
Communities, knowledge and fisheries of the future

Kevin St. Martin*

Department of Geography,
Rutgers the State University of New Jersey,
54 Joyce Kilmer Drive,
Piscataway, NJ 08854-8045, USA
Fax: +1-732-445-0006
E-mail: kstmarti@rci.rutgers.edu
*Corresponding author

Bonnie J. McCay

Department of Human Ecology,
Rutgers the State University of New Jersey,
55 Dudley Road,
New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA
Fax: +1-732-932-6667
E-mail: mccay@aesop.rutgers.edu

Grant D. Murray

Institute for Coastal Research,
Malaspina University-College,
900-5th Street,
Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada V9R 5S5
E-mail: murrayg@mala.bc.ca

Teresa R. Johnson

Graduate Program in Ecology and Evolution and
Department of Human Ecology,
Rutgers the State University of New Jersey
55 Dudley Road,
New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA
Fax: +1-732-932-6667
E-mail: tjohnson@aesop.rutgers.edu

Bryan Oles

I.M. Systems Group, Inc.,
6307 Executive Blvd.,
Rockville, MD 20852, USA
Fax: +1-301-850-4596
E-mail: olesb@imsg.com

Abstract: The ‘human dimension’ in fisheries management has historically been incorporated via a specific economic understanding of fisheries wedded to a single-species approach. Meeting the challenge of fisheries, however, will require a broadening of fisheries science towards an ecosystems-based approach. There is also the need for a parallel shift in social science understandings of fishing towards context and interrelationships amongst and between fishermen and fishing communities. While the move towards ecosystems is well underway, a corresponding movement in fisheries social science is less well established. The latter will require a commitment to new sources of data, methods and forms and scales of analysis. Promising initiatives that align with ecosystem-based approaches include the documentation and incorporation of Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK), cooperative research that bridges communicative and epistemological gaps between fishermen and scientists and community-level data collections and analyses emerging from legislative mandates and community-based advocacy. These examples suggest a reorientation of fisheries social science in step with ecosystem approaches.

Keywords: fisheries; fishing communities; fisheries management; fisheries policy; local ecological knowledge; LEK; cooperative research; ecosystem-based management; social practice of fishing; fisheries social science; human dimensions of fisheries.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: St. Martin, K., McCay, B.J., Murray, G.D., Johnson, T.R. and Oles, B. (2007) ‘Communities, knowledge and fisheries of the future’, *Int. J. Global Environmental Issues*, Vol. 7, Nos. 2/3, pp.221–239.

Biographical notes: Kevin St. Martin is an Economic Geographer with a specialisation in the Application of Geographic Information Systems (GIS). He is interested in critical analyses of economic and resource management discourse. His current research focuses on the discourse and practice of fisheries science and management and its implications on both resource management and community-based economic development. His interest in GIS has lead to an examination of the use of GIS in participatory scientific and resource management initiatives.

Bonnie J. McCay is an Environmental Anthropologist who specialises in studying marine fisheries and fishing-dependent communities. Her research has been in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, Canada, Puerto Rico and New Jersey, the USA and most recently, Baja California Sur, Mexico. Major themes of her work have been critical examination of the idea of ‘tragedy of the commons’ and its social and policy implications; the roles of cooperatives and other community-based institutions in community development and fisheries management and the social and ecological aspects of changing property rights in fisheries.

Grant D. Murray is currently Canada Research Chair in Coastal Resource Management at Malaspina University-College. With a background in marine ecology and natural resource sociology, his interdisciplinary research involves the combination of elements from both natural and social sciences, emphasises local and traditional ecological knowledge, and has focused on historical marine social-ecological system interactions in Mexico, the USA and Canada. Major areas of interest include marine protected areas, commercial fishing and eco-tourism.

Teresa R. Johnson is a PhD candidate in the Ecology and Evolution Graduate Programme in the Department of Human Ecology at Rutgers University. She received an MS in Marine Policy from the University of Maine. She adopts an interdisciplinary approach to the study and management of complex marine ecosystems, focusing on the ecological, socio-economic, political and institutional dimensions of fisheries. Her dissertation research is looking at the production of knowledge through cooperative research in the Northeastern USA, including the role of fishermen's experience-based knowledge in these collaborations.

Bryan Oles is a Cultural Anthropologist whose work focuses on the application of social science to the human dimensions of natural resource management. His research among communities in Oceania and the USA employs an ethnographic approach to understanding meanings, uses and conflicts surrounding coastal and marine resources. He is particularly interested in the interplay between global socio-economic and political processes and local constructions of place, environment and identity.

1 Introduction

Fisheries management has been viewed as ideally based on scientific knowledge of fish biology and the related enterprise of stock assessment. This reliance on the natural sciences is tempered, of course, by the politics of deciding what to do in a given instance. Those politics are persistent reminders that people and their activities, not the fish themselves, are what are being managed, and furthermore, that human desires and institutions are central determinants of how, where and to what extent fishing takes place. We argue that the incorporation of this 'human dimension' is central to the challenge of sustainability. Yet, we also note that the incorporation of this human dimension has historically been accomplished, in theory and management practice, via a particular economic understanding of fisheries and fishermen that emerged in the 1950s (Mansfield, 2004a; Smith, 1994). This understanding of the rational economic behaviour of individual fishermen is, in practice, closely aligned with traditional single-species assessments and management initiatives (St. Martin, 2001).

It is, however, well known that meeting the challenge of fisheries will require a broadening of fisheries science beyond single-species modelling and management and a movement towards an 'ecosystems' perspective relative (Botsford et al., 1997; Browman and Stergiou, 2004a; Pauly and MacLean, 2003). In the latter, fisheries are understood as constituted by complex relationships and processes between and amongst species and environments across a number of scales (Langton et al., 1995). To some, the movement towards ecosystem approaches constitutes a necessary 'paradigm shift' in fisheries science and management (Caddy, 1996; Costanza et al., 1998; Sainsbury, 1998). Meeting the challenge of Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management (EBFM) will, however, require a broadening attention to the social dimensions of ecosystems (McCay, 2000a). That is, there is the need for a parallel and complementary shift in our social science understandings of fishing towards context and inter-relationships amongst and between fishermen and fishing communities; a sensitivity to locations and how they are inhabited by communities and socio-economic processes and fish harvesting practices across multiple scales (Grafton et al., 2005; McCay and Jentoft, 1996; Wilson, 2006; Wilson et al., 1999).

Just as a wide range of alternative understandings, data collection innovations, forms of analysis and management initiatives are loosely grouped under ecosystem approaches, we group a wide range of alternative understandings, data collection innovations, forms of analysis and management initiatives emerging from social science under the rubric of community approaches which we posit is the necessary complement to the move towards ecosystem approaches. Our goal is to emphasise community-level processes, practices, interactions and interdependencies as *starting points* for understanding the relationship between the rich and complex social practice of fishing and marine ecosystems. While we use the term ‘community’, we do not wish to reduce the social and ecological dynamic of fisheries to a function of some difficult to imagine discrete, bounded and/or traditional community but to see that dynamic as constituted by, in part, a host of community-level practices and processes.

This paper focuses on three areas of social science enquiry, directly relevant to EBFM, where a paradigm shift in social science understandings of fisheries is underway. The first instance repositions fishermen as knowing subjects interested in using their knowledge to sustain fisheries. We examine fishermen’s Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK) and its relationship to dominant forms of fisheries knowledge and management in Canada. The second instance is the case of cooperative research in the Northeast USA. The research discussed there asks: what is the fate of LEK once it comes into contact with standard forms of science and management? The third instance is the rethinking and repositioning of fishing communities themselves. Just as fishermen are recast as knowing subjects and stewards of resources, we note the ongoing struggle to recast communities as more than just sites of impact but as determinants of both fisheries dynamics and management options. This paper begins by briefly reviewing the nature of a paradigm shift relative to fisheries social science.

2 New voices in fisheries science and management

Fisheries economics, building upon the initial neoclassical insights of Gordon (1954), Scott (1955) and others, has as its entry point and ontological foundation an understanding of fishermen as individuals competing on an open access commons (Feeny et al., 1996; Mansfield, 2004a; St. Martin, 2001, 2005a). As such, fisheries economics gives to fisheries science an explanation of the propensity for fishing effort to increase beyond what is economically optimal and ultimately damaging to fisheries resources (e.g. Iudicello et al., 1999). The assumptions of fisheries economics align well with single-species modelling of fish stock that has dominated fisheries science and management over the last half-century (Smith, 1994). In both cases, management units are large and homogeneous containers of quantities of single species of fish (Booth, 2000) and fishermen, within these logics, are conceived to be the bearers of an aggregate and distributed effort which is the essential cause of fisheries degradation (St. Martin, 2001).

To solve ‘the problem of fishing’, the problem of individual fishermen maximising their utility on an open access resource, fisheries economics suggests the institutionalisation of property rights, specifically Individually Transferable Quotas (ITQs) (Hannesson, 2004; Iudicello et al., 1999). While appropriate and effective in many contexts, the narrow set of management solutions that emerge have a number of

socio-economic shortcomings that trouble many academics (Apostle et al., 2002; Davis, 1996; Mansfield, 2004b; McCay, 1995; St. Martin, 2005b) as well as many within fishing communities themselves (Shivlani and Milon, 2000). In some cases, this has led to civil disobedience and experiments in community-based alternatives, such as the Community Management Board system in Atlantic Canada (Kearney et al., 1998; McCay, 2000b, 2004).

Fisheries science has not, however, been restricted to the formal single-species modelling so clearly aligned with fisheries economics and institutionalised in fisheries management. There is within fisheries science a call to implement EBFM approaches in opposition to the single-species model which has been heard clearly by all and heeded by many (Botsford et al., 1997; EPAP, 1999; McLeod et al., 2005). While EBFM remains only broadly defined and rarely implemented, it has had the welcomed effect of providing a space within which to reimagine new forms of fisheries management, such as incorporating marine reserves both to protect critical habitats or life cycle events and to aid in adaptive management through experimentation (Grafton and Kompas, 2005; Kaufman et al., 2004). The movement towards EBFM relies, however, upon more than a shift in perspective or attitude on the part of fisheries scientists and managers. It requires new ontological foundations and forms of data as well as new methods and scales of analysis (Langton et al., 1995; Pauly, 1997; St. Martin, 2004; Wilson et al., 1999).

Similarly, fisheries social science is broader than the neoclassical understanding of fishermen's aggregate economic behaviour vis-à-vis single species of fish. In particular, anthropologists, sociologists, geographers and other social scientists point to the importance of social and political as well as economic relationships, cultural as well as economic valuation, communities as well as individuals and diverse sources of knowledge. Although not denying the role of individual competition and desires to maximise utility, these traditions emphasise the institutions and mechanisms that are embedded within and constitutive of fishing communities as the source of solutions (or potential solutions) to the problem of fishing (Jentoft et al., 1998; McCay and Jentoft, 1998). The movement towards communities heralds a foregrounding of context, inter-relationships, process, heterogeneity and multiple scales of analysis that are aligned with the conceptual foundations of EBFM. Indeed, seeing communities as fundamental to the dynamic of fisheries is an important element within any critical rethinking of fisheries management models that have traditionally relied upon an ontology of competing individual fishermen (cf. Dyer and McGoodwin, 1994; Jentoft, 2000; McCay and Jentoft, 1998; Pinkerton, 1989; Wilson, 1999).

Unlike new biological understandings of fisheries essential to EBFM which build upon decades of in situ biological research and enjoy wide acceptance amongst fisheries biologists, the movement towards community will require the collection and integration of previously non-existent baseline data such as the socio-cultural composition of fishing communities, their interactions and connections, the diversity of their fishing practices, their local environmental knowledge and their spatial domains (cf. Hall-Arber et al., 2001; McCay et al., 2002a,b). The goal of community-level research should not be to precisely define the boundaries of discrete communities, but, like ecosystems, to build upon an alternative and holistic understanding of fisheries dynamics.

3 The nature of local knowledge

The traditional role of social science in fisheries (i.e. fisheries economics) has been to make clear the impact upon fish stocks of competitive individual fishermen's aggregate efforts to maximise utility. Knowledge, within this model, is individually possessed and utilised towards individual gain. Yet, other traditions within social science have documented the vital role of fishermen's LEK in traditional, cooperative and community-based systems of fisheries management (Johannes, 1981; Neis and Felt, 2000). LEK is based on personal, shared and inherited experience and while the term 'ecological' is often used to describe this knowledge, it is much broader. Murray et al. (2006) view fish harvesters as embedded in webs of relations, or 'networks,' that include not only the surrounding bio-physical environment, but also such things as management regulations, kinship ties, peer pressure, social support mechanisms and the global seafood market. In their view, LEK is a *social-ecological product*.

In addition, researchers have, more recently, developed methods that solicit LEK from cooperating fishermen and incorporate it into science-based systems of fisheries management. In particular, LEK can be used to address issues where other data are wanting (Ames et al., 2000; Wroblewski, 2000) and, combined with archival sources, it can be used to reconstruct and interpret the history of fisheries (Hutchings and Ferguson, 2000; Rosenberg et al., 2005). Neis and Felt (2000) have argued that, with the involvement of fish harvesters, contemporary LEK can be documented in a systematic and ethical fashion and can be aggregated to construct a larger scale, finely textured picture of regional fisheries extending back several decades (see also Neis et al., 1999). In both traditional and contemporary management regimes, LEK recasts fishermen as not only knowledgeable subjects but also as cooperators and stewards (or nascent stewards) of the environment.

Fishermen's knowledge is, however, largely qualitative, gained through and maintained by interactions within communities (Pálsson, 1994), and is relative to distinct locations. Therefore, management regimes that incorporate fishermen's knowledge and are built from the 'bottom up' (McCay and Jentoft, 1996) are primarily enacted at the level of communities and in locations where technocratic systems of fisheries management have not been institutionalised (e.g. third world settings). To operationalise LEK at other scales, in conjunction with state-sponsored fisheries management systems or within more highly industrialised fisheries, will require a broader institutionalisation of qualitative and participatory methods, new systems of cooperation between fishing communities and fisheries scientists and managers, and an understanding that LEK might be appropriate for ecosystem- and community-based management practices.

4 Complementary knowledge systems: Newfoundland and Labrador case study

As part of a recent interdisciplinary project in the Canadian Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, researchers collected, analysed and combined information drawn from different knowledge systems (LEK, natural sciences, governance and social sciences) in order to track socio-ecological interactions over time, to compare that information and to assess potential consequences for the health of fishery dependent communities as well as fish and shellfish stocks. The information used included results of LEK interviews with

fish harvester experts, information developed from archival sources and scientific data (primarily government trawl survey results). The goal was to find a common ground that allows complementary use of different types of knowledge and thereby movement towards a nuanced and informed understanding of the complex environmental history of fish and fisheries in the study area. Through a better understanding of the past, the researchers ultimately sought to facilitate movement towards health (broadly defined) in the social-ecological systems of coastal Newfoundland.

The use of interdisciplinary teams to design and conduct research related to LEK is one way to help resolve some important methodological issues. Social scientists, for example, are relatively familiar with interviewing techniques and with the dynamics of fisheries, local fisheries terminologies and technologies, but less familiar than natural scientists with fish ecology. Together, they provide a more informed position when interviewing and observing fishermen (see Murray et al., submitted; Neis et al., 1999, for details on the studies and methods used). In this research, interviews with fish harvesters involved the use of nautical charts and a range of topics pertinent to EBFM and/or community approaches. For example, topics included biophysical considerations such as spawning locations, juvenile nursery areas and migration routes, but also included such community-oriented topics as kinship ties, crew structure, traditional management measures, the influence of the market and learning (Murray et al., 2006). Information from the interviews was then organised using GIS and qualitative analysis software, allowing for the 'aggregation' of LEK to a regional scale, which also facilitated comparison with existing fisheries science. Finally, these results were presented at a series of feedback sessions and were used to help spark discussion about policy recommendations, management alternatives and the future of Newfoundland's resource dependent fishing communities.

Generally, the researchers found that by combining and contrasting insights from different knowledge systems and by looking at processes that have shaped interactions between different groups of actors in these socio-ecological networks, they were able to develop a more nuanced, subtle and effective description and analysis of the history and dynamics of the fisheries studied. These results suggest that LEK is not only compatible with single-species assessments but with a broad ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management as well. Indeed, an ecosystems approach might better incorporate fishermen's qualitative knowledge of habitat, species interactions, spawning locations, etc. Assembling knowledge through talking to fishermen provides valuable insight into microscale processes, conditions and variability because it is built from the 'bottom up'. Drawing on different sorts of information broadens the diversity of available information, fundamentally involves fishermen in the very process of knowledge creation and strengthens the basis for truly participatory, future-oriented discussions.

5 Cooperative research and the fate of LEK in the Northeastern USA

Recent research in Northeastern USA allows us to examine the role of cooperative research for valuing LEK, and integrating it into and potentially transforming the decision-making process. Fisheries research that is carried out cooperatively by scientists and fishermen offers a tentative solution to the challenge of incorporating fishermen's knowledge into the decision-making process for fisheries management

(Bernstein and Iudicello, 2000; National Research Council, 2004; Neis and Felt, 2000; Wilson, 2003). It also makes clear the current barriers to that incorporation.

In Northeastern USA, interest in and opportunities for cooperative research are at an unprecedented level (Sissenwine, 2001). A diversity of projects that range from community-based mapping to gear selectivity studies have focused on some aspect of virtually all important species of fish and shellfish as well as on habitat and environmental conditions (Hall-Arber and Pederson, 1999). Indeed, many fishermen now make their annual business plans based on how much financial support they will receive from collaborative research. The recent growth of cooperative research attests to the potential for institutional change and the willingness of all parties to entertain a paradigm shift.

6 The use of LEK in cooperative research

Fishermen and their LEK, particularly knowledge regarding where, when and how to catch fish are integrated into cooperative research programmes in different ways depending upon the type of research conducted. For example, in cooperative survey research, sampling stations are selected randomly, and so these surveys seemingly do not utilise fishermen's knowledge. However, fishermen's knowledge and skill have proven important when these random stations are areas of complex and rocky bottom making successful sampling (via the towing of bottom nets) difficult without experience. Moreover, such cooperation is necessary when, as in the case researched, the survey was focused on a smaller inshore area than had been traditionally sampled. Indeed, the 'industry-based survey' project we examined emerged from fishing community complaints that inshore areas (fishing grounds accessible to inshore vessels and vital to local community survival) were excluded from region-wide sea sampling programmes but subject to the regulations they informed; it was argued that the latter could not then reflect local stock conditions, species interactions or habitat considerations. Intimate knowledge of bottom type within specific localities became essential to surveying at new scales.

In cooperative tagging studies, fishermen provide their knowledge about fishing locations (both spatial and temporal knowledge), catching fish (using gear and vessels) and handling fish (including recreational angler knowledge). Tagging programmes also rely on fishermen's skills in catching fish to get tag returns, and in some cases, fishermen have been trained to do the tagging themselves in the absence of scientists on board. Including fishermen directly increases their compliance and therefore, the number of returned tags. While the tagging programmes examined have had, to date, only limited effect relative to fisheries management, many participants (scientists and fishermen) were impressed by the way these programmes changed the culture of scientist/fishermen relations. The projects facilitated new appreciations and understandings across what had been a significant boundary and have, perhaps, laid the foundations for future cooperative projects.

Finally, participatory gear studies have long been successful at integrating fishermen's LEK. While gear studies were originally focused on fleet modernisation and increasing catch, they are, today, focused on species and size selectivity. Interestingly, fishermen are as interested to cooperate in the latter as they were in the former. In both cases, fishermen's technical knowledge about gear design, deployment and vessel

operations are vital. However, fishermen also provide ecological knowledge to such studies. They know how different gear interacts with different environments and how it will be used relative to the behaviour of fish. Today, the norm is to see fishermen working with scientists designing gear, testing models in flume tanks, testing gear at sea and recommending modifications for future research. An outside observer might have a difficult time differentiating the 'scientists' from the 'fishermen' in these projects.

7 Integrating cooperative research into management

Integrating cooperative research into the fisheries science used for management has proven more challenging than integrating fishermen and their knowledge into cooperative research. To be effectively integrated in the stock assessment process, for example, industry-based surveys must be standardised and replicated over a relatively long period of time. Standardisation itself calls for experimentation and learning, such as calibration experiments and a relatively long time-series of data is desired for stock assessment, resulting in delays in the use of data from cooperative research projects, and hence, difficulty assessing their use. Yet, as the tagging studies illustrated, such projects produce new possibilities for cooperation as they reposition both fishermen and scientists in new relationships to each other and the environment. In addition, cooperative research, which by definition does not replicate large-area science-based surveys, is creating new knowledge of species, interactions and habitat at new scales that may prove to be appropriate for ecosystem-based endeavours.

The incorporation of LEK will clearly vary by project objectives and design as well as the species-specific information needs of stock assessment. Most of the examples where cooperative research has been incorporated into management are gear studies, which provide immediate answers to pressing management problems. For example, several 'special access programmes' were created based in part on data produced through cooperative gear selectivity research (e.g. yellowtail flounder access in a closed area and a haddock hook fishery) (Plante, 2004, 2005). And an exempted whiting fishery exists because of data produced through cooperative research (Plante, 2003). Including fishermen and their LEK from design to implementation produces management outcomes that are more likely to be widely (or easily) accepted by fishing communities or relevant to the problems faced by those communities.

8 The limitations of LEK and challenges in LEK research

The projects outlined above recognise the local knowledge, insights and experiences of fishermen. They enlarge the field of what is credible and thereby produce new conditions for what is possible (cf. Gibson-Graham, 2005). While these projects do not necessarily alter the trajectory of fisheries science and management, the intermingling of what was once ontologically and spatially divided creates new opportunities and engages participants in new imaginings of the future of fisheries. Yet, this intermingling produces frictions even as it suggests new possibilities. LEK is not universally celebrated as a solution to the problems of fisheries and substantial barriers to its incorporation persist. Similarly, in cooperative research, only particular forms of LEK (i.e. knowledge of fish

locations and/or gear handling) are readily merged within existing procedures of science and management.

Barriers to the integration of LEK may be internal to LEK and the methods by which it is documented. For example, critiques of LEK research and/or the usage of LEK in fisheries management have focused on the validity of LEK itself, particularly as compared to 'objective', positivistic Western science upon which fisheries management is ostensibly built (Neis and Felt, 2000; Neis et al., 1999). In short, the data contained in fishermen's knowledge have a high degree of complexity and are not usually standardised as to temporal scale, territorial coverage, technology, effort and expertise (Murray et al., 2005). Because LEK is largely motivated by fishing success rather than scientific criteria of consistency and generality, it is also more difficult to 'take out of people' and present to an audience so that it can be digested and understood. There also has been a lack of methodological consistency and clarity in LEK research (Murray et al., submitted). Researchers, for example, sometimes fail to explain their selection of 'local experts' (Davis and Wagner, 2003). Moreover, the methods and practices of LEK researchers, including the abstraction of LEK from local contexts, can sometimes tend to subordinate LEK to science (Agrawal, 1995; Gray, 2002; Holm, 2003; Pålsson, 2000; see also Neis, 2003).

Our research suggests that, in addition to the nature of LEK itself, there are substantial institutional barriers to its incorporation and use. For example, in the USA new legislative acts mandate standards and assessments of data quality; such procedures may hinder or delay the incorporation of cooperative research in management where data emerges from a variety of non-traditional and unfamiliar sources that make technical and peer review challenging. This is a delicate issue, since on one hand, there are requirements for transparency, public review and information quality standards, which take time, while on other hand, there are desires for more flexible, adaptive and responsive management that can respond to new information provided from a variety of knowledge sources, including LEK, traditional science and cooperative research.

In addition to accepting the validity of LEK and cooperative research outcomes, there remains the issue of its integration into existing systems of, for example, stock assessment. The latter requires specific forms of data over long time periods and at specific scales (typically produced by sea sampling and landings monitoring for large regions). In our research, stock assessment scientists who were interviewed clearly appreciated fishermen's knowledge but saw little use for it relative to region-wide stock assessment. They pointed to the differences between fishermen's and scientific knowledge (e.g. in terms of scale and review) as well as a profound cultural and communication gap between fishermen and scientists. While they saw cooperative research as a way to address the latter, they also saw the results of such research as largely superfluous relative to current systems of stock assessment.

Yet, our work also suggests that the formal institutions of fisheries science and management are neither static nor necessarily hostile towards LEK and/or cooperative science, and that there are new methods and frameworks forming to accommodate such non-traditional research. For example, in Northeast USA, in addition to the formalisation of cooperative research funding mechanisms and a number of 'successful' projects, there is the recent initiative by the regional management council to formalise the review of cooperative research outcomes with the goal of directly using such outcomes in decision-making and management. While others have noted the ways that the incorporation of LEK into formal management practice threatens to discipline

and essentially alter LEK (e.g. Holm, 2003), we are interested in how its incorporation also foments institutional change. The presence of valid and vetted knowledge relative to localities, lifetimes of environmental observation and community practices makes possible new understandings of fisheries that are compatible with ecosystem- and community-based forms of management.

9 Linking communities and ecosystems

LEK and cooperative research may be the source of information necessary for or productive of a paradigm shift in fisheries science and management, yet it is the broad notion of community that provides a framework for their understanding and operationalisation. While there is no definitive answer as to what constitutes a fishing community or what are its bounds (see below), the notion of community can nevertheless act as a frame for the analysis of the relationship between fishermen and fisheries and as a rubric for policy development (Olson, 2005). Like ecosystems, communities foreground understandings of interrelationships (between and amongst fishermen), multiscalar approaches (to social and economic processes), the importance of context (cultural and historical) and embeddedness in locality (of fisheries and fishing communities) *even as it remains poorly defined*. Community, as an analytical frame increasingly incorporated into the institutions of fisheries science and management, is, then, our third instance where we see a potential for an emerging paradigm shift.

10 Community as site of regulatory impact

The USA provides an excellent opportunity for examining questions about community and fisheries because legal mandates governing US federal fisheries management require the application of social science in the examination of impacts to both occupational groups and place-based communities (e.g. McCay et al., 2002a,b). Mandates with the most direct relevance to the study of fishing communities come from the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) and its 1996 amendment where, for the first time, the entity known as a ‘fishing community’ appeared in national legislation.¹ The Act defines ‘fishing community’ as

“a community which is substantially dependent on or substantially engaged in the harvesting or processing of fishery resources to meet social and economic needs, and includes fishing vessel owners, operators, and crew and United States fish processors that are based in such communities” (Sec. 3 Definitions 16 U.S.C. 1802).

The definition assigns community to a geographical place that is characterised by the presence of landing sites, processors and/or residences of those who participate in fisheries. This place-based definition, like any definition that attempts to limit community to a single characteristic, makes it difficult to analyse the complexity of social, economic and cultural processes that constitute community and do not map onto discrete locales.

Our research in the Mid-Atlantic region of the USA, itself emerging from the federal mandate to assess fishing communities, suggests that ports and other discrete places, defined in a strict, geopolitical sense, are not necessarily the privileged or exclusive loci

of fishing communities. In short, the socio-cultural, political and economic ties that cross geopolitical boundaries are essential to understanding social impacts experienced in any one place. This is because multiple places are intimately connected in space and time by the social, economic and cultural networks established by various actors moving between places (Clifford, 1994; Malkki, 1995). Fishing communities, as experienced by their members, may not be contiguous with the boundaries of discrete locales at all, or, put in another way, the places relevant to communities of fishermen may have multiple localities (cf. Gupta and Ferguson, 1997).

Our research has reinforced our contention that defining communities along single axes or bounding them by particular geographies contradicts rather than complements the movement towards ecosystems-based science and management. For example, multilocal socio-economic and cultural networks constitute some of the most salient aspects of fishing communities in the Mid-Atlantic. Members of these communities are mobile at sea, on land and in the virtual world. They are embedded in local, regional, national and global systems of capital flow. Their members are regulated at the local, state and federal levels and their activities are tied to the global political economy. The official definition of fishing communities neither captures the reality of these communities nor directly proposes that community be anything more than a site of regulatory impact (cf. McCay, 2005; St. Martin, 2006). Nevertheless, we are heartened by the establishment of fishing communities as objects of analysis within the institutions of fisheries science and management.

While initially limited, fishing communities are increasingly visible as, for example, in the 'Community Panels Project' that engages fishing community members in the ongoing assessment of their own communities and economies relative to fisheries management in the Northeast.² Implemented in a variety of ports across New England, the panels reflect upon social, cultural and economic transformations of their communities relative to existing and pending fisheries management legislation. The results of the project inform policy makers but also serve to bring to the fore processes of community and culture that are more typically treated as secondary concerns by the institutions of fisheries management (Hall-Arber, 2006b). In this and other projects, communities exceed their boundaries and become more than just sites of impact; they, in short, are beginning to 'take on the muscle of reality' (Popper and Popper, 1999).

11 Community as constitutive of fisheries

Like LEK and cooperative research, working with and building upon 'communities' will require new methods that not only incorporate communities into fisheries science and management as sites of impact but reveal community-based processes as constitutive of fisheries and ecosystem processes directly (McCay, 2005). While aggregate fishing effort has long been seen as the major determinant of the (degraded) status of fisheries, communities suggest we examine a disaggregated effort and a differentiation of fishing practices across space and within communities; it suggests that we examine the complexity of cultural, social and economic processes that together produce that differentiation. A recognition and documentation of the heterogeneous nature of the social landscape that overlays, interacts with, and, in part, constitutes the natural environment is needed if ecosystem-based approaches to fisheries are to be comprehensive and sustainable.

The necessity of considering communities relative to ecosystems is perhaps best illustrated by the example of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). MPAs are increasingly advocated as mechanisms for fisheries management. Widely associated with ecosystem-based approaches to marine resource management (Browman and Stergiou, 2004b; McLeod et al., 2005; but see Sissenwine and Murawski, 2004), MPAs restrict a variety of human activities across often, large areas of sensitive habitat which makes them vulnerable to incursion, making voluntary compliance extremely important. The success of MPAs is contingent on the involvement and support of the communities of fishermen and other marine resource users who depend upon the area considered for protection (Christie et al., 2003). The participation of fishing communities in the design and implementation of the MPA can be facilitated by the incorporation of the practices and knowledge of those fishing communities (Aswani and Hamilton, 2004; Aswani and Lauer, 2006). In short, both community and biophysical processes associated with ecosystems must be understood and incorporated in MPA siting and design in order to produce a management regime that is sustainable over time.

12 Conclusion: towards a research agenda?

In this paper, we have examined work that traces the existence of processes and practices that emerge from and serve to constitute fishing communities in North America. This work, with its roots in the anthropological tradition, includes a variety of initiatives from the documentation of LEK to the institutionalisation of community panels. We believe these initiatives represent new opportunities for fisheries science (biological and social) and point to alternative foundations upon which to base an emerging ecosystems-based approach to fisheries management. Although results from such work are only recently and weakly incorporated within fisheries science and management, it is increasingly clear that the processes and practices documented are present within a much wider range of fisheries than previously imagined.

The work reviewed above suggests a research agenda that would include a variety of initiatives that first make visible, map or otherwise document processes such as LEK that have been neglected or displaced. It would examine the many sites, such as cooperative research projects, where such processes intersect with standard fisheries science and management and would examine closely the effects of these encounters. It would critically assess the insertion and/or adoption of community as a category and framework for analysis within fisheries science and management, and it would focus on the shift towards community as a fundamental element of a broader shift towards ecosystems-based fisheries management. Finally, it would acknowledge the ways that an ecosystem- and community-based approach might transform fishing communities themselves, for example, by developing stronger local identities and institutions for environmental stewardship (cf. Agrawal, 2005).

Along with others who have demonstrated the relevance of anthropological and related work in the North American context (Clay and McGoodwin, 1995; Dyer, 1994), we have pointed to the growing body of research that is currently defining and revealing fishing communities and community-based processes. It is our contention that a focus on these processes, for example LEK, helps to create alternative foundations upon which to build fisheries futures. Such foundations are needed, given the fact that decades of the dominant model of fisheries science and management have not worked. The shift

towards ecosystems, to which we add a complementary shift towards communities, provides a loose but ultimately generative framework for articulating new understandings of fisheries, new forms of data and analysis that incorporate multiple scales and the expansion of fisheries management possibilities.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on research supported in part by the following projects: 'Experience Based Knowledge in a Science Policy Context', US NSF, SES-0349907 and SES-0322570; 'Coasts Under Stress', SSHRC and NSERC of Canada, and with support from Memorial University and the University of Victoria; 'Environmental Knowledge of Commercial Fishermen and Its Application to Fisheries Management', New Jersey Sea Grant College Programme; 'An Atlas-based Audit of Fishing Territories', NOAA; 'Cumulative Effects and New Jersey Fisheries', New Jersey Sea Grant College Programme, New Jersey Marine Sciences Consortium and the following CMER projects of the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, NOAA: 'Fishing Communities of the Mid-Atlantic', 'Recreational Fishing and National Standard 8' and 'Spatial Dimensions of Fisheries and Their Implications for Property Rights Alternatives'. It was also supported by Hatch Projects #NJ26107 and NJ26108 of the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station and a grant from the New Jersey Fisheries Information and Development Center.

References

- Agrawal, A. (1995) 'Dismantling the divide between indigenous and scientific knowledge', *Development and Change*, Vol. 26, pp.413–439.
- Agrawal, A. (2005) *Environmentality: Technologies of Government and the Making of Subjects*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ames, E., Watson, S. and Wilson, J. (2000) 'Rethinking overfishing: insights from oral histories of retired groundfishermen', in B. Neis and L. Felt (Eds). *Finding Our Sea Legs: Linking Fishery People and Their Knowledge with Science and Management*, St. John's, Newfoundland: ISER Books.
- Apostle, R., McCay, B. and Mikalsen, K.H. (2002) *Enclosing the Commons: Individual Transferable Quotas in the Nova Scotia Fishery*, St. John's, Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research.
- Aswani, S. and Hamilton, R.J. (2004) 'Integrating indigenous ecological knowledge and customary sea tenure with marine and social science for conservation of Bumphead parrotfish (*Bombometopon muricatum*) in the Roviana Lagoon, Solomon Islands', *Environmental Conservation*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp.69–83.
- Aswani, S. and Lauer, M. (2006) 'Incorporating fishermen's local knowledge and behavior into geographical information systems (GIS) for designing marine protected areas in Oceania', *Human Organization*, Vol. 65, No. 1, pp.81–102.
- Bernstein, B.B. and Iudicello, S. (2000) *National Evaluation of Cooperative Data Gathering Efforts in Fisheries: A Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service*, National Fisheries Conservation Center.
- Booth, A.J. (2000) 'Incorporating the spatial component of fisheries data into stock assessment models', *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, Vol. 57.
- Botsford, L., Castilla, J.C. and Peterson, C.H. (1997) 'The management of fisheries and marine ecosystems', *Science*, Vol. 277, pp.509–515.

- Browman, H.L. and Stergiou, K.I. (Eds) (2004a) 'Theme section: perspectives on ecosystem-based approaches to the management of marine resources', *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, Vol. 274, pp.269–303.
- Browman, H.L. and Stergiou, K.I. (Eds) (2004b) 'Marine protected areas as a central element of ecosystem-based management: defining their location, size and number', *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, Vol. 274, pp.271–272.
- Caddy, J.F. (1996) 'Regime shifts and paradigm changes: is there still a place for equilibrium thinking?' *Fisheries Research*, Vol. 25, pp.219–230.
- Christie, P., et al. (2003) 'Toward developing a complete understanding: a social science research agenda for marine protected areas', *Fisheries*, Vol. 28, No. 12, pp.22–26.
- Clay, P.M. and McGoodwin, J.R. (1995) 'Utilizing social sciences in fisheries management', *Aquatic Living Resources*, Vol. 8, pp.203–207.
- Clifford, J. (1994) 'Diasporas', *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp.302–338.
- Costanza, R., et al. (1998) 'Principles for sustainable governance of the oceans', *Science*, Vol. 281, pp.198–199.
- Davis, A. (1996) 'Barbed wire and bandwagons: a comment on ITQ fisheries management', *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, Vol. 6, pp.97–107.
- Davis, A. and Wagner, J.R. (2003) 'Who knows? On the importance of identifying 'experts' when researching local ecological knowledge (LEK)', *Human Ecology*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp.463–449.
- Dyer, C. and McGoodwin, J. (Eds) (1994) *Folk Management in the World's Fisheries: Lessons for Modern Fisheries Management*, Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- Dyer, C.L. (1994) 'Proaction versus reaction: integrating applied anthropology into fishery management', *Human Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 1, pp.83–88.
- EPAP (Ecosystem Principles Advisory Panel) (1999) *Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management: A Report to Congress by the Ecosystem Principles Advisory Panel*, Silver Spring, MD: National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA.
- Feeny, D., Hanna, S. and McEvoy, A.F. (1996) 'Questioning the assumptions of the 'tragedy of the commons' model of fisheries', *Land Economics*, Vol. 72, No. 2, pp.187–205.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2005) 'Surplus possibilities: postdevelopment and community economies', *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp.4–26.
- Gordon, H.S. (1954) 'The economic theory of a common property resource: the fishery', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 62, pp.124–142.
- Grafton, Q. and Kompas, T. (2005) 'Uncertainty and the active adaptive management of marine reserves', *Marine Policy*, Vol. 29, pp.471–479.
- Grafton, Q., et al. (2006) 'Incentive-based approaches to sustainable fisheries', *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, Vol. 63, pp.699–710.
- Gray, T. (2002) *Fisheries Science and Fishers' Knowledge*, ENSUS 2002 – Marine Science and Technology for Environmental Sustainability Conference, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK, December, Available at: <http://www.efep.org/TSGENSUS.pdf>, Accessed on 24 September 2003.
- Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. (1997) 'Culture, power, place: ethnography at the end of an era', in A. Gupta and J. Ferguson (Eds). *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*, Durham: Duke University Press, pp.1–29.
- Hall-Arber, M. (2006b) *Final Report to NOAA Fisheries, Institutionalizing Social Science Data Collection*, 24 May 2006, Award Number: NMFS Grant No. 01-NER-034 (2001), Principal Investigators David Bergeron, Bonnie J. McCay, and Madeleine Hall-Arber, Available at: <http://www.mass-fish.org/communit.htm> and [http://web.mit.edu/seagrant/aqua/cmss/comm %20mtgs/ commmtgs.html](http://web.mit.edu/seagrant/aqua/cmss/comm%20mtgs/commmtgs.html).

- Hall-Arber, M. and Pederson, J. (1999) 'Habitat observed from the decks of fishing vessels', *Fisheries*, Vol. 24, pp.6–13.
- Hall-Arber, M., Dyer, C., Poggie, J., McNally, J. and Gagne, R. (2001) *New England's Fishing Communities*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Sea Grant College Program.
- Hannesson, R. (2004) *The Privatization of the Oceans*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Holm, P. (2003) 'Crossing the border: on the relationship between science and fishermen's knowledge in a resource management context', *MAST*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.5–33.
- Hutchings, J. and Ferguson, M. (2000) 'Temporal changes in harvesting dynamics of Canadian inshore fisheries for Northern Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*)', *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, Vol. 57, pp.805–814.
- Iudicello, S., Weber, M. and Wieland, R. (1999) *Fish, Markets, and Fishermen*, Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Jentoft, S. (2000) 'The community: a missing link of fisheries management', *Marine Policy*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp.53–60.
- Jentoft, S., McCay, B.J. and Wilson, D. (1998) 'Social theory and fisheries co-management', *Marine Policy*, Vol. 22, Nos. 4–5, pp.423–436.
- Johannes, R. (1981) *Words of the Lagoon: Fishing and Marine Lore in the Palau District of Micronesia*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kaufman, L., Heneman, B., Barnes, J.T. and Fujita, R. (2004) 'Transition from low to high data richness: an experiment in ecosystem-based fishery management from California', *Bulletin of Marine Science*, Vol. 74, No. 3, pp.693–708.
- Kearney, J., Arthur, B., Maria, R., Maryh, D., Langille, L. and Cunningham, G. (1998) 'Resistance to privatisation: community-based fisheries management in an industrialised nation', *Paper Delivered to International Workshop on Community-Based Natural Resource Management*, 10–14 May, Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Langton, R.W., Auster, P.J. and Schneider, D.C. (1995) 'A spatial and temporal perspective on research and management of groundfish in the Northwest Atlantic', *Reviews in Fisheries Science*, Vol. 3, pp.201–229.
- Malkki, L. (1995) 'Refugees and exile: from refugee studies to the national order of things', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 24, pp.495–523.
- Mansfield, B. (2004a) 'Neoliberalism in the oceans: 'rationalization,' property rights, and the commons question', *Geoforum*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp.313–326.
- Mansfield, B. (2004b) 'Rules of privatization: contradictions in neoliberal regulation of North Pacific Fisheries', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 94, No. 3, pp.565–584.
- McCay, B.J. (1995) 'Social and ecological implications of ITQs: an overview', *Ocean and Coastal Management*, Vol. 28, Nos. 1–3, pp.3–22.
- McCay, B.J. (2000a) 'Post-modernism and the management of natural and common resources, presidential address to the international association for the study of common property, Part I', *Common Property Resource Digest*, No. 54, September 2000, pp.1–6.
- McCay, B.J. (2000b) 'Resistance to changes in property rights or, why not ITQs?' in R. Shotton (Ed). *Use of Property Rights in Fisheries Management, Proceedings of the FishRights99 Conference*, Fremantle, Western Australia, 11–19 November 1999, *Mini-Course Lectures and Core Conference Presentations*, *FAO Fisheries Technical Paper 404/1*, Rome: FAO of the UN, pp.39–44.
- McCay, B.J. (2004) 'ITQs and community: an essay on environmental governance', *Review of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp.162–170.
- McCay, B.J. (2005) 'Getting to the bottom of it: bringing social science into benthic habitat management', in P.W. Barnes and J.P. Thomas (Eds). *Benthic Habitats and the Effects of Fishing*, American Fisheries Society Symposium 41, Bethesda, MD: American Fisheries Society, pp.713–725.

- McCay, B.J. and Jentoft, S. (1996) 'From the bottom up: participatory issues in fisheries management', *Society and Natural Resources*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp.237–250.
- McCay, B.J. and Jentoft, S. (1998) 'Market or community failure? Critical perspectives on common property research', *Human Organization*, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp.21–29.
- McCay, B.J., Oles, B., Stoffle, B., Bochenek, E., St Martin, K., Graziosi, V., Johnson, T. and Lamarque, J. (2002a) *Port and Community Profiles, Amendment 9, Squid, Atlantic Mackerel, and Butterfish Fishery Management Plan: A Report to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council*, New Brunswick: The Fisheries Project, Rutgers University.
- McCay, B.J., Wilson, D.C., Lamarque, J., St Martin, K., Bochenek, E., Stoffle, B., Oles, B. and Johnson, T. (2002b) *Port and Community Profiles and Social Impact Assessment, Amendment 13 of the Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery Management Plan: A Report to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council*, Rutgers University, New Brunswick: The Fisheries Project.
- McLeod, K.L., Lubchenco, J., Palumbi, S.R. and Rosenberg, A.A. (2005) *Scientific Consensus Statement on Marine Ecosystem-Based Management*, Signed by 219 academic scientists and policy experts with relevant expertise and published by the Communication Partnership for Science and the Sea at <http://compassonline.org/?q=EBM>.
- Murray, G.D., Bavington, D. and Neis, B. (2005) 'Local ecological knowledge, science, participation and fisheries governance in Newfoundland and Labrador: a complex, contested, and changing relationship', in T.S. Gray (Ed). *Participation in Fisheries Governance*, Kluwer.
- Murray, G.D., Neis, B. and Johnsen, J.P. (2006) 'Lessons learned from reconstructing interactions between local ecological knowledge, fisheries science and fisheries management in the commercial fisheries of Newfoundland and Labrador', *Canada Human Ecology*.
- Murray, G.D., Neis, B., Ings, D., Schneider, D., Whalen, J., Gosse, K. and Palmer, C. (submitted) 'Local ecological knowledge in the historical reconstruction of marine socio-environmental systems: methods, procedures and challenges', in B. Neis and J. Lutz (Eds). *Making and Moving Knowledge*, Chapter 7.
- National Research Council (2004) *Cooperative Research in the National Marine Fisheries Service*, Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Neis, B. (2003) 'Bridging the equality of embeddedness. Commentary on holm', *MAST*, Vol. 2, No. 1.
- Neis, B. and Felt, L. (Eds) (2000) *Finding our Sea Legs: Linking Fishery People and Their Knowledge with Science and Management*, St. John's, Newfoundland, ISER Books.
- Neis, B., Schneider, D.C., Felt, L.F., Haedrich, R.L., Hutchings, J.A. and Fischer, J. (1999) 'Northern cod stock assessment: what can be learned from interviewing resource users?' *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, Vol. 56, pp.1944–1963.
- Olson, J. (2005) 'Re-placing the space of community: a story of cultural politics, policies, and fisheries management', *Anthropological Quarterly*, Vol. 78, No. 1, pp.247–267.
- Pálsson, G. (1994) 'Enskillment at sea', *Man*, Vol. 29, pp.875–900.
- Pálsson, G. (2000) 'Finding one's sea legs: learning, the process of enskillment, and integrating fishers and their knowledge into fisheries science and management', in B. Neis and L. Felt (Eds). *Finding Our Sea Legs: Linking Fishery People and Their Knowledge with Science and Management*, St. John's, Newfoundland: ISER Books.
- Pauly, D. (1997) 'Putting fisheries management back in places', *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.125–127.
- Pauly, D. and Maclean, J. (2003) *In a Perfect Ocean: The State of Fisheries and Ecosystems in the North Atlantic Ocean*, Washington: Island Press.
- Pinkerton, E. (Ed) (1989) *Co-Operative Management of Local Fisheries*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Plante, J.M. (2003) 'NE Council approves inshore GOM whiting grate fishery', *Commercial Fisheries News*.
- Plante, J.M. (2004) 'SAPs: Way to target healthy groundfish stocks', *Commercial Fisheries News*.

- Plante, J.M. (2005) 'Hook gear haddock SAP underway in closed area I', *Commercial Fisheries News*.
- Popper, D. and Popper, F. (1999) 'The buffalo commons: metaphor as method', *Geographical Review*, Vol. 89, No. 4, p.491, 20.
- Rosenberg, A., Bolster, W.J., Alexander, K.E., Leavenworth, W.B., Cooper, A.B. and McKenzie, M.G. (2005) 'The history of ocean resources: modeling cod biomass using historical records', *Frontiers Ecology Environment*, Vol. 3, pp.84–90.
- Sainsbury, K. (1998) 'Living marine resource assessment for the 21st century: what will be needed and how will it be provided?' in F. Funk, T.J. Quinn II, J. Heifetz, J.N. Ianelli, T.F. Powers, J.F. Schweigert, P.J. Sullivan, C.I. Zhang and A.K. Anchorage (Eds). *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Fishing Stock Assessment Models for the 21st Century*, Lowell Wakefield Fisheries Symposium, pp.1–40.
- Scott, A. (1955) 'The fishery: the objectives of sole ownership', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 63, pp.116–124.
- Shivlani, M.P. and Milon, J.W. (2000) 'Sociocultural effects of a market-based fishery management program in the Florida keys', *Coastal Management*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp.133–147.
- Sissenwine, M. and Murawski, S. (2004) 'Moving beyond 'intelligent tinkering': advancing an ecosystem approach to fisheries', *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, Vol. 274, p.291.
- Sissenwine, M.P. (2001) *Testimony on Fisheries Cooperative Research Before the Committee on Resources*, Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, US House of Representatives, Ocean City, MD, 11 December 2001.
- Smith, T.D. (1994) *Scaling Fisheries: The Science of Measuring the Effects of Fishing, 1855–1955*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- St. Martin, K. (2001) 'Making space for community resource management in fisheries', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 91, No. 1, pp.122–142.
- St. Martin, K. (2004) 'GIS in marine fisheries science and decision making', in W.L. Fisher and F.J. Rahel (Eds). *Geographic Information Systems in Fisheries*, American Fisheries Society, pp.237–258.
- St. Martin, K. (2005a) 'Mapping economic diversity in the first world: the case of fisheries', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 37, pp.959–979.
- St. Martin, K. (2005b) 'Disrupting enclosure and the potential for non-capitalism in New England fisheries', *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.63–80.
- St. Martin, K. (2006) 'The impact of 'community' on fisheries management in the US Northeast', *Geoforum*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp.169–184.
- Wilson, D. (1999) 'Fisheries science collaborations: the critical role of the community', *Research Publication No. 45*, Institute for Fisheries Management and Coastal Community Development.
- Wilson, D. (2003) 'Fisheries co-management and the knowledge base for management decisions', in D.C. Wilson, J.R. Nielsen and P. Degnbol (Eds). *The Fisheries Co-Management Experience: Accomplishments, Challenges and Prospect*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp.265–279.
- Wilson, J., Low, B., Costanza, R. and Ostrom, E. (1999) 'Scale misperceptions and the spatial dynamics of a socialecological system', *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 31, pp.243–257.
- Wilson, J.A. (2006) 'Matching social and ecological systems in complex ocean fisheries', *Ecology and Society*, Vol. 11, No. 1, p.9.
- Wroblewski, J. (2000) 'The colour of cod: fishers and scientists identify a local cod stock in Gilbert Bay, Southern Labrador', in B. Neis and L. Felt (Eds). *Finding our Sea Legs: Linking Fishery People and Their Knowledge with Science and Management*, St. John's, Newfoundland: ISER Books.

Notes

¹NOAA Fisheries is the federal agency responsible for overseeing the execution of impact assessments related to federal fisheries. NOAA Fisheries, which is a division of the Department of Commerce, is responsible for the management and conservation of living marine resources within the Exclusive Economic Zone of the USA (waters between three and 200 miles offshore). For additional information on the mandates pertaining to social impact assessments in fisheries, see <http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/econ/impact.html>.

²The Community Panels Project (principal investigators: David Bergeron, Madeleine Hall-Arber and Bonnie J. McCay) was a project of the Massachusetts Fishermen's Partnership and was funded by Northeast Consortium and Saltonstall-Kennedy grants of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) of the USA. See <http://www.mass-fish.org/communit.htm>.