…two different opinions were in conflict: one recognised the Newts as a new working class, and sought to ensure that all social legislation should be extended to them as regards the working day, holidays with pay, health insurance and old age pensions, and so on; the other view, on the contrary, was that the Newts constituted a dangerous and growing menace to working men, and that Newt labour should be simply prohibited on the grounds that it was anti-social. Against this argument not only did the representatives of the workers raise objections, but the delegates of the workers pointed out that the Newts were not only a new labour force, but also a big and increasingly important outlet as consumers… The International Labour Office, of course, could not ignore these objections; and as a result of lengthy negotiations a compromise was arrived at so that ‘employees mentioned above as belonging to Group A (amphibian) could only be employed under water, or in the water, or if on shore then only within a distance of ten yards from high-water mark; that they should not mine for coal or petroleum at the bottom of the sea; that they should not manufacture paper, textiles, or artificial leather from seaweed for consumption on land,’ etc: these regulations imposed on the activities of the Newts were put together in a code of nineteen paragraphs, of which we give no details chiefly because as a matter of course nobody ever respected them; but as a solution to the Newt problem, on broad and truly international lines dealing with industrial and social questions, the code referred to above was a meritorious and imposing effort. Capek, Válka s mloky (War With The Newts) (1936), pp. 230, 231

Many public policy initiatives in the shipping and ports sectors have failed significantly in the past 25 years, with particularly notable examples from the European Union and its relationship with other jurisdictions. These range from the inconsistencies associated with liner shipping regulation, through repeated disasters in the bulk and ferry shipping sectors, to problematic relations among the European Union, the IMO, the OECD and major maritime nation-states and culminating in the recent inadequacies in EU ports policy initiatives and open dispute between European Commissioners over division of responsibilities in the maritime sector.

Maritime policy analysis presented in the following pages takes Harvey’s (1982, 1989, 1990) concept of a ‘spatial fix’ with regards to capital accumulation that requires continuous space–time compression to sustain the capitalist system’s desire for growth and development. Passing from a Post-Fordist/Modernist
environment characterized in governance terms by a period of state-centred hierarchies whereby maritime policy-making focused upon state initiatives, state influence in supra national and international bodies such as the EU and IMO, and state control of regional and local finance, we have moved from around 1970–1980 into a period of Postmodernism characterized by accelerated and intense compression of space and time as globalization continues to progress which has made unviable the modernist state-centric governance hierarchy. Whilst the term Postmodern may have its detractors the existence of a new global scenario is undeniable. Meanwhile the archetypal state-centric, hierarchical political and governance structures of the maritime sector have yet to catch up contributing to the policy failures that have increasingly characterized the sector in recent years.

The focus is upon how governance in the maritime sector needs to adapt to meet the demands of a Postmodernist environment and the continuing pressure for accelerated space-time compression. It identifies the failures of governance, the processes which characterize maritime governance, and a selection of potential responses to the problems identified. It also questions the lack of enthusiasm shown by the shipping industry for revision of the governance framework within which it currently works. Is this merely the response of an industry characterized by regulatory anachronism or is it a reflection of the advantages that can be gained from a weak and inefficient governance structure for an industry grounded in an environment where capital accumulation is paramount?

There really are too many people to thank individually and without whose help and encouragement this project would never have been completed. However, it would be unforgivable not to mention the Onassis Foundation for their financial support and in particular Frederique Hadgiantoniou in Athens, the help of Venus Lun at Hong Kong Polytechnic University and of course colleagues at the University of Plymouth who were especially supportive in providing a research grant, a sabbatical from teaching and also while I recovered from an unexpected and unappreciated subarachnoid haemorrhage. Notable thanks also go to my ever faithful insulin pump—not everybody carries around a major organ in a pocket, after all.

Finally, enormous thanks as always go to Liz, Joe and Siân for making it all worthwhile.

Meanwhile in a season that at the moment is looking promising, hope springs eternal that Charlton Athletic will soon return to where they belong.

West Hoe, Plymouth, March 2012
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