



THE PUPPETEERS AND PUPPET: INDIAN MARINE CAPTURE FISHERIES

Jones Thomas Spartgeus
Smitu Kothari Fellow-2020
Centre for Financial Accountability(CFA), India

Contents

INTRODUCTION	2
<i>Globalised Marine Fisheries and Fishers</i>	2
PUPPETEERS: FISHING THE FISHERIES OF DEVELOPING NATIONS	4
<i>Trawling the Underutilised Fisheries</i>	6
<i>Sustaining the Over Exploited Fisheries</i>	7
<i>Institutionalising the Fisheries</i>	8
<i>Netting the Sunken Billions</i>	9
<i>Purse seining the Marine and Coastal Commons: Blue Economy</i>	9
<i>Quantifying and Estimating the Capture Fisheries</i>	10
<i>Capitalising and Corporatizing Fisheries</i>	11
PUPPETERS HOOKED – THE MARINE CAPTURE FISHERIES	12
PUPPET (INDIA) IN THE HANDS OF PUPPETERS (WBG & FAO)	14
UNTOLD BLUE REVOLUTION: MARINE FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT	15
<i>Marine Fishing Industry Transformation</i>	16
<i>Neoliberal Economic Reforms – Opening the Seas and Shores</i>	18
<i>Post Tsunami Marine Fisheries Recovery</i>	19
<i>Marine Fisheries Sustainable Development Transitions</i>	20
<i>Saffroning the Marine Fisheries</i>	21
UNEARTHED MARINE FISHERIES GOVERNANCE	25
<i>Indian Laws of Seas: Curbing the Freedom of Seas</i>	25
<i>Fisheries Policy Reforms: Restructuring the Marine Fisheries</i>	27
<i>Fisheries Institutions: Reconfiguring the Marine Fisheries</i>	29
UNHEARD BLUE VOICES: REPRESSED MARINE CAPTURE FISHERS	33
<i>Pink Dollar (Shrimp): Manure to Protein seafood</i>	33
<i>Fishers of Cooperative Societies: Livelihood to Occupation</i>	33
<i>Promotion of Mono Fishing Method: Fish for Global market</i>	34
<i>Centralized Fisheries Governance: States with No Sovereign (Sea)Rights</i>	35
<i>Diminishing Women Fishers: Expandable commodities</i>	35
UNENED PUPPETRY: BLUE CONQUEST ON MARINE FISHERS	36

INTRODUCTION

Natural Resources¹ play a vital role in the development of the human civilisation. The Natural Resources served as a source of livelihoods' sustenance for the Natural Resource Dependent Communities (NRDC), since the ages. The NRDC are indigenous in nature, their interface with nature and the ecology helped flourish their communities. The larger sections of the NRDC were concentrated in the so-called *developing nations* where higher scales of poverty, rapid population growth, lack of nutrition and poor living standards. In addition, the modernised societies labelled the NRDC as traditional communities who are vulnerable to all levels of marginalisation, hence they are been targets(subjects) of the socio-development projects such as poverty reduction, improvising nutrition levels and enhancing economic standards.

Most of the *developing nations* got independence in the 20th century. These nations envisioned for a modern development, which will enable them to move forward in the ladder, to achieve the power status of *developed countries*. They perceived that science and technologies are the gears for the modern development, particularly Africa, Asia and Latin America. For doing so, these developing nations liberalise and open their natural resources, labour, and markets to foreign investments and corporations in order to maximise economic growth. These restructuring developments were backed up and facilitated with International Financial Aids and liberal trade agreements. The World Bank (WB) is one of the International Lending Institutions, financing developing nations for economic development. The WB facilitates the nation's developments with severe conditionalities, packaged as *Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs)* which will boost the nation's economies by removing State controls and promoting market competition. Thus, WB, the non-state actor holds the thumb rule, the power of decision-making and the borrower developing nations dance to the WB's tune. However, there are proven economies went economically unstable due to the WB's SAPs and finally surrender nations to the WB's conditionalities, particularly developing nation and under developed nations fall easy prey for the SAP WB's debt trap.

Globalised Marine Fisheries and Fishers

Globally, Ocean and its Coastal Resources serve as a livelihood for millions of traditional fishers and coastal communities, particularly in coastal developing nations. Fish remains as the main and cheap source of animal protein for one billion people across the globe.

¹ Includes naturally available resources of forests, fisheries, lands, and water bodies

Fisheries² provide 3 billion people with at least 20 percent of their average per capita consumption of animal protein, with 400 million depending critically on fish for livelihood and food, particularly in the developing countries. In addition, it also provides a range of direct and indirect employment for more than 300 million people.

Fisheries are largely classified into Capture and Culture Fisheries³. Further, Capture fisheries can be classified into fishing in Marine and Inland (includes freshwater and brackish water fisheries). Historically, the marine traditional fishing and coastal communities inhabit coastal areas, they are mostly indigenous communities by nature, fishing is the main source livelihood existence. These communities practise fishing in diverse marine and coastal ecosystems such as Territorial Waters (nearshore), Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ) - Deepsea, High Seas, as well as Brackish waters areas such as Lagoons, Backwaters, Creeks, Estuaries and other tidal influenced areas. Both fishing and coastal communities considered these ecosystems as a Sacred Ecology (Mother Sea), hence they traditionally owned ecosystems (sea and coast) as their Customary Common Property, further they manage and govern their Common Property through their customary societal customs, ecological knowledge, and governance systems. These Fishers Customary Commons are well established as *Marine and Coastal Commons* by prominent academic researchers.

In due course, the development of science and technology had advanced the global populations towards industrialisation, which conceptualised the Natural Resources as the Natural Capital or Assets for economic prosperity. and also transformed from primitive societies to a modern globalised cultured society. The Fisheries were penetrated with capital intensive technological innovations which transformed fishing sector into Fishing Industry, interlocked with the global markets. This has been a common framework adopted by all the Coastal and island States across globe, especially Coastal Developing and Island Nations. However, the fishing has been a hereditary occupation in coastal communities especially in developing countries, so globalised modern fisheries development impacted fishers and coastal communities were inextricably and pushed them to the fringes of marginalisation. Adding to the fuel, the neoliberal order of economic reforms with SAP in early 90's catalysed the pre-existing marginalities of fishers to the core, the politically marginalised fishers' voices are not heard by the dominant terrestrial (land based) communities in most of the developing countries.

² means resources of fish and other aquatic animals and organisms or place where fishing is done

³ Farming or cultivating the fish and other aquatic organisms

Therefore, the subjugation of fishers' rights and State Repression on fishers and coastal communities prevailed as part of the everyday life in the coastal developing nations.

In this paper, we will focus on Marine Capture Fisheries (MCF) sector of the developing countries, particularly India. We purposely had not used the largely accepted term Small Scale Fisheries (SSF) because for certain reasons, classifying the fisheries as small scale and large scale echoes for the scale economic exploitation or loot, represent both inland and Marine and further SSF is not clearly defined term, it changes according coastal nations, For instance, All Indian fishing boats such as Mechanised, Non- Mechanised , Motorised and Non- Motorised boats (big or small) except Fishing Vessels⁴ are classified as SSF according to the so called global fisheries definitions. Therefore, we used the term Marine Capture Fisheries (MCF). Further, this paper attempts to decode Marine Fisheries development loan interventions of World Bank and its Fisheries technical expertise the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) in the developing nations, we term the both Fisheries Development Strategists as the '*Puppeteers*' of Marine Fisheries and then reflecting the analyses on the Structurally Adjusted Indian Marine Fisheries Development Policies as the '*Puppet*' and its impacts on the Marine Capture Fishers of India.

PUPPETEERS: FISHING THE FISHERIES OF DEVELOPING NATIONS

The World Bank Group (WBG)⁵ is the web of five lending and investment institutions namely IBRD, IDA, IFC, ICSID and MIGA. The WBG provides Development Assistance Loans to the member countries of United Nations for long-term economic development and poverty reduction by supporting with technical expertise and financial assistance to reform certain sectors. As a conditionality, the WBG mandates the borrower country to accept and mainstream Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) into national development agenda. Basically, the SAP reorients the country's national development policies to focus on debt repayment which will mandate the borrower countries to open their natural resources, labour, and markets to investments of foreign corporations. On the acceptance of the SAP, the WB redefine, restructure the functions of indebted sovereign states, their loan penetrates into nooks

⁴ large industrial fishing boats berthed in Ports

⁵ consists of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) which provides financial development and policy financing, International Development Association (IDA) which provides zero-to low-interest loans and grants, International Finance Corporation (IFC) which mobilizes private sector investment, International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) undertakes services for the settlement of investment disputes and Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) offers political risk insurance (guarantees)

and corners of the development sectors starting from Agriculture, Nutrition, Forest, Fisheries, Infrastructure, Transport, Health, Mining, Education, Research and Planning, to Urban Housing, Sanitation, Water Supply protecting the environment.

To start with, we have to know the loan granting process of WBG, so that we have understand operations and strategies of the WBG with regard to development of the developing nation. The Bank systemically diagnosis the country for the economic reforms, the *diagnose reports* were to be considered as the bank's loan possibility document, then the Bank with the bower country stakeholders prepare a country partnership engagement document which is detail the objectives, strategies, budget and outcomes of the development assistance includes structural adjustment policy, legal and institutions reforms which develop pathways for economic prosperity. In the country partnership engagement documents are refereed as Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) was the four-year period Country Level Analytical document developed based on the borrower (government) data as well as Bank's Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP). Now, the Bank had replaced CAS with Country Partnership Framework (CPF) more evidence based systematic country-driven model focused on ending extreme poverty and increasing shared prosperity in a sustainable manner. In nutshell, the WBG is global lending bank to developing nations, finance billions of dollars in low-interest loans, to establish control over the natural resources, and increase exports by plundering natural resources, through facilitating foreign ownership (privatisation)of their economies. In addition, the WB's development mantra is that export-led economic growth fuelled by foreign borrowing and investment leads developing nations towards economic prosperity.

The *Fish and Fisheries* products have become the expensive commodity in the globalised markets. The Western and European countries' high consumption of the seafood might be the reason behind the fisheries as commodity gaining more hundred billion dollars export value. The billion-dollar value also placed Fisheries as one of the prime sectors of development in the World Bank's lending agenda. The WBG Financial Aid is the largest blue whale finance into fisheries development, especially targeted to support and enhance marine capture fisheries in a large scale. The *Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)* plays a crucial role with in Fisheries related matters, it provides fisheries technical and knowledge assistance to the bank. In fisheries, the WBG & FAO assist nations to sustainable exploit the fisheries with effective fisheries governance and management tools in order sustain fishers' livelihoods, reduce poverty and contribute to the larger food-security agenda. However, their hidden agenda is that feed wealthier (developed)nations with the exploited cheap resources of the poor (developing) countries.

Hamilton (2018) had analysed the World Bank Aid, Objectives and Interventions in supporting Small-Scale Fisheries (SSF) discloses that atleast 56 projects were targeted to support to Small-Scale Fisheries from 1971 to 2018, and more than \$463 million USD in explicit SSF funding since the year 2000. Furthermore, the majority aid was allocated to support projects in East Asia and the Pacific (36.1%), Africa (32.8%) and South Asia (22.4%), with limited aid supporting projects in Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe, and the Middle East from 2000 to 2018. A closer look at the Aid Receiving Countries reveals that they are largely the Coastal Least Developing Nations and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) such that South Asia's (22.4%) was estimated as 104.0 (USD millions) which was received by two countries only i.e. India 102.0 (22.0 %) and Maldives 1.9 (0.4%) respectively.

Further, we attempted decoding WBG and its FAO fisheries strategies by revisiting loan assistance project components executed in developing nations.

Trawling the Underutilised Fisheries

From 1950-1992, the MCF remains as underutilized and unutilised resources but has huge development potential. The WB's reasoning was that the inefficient fishing methods, traditional fishing gears and crafts were the barriers held the MCF as untapped resources. So, the WB's devised technological development interventions which largely focused on increasing fish catch and efficiency. The financial assistance provided for the construction of economic potential mechanised boats (trawlers), modernisation of the crafts, modernising the gears from passive to active and construction of fishing harbours to facilitate the seafood supply chain as well as innovative projects that promote the increased exploitation of fisheries resources, executed in a full-fledged manner.

However, the actual grounds for Banks's assistance was that the victory of Chinese Communist regime lead to imposing ban on Chinses exports to USA, Japan and South East Asia in 1949. This resulted in huge demand of seafoods, especially in shrimps in global markets, so the global market focus turned towards the Asia's developing nations for the supply of shrimp, particularly India, Thailand, Indonesia and other developing coastal and island nations. Hence, the WB and other International Development Aid agencies fuelled the promotion mechanised bottom trawlers to harvest the shrimps in the coastal waters. Thus, the Shrimps gained export dollar value and established the pathways for the coastal developing nation in Asia to transforms the fisheries economies to export oriented economies.

Sustaining the Over Exploited Fisheries

In mid-90's, the WB interventions focused in conserving and sustainably managing overexploited fisheries. The Bank realised that MCF encounters problems of resource overexploitation due to more illegal fishing, habitat degradation and destruction and ungoverned MCF, resulting in unsustainable plundering of resources. The bank devised strategies for conservation of marine and coastal resources for healthy ecosystems, assistance projects like Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Project (COREMAP), Integrated Marine and Coastal Resources Management Project were financed to restore the resources as well as supported policy development interventions to strengthen the fisheries governance. The FAO came up regulatory standards and agreements such as the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (1995) to enhance the fisheries governance interventions in the mid 90's. The WB's revised their vision to harness the fisheries economic potential in order to reduce poverty and malnutrition, enhance fishers' livelihoods and wellbeing by promoting sustainable fisheries.

From the tapping *Underexploited Fisheries to a Sustainable Fisheries* does not happen all of a sudden, it is a WB's deliberate proactive step of the World Bank. The rapid expansion of globalised economic growth burdened environment of the developing countries which resulted in production and revenue decline in large-scale. From 1970 onwards, the concerns on environmental protection were debated on global platforms, led to United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (1972), followed by World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) in 1983, the commission came up with the report *Our Common Future, also known as the Brundtland Report*, in 1987. The report coined word *Sustainable Development* a developmental concept that would permit reconciling economic development with environmental protection. In 1992, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), well known as Rio Conference or Earth Summit, mandated the integration of Sustainable Development in the all the development interventions undertaken in United Nations agencies, programs and funds which include the International Financial Institutions and the multilateral development banks and all the rest of the UN systems. Therefore, the WB strategically relocated itself sustainable fisheries interventions, this act resembles the chameleon configuration changing intervention according global concerns and market situations

In addition, it is evident that the WB had introduced and promoted production export-oriented modern fishing methods, crafts and gears to fish more tonnages and gain exports

revenue, then turning the tide round to conserve and manage resources, by accusing and framing the fishers for overexploitation of fisheries resources which seemed unethical and unfair.

Institutionalising the Fisheries

In 200 (Post Rio+10), the WB came up with Fisheries Sector Approach Paper, *Saving Fish and Fisheries: Towards Sustainable and Equitable Governance of the global fishing sector*, which illustrated the WB's Objectives, Strategies and Support for Fisheries. It analysed the problems of Fishers and Fisheries, especially SSF, implementation issues of fisheries governance, and resource management and finally suggested Institutional Governance Framework for Sustainable Fisheries and Tools for the Sustainable Management of Fisheries Resources and also scoped out the WB's future strategies for fisheries, including SSF. The WB's Approach Paper highlighted overfishing, destruction and degradation of ecosystems, biodiversity loss, and weak and poor fisheries governance were impeding the growth of fisheries resulting in a steady income decline for 30 million Fishers, Fishworkers as well as coastal communities to a larger extent. To overcome, the WB put forward key support strategies such as the organisation of fishers, the allocation of use rights, alternative employment and income-generating opportunities where needed, and the establishment of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in order to improve the socioeconomic welling of fisheries and fish workers as well as for sustainable growth of fisheries.

In addition, the approach paper suggests *Institutional Framework for Governance of Sustainable Fisheries* with detailed components such as a Fisheries Management System, a Monitoring, Control, and Surveillance (MCS) System, a Fisheries Judicial System, Collaborative Fisheries Management (Co-Management) and Allocation of Access and User Rights and also charted out a *Tools for the Sustainable Management of Fisheries Resources* which illustrated Marine Protected Areas, Changing Exploitation Patterns, Restocking and Stock Enhancement, Methods for Reducing Fishing Capacity, Trade, and Food Safety, and Certification. The Approach paper concludes saying promotion of Alternative Livelihoods to Fishing and Aquaculture for enhancing fish supply and reduction of poverty.

However, the reviewing the WB's approach paper from fishers and fish workers' perspective, it catalyses the existing problems of the SSF, the suggested frameworks, tools and conclusions will limit the access of the fishers to the resources and legally disposes (replacing the customary rights with Tenure rights) fishers and fish workers rights over resources and finally culturing fish as an alternative livelihood and alternative production solution to the overexploitation of the resources seems to be a nail in the coffin of the MCF.

Netting the Sunken Billions

In 2009, the World Bank and its Fisheries expertise collaborator Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) jointly released a report titled '*Sunken Billions: The Economic Justification for Fisheries Reform*'. The World Bank and FAO valued that losses due to inefficient fisheries is around \$50 billion annually with the cumulative loss over the past three decades around \$2 trillion. According to the report "*by improving the governance of marine fisheries, society could capture a substantial part of this \$50 billion annual economic loss*" (WB & FAO 2009). The report put forward a comprehensive reform agenda for the fisheries sector which could benefit the marine and coastal dependent countries economic prosperity as well as generated millions of jobs and alternative livelihoods. Further, the report disclosed that a recovery of the sunken billions could be achieved by two possible ways, a reduction in fishing effort can rapidly increase productivity, profitability, and net economic benefits from a fishery and rebuilding fish stocks will lead to increased sustainable yields and lower fishing cost. The suggested solutions sounded on conservation and sustainable fishing promotion.

For instance, the promotion of Deep sea fishing claim the sustainable fishing label compared to trawling but Deepsea fishing largely targeted Tuna species which has high global market value, the WB support assistance strategies will focus on introduction Deep sea boats as well as conversion of existing fleets to sustainable e fishing boat. This unrealistic theoretical fisheries expertise solutions obviously gained a sustainable economic benefit viable product for bank, but for ecology the mono-fishing species-specific gears and boat will lead a massive disturbance on marine ecology.

Holt 2008 urges on the same lines stating "*The Bank and FAO should be applauded for making a serious attempt to give economic perspective to failed fisheries management, and their conclusions are surely qualitatively correct subject to the validity of the assumption that the ongoing biomass depletion process is reversible*".

Purse seining the Marine and Coastal Commons: Blue Economy

In 2012, "Rio +20" outcome was with two key themes '*Green Economy*' Concept and refinement of the *Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development*. However, the Coastal and Island developing countries were unhappy about the relevance of Green Economy concept to the coastal countries. As a result, the Green Economy was expanded with Blue aspects, which evolved as '*Green Economy in a Blue World*'. But the Coastal and Island developing countries moved beyond this and profound '*Blue Economy*' concept for ocean and coastal

countries, recognising that the Oceans new frontier for future development, Blue Economy was the suitable approach to address circumstances, constraints and challenges of the Coastal and Island developing countries.

The Blue Economy approach is based on the assessment and incorporation of the real value of the natural (Blue) capital into all aspects of economic activity (conceptualization, planning, infrastructure development, trade, travel, renewable resource exploitation, energy production/consumption. According to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the Blue economy accounts for about 3.5 to 7 percent of global GDP. The Blue Economy theorizes oceans and coasts as a “*Shared Economic Development Spaces*” where Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) integrates conservation, sustainable use of living resources, oil and mineral wealth extraction, bio-prospecting, sustainable energy production and marine transport. The Small Islands Developing Nations and Coastal Least Developing countries adopts Blue Economy’s sustainable development framework to address the equity in access to development, equal sharing of benefits from marine resources in order reduce poverty, and the alleviation of crippling national debt burdens. Therefore, the Blue Economy Model is the successor of Ocean Economy Model with a tag of sustainable exploitations and explorations of the oceans and coastal resources.

Quantifying and Estimating the Capture Fisheries

In 2012, the WB published a report ‘*Hidden Harvest: The Global Contribution of Capture Fisheries*’, which brought out the problems faced by MCF and Fishers in developing countries, it revealed that SSF dominates the fisheries sector, 90% of the livelihoods of the 120 million employed, depended on SSF, and among them majority of the fish workers live in developing countries. The report disclosed that the deficiencies in SSF data which make the situation complex and difficult for policy makers and experts to understand the potential of SSF and so the report suggested the disaggregated information and separate analysis of largescale, small-scale, artisanal, recreational, marine, and inland fisheries make a better understanding of their respective roles and social and economic importance, further disaggregated analysis can attract reforms investments in sustainable fisheries and betterment fisheries governance. This report gave an estimation of MCF as well as scoped out the investments in the MCF for sustainable fisheries.

Capitalising and Corporatizing Fisheries

In 2017, the Coastal and Island developing countries' voices of BE stimulated the WB resulted in *"The Sunken Billions Revisited: Progress and Challenges in Global Marine Fisheries"*, crisis of the Global marine fisheries was problematised with overfishing, and proposed for equilibrium, comprehensive and coordinated reforms in global fisheries management, including the financial and social costs of transitioning to a sustainable resource management. The report suggested Bio-Economic Model, an integrated Economic - Ecological tool used to analyse the welfare effects of changes in environmental quality.

Consequently, the World Bank together with a Working Group of United Nations Entities came up with report titled *'The Potential of the Blue Economy: Increasing Long-term Benefits of the Sustainable Use of Marine Resources for Small Island Developing States and Coastal Least Developed Countries'*. This report gave a common understanding of the blue economy and the illustrated BE potential in Small Island Developing States and Coastal Least Developed Countries. In addition, the report underpins the range of economic sectors and related policies (ocean and coastal related business components) such as Fisheries, Aquaculture, Tourism, Shipping, Biotechnologies, Maritime Security, Seabed Mining, Oil and Gas, Renewable Energy as well as thrusts on substantial ocean governance which requires collaboration across nation-states and across the public-private sectors partnership.

Taking the case of WB's BE execution in Bangladesh, the Bangladesh adopted and the components of the Blue Economy were mainstreamed in the Bangladesh national development Plans as "Unlocking the Potential of Blue Economy" (7th Five Year Plan-FY2016 – FY2020), then WB developed a scoping report *"Toward a Blue Economy: A Pathway for Sustainable Growth in Bangladesh"* which recommended an array of institutions and polices and laws are subjected reforms and dilutions for exploitation, further an exclusive Fisheries project named Bangladesh Sustainable Coastal and Marine Fisheries Project (BSCMFP) was provided to sustainably exploit the marine and coastal fisheries resources and finally BE Cell a Single Window Service cell to facilitate all the BE initiatives in Bangladesh. Thus, the Blue Economy was injected into the Bangladesh's economic growth. This WB's BE implementation Framework was largely executed in Caribbean, Pacific and Asia regions as well as in SIDS and Coastal countries.

With this, the WB started supporting the Blue Economy agenda, assisting governments in creating an enabling environment for the integrated and sustainable development of marine and coastal resources in healthy oceans.

Currently, the World Bank's active Blue Economy is estimated around \$5 billion with a further \$1.65 billion in the pipeline. These projects are executed to facilitate the BE

components as well as support coastal development in the large scale including tackling marine pollution and climate change. The program PROBLUE is fully aligned with the World Bank's Blue Economy program at the Bank. PROBLUE focuses on management of fisheries and aquaculture; the threat posed to ocean health by marine pollution, including plastics; the sustainable development of key oceanic sectors such as tourism, maritime transport and offshore renewable energy; and building the capacity of governments to manage their marine and coastal resources in an integrated fashion to deliver more and long-lasting benefits to countries and communities. PROBLUE chained with implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14 (SDG 14) and with the World Bank's twin goals of ending extreme poverty and increasing the income and welfare of the poor in a sustainable way. So, \$75 million has been committed to the PROBLUE Fund, Norway provided the initial pledge of \$15 million as part of a planned multi-year contribution to PROBLUE. Therefore, the World Bank, FAO, and other Multilateral Financial Institutions, State Development Agencies, and other global actors conceived and promulgated Blue Economy as a Sustainable tool to attain the SDG 2030 targets, the Small Islands Developing Nations and Coastal Least Developing countries are assisted with financial aid and technical support to experiment and extract Blue Economy sectors for profiteering as well as for the growth of developed countries.

To conclude, the Blue Economy Growth Model is nothing but transforming the Blue (Natural) Capital into various economic sectors i.e. Oceans and Seas as Sustainable Shared Economic Viable Development Spaces for long-term economic growth for corporations and developed countries.

PUPPETERS HOOKED – THE MARINE CAPTURE FISHERIES

The Fisheries nature of being fluidity, opaque and unpredictability resists to the accumulation of resources. The Financialisation, Privatisation, Deregulation of markets and commodification of fisheries impacts the different grounds differently and at different intervals in different parts of the world. Further, these fisheries interventions are highly backed with powerful global Non-state Actors such as United Nations Development Aid agencies, World Bank as well as International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) to charted the needs of the developed countries as well as their crony corporates.

The WBG and its Fisheries Expert FAO had systemically plundered the fisheries resources from underutilisation to overexploitation. The WB supported fisheries development policies corrupted the minds of fisher communities to “*race for fish*”, transformation of traditional gears and crafts with capital intensive and sophisticated technologies had

modernised fisheries sector to export production-oriented industry (Business enterprises.) as well as brutally looted the fisheries resources for the dollar race competing the global seafood markets. Further, the transformations had not increased the share catch of the fishers, rather it surges the capital cost for fishing and ended the fishing as economically inefficient operation. The globalisation in fisheries survived through the reconfiguration of nature and human relationship that have emerged under marked based economy (McCormack, 2017).

The Rio Earth summit's alarming concerns on Fisheries resources were painted with Blue-Green Sustainable and Conservation tag, and continued the exploitation of the fisheries. The Sustainability tag catalyst the competitive advantage to a spectrum of business enterprises from grassroot (small and medium) to transnational corporates. Many scholars had reflected the sustainable in the context of green economy conservation and so on, but Sustainable Development is primarily concerned with economic system that is webbed in neoliberal regime (McCormack, 2017).

Further, the we understand scientific assessments of sustainability and Natural Assets for economic growth dominated the strategies and objectives WBG and FAO. For instance, FAO's Fisheries Biologist Expert whose concern on fisheries biodiversity strategies their interventions such as assessment of fish stocks, Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) to conserve and mange resources, and on the other hand WB's Fisheries Economist whose concern on economic growth, put forward interventions such as allocation of property rights, privatising and leasing the resources for better revenue. However, the sustainable fisheries and economic development interventions subjugated the customary resource rights and human rights of the fishers and fish workers in developing nations for feeding the local economies of developed countries.

The WBG along with FAO fisheries expertise had harvested and has been harvesting the sunken billions for several transnational corporations as well as regional corporates of the globalised world with a well secured State sponsored liberal policies and legalisation governance structures for establishing a sustainable viable profiteering business. However, the irony of the whole investments is that Developing nations are provided with loans for eradicating the poverty and improve the socio-economic well-being of the fishers and fish workers, but in reality they are provided with fisheries business modules as project components to further marginalise the fisher and fish workers and push them to the fringes of poverty by legally dispossessing and degrading their livelihood resource base.

PUPPET (INDIA) IN THE HANDS OF PUPPETERS (WBG & FAO)

India (*Puppet*) is one of the founder members of IBRD, IDA, IFC and MIGA, not member of ICSID, and it is one of the largest borrower nations of the WBG, obtained numerous development projects mostly from IBRD and IDA. The WBGs (*Puppeteer:1*) financial lending patterns were traced starting from Infrastructure, Development Finance, and Industry in 1950's Agricultural Machinery Project was the WBs first approved development assistance in 1948, then in 60's and 70's largely it is Green Revolution for Agriculture, followed by rapidly extending their tentacles into all public sector enterprises in 1980's. Notably, the early 90's economic crisis of India became the window opportunity of the WBG to diverse with assistance towards the enhancement and liberalisation of the Indian economy, with their structural adjusted policy and legal reforms focused primarily on poverty eradication and efficient use of resources by adopting the liberalisation, commoditisation and privatisation approaches.

Further, India being an active borrower of the WBG mainstream the Banks's economic reform strategies into national development policies in order to fulfil global commitments to liberalisation and globalisation which will lead India towards sustainable economic growth. While reviewing the India's CAS and CPF documents, one can realize that both CAS and CPF were mainstreamed into the India's Fiver Year Plans (FYP), and also, we can critically argue that the CAS and CPF were drives and shapes the India's National Development FYP to a larger extent. The modernisation and liberal development interventions were injected into the India's FYP through the Bank's Country Partnership Frameworks.

As said earlier, India is the largest borrower country, lending program includes 97 lending operations (\$22.7 billion in commitments, of which \$17.8 billion is IBRD, \$4.8 billion is IDA, and \$0.1 billion is from other sources, primarily grant funding from the Global Environment Fund). The largest projects are Water (12 projects totalling \$4.2 billion in commitments), Transport (12 projects totalling \$3.2 billion), and Agriculture (15 operations totalling \$3.2 billion). The Bank had approved \$1.6 billion (\$1.2 billion from IBRD and \$0.4 billion from IDA) for 8 operations in FY21. In addition, IFC has financed more than US\$24 billion (including mobilization) in more than 500 companies since 1958¹.

For the resource privileged developing nation India, the Bank's core strategy is that 'resource efficient sustainable growth' means efficient use of resources to gain more revenues for economic prosperity, largely targeted on the India's Agriculture sector which includes Livestock, Fisheries and Animal Husbandry, with key focus on Integration, Transformation, and Inclusion to accelerate poverty reduction and increase shared economic prosperity. The WBGs India's CPF (FY 18-22) discloses that "WBG will continue to shift its emphasis from serving as a "lending Bank" to playing the role of a "leveraging Bank" which means WBGs

taking advantage of accumulating power to rule or operate the borrower country India. Therefore, the larger WBGs investments in India evidences that it has been driving the country national development with its own liberal economic oriented interventions, leading to unstable and unsustainable growth the nation. In other words, the WBGs financial interventions are colonising the developing nations with the facilitation of the State.

UNTOLD BLUE REVOLUTION: MARINE FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT

India is largely populated developing peninsular nation in Asia. The Marine Fisheries has long coastline of 8118 km with 2.02 million square km Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and continental shelf area of 0.53 million sq.km. Apart from Marine, India has a vast Inland (Fresh Water and Brackish water) fisheries resources suitable for production of fish and other aquatic animals. Fish remains as a cheapest affordable secure of protein food, employment and income for millions in India. The Fisheries provides a major contribution to the economy as well as ensures nutritional food security of the nation. Notably, the Fisheries provides livelihood to 16 million fisher people and fishworkers as well as assures employment for 36 million people in fisheries allied activities, especially the rural poor. During 2019-20, the India exported 12.9 Lakh MT fish and fishery products and gained a value of Rs. 46,662.85 crores (6.68 billion USD). The fisheries sector contributed 1.24% (approx.) of the National GDP and more than 5% of the Agricultural GDP during 2018-19. In the recent years, the fisheries sector has been recording progressive growth, holding second position in farmed fish production (aquaculture) and third marine capture fish production in the world. However, the Fisheries is classified as fastest growing Agriculture Allied Sector under Ministry of Agriculture and there is no separate Ministry for Fisheries still date, except a Department of Fisheries. In the paper, we focused only on the Marine (Capture) Fisheries sector which targeted to export oriented fishing industry transformation since independence, the boom of culture fisheries had diminished the existence of the marine capture fisheries to larger extent in recent years.

As discussed earlier, the twin brothers WBG and FAO (hereafter as '*Puppeteers*') holds the developing nation resources as their ground for puppetry. Since Independence, India is well-known as WBG's privileged borrower for the nation's economic development and prosperity. Fisheries remains is one of the principle resources that has been subjected for the privileged borrowing. The above the WBG's country partnership documents revealed that Fisheries are conceived as a subsector or additional sector of the dominant agriculture. The India's Fisheries Development, especially Marine Capture Fisheries are being driven by the WBG interventions with its FAO expertise guidance. The FAO (*Puppetter:2*) is the Fisheries

Expertise Arm of the WBG, India is a member of FAO since 1945. India has actively cooperated with FAO to promote economic efficient sustainable utilization of the fisheries resources as well as satisfy the demand of nutrition and ensure food security. In addition, the FAO has major role in implementing binding and non-binding (voluntary) fisheries instruments like Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and also executed many fisheries technical cooperation projects. Therefore, the FAO is being playing major role in development of Indian Fisheries, particularly the Marine Capture Fisheries.

In this chapter, we will be mirroring *Puppeteers'* Marine Fisheries objectives, strategies and interventions with the WBG's larger India Country Partnership Strategy which are mainstreamed into Indian national development policies and law, especially Fiver Year Plan. The WBG's '*Green Revolution in India – Agriculture Reforms*' were extensively documented and critiqued by the Indian as well as the global researchers, academicians, policy makers and other experts, but WBG's Blue Revolution strategies on Indian marine Fisheries remains untold histories of the Independent India. The Indian Marine Fisheries developments were largely discoursed on the technological advancements and neoliberal economic reforms, but the act of the puppeteers - the root causes of the fisheries developments were hidden in the puppetry.

Marine Fishing Industry Transformation

The WBG (*Puppeteer:1*) executed its Marine Fisheries Development Formula starting from problematising Underutilisation Fisheries Resources which was assisted with *Resource Efficient Gears and Crafts* to exploit maximum resources from territorial waters (0-12nm), mainly Trawlers for Wild Shrimps in 50's and 60's, then motorisation of traditional crafts and introduction synthetic active gears for inshore (0-5nm)resource exploitations particularly Purse seine net for nearshore shrimps and also invested in the fisheries infrastructure development such as fishing harbours and fish landing centres in70's and 80's. In 1952, the first of its introduction the Indo-Norwegian Project (INP) in Kerala transformed the fisheries sector into fishing industry through mechanisation and modernisation of fishing crafts and gears. Consequently, the Kerala Fisheries Development Model was rolled out to all the coastal states of India. Between 1952–1972, the Norway had financially assisted 120 million NOK for the promotion of the fishery industry of India. In 1962, the Shipping Development Fund Committee (SDFC) started to give subsidised funds for mechanised boats, the number of Larger Steel Trawlers imported from USA, Mexico (>50 m) and then private companies boomed the deepsea fishing industry in India.

The *FAO's (Puppeteer:2)* presence dominated in fisheries policy making and technical inputs catalysed the progress of fishing industry in India, since independence. In 1948 (Post-independence), India sought foreign co-operation to modernise fisheries and establish fisheries infrastructure in the first All India Fisheries Conference held in 1948 at New Delhi. Consequently, it reflected in the 1st Five-Year Plan (1951-1956) stating that the nation has not increase the sea food production to the met food requirement of the growing population, in order to increase production nation should mechanise the fishing crafts. Since the GoI lack in expertise, they invited FAO to assess the fishing boats in India, The FAO experts surveyed the fishing crafts in India, recommended the GoI that the only few traditional crafts are suitable for mechanisation, since we have to invent new mechanised fishing boat designs for Indian waters, they recommend U.S mechanised Fishing Boats. The GoI agreed the expertise recommendations and imported the U.S mechanised Fishing Boats.

In addition to INP, the Regional Fisheries Bay of Bengal Programme (BOBP)⁶, a flagship programme of the FAO's fastened the progress of fishing transformation by promoting Cottage Industries for making Fishing Gears (Machine made Nylon Nets), Fish Aggravating Devices, Two Boat Trawling, Motorisation of Kattumaram, Fibre-Reinforced Plastic (FRP)boats with Out Board and Inboard Engines and also safety measures of fishing. The BOBP was implemented in three phases, first phase (1979-1986) and Second phase (1987-1994) largely demonstrated and promoted fishing new techniques and technologies (modernised fishing craft and gear) particularly focused on small traditional fishing boats (operating in nearshores), and post-harvest fisheries with attention to fisherwomen in fish markets, both phases were funded by Sweden and Denmark.

Further, the FAO's facilitated and executed International cooperation Fisheries Aid Programmes from ODA- UK (technical aid for prevention of post-harvest losses in marine fisheries), NORAD (assistance for developing deepsea fisheries and cold-water fisheries),FAO-UNDP Pelagic Fisheries Project(aided programme estimated mainly the pelagic fishery resources along the neritic and oceanic waters using pelagic fishing gear and acoustics from the FAO Research Vessel Rastrelliger, an all-weather boat), DANIDA (assistance in coastal fisheries development and manpower training in marine fisheries), French Aid (assistance in fresh water prawn farming) and Japanese Aid (assistance for deepsea fishing

⁶ BOBP's objective was to improve the conditions of small-scale-fisherfolk in seven countries around the Bay of Bengal, through pilot activities in co-operation with the governments of these countries Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Thailand.

development) in India. Therefore, it is evident that FAO's BOBP had fastened the progress of traditional fishing craft motorisation and modernised traditional gears as active gears in order to enhance fish production and gain more export revenues and all FAO's Fisheries related technical expertise works are well aligned and framed with WBG Fisheries Reform agenda projects in India.

Neoliberal Economic Reforms – Opening the Seas and Shores

The Indian economic crisis and thirst for modernisation pushed them to adopt neoliberal agenda in 1990's. The neoliberal reforms opened seas for Joint Venture Vessels for gaining revenue from permitting foreign vessels in Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ)resources. This initiative gained opposition from the fishers, however the GoI acted proactively by introducing *Deep-Sea Fisheries with Equity Participation* providing a Letter of Permit (LOP) to deepsea fishing vessels. Then, the commitments on Conservation, Management and Sustainable agendas promoted Aquaculture on the coastal lands, the WBG assistance programme (Shrimp and Fish Culture Project) was implemented in states of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, as alternate conservative measures for fish production as well as sustainable solution to marine fisheries overexploitation. In addition, the WBG culturing fish production assistance programmes moved towards the land ward side, the project Integrated Development of Riverine Fisheries and Development of Freshwater Aquaculture attracted the farmers, new category Fish Farmers mushroomed across the agriculture prominent states and delta regions of India.

Further, the BOBP third phase (1994 -1999), focused on fisheries management and conservation of fisheries i.e. "*Integrated Coastal Fisheries Management in the Bay of Bengal*", funded by Denmark and Japan. The activities focused on Implementation of the code of conduct for responsible fisheries and Fisheries Gender Programmes, with emphasis on conservation of fisheries resources. From 2000, the BOBP established as an Inter-Government Organization (IGO)-BOBP-IGO, extended its work by providing technical and management assistance for fisheries development in the Bay of Bengal region, particularly focusing on enhancing the livelihood opportunities and improving the quality of life of the small-scale/ artisanal fisher folks. Recently (2014), the BOBP -IGO partnered the WBG's OPP- BOB Project in the Bay of Bengal Region. However, the FAO's BOBP development phases extensively reflected the WBG Marine Fisheries Formula such that 1980- 1994 (I and II phases) focusing of resource production efficient fishing gears and crafts and 1994 (III phase) onwards turning the tide to conserve and manage fisheries resources.

Post Tsunami Marine Fisheries Recovery

In 2004, the India Ocean 2004 devastated the Indian coastal states, particularly Tamil Nadu and Kerala impacts with huge loss of lives and property. With the immediate effect, Joint Assessment Mission carried out by United Nations (UN), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Humanitarian Aid Agencies, Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the World Bank estimated the amount US\$1.2 billion for Tsunami Recovery Programme (TRP) in India, and the recovery programmed was by United Nations Team for Tsunami Recovery Support (UNTRS). The WBG extended their support of US\$ 465 million as Emergency Tsunami Reconstruction Project (ETRP) to assist and facilitate the government of India in the reconstruction activities in Tamil Nadu and Puducherry in May 2005 and in addition, the WBG provided a grant US\$ 2.50 million to TRP, trust fund supported for Technical Assistance to the Fisheries Sector which was executed under the ETRP. The objective of the Fisheries Technical Assistance Grant was to develop and implement the *Policy for Sustainable Fisheries Management and Sustainable revival of coastal communities* in the tsunami-affected areas, with the project components *Support for the Development of Sustainable Fisheries Policy and Introduction of Alternative Livelihood Opportunities*. The objective and components of the Fisheries Grant could be mirrored with WB's Fisheries Sector Approach Paper *Saving Fish and Fisheries: Towards Sustainable and Equitable Governance of the global fishing sector* which suggested institutionalising the fisheries with Institutional Framework for Governance of Sustainable Fisheries and Tools for the Sustainable Management of Fisheries Resources. Therefore, the WBG's Fisheries Grant was to successfully execute their fisheries agenda in India using the disaster Tsunami as the window opportunity.

In Tsunami Fisheries Recovery, the FAO was also active and instrumental in the long-term fisheries related Post Tsunami Fisheries Recovery Project, UNTRS project and its successor project FAO's FIMSUL which supported the tsunami affected Government of Tamil Nadu and Puducherry in the revisiting and develop policy framework for the future management and use of marine fisheries in Tamil Nadu and Puducherry. In addition, the Post-Tsunami Era also facilitated WBG with number of restructure projects on the coastal lands such as Integrated Coastal Zone Management Project (ICZMP) with the objective sustainable use of coastal resources through effective coastal management practices. Not only Tsunami, all the coastal disasters in India are being an opportunity for the WBG to execute disasters reconstruction projects⁷ with Fisheries reform agenda as the components.

⁷ <https://www.cenfa.org/international-finance-institutions/worldbankcovid/>

Marine Fisheries Sustainable Development Transitions

In 2010, the first of its kind a collaborative initiative was carried out by the Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries (DAHDF)-Ministry of Agriculture (Government of India) and World Bank to review the marine fisheries sub-sector, which includes aquaculture and inland fisheries. Conferring to the request of GOI's DAHDF in 2006 for Marine Fisheries Analytical and Policy Assistance the WB grounded the policy study towards improving the understanding of the marine fisheries sub-sector in India. In 2010, they jointly published the report *India Marine Fisheries Issues, Opportunities and Transitions for Sustainable Development*, an analytical review of the Indian marine sub-sector particularly focused on territorial waters, 0-12NM (State Jurisdiction), which faces the challenges for management and sustainable development.

The report starts with global best practice in fisheries development outlook, then phased out the *Historical Overview of Marine Fisheries* in four phases namely Phase I pre-development stage (up to 1965) as a introduction of mechanisation, Phase II (from 1965 to 1986) major expansion crafts and gears includes mechanisations and motorisations of crafts and modernisations of gears and construction of fisheries infrastructure facilities such as fishing harbours, Phase III (1986-2000) rapid growth in motorizing the artisanal crafts, multiday fishing, and introduction of conservation, regulation and management measures and the Phase IV (post-2000 modernization) detailed declined of fisheries in territorial waters due to overexploitation of fisheries resources, then finally scoping out the future marine fisheries on deep sea fisheries resources, extending fishing to EEZ, 12–200Nm (Centre Jurisdiction).

Followed by historical review, the report put forward an analytical review policy, legal and livelihood regimes of the marine fisheries, which reveals Constraints of Marine Fisheries are largely the weak fisheries administration policy and legal governance, poor Fisheries management in territorial waters, degradation of marine biodiversity, loss of fisher livelihoods with no alternative livelihood options (non-fishing employment), and also stating that Union Government funds are more utilised for subsidies and welfare for fisheries rather than reward for good fisheries management performance. Further, the report bonds that marine fisheries are the potential valuable asset base of India.

Finally, the report brings out the three Marine Fisheries Reform Phases (for both Centre and State Governments) such as Consultation and Review (comprehensive assessment of the marine fisheries, Capacity-building and institutional strengthening), Policy Development (National Fisheries Policy and Act with State Guidelines and Rules, Fisheries Management Systems and Plans) and Policy Implementation Planning (Resource management with FAO

Ecosystems Approach, Awareness raising and capacity-building on fisheries development and management, National Resource Centre for National Fisheries Data and Statistics) with implementing period of 3 to 5 years. The Report recommends the National Fisheries Development Board (NFDB), an autonomy and flexible body to coordinate the marine fisheries development strategies in India. The suggested reforms were highly accounted by the DAHDF, executed in systematic way.

In addition, the reforms components such as Fisheries Management Systems and Plans, and other components like Fisheries Statistics seems to be echoing *The Sunken Billions and Hidden Harvest Fisheries positions documents of WBG and FAO*. Therefore, the once again it evident that puppeteers make use of their strings to act forward their fisheries economic loot technical assistance strategies as the development sustainable tools for nation prosperity.

Saffroning the Marine Fisheries

In 2014, the GoI (Modi's Government) dissolved the Planning Commission of India (no more Five-Year plans) and formed National Institution for Transforming India (NITI) Aayog in 2015. The NITI Aayog's envisioned to achieve Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with the involvement of State Governments of India in the economic policy decision making. The Modi's Government Fisheries Development Mantra was "*Blue Revolution: A Developmental Agenda*". The Hon'ble Prime Minister quoted Rio+20 (2012), stating 'Blue Revolution' emphasizes the "Blue Growth Initiative" (BGI) to sustainably harvest the marine resources to feed the World's growing population, India should explore the marine wealth to enhance lives and livelihoods of fishers and their families as well as the compete global seafood market. Further, he said the Blue Ashoka Charka of the Indian flag resembles the Blue Revolution for nation growth⁸. With the Immediate effect, the Government of India (GoI) launched the *Scheme of Blue Revolution (2015-2020)*, otherwise called *Neel Kranti Mission of Integrated Development and Management of Fisheries*. The National Fisheries Development Board (NFDB) is the nodal -agency implementing the major components of the scheme and also supports the state government for its effective implementation. Thus, the larger Blue Economy landed in India and its one of the component sustainable Fisheries been mainstreamed as the Fisheries Development Schemes of India. Further, the GoI had implemented the recommendation of WB by designating NFDB as the Nodal Agency for Fisheries related coordination and implementation of Blue Revolution.

⁸ Speech on Eighty-sixth Foundation Day and Award Ceremony of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research in New Delhi on 29th July 2014

In continuation to Blue Revolution (2020-2025), the GoI proposed expanded version Blue Revolution, Pradhan Mantri Matsya Sampada Yojana (PMMSY) was announced as a successor of Neel Kranti Mission, estimated for 10,000 crores from 2019-2024, then Honourable Prime Minister called for Self-Reliant India Movement "Atmanirbhar Bharat" (May 2020) in the COVID pandemic situation. In Agriculture sector, the for Fisheries "PMMSY- A scheme to bring about Blue Revolution through sustainable and responsible development of fisheries sector in India" was restructured and boosted with 20,000 crores, the highest ever investment in fisheries sector, to achieve additional Fish Production of 70 lakh tonnes and the double exports revenue to Rs 1,00,000 Crores over 5 years. In addition, PMMSY will generate employment opportunities to over 55 lakh persons. The PMMSY is projected as one of the successful projects in post COVID reform. Recently, the GoI approached the WBG seeking assistance for Blue Revolution Programme (concept stage) named as *Prime Minister's Fisheries Resources Program (PMMSY)* with the estimate of US\$300 million loan. The main objective of the programmed is to augment institutional capacities and systems for increased resilience, efficiency, productivity and seafood safety in the fisheries and aquaculture sector in selected states in India. The post-covid PMMSY project is already implemented and successful running as propagated by GoI, then why Blue Revolution loan from World Bank.

Overall, the review of the marine fisheries reveals that fisheries development were largely financially assisted by the WBG along with technical expertise FAO, so the Indian Marine Fisheries Development Plans were designed and driven by the *Puppeteer's* marine fisheries economic development formula, not the *Puppet*.

PUPPETERS FISHERIES FORMULA	PUPPET'S FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT PATHWAYS <i>(Five Year Plans (FYP) – Union/ Centre Government Sponsored Schemes)</i>		NATIONAL FISHERIES POLICIES⁹
<p align="center">Underexploited Fisheries Assistance for Resource efficient fishing methods, and modernisation fishing gears and crafts through technological interventions</p>	<p align="center">1950-1992 (1st FYP to 7th FYP)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indigenous Fishing Craft Mechanisation • Introduction of Mechanised Trawlers • Introduction of Modern Gears • Introduction of Synthetic • Promotion of Fish Aggravating Devices, • Introduction of Pair (Two Boat) Trawling and Purse Seining • Import of Deep-Sea Shrimp Trawlers (Japan and Mexico) through Private Companies and State Government Corporations • Introduction of Chartered Fishing Vessels (Taiwan, Thailand) • Indigenous Construction of Deep-Sea Trawlers • Fishing Harbours Construction • Motorisation of Artisanal Craft • Introduction Fibre-Reinforced Plastic (FRP)boats with Out Board and Inboard Engines Gear Materials • Exploratory Surveys in Offshore Grounds (Pelagic) 	<p>There was no comprehensive or separate Fisheries Policies, States had Policy Notes and Fisheries policy for their own, but not all coastal states. Fisheries largely considered as Agriculture sub sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 1981 Charter Policy (Lease out deepsea waters for Taiwan and Thailand Fishing Vessels) ➤ 1989-<u>New Charter Policy</u> was introduced to promote Deep sea fishing operations through Licensing, Chartering and Joint Venture Vessels, number of 187 deepsea vessels (above 23 m. OAL) were operated under the policy
<p align="center">Over Exploited Fisheries Assistance for Conservation of marine and coastal resources for healthy ecosystems and Aquaculture (conceived as alternate conservative measures for fish production as well as sustainable solution to marine fisheries overexploitation)</p>	<p align="center">1992-2007 (8th FYP to 10th FYP)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Venture in Deep Sea Fishing • Development of Coastal Aquaculture • Development of Freshwater Aquaculture • Integrated Coastal Aquaculture • Fisher Welfare Programmes • Deep-sea fisheries with equity participation • Integrated development of riverine fisheries • Aquaculture on par with agriculture. • Infrastructure post-harvest developments • Gender Programmes • Implementation of the code of conduct for responsible fisheries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 1991- <u>New Deep-Sea Fishing Policy (NDSP)</u> - The NDSP liberally opened Indian EEZ and proposed three schemes (i) leasing out of foreign fishing vessels to operate in the Indian EEZ; (ii) engaging foreign fishing vessels for test fishing and (iii) forming joint ventures between foreign companies and Indian companies on 49:51 equity basis in deep sea fishing, processing and marketing.

⁹ not included Coastal land ward policies and mega programmes such as Sagarmala, Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) and also State Fisheries Policies were not included

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation and Management of fisheries 	
<p>Institutionalising the Fisheries Assistance for developing Institutional Framework for Governance of Sustainable Fisheries and tools for Sustainable Management of Fisheries Resources</p>	<p>2007-2017 (11th FYP & 12th FYP)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of Mariculture • Introduction of improved design intermediate craft • Establishment and operation of Vessel Monitoring System • Promotion of fuel-efficient fishing • Conversion of trawlers to Resource Specific Fishing Vessels • Development of Monitoring, Control and Surveillance system for Marine Fisheries • Enhancement Mariculture Production • Construction and expansion of Minor Fishing Harbours (FHs) and Fish Landing Centres (FLCs) • Development of Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture • National Scheme for Welfare of Fishermen and Fisherwomen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 2002- <u>Broad Guidelines for the Operation of Indian Deep-Sea Fishing Vessels in Indian EEZ</u> to regulate the operation the Indian Deep-Sea Fishing vessels. A Letter of Permission (LoP) should be obtained for operating any fishing vessel in Indian EEZ. ➤ 2004- <u>Marine Fishing Policy</u> directing on the conservation of the marine resources, Social Welfare and Security measures for the fisherfolks, Monitoring control and surveillance system (MCS) of fishing vessel, Sea Safety and Safeguard measures and promotion of Aquaculture and Mariculture.
<p>Blue Economy Agenda Assistance for Blue Transformations of Fisheries such that Blue Food, Blue Trade, Blue Carbon, Blue Tourism</p>	<p>2015-2020 National Institution for Transforming India (NITI) Aayog</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neel Kranti (Blue Revolution), 2015 - <i>Neel Kranti Mission of Integrated Development and Management of Fisheries.</i> • Blue Economy ‘<i>Vision for the Decade</i>’ Interim Budget 2019-20 • Blue Economy as a Budget component, 2020-2021 • Department of Fisheries (Matsyapalan Vibhag), 2019 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 2017- National Marine Fisheries Policy ➤ 2018- National Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy (Draft) ➤ 2018 - National Policy on Mariculture (Draft) ➤ 2019- Revised National Policy on Mariculture (Draft) ➤ 2020- Draft National Fisheries Policy
	<p>2020-2025</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pradhan Mantri Matsya Sampada Yojana (PMMSY) <i>A scheme to bring about Blue Revolution through sustainable and responsible development of fisheries sector in India” with 20,000 crores, the highest ever investment in fisheries sector</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 2021- National Policy on Blue Economy Policy (Draft) ➤ National Fisheries Policy, 2021 (6th Draft)

UNEARTHED MARINE FISHERIES GOVERNANCE

The Marine Fisheries are considered as the prominent economic extraction epicentre subjected to resource exploitation since the ages. After Independence, the *Constitution of India* provides legal entitlements, deliberates powers and delimits /allocates resources between the State and Union Government. According to the Constitution of India, the Entry 57 of List 1 of the 7th Schedule states that Fishing and Fisheries beyond Territorial Waters (12 Nautical Miles (NM)) as Union Subject, whereas Entry 21 of List 11 states that Fishing and Fisheries within Territorial Waters (0-12NM) as a State Subject. It means that State Government and Union Territories holds power within territorial waters (12NM only) and the Central Government (188NM) holds power beyond Territorial Waters in the sea space. In addition, the State has powers only to control and regulate of fishing and fisheries within territorial waters whereas the Union acts as a facilitator and coordinator responsible for policy formulation, carrying out fishery research and channelling funding support to the States/UTs in line with the national priorities and the commitments made to the State/UT Governments.

The Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries-DAHD&F) is the nodal Ministry to address the fisheries related matters, there is no separate Ministry for Fisheries (still date), rather there is exists Department for Fisheries with an empowered State Minister of Fisheries. Therefore, Fisheries is considered as part(subsector) of Agriculture, even though fishing industry contributes a larger suck to national GDP and also Fisheries in large deal with fishery resources activities including culturing fish and aquatic animals, rather welfare of fishers are minimally addressed.

Indian Laws of Seas: Curbing the Freedom of Seas

The limitations of fisheries borders on sea paved way for sveral marine fisheries acts/laws such as Merchant Shipping Act 1958, Major Port Trusts Act of 1963, Marine Products Export Development Authority Act 1972, Indian Coast Guard Act, 1978, the Marine Fishing Regulation Act of the Maritime States 1980 as well as the Maritime Zone of India (Regulation of Fishing by Foreign Vessels) Act 1981. The core objective of the acts to regulate, delimits powers and enforce marine surveillance and security in the seascape, not on the coast(landward side). Among the Seascape Acts, the *Territorial Waters, Continental Shelf, Exclusive Economic Zone and other Maritime Zones Act, 1976* is a prominent one. The Act declared the maritime zones of India to seeks to reaffirm India's sovereignty over to the territorial waters, the seabed and underlying subsoil, and air space over such waters. However, the act limited the boundaries of the States as 12 NM and Union Government as 188NM. In 2009, Union Government proposed *Marine Fisheries (Regulation and Management) Bill, 2009* which aimed

at regulation and accountability of Indian origin fishing vessels in all maritime zones (EEZ) including Territorial Waters through a common legal framework addressing regulation of fisheries, and conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources. The scope of the Bill dissolves the powers of the States in the Territorial Waters. The Marine Coastal States and the National Fishworkers Forum (NFF) opposed the Bill stating unconstitutional.

The transformation of fishing industry mooted a class division i.e. Mechanised and Non - Mechanised Fisherfolks, further within Non-Mechanised fisherfolks the introduction of modern destructive gears fishing methods like purse-seining doubled the division of fisherfolks. As a result, many conflicts among the fisherfolks occurred across the coastal states of India. The conflicts of interest arose because the mechanised boats and modern destructive gears fishing methods which spoiled the shore based marine resources and caused livelihood threat for the traditional fisherfolks.

*In 1976, the GoI formed Majumdar Committee to investigate the conflicts between traditional and mechanised boats and to classify the areas of fishing for different types of boats. The committee proposed the model Marine Fishing Regulation Bill, and recommended a seasonal ban on trawlers. However, the Central deliberated the power of regulation and classifications of the Territorial Waters to the State. The model **Marine Fishing Regulation (MFR) Bill** was circulated to marine states and Union Territories to amend the MFR legislation. With the immediate effect, the Marine States and Union Territories enacted state specific MFRA to regulate the fishing vessels in the 12 NM territorial sea, in order to protect the life and livelihood of the traditional fisherfolks.*

Recently, the Saffron's Blue Revolution revised some of the ocean related Acts such Major Port Trust Act (1963) and Merchant Shipping Act (1958) to adjust with Blue Economy framework of India. Once again, they reintroduced *National Marine (Regulation and Management) Bill, 2019* in order to conserve, regulate and manage fisheries resources as well as monitor and surveillance the Centre Government seascape territory (13-200NM) with their naval and coastal guard forces. This Bill was highly resisted by the fishers and NFF, so this bill was currently put-on hold. In nutshell, all the Marine Fishers Regulation Acts and Bills (related to Seascape) largely alienates the fishers rights in the sea, resulting in large-scale ocean grab, dispossessing the customary access of fishers over the sea. So, these Acts were enacted for two main reasons, first, to satisfy India's commitments under 1982 United Nations Law of the sea convention and other fisheries related conventions and then to manage the fishers' conflict over the resources and maintain law and order on sea.

Fisheries Policy Reforms: Restructuring the Marine Fisheries

The Indian State had no National Fisheries Policy (except Charter Policy 1981) since 1950-1991. As a part of Neoliberal Economic Reform Programme, the GoI (Union Government) spelled out **New Deep-Sea Fishing Policy**¹⁰ (NDSP) which is the first common fisheries policy, particular to deep-sea. The NDSP liberally opened Indian EEZ and proposed three schemes (i) leasing out of foreign fishing vessels to operate in the Indian EEZ; (ii) engaging foreign fishing vessels for test fishing and (iii) forming joint ventures between foreign companies and Indian companies on 49:51 equity basis in deep sea fishing, processing and marketing. With an immediate effect, GoI provided licenses to the operation of foreign fishing vessels. The NDSP was opposed by various all the fisherfolks because their fishing grounds was encroached by the larger chartered foreign vessels and the vessels operating through joint ventures and also damaged to the craft and gear of traditional fishers. The **National Fishworkers' Forum (NFF)**¹¹, (Federation of Traditional, Artisanal Fishworker Unions of the various maritime states in India) formed *National Fisheries Action Committee Against Joint Ventures (NFACAJV)* and organised national wide protests which gained a huge resistance along coast of India. The mass resistance of fisherfolks pressured GoI to appoint the *Murari Committee*¹² to review the deep-sea fishing policy. The Committee put forwarded 21 recommendations which were approved by the cabinet in 1997. The Minister of Food Processing Industry nominated a small committee, named *National Fisheries Action Committee against Foreign Fishing Vessels* to oversee the implementation of Murari Committee recommendations.

In 2004, the GoI released the *compressive Marine Fishing Policy*¹³, 2004 directing on the conservation of the marine resources, Social Welfare and Security measures for the fisherfolks, Monitoring control and surveillance system (MCS) of fishing vessel, Sea Safety and Safeguard measures and promotion of Aquaculture and Mariculture. This policy however remained unexecuted for years. In 2014, the Union Government attempted with the *'Dr. B.Meenakumari Expert Committee Report'* on the comprehensive review of Deep-Sea Fishing Policy and Guidelines, the report proposed the same NSDP schemes such that permitting foreign vessels engaged in Deep Sea Fishing into the Exclusive Economic Zone of Indian waters in a modern way. As a consequence, the report fuelled the NFACAJV spread headed by NFF opposed

¹⁰ Ibid, pg. no:46

¹¹ <http://www.nffindia.org/about-us-2/history/>

¹² Ibid, pg. no:46

¹³ Ibid, pg. no:47

nation-wide and halted the implementation of the recommendations of the report. However, the shadowing the Dr. Meena Kumari Report the Marine Capture Fisheries schemes were reoriented to Deepsea Fishing, which is evident in the Neel Kranti Scheme (2015-2020).

In 2017, the Safron's Blue Revolution Agenda came up with **National Policy on Marine Fisheries (NPMF)¹⁴2017** based on seven pillars namely sustainable development, socio-economic upliftment of fisher communities, the principle of subsidiarity, partnership, inter-generational equity, gender justice, and the precautionary approach. The NPMF 2017 ensures 'Blue Revolution' (Neeli Kranti) by sustainable use of marine and inland resources for improving the lives and livelihoods of fishers and their families. However, the policy encourages *Public-Private Partnership* which in turn permits capital intensive, industrial-scale fish production with a focus on productivity on Deep-sea Assistance enhanced with Vessel Monitoring, Joint Venture and foreign deep-sea vessels to operate and exploit marine resources of Indian waters, Open Sea Cage Culture, Seaweed Culture, Bivalve Culture, Pearl Culture, and IT-enabled Processing Fish Zones. As a result, the marine fishery resources were looted by large-scale commercial investors, alienating the coastal communities from ocean and coast. The NPMF called for stakeholder consultation with fisher forums and attempted to draw action plan to implement the policy. However, the fishers raised that NPMF was drafted without their participation and so they reject the NPMF anti-fisher policy. Followed that, the Union Government lined-up several drafts such as National Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy (2018), and revised draft National Policy on Mariculture (2019), but all efforts remained as drafts in paper.

In 2020 a few days prior to COIVID19 Lockdown, the GoI came up with integrated **Draft National Fisheries Policy,2020** a combination of Marine, Inland, Aquaculture, and Mariculture, the fisherforums opposed the draft policy for the non-participatory process of drafting as well as the policy focused on culture fisheries, not capture fisheries and incorporated the fisheries within the Blue economy framework. In 2021, again the GoI released the 6th draft of National Fisheries Policy which also reflects the same contradiction of the previous, so the policy gained opposition from fisheries forums and halted the finalisation of the policy. In 2021, the GoI came up with the Draft Policy Framework for India's Blue Economy named as "**National Policy for India's Blue Economy - 2020**" with focus on proper measurement of

¹⁴Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries. 2017.National Policy on Marine Fisheries, 2017. Retrieved from <http://www.dahd.nic.in/sites/default/files/National%20Policy%20on%20Marine%20Fisheries%2017-1.pdf>

Blue Economy activities and their contribution to the national income as well as investment in financial capital, physical capital, natural capital and human capital to harness the potential of the Blue Economy and optimize GDP and employment growth for nation growth and prosperity. Therefore, the fisheries policy review reveals that Indian *Marine Fisheries and its Coastal Resources policy development* are largely bracketed for resource extraction to feed the market economy and now the proposed Fisheries Policy are well framed under the Blue Economy Framework which is the brainchild of the Puppeteers.

Fisheries Institutions: Reconfiguring the Marine Fisheries

The Fisheries Institutional arrangements are considered as the lifeline, shaping the fisheries related decision making (use and share of the resources). In India, the Fisheries institutions are largely echoing the free market economy principle with well-defined and enforced property rights on fisheries resources i.e. their interventions focus on increase production of high value species, invent production increase technologies and manage the resources for economic efficient growth. In 1947, the first Marine Fisheries Institutions Central Marine Fisheries Research Station (presently known as the Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute or CMFRI) was established in the Zoology Department of Madras University and also Central Inland Fisheries Research Station, renamed Central Inland Fisheries Research Institute (CIFRI) was established at Barrackpore, West Bengal. Basically, both institutions rooted in Biology of the Fishes and Fisheries Science, so there is no doubt that their interventions will focus of more production of fishers through the biological sciences.

The Fisheries Development Plans (FYP) disclosed that several fisheries institutions are established to facilitate the transformations of marine fisheries industry. During the 1950 - 1992, number of fisheries institutions were created to cater the needs of fishing industry such as Institutions for fishing technology, fish resources survey, fishing skill empower and fisheries sciences for culturing fishers. Since, 1980, several resource (Freshwater, Brackishwater and Cold water) specific research institutes were established to explore research on aquaculture (culturing fishes) and legislating fish genetic resources of India. The table below *Pathways of Fisheries Institutional Developments* illustrates scope and focus of the fisheries institutions. In mid90's, the establishment of fisheries institutions were saturated, and the institutions efforts were on extending and flourishing research on fisheries sciences. In 2006 (PostTsunami), the Union Government established the National Fisheries Development Board (NFDB) to autonomous organization to oversee the fisheries related matters under the department of the fisheries, and then WB's report *India Marine Fisheries Issues, Opportunities and Transitions for Sustainable Development*, acknowledged the autonomous works of NFDB and

recommended the NFDB an efficient agency to coordinate and oversee the fisheries administration with all other the fisheries institutions . Hence, the NFDB acted as nodal agency and executed the Neel Kranti Mission 2016-2020. The recent National Fisheries Policy (2020), a production-oriented policy proposes establishing a new Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Affairs' and Directorate General of Fishing and Maritime Affairs' and the new National Policy for India's Blue Economy (2020) recommends apex body called the National Blue Economy Council (NBEC) for effective Ocean Governance. Both the Policies are mounted on the Blue Economy Framework, so the proposed institutions will accommodate interventions to attain Blue Economy, facilitating ease doing Blue Business and Trade on ocean and coastal resources. Therefore, the fisheries institutional development analysis reveals that Indian fisheries institutions based on the Fisheries Sciences and Biology intending to progress and achieve resource efficiency and enhanced production for greater returns, so institutions are largely occupied by Biologist, Fisheries Scientist, Resource Managers and Economists i.e. Fish and Fishery resources is the target. Therefore, these institutions concerns were towards the wellbeing of the fish and fisheries (animals and nature), rather the wellbeing of the Fishers (humans) were minimally taken to consideration. As result, the conflict of interest between the duty bearers (officials) and the right holders (fishers) are inherent in nature.

In nutshell, the unearthing Marine Fisheries Governance such as Policy, Legislations and Institutions are systematically advanced to legitimise the grab of the customary ocean and coastal commons of the fisher people and coastal communities. Further, these Fisheries governance structures are shadowed by the Puppeteers Marine Formula, so these are considered as the structurally adjusted reforms packages for the puppet.

PATHWAYS OF FISHERIES INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

YEAR	FISHERIES INSTITUTION - NATURE AND SCOPE
1947	<p>Central Marine Fisheries Research Station (presently known as the Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute or CMFRI) was established on February 3, 1947 in the Zoology Department of Madras University, and subsequently shifted in 1949 to Mandapam Camp, Tamil Nadu, and in 1972 to Cochin, Kerala. <i>Focus on Marine Resources</i>; Research on marine fishes' reproduction, Fisheries Science and GoI advisory body on Marine Fisheries related matters. Marine Census of India was conducted and released by CMFRI once in 5years.</p> <p>Central Inland Fisheries Research Station, renamed Central Inland Fisheries Research Institute (CIFRI) was established at Barrackpore, West Bengal <i>Inland Freshwater and Brackishwater Resources</i>: Research on increase fish production and culturing fish to increase more production</p>
1957	<p>Earlier, Central Fisheries Technology Research Station (CFTRS) for dealing with research on design and develop energy efficient fishing systems for responsible fishing, development machinery for fishing and fish processing. The CFTRS was elevated to the status of an Institute as the Central Institute of Fisheries Technology (CIFT) in 1957 supported by Norway Foreign Aid Development Project. <i>Focus on Fishing Technology</i></p>
1963	<p>Central Institute of Fisheries Nautical and Engineering Training(CIFNET) wellknown as Central Institute of Fisheries Operatives (CIFO), established in 1963 at Kochi on the recommendation of above committee to meet the trained manpower needs of ocean-going fishing vessels and that of fishing industry. CIFNET is serving the nation by creating trained manpower needed for manning the fishing vessels. Subsequently, a unit of CIFNET was established in Chennai in 1968 and another unit at Vizag in 1981 to meet the manpower of the expansion of fishing industry <i>Focus on equipping skilled manpower for fishing industry</i></p>
1969	<p>Central Institute of Coastal Engineering for Fishery (CICEF), formerly known as Pre-Investment Survey of Fishing Harbours (PISFH) is a premier institution with its jurisdiction covering the entire Indian coastline for conducting engineering and economic investigations and preparing the Techno Economic Feasibility Reports (TEFRs) for the Fishing Harbour projects. <i>Focus on Post Harvest Infrastructure Facilities</i></p>
1970	<p>Centre of Advance Studies in Mariculture was started under the CMFRI Mariculture research programmes and separate Centre of Advanced Studies in Mariculture was established in 1979. <i>Focus on culturing the economic value marine species</i></p>
1972	<p>Marine Products Export Development Authority (MPEDA) was established with the mandate to promote the marine products industry with special reference to exports from the country under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. MPEDA is the nodal agency for the holistic development of seafood industry in India to realise its full export potential as a nodal agency. <i>Focus on Marine Products Export and Trade</i></p>
1979	<p>Central Institute of Fisheries Education (CIFE) was established in 1961 at Versova, Mumbai and was elevated to the status of a Deemed University on March 29, 1989. CMFRI, CIFRI and CIFT were transferred in August 1967, CIFE from the Ministry of Agriculture to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. <i>Focus on Fisheries Science Education</i></p>

1980	<p>Department of Ocean Development (DOD) played a major role in facilitating fisheries and oceanographic research in the Indian EEZ as well as the contiguous high seas under Ministry of earth Sciences, currently nodal agency for the proposed blue economy policy.</p> <p><i>Focus on underwater(seabed)ocean resources such as Mineral, Oil & Gas</i></p>
1983	<p>A pilot project known as Deep Sea Fishing Station (DSFS) by the Government of India with the objective of augmenting food supply through development of deep-sea fishing. Later, Offshore Fishing Stations (OFS) were established in 1957 and 1958 under the control of DSFS.</p> <p>In 1974, the Institute was graduated to the status of a Survey Institute under the name Exploratory Fisheries Project (EFP) with the Bases known as Offshore Fishing Stations in all the maritime states supported by Indo-Norwegian Project (1952 -1972)</p> <p>After the UNCLOS (1982), the Institute was designated a national institute and renamed as Fishery Survey of India (FSI, earlier known as Deep Sea Fishing Station) which has seagoing facilities and helps in fish stock assessment research.</p> <p><i>Focus on Depthwise Marine Fish Resources</i></p>
1983	<p>The Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) established a National Bureau of Fish Genetic Resources (NBFGR) at Lucknow to assess and conserve fish genetic resources for intellectual property protection, sustainable utilization and posterity of the country.</p> <p><i>Focus on Conservation of fish germplasm resources - Aquaculture</i></p>
1985	<p>The Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) established Central Institute of Brackishwater Aquaculture (CIBA) at Chennai, a nodal agency for catering to the needs of the brackishwater aquaculture research in India</p> <p><i>Focus on developing techno-economically viable and sustainable culture systems for finfish and shellfish in brackish water - Aquaculture</i></p>
1987	<p>The Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) established Central Institute of Freshwater Aquaculture (CIFA) at Bhubaneswar to undergo freshwater aquaculture research and development in India.</p> <p><i>Focus on Freshwater Aquaculture</i></p>
1988	<p>The Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) established a National Research Centre for Cold Water Fisheries (NRCCWF) at Bhimtal , a premier research institute working towards sustainable development of Coldwater aquaculture, management, and conservation of the hill stream fishes in India</p> <p><i>Focus on Coldwater Fisheries – Aquaculture</i></p>
2006	<p>The National Fisheries Development Board (NFDB) was established in 2006 as an autonomous organization under the administrative control of the Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Government of India to enhance fish production and productivity in the country and to coordinate fishery development in an integrated and holistic manner.</p> <p>During 2015- 2020, NFDB being a nodal agency executed the “Neel Kranti Mission Plan (Blue Revolution Mission Plan) for tapping the full potential of the Inland and Marine Culture Fisheries of the country by developing it as a professional modern world-class industry”.</p> <p><i>Focus on Fisheries Administration</i></p>

UNHEARD BLUE VOICES: REPRESSED MARINE CAPTURE FISHERS

As discussed earlier, the Peninsular Coastal Developing Nation India established the Marine Fisheries (resources) as a Capital-Intensive Export Production Industry, started with introduction of mechanized trawlers to exploit Shrimps for global markets, neoliberal adoption pushed promotion of Aquaculture and Joint Venture Deepsea fishing and finally now Marine Spatial Planning for exploring Blue Trade Businesses, to compete global GDP enlarge. The review of the marine fisheries transformation illustrates that the Marine Fishing Export Production Industry transformation are strategically executed by *Puppeteers* with their Marine Fisheries Development Formula, Technical Support and Development Aid Assistance, the responsibility of the Puppet is to execute the *Puppeteers* strategies without modification. So, the India Marine Fisheries Development interventions are largely the devised and driven by the WBG and FAO (*Puppeteers*), not the *Puppet*. As a consequence, the marine fisheries Industrial transformation had catalyzed and rooted socio-economic political and ecological implications on the Marine Capture Fishers (MCF) who are historically depend on the marine fisheries resources for life and livelihood. The resource custodians MCF, are now the marginalized vulnerable communities living in the fringes of the fragile coastline. The implications are narrated under certain themes as follows

Pink Dollar (Shrimp): Manure to Protein seafood

Post-Independence, Indian State framed the Fisheries as Natural Capital, started planned modernization and development of Fisheries. The Marine Fisheries were exploited for export revenue through transforming fishing as an Industry to attain food security, generate employment and more export-oriented revenues. The Union Government provided attractive subsidies for the fishing mechanization programme and large capital were invested fishing infrastructure facilities such as harbours and landing centres. The shrimp trawlers were promoted to catch the 'Pink Gold' (Shrimps) for global seafood market. But, those days, these shrimps were commonly used as manure for coconut palms Kerala. Similarly, today's Tuna Fish is billion-dollar seafood which is least consumed by the fishers of India. The mechanization programme gained dollar value for Indian manure in the global markets to feed the developed countries. Hence, the purchasing power-based nutrition and market determined food may gained profits, but at the cost of India's Food Sovereignty.

Fishers of Cooperative Societies: Livelihood to Occupation

The Indian marine fishing communities are the traditional fishers depend on fisheries resources as the main source of subsistence living. In most of the developing countries, the fishing has been a way of life for the marine fisher communities. The Union Government

executed the marine fisheries schemes through State Fishermen Cooperative Societies with liberal subsidies. These schemes were largely capital investment oriented, so they were large attracted and benefited by the land-based business communities who perceived the fish is the profitable export business. These business communities are politically influenceable, occupied the fisher cooperative societies as boat owners, fish exporters and merchants. Hence, in course of time number of shrimps mechanised trawlers mushroomed in coastline. This introduced a new identity *Fishers by Occupation*. These fishers' fish for commercial profits and has no other cultural belongness to sea and coast, resulted in socio-cultural and ecological descriptions among the fisher communities. Today, this neofisher Occupation Groups are government friendly and dominating the fisher communities and scrapping the seabed for more and more export profits and capital accumulation. As a result, the inclusion of the powerholders had strategically excluded the right holders, the non-political traditional marine fishers lost their indigeneity in large, indulged in economic debt trap and their community ease living has been disintegrated.

Promotion of Mono Fishing Method: Fish for Global market

The Fisheries means the larger ocean and coast resources in which fishers, coastal communities and fisheries allied workers are depended on the fishery resources for their livelihood and life existence. The Fisheries (resources) provides a various forms landscape and ecosystems such as Territorial Waters, Deepsea, Bays, Islands, Gulfs, Peninsula, Lagoons, Capes, Backwaters, Salt Marshes, Estuaries, Brackish waters, coral reef, mangroves, and other delt regions. These landscapes diversity in incudes a diverse fishing and coastal communities depended on the same with their own customs and governance. Therefore, a uniform way of fishing or fishing methods (craft/ gears) is not all possible in any means. The marine industrial transformation policies promoted homogenous capital-intensive fishing crafts and gears such that the Trawlers were specialized vessels to catch the prawns for global markets and now Deepsea Fishing vessels are specialized for hunting the Tuna Fish for the export markets. This resources (fish) specific fishing method with specialized gears and crafts resulted in degradation of the marine food web resulting in endangered species in a particular time, it is similar to promotion of Monocropping methods in Green Revolution (Agriculture). Further, this method of fishing large decline the fishes reaching the shore waters, resulting no catch for the small traditional boats in coastal and inland waters. Hence, the fish for global market distinguished the fisher people with crafts and gears i.e. Mechanized and Non- mechanized fishers and mooted conflicts between them over sea and land for fishing grounds.

Centralized Fisheries Governance: States with No Sovereign (Sea)Rights

Constitutionally, the Fisheries development is a state subject in India. But the Union Government promotes and finances the fisheries development through State's Planning, and Implementation institutions. So, the State's Fisheries Policy and Schemes will reflect the Union Government's fisheries development frameworks. Further, the Union Government has allocated States a boundary of 12Nm in the sea, and remaining 188NM of EEZ belongs to Union Government. This distribution of fisheries resources with centralized policies and acts reveals that that sates has limited sovereign rights over sea and also fisheries governance arrangements such as policies, acts and institutions operate with centralized fisheries management and regulation systems. Therefore, the unequal power balances between the Union and States accumulates major share of Property rights over sea spaces to the Union Government, so the Union Government unilateral decides the fisheries developments of India with or without the consultation of the princely States of India. This centralized Fisheries governance is undemocratic, unconstitutional and unethical in nature. Recently, the Union Government had adopted the Blue Economy Framework for nation's prosperity, the National Policy on Blue Economy, 2020(Draft) had proposed the leasing out the EEZ with Marine Spatial Planning and National Marine Fisheries (Regulation and Management) Bill, 2019 (Draft), reveals that State fishers venturing the EEZ (beyond 12NM) will be booked by the Union Government forces coastal guard and navy of India. These proposed Blue National Governance centralized policies and Bills reveals that the Fisheries Centralized governance had further advanced to Naval (militarized) governance for nation's economic prosperity and security.

Diminishing Women Fishers: Expandable commodities

Globally, it is estimated 90 percent fishers and fish workers are employed in Marine Capture Fisheries (not includes fishing vessels anchored in ports), nearly half of those employed in fisheries are Women and most of them live in developing countries. In general, the women's work in fisheries contributes for sustaining household nutritional and income security of the fishing families and communities. The Fisherwomen and Women Fish workers serves as bridge connecting the supply and value chain in fisheries, but remain misrepresented and misrecognized. In those days, the marine fishing cotton nets are mended by the fisher women households and presence of women in fish landing were immense starting from separation of fishes from nets to vending the fish local markets. But the marine transformation had systematically diminished the presence of the women fisheries, the resource of efficient machine-made synthetic nets pushed women out from net mending, the production-oriented

infrastructure facilities such as fishing harbors and fishing landing centres limited the role of fisherwomen in fishing landing sites and finally the eMarkets (online Trading) are invisibilised the women fishers in vending activities. The puppeteers propagated that marine fisher's development strategies paved way for gender equality and equity, but fisherwomen are marginalised to the core in reality.

Overall, the puppeteer's marine development strategies executed by the Puppet resulted in destroying the local resources to feed the global elites, denied Fishing and Livelihood Rights for the custodian of the resources, centralized the fisheries governance and changed way of life of the self-sustained Livelihoods fishers to move as Distress Migrants for livelihood. One of the core implications of the marine industrial transformation is that the traditional non-mechanized fishers slowly moved as daily wage-earning fisher workers in the mechanized boats across the coastal states of India. The puppeteers and puppet propagate marine fisheries development as sustainable one, however the decades of marine fisheries development had transformed the sustainable fisheries to financialized Natural capital for more blue investments and trade.

UNENED PUPPETRY: BLUE CONQUEST ON MARINE FISHERS

In most of the developing countries, the natural resources are being a source of livelihoods for the marginalized communities. Fisheries are being primary source of livelihood and food and food to many millions of fisher people along the coastline. The Blue Revolution Marine Fisheries development plans had grabbed the marine spaces, the curbed the lives of the marginalized marine capture fishers who voices remain unheard. In fact, these marine fisheries developments are largely assisted by *Puppeteers* development assistance loans which made India act as a *Puppet* towards the subjunction and dispossession of the customary rights of the traditional Indian marine capture fishers.

Above mentioned, the Indian marine fisheries development systemically transformed as export production industry with the generous WBG development assistance loans and FAO technical assistance for sustainably exploring the resources. Further, the bilateral trade cooperation agreements with several countries like Japan and Thailand, particularly Norway catalysed the transformation of Indian fishing industry within a three decades of independence. These countries largely seized Indian export fisheries, leaving the sea floor unfertile. The Puppet India acted to the signs of the foreign fisheries investors with regard to fisheries and the distorted fisheries food sector as industrial production sector for immense export revenue, but at the cost of the fisher's way of life and livelihood. As a consequence, the traditional

sustenance fishing had been reduced, the reduction process had fastened by the involvement of merchants (nonfishers) in fisheries had fastened the reduction and also disrupted the socio-cultural well-being of the marine fishers' way of life to the heights. Later, the introduction for culture Fisheries (aquaculture) had strategically lifted the fisheries a production industry *without marine spaces and marine capture fishers*. The India being Agriculture state boosted the culture fisheries as additional income generation activity, with larger involvement and investments of the farmer communities (non-fishers), technically named as Fish *Farmers*. The Puppeteers Inland Fisheries Development projects and Coastal Aquaculture Project feasted the culture fisheries to the non-marine states. The saffron's Neel Kranti Mission (2015 -2020) with mission of doubling the income of fish farmers had mushroomed the culture fisheries all around the Indian states. The Culture fisheries growth had made the marine capture fisheries an overfished/exploited stagnant fisheries industry, blaming the marine capture fishers for depletion and degradation of resources. Today's, the Mariculture, farming fishes in sea is a prorogated a future marine capture Fisheries and income secured able, non-risky occupation for the marine capture fishers.

With the exiting marginalization, now India had extended its Blue Mission Operations with the enclosures of the Blue Economy (BE) Framework. The Blue Enclosures had conceptualized Ocean as a new economy frontier for development. In addition, the COVID-19 economic crisis had fueled the Blue Economy Model stating that Blue Trade investments are the economic boosters to move out the developing countries from the economic crisis. The Union Government of India placed Blue Economy has one of the economy revitalizers for nation's economic prosperity. The Aatma Nirbhar Bharat Abhiyaan (Self-Reliant India Movement) COVID economic reform packages had pooled a sum of Rs. 20,000 crores scheme Pradhan Mantri Matsya Sampada Yojana (PMMSY) for the integrated, sustainable, and inclusive development of marine and inland fisheries sector under the Agriculture (Tranche3), further the Government of India had sought for a US\$ 300 million Blue Revolution Program a development assistance loan for revamping the fisheries sector. Recently, the Government of India had proposed the National Policy of Blue Economy (2020) to utilise and exploit a range of living and non-living oceanic resources in order to enhance the blue economy contributions to India's GDP, while improving lives of coastal communities, preserve marine biodiversity and maintain the national security in ocean region resources through a legalized coastal Marine Spatial Plans. Basically, the Blue Economy Policy legally spatially allocate and distribute the ocean and spaces for the blue investors. The BE is not new concept for India, it is an extension of ocean grab, the draft BE Policy a legitimate tool for exploitation and expropriation of ocean

capital by Blue Traders (corporates), at cost of denying and dispossessing the fishing customary spaces of the marine capture fishers. Further, the BE were largely institutionalized and steered by the bilateral cooperation Blue Economy partnership between India and Norway. It is evident that Norway pioneered Indian marine fisheries transformation with Integrated Fisheries Sustainable Management Approaches, and finally the left behind the marine fisheries as an overexploited unfertile resource, now they are back-again to exploit the fertile *Seabed Blue Resources* with their *Integrated Ocean Management & Research Initiative* to progress the ocean resource management, enable expansion and establishment of ocean industries in a sustainable manner. Hence, the lessons and reflections of Norway's Fisheries Development (Blue Revolution) visible that the Norway' Ocean Development (Blue Economy) will desert the ocean resources within few decades.

To conclude, the Marine Capture Fishers were largely suppressed politically vulnerable marginalized communities of India. Since independence, these community's common livelihood resources (fisheries) are being plundered by the transnational corporates with the larger financial and technical support of Puppeteers in name of marine Fisheries Development for nation's growth and prosperity. The National Fishworkers Forum (NFF) of India, had resisting the marine fisheries industrial developments in all the phases. The NFF's struggle had played a major role in taking back some of the capital-intensive fishing policies and acts, but NFF resistance strategies on state's repression had only slowdown the process of suppression and dispossession of rights of marine capture fishers. The present Blue Economy's Blue Authoritarianism over ocean resources will be legitimate the dispossession of the Marine Capture Fishers, and make them invisible in future. I conclude saying that *"There will be Fish in the market, but no Fishers; Ships and Industries in sea, but no Fishing Canoes and Catamarans; and there will be Beaches and Resorts, but no Shores and Coastal Villages"*.