

EDITORIAL – MAST VOLUME 8.1

Derek Johnson

Associate Chief Editor, MAST
Department of Anthropology, University of Manitoba
MARE, Amsterdam
Derek_Johnson@umanitoba.ca

Last year was auspicious for Maritime Studies (MAST), as it marked the moment when the new series of the journal surpassed the number of issues published in the first series of its predecessor Maritime Anthropological Studies (MAST) between 1988 and 1993. The momentum has continued through 2009 and we are proud to offer you here the first issue of volume eight. This issue is important for two reasons. First, its publication in mid-2009 marks the return of MAST to publication on its set schedule, several years after falling behind. Second, with this issue we welcome Svein Jentoft as the new Chief Editor of MAST. As many of our readers know, Svein is a major figure in maritime studies globally. He is also one of that select band of authors who have had papers published in both the old series and new series of MAST. Bonnie McCay, Russ McGoodwin, Charles Menzies, Gísli Pálsson, Peter Sinclair, Rob van Ginkel, and Jojada Verrips are the others.

With Svein's assumption of his new role comes a new distribution of tasks among the editorial staff. The Chief Editor's role will now shift to an agenda setting and advisory position, while the bulk of the day-to-day editorial management will be carried out by four Associate Chief Editors: Maarten Bavinck; Ben Blount; Simon Bush; and me. Maarten is responsible for administration of the journal while the other three Associate Chief Editors are responsible for content and editorial matters. Supporting this group is an editorial team, whose names you can find in the front matter of the journal. Eva-Maria van Straaten continues in her role as Editorial Manager.

Given the transition in Chief Editorship, the time seemed appropriate for taking stock of the achievements of MAST so far. A separate forward-looking editorial will anchor MAST 8(2).

The most striking feature of the history of MAST to date is its history of two incarnations: the first as a journal of maritime anthropology, the second moving to encompass maritime social science in a broader sense. My review straddles the two in order to show the continuities between the two periods of publication of MAST, while also showing how the journal has changed over time in ways that reflect its internal organization and broader shifts in social science approaches to the sea.

While MAST shares themes and contributors with other journals, most notably *Marine Policy* and *Ocean and Coastal Management*, throughout its history it has maintained a distinct if evolving identity. The foundation of that distinct identity can be traced all the way back to the editorial authored by Rob van Ginkel and Jojada Verrips for MAST 1(1) in 1988. In that editorial they spoke of the need to pro-

vide a single platform for the publication of articles in the area of maritime anthropology that would merge two overlapping strands: the anthropology of fishing and the ethnographic analysis of the relationship between coastal dwellers and the sea. The first research area pertained particularly to the practice of fishing at sea and the second to the broader social and cultural contexts of coastal peoples. In creating a space for the exploration of maritime anthropology in this way, MAST was founded with an interest in understanding the complex and particular conditions of coastal and fishing societies, a concern that continues to inspire the journal.

Rob and Jojada's initial formulation was quickly shown to be incomplete, or at least imbalanced in its weighting, as MAST in short order began to publish significant numbers of papers in the area of fisheries management. Certainly this theme links to the second strand of maritime anthropology that MAST sought to cover, but Rob and Jojada did not seem to foresee that a first step in the evolution of MAST's distinctiveness would be to link maritime anthropology to the social science of fisheries management, an area of research that took off at the end of the 1980s. Over the history of MAST, the governance theme, as it has now come to be known within MARE, has dominated the journal's content, reflecting a broader shift of concern within maritime social science towards the management of human-ecological relationships. While MAST has retained that original commitment to the analytical and empirical richness of the old series, and this is really what marks MAST as distinctive, the new series has deliberately sought to move to represent an interdisciplinary social science perspective on maritime studies. This shift has been reflected in the recruitment of editors who represent a variety of social sciences.

In both the earlier and later MAST series, therefore, there has been a mix of attention towards more classic social science themes and the more contemporary concern with governance. This mix is evident from table one but it is also clear that there has been a continued strong shift towards governance in the new MAST.

*Table 1. Thematic contents of the old and new series of MAST by characteristics of papers**

	Fisheries	Maritime Cultures and Work Worlds	Governance	Other
Old MAST	66	25	32	7
New MAST	59	18	60	15
* I assigned the four general themes in the heading of this table to each paper as I interpreted them to fit. Many papers had more than one theme				

Table 2. Fisheries and non-fisheries oriented papers in the old and new series of MAST

	Fisheries	Other	Total
Old MAST	66	2	68
New MAST	59	30	89

A second marked difference between the two series is in the weight of fisheries. As table two indicates, fisheries had a hugely dominant role in the papers of the old series of MAST. New MAST has succeeded in diversifying its topics of focus, including attention to subjects such as coastal tourism, piracy, and flagship species. Attention

to strengthening the diversity of MAST's content has been a deliberate goal of the new series and it is heartening to see that the effort has led to positive results.

While the new MAST has broadened its focus and innovated thematically, there are nonetheless pleasing symmetries between the old and new series. In the area of very specific topics, both series contain contributions looking at fishermen's resistance and adaptation to turtle excluder devices; both series have articles focused on the specialized topic of boat typologies and fishing technologies; and both have multiple articles concerned with perceptions of, and disputes over, whaling. Somewhat more broadly, the two series contain articles that reflect on local interpretations of the sea. Theoretically, in the new MAST Petter Holm and Jahn Petter Johnsen, and collaborators, have presented creative new ways of understanding fisheries governance that are as cutting edge as the discussions of chaos theory were in the old series of MAST. Of course, in addition to these thematic connections, there is also the overlap of specific maritime researchers listed above.

The new MAST has also made institutional and formatting innovations. MAST now has the relative luxury given by its association with MARE, which is institutionally linked to the University of Amsterdam and Wageningen University. MARE provides the institutional home that Rob and Jojada so sorely missed for the old MAST and which was a major reason that led to its dormancy from 1993 to 2001. The director of MARE, Maarten Bavinck, has made a key part of his vision for the organization the tight interconnection of the organization's different activities. For MAST, MARE has offered the great institutional advantage of its biennial People and the Sea conferences, which have provided key content inputs for MAST, especially the now traditional publication of the People and the Sea keynote lectures as the basis for MAST special issues. MARE's university affiliations have also afforded the financial, personnel, and other benefits associated with large academic organisations.

In formatting terms, the new series of MAST has refined the earlier model and has made a much more regular habit of special issues around particular themes and around dialogues with well known figures in maritime studies. MAST has also sought as much as possible to engage in cross-disciplinary dialogue. As table three indicates, the new MAST has become more diverse disciplinarily. One area of comparative disadvantage relative to the old MAST, however, has been the relative decline of the book reviews section, which was a strong feature of the old series.

Table 3. Background of contributing authors to the old and new series of MAST

	Anthropology	Other Social Science	Natural Science	Civil Society	Unknown
Old MAST	49	14	2	2	4
New MAST	26	47	17	7	0

A final point of comparison between the two series of MAST is geographical coverage in terms of the focus of papers published in the journal and in terms of the origins of their contributing authors. This point is particularly important as

MARE, as an organization, is committed to building bridges between North and South for maritime studies.

Tables four and five convey mixed messages in regards to the geographical ambitions of MAST. As the comparison between the two tables shows, while both series have a reasonably wide coverage, Northern authors, especially those from Europe and North America, have dominated the journal. Three changes are noticeable between the two series. First, the new MAST has at least broadened its global geographical scope in terms of article focus, even if those articles continue to be written by Northern authors. Second, the new MAST has considerably more articles in the global category that I use as shorthand for articles that either discuss an issue at the global level or have a theoretical orientation that is global in applicability. Third, there has been a shift in Northern contributions to MAST from the North from North American to Europe and, to a minor degree, to the Antipodes, which provide the bulk of the papers under the Oceania category.

Table 4. *Geographical focus of MAST articles^a*

Geographical focus	Old MAST	New MAST
North America ^b	29	18
Europe	14	21
Africa	8	3
Global	8	31
Asia	7	12
Caribbean	1	4
South America	1	2
Oceania ^c	1	7

a Some articles focus on several main geographical locations
b Includes Mexico
c Australia, New Zealand, and South Pacific countries

Table 5. *Author's country of institutional affiliation*

Author's residence	Old MAST	New MAST
North America ^a	46	45
Europe	23	44
Africa	3	1
Asia	2	2
Oceania ^b	2	9
South America	1	5
Caribbean	0	1
Unknown	1	0

a Includes Mexico
b Australia, New Zealand, and South Pacific countries

In its two fold but well received history, MAST has played a significant and unique role as a place for the publication of social science articles on the relationship between people and the sea. As a result of shifting trends in research emphases and through deliberate editorial policy, MAST has come to publish a larger proportion

of papers on governance while increasing the range of its papers, both in terms of discipline and topic. The journal retains, however, its foundational commitment to innovative and analytically rich social science research on maritime studies. While this is not yet the moment to sketch MAST's ambitions for the future, it is not revealing too much to indicate that under the new direction of Svein Jentoft we envisage an invigorated commitment to high quality scholarship on a broad range of maritime social science topics that recognizes the extremely serious challenges faced by the world's coastal and maritime population.

This current issue 8(1) of MAST represents in microcosm several of the key points in the review above. In keeping with the shift observed from the old to new MAST, the issue has a strong European orientation, as all of the authors, including those of the book reviews, are from European institutions, even if not all of them are Europeans by origin. The issue also illustrates the changing emphasis of MAST towards a broader social science scope as the authors draw on literatures that range far from anthropology yet also connect us to the most innovative of contemporary forms of anthropology. Similarly, the topical focus shows a novel diversity, with attention to coastal tourism, new governance practices and institutions, maritime security, and anthropological explorations of the strange worlds of marine biology. Of the four main articles, three are European in focus, which gives us a mini special issue on European maritime affairs. The fourth takes us to Mexico and, lest we become too immersed in the arcane worlds of European regulatory frameworks, shows us a compelling example of savvy community-driven resource governance.