

5

NETS AND FLOWS I: FISHERIES



Introduction

'Fisheries are areas of the sea where fish are caught in large quantities for commercial purposes' (*Collins Cobuild English Dictionary* 1999: 635). This entry reveals a great deal. First, fisheries have increasingly become associated with territorialised 'areas of the sea', an indication of the attempts to produce territorial resource management societies at sea. Secondly, fish are at centre stage, but as an object for a practice in the passive mode, from which fishing humans have been erased. Thirdly, catching fish is more than coincidental, instrumentally serving business interests. This chapter examines the complexities in the spatialities, objects/actors and economic connections of fisheries in the North Atlantic. Its focus is not only the fishers, but also fish on the move, the flows of capital in fisheries, routed societies of fishermen and fisherwomen, networks and flows of fish to consumers, native and emigrant workers in fish-processing plants and the like. Fisheries create practices that are most important in the formation of Nordic Atlantic societies. The region depends on fishing as an economic foundation, as the basis for various social organisations and as one of the most prominent sources of identification.

The colonial exploration of the Nordic Atlantic areas and the society building that followed were oriented to the exploitation of marine resources; monopoly trade had fish as its staple (see Chapter 3). Some of the major international definitions of the area, and central political struggles, are about fish, from the cod wars of the early 1970s to the non-membership of the Nordic Atlantic in the European Union. People in the Nordic Atlantic have tried to define their societies as fishing societies, and their unity and relations in terms of territorial control over mobile fish. Iceland was a pioneer in defining and later extending Exclusive Economic Zones to 200 sea miles in 1976, a central practice in the contemporary territorial bridging

of nation building. Meanwhile, there are more or less invisible mobile bonds (see Chapter 1) among fishers across the Atlantic, on their travelling vessels, sharing tacit knowledge across borders. As a former Faroese fisherman said to me in an interview in 1989: 'Fishermen were caught behind the fences of Exclusive Economic Zones.' They had been used to fishing in distant waters and to a life without regulations or resource management systems, but now had to concentrate on domestic waters. This particular fisherman faced the consequences squarely, and began raising salmon in closed aquaculture nets, a practice far more in keeping with agriculture than with fishing. There are clearly diverse forms of network and flow in fisheries, where people cope with unpredictable and invisible fish populations, more or less migrating, together with the global circulation of oceans, climate changes, topographies, pollutants and food chains, from plankton to mammals. It is no surprise that modelling fishery systems needs to address complexity and uncertainty as core issues (see Charles 2001).

This chapter analyses the more or less unintended consequences of people's coping with these complexities and uncertainties and the societies produced by these practices. Since these socio-material practices involve both humans and non-humans at significant levels, there is a continuing undercurrent of ontological debate. It is therefore not possible to limit oneself to discussing only strictly social ontology: fisheries cross major academic fields dealing with nature and society, while also transcending boundaries between various forms of knowledge – scientific, local, tacit, mobile and the like.

This investigation starts with the rich traditions of social sciences in examining fisheries, and the ambivalences in the ontologies of these sciences, including community embeddedness approaches and Actor–Network Theory (ANT). The analysis continues with the historical, colonial tradition of approaching fisheries as non-social, purely economic practices, ones that destroy the indigenous. From here the empirical focus turns to studies of mobile fishing societies, the introduction of Individually Transferable Quotas (ITQs), contemporary socio-economic networks and flows of fishing in the Nordic Atlantic, the role of women in fisheries, fishing heritages and festivals, and the constitutive role of labour migrants in fish processing and their associated locations.

This chapter takes into account a number of cases of social transformations in fishing societies, where isolated positions and requirements for distant transport and communication used to be the basis for trade monopolies and dominant merchants, brokering with the 'outside' (Löfgren 1982: 164; see also above, Chapter 3). Other ways of coping with distance emerged with the twentieth-century social institutionalisation of fishery regimes, introduction of nationalised Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs), attempts at state resource management, deregulation and introduction of

neoliberal principles (like ITQs) in order to cope with overcapacity without 'troublesome' state interventions. The result of this was to a great extent that mobilities of fish, capital and labour increased, propelled by an increasingly capitalist organisation of fisheries, together with other adaptations, such as household strategies, many of which are also mobile. One aspect of this chapter is its attempt to take the voluminous discourse on fishery 'communities' out of its often narrow localism, since fisheries are enmeshed in so many and varied networks and flows beyond the 'local community', thus destabilising localised life and restructuring societies spatially.

Social Science Networks in Fisheries

Networks and flows, alongside more territorial notions of place and region, are among the central socio-spatial concepts or metaphors of the last decade or so (Mol and Law 1994; Castells 1996; Urry 2000). Society is no longer primarily territorial, but is also made up of networks, fluid objects and bits and pieces.

It has been said, that the social-science concept of a network originates from research on 'knitted' relationships among people in a Norwegian fishing community studied by the British anthropologist, J.A. Barnes (1954). The concept occurred to him while looking at fishing nets hanging out to dry (Jentoft 1993: 39). For Barnes, networks were about the 'social field' of interactions between people with interwoven relationships of kinship, friendship and community life, with no external boundaries to the social fields of fluid fisheries and static administration and agriculture (Barnes 1954: 43). The concept of networks spread into management studies, economic sociology and the like as a way of addressing relatively permanent relationships that are horizontal rather than vertical. The concept of the network became one of ties between individuals who know each other, expressing trust and, perhaps most of all, reciprocity. Networks became a central idea in economic sociology for forms of organisation other than anonymous, amoral markets, or the hierarchies of corporations, state governments and the like (Grabher 1993). From its original focus on interaction among individuals, the concept was extended to inter-firm relations and governance networks. Whereas the socio-material character of interaction and exchange was implicit in the network analysis of inter-personal and inter-firm relations, the concept was increasingly being used for anything, anywhere, at any time. Castells's *The Rise of the Network Society* (1996) opened the path to an increasing focus on distant connections propelled by the development of information and communication technologies.

Meanwhile, in the literature about fishing communities, networks continue to be affiliated with notions of the local, the community, embedded-

ness and, more or less explicitly, territoriality. The classical reference in anthropology became Anthony Cohen's *The Symbolic Construction of Community* (1985), based on his studies of the Shetland Islands. In North Atlantic community studies, the anthropological approach was linked to economic sociology through the works of Granovetter (1985) and K. Polanyi (1957; also Hovgaard 2001). A whole transatlantic community of researchers contributed to this approach, a tradition ranging from classical works by, among others, Ottar Brox (see above, Chapter 2) to Apostle et al., *Community, State, and Market on the North Atlantic Rim* (1998) and a number of contributions to the UNESCO MOST Circumpolar Coping Processes Project (Bærenholdt and Aarsæther 1998; Aarsæther and Bærenholdt 2001a, b). With reference to Anthony Cohen's work, Apostle et al. defined their main concept as follows: 'For us, community embeddedness refers to an emergent sense of identity and belonging that is a product of interactive density and role homogeneity in a social setting with definable boundaries. Identity springs from a depth of knowing – 'memoryscape', attachment to people and place, and a normative structure that gives the physical boundaries of place social closure' (Apostle et al. 1998: 236). These studies focus on reciprocity in local networks, and how *Gesellschaft* is nested in *Gemeinschaft* in the embedded fishing community (Apostle et al. 1998: 260). These unities and boundaries are simultaneously under threat from the dis-embedding forces of capitalist markets, creating the challenge of re-embedding social relations in new forms of solidarity and sustainable development. Increasingly, this literature also raised awareness of the possible negative aspects of embeddedness, such as clientelism, free riders, patriarchy and xenophobia.

This research discourse has pervasive messages for people in power about taking decisions. Especially in Norway, the community-oriented discourse in the areas of fisheries and regional policies has parallels in the societal institutionalisation, dominated by the rural left, of such policies. This process started in the 1930s and culminated in the 1970s, with some echoes in today's neoliberal discourses. Jahn Petter Johnsen has shown how – though being in conflict with other, more market-oriented approaches – the community-oriented discourse came to influence fishery policies in Norway after the Second World War (Johnsen 2002). Meanwhile, Petter Holm demonstrated the invisible revolution that has taken place in Norway since the 1980s, introducing more and more market-based forms of regulation in the resource management system (Holm 2001). While still in many ways rooted in the community and embeddedness tradition, Holm's and Johnsen's dissertations opened new routes of research, based in Actor–Network Theory (ANT). In fishery sciences, one source of inspiration, and debate, has especially been Michel Callon's now classic case study of the 'translations' of relations between researchers, fishermen, scallops and the scientific community. Callon argued that 'understanding what sociologists

generally call power relationships means describing the way in which actors are defined, associated and simultaneously obliged to remain faithful to their alliances' (Callon 1986: 224).

ANT does not provide a general theory of practice and change (see Chapter 2). Rather, it opens up a path for concrete, contextual studies that show how actors are associated with one another and, most provocatively, introduce a generalised symmetry between nature and society. If there is a theory, it is one in which only networks are actors. Networks are simultaneously material and social, but if the emphasis is placed on the material side, then one acquires an understanding of relationality that is rather different from the original network concept discussed above. This is because no social forms are taken as given, as society is the category to be explained, rather than being just taken for granted. Here, networks are not about reciprocity between humans, but about the associations made between the various types of actor involved.

More specifically, Callon's economic sociology, although influenced by Polanyi, breaks away from the embeddedness approach mentioned above. Callon (1999) does not accept Granovetter's dichotomy between networks and markets, between the social and the economic, because this approach tends to accept markets as having been defined a priori. For Callon, in contrast, markets are also constructed networks. He does not accept market ontology, but this does not prevent him from acknowledging the existence of markets, once they are built up and stabilised. For Callon, markets are not only abstractions (Callon 1998): they work as they are performed, when property rights and other stabilising devices have been put into practice. As Holm remarks:

It is these devices that allow framing and disentanglement, and they are built into organizations, routines and regulations, physical structures and machines. The more institutionalized, naturalized, technological, material and thing-like they become, the better they will work in dis-embedding agents and objects from their social, cultural and technological contexts, setting them free so as to realize – put into reality – the market model invented by the economist. (Holm 2002: 16)

An example of this is the implementation of Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs) in fisheries in many countries around the world, with Iceland being at the forefront of this development in the Nordic Atlantic. ITQs introduce the concept of private property in natural resources. They have exerted tremendous transformative powers, changing fishermen into the owners of fish resources, with considerable consequences for the losers in this battle (see later section).

Hence, markets do not exist a priori: they are produced through processes of networking. Their functioning is not due to any other reality behind the 'ideology' of the market. ANT approaches perform a materialist critique of the forms of constructivism that view the world in two layers: reality, and representations, abstractions or discourses. Meanings and

abstractions are not external to the practices of reality – they are part of it. Thus, the central notion of networks in ANT is simultaneously material, social and cultural.

In the ANT approach to research, networks are a set of tools that can be used to describe how certain socio-material networks stabilise and frame society, sociality or social relations. The interest of ANT in ethnographic, descriptive research may be seen as a plea for contextual socio-material analysis of the making of societies. Alongside this, there is an interesting tendency in the conclusions of actual studies. The process of disengagement, disentanglement or dis-embedding, if studied in the concrete, is seen as problematic. Holm (2001) and Johnsen (2002) end their dissertations with normative claims of how fishermen may be put back into power again. They obviously dislike their own analytical results, where fishermen and other actors have been turned into dis-embedded networks. Does their obsession with technological, material relations make ANT's use of network concepts too abstract to be able to distinguish crucial differences between types of network? For example, how does using the idea of networks as a stabilising process differ from the way mainstream economics uses the concept of markets? How do we understand networks as more than their functions (Descola 1996: 99)? In other words, the interest in more genuine research on the material side of socio-material practices should not lead to an avoidance in research of conceptualisations of the various ways they work.

This is also an argument for reassessing embeddedness approaches. Mingione (1991), drawing on Polanyi, stresses that the market differs from reciprocity and association as ways of connecting people. Reciprocity connects people through commitment over time in social relations among people (Bourdieu 1977; see also above, Chapter 2). The point here is that reciprocity extends relations over time; if you help me now, you can count on me helping you at another time, when you need it. The principle of association, developed from Polanyi's concept of redistribution, generalises a form of solidarity in which people do not exchange with one another, but commit themselves to certain socio-material networks, thus construing patterns of redistribution among all members across time and space (Mingione 1991; Martin 2001). Where face-to-face interaction would be the metaphor for reciprocity, standing shoulder to shoulder would be the metaphor for association.

However, both reciprocity and association can be performed at a distance, provided that physical non-presence is 'compensated' for by other forms of social, political or virtual proximity. Hence, there are in fact multiple forms of community or societies that people can embed themselves in, or commit themselves to, through their practices. The major problem with the embeddedness tradition is that it does not reflect critically on the spatial and temporal character of units and relations. In other words, embeddedness is

seen as an external relationship between instrumental economies and social commitments, when it should rather be viewed as characteristic of the practices producing societies, in various ways combining territoriality and mobility, bridging and bonding (see Chapter 1).

The inspiration that ANT, and also Tim Ingold's work, adds to this is to stress the biological and physical, 'embodied and embedded' character of practices that produce certain types of society. One suggestion could be to extend the concepts of reciprocity and association into human–environment relations, as has been suggested at a theoretical level (Pálsson 1996: 67), but which is also implied in the cosmologies of Inuit fishermen (Roepstorff 2003). Hence, one should not idealise human–environment relations: reciprocity and association in human–environment relations do have human practices as their point of reference – the cosmology is anthropocentric.

This can be illustrated more precisely by the way Greenlandic fishermen from Ilulissat perceive over fishing: they use the Greenlandic word *aalisapilunneq*, but this concept is semantically different from the scientific understanding of 'over fishing' as a technical matter of not harvesting fish stocks efficiently. The Greenlandic word is 'an abstract noun related to *aalisapilutoq*, denoting ... someone who fishes more than he needs. To be accused of *aalisapilunneq* is therefore to be accused of violating one of the most basic rules in the exchange with animals: namely to take more than one needs, and that is a serious insult' (Roepstorff 2003: 134). Interestingly, the ethics regulating this form of reciprocity are social; it is a question of the distribution of catches among the members of a society, all of whose members depend on the same resources. Like the concept of 'sustainable development', it is a question of the distribution of harvesting possibilities among people over both space and time (generations). In this context, socially embedded practices perform human–environment relations guided by principles of reciprocity and association, in time and space, among humans. Coping with the environment produces sociality.

As a consequence, networks should always be understood as networking human practices. Thus networking is an aspect of coping (see Chapter 1), and should not be confused with the flows, fluids and fixities that people constantly have to cope with. One can talk of telephone networks, satellite connections and the like, but their affordances are not really performed until they have been inserted into a network of communicating people. This does not mean that networking practices are only human; they are socio-material practices, involving wires, radio signals, talking bodies, senses and the like. 'Since almost all social entities do involve networks of connections between humans and these other [non-human] components, so there are no uniquely *human* societies as such. Societies are necessarily hybrids' (Urry 2000: 15).

Coping with Flows in Fisheries: the Ambivalence of Danish Colonialism

Flows or fluids have topologies other than networks (Mol and Law 1994; Urry 2000: 38–39). They are not reciprocal or associative relations organised by and between people, but they create movements and circulations that are non-regular, unintended, without final destinations, they change shape and speed and can follow but also replace set routes and form new scapes. They are not totally out of reach of human practices, but they can never be fully controlled. In fishery societies, a number of crucial fluids, both human and non-human, can be identified: ocean currents, streams, winds, fish migrations, drifting objects, but also the networked, more or less organised flows of secret but also coded knowledge – money, rumours, ‘news’ and so on. Thus, knowledge is not only derived from the life worlds of particular humans, it can also travel in the dis-embedded forms of information transmitted by printed books, attached files and films. This is something Latour adds to Ingold’s understanding (Roepstorff 2003: 139). Dis-embedded information is incorporated into vessels, computers and the like as expert systems, thus regulating the use we can make of them, while the effect that these flows and systems have on social organisation is a question of how people cope with them in their daily practices. However, disconnecting is hardly a realistic way to deal with flows and systems that people have come to depend on. Thus we need to look at both fishers’ coping practices and the flows and systems they cope with.

Fishers’ practices rest on the logic of hunting, where the relations between humans and fish are less stable and only performed in specific moments, as opposed to the calculations and evaluations that peasants perform in the social organisation of farming. In an ideal-type fishery, as opposed to aquaculture (Callon 1986), work does not perform any long-term investment in the resource, as is the case with farmers’ use of land (Bærenholdt 1991: 54–63). Not even the privatisation of rights to fish in the form of ITQs will fundamentally transform these characteristics. There are specific material–bodily–social–imaginary characteristics bound to the performance of the working capacities (*Arbeitsvermögen*, Negt and Kluge 1981) of fisheries, and these are different from hunting: the hunter, like the fisher, is searching, but, apart from trapping, hunters do not act blindly. In spite of the skills and technical devices that fishers use to ‘see’ fish, the fisher–fish relationship is not a face to face one: it is mediated by fishing gear and various ICTs. This characteristic is associated with the fisher’s traditions consisting of myths and secret knowledge practised through imitation, but increasingly being performed via smart technologies, observing what other fishers do, and talking over inter-boat radios in the constant search for fruitful fishing grounds. Certain forms of sociality at a distance are performed, thus producing societies that are more open,

porous and horizontal than those of property-owning farmers. Fisheries are always uncertain and unpredictable. Fishing is a hybrid performance; the sea is a 'taskscape' incorporating fishers' bodies in coping by moving with the sea (Rossvær 1998: 79; Ingold 2000). Rather than the aggressive abilities of the hunter, who kills the mammal, fishers need to be patient, to adapt and respond to the sea, on which they dwell in their vessels. But in contrast to the farmer or the pastoralist, the fisher, like the hunter, has no land or herd and thus lives in moments and on the move.

Coping with flows involves bodily, imaginary and technologically mediated movement, with variations over long distances and long periods, from ocean fishing to coastal and fjord fishing on a day-to-day basis. But there are always various kinds of information, skills, technologies and regulations floating around. These can be part of the distant socialities of fishers, the more or less strict enforcement of various systems of resource management, or the networks and markets used for selling fish, most often over long distances. The involvement of people in the Nordic Atlantic in systems of regulation and commodification at a distance has a long history, as, for example, in the cases of Danish colonialism and paternalism in Greenland and Iceland.

The colonisation of Greenland and of the Greenlandic Inuit in the nineteenth century was subject to intense discussions among Danish politicians and administrators. Most significantly, the Dane H.J. Rink (see Chapter 3) travelled to Northern Greenland in 1848 to 1851, came to head the southern of the two *Forstanderskaber* (kind of local council; see Chapter 7) in Greenland, first introduced in 1856, and was later director of the Royal Greenland Trade monopoly until 1882 (Marquardt 1992). In many writings and through his own actions, Rink warned about the possible negative consequences of modernisation in Greenland, and the potential destruction of the Inuit. He became the main advocate of paternalist policies protecting the Inuit from the effects of going into commercial fisheries, thus being responsible for a shift in Denmark's Greenland policy in the second part of the nineteenth century (Marquardt 1999). Rink stated that Greenlanders' ability to think in terms of long-term investments had been destroyed by their interest in consuming imported goods (such as coffee and alcohol), and that their past norms and orders had been broken down without introducing new ones. Greenlanders were reported to be losing their ability to hunt mammals from kayaks and were on the road to 'decadence'.

Rink's reports increasingly influenced debates in the Danish Parliament, which brought the issue of 'the destiny of native/nature people encountering civilization' to the top of the agenda (quoted in Marquardt 1999: 13). Following years of investigation and debate, the monopoly of the Danish State's Royal Greenland Trade was not abolished, in contrast to Finnmark (Northern Norway), Iceland and the Faroes (see Chapter 3). Although the

reason for this decision had much more to do with the potential incomes to the Danish state from the monopoly than with the protection of the Greenlanders (Marquardt 1999: 20), the paternalistic agenda of 'protection' illustrates the specific form of 'orientalism' exercised by Danish colonialism. Ironically, the Greenlanders were to be defended and protected, by the colonisers, against the influences of the culture and consumption of the colonisers (!). Greenlanders should remain a hunting, 'nature' people, as long as possible.

While Indian policy in the USA in the same period was different, it rested on the same 'orientalist' dichotomy: the indigenous people should either remain hunters, or give up hunting and become civilised (Marquardt 1999: 22). A modern (Inuit or Indian) way of life based on hunting, fishing and the like was out of question, if contact with Western cash, consumer goods and markets were to lead to the Greenlandic population collapsing: they had to be educated properly first. Coping with the flows of cash, goods and markets was for the paternalist Royal Greenland Trade to organise. A colonial system was constructed based on this perspective, and it lasted long into the twentieth century.

Indeed, the Trade Monopoly was not formally abolished until 1950, not without resistance from northern parts of Greenland, where people were afraid of the consequences of opening the country to the outside world (Lidegaard, 1991: 194). In reality, monopoly trade continued much longer; most significantly, the monopoly's persistence was partly a result of how colonial paternalism was embedded in Greenlandic political culture (see Chapter 8). Fear of the flows of international capitalism may well lead to protectionist nationalism. Whether this is a consequence of colonialism or the logic of an indigenous culture's way of coping with nature is open for discussion. In other words, was Rink reporting the 'truth', because his investigations and reports were, ANT-like, turned into reality, or because he, Ingold-like, reported the more or less authentic, vulnerable way of life among Greenlanders?

Greenlandic fishers have experienced these ambivalences, primarily through class divisions among themselves. Are they supposed to be skipper capitalists, forming independent economies once released from colonial restrictions, as Icelanders did from around 1900? Or are they the sole true bearers of the Inuit hunting way of life?

A similar ambivalence is found in historical writing about Iceland (see also Chapter 3). The leading Danish anthropologist Kirsten Hastrup interpreted Icelandic culture as being rooted in a specific reading of Iceland's historical geography:

The social and conceptual significance of the *bú* [farm household] as a microcosm was related to its relatively isolated position in the landscape. Towns were entirely absent, and so were villages. This meant that each farm was the centre of its own world, and such 'worlds' were conceptually mapped as if they

were serially placed, either along the coastline or in the narrow valleys. (Hastrup 1990a: 49)

This analysis leads to a fascinating interpretation of the dichotomies between ‘social’ agriculture and ‘non-social’ fisheries in Icelandic history, easily convincing a geographer like me that these mappings reveal the truth about Icelandic culture as such, with the sociality of farm households at the centre (see Bærenholdt 1991: 335–37). The problem, in the context of the 1990s post-colonial debate, is, who is doing the mapping? In other words, is the analysis a product of colonial conceptualising, or does it reveal the ‘inherent’ truth about Icelandic culture, as performed in nationalist discourse? This is the same question posed with regard to Greenlandic fishers above. Unsurprisingly, this tension has also been subject to debate concerning colonial history in Iceland. For example, in his PhD thesis, *The Hidden Class* (1990), the Icelandic ethnologist Finnur Magnússon showed how a new class of workers and fishers defined another, new culture around 1900, opposed to that based in agriculture. Therefore, to speak about a single Icelandic culture is to perform a historicist interpretation encouraged by both Danish colonialism and Icelandic nationalism. Such interpretations tend to ignore crucial social transformations associated with the abolition of monopolies, the development of capitalism and class antagonisms. As explained by the leading Icelandic anthropologist Gísli Pálsson, ‘The decisive growth in fishing occurred *despite* attempts by the landowners to maintain a labour reserve in farming. As colonial relations with Denmark weakened, traditional household production gave way to different forms of production: those of the skipper-owner or the petty entrepreneur, and the capitalist company. These transitions involved fundamental changes in social relations and means of production’ (Pálsson 1991: 106, emphasis in the original).

In his book *The Textual Life of Savants*, Pálsson addresses Kirsten Hastrup’s work directly. While appreciating her work on medieval Iceland, he points to the problems in her dualistic interpretations of inside and outside in contemporary, modern Iceland, characterising her approach as ‘neo-Orientalism *par excellence*’ (Pálsson 1995: 65), which he explains as the tendency ‘to essentialize his or her informants, disempowering and “canonizing” their voices, refusing them the right to speak’ (Pálsson 1995: 170). As we saw in Chapter 3, historical accounts are produced for various practices involved in the production of societies, and research is one of the agendas in which the battle is played out.

From these examples, we can learn that the networking practices of people, here fishers, exist not only as connections associated with ‘pure’ human–environment relations (the fisher imitating other fishers on vessels at sea). With ANT, we can acknowledge how scientific knowledge is deeply inscribed in the practices and imaginations of the flows and networks that

are performed. How fishers cope with the flows of the sea, fish, money and regulations is not only a question of revealing an inherent 'truth' by stripping layers of ascriptions away. Floating knowledge is itself inscribed in the very practices and social transformations it talks about. Thus, researchers' forms of knowledge do not differ from fishers' traditions, myths and secret knowledge, which are practised through imitation, and increasingly performed via smart technologies.

Fisheries and societies formed around fisheries, like those of researchers, are created through the specific transitions and translations of their historical and material geographies. And significantly, fisheries and research are connected. Among the following cases, I shall begin with the process of introducing Individually Transferable Quotas (ITQs) in Iceland, since this is an obvious case of how researchers' ideas have been translated into the practices of Icelandic fisheries, implying deep transformations of social relations and regional development. It is a case of how economics is involved in producing society (Callon 1998; Holm 2001).

Enacting Individually Transferable Quotas in Iceland

Resource management in fisheries is an increasingly international business, where ideas travel around, and the research practices of biologists and economists in particular are deeply involved in translations and transformations. Since the 1980s, the system of Individually Transferable Quotas (ITQs) has been globalised, at least as an alternative. Based on the economic theory of 'the tragedy of the commons', resource economists in the University of British Columbia (Canada) developed ITQs as a market system for capitalising fishing rights as a means of avoiding over-investment and generating higher resource rents. The system was then exported and implemented in certain fisheries in Canada, Australia and New Zealand in the early 1980s (Jentoft and McCay 2003), and in its first limited version in Iceland in 1984 (Pálsson and Helgason 1997). It has also been proposed for adoption in the Nordic Atlantic countries, being actually used in modified versions in Norway, the Faroes and Greenland. Also in systems where quotas are fixed to vessels and quotas are not formally tradable, quotas are de facto capitalised and traded together with vessels. Such practices come along with a neoliberal discourse, and the enactment of the system seems to have much to do with how it actually changes fishermen or skippers so that they willingly engage in implementing systems in practice that they initially were opposed to (Brox 1997; Holm and Nielsen 2004).

Both economists and the fishing industry are heavily involved in the increasing implementation of the system, crediting the clear and simple logic of its way of reasoning – the ITQ model's 'simplified representation of reality' (Eythórsson 1996a: 213) – as leading to the one and only solution

for a more effective fish industry. Economists in favour of ITQs eagerly argue for the potentials of their model, while admitting the necessity of 'distributional considerations' when designing an ITQ system (Árnason 1995), and fishermen, once having received their ITQs, play the game. Even critics of the system acknowledge the merits of ITQ systems in rationalising fisheries and the problems involved in many alternative systems (Copes 1995). The ITQ system must be seen in terms of the spread of neoliberal thinking in response to the challenges of securing a more competitive fishing industry in increasingly open markets. Thus although ITQ systems are based on quotas as shares of national TACs (Total Allowable Catches), the enactment of the system is embedded in the context of increased international competition in fisheries, fish processing and sales.

When ITQs were first introduced in Iceland in 1984, quotas were initially attributed to individuals 'who happened to be boat owners when the system was introduced', based on their last three years' fishing record (Pálsson and Helgason 1997: 190). The 1984 system still had limitations on transferability, and in other countries too, like Norway, ITQs began as non-transferable Individual Quotas (IQs). But transferability was implemented in Iceland in 1990, and the system was applied to the management of more species and also smaller vessels, so that it became fully institutionalised in all demersal fisheries. Quotas as shares of TACs became fully alienable as separate commodities that could be sold without an accompanying vessel. The result has in fact been a kind of improved economic efficiency, mostly due to the many vessels that have been taken out of the fleet. This result has been achieved by way of a strong concentration of ownership of quotas, especially after 1990. Fewer and bigger ITQ holders became 'quotas-kings' and 'lords of the sea' (Pálsson 1995: 150–61; Pálsson and Helgason 1997; Eythórsson 2000).

Economic concentration meant that fisheries became increasingly vertically integrated. The big owners of quotas also control a fleet of vessels and the fish-processing plants, which they have given a priority to running (Photograph 5.1). Local communities and municipal authorities have lost much of their influence and, apart from the cases where such more localised networks have been able to buy and secure quotas 'for the community', the dominant position in the fishing industry is occupied by those who control the quotas. And the industry is, of course, itself a central enactor of all this:

Along with a general liberalisation of economic policy in Iceland, there is a trend towards an ideological shift within the industry, leaving behind the idea that fisheries and fish-processing should be locally embedded in fisheries communities. Many fisheries companies have joined the Icelandic stockmarket, and ownership is in many cases not linked to any particular community. Investors without a fisheries background are now well represented among the owners of quota-holding companies. (Eythórsson 2000: 488)



Photograph 5.1: Fishing vessels in the port of Isafjörður (2005).

Fisheries have more or less been transformed into a ‘normal’ business, as was the economists’ intention. These dynamics and the flows of capital involved tend to disconnect fishing from smaller villages, especially those with fewer than 500 inhabitants. Boat owners who received ITQs have become rich, while their (often former) neighbouring fish workers and crew members lost their networks with the coming of fish quotas. In Iceland, the ITQ has clearly had the social and regional distributional ‘side effects’ that economists on both sides in the battle over ITQs warned about: ‘a semi-feudal system has developed with a fundamental division between quota holders and quota renters – between “sea lords” and “tenants”, to borrow local jargon. A small class of boat owners, it is argued, has become the de facto owner of the fishing stocks in Icelandic waters’ (Pálsson 1999: 2).

There have been court cases about the legality of making the national commons de facto private property, although it is still *de jure* public property. For economists like Árnason (1995), there was no doubt that the introduction of private property was actually the decisive, transformative move. The system has meant further growth in the fleet of factory trawlers, thus speeding up the mobility of the industry, now ‘liberated’ from the constraints and troubles of on-shore fish processing. These vessels, made possible economically by the accumulation of capital within the ITQ

system, are extending their fisheries beyond the ITQs into fishing in areas outside the 200-nautical-mile Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs), while the possession of ITQs by the boat owners is stabilising this riskier business, since ITQs ensure a share of the resource rent in domestic waters. So, while fish companies are becoming the dominant networks, or mobile bonds, the strategies of territorial (e.g. municipal) communities do not work any more (Eythórsson 1996a). No doubt the introduction of ITQs in Iceland has facilitated the accumulation of capital and the transfer of domestic capital into international fishing businesses and other business too. While foreign ownership of Icelandic ITQs has been limited, Icelandic fish companies are active in other countries around the world.

The ITQ system was introduced as an experiment, but it is apparently an irreversible one. Once allocated for free to boat owners, in what might be described as a kind of primitive accumulation, the state of Iceland is not able to take or even buy back quotas. 'The quotas capital is already being invested, primarily in freezer trawlers and fisheries abroad. The political influence of the quota-owners in Icelandic society should not be underestimated' (Eythórsson 1996b: 281). It is therefore no surprise that boat owners accepted the gift from the outset: it changed power relations overnight, and mobilised new flows of capitalised fishing rights. There has been much public criticism of the system, which many Icelanders would like to abolish or at least modify, though the need for some sort of transferability seems to have been generally accepted (Pálsson 1999, Eythórsson 2000).

The implementation of the ITQ system involves the practices of multiple actors and networks (including those of economists and boat owners – Pálsson 1995: 155–56) that destabilise local communities and contribute to the building of new mobile networks in the business community. There are still other networks within the fishing industry, some of which are local, as we shall see in the next section. Meanwhile, resource management schemes based on ITQ shares of TACs combine management in the name of the nation with the neoliberal principles of private property, competition and the free flow of capital. By implication, in their networking practices, people have to cope with the challenges of capitalism in accessing natural resources too.

Flows of Networking in the Fishing Business

Fishing is a business involving a whole set of flows in transport, processing and sales, in addition to the question of quotas or licences. It is a fluctuating business, and not only due to the fragility of natural resources. Networks performed in the fishing business are complex networks that often destabilise actors in business and political life.



Photograph 5.2: Landing of Greenlandic halibut from dog sledge and snowmobile on sea ice, Uummannaq (March 2001).

A business story of fisheries in Uummannaq in Greenland (see Map 4.4 and Photograph 5.2) demonstrates this (Bærenholdt 2002b). The context is a Greenlandic fishing business-cum-political system with traces of the colonial monopoly trade, where the government-owned company, Royal Greenland, plays a central role in organising the majority of Greenland's exports. The firm is vertically integrated and has facilities in many places in Greenland, but it also plays a role in the Danish and international fish industry. From the mid-1990s Royal Greenland dealt with German, Russian and Pacific US fish businesses, and also bought up prawn enterprises in Northern Norway in 2003–4. Royal Greenland went global, seeking to consolidate its role as the world's largest producer of cold-water prawns.

Royal Greenland's dominant role in Greenlandic fisheries has been challenged. New firms have emerged, often with municipal authorities playing a key role. For example, Uummannaq Seafood A/S was established in 1998, following an initiative by the mayor of Uummannaq, conceived after a local industrial development seminar. The local industrial development officer formed a network with the local association of fishermen. Initially 166 fishermen signed up, and sixty-two fishermen in the district invested in the company. Local fishermen came to control one-third of the shares in the new company, with the other two-thirds being controlled by a Greenlandic family fish company in Maniitsoq (further south) and a Danish company associated with it. Local fishermen had for long been dissatisfied with prices and seasons in Royal Greenland's purchase of their Greenlandic halibut. Since catches had increased during

the 1990s and had financed a growing fleet of vessels (with the investment subsidies available from government), fisheries had become the backbone of the local economy. Fishermen from Uummannaq and the seven villages scattered around the district became the most important entrepreneurs.

Uummannaq Seafood A/S bought and fitted out a factory ship to buy catches of Greenlandic halibut and process it on board as 'Japan-cut' for the Asian market. The firm in Maniitsoq and its Danish partner took care of marketing and sales. Some fishermen did not support the idea of a factory ship, as it is less appealing in the winter period, when fish are caught through ice holes. Meanwhile, Royal Greenland also introduced factory ships, both before and after the foundation of Uummannaq Seafood. One year, a Russian factory ship was deliberately stuck in the sea ice near the far northern village of Nuugaatsiaq in Uummannaq district and bought fish, thus attracting the activities of mobile fishermen on their dog sledges and snowmobiles. Fishermen were happy with these factory ships, especially when there were competing fish buyers, both onshore and offshore. Factory ships are usually more efficient than onshore processing, but it is only people without family obligations who normally stay on the ships. Working hours are also much longer than onshore, and there is a question how long people can cope with such conditions.

Political regulation imposed obligations to develop onshore processing. In October 2001, the government awarded Royal Greenland a monopoly on buying Greenlandic halibut in Uummannaq in order to develop 'commercial fisheries' (Grønlands Radioavis, 9 October 2001). Protests, negotiations, restructurings and new coalitions followed, and politics played a role the whole time. In certain periods, the government allowed Uummannaq Seafood's vessel to buy fish under certain conditions, if, for example, the vessel was fixed at a certain location (the village of Illorsuit). In other periods, share-holding fishers, with their vessels, followed the factory ship as a mother ship into other areas (Disko Bay), away from Uummannaq. Another continuing issue was the arrangements between Royal Greenland and the government for transporting fish catches to areas of Greenland where processing plants lacked raw materials. Protest at this practice was the main theme in the campaign for municipal council elections in Uummannaq in the spring of 2001.

The Greenlandic managing director of Uummannaq Seafood in 2001 had been the Minister of Fisheries in 1995–99, and had contacts in the Maniitsoq fish company families who were behind the new vessel initiative. However, he became chairman of the board of Royal Greenland in September 2004, following a number of the usual internal conflicts and restructurings among the many Danish managers at various levels of the organisation. This story recalls many other cases of business and politics in the world, where connections are always crucial in the flows of the play of networking. Uummannaq Seafood started as an attempt to build a fishing

industry that was more locally embedded than Royal Greenland, but the story is also about distant connections alongside friendships, kin, sales, capital and transport. Many locals were not happy about the factory ship because of both pollution and poor working conditions. The question of the sustainability of the fisheries in parts of the Uummannaq district was also an issue as the average size of fish being caught began to decrease.

Other examples of the dynamics in fishing businesses, such as Arctic Fish in Ilulissat, Greenland (Bærenholdt 2002b), and the post-1992 reconstruction of fish processing in Klaksvík in the Faroes (Hovgaard in Apostle et al. 2002: 105–22), also point to the fragility of networking in fisheries. Political negotiations over licences to fish in nearby or distant seas is a public matter, decided by ‘connections’. Financial activities are also crucial, ranging from the role of local saving banks to international financing. And financing is also about networks, where trust and confidence are central issues. Municipal initiatives and agenda setting often stabilise the complex flows of business affairs, creating the orientation and momentum needed to bring specific, and often rather different, partners to work jointly on projects.

In economic geography, such cases have often been described as examples of localised learning (see Chapter 2), but there is persuasive evidence from the cases described here that the key is a broader ‘community of practice’ characterised by diversity, rivalry and reflexivity (Wenger 1998; Grabher 2004). Here political negotiations and connections can be stabilisers, producing memory, commitment and engagement over longer periods in the Nordic Atlantic fishing villages, and often being played out with the territorial practices of municipal authorities (see Chapter 7). However, there is also a mobile and international ‘community of practice’ among fishermen, businessmen, organisations and politicians in the fishing industry, who are playing an increasingly dominant role, thanks to the capitalisation of fisheries.

The Networks of Sailing Fishers

There are still other networks in fisheries than those governed by the circulation and accumulation of capital – indeed, fisheries would probably not work without the social networks implicit in fishing. But the communities and bonds of fishers, crews and their families are intertwined with, respond to and contribute to social transformations. Fishing communities are dynamic: their coping practices change and translate social relations over time and space. Orvar Löfgren argued ‘that much of what has been regarded as traditional elements in the rural fishing communities along the North Atlantic Fringe ... are adaptations to recent changes in the macro-economic system’ (Löfgren 1982: 172).

The classic analyses of networks in the social organisation of fisheries concern relationships on board fishing vessels, especially studies of the roles of the skipper and the 'net boss' (Barth 1966; Löfgren 1977; Pálsson 1991: 112ff.). These studies show how people network in order to cope with flows, and they stress forms of bonding among people on board, according to kin relations, religious beliefs and associated fishing cooperatives. People organise networks in order to secure and make their lives more certain by coping with the dangers and uncertainties of the sea. Fishermen used to occupy key positions in these networks, but this was due to their simultaneous role of transmitters and communicators with the outside world, often representing the local externally, as fishers were always the more mobile (Johnsen 2002: 192).

A widespread idea has been that there is a land–sea gendered division of labour, where fishers were *men*, while women took care of community building ashore (see later). But this is not the whole story: fishing women are part of the tradition, both in factory trawlers and on board small coastal vessels. However, knowledge about this is situated, being part of the relations of dominance that feminist approaches have questioned, thus introducing new perspectives on the gendering of fishers' networks. A major contribution to this has come from Eva Munk-Madsen (1990, 1993), whose case studies of fishing couples in small-scale coastal fishing I shall now discuss (Munk-Madsen, 2000).

The fishing couple is a quintessential example of care-taking, affective and intimate reciprocity, stabilising human life:

Mutual recognition requires acceptance of both separation and connection, of difference and sameness. Culturally, separation (the autonomous individual) is ranked higher than connection (interdependent individuals) and the split between these forms of relating is gendered. The ranking of separation over connection, matching an oppositional perception of masculinity and femininity, prepares ground for relationships based on dominance and submission rather than mutual recognition. (Munk-Madsen 2000: 336)

Munk-Madsen analyses the construction of gendered relations in two cases of fishing couples in Northern Norway, based on on-board fieldwork. For one couple (Britt and Bjørn) the division of labour on board is clear – he is the skipper and she is the deckhand, leaving authority about the machinery, vessel, gear and navigation to him – but roles are negotiated on board. Their reciprocity is based on closeness, where power and love, authority and submission are performed. For another couple (Tone and Johan) the situation is different: Tone's role is to stabilise their way of life, so that their pub life will not destroy their livelihood. Both women support the masculinity of their male partners. In fact, they 'support the masculine identity of their husbands by not threatening the symbolic values of authority and by helping their husbands to demonstrate decision-making power as skippers', thus supporting the otherwise fragile (myth of)

fishermen's identity (Munk-Madsen 2000: 339). This is also how women confirm their own femininity, even while doing what used to be mostly men's work. Gender relations are performed interdependently, taking the form of reciprocal, emotional, bonds beyond the realms of efficiency. However, such relations are not performed in a social vacuum, but are inscribed in wider networks of kin, the economy, and communities of friendship and business.

Johnsen (2002) talks about 'short and long networks', given the wide variations, from the intimate bonding of a fishing couple to the detached connections spun around ocean-going fishing vessels. Meanwhile, bonding couples have their own mobilities, for example, taking part in the seasonal winter fisheries around the Lofoten Islands. The many historical *rorbu* cottages on the Lofotens are symbols of this way of life, now made into tourist accommodation, but they are also still used by seasonally migrating fishing couples.

On the other hand, there are examples of fishermen involved in long bridging networks (such as Knut; Johnsen 2002: 232–36), whose path in fisheries is created by the skipper-owner's strategy of acquiring larger and larger vessels to guard against changing environments and competition, as well as establishing new connections. Local networks do not play a role here: the essential stabiliser is the bond of a stable crew following their skipper-owner over time. Networks are performed in order to make vessels move, to exchange vessels for larger ones with greater facilities, to adapt to new seas – always in connection with a bank financing the business. It is 'a continuing process of translation to enrol, mobilise, making interested and stabilise a never-ending pool of co-players' (translated from Johnsen 2002: 235). The crew on board various vessels is the bond, the bank the main connection. Knut is an example of the capitalised Norwegian fishery, most prominently following the distant networks and connections. The socio-materialities involved in the capitalisation of fisheries are apparent here.

Meanwhile, there are still coastal fishermen taking day trips from their home port, such as Kurt (Johnsen 2002: 242–47), who has reflexively chosen not to engage in 'longer' networks but prefers to keep strong relations locally, stabilising his fisheries by networking family and other fishers locally. This also allows him to take part in bringing up his children. Another version is represented by another fishing couple (Linda and Pål; Johnsen 2002: 256–59), not unlike the two couples studied by Munk-Madsen (see above). Although fishing couples are still not the rule, their very existence is interesting. They perform a mode of life reflexively, realising their 'good life' in a project bound to place. Linda normally takes part in the fisheries from ashore, where she is the 'land man', baiting lines, thus taking part in performing a rather emblematic kind of place.

The baiting cottage (*egnebua*) is an iconic meeting place in fishing communities. It is either private or public; people come and go, young

fishers are socialised and trained into the business, but it also an open place or agora, where many belong. A specific form of sociality is performed across distinctions of gender and generation (Solberg 1982, Rossvær 1998). Each vessel has its *egnebua*, while these meeting places are often located more or less in a row, materially framing a hybrid place of work, meeting and family life, including raising children and young people. The *egnebua* is an intermediate place between the vessel and the home; it is an indoor space, but in fact a place outside, a vibrant setting for contingencies and which is almost the most central. However, we need to remember that such a place is bound to specific forms of fishing, and to manual equipment that increasingly belongs to the past.

All forms of analysed bonds and bridges change when coping practices adjust and new technological framings are enacted. We have seen how people cope with the uncertainties of a diversity of flows, including fish, technologies, knowledge and money, by netting their partners, crews and banks in various ways and securing meetings in local venues.

Women's Networking of Society and Heritage Ashore

Women tend to stabilise social relations ashore, as they perform childcare and family life, especially when fishermen are away. For example, in a 1989 interview, Lena gave an account of her attachment to the village of Hvannasund, in the Faroes, where she had lived most of her life. The attachment was not because of nature or the view, since it was also beautiful in the Faroese village where she grew up before marrying a man from Hvannasund. She explained the role of networks among humans by describing her relationship with her place of birth:

Because when I was young, I knew all the people there – my friends and all the people there ... strangers have now moved into [place of birth], and the old are dead, and the young moved away. I do not know ... the people there. And [place of birth] has been developed so much that I do not know it as it was, when I was small, that is, at the time when I lived in [place of birth]. (Bærenholdt 1991: 125, translated from the Danish)

Place is both space and time; it is about networks among people that know each other. These networks are performed by local women, but this is easier for those who are married and have family locally than for single women coping with village life. Although these women all work in the local fish-processing plant, their relations, the meaning of work for them and their positions in local networks can be quite different (Bærenholdt 1991: 119–42).

The historical development of fish processing from the late 1800s onwards changed the orientations of women's lives. For example, in the Icelandic villages of Eyrarbakki and Stokkseyri, these innovations brought

‘contact with a far wider social field’ (Magnússon 1990: 118). Women engage in health associations, the local choir, the women’s association, the local rescue team, the handicraft centre and what is called ‘the Society House’ or ‘Community Hall’ (*samfunnshus* in Norwegian, *félagsheimili* in Icelandic). It is women who form collective networks in response to crises in the fisheries or the loss of fish quotas, while men cope more individually, typically doing the hard, voluntary work needed (see Rossvær 1998 on Sørsvær in Northern Norway, Skaptadóttir 2000 on ‘Eyri’ in Iceland).

It is normally said that women in fishing communities cope with the long periods of men’s absence by socialising in various associations. Households in such communities are traditionally thought of as women-centred. It was the wives’ association that organised the political response to the fisheries crisis of the early 1990s in Sørsvær (Rossvær 1998), and it was women in ‘Eyri’ who developed the new handicraft centre to cope with unemployment in the fishing industry, following the loss of quotas in Iceland in the early 1990s (Skaptadóttir 1998). Women also play the main roles in other transformations of social life in fishing localities, for example, in setting up local festivals, as in Skarsvåg in North Cape municipality and many other localities in Northern Norway (Gerrard 2000). These festivals, like the one in Siglufjörður in Iceland, build on the symbols and celebrate the knowledge of fishermen, but increasingly women use such occasions to create their own agendas. One such agenda is the development of tourism (see Chapter 6), another is knitting connections with those who have moved away.

Thus, the festivals stand out as identity markers for an extended local population and an extended local community. The local community’s boundaries no longer stop at the last house in the village. It includes men and women who have emigrated, wherever they live. In this way, the festivals exemplify the fact that former neighbourhood ties based upon face-to-face interaction are important in people’s lives ... Kinship and former neighbourhood relations are maintained, not necessarily on the day-to-day basis, but over years. (Gerrard 2000: 307)

Fishery networks expand to areas beyond fisheries. Affiliation with fisheries via kinship, friends, neighbourhoods and even tourist visits facilitate new mobilities bridging formerly separate spheres. Still, fishing is primarily the business of men and their mobile bridging practices: many women, conversely, engage in attempts to produce bonds with territorial places, staging events that will bring people together.

Migrant Labour Connections

The transformation of localities considered to be ‘fishing communities’ coincides with changes in occupational patterns. The hard, wet, monotonous and cold work involved in fish processing is hardly attractive to youngsters in the Nordic Atlantic. This lack of a stable labour force in fish

processing has led many labour migrants, from Sri Lanka, Thailand, the Philippines, Poland, Lithuania and Russia, to go to Northern Norway and Iceland, and there is also some demand for migrant labour in Greenland and the Faroes.

Migrant labour produces a number of new socio-material relations, which have been studied by Marit Aure in the case of the transnational connections between two fishing localities on the Barents Sea: Båtsfjord, in Finnmark, Norway; and Teriberka, in Murmansk Region, Russia (Aure 2002, 2004a,b). Båtsfjord has been a mobile place, dominated by people coming and going in its entrepreneurial fishing industry for most of the twentieth century. Rural–urban migration shaped this place as a very specific fishing town, well known for its numerous fish-processing plants and vessels from many countries. Foreigners account for 16 per cent of the population; only Oslo has a higher proportion in Norway. Since the late 1980s, Tamil migrants from Sri Lanka have come to work in the fishing industry, but, with the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the gradual opening of the Norwegian–Russian border, more and more Russian workers arrived. Some ninety to 100 Russians lived in Båtsfjord (out of a total population of around 2,500) and took around 10 per cent of all the jobs in the four fish-processing plants (Aure 2002: 6). Migrant labourers generally followed flows of fish landed by Russian vessels during the 1990s, following the transformation of the Russian economy.

Meanwhile, the fishing industry in the Murmansk Region (Kola Peninsula) suffered from these transformations: landings of fish declined, while vessels went to foreign ports to earn foreign currency (money that did not always flow back to Russia). Among the few coastal villages developed in the Soviet period, fish kolkhozes in Teriberka, east of Murmansk, were among the more conservative, in trying to keep some of their income for local investment (Bærenholdt 1995). Cooperative relations developed between fishing industries in Teriberka and Båtsfjord, with the prospect of Båtsfjord firms investing in the industry in Teriberka. However, the Båtsfjord firms suggested training in Norway first, thus stimulating a widespread practice of people from Teriberka working temporarily in Båtsfjord as a reserve labour force. In the meantime, Teriberka fishing industries found other international partners.¹

Russian migrants in Båtsfjord maintain connections with their families in Teriberka; some leave their children and partners there. This pattern of working through long-term commuting continues practices that are well known in shipping and fisheries, though they are also widespread among rural residents in Northern Norway (as in the case of Storfjord; see Chapter 4). Thus, transnational migration and commuting should be understood in connection with other forms of mobility and migration (Olwig and Sørensen 2002). However, in the case of temporary Russian migration into Norway, legal regulations limiting the length of work permits and the like

"Coping with Distances: Producing Nordic Atlantic Societies"

by Jørgen Ole Bærenholdt. <http://berghahnbooks.com/title/BaerenholdtCoping>

also contribute to the commuting practices of people living in multiple places (Aure 2002: 20). However, this form of transnational migration contributes to a number of forms of mobility, other than just cross-border migration of people. It means regular phone calls to children and families, visits by families, the transport of goods, the transfer of money, fishing industry networks among politicians and entrepreneurs in Teriberka and Båtsfjord, cross-border marriages, 'bi-national' children, flows of information and knowledge, and various forms of new colonialism (Aure 2004b: 16). These connections also function as complex forms of 'recruitment networks' supporting further migration on the basis of relations of kin, place of origin, language and gender (Leitner 2003), as has also been shown in the case of Polish labour migrants in Iceland (Wojtyńska 2004: 9–10).

Migration routes become new associative societies of people living in multiple places and maintaining connections between them in search of better livelihoods, potentially being celebrated for aiding repopulation and multiculturalism in receiving areas (Skaptadóttir 2004). However, national stereotypes are also manifested, as when the purity of Scandinavian national cultures are challenged by foreign women 'potentially represented as prostitutes', and foreigners perceived as being too unhealthy or dirty to be allowed access to local swimming facilities (Aure 2004a). Contemporary approaches in migration research are critical of the equation 'one nation = one culture' and suggest that 'migrants become parts of transnational socio-cultural systems that transcend the political border between the receiving and sending countries' (Olwig and Sørensen 2002: 9). These approaches highlight the problems involved in many, more or less hegemonic, Nordic essentialisms about nationhood, especially in the western part of the Nordic countries, the Nordic Atlantic and Danish areas (see Chapter 8).

Mobile livelihoods are nothing new. Thus, new Russian–Norwegian routes of migration cannot be isolated from the nineteenth-century Pomor trade and migration across various types of border between Russian, Finnish, Norwegian and Sami areas (see Chapter 3), contemporary rural–urban migration patterns inside, for example, Norway, or the various forms of forced migration in the Soviet Union, which were largely responsible for the population of the Kola Peninsula and other northern parts of Russia. People have had to cope with physical, social and cultural distances and differences for centuries. Most Russians, but also many Ukrainians and Jews in the Russian north, have contacts with places of 'origin' in the south. The Sami recall times when some of their pastoralist practices were easier to perform, before many of them were more or less forced to settle as 'coastal Sami' fishers and farmers.

Coping with the distance embedded in livelihood practices implies the practising of various social routes combining mobility and territoriality, bonding and bridging, to such an extent that it becomes networked mobility that makes bonds and territorial networking that bridges, rather

than the opposite. Most often, the sociality and bonds performed between people only become stronger the more they are performed at a distance.

Fishery Societies?

It is now clear that fisheries are more than just 'areas of the sea where fish are caught in large quantities' (*Collins Cobuild English Dictionary* 1999: 635). Humans network in coping with various flows of fish, money, regulation systems and knowledge to make fisheries a livelihood and a business. This coping involves human relations producing societies in response to uncertainties of the environment, but these relations are socio-material, involving the framing of bodies and communication by vessels, technologies, licences to fish, festivals, baiting cottages and other material meeting places. People cope with distance by living as couples and in crews associated with various sorts of fishing vessels used for fishing, storage, transport and accommodation, as well as the communication of socio-material status and ability. Fish business actors cooperate in episodic initiatives, governed by the various forms of 'connections' that produce the 'political capital' required to access public resources. Political capital is a form of social capital that Bourdieu found especially in Soviet and Social Democratic societies (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992), but which may be just as relevant to the translation of Iceland fishing rights into private property (ITQs), a translation from political commons to economic private property.

Municipal authorities persist in playing key roles as intermediaries for business entrepreneurship, bringing fishermen and other actors into the same rooms, seminars and networks. In other cases, we have noted the specific activities of women in organising festivals, associations and voluntary work. Societies are performed in routes, attracted by the jobs available in processing fish or by shared memories of fisheries of the past. Emigrants come back for visits and immigrants come and go, also performing family life at a distance here and there. Places are constructed through the mobile practices that cross through them, but many bonds become stronger the more they are performed at a distance. Consequently, approaches invoking community embeddedness find they have analytic problems in equating community with a territorial locality, since reciprocities and associations are performed just as much at a distance and by way of short meetings.

Networks are performed among humans, and the very crucial moment of networking is, as always, reciprocity. Flows are non-stable, non-reciprocal, uncertain fluids of objects, knowledge, regulations and money. And networks and flows produce societies in various ways. There are variations in the social formations in each of the territorial countries in the

Nordic Atlantic, as I shall show in later chapters. Across these variations in territorial regimes, fishery societies are mobile, patient 'communities of practice' (Wenger 1998). Though the nationalisation of Exclusive Economic Zones meant that marine resources were territorialised, fishers are still on the move. But it is not least the international flows of capital that further mobilise businesses, and, if they only produce non-committed, mobile, bridging connections, it is questionable whether these will qualify as societies. However, fishers' 'communities of practice' can also be mobile bonds of partners, crews and ties on board vessels that are networked with other vessels, thus making societies also at sea. Coastal and distant fisheries differ greatly in this respect because of differences in their temporal and spatial modes of organisation. Meanwhile, it is often women ashore who maintain social life in villages, making territorial bonds of commitment to and support for fishing activities, including through networks of attachment to people in other places. Labour migration has meant the arrival of new groups, and, in cases where 'integration' is succeeding in the making of local communities, these represent new forms of territorial bridging. It is not the fisheries or business practices that make the bridging or the exclusive bonding, but other forms of social and political practices associated with territorialising policies, such as those of municipalities. Thus there are fishery societies, built especially around networks and flows at sea, while the making of societies more comprehensively involves other social, economic, political and cultural practices, such as those associated with tourism, municipalities and welfare systems, to be discussed in the following chapters.

Note

1. As reported by the mayor of Teriberka at the MOST CCPP user conference, Storfjord, June 2001. Larissa Riabova has investigated the transformation of Teriberka, also comparing it with Icelandic and Faroese localities, in Skaptadóttir et al. (2001).