



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Postscript

Bavinck, M.; Verrips, J.

DOI

[10.1007/s40152-020-00193-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40152-020-00193-z)

Publication date

2020

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

MAST: Maritime studies

License

CC BY

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bavinck, M., & Verrips, J. (2020). Postscript. *MAST: Maritime studies*, 19(2), 153. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40152-020-00193-z>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.



Postscript

Maarten Bavinck^{1,2} · Jojada Verrips¹

Published online: 3 July 2020
© The Author(s) 2020

The twelve commentaries on the Manifesto for the Marine Social Sciences take various approaches and possess different merits. Some are more practical, while others have a theoretical purpose; some focus specifically on capture fisheries (which is where many in the field of marine social sciences started), whereas others embrace a fuller range of marine pursuits; some are more supportive, while others take a critical stance. All this is well and good—the social sciences are after all not homogenous but thrive on debate.

In wrapping up this first conversation on the agenda of the marine social sciences, we choose to emphasize three points. First, many commentators appear to recognize what Pauwelussen (2020) calls “the multiplicity of marine realities,” which is also highlighted in the Manifesto. Frangoudes and co-authors (2020) thus emphasize the role of gender in fisheries, Vandergeest and Marschke (2020) unpack the research agenda for labor in industrial fisheries, Khan (2020) pleads for diversification of the range of social sciences included, and Knol-Kaufmann and Arbo (2020), to mention just a few, the need to broaden the focus to a range of “blue growth” activities and engage with “ocean futures.” Charles (2020) revisits a set of global themes that also deserve attention, while Burbridge (2020) takes the stacked policy agenda by the horns and highlights the utility of integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) in helping to solve critical issues of interference. Referring to the fact that “anthropologists have encountered ways of understanding and ordering marine reality that challenge the western-secular frameworks on which marine social science is commonly based,” Pauwelussen (2020) finally pleads for more ontological and methodological openness. For this, as Hornidge and Schlüter (2020) point out, we also need to engage in concept and theory production.

Second, some commentators have taken positions on the “political nature” of some points included in the Manifesto. Thus, Steins and co-authors (2020), reflecting on the “bias” toward small-scale fisheries (MMSS 2.2.2), conclude that: “Being seen as ‘advocates’ pressing the case for one particular group or outcome is likely to damage the still fragile position the social sciences have in this context.” Similarly, Kraan and Linke (2020) disapprove of the “normative nature” of some statements, and even of the designation “Manifesto,” which is supposed to have a “political connotation.” But Scholtens and Bennett (2020) take an opposite position, arguing that: “research agendas that present themselves as apolitical... may in fact be quite political by implicitly legitimizing and reproducing a status quo” and praise the Manifesto for “holding the middle ground.” Rather than apologizing this way or the other, we conclude that the availability of “bias” is just as much an issue of debate in this Manifesto as in other documents of this kind.

Finally, we draw attention to the fact that the Manifesto, and the majority of commentaries included in this issue, largely reflect the views of what Kurien (2002) calls the “temperate minority,” otherwise known as the Global North, with only a few commentaries (Sridhar 2020; Khan 2020) originating from the “tropical majority,” or the Global South. We therefore call on social science scholars based in the Global South to add to the Manifesto as it stands now; we also call on other marine social scientists to continue the conversation that has been started.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

✉ Maarten Bavinck
j.m.bavinck@uva.nl

¹ University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

² UiT Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.