Notes

An early political map of Antarctica
Rip Bulkeley

38 Lonsdale Road, Oxford, OX2 7EW (rip@igy50.net)

were only the third published map to use the name 'Antarctica', and only the second to use it as a legend within the map. They are different in several ways from the only previous such map, published by JGB's father John Bartholomew Jr. in 1887 (Woodburn 2008). The paperweights map uses a more emphatically dotted line to draw a shape which is closer to that

The pair of paperweights illustrated on the front cover of this issue of *Polar Record* and reproduced as Fig. 1 were made in 1889 at the Burslem pottery of James Macintyre & Co. (best known for employing William Moorcroft a few years later) using maps engraved by the Edinburgh firm of J.G. Bartholomew (JGB). Macintyre produced other paperweights with Bartholomew maps of Central Africa, India, British South Africa and the rarest, Australasia, to a pottery design 9.9cm in diameter, weight 333gm, registered as No.141265. The correspondence shows that the hemispheres came first, and were intended to feature the British Empire worldwide, although that political appellation does not appear.

The paperweights have a dual significance for Antarctic history. First, as previously mentioned (Bulkeley 2015), they

conjectured by Heinrich Berghaus in the 1840s (also usually on two hemispheres) than to the vague outline published by JGB's father just two years earlier.

The second Antarctic aspect of the paperweights is that, whereas British navigators including Bransfield (1820), Biscoe (1832) and Ross (1841) had made inchoate claims to portions of Antarctica on behalf of the British crown, the western hemisphere map created by JGB in 1889 took the next step, by treating such claims as if they had been perfected. Customers could pay for different amounts of tinting added to transfers taken from the engravings. Some have no colour added; in others only the sea is coloured. The empire is less visible in those examples. In this fully coloured version, however, Victoria Land and a poorly located Graham Land (detail) are just

as much British possessions as the Kermadec Islands, formally annexed in January 1887. As early as 1868 JGB's father had published an empire map which showed Victoria Land, the Balleny Islands and Enderby Land as British possessions, daubed a provocative red smudge across an unnamed Wilkes Land, and added 'Kerguelen's Land' into the bargain. But in 1868 Graham Land and the South Shetlands, though shown, were not included in the empire, one foreign discovery, Adelie Land, was shown, and there was no outline of an Antarctic continent to draw the parts together (Bartholomew 1868: Sheet 1). By 1889, although Wilkes Land was shown and not claimed, the overall possessive political impression created by the paperweights map was clearer and stronger, as British geographers became steadily more confident that Antarctica existed.

References

Bartholomew, J. 1868. *Atlas of the British Empire throughout the world.* London: Philip and Son.

Bulkeley, R. 2015. Naming Antarctica. *Polar Record.* doi: 10.1017/S0032247415000200.

Woodburn, S. 2008. John George Bartholomew and the naming of Antarctica. *Cairt* 12: 4–6.

Early sealing regimes: the Bering Sea fur seal regime *vis-à-vis* Finnish–Soviet fishing and sealing agreements

Nikolas Sellheim

Faculty of Law, University of Lapland, PO Box 122, 96101 Rovaniemi, Finland (nikolas.sellheim@ulapland.fi)

ABSTRACT. Environmental management had its early stages in the early years of the 20th century. This note contrasts the different regimes that emerged with regard to the management of seals and the seal hunt: the well-researched Bering Sea regime and the little known regimes between Finland and the Soviet Union. While the former shaped and already embedded principles of modern environmental law and has the seal population as its primary focus, the latter agreements did not make reference to the environmental dimension of the seal hunt, but must be read against the backdrop of the difficult border situations between the two countries.

Introduction

The modern dimensions of environmental law and policy are often traced back to Carson's famous treatise *Silent spring* (Carson 1962) that triggered the emergence of the environmental movement. Large international gatherings, such as the UN Conference on the Human Environment of 1972 in Stockholm or the UN Conference on Environment and Development of 1992 in Rio de Janeiro, serve as benchmarks for shaping international environmental law (Birnie and others 2009: 48–50). But environmental decision-making had seen its beginning many decades before the emergence of the League of Nations and the United Nations. This was especially with regard to the protection of specific species or ecosystems that provided marine resources for motivated states to enter into bi- or multilateral agreements (Koivurova 2013: 31).

This note briefly presents some agreements with regard to the seal resource that emerged in the Bering Sea as well as between Finland and the Soviet Union. While seemingly both are environmental in character, seal management occurred under significantly different premises in the two cases.

The Bering Sea fur seal agreements

The fur seal hunts in the Bering Sea

In the late 1700s and early 1800s, large populations of fur seals were discovered on the Pribilof Islands, a group of several volcanic islands the most important of which are St. Paul and St. George, north of the Aleutian Islands. With the decline of otters, the hunt of the abundant seal populations was conducted in an unregulated manner under the auspices of the Russian-American Company, leading to an overabundance of unusable seal skins and associated drastic decline in the seal population. Given the decline in numbers, the years 1806–1807 saw no hunt for fur seals in the Pribilofs for the herd to recover. In 1808, however, unregulated killing continued until the enactment of the first killing bans: in 1822 a two year ban was issued for St. Paul; a seasonal ban for the 1826–1827 season in St. George and another two-year ban for St. Paul in 1835–1837. During the time of heavy exploitation of the seals in the Pribilof Islands the human population of the Aleutian Islands was under the dominance of the Russian-American Company which relocated them to the Pribilofs in order to enable the company to uphold its demand for seal furs (Bonner 1982: 48; Busch 1985: 100, 101; Stone 2005: 47). In light of the declining seal populations, Russia pushed for a more regulated hunt in order to protect the herds. To this end specific regulations were established that protected females from the hunt and enabled only the hunt of premature males. Due to these protective measures by 1867 the seal population had increased significantly (Bonner 1982: 48; Busch 1985: 100).

With the sale of Alaska to the United States in 1867 the seal hunt fell under American jurisdiction and although the US intended to continue with the Russian scheme of protecting female seals, heavy sealing operations decimated the seal herds. Therefore, in 1869 the Pribilof Islands were protected as a special reservation for fur seals with the control over the sale of sealing rights to the Alaskan Commercial Company. Hunting of females and young seals under one year was now prohibited and sealing operations were only allowed in the months of June, July, September and October (Bonner 1982: 48; Busch 1985: 107).

The Bering Sea sealing agreements

Throughout the latter half of the 19th century until the early 20th century, it was especially Russian, American, Japanese and Canadian/British schooners which hunted large numbers of