**

JATAN aims to generate a sense of guilt among the audiences, which leads it to begin the discussion with implication of Japan's responsibility for those problems. At the outset of this discussion, JATAN (1994b) asks the audiences, "What problems are occurring in temperate, subarctic, and tropical forests in the course of producing our paper, and what do local citizens want us to do about these problems?" (p.2). Using the
phrase *our* paper, this question implies that Japanese citizens are responsible for the problems in connection with logging in those areas. However, such implication does not intend to criticize Japanese citizens directly. It attempts to show that Japanese consumption of imported timber products is related to problems in other countries. Although JATAN becomes more explicit later, in earlier stage of discussion, JATAN’s criticism is implicit and indirect, rather than explicit. Such implication structures a reality in which citizens see themselves as catalysts of the problems and see the local populations as victims and initiates a sense of guilt about what is happening in the areas. At the same time, a sense of guilt leads the audiences to start looking for ways to alleviate it including solutions for the problem or someone to blame.

After establishing a direction to interpret the situation, JATAN covers adverse effects of logging in connection with Japan’s timber trade and how local populations have suffered from them. It also indicates who should be blamed, other than Japanese citizens, in these discussions.

**Effects of Logging on Local Populations**

Logging often affects the vegetation and the water system, causing soil erosion, water contamination, sedimentation, and increase of flood. These problems give negative impacts not only on the environment but also on the lives of local populations. JATAN emphasizes social problems of logging by quoting from the presentation made by Indonesian citizens who suffer from the aftermath of logging. A village leader from the Kalimantan Island said:

In the areas we live, there are four rivers that originate in (a) mountain(s). After logging in the mountain(s), the water level of the rivers significantly decreased
and the river water became contaminated because of soil influx into the rivers after timber harvesting....We used the river water as our drinking water, but now it becomes difficult to get clean water from the rivers....(Due to shallow river water) we can no longer transport our (agricultural) products to town ....Fish disappeared from the rivers; the fish used to help us to supplement income (JATAN, 1994a, p. 8).

Those words indicate that logging is destructive not only for the environment but also for the local society. The local citizens lose clean water and all the means for cash income they used to have. Knowing these devastated situations of timber exporting nations leads the audiences to feel responsible for the problems. The village leader also said that despite all of their losses, they have not received anything from logging companies such as new jobs, hospitals, and schools, although government officers said that they would. As the audiences blame themselves, they may simultaneously see the companies as socially irresponsible and condemn this.

Problems of logging also include destruction of culturally important places or trees in forest. Another representative from Indonesia described the values of forest for the local populations and blames logging companies for destroying them. He said that forests and mountains have religious values and that they believe that spirits of their ancestors reside in trees, stones, and mountains. He laments, “Logging companies cut sacred trees and destroy sacred mountains,” and “Our forest has more than economic value. It has religious, environmental, ecological and social values” (JATAN, 1994a, p. 11). Those values are familiar to many Japanese audiences who also have a lot of historically and culturally valuable temples and shrines located deeper in the interior of Japan’s forest. By using the above quotes, JATAN can also direct the audiences to see the actions by those companies as vicious because the companies are destroying the places where the spirit of nature enshrined.
As Japanese audiences continue to learn about what occurs to the environment and local populations in connection with production of paper and timber products they use, they may feel more sorry for what happens in the river basin. They also may feel guilty for it because the logging aims to export timber to Japan. Feeling this way, the audiences can draw a picture of the situation where the local citizens are the victims of the aftermath of logging and Japan contributes to causing the problem by importing timber.

However, they also attempt to seek for ways to get rid of a sense of guilt. The audiences may review their consumption behavior and realize that reduction of their paper use might contribute to mitigating such adverse effects. But while they are criticizing themselves, they may also be blaming logging companies for contaminating the river water. By such criticism, they can divert attention from their guilt and focus on the actions of these companies. They see these companies disqualified as a fellow member of community and locate the companies outside of their community even though the companies are related to Japan as timber sellers. JATAN plays on this by scapegoating other actors, thus diverting attention from the role of over-consumption by Japanese consumers.

Responsible Actors of Deforestation

Describing forest values and problems of logging caused by Japan’s trade, JATAN shows how these values are violated. It depicts Japan as a large importer of
timber products and a consumer who massively uses them. This directly connects the 
audiences with deforestation. However, this argument may violate the cultural norm to 
avoid criticizing fellow members of the society. JATAN may make the audiences 
adversarial and will fail to gain their support. Like FoE-J, JATAN also adopts the 
scapegoating process. But the major difference between these groups is that JATAN 
attempts to describe the responsibility of Japanese citizens for causing deforestation by 
using the scapegoats as a shock absorber of direct criticism of the citizens while FoE-J 
strives to avoid any criticism of the citizens.

In the prior argument, JATAN indicated Japan’s guilt. This discussion helped the 
audiences understand the relationship between Japan’s timber trade, their consumption 
pattern, and deforestation. It also aided JATAN to stimulate a sense of guilt among them 
about Japan’s role and their consumption pattern. As mentioned earlier, to keep a sense of 
guilt without causing adversarial feelings, JATAN needs someone whom the audiences 
can blame as their sacrifice to atone for their guilt. When JATAN alluded to Japan’s 
responsibility when discussing the social problems caused by logging, it also described 
who had done the logging, indicating who can be blamed other than Japan. Because a 
sense of guilt and blame of others tend to occur simultaneously, this description guides 
the audiences to blame those who did the logging and helped them lessen their sense of 
guilt. By providing a scapegoat, JATAN managed to discuss Japan’s responsibility 
without making the audiences feel angry or uncomfortable. JATAN’s strategy to blame 
Japan without causing anger begins with giving audiences someone else to blame. To 
avoid making the audiences feel uncomfortable or angry, JATAN takes a few more steps
before criticizing Japanese consumers: using certain words and blaming other groups of people in Japan prior to criticizing the consumers.

**Criticism of Local Actors**

The actors JATAN highlights include 1) logging companies and 2) law-enforcement officers and politicians. As FoE-J does, in the arguments about these actors, JATAN also depicts their actions as inconsiderate for the environment, greedy, and selfish qualities that Japanese society tends to dislike. Because JATAN has discussed values of forests that support biodiversity and the lives of endangered species and social problems of logging, they can show audiences how the actions of these groups directly violate those values.

**Logging Companies**

JATAN criticizes logging companies for clear-cutting and destructive plantation in Australia and several kinds of illegal logging practices in Indonesia. When discussing problems of clearcutting, JATAN attempts to portray the companies as apathetic toward the environment. JATAN argues that in Australia, 70 percent of logging is clear-cutting that destroys the ecosystems. JATAN (2000e) says, “Old-growth forest will never be restored once it is destroyed. Habitat of species and ecological integrity will be lost” (¶ 4). JATAN also argues that some of the logging companies destroy old-growth forests by converting part of these forests to plantation. JATAN (1994b) says, “After clearcutting, the open field in (Australia’s) old-growth forest is razed to the ground by burning,
which is called burning for restoration” (p.17). Before planting commercially valuable trees, the companies burn the remnant forest vegetation. This burning aims to “eradicate native plant species in the region to plant commercially valuable eucalyptuses” (p.17). JATAN (1994b) warns, “Burning for restoration could destroy vast areas of old-growth forest” (p.17).

These practices look not only destructive to forest and to the species, but also vicious and selfish. JATAN has discussed the ecological significance of Australia’s old-growth forests by focusing on endangered and indigenous species, clearcutting, and destructive plantation. Clear-cutting deprives a species of its habitat. Plantation emphasizes commercial benefits, but it appears to ignore ecological integrity. JATAN (1994b) calls production of woodchips, which logs old-growth trees, “a crime against nature” (p.17), indicating that nature should be protected and the practices are ethically wrong.

JATAN also blames illegal logging practices in Indonesia, focusing on pursuit of profit and violation of forest values by logging companies. This criticism focuses on 1) harvesting trees more than the amount specified in a logging concession, 2) logging trees in contradiction to the stated purpose, and 3) harvesting them in Indonesia’s national parks where logging is prohibited. First, JATAN (2001d) argues that some logging companies take advantage of a loophole of self-reporting system concerning the amount of trees they are allowed to harvest. JATAN (2001d) says that logging trees more than the allowable harvest is not only illegal but also “lowers the quality of forests” (p.6) because these logging practices encourage clear-cutting and hamper sustainable forest management in Indonesia. Secondly, JATAN points out that other companies abuse
expansion of oil palm industry by cutting vast areas of forest under the name of “development.” JATAN (2001d) argues, “In 1999, in western Kalimantan, logging 870,000 hectares of forest area was approved for oil-palm plantation. But the area where such plantation had been implemented was only 18,278 hectare (about two percent). This contradiction indicates that the primary purpose was to get timber by clear-cutting” (p.7).

Concerning the third case of illegal logging, JATAN (2001d) reports:

In the Tanjung Puting National Park, ramin is becoming extinct from the eastern area (where illegal logging is carried out). At present, meranti, secondly valuable tree species as commercial timber, is being logged and logging operations moves deeper into the interior of the park...If logging were stopped immediately, unharmed forest area in the park would be completely gone (p.13).

JATAN refers to regional extinction of a commercially valuable tree species to show the impact of illegal logging on the environment. Because of its high commercial value that resulted in rampant harvest, Ramin now is listed as endangered species (JATAN, 2001d). JATAN uses the word infection to describe fast spread of such illegal logging. JATAN (2001d) says, “The Tanjung Puting National Park has been destroyed by a group of powerful logging companies.... Like infection spreads, logged area has been expanded from the southern part of the park to the eastern and now moves to the central” (p.11).

Through such criticism of logging companies, JATAN focuses on certain actions of these companies and attempts to influence how Japanese audiences see them based on their social norm and the lessons of Zen Buddhism. In the criticism, JATAN highlights the same aspects of the companies' actions as FoE-J does, including destructive logging practices, violation of laws and regulations, indifference of environmental outcome of their acts, and pursuit of profit. It portrays these companies as socially irresponsible, ethically wrong, and greedy, recasting them from those who help Japan produce goods
with competitive prices for domestic use. The companies also appear to be selfish because they are pursuing self-interest without considering negative impacts of logging on the environment and the local populations as the audiences have learned in former discussion. Such a selfish action would seem to contradict with Japanese social norm that promotes harmony. Focusing on the pursuit of self-interest, they also appear to use nature for a selfish purpose, which is prohibited by Zen Buddhism. Referring to these values, JATAN encourages audiences to believe that the companies represent greedy and selfish acts and seem to be ethically wrong, failing to consider the environmental consequences of their actions to nature. With this view, the audiences are more likely to locate these companies outside of the community.

**Law-enforcement Officers**

The second actor that JATAN uses is the group of local law-enforcement officers. JATAN highlights neglect of their duty and condemns that they assist illegal logging by allowing the harvest of trees in Indonesian national parks in exchange for bribery offered by logging companies. In the Gunung Leuser National Park in northern Sumatra, the officers, including forest guards, representatives of the environmental protection agency, military officers, and policemen, are involved in the illegal logging. JATAN (2001d) blames, “The ways of their involvement vary, ranging from bribery taking to organizing groups that conduct illegal logging” (p.19). JATAN also argues that in the Tanjung Puting National Park of Indonesia, logging is conducted in the area where law-enforcement officers can supervise. It (2001) says, “Bribery-taking by park guards, policemen, and military officers is conducted extensively in the park” (p. 11). The
officers who supervise violations of laws and/or protect the environment of national parks neglect their duty and cooperate with the logging companies that violate the laws and destroy national parks. JATAN claims that the corruption among law-enforcement officers is so prevalent in national parks of Indonesia and that there are few chances of supervision or crackdown of illegal logging in the parks by the authority. Thus, people who are logging trees in national parks do not have to worry about being punished if they violate laws. Some areas of the parks seem to be “in a state of anarchy” (JATAN 2001, p. 19).

JATAN also refers to economic hardships that the Indonesian citizens face, but emphasizing bribery taking by the officers makes the audience draw attention to this illegal action and directs them to believe that the officers are wrong. By cooperating with logging companies that are already seen as ethically wrong, the officers will be seen in the same way. However, the officers look more vicious than the logging companies because it is the officers’ duty to protect the national parks, and they fail to do it. The prevalence of illegal logging seems to originate from their neglect. JATAN can make this neglect look more blameworthy by contrasting their action with their duty that promotes compliance with laws. Along with being greedy, inconsiderate, and selfish, the audience may believe that the officers also represent social irresponsibility and are also located outside of the community.

JATAN presented those two actors outside of Japan to blame their actions to forests. This blame helped the audiences to decrease a sense of guilt about their consumption of imported timber products that causes deforestation. The presentation of those actors serves as the first step for JATAN to soften criticism of Japanese audiences.
As mentioned earlier, at an earlier stage, JATAN uses indirect criticism about Japan, and it gradually changes the tone to more direct criticism. In the next section, I will discuss the transition of JATAN’s criticism, focusing on how JATAN criticizes the Japanese role in tropical deforestation.

**Criticism of Japan’s Action**

To describe Japan’s responsibility while avoiding the problems of violating social norm, JATAN takes four steps. The first step is to present the enemy as guilty of wrong doings as discussed in the previous section. The second and third step involves use of certain words to minimize the impact of criticism. JATAN uses the word *Japan* to refer to the collective subject that imports timber and the word *responsibility* to describe what Japanese consumers should do to compensate for their crime to world’s forests. The final step is to criticize the responsible parties in Japan in a step-by-step manner, starting from Japanese corporations that import timber and manufacture goods from timber, moving to the Japanese national government, and then finally describing the guilt of Japanese consumers. As JATAN continues its criticism about Japan’s roles in deforestation, it changes the quality of the criticism from implicit and indirect to direct. All of those four steps help JATAN to maintain the criticism and thus the audiences’ sense of guilt, without making them feel angry. Scapegoats can defuse this sense about causing deforestation by taking all of the blame. The gradual transition of the quality of criticism can absorb the psychological impacts that stem from direct criticism of Japan’s consumption, helping to avoid adversarial feeling among the audiences. Without making
them feel blamed, these words can direct them to understand their role in deforestation and accept obligation to solve it.

**Blaming Japan**

JATAN uses the word *Japan*, a collective subject, that allows it to describe how Japanese citizens contribute to deforestation without causing anger or hostility among the audiences. They know that they are included in the word *Japan* and thus that they may be responsible, but they do not have to take the blame directly. The word represents Japanese citizens, but it is ambiguous and does not specify which group of the citizens is represented. For instance, JATAN (1994a) mentions, “We will explore how *Japan* has contributed to deforestation in Indonesia and consider the measures that *Japan* should take to prevent its further destruction of the forest” (p.34). This argument clarifies Japan’s responsibility for deforestation, but JATAN does not directly criticize the audiences’ massive consumption of goods. Instead of using the phrase, “Japanese consumers,” JATAN uses the word *Japan* to obscure who is primarily responsible for deforestation.

Then, JATAN outlines Japan’s action regarding its timber import, arguing, “In the history of Japan’s import of tropical timber products, *Japan* has repeated irresponsible acts over and over again” (1994a, p. 34). JATAN continues to criticize that *Japan* bought a huge amount of the products from certain areas in the world during certain periods of time. When such intensive import depleted the forest resources in timber exporting countries or aroused strong opposition against the export, *Japan* just stopped its import from the countries and found new countries that would provide the timber product. As
Japan repeated such acts, deforested areas in the world expanded (1994a). Moreover, JATAN refers to deforestation caused by Japan's timber trade in Australia, saying, "Old-growth forest in western Australia is logged at the rate of 20,000 hectares per a year, and most of the timber is exported to Japan to be used as low quality products such as woodchips" (2001e, ¶ 5). JATAN points out that Japan imports a massive amount of timber and that deforestation occurs as a result of the import. JATAN makes clear who should be blamed for deforestation. But it can avert direct criticism of Japanese consumers because JATAN's use of the word Japan is ambiguous and there are various possibilities of how the word can be interpreted. Japan can indicate the national government, Japanese companies that produce goods from imported timber or use those goods, and/or Japanese consumers. Whoever would be indicated by the word Japan, Japanese audiences know that JATAN's word suggests that a lot of timber products are imported because they use it and their massive use of the product causes deforestation in the world. JATAN seems to violate a Japanese social norm that discourages criticism of the fellow members of the society. However, the ambiguity of the word Japan helps JATAN avoid directly blaming the audience's massive consumption of imported timber.

**Japan's Responsibility**

JATAN also uses another word to maintain the blame without violating Japanese social norms. JATAN uses the word responsibility and says that Japan is responsible for deforestation in the world when JATAN refers to what Japan has done to the forest or what Japan should do to compensate for the crime. JATAN (2001d) argues, "Japan is still the largest importer of tropical timber products and assumes a significant
responsibility for destruction of tropical forest" (p.34). Likewise, JATAN (1994b) asserts, "Deforestation has been rapidly expanding in Indonesia. In the face of such a serious situation, Japan's responsibility must be clarified because it imported a large amount of timber products from the country" (p.33). By using the words responsibility or responsible, JATAN can encourage the audiences to see what Japanese citizens can do for protection of world's forests as a social obligation. The word responsibility is not necessarily presumed as a responsive action for wrong doings. Thus, it can help the audiences divert attention from self-criticism about their over-consumption of timber and also prevents JATAN from violating Japanese social norm that prohibits criticizing fellow members. Further, the words can also lead the audiences to feel good because they can be good citizens by fulfilling the responsibility. Due to the connotations of the word responsibility, JATAN can avoid making the audiences feel blamed.

Who is Japan? Description of Three Responsible Parties

As discussed earlier, criticizing other parties can let the audiences cast some of their guilt into those who are being blamed by JATAN and keep a sense of guilt at a minimum level. Like FoE-J blames Russian logging companies, JATAN attempts to show how guilty the companies are in order to depict them as deserving of blame by fellow members. But in JATAN's rhetoric, criticizing them can also provide ample reasons to the audiences why the consumers should be blamed because corporate activity is assumed to originate with the over-consumption of timber products by citizens. By the time JATAN begins discussing the consumers' responsibility, they are already well prepared for such an argument. In the following section, I will examine how JATAN
criticizes each of the three parties and how JATAN’s rhetoric encourages the audiences to take positive action. This helps JATAN to avoid violating Japanese social norm that discourages criticizing fellow members of the society.

1) Japanese Corporations

First, JATAN blames Japanese paper manufactures and their local subsidiaries. For example, JATAN (2001g) argues, “The reason why we see logging practice by Harris Daishowa as destructive is that this company leaves many logs in the forest area just because the logs rot a little or the logs are not straight and difficult to transport” (1 8). As discussed in the FoE-J’s chapter, waste of timber can indicate that the company does not respect nature and sees it as an object, violating Japanese social norms originated from Zen Buddhism. Based on these indications, the audiences may interpret the company’s actions as ethically wrong based on their cultural beliefs about nature. To further emphasize the company’s view of nature, JATAN presents the company’s comment about the reason why they import woodchips from Australia. It is because “they are cheap; the quality is bad, though” (JATAN, 1994b, p.17). Because JATAN uses the above remark after covering the values of forest, it seems that the paper manufacturers fail to recognize these values. The remark also suggests that the company may see nature as an object because it recognizes the value of trees by the prices of the chips that help it to gain economic profit. Using Japanese cultural beliefs about nature, the audiences may believe that the companies are ethically wrong.

JATAN also discusses wrong actions by the companies in terms of social responsibility, which is a different focus than FoE-J’s argument. JATAN attempts to
show that they do not believe in this responsibility by highlighting a contradiction between their words and actions as well as neglect of appropriate actions. JATAN (2001g) points out, "Harris Daishowa says that it is using all of the harvested trees but what it is actually doing after logging contradicts with this explanation" (p. 8). JATAN (2001e) says, "Japanese paper manufactures claim that they import timber only from the forests that are sustainable managed. But in western Australia, logging in old-growth forests that are officially recognized as unsustainable still continues" (p. 6). These arguments highlight the contradiction between the words and the actions, drawing attention to their actions and making these actions look more vicious. Thus, the audiences may believe that the companies should be criticized.

To reiterate the lack of social responsibility, JATAN criticizes the companies for ignoring the destruction of forests and failing to address it. JATAN (1994a) says:

Japanese trading companies clearly understood the depletion of forest resources because they went to exporting countries to buy timber and witnessed the depletion. Nonetheless, the companies ignored negative impacts of logging on the local society and continued to purchase a lot of logs harvested in a certain area. After the forest resource in the area became completely depleted, they moved to another area to harvest trees. They repeated such socially irresponsible acts over and over again (p. 67).

Describing these problems implies that those companies could have taken preventive measures against depletion of forest resources and addressed social problems caused by their logging. Thus, the companies are portrayed as failing to fulfill their responsibilities, and they seem to deserve to be blamed. It may be Japanese consumers who over-used timber products and caused excessive timber demand, but the audience can believe that the lack of social responsibility by the companies is worse than their crime.
2) Japanese Government

Second, JATAN argues that the Japanese national government should also be blamed for deforestation in timber exporting countries. JATAN claims that the government was not considerate of environmental and social impacts caused by logging. JATAN (1994a) says:

Tokyo did not consider how a governmental plan of timber import would affect the local populations of exporting countries. It set up the plan simply for meeting domestic timber demand. As a result, Tokyo contributed to irresponsible acts of Japanese trading companies through improvement of domestic infrastructure, the Official Development Aid, ODA, and other official flows, OOF (p. 69).

The Japanese government was wrong because it gave the first priority to meeting domestic timber demand and failed to consider environmental and social impacts of its decision. Public construction projects in connection with domestic infrastructure are often included in a national economic stimulus plan that aims to create new jobs. The construction projects tend to involve public utilities that used a lot of tropical plywood and other imported timber. Promotion of public construction by the government resulted in increase of Japan's use of imported timber products (JATAN, 1994a). JATAN's argument indicates that the government's domestic infrastructure projects violated values of nature. Thus, the government looks indifferent to the environment; they used forest resources for a selfish purpose because the primary interest was to procure enough timber for domestic use and did not seem to consider anything but this. Highlighting such apathetic behavior toward nature, JATAN encourages the audiences to believe that the government violates the Japanese social norm that prohibits the citizens from using nature for a selfish purpose.
Further, JATAN says that the government emphasized domestic affairs and did not consider local populations when supporting Japanese companies that planned to enter foreign markets to procure timber for domestic use. To stress such attitude, JATAN quotes from a report by the Overseas Economic Corporation Fund (1970), saying, “It is needless to say that our country (Japan) will gain significant benefit through helping Japanese companies enter the international markets (to procure timber)” (p. 167).

However, it can be natural for a national government to focus more on domestic affairs. But criticizing such political attitudes helps JATAN influence the audiences to believe differently. The criticism can highlight what the government did not do and make the domestic policy look wrong. The criticism also guides the audiences to apply their social norm that encourages consideration for others to a larger community. JATAN has already raised concern for local populations in the discussion of the problems suffered by local populations. By using this existing concern, JATAN’s criticism is building on this appeal. Based on JATAN’s rhetoric, the audience may come to believe that the government was wrong and should have been considered about the people outside of Japan based on the norm.

Moreover, JATAN contends that the Japanese government needs to correct prices of timber (by raising tariffs). JATAN (1994a) laments, “It is unjust that price of a konpane, wooden frame for cement, is just 900 yen (about eight U.S. dollars), although it took hundreds of years for the trees used for producing such frame to grow” (p. 69). JATAN argues that the prices should reflect the value of the trees that lived for hundreds of years. It says that, at present, the prices of timber discourage plantation after logging and careful logging operation in timber-export countries to minimize adverse effects of
logging on the environment because both the plantation and careful operation may require more cost, and thus contribute to acceleration of forest destruction. The current prices of the timber also foster Japan's throwaway principle of wood products that originates from the lack of understanding the value of trees used for manufacturing the products. JATAN (1994a) says, "Plywood is often used to make furniture such as bookshelves of reasonable prices. Because of the prices, such furniture is more likely to be disposed easily when people are moving" (p.65). JATAN's argument guides the audiences to believe that the unjustly cheap prices lead Japanese consumers to overlook values of old trees and encourage them to consume timber products wastefully. Instead of placing all the blames on the consumers, JATAN attempts to put some of them on the government, which helps to alleviate self-criticism about the throwing-away attitude that some of the audience may have. The audiences may be influenced by JATAN's argument about the timber prices and come to think in the following way. Because the government has the responsibility for the unjust prices of imported timber as well as for the problems in the timber export countries and the problems within Japan, the Japanese government should increase the price, which would rectify Japan's wasteful consumption.

3) Japanese Consumers

Lastly, JATAN refers to the responsibility of Japanese consumers. After learning the relationship between their consumption and deforestation and blaming the responsible parties other than themselves, the audiences are better prepared to learn about and accept their own responsibility. JATAN (1994a) says, "We are also responsible for deforestation because we are the citizens of the society that has destroyed forests of Indonesia" (p. 69).
However, JATAN's rhetoric here shows a contrast to its rhetoric used in discussing crimes of Japanese corporations and the national government in connection with deforestation. JATAN's tone here does not sound accusatory. But rather, it seems to produce a social obligation shared by Japanese citizens as consumers of imported timber product. In order to produce it, JATAN begins arguments by clarifying the relationship between Japan's timber trade and deforestation to promote a sense of guilt. Then, it moves to ask for the consumers' cooperative actions in protecting the forests. For instance, JATAN (1994a) mentions, "Destruction of forests has dramatically changed society of timber producing countries. But many of us do not realize that the houses we live in were constructed at the sacrifice of the local populations" (p. 69). JATAN attempts to remind Japanese audiences about the relationship between their consumption of timber products and the consequences that happened outside of Japan. Earlier discussion has shown that the consumption can adversely affect the environment and local societies of the countries that export timber products to Japan. In discussions on deforestation in Australia, JATAN (2001h) argues, "It is clear that Japan is deeply involved in deforestation by manufacturing paper and consuming it" (¶ 2). After clarifying Japan's involvement, JATAN (2001h) continues to say, "This means we have the key to protecting (Australia's) old-growth forests" (¶ 2). Likewise, JATAN (2001c) argues, "All woodchips produced here are exported to Japan (for domestic use). . . . It is necessary for Japanese citizens to know what is happening here and to take some actions against woodchip production" (¶ 16). JATAN highlights the responsibility of Japanese citizens to protect forests by referring to the relationship between deforestation in Australia and Japan's import of woodchips. Then, JATAN presents the need for actions by Japanese citizens in protecting
the forests. To invited many participants in the actions, JATAN uses the words, *we* and *our*, which imply that the obligation is societal.

In the discussion of the responsibility of Japanese consumers, JATAN attempts to make Japanese audiences more critical about their consumption pattern as well as to create a social obligation to change their consumption pattern that negatively affects the environment and the lives of local populations. JATAN discusses what Japanese citizens can do for reducing their consumption of imported timber products to protect forests. It suggests that the citizens reduce, reuse, and recycle the goods that they use. By presenting social obligations and describing forest values, JATAN attempts to encourage the audiences to have a new way of thinking about nature; nature can be used, but not selfishly.

**Diversion from the Behaviors of Japanese Corporation**

One of the effects of the scapegoating process is to divert attention from the aspects that the rhetor does not want to emphasize. Like FoE-J’s diversion of attention from sustainable forest management, JATAN also uses this effect in its rhetoric to avoid implementing change in Japanese corporations, which will be more difficult than the audience to reuse and recycle timber products. Japanese corporations include timber companies, construction companies, traders, paper manufactures and other business that are involved in timber imports and use imported timber. Although JATAN criticizes these companies for causing deforestation, ultimate purpose of JATAN’s rhetoric is to direct Japanese citizens to decrease their use of timber products. Most of the criticism
involves broad descriptions of the Japanese industries such as “Japanese paper manufacturers” (JATAN, 2001b, ¶ 4), or “Japanese trading companies” (JATAN, 1994, p.67) rather than referring to the name of individual company. It may not be so influential that it can bring about the change of the corporations’ behavior. However, this change may have a more significant impact on minimizing deforestation in Japan’s timber trade because those corporations are the ones that help to provide goods manufactured from timber to Japanese citizens. For instance, if a paper manufacturer uses more recycled paper instead of woodchips of old-growth trees (JATAN, 1994b), this change will lead to a sharp decline in Japan’s use of woodchips. This change may be easy to envision, but difficult to implement due to the market system that encompasses a lot of smaller-sized companies that are involved in the distribution of the woodchips. Effects of the change in paper manufacturers may result in repercussions to the smaller companies under the umbrella of these manufactures. Some companies may lose economic profits and have layoffs due to less use of imported woodchips. Also because Japanese corporations are connected with each other based on personal relationships rather than business contracts, it may be difficult for JATAN to change business practices of the Japanese corporations. For JATAN, it is easier to change consumers’ behaviors rather than the companies' behaviors that entail more obstacles. In JATAN’s rhetoric, these companies are scapegoats whose role is to be blamed, and they are not required to change. However, avoiding the issue of their change may limit the effects of JATAN’s rhetoric, which may be necessary to resolve deforestation. For the Japanese corporations that are not supposed to change, decreasing timber consumption only by Japanese consumers means loss of economic profits. As a result, these corporations would attempt to sell their products to
other countries, switching the markets. Deforestation caused by Japan’s trade would continue to occur.
Conclusion

Both FoE-J and JATAN attempt to minimize deforestation in the world by reducing Japan’s use of imported timber. They appeal to Japanese cultural beliefs about nature and community when arguing about deforestation and the environmental and social problems caused by deforestation. The cultural beliefs about nature are influenced by the lessons of Zen Buddhism that encourage people to see nature as a friend whose inner being is thoroughly like their own and prohibit them to use nature for a selfish purpose. Both FoE-J and JATAN use these beliefs as ethical standards later when blaming responsible actors that cause or contribute to causing deforestation.

Japanese cultural beliefs about community promote cooperation with fellow members of a community and strongly discourage the citizens from criticizing these members. Both FoE-J and JATAN use these beliefs to gain support from the audiences. For this purpose, these environmental groups attempt to construct shared interests with the audiences in solving deforestation because it occurs outside of Japan and does not seem to affect their daily life or to be caused by them. Those interests give meaningful relationships between the audiences and the problem, leading them to identify themselves with FoE-J and JATAN and to locate these groups inside of the community.

The cultural beliefs about community and about nature interrelate with each other in the environmental discourse undertaken by FoE-J and JATAN. As discussed, these beliefs involve identification with the audiences based on shared interests. My analysis of the discourse has showed how these environmental groups strive to lead the audiences
to identify themselves with them, how shared interests play crucial roles in such an identification process, and how these groups attempt to strengthen the identification.

**Similarities and Differences**

FoE-J and JATAN share some rhetorical strategies because both of these groups want to deliver the message to the general public in Japan. They are interested in emphasizing the values of forests, constructing shared interests, and avoiding direct criticism of Japanese people when implying or alluding to Japan's over-consumption of imported timber. However, their strategies also have differences in how they construct the shared interests due to the different methods and solutions each of them chooses to decrease Japan's use of imported timber.

Both of these environmental groups emphasize biodiversity and endangered species to explain values of the forests. This description directs Japanese audiences to look at the organisms that support the lives of various wildlife and plants in the forests. Both of the groups discuss the diversity of these lives, the potential extinction that some of these species face, and the importance of maintaining this diversity, downplaying commercial value of timber in the forest. Because this discussion focuses on the importance of the lives, it reminds the audiences about Japanese cultural beliefs about nature that teach the importance of all the lives in nature and encourages people to respect them.

Both FoE-J and JATAN portray deforestation as shared interests with Japanese citizens. As mentioned above, the shared interests indicate that these citizens are either
affected by a problem or responsible for it, and thus they may need to take action to avoid or solve it. Because the groups are concerned with different forests and timber products, they focus on different aspects of the shared interests. FoE-J is interested in potential environmental and social effects on Japan caused by deforestation, whereas JATAN focuses on environmental and social problems caused by deforestation in connection with Japan’s trade. In both cases, the groups try to depict deforestation as a shared interest among Japanese citizens.

FoE-J emphasizes Japan-oriented problems to describe how Japan and the citizens could be affected by deforestation in the Russian Taiga. Using language in this way, FoE-J wants Japanese audiences to see themselves as the victims of deforestation, stimulating a sense of crisis among these audiences. To deal with this crisis, FoE-J encourages them to use more domestic lumber rather than imported timber. In contrast, JATAN highlights local problems in Indonesia and Malaysia to show how Japanese citizens have contributed to deforestation in the world and how they have affected the environment and local populations negatively. JATAN depicts local populations as the victims of deforestation to arouse a sense of guilt among the audiences for their consumption of timber products. To overcome this guilt, JATAN encourages the audiences to change their consumption habits and reuse and recycle wood products to decrease their use of imported timber. Both of these environmental groups use the parties of adversarial interests with FoE-J and JATAN as scapegoats and portray their actions as ethically wrong based on Zen Buddhism beliefs about nature. This portrait aims at separating the adversaries from the community. Both FoE-J and JATAN attempt to strengthen the
identification with the audiences by the scapegoating timber companies, symbolically casting them outside the community of shared Japanese values.

Both FoE-J and JATAN use scapegoating to avoid direct criticism of Japanese audiences by attempting to depict them as greedy, selfish, and irresponsible. They blame the responsible actors in foreign countries such as logging companies and local law-enforcement officers, highlighting these actors’ profit-oriented attitudes and apathy toward the environment. These accusations encourage moral indignation by appealing to the Japanese social norm and beliefs about nature. Criticizing the responsible actors deflects the audiences’ attention from their own guilt and thus allows FoE-J and JATAN to avoid direct criticism of the Japanese public. Using the actors in other countries as scapegoats, these environmental groups can maintain its location in the Japanese society even if they allude to criticism of Japan’s guilt in deforestation.

FoE-J and JATAN do condemn actors in Japan, but they manage to avoid violating the Japanese social norm about criticism. FoE-J criticizes the Japanese housing industry, but this claim can be exempted from the violation because of the serious, fatal health risks posed by this industry. The health risks are depicted as a threat to the society, so the industry can be seen as deserving blame and dislocated from their community. Audiences would be unlikely to see FoE-J as violating the social norm when criticizing such a socially harmful industry. JATAN argues the guilt of the Japanese national government, corporations, and consumers by using the following words: Japan and responsibility. The first word aids JATAN to avoid criticizing the audiences directly by obscuring who is represented by this word. The second word helps JATAN divert the audiences’ attention from their crime to the forests. It also produces a social obligation
toward the future rather than assigning about the past, which may be more acceptable for
the audiences. Using these strategies, both FoE-J and JATAN can continue to blame the
responsible actors in Japan for deforestation without alienating the audiences.

However, the scapegoating process does not necessarily help FoE-J and JATAN
address how to provoke sustainable Japanese forest management or change the behavior
of Japanese corporation. As discussed above, the scapegoating process focuses on
someone's guilt. Highlighting such guilt helps to divert attention from other responsible
parties and other aspects of deforestation or the problems that may be more difficult to
deal with. For example, FoE-J uses this feature to avoid the issues of sustainable forest
management in Japan supported by sufficient annual growth of trees. JATAN’s
scapegoating deflects attention from needed changes in the business practices of Japanese
corporations that import timber and/or manufacture goods to sell to the citizens (Luke,
1997). That change might be more influential than the change in consumption behavior of
individual citizens in Japan. But it may be more challenging to address and solve it
because of the distribution and commercial channels that have been existed, developed,
and operated since the 1960s when Japan's timber demand grew sharply in accordance
with the rapid economic growth (Marchak, 1995 and Blandon, 1999). Besides, Japanese
construction companies tend to have political power thanks to their close ties with the
politicians of Japan’s major political party (Bevis, 1995). They may attempt to put
political pressure on JATAN to impede any change in business practices that would
negatively affect their industry and the relationships with their business partners unless
this change has the economic incentives that overcome such problems. Rather than
addressing those difficult problems, it is easier for JATAN to ask the audiences to reuse and recycle timber products.

**Theoretical Implications of FoE-J' and JATAN's Rhetoric**

The rhetorical strategies employed by FoE-J and JATAN indicate that the process of identification aims at achieving social unity with the target audiences to acquire their support in solving the problem that these environmental groups are concerned with. These groups present shared interests with Japanese citizens, which lead to identification with the audiences. The Japanese sense of community usually is applied to the problems within Japan. However, FoE-J’s and JATAN’s rhetoric expands identification and shared interests beyond geographical boundaries by showing how Japan can be affected by deforestation and why it is responsible for this environmental issue. The Japanese sense of nature is affected by the sense of community. When Japan is negatively affected by destruction of nature in other countries or is responsible for harming it, the lessons of Zen Buddhism is applied to minimizing this destruction. Thus, the sense of nature is expanded beyond Japan’s boundaries. FoE-J stresses negative environmental impacts on Japan caused by deforestation in Russia to encourage the audiences to apply those lessons. JATAN manages to use the Japanese sense of community when describing the plight of local populations on other countries based on Japan’s responsibility for problems that affect those populations. Identification through shared interests direct the audiences to employ Japanese cultural beliefs about community and nature to the problems outside of Japan.
The rhetorical strategies also suggest that both FoE-J and JATAN attempt to maintain support from the audiences acquired in the process of identification. For this purpose, they use scapegoating process in which they blame the responsible parties other than Japanese consumers for causing deforestation. This process has the following effects that help them achieve the purpose. Criticizing these parties allows FoE-J and JATAN to strengthen identification with the audiences and to resolve two rhetorical problems: maintaining the argument of deforestation without criticizing them, and avoiding more difficult issues.

Discussing deforestation without criticizing the cause, over-consumption of timber products by Japanese consumers, would be extremely difficult without scapegoats that take all of the blame. As discussed above, both FoE-J and JATAN use the scapegoating process to avoid the direct criticism. As long as they criticize the scapegoats, the audiences can avoid looking at their own guilt that causes deforestation. FoE-J and JATAN can continue to argue about deforestation caused by Japan's timber trade. By using the scapegoating process, both of these groups can simplify the causes of deforestation. As discussed at the outset of this paper, deforestation tends to involve multiple causes, interweaving with each other. However, rather than addressing these complex causes, both FoE-J and JATAN seem to attempt to keep the causes of deforestation as simple as they could. Both of them outline more complicated aspects of the causes, and JATAN refers to more of these aspects than FoE-J does. But both of them tend not to discuss the complicated parts in detail. Instead, they highlight the crimes of scapegoats and elaborate these crimes. Simplifying the causes of deforestation may hamper the audiences from understanding the problems fully, but this rhetorical strategy
may prevent confusion of the audiences, allow them to learn about these problems easier, and to interpret the problems as FoE-J and JATAN hope to. Thus, simplifying the causes can contribute to motivating the audiences to give support to these environmental groups. Nonetheless, it is a difficult choice to decide whether an environmental group should maintain arguments of deforestation simple or it should discuss complexity of this issue. However, the choice seems to depend on the audiences the environmental group targets. When the target audiences are the general public that has various values and different levels of interests in deforestation, keeping the cause and arguments simple may be appropriate. However, when such audiences are the certain group of citizens who have strong interests in this issue, the environmental group may want to present more detailed, complex causes and arguments.

Further, scapegoating allows both FoE-J and JATAN to avoid addressing more difficult problems. For FoE-J, dealing with sustainable forest management in Japan would be more complex than directing the audience to use more domestic lumber. Such management may require it to have a long-term perspective, considering practical problems such as labor force, silviculturalists, and scientific research to find out sustainable level of harvestable amounts of trees. Meanwhile, for JATAN, it would be more laborious to change the behaviors of the Japanese corporations that include Japanese traders, construction companies, and paper manufactures than to ask the audiences to reuse and recycle timber products. Changing these corporations' behaviors means changing commercial and distribution channels. JATAN may need to provide them economic incentives to show such change would lead to an increase in economic profit. To avoid addressing those complex, laborious issues, both FoE-J and JATAN take
advantage of the scapegoating process that directs the audiences to concentrate on the crimes committed by the scapegoats.

**Practical Strategies: Assessing the Strengths and Limitations of FoE-J’s and JATAN’s Rhetoric**

The analyses of the rhetorical strategies by FoE-J and JATAN indicate both strengths and limitations. The strengths help these environmental groups appeal to the general public. But the limitations may prevent them from sustaining their projects or minimizing deforestation in any significant way. Learning about these strengths and limitations will provide valuable lessons to improve the strategies of FoE-J and JATAN. Learning about them can also help other Japanese environmental groups make strategies in communicating with the general public. I will discuss the strengths and limitations to explore how the strategies can be improved.

FoE-J’s rhetoric may help to achieve three positive results. First, it may minimize deforestation in other countries, especially in Russia by reducing Japan’s over-consumption of imported lumber. Second, the rhetoric, which emphasizes the increase in Japan’s use of domestic lumber, may help Japan achieve self-sufficiency. Currently, Japanese forest industry meets less than 20 percent of Japan’s total timber demand (Helten et al., 1999). Third, the rhetoric can lead the audiences to support FoE-J and its suggestion that Japan should use more domestic lumber. The rhetoric portrays this suggestion as imminent and necessary due to a clear connection between deforestation in Russia and the negative effects on Japanese citizens. The rhetoric also makes the
suggestion more acceptable because FoE-J depicts these citizens as the victims of
deforestation, not as the contributors. Considering those three strengths, FoE-J’s rhetoric
seems to serve the following five interests. They include FoE-J, all of the species that live
in the Russian Taiga, the local populations whose lives depend on the healthy Taiga,
Japanese forest industry, and the Japanese general public who want to avoid the crisis
caused by deforestation in the Taiga and by using imported timber. But the rhetoric may
exclude the interests of the species in Japan’s forests, and Japanese citizens who live near
the forests and thus could be affected by the increase in domestic logging. The exclusion
of these interests leads to the limitations of FoE-J’s rhetoric.

These limitations are the lack of consideration about environmental impacts on
Japan’s forests and the problem of Japan’s over-consumption. FoE-J’s encouragement of
using more domestic lumber is likely to destroy the ecological integrity in Japan’s forests
as a result of an increase in their harvesting. This encouragement also can cause more
conversion of Japan’s natural forests to plantations and a decrease in Japan’s natural
forests. According to Peter Blandon (1999), author of Japan and World Timber Markets,
40 percent of Japan’s forests is man-made forests. Most of them were converted from
natural, broad-leaf forests to the commercially valuable, coniferous during late 1950s
when Japan was in post-housing boom and ran out of timber due to over-logging (Helen
et al., 1999). The World Wildlife Fund classifies the conservation status of most of the
Japan’s natural forests as either critical or endangered (2001a-d). If domestic timber
demand increases as FoE-J hopes, over-logging could happen again. New man-made
forests could be made, and the remnant of Japan’s natural forests will be further
diminished.
FoE-J’s rhetoric increases the potential of these problems. It ignores the problem of Japan’s over-consumption of timber products, while focusing on the increase in its use of domestic timber. Because FoE-J does not address the fundamental problem that caused deforestation, encouraging the audiences to use more domestic lumber will simply shift deforestation problems back to Japan.

To overcome these limitations, FoE-J may want to draw more attention to the relationship between Japan’s over-consumption of timber products and the environmental consequences. Without the change in this consumption pattern, deforestation will not be minimized. FoE-J can also protect Japan’s diminishing natural forests from further conversion by advocating specific sustainable harvesting to avoid over-logging in man-made forests. FoE-J may be interested in using a sense of crisis when discussing the problems of the over-consumption and problems of more loss of Japan’s natural forests by focusing on the negative effects on Japanese forests caused by such consumption.

Like FoE-J’s rhetoric, JATAN’s rhetoric may help to minimize deforestation in other countries and alleviate some of the social problems in connection with deforestation by changing the consumption pattern of Japanese citizens to reduce their use of imported timber. JATAN argues that Japan is responsible for deforestation and the environmental and social problems that give suffer to local populations. It attempts to stimulate a sense of guilt among the audiences and describes Japan’s over-consumption of timber products as the driving force to rampant logging and corruption in timber-export countries that cause deforestation. To be responsible for what they have caused, JATAN suggests that Japanese citizens should change their consumption behavior. Unlike FoE-J that avoids dealing with these issues, JATAN endeavors to address the fundamental problem of
deforestation and implement the change by pointing out Japan’s involvement in
deforestation and teaching the audiences how local populations suffer from it.

JATAN’s rhetoric may also lead the audiences to understand the connection
between their consumption of timber products and the environmental consequences.
Understanding this connection will encourage Japanese citizens to reuse and recycle
these products. Like FoE-J’s rhetoric, JATAN’s rhetoric also seems to serve the interests
of the species in the forests, local populations whose lives depend on the health of these
forests, and the Japanese general public who wants to resolve the guilt of their
consumption that they are persuaded to feel. But JATAN seems to ignore the interests of
the public who have lived in a society of mass-consumption for a long time and may be
reluctant to change their lifestyle. JATAN also ignores the interests of the Japanese
corporations that may be crucial to decreasing Japan’s use of imported timber. Excluding
these interests leads to the limitations of JATAN’s rhetoric.

Several factors seem to limit the influence of JATAN’s rhetoric on the general
Japanese audiences and Japanese corporations. First, JATAN attempts to decrease
Japan’s consumption of timber products without tangible alternatives for goods
manufactured from wood, depending too much on the change in consumption pattern of
Japanese citizens. For instance, paper can be manufactured from straw (Koehler, 2001).
Providing such alternatives will result in the decrease in Japan’s use of timber product.
Changing the consumption pattern may result in some decrease in Japan’s use of timber
products. But the citizens may feel that their individual actions will not make a difference
and that decreasing Japan’s use of those products only by their lifestyle change is too
daunting. JATAN’s strategy may appeal to few Japanese citizens because the lifestyle
change that JATAN calls for involves a fundamental transformation of how they live, but the result of their daily effort can be trifling. The gap between the trifling results of individual efforts and the significant change in their lifestyle may hamper citizens from taking action. Some audiences may give up the hope for decreasing timber products before trying. Others may reject the suggestion by JATAN if they are not willing to make a drastic change in lifestyle. JATAN's rhetoric offers little in the way of tangible, feasible alternatives to wood consumption.

Second, JATAN does not seek any options for sustainable logging in tropical forests of Indonesia and Malaysia, which may help to resolve one of the causes of deforestation, a need of economic development. Although there are no tangible methods yet, FoE-J strives to find how to manage the Russian Taiga sustainably and how to integrate conservation and the development. Unlike FoE-J, JATAN does not seem to address these tasks. The major factor of illegal logging that JATAN condemns relates to the need. The tasks are significantly challenging, but solving the problems JATAN presents may not be achieved unless it looks at the future and attempts to undertake the integration of the environmental and economic concerns in the forests. These problems include maintaining biodiversity and species extinction and sustaining cultural significance of the forests, which relate to future concern of forest protection. The solutions and prevention of the reoccurrence may require long-term coexistence of conservation and the development. JATAN argues that the increase in import tax for timber products by the Japanese government would contribute to implementation of sustainable logging practices in the countries of tropical forests, but this argument may be weak. The price increase would enhance revenue of the national governments of such
countries, but does not necessarily link with the economic development for the local populations. Without the choices for the integration of conservation and the development, the people who are involved in illegal and destructive logging practices may not stop these practices because they do not have a real incentive for sustaining forest resources. There are no fixed measures for sustainable logging because ecosystems vary from one region to the other. But selective logging and planting native tree species after logging can help to achieve sustainable forest management. These methods tend to be less harmful to the forests than clear-cutting and monocultural, exotic plantation. But they could result in some decrease in the current economic profits. Selective logging is not labor-intensive like clear-cutting. Native plants may take longer time to be harvested than the monocultural plantation does because this plantation tends to use genetically engineered plants for faster growth (JATAN, 1994b). To implement sustainable logging practices, promotion of non-timber products also may be necessary to compensate for the loss.

Third, JATAN blames too many actors for deforestation, which may confuse the audiences about the causes of deforestation and what should be done. Blaming in such a way may lead the audiences to wonder why they have to sacrifice their lives when there are many other responsible parties, and feel that other parties will make an effort to minimize deforestation if the audiences do not. This aspect of JATAN's rhetoric may actually minimize a sense of responsibility among the audiences and weaken their desire to change their consumption pattern. As mentioned earlier, it is difficult to choose whether an environmental group keeps arguments of deforestation simple by attacking limited numbers of responsible actors as the cause or draws audiences' attention to the
complex, interweaving causes. However, it may be necessary for such a group to simplify the argument that aims at reaching the general public.

Fourth, as discussed in the previous section of the similarities and differences, JATAN pays little attention to changing the behavior and business practices undertaken by the Japanese corporations. However, because those corporations import timber and/or manufacture and sell goods in Japan, their changes may be influential in addressing deforestation. If Japanese citizens reduce their consumption of timber products, the corporations may look at new markets in other countries to sell their products. In fact, Japan's neighbor countries, China and South Korea, are also the major timber importers (Bourke, 2000). Especially, China's timber demand has grown rapidly along with the growth of the population and rapid economic development, and China is seen as a potential lucrative timber market (Yang, 1997). By switching markets, the corporations would repeat the same practices, and the issue of deforestation caused by Japan's trade would not be solved. Focusing on the change in the Japanese corporations is essential in addressing deforestation in connection with the global timber trade.

To achieve the protection of the world's forests, JATAN could consider four rhetorical strategies. First, JATAN could issue a call for action in relation to these corporations. It needs to be sensitive to possible incentives for change; building a positive image of corporations or saving expenses can be included in the options. Eco-labels may be one of the options. These labels would show not only the corporations reuse and recycle the materials but also they use the trees from sustainably managed forests. Second, JATAN may also need to show a clearer picture of what causes deforestation. If it is interested in the discussion about the multiple, complex causes, JATAN may want to
reorganize the information about these causes to clarify the interrelationships among them. Because JATAN criticizes everybody who is involved in deforestation without explaining well how they are connected with each other, the audiences may feel overwhelmed and may get confused about why Japanese citizens are blamed. The audiences also may become unsure about whom they can identify themselves with and whether JATAN is a fellow member or outside in their community. Such confusion could disturb their belief about the shared interests with JATAN that it has presented. JATAN can use a diagram or present a summary of their discussion before they start the discussion about the citizens’ responsibility. Third, JATAN could present potential methods for sustainable logging practices in the countries with tropical forests to resolve deforestation and anticipate the reoccurrence in connection with the need of economic development. Lastly, JATAN needs to be more vigorous advocate of alternative materials that can substitute for wood. These alternatives can decrease the amount of harvesting and can serve as a shock absorber for the citizens who are reluctant to sacrifice their lifestyle supported by mass-consumption.

To make their rhetoric more persuasive for minimizing deforestation in other countries, both FoE-J and JATAN may want consider several rhetorical and conservation strategies. FoE-J can show a connection between over-consumption of timber products by Japanese consumers and the environmental outcomes, and advocate sustainable harvesting in Japan’s forests based on more holistic and long-term perspectives. JATAN may be interested in the following points: promoting the alternative materials, integrating conservation and development projects, and encouraging Japanese corporations to change
their business practices with the incentives that can lead to more economic profits based on better corporate image.

These changes would present Japanese audiences a more comprehensible and relative picture between causes and effects surrounding deforestation. Both FoE-J and JATAN need to be sensitive to how to organize their argument to give a clear picture, which may result in strengthening motivation of these audiences to work toward solving the issues. The changes also could provide FoE-J and JATAN sustainable and practical approaches, necessary to implement the enduring efforts by the environmental groups and audience. By making the environmental strategies more persuasive and practicable through those changes, both FoE-J and JATAN can address more complex issues that impede resolution of deforestation: Japan's over consumption and the business practices of Japanese corporations, which have been existed for a long time and thus require long-term efforts.

All of these changes may be vital for FoE-J and JATAN to minimize deforestation in the world. Nonetheless, solving this problem is still difficult because it is a complex issue, intertwined with cultural, social, and political aspects of the countries involving timber trade. There may be no single solution. However, environmental action to deal with this problem should start from the changes in Japanese citizens who contribute to causing this problem. To make these changes happen, language is an essential means that fosters understanding of the problem, motivates Japanese audiences for taking action, and encourages them to maintain it. Both FoE-J and JATAN can take advantage of the power of rhetoric.
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