

Rebecca Korda  
Tim Gray  
Selina M. Stead

# Resilience in the English Small-Scale Fishery

Small Fry but Big Issue

 Springer

# Resilience in the English Small-Scale Fishery

Rebecca Korda • Tim Gray • Selina M. Stead

# Resilience in the English Small-Scale Fishery

Small Fry but Big Issue

 Springer

Rebecca Korda  
Newcastle University  
Brighton, UK

Tim Gray  
Newcastle University  
Northumberland, UK

Selina M. Stead  
University of Stirling  
Stirling, UK

ISBN 978-3-030-54244-3      ISBN 978-3-030-54245-0 (eBook)  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-54245-0>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG  
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

*This book is dedicated to Becca's partner, Iain, and their son, Toby, as well as to the inshore fishers living and working around the English coast. You are all inspirational.*

# Acknowledgements

This book originated from a PhD thesis submitted by Rebecca Korda to Newcastle University in 2019, supervised by Professors Tim Gray and Selina Stead. We are grateful to the university for providing the facilities which made the PhD doctoral research possible and to the examiners (Professors Svein Jentoft and Jeremy Phillipson) whose feedback helped shape this work. Becca thanks her employer, Natural England, for granting several periods of leave to undertake fieldwork and write up her thesis though Natural England is in no way responsible for any of the views expressed in this book. We would like to wholeheartedly thank all of the respondents, for their graciousness in giving their time and entrusting us with their experiences. Thank you for being such kind and generous hosts. Becca extends thanks to B. Pool who accompanied her on some of her travels and to K. Cook, L. Paver and J. Selvage for putting her up during her tour of the country. Thanks also go out to J. Percy, C. Williams, B. Pool, H. Burrell and G. Ellis for their invaluable advice and feedback.

Finally, Becca acknowledges the enormous support she received from her family and friends. She thanks her son Toby, who joined her halfway through her studies, for bringing such joy and inspiration and sustaining her with mud pies. She thanks her partner, Iain, for supporting and encouraging her during the last 6 years, as well as picking up the lion's share of parenting duties to provide her with the space and time to focus on this work. She thanks her parents for their enthusiasm, sureness, endless cups of tea and for cheerily helping out with child care. She also wishes to thank her brother Ben for being an eternal cheerleader. Finally, special thanks go to her friends, T. Rich, S. Colover, L. Broom, O. Stephens-Denyer, K. Spears, K. Franke, R. Mayers, B. Hicks, J. Khalfan, R. Armstrong, L. Torres, F. Wood, P. Shackley, H. Burrell, S. Bostock, T. Bartlett, J. Daniels, C. Williams and D. Kirk-Adams, with more gratitude and affection than can well be put down here.

# Abbreviations

CBFM	Community-based fisheries management
Cefas	Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science
CFO	Chief Fisheries Officer [full title Chief Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Officer]
CFP	Common Fisheries Policy of the European Union
Defra	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
EA	Environment Agency
EEZ	Exclusive economic zone
EFZ	Exclusive fishing zone
EU	European Union
FA	Fishermen's Association
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FGD	Focus group discussion
FLAG	Fisheries Local Action Group
FLC	Fish Locally Collaborative
FQA	Fixed quota allocation
ICES	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
ICSF	International Collective in Support of Fishworkers
IFCA	Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority
ITQs	Individual transferable quotas
IUU	Illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing
KI	Key informant
LIFE	Low Impact Fishers of Europe
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
MARE	Centre for Maritime Research
MCCA	Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009
MCZ	Marine Conservation Zone
MPA	Marine protected area
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
MSY	Maximum sustainable yield
NEF	New Economics Foundation

NFFO	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NUTFA	New Under Ten Fishermens Association
PO	Producer Organisation
RBS	Registration of Buyers and Sellers
SFC	Sea Fisheries Committee
SFF	Scottish Fishermen's Federation
SLA	Sustainable livelihoods approach
SSF	Small-scale fisheries/fishers
TAC	Total allowable catch
TBTI	Too Big to Ignore
UKIP	United Kingdom Independence Party
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VMS	Vessel monitoring system
WFFP	World Forum of Fisher People
WWII	World War II



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	1
1.1	Marginalisation of Small-Scale Fisheries (SSF) . . . . .	1
1.2	Backlash Against the Marginalisation of SSF . . . . .	5
1.3	Ideational Currents Supporting the Backlash Against Marginalisation of SSF . . . . .	9
1.4	Explosion of Research on SSF . . . . .	13
1.5	The Value of SSF Globally . . . . .	22
1.6	The Challenges Facing SSF Globally . . . . .	25
1.7	The Coping Strategies Adopted by SSF Globally . . . . .	30
1.8	Conclusion . . . . .	35
<b>2</b>	<b>Interpretive Framework and Methodology</b> . . . . .	37
2.1	Introduction . . . . .	37
2.2	Human Resilience Theory . . . . .	39
2.3	Methods of Obtaining and Analysing Primary Data . . . . .	45
2.4	Conclusion . . . . .	51
<b>3</b>	<b>The English SSF Fleet</b> . . . . .	53
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	53
3.2	Profile of the SSF in England . . . . .	54
3.3	Governance of the SSF in England . . . . .	55
3.4	Quota Management of the SSF in England . . . . .	59
3.5	Conclusion . . . . .	65
<b>4</b>	<b>Perceptions of Vulnerability in the English SSF</b> . . . . .	67
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	67
4.2	External Threats . . . . .	68
4.3	Internal Obstacles . . . . .	81
4.4	Conclusion . . . . .	86

- 5 Strategies of Resilience in the English SSF** ..... 89
  - 5.1 Introduction ..... 89
  - 5.2 Passive Resilients ..... 89
  - 5.3 Adaptive Resilients ..... 94
  - 5.4 Transformative Resilients ..... 102
  - 5.5 Conclusion ..... 115
  
- 6 Discussion of the Resilience Strategies** ..... 117
  - 6.1 Introduction ..... 117
  - 6.2 What Are the Factors that Determine English SSF’s Choice of Resilience Strategies? ..... 117
  - 6.3 What Is the Role of IFCA’s in Influencing the Choice of Resilience Strategies? ..... 122
  - 6.4 Can Different Resilience Strategies Co-Exist? ..... 127
  - 6.5 Are There Any Trends in Resilience Strategies? ..... 133
  - 6.6 Are Some Resilience Strategies More Sustainable than Others? ..... 136
  - 6.7 Conclusion ..... 136
  
- 7 Conclusion** ..... 139
  - 7.1 Introduction ..... 139
  - 7.2 Brexit Is Not the Panacea ..... 140
  - 7.3 Participation in Fisheries Management Decision-Making Is Essential ..... 141
  - 7.4 Recommendations for the English Inshore Sector ..... 148
  - 7.5 Wider Implications ..... 154
  - 7.6 Conclusion ..... 159
  - 7.7 Postscript ..... 160
  
- References** ..... 161
  
- Index** ..... 183

# Chapter 1

## Introduction



*'Small-scale fisheries are too big to ignore and too important to fail' (Ratana Chuenpagdee)*  
*'They see us as such small fry that we can just be brushed aside' (KI-59)*

### 1.1 Marginalisation of Small-Scale Fisheries (SSF)

This book is intended as a contribution to our understanding of the uncertain situation of small-scale fisheries (SSF) which face marginalisation in most coastal countries, and possible extinction in some. This situation is paradoxical in that SSF constitute by far the largest proportion of commercial marine fishers in the world yet possess the least power by which to ensure the continuation of sustainable livelihoods. In this introductory chapter, we explain why SSF are so marginalised; how there has been a powerful backlash against this marginalisation during the last 30 years; what are the main ideational currents supporting this backlash; and what is the enduring value of SSF that justifies that support. But first, we must deal with the vexed question of what defines small-scale fisheries.

There is considerable controversy over what constitutes a small-scale fishery (SSF). For one thing, many different names are given to SSF, including artisanal, subsistence, inshore, coastal, traditional, and low-tech. For another thing, there is no single internationally-accepted definition for SSF (Jentoft and Eide 2011; García-Flórez et al. 2014; Jacinto and Pomeroy 2011; Basurto et al. 2017; Davies et al. 2018). Smith and Basurto (2019) point out that definitions of SSF are sometimes chosen to serve management purposes. It may be that the best way to explain the meaning of SSF is to contrast the above names with their antonyms: small-scale versus large-scale; artisanal versus industrial; subsistence versus commercial; inshore versus offshore; coastal versus distant; traditional versus modern; and low-tech versus high-tech (McConney and Charles 2012). However, none of these characterisations definitively describes SSFs, because each SSF is unique (Johnson and

Pálsson 2015), and can only be fully understood in the specific context of its own particular situations. As McConney and Charles (2012) point out, what constitutes small-scale in one situation may constitute large-scale in another situation: for example, in the English fleet, small-scale signifies vessels measuring 10 m or under, whereas in North America, most small-scale vessels are 15–20 m in length. We will return to this issue of the definition of SSF in Chap. 3: in the meantime, we will interpret SSF as meaning inshore, coastal fishing.

Small-scale fisheries (however defined) have not always been marginalised. Indeed, the very origin of fishing was on a small-scale. It is only with the advent of industrialisation in the nineteenth century and globalisation in the twentieth century that SSF came under the threat of displacement by larger and more efficient vessels. Kolding et al. (2014, pp. 1, 2) point out that SSF have a much longer history than industrial fisheries, yet have now been side-lined by them:

Small-scale or artisanal fisheries date back to the dawn of human history, and still constitute a widespread activity and occupation. Large-scale or industrial fisheries on the other hand have evolved during the past century and have now come to dominate the realms of policy and science... Modern industrial fisheries have captured the limelight and shaped most fisheries paradigms, relegating the traditional, 'primitive' and 'inefficient' activities that habitually characterize SSFs to the margins.

One illustration of SSF's marginal status is the fact that although 50 million of the global total of 51 million fishers are small-scale (Salmi 2015), SSF have until comparatively recently not been studied nearly as much as large-scale fisheries (Jentoft et al. 2017a; Lloret et al. 2018; Salas et al. 2007, 2019; Chuenpagdee 2011b; Finkbeiner et al. 2015; Kolding and van Zwieten 2011; Islam and Berkes 2016). For example, Percy said that of the 3924 scientific papers that have been published on discards, 3760 were about large-scale fisheries and only 164 were about SSF (Oliver 2019g). As Kolding et al. (2014) note, one reason for this historical lack of research on SSF is that they are perceived to be inefficient and uneconomic (see also Pinkerton and Davis 2015; Ifremer 2007; Krogseng 2016). The assumption is that by replacing SSF with larger industrial vessels, productivity would be improved and economic returns would rise (Cohen et al. 2019). Commentators report that for some developmental economists, this is the price that must be paid for progress and modernisation: it is an inevitability that SSF will eventually be superseded (Jentoft and Chuenpagdee 2018; Pauly 2011; Jentoft et al. 2017b).

The popular paradigm during the development decades (1950–1970s) was that the natural progression of the world's fishing was necessarily towards the industrial mode. Nations worldwide promoted this mode of fisheries development with strategies focusing almost exclusively on large-scale fisheries and the need to increase fishing effort and capacity... it was assumed that the [SSF] subsector would either expand its scale of production by adopting large-scale fishing techniques or else provide labour to industrial operations and gradually disappear (Carvalho et al. 2011, p. 360).

Haakonsen (1992, p. 33) traces this doom-laden scenario to the late nineteenth century:

The fisheries sector[']s... industrialisation in Europe and North America can be said to have started in the second half of the nineteenth century with the introduction of steam engines on

fishing vessels which in turn allowed for the installation of winches, refrigeration systems, etc., culminating in some of today's giant factory ships with all the latest navigation, fish detection, processing and preservation technologies. It is not surprising then that the industrialisation-equals-progress belief was readily accepted as a guide for developing the often marginally exploited fisheries sector in the new emerging nations in Africa in the 1950s and 1960s. Whatever fisheries existed they were, in their very basic artisanal form, seen as backward and inefficient and bound to disappear over time once the industrial part of the sector 'took off', to use a prevailing development terminology from the 1960s.

Béné et al. (2015a, p. 19) point out that some commentators portrayed SSF as "backward, informal and marginal economic actors that were doomed to disappear with economic development and modernization".

This narrative of inevitable decline of SSF has been underpinned by two powerful interconnected economic concepts: neo-liberalism and globalisation. Neo-liberalism, the ideology of capitalism which advocates deregulation, lower government spending, and reduced taxes, prioritises the private sector, promotes the free market, and endorses private property rights (Pinkerton 2017), enjoyed widespread support after the collapse of the Soviet bloc's command and control regimes in the 1990s. Knutson (2017) names this neo-liberal turn 'corporate domination'; Knott and Neiss (2017) describe its processes of 'privatization', 'marketization' and 'financialization'; Longo and Clark (2012, p. 204) refer to its "high-tech, capital-intensive methods"; and Lalancette (2017, p. 47) mentions "neoliberal principles of market governance, commodification of natural resources, profit-maximization, individualization and property rights".

Applying neo-liberalism to the fishing industry, fisheries economists from the neo-liberal perspective argue that large-scale fisheries are far more efficient economically than are SSF because of economies of scale, and they drive down the price of fish to consumers. Macfadyen et al. (2011, p. 78) comment on EU (European Union) fisheries that "the economic data presented here show that...the economy is not well served by SSF...Average earnings per fisherman employed in SSF are significantly lower than in large-scale fisheries...the value of landings from large-scale fisheries is almost three times higher than from SSF" (see also Ifremer 2007). Hardin's famous notion of the 'tragedy of the commons' (Hardin 1968, p. 1244) adds a Malthusian strand to the neo-liberal critique of SSF, arguing that free access to coastal marine resources is a recipe for disaster as the number of artisanal fishers increases to the point at which fish stocks collapse because of overfishing: "Freedom in a commons brings ruin to all". Like Hardin, Gordon (1954) asserts that property rights of some kind are necessary to prevent excessive exploitation of fish stocks. One important manifestation of this neo-liberal turn is the adoption of 'catch shares' systems, particularly in the form of individual transferable quotas (ITQs). Bodwitch (2017, p. 89) reports that "Starting in the late 1970s, fishery economists argued that privatization of fishing rights, in the form of individual transferable quota, could stop overfishing" (see also Bennett 2017).

Closely linked to neo-liberalism, globalisation is the second economic concept that seemed to seal the fate of SSF. Defined as the limitless expansion of movement across national boundaries of goods, services, labour, capital, technology, and data,

globalisation has led to increasing integration of regional, national and local economies throughout the world, offering vast opportunities for economic development. Meyer (2017, p. 80) says “globalization has been a major source of economic growth and prosperity”, while Warner (2005) claims globalisation has created millions of new jobs, and Bhagwati (2004) asserts that economic globalisation is the only way to combat global poverty. Daboub and Calton (2002, p. 1) describe globalisation as “the most important development of our time”, while Warner (2005, p. 238) claims that in the mid-1990s, “economists and politicians everywhere were proclaiming the dawn of a new age for humanity... ‘globalisation’ was widely accepted as the new world order”. Hines (2000, p. vii) quotes world leaders who proclaim that globalisation is a fact of life: “Globalisation is not a policy choice, it is a fact” (Bill Clinton); “Globalisation is ‘irreversible and irresistible’” (Tony Blair). Many writers argue that the march of globalisation is relentless, and that governments who try to resist it, will, like Canute, fail badly, and in doing so, undermine the sustainability of their entire economies. On this view, economic development or ‘progress’ lies inexorably in the adage ‘large is beautiful’.

Some commentators have added an evolutionary interpretation to the march of globalisation. For example, Jentoft (2019, pp. 313–314) characterises globalisation in Herbert Spencer’s evolutionary terms of the ‘survival of the fittest’:

Spencer is famous for the term ‘survival of the fittest’, where, like in nature, social evolution rids us of things that are not well adapted. Policy-makers and governors may be tempted to look at small-scale fisheries development in a similar way. As a natural process, the idea would be that the industrial, large-scale fisheries as a more efficient mode, would unavoidably supplant small-scale fisheries. Any effort to save small-scale fisheries from becoming extinct is, at best, delaying their demise because it would be against the ‘the law of nature’. Small-scale fisheries are bound to perish, as an adaptive process tantamount with evolution.

So it has been argued that SSF are the past, and industrial fisheries are the future: the economies of scale cannot and must not be ignored. Advocates of large-scale fisheries point out that industrial fishing has contributed hugely to the enormous expansion of global production of caught fish—from 18 million tonnes to 90 million tonnes during the last 50 years (Eide et al. 2011). Song et al. (2018) report that 4% of fishers produce 76% of the global catch, and during 2007–2012, the 16 largest international fishing corporations nearly doubled their revenues. There are many examples around the world of this shift from small to large fisheries. For instance, Bavink (2011) describes the occurrence of industrial fishing in post-independence India as the ‘Blue Revolution’ in parallel to the ‘Green Revolution’ of the industrialisation of agriculture. Monnereau and McConney (2015, p. 224) refer to “the industrialization of the world’s oceans” (see also Smith 2000). Longo and Clark (2012) report how industrialised fishing for blue fin tuna in the Mediterranean Sea threatens to wipe out SSF tuna trap fishing. Referring to Greenland’s coastal halibut fishery, Jacobsen (2013, p. 16) says “the dominant development discourse in Greenlandic fisheries governance... asserts that big is simply better”. Jacobsen (2013) says another reason why fisheries managers prefer large-scale vessels to

small-scale vessels is because SSF are regarded as much harder to control: indeed, there is a question over whether SSF is ungovernable.

Given these understandings, it is hardly surprising that in the name of ‘development’ and ‘modernisation’ many governments have been encouraging artisanal fishers to move away from SSF to large-scale industrial fisheries (Jacobsen 2013; Kraan 2011). Brattland (2014, p. 3) says in Norway, this has been dubbed a process of ‘cyborgization’, whereby the close ‘organic’ relationship between SSF and their vessels is replaced by a detached ‘mechanical’ and electronic relationship: “small-scale coastal fishing vessels are transformed into technologically sophisticated killing-fish machines or ‘fishing cyborgs’”. Lalancette (2017, p. 52) describes it as “professionalization...Fishers are being redefined as ‘business managers’ with efficiency and profitability as the primary goals”. Campling et al. (2012, p. 182) refer to it as a process of commodification of fishing: “fish have changed from being produced as food for producing communities to being produced as commodities for sale”. Bailey (2018) describes how across the world, large-scale fishers have long been trying to force SSF out of business. De Schutter (2012) claims that “the encroachment of industrial fleets...poses a major existential threat to these traditional fishing communities”.

Several writers claim that SSFs are already insignificant. For example, de Vos and Kraan (2015, p. 629) say “many small-scale métiers...are out of sight, as they are outside the bounds of data collected”, and refer to the “relative invisibility of the small-scale fisheries in the Netherlands” (see also Acott et al. 2018). Arias-Schreiber et al. (2019) claim that SSF in the Baltic Sea is rapidly disappearing. Seixas et al. (2019) report that in Brazil, during 1962–1989, SSF landings as a proportion of total landings shrunk from 80% to 20% as the government strove to develop the industrial fleet (see also De Mattos and Wojciechowski 2019). Pauly (2006, p. 16) warns that SSF is in danger of extinction: “In the long term (two to three decades?), fisheries and fishing-based cultures will not survive if we do not manage to put small-scale fisheries and resources first”.

## 1.2 Backlash Against the Marginalisation of SSF

However, during the last 30 years there has been a concerted and forceful backlash against this marginalisation of SSF. One element of this backlash is the claim that in some countries, especially developing countries, far from declining, SSFs have been growing. For example, Haakonsen (1992, pp. 33, 47–48) argues that in some West African countries, SSF have adopted simple technological improvements to flourish where industrial fisheries have failed:

In West Africa, only in a couple of countries did industrial fisheries ‘take off’, and then only to a moderate extent and with a limited degree of success. The ‘backward’ artisanal fisheries, on the other hand, has prevailed, expanded and even prospered by comparison, adopting simple, but efficient technological innovations...the reason for the progress of much of the artisanal fisheries in countries like Senegal and Ghana has been the fishermen’s adaptability

and readiness to incorporate new technologies, thus proving themselves quite different from the image of the backward, narrow-minded and ultratraditional 'peasant-type. First and foremost has been the rapid acceptance of the outboard engine on traditional canoes, which took place in the late 1950s in both countries.

Likewise, Jul-Larsen (1992), argues that SSF in West African countries can improve economically from within their own traditional systems by adopting some technological innovations without embracing the capitalist system of industrial fisheries. As we shall see, this argument chimes with Schumacher's advocacy of alternative or intermediate technology. Kolding et al. (2014) point out that far from dwindling, SSF is growing (at least in developing countries) with more people joining it and introducing improvements in its fishing technology.

Another element of the backlash is the recent huge upsurge of interest in SSF across the world because of a claim that they are much more sustainable than is industrial fishing. As Carvalho et al. (2011, p. 360) noted, a global crisis of overfishing has begun to undermine much support for industrial methods:

With the crises in world fisheries, the industrial model of development has increasingly been put under scrutiny. After more than half a century of a strong modernisation imperative that put economic efficiency high on the policy agenda for fisheries, the policy arena is finally becoming more conducive to sustaining small-scale fisheries. The notion that small-scale fisheries are probably our best option for a sustainable use of fisheries resources, assembling most of the criteria required for an enlightened fisheries policy in terms of employment, income distribution, energy consumption, and product quality, has gained significance...with many studies emphasising the social significance, cultural diversity and economic importance of sustaining this subsector.

Armitage et al. (2017a) claim that the need to sustain local coastal fishing communities pursuing fishing on a small scale basis, is now being acknowledged as a global priority, and Allison and Ellis (2001) state that the importance of sustaining SSF is becoming increasingly recognized by development organisations and fisheries managers. Béné et al. (2015a, p. 14) state that "At the international level, substantial progress has been made in recent decades to raise the profile of small-scale fisheries". For example, in 2014 the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations issued the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Alleviation, which was the first internationally agreed instrument dedicated exclusively to the SSF, asserted that small-scale fisheries must have secure tenure rights to the fishery resources that sustain their livelihoods, their cultural well-being, and their sustainable development:

States should, where appropriate, grant preferential access of small-scale fisheries to fish in waters under national jurisdiction, with a view to achieving equitable outcomes for different groups of people, in particular vulnerable groups. Where appropriate, specific measures, inter alia, the creation and enforcement of exclusive zones for small-scale fisheries, should be considered. Small-scale fisheries should be given due consideration before agreements on resource access are entered into with third countries and third parties" (FAO 2015, p. 6, para 5.7).

This was seen as a "historic moment" and "potential turning point" (Jentoft et al. 2017b, p. 3) and "a milestone event for small-scale fisheries worldwide" (Franz and



Barragán-Paladines 2017, p. 36. There are many examples across the world of projects pushing back against industrial fisheries in recent years. Ratner and Allison (2012, p. 372) state that “The critique of modernisation and structural adjustment policies, and recognition of their limitations and undesirable effects on the poorest and most vulnerable, gave rise to a series of projects in the 1990s and 2000s that focused on strengthening fisherfolk’s livelihoods”. For example, in Brazil, Gasalla (2011, p. 189) describes a process of “re-artisanalization” of fishing activities in coastal areas following a decline and collapse of industrial fisheries. Aryeetey (2002, p. 336) says “failure of the newly established industrial fleets to deliver the expected outputs in many African countries has made governments turn attention, once again, to the activities of the artisanal sector”. In South Africa, Sowman (2006, p. 60) reports that the Marine Living Resources Act in 1998 “legally recognised subsistence fishers and made provision for the declaration of coastal areas for their exclusive use. In 2001, a limited [SSF] commercial fisheries sector was created. These changes indicated government’s commitment to addressing the historical marginalisation of small-scale fishers”. This policy marked “a paradigm shift” for the rehabilitation of the traditional black SSF sector in the country which had been systematically discriminated against during the apartheid era in favour of the white industrial sector: “This policy aims to provide redress and recognition to the rights of small-scale fisher communities in South Africa previously marginalised and discriminated against in terms of racially exclusionary laws and policies, individualised permit-based systems of resource allocation and insensitive impositions of conservation-driven regulation” (DAFF 2012, p. 17, 1). Islam and Berkes (2016, p. 2) report that “Canadian courts have established that...subsistence fisheries of indigenous people have priority over all other uses of the resource”.

Moreover, several associations have been established to represent SSFs at national and international levels and monitor their treatment by governments and intergovernmental authorities such as the EU. For example, in the Mediterranean and Black Sea region, a digital platform has been set up called the Friends of Small-Scale Fishermen, partly funded by the EU, to provide a mapping tool to monitor projects in SSF and improve cooperation in such projects. Another association is the World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fish Workers, which is a civil society organisation based in Uganda established to bring together SSFs from across the world to discuss key issues facing them. It was formed in the late 1990s as a response to SSFs’ exclusion from international bodies such as the FAO, and has held five general assembly meetings since 1997 (Basurto et al. 2017). A similar association is the World Forum of Fisher Peoples which focuses especially on providing capacity building for SSF organisations.

Furthermore, many international bodies have endorsed the case for supporting SSF. Basurto et al. (2017) reports that funding for projects relevant to SSF across the globe during 2000-2016 was a total of \$1.8 billion, most of which came from multilateral aid agencies, especially the World Bank. Such initiatives are characterised by Penca (2019) as ‘transnational localism’—i.e. the use of international mechanisms to champion local SSF. Penca points to three major steps in this direction: the EU’s reformed Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) adopted in 2013 included a

commitment to support SSF; the FAO's Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries, published in 2014; and the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals in 2015, especially SDG 14 which urges governments to provide access to marine resources and markets to SSF. In 2018, the Ministerial Council of the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism endorsed a protocol on Sustaining Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the region, where SSF accounts for 95% of fisheries (CRFM 2018). In Malta in 2018, a Ministerial Declaration on a Regional Plan of Action for Small-Scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea was signed by Karmenu Vella (then EU Commissioner for the Environment, Fisheries and Maritime Affairs) at a High Level Conference which "reinforces opportunities for small-scale fishermen in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea regions by giving them a voice in the decisions that affect their livelihoods. It aims at enhancing their capacities in contributing to food security and in achieving economic, social and employment benefits while safeguarding environmentally sustainable fishing practices" (EU Commission 2018). A digital platform 'Friends of Small-scale fishermen' was also launched, funded in part by the EU, to record projects and investment in SSF in the region, and encourage cooperation between them. In 2016, the Commission for Natural Resources of the European Parliament's powerful Committee of the Regions urged the EU to take measures to prevent the further decline of SSF, declaring SSF "a small but indispensable part of the local economy" (EU Parliament 2016). Despite much criticism of the EU for subsidising the expansion of the industrial sector, it has been pointed out that

Under the Common Fisheries Policy, the fleet has preferential access in the 12-nautical-miles coastal band of the EU and is exempted from a number of obligations that apply to larger vessels, such as...fishing authorisations, landing declarations, sales notes, separate storage...the exemption from reporting catches under 50kg...is tantamount to a general exemption from logbook reporting. More 'affirmative action' comes from the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (MAF 2016).

In 2014, the reformed CFP referred to the need for a fair standard of living for the fisheries sector (including SSF) in EU waters, and for preferential access to fishing opportunities for SSF, including incentives to use fishing methods with low impacts on fisheries resources and marine ecosystems, while the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund required Member States which had more than 1000 small-scale fishing vessels to produce action plans for their development, competitiveness and sustainability (Percy 2016, 2015). In a 2011 report commissioned by the European Parliament, it is stated "The maintenance of small-scale fleets is a widespread policy objective in many EU Member States...Small-scale fishers can be considered as the '*guardians of the coastal zone*', similar to the role of some farmers in the rural areas" (Macfadyen et al. 2011, p. 13, 81) [italics in original]. In 2012, an international group of SSF founded an advocacy group of local SSF organisations called Low Impact Fishers of Europe (LIFE) to give a voice to the thousands of small boat fishers across Europe (Penca 2019). Jerry Percy, then executive director of LIFE, explained that "LIFE is here to give them a clear and coherent voice at the political heart of Europe...there is a growing recognition that it is now vital to have a dedi-

cated voice to champion their cause” (Oliver 2014). By 2016, LIFE had 7000 active inshore fisher members (Percy 2016). Percy (2015) also drew attention to Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs)’s 2027 Vision Document in which it states that

Access to fisheries continues to be available to small-scale fisheries vessels, even if in some cases that is not the most economically efficient way of harvesting the resource. This is because the wider economic, social and environmental benefits of small-scale fishing can outweigh the comparative inefficiency in harvesting the resource and make a significant economic and social contribution to the lives of individuals and coastal communities.

### 1.3 Ideational Currents Supporting the Backlash Against Marginalisation of SSF

This backlash in favour of a return to small-scale fisheries is in part inspired by Schumacher’s (1973) book entitled *Small is beautiful: A study of economics as if people mattered*, which has united several strands of activism against western neo-liberalism. Schumacher (1973, section 1) declares that “the whole world is now in a process of westernisation” but argues that western capitalism is unsustainable, over-exploiting and polluting non-renewable natural resources, and that exporting western technology to the developing world (technology transfer) would merely replicate that unsustainability: a case of “the blind leading the blind”. His philosophy of sufficiency urges communities to adopt appropriate or intermediate technologies and seek to maximise well-being, not commodity production—i.e. to pursue human worth and dignity, not soul-destroying material affluence. On smallness, Schumacher (1973, sections 18, 2, 3, and 5) says:

In general, small enterprises are to be preferred to large ones...Small-scale operations, no matter how numerous, are always less likely to be harmful to the natural environment than large-scale ones...There is wisdom in smallness if only on account of the smallness and patchiness of human knowledge, which relies on experiment far more than on understanding...Today, we suffer from an almost universal idolatry of gigantism. It is therefore necessary to insist on the virtues of smallness.

On technology, Schumacher (1973, sections 10 and 12) says we need

a different kind of technology, a technology with a human face, which instead of making human hands and brains redundant, helps them to become far more productive than they have ever been before. As Gandhi said, the poor of the world cannot be helped by mass production, only by production by the masses...I have named it intermediate technology to signify that it is vastly superior to the primitive technology of bygone ages but at the same time much simpler, cheaper, and freer than the super-technology of the rich. One can also call it self-help technology, or democratic or people’s technology - a technology to which everybody can gain admittance and which is not reserved to those already rich and powerful...intermediate technology will be ‘labour-intensive’ and will lend itself to use in small-scale establishments.

For the neo-liberal economist, “growth of GNP [gross national product] must be a good thing, irrespective of what has grown and who, if anyone, has benefited. The

idea that there could be pathological growth, unhealthy growth. disruptive or destructive growth, is to him a perverse idea” (Schumacher 1973, section 3). For the neo-liberal economist, economic growth depends on increased output (what the fisheries economist would characterise as increased catch per unit of effort (CPUE)). But for Schumacher (1973, section 12), jobs are more important than output: “It is more important that everybody should produce something than that a few people should each produce a great deal... Within manufacturing, there should be imaginative exploration of small-scale, more decentralised, more labour-using forms of organisation”.

Schumacher’s philosophy feeds off and reinforces the anti-economic growth movement that began in 1972 with the publication of the report entitled *The Limits to Growth* by Donella Meadows, Dennis Meadows, Jørgen Randers, and William Behrens which was based on a computer simulation of unsustainable endless economic and population growth with a finite supply of resources. The Brundtland Report, *Our Common Future*, published in 1987, derived the concept of ‘sustainable development’ to restrain economic growth to the extent that it left sufficient natural resources for succeeding generations, and this was the foundational principle for the Rio Earth Summit on Sustainable Development in 1992. More recently, the term ‘unjust uneconomic growth’ has been used to characterise the damaging nature of capitalist excess (Sabau and van Zyll de Jong 2015).

Another ideational current supporting the backlash against the marginalisation of SSF is the anti-globalisation movement. During the twenty-first century, there has been growing disillusion with globalisation, which has been blamed for the Asian financial crisis in 1997 and the western financial crisis in 2008, that ushered in an age of austerity for many developing and developed nations. Moreover, as Daboub and Calton (2002, p. 1) explain, globalisation has been “blamed for increasing the gap between rich and poor, accelerating the destruction of the environment, and threatening human rights”. Held and McGrew (2003, pp. 29; 30) say critics argue that economic globalisation “is directly responsible for widening disparities in life chances across the globe—a deepening polarisation of income and wealth...the segmentation of the global workforce into those who gain and those who lose...the growing marginalisation of the losers from the global economy...and the erosion of social solidarity...Unless economic globalisation is tamed, so the argument goes, a new barbarism will prevail as poverty, social exclusion and social conflict envelop the world”. Hoffmann (2003, p. 108) says “Economic globalisation has...become a formidable cause of inequality among and within states”. Woods (2003, p. 465) writes “Globalisation is cementing old inequalities between ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’”. Even advocates of globalisation such as Meyer (2017, p. 80) admit its inequalitarian outcomes: “international trade has made people around the world better off *on average*. But that average hides the unequal nature of the gains from globalisation” [*italics in original*]. Warner (2005, p. 238) says “the accelerated pace of globalisation has...proven to be a destructive force to millions, perhaps billions, of people the world over. Some staggering statistics are illustrative: two billion people live on less than \$2 a day, while three billion people live on less than \$3 a day...In sub-Saharan Africa, per capita growth was 36 percent between 1960 and 1980, and