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ABSTRACT
Through various political, social, environmental and economic systems and processes many traditional fishers in Hangberg have no legal rights to harvest marine resources. Subsistence fishers were legally recognised for the first time in South Africa in the Marine Living Resources Act 18 of 1998 (MLRA). Combined with the limited-commercial fisheries sector created in 2001, these two fisher categories were created to reverse the historical marginalisation of small-scale fishers (Sowman, forthcoming). Despite these recent legislative changes many of these fishers are still unable to access legal rights to fish for a number of reasons. Firstly, the dominance of established companies and their economic hegemony of the commercial fishing sector make the entrance into that industry extremely difficult for subsistence fishers. Secondly, the creation of the Cape Peninsula Marine Protected area lists the area traditionally used for subsistence fishing as a Sanctuary Zone which means it is a ‘no-take’ area in terms of marine resources. Thirdly, the organisational (forming a legal entity) and financial requirements necessary to apply for legal quotas are simply out of reach of many marginalised fishers. Lastly, the government has been slow to implement recommendations made by the Subsistence Fisheries Task Group (SFTG) around the management of subsistence fishing and have not made quotas available to subsistence fishers in South Africa, making the only legal way to access quotas through commercial or recreational channels.

The result of this systematic exclusion from legal rights and quotas has left the bona fide fishers of Hangberg extremely vulnerable. In light of limited employment opportunities, these fishers have turned to poaching marine resources as a means to secure a source of income. This choice serves to further increase their vulnerability as the risks and consequences (for individual and households) associated with such an activity are extremely high. Using The Pressure and Release Model (PAR) as explained by Wisner et al. (2004) this research will trace the progression of vulnerability of the fishers of Hangberg to examine and explain their current status as poachers.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>African National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEE</td>
<td>Black Economic Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPMPA</td>
<td>Cape Peninsula Marine Protected Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAT</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>Fishers's Community Trusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus/ Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>Kwa-Zulu Natal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCM</td>
<td>Marine and Coastal Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLRA</td>
<td>Marine Living Resources Act 18 of 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>Marine Protected Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>Pressure and Release Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANParks</td>
<td>South African National Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFTG</td>
<td>Subsistence Fisheries Task Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Total Allowable Catch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAE</td>
<td>Total Allowable Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMNP MPA</td>
<td>Table Mountain National Park Marine Protected Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCRL</td>
<td>West Coast Rock Lobster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

During July 2005, I was involved in a course on Environmental Justice which was run for students from Pennsylvania State University and the University of Cape Town. One component of the course was focussed on exploring environmental justice and urban risk in informal settlements. One of the informal settlements was Hangberg. During the time spent in Hangberg, we were introduced to a number of poachers who spoke of their exclusion from legal fishing rights, the precariousness of illegal fishing activities and the risks associated with poaching as a livelihood. Our facilitator from Hangberg (a poacher of 17 years) had a great deal of knowledge about the issues facing poachers and showed a passion for getting their story ‘out there’ to lobby for legal rights. His passion for this situation sparked a deep interest within me to understand and research the historical and current issues and risks faced by the poachers of Hangberg.

1.2 Context

Hangberg is a predominantly ‘coloured’ community located behind the Hout Bay harbour (See Figures, 1 and 2).

Figure 1: Hout Bay

Figure 2: The Cape Peninsula
It is considered by many to be a fishing community as many of the residents are employed either on the commercial fishing boats or in the processing factories. The population in Hout Bay in 2001 was 13250. Of this, 5438 were ‘Coloured’ – male total was 2593 and the female total was 2845 (www.str.com.au). Until 1989 there was no secondary level education in Hout Bay, leading to a large drop-out rate at primary and secondary schools. This contributed to an increase in unemployment, gangsterism, drug and alcohol abuse and teenage pregnancies in the community. Escalating levels of Tuberculosis (TB) have been found, especially among the fishers. There are also increasing numbers of cases of HIV/AIDS in the community.

1.3 Profile of a fishing community as found by the SFTG

The SFTG was appointed to advise MCM on the management of a subsistence fisheries sector. In their research they found the following results. The average number of resident members of each household was 5.0 people (4.2 on West Coast). Fishing is male dominated; 100% on the West Coast. The average age of a fisherman is 27; most fall in the age range 22-40. 15% of fishers were children <18 years old. Education levels are relatively low in fishing communities. In urban fishing communities, 44-59% had some primary schooling. Few had Matric and virtually none had tertiary education. Economic activities apart from selling of excess catch: of the economically active age group (15-64), 40.3% were unemployed (Branch et al., 2002). In most regions, the majority of fishers had no alternative income and of those that did, only a small minority had full-time work. On the West Coast, 36% have no alternative source of income. Of the 64% that do: 5% have full-time work, 65% have seasonal work and 30% have part-time/sporadic work (Clark et al., 2002). Poverty is high among these households. Only half of the households had an occupant with waged employment and the average adult income per month was R455. Cape Town’s average income was R567 per month, surprisingly low for a metropolitan area (Branch et al., 2002).

1.4 Aim

The aim of the research is to identify the political, social, environmental and economic factors that (historically and currently) increase the vulnerability of the fishers in Hangberg. The research will divide the factors into Root Causes, Dynamic Pressures and Unsafe Conditions as per the Wisner et al. (2004) Pressure and
Release Model. The research will identify the external pressures that transfer the vulnerability\(^1\) into risk\(^2\) for fishing individuals and households.

1.5 Objectives
- Identify the importance of or reliance on poaching\(^3\) for the overall livelihood of a household.
- Document the poaching process and identify the related vulnerabilities and risks.
- Identify the external pressures that transform the vulnerabilities into risk for a household or individual.
- Analyse the impact of an ‘everyday hazard’\(^4\) on the household level.

1.6 Summary
Initial reading on Hangberg and subsistence fishing in South Africa highlighted the complexity of finding a balance between conservation of natural resources and transformation and social justice. The context of a fishing community and Hangberg in specific shows a group of historically marginalised South Africans who seemingly have no voice with which to change their status as poachers. The resulting vulnerabilities and hazards that they face can form part of the Pressure and Release Model which is explained in Chapter Two.

\(^1\) See definition in Theoretical framework section (2.1).
\(^2\) Disaster risk is defined as “the probability of harmful losses (illness, injury, death, property and environmental damage, disrupted lives and livelihoods) as a result of the interaction between hazards and vulnerability”. Risk = hazard × vulnerability
\(^3\) Many of the poachers do not identify themselves as poachers, but rather as subsistence fishers. I have used the terms poachers and poaching to indicate that their fishing activities are deemed illegal.
\(^4\) Everyday hazard refers to relatively small scale events (such as being arrested) that have a significant impact on the individual/household or community.
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 The Pressure and Release Model (PAR)

Wisner et al. (2004) define vulnerability as: "the characteristics of a person or group and their situation that influence their capacity to anticipate, cope with, resist and recover from the impact of a natural hazard (an extreme natural event or process)."

For the authors, this vulnerability is socially constructed from the political, social and economic environment and will differ in level and magnitude depending on the specific household. The interaction of vulnerability with a natural hazard (or external pressure) leads to disaster. However, in the case of Hangberg we are not dealing with large scale disasters such as tsunamis and earthquakes; but rather with ‘everyday hazards’ and dangers related to the risks of illegal fishing. The progression of vulnerability is divided into root causes, dynamic pressures and unsafe conditions. The Pressure and Release Model (PAR) (See Appendix 1 for full schematic diagram)

PROGRESSION OF VULNERABILITY

ROOT CAUSES  DYNAMIC PRESSURES  UNSAFE CONDITIONS  DISASTER R = H * V  HAZARDS

2.1.1 Root Causes

Root Causes are the underlying political, economic and demographic processes that determine the distribution of resources and power within a society. They are interrelated, widespread and general processes that are ‘distant’ both spatially and temporally and are bound up in cultural assumptions and ideology and are therefore ‘invisible’ or ‘taken for granted’ (Wisner et al. 2004). These root causes are a function of economic, social, and political structures, legal definitions, and enforcement of rights and gender relations of the ideological order. They are connected to the function of the state and control by authorities. Those who are economically marginal (or live in marginal areas) tend to be of marginal importance to those in power (economically and politically). These form mutually reinforcing sources of

---

5 They are distant processes in that they are located in the past (temporally) or in a far geographical location (spatially): in this case the previous Apartheid government’s power and racially discriminating legislature.
vulnerability. People have access to livelihoods and resources that are insecure; therefore activities lead to increased vulnerability and low priority of government intervention (Wisner et al. 2004).

2.1.2 Dynamic Pressures

*Dynamic Pressures* are processes that 'translate' the effects of *root causes* (temporally and spatially) into *unsafe conditions*. They are the contemporary/immediate conjectural manifestations of general underlying economic, social, and political patterns. *Dynamic pressures* channel the *root causes* into particular forms of *unsafe conditions* that then have to be considered in relation to the different types of hazards people face (Wisner et al. 2004). Examples include epidemic disease, rapid urbanisation and current wars.

2.1.3 Unsafe Conditions

*Unsafe Conditions* are the specific forms in which vulnerability of a population is expressed in time and space in conjunction with a hazard. Examples include living in a hazardous location, lack of protection from state, no building/safety codes, dangerous livelihoods, minimal food entitlements or entitlements prone to rapid disruption. *Unsafe conditions* depend on an initial level of well-being and how this varies between regions, households and individuals. One also needs to consider patterns of access to tangible resources (cash, food, equipment) and intangible resources (social networks, local knowledge) when analysing *unsafe conditions* (Wisner et al. 2004).

2.2 Justification

The initial contact with the poachers and background reading highlighted the historical marginalisation of this community and the historical exclusion of the fishers from legal rights. Therefore, the theoretical framework had to extend further than the environmental and legal aspects of the case to look at the *root causes* of the problem. The current processes that are translating the *root causes* into *unsafe conditions* are found in the current policy and implementation difficulties being experienced in the small-scale fishing industry. The theory also had to pertain to the specific risks and dangers faced by the poachers. *Unsafe conditions* served to highlight these risks very
neatly. The use of the *PAR* can therefore be justified as it serves to emphasize the socially constructed vulnerability of the poachers, and the resulting dangers they face.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
The research conducted can be divided into two components. Firstly, a historic desk review of subsistence fishing and the difficulties associated with obtaining legal fishing rights; and secondly, field research conducted in Hangberg. This chapter will explore these two components separately, and conclude with ethical considerations, method for analysing data and the limitations of the research.

3.2 The Historic Desk Review
The methods used for the historic desk review consisted of a review of secondary data related to marine policy and subsistence fishing and an interview with a key informant. The secondary data review was a review of relevant published and unpublished literature on the subject. This enabled me to have a historical perspective on the issue of small-scale and subsistence fishing in South Africa and the difficulties associated with accessing legal rights to marine resources. This was a necessary step as the current vulnerability of Hangberg fishers are formed by the root causes which are temporally distant and are therefore located in the historical context.

I interviewed the Co-director of the Environmental Evaluation Unit at UCT) who has been involved in the SFTG, is co-editor of a book on fisheries co-management in South Africa. She has a great deal of knowledge and experience on the issues of subsistence fishing and poaching in South Africa. She was able to highlight the most important issues that I would need to explore during my field research and also guided me to the relevant literature and policy documents.

3.3 The Field Research
The field research component consisted of interviews with fishers, a key informant and the authorities and observations of the fishers, their activities and the conditions under which they work and the activities of the authorities. My initial contact with the key informant in Hangberg was in July 2005. The field research was conducted over a
period of 14 days from the 26 August – 08 September 2005, with a follow-up visit on 25 September. (See Table 1).

3.3.1 Interviews
The research is primarily a qualitative research project. The main source of information was the poachers themselves (See Appendix 2 for questionnaire). Interviews were conducted with the poachers to gain an understanding of the importance of fishing to their personal or household livelihood. The interviews also helped understand the factors/processes that have led to them being excluded from legal rights, as well as the vulnerabilities and risks they face as a result of having to fish illegally.

In order to gain a better understanding of the historical marginalisation of fishers in Hangberg, I conducted a life history interview with a fisherman whose family has been fishing in Hout Bay for over 50 years (See Appendix 3 for questionnaire). The man, whose father had been a fisherman in Hout Bay, was 52 years old and had been fishing for 40 years.

I was hoping to conduct focus group interviews in order to gain an understanding of the fishers’ experiences, opinions and concerns related to their illegal fishing activities. As Barbour and Kitzinger (1998) explain, focus group interviews are particularly suited to the study of attitudes and experiences around specific topics. While individual interviews may be more effective for individual biographies of the fishers, focus group interviews will allow the fishers to “express differing opinions” or “foster consensus” among themselves (Goldman and Schmalz, 2001: 14). Unfortunately, it was not possible to get a significant number of poachers together at one particular time. My interviews were all with 1 – 3 people and fairly informal. While a typical focus group interview was not possible, many times the group of respondents did discuss the issues at hand and fostered a consensus among themselves.

3.3.2 Key Informant
I had a key informant who assisted me with all my fieldwork in Hangberg. He has been living there for his whole life and has been involved in fishing and poaching in
Hout Bay for approximately 17 years. His knowledge of ‘the game’ (poaching) and those involved in it was invaluable to my research. He arranged all of the interviews with the poachers and helped with translation when necessary. His facilitation of the contact between myself and the poachers gave me credibility and access to situations and information that would otherwise have been near impossible to gain. Our discussions before and after interviews helped fill in any other questions I had. I also interviewed him in depth three times, these were extremely informative times.

Interviews were conducted with institutional role players from MCM (Chief Marine Conservation Inspector (CMCI)) and SANParks (Operations Manager (OM) TMNP MPA) (See Appendix 4 for questionnaire). The purpose of interviewing these officials was to gain another perspective on the issue of poaching so as not to be biased or subjective in the research. I also spent a day with the Marine Rangers from SANParks as they did their daily checks for poachers in the Sanctuary Zones of the MPA. Speaking to them and watching them work gave me good understanding of how the poachers operate. During my time with them I managed to obtain a limited amount of quantitative data that was available on the scale of poaching. This included getting information on the number of deaths of poachers, arrests made and equipment confiscated from the policing of poaching. I also tried to obtain an approximation for the number of households involved in poaching.

3.3.3 Observation

In order to document the poaching process it was necessary to do some observational work. I did not go out to sea with the poachers as it was deemed too dangerous. However, I observed the process of preparing to go out to sea and the launching of a poaching vessel during the night. In order to see the conditions that the poachers faced while out at sea I took two boat rides to the area in which they poach. The first trip was during the day on a Seal Island tour, the boat travels right into the area in which the poachers usually operate. The second trip was on the Pelagus, this is MCM’s dedicated anti-poaching vessel. This boat ride was during the evening and night and I got to experience what is like to be out at sea during the night. I also had the opportunity to interview the captain of the vessel who has been involved in anti-poaching activities for many years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-08-05</td>
<td>Key Informant</td>
<td>Explanation of research, planning, informal interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-08-05</td>
<td>3 Respondents</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Informant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-09-05</td>
<td>Operations Manager (TMNP MPA) Marine Rangers</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of activities and informal interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-09-05</td>
<td>3 Respondents</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of launching a poaching vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-09-05</td>
<td>Chief Marine Conservation Inspector (MCM) Captain of Pelagus</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ride on <em>Pelagus</em>, interview with captain, observation of poaching areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09-05</td>
<td>2 Respondents Key Informant Key Informants Father</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Life-history interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Field Research Completed

Comparing the perceptions and accounts of their activities with observations of the conditions under which the poachers were operating served to validate the finding of the research to a certain degree. In a sense, the research was *triangulated* by looking at it from the perspective of the poachers, the authorities and through observation.

3.4 Scope

The fieldwork conducted only focused on a small selection of fishers in Hangberg, specifically those that consider themselves *bona fide*, traditional fishers, but have no legal rights to fish (as opposed to those with limited-commercial rights, commercial
rights or those that are poaching for large scale operations). There are those who are poaching marine resources in the Hout Bay area for large scale gang-related profits. While there is not always a clear distinction between groups, this research has focused on fishers who fish for their own household livelihood and income.

3.5 Ethical Considerations
In her research on transformation in the fishing industry, Isaacs (2003: 20) found that "there are certain advantages in sharing the context, language and background that facilitated the ease of access to information". Considering that I have no such links with the Hangberg community or any other fishing community it was necessary to be sensitive to the fact that I was an outsider and that accessing information was not going to be straightforward. Isaacs also found that many people believed that she was in position to issue them with fishing quotas or to explain why they had not been successful in their application. In this light it was very important to explicitly state that I was conducting research, had no link to any authorities and could not provide fishing quotas to anyone. While this was a concern before entering the field, I found that no-one expected anything from me, and that people were very willing to share their opinions and experiences with me.

3.6 Analysing field data
Once the information and data had been collected from informants and sources it was analysed systematically. First the data was put into a spreadsheet to examine the general profile of the respondents and to highlight trends and themes explored during the research. The aim of the research was to apply the PAR Model to the context of Hangberg. Therefore, the information was analysed so as to divide it into root causes, dynamic pressures and unsafe conditions as well as into the categories of external pressures and 'everyday hazards'. In this way, the individual and group experiences as well as quantitative data, are conceptually organised in such a way that they feed into the theoretical model to produce a holistic picture of the ways in which the progression of vulnerability combines with external pressures to produce a hazard or risk for a household or individual member of the Hangberg fishing community.

3.7 Limitations
As the first language of Hangberg is Afrikaans, I had expected that the interviews would need to be translated, and that this may be a limiting factor in terms of the depth of my understanding. However, all of the respondents were willing to conduct the interviews in English. While this certainly made it easier for me, it may have limited the understanding of some of the questions and limited the ability of the respondents to answer the questions as they would have had they been speaking Afrikaans.

While the research intended to focus on a specific sub-section of poachers in Hangberg (those that consider themselves bona fide, traditional fishers, but have no legal rights to fish), I feel that if I had been able to speak to a wider variety of poachers (those that are more profit-oriented) it would have helped with my understanding of poaching activities as a whole. Similarly, it would have been necessary to speak to more senior officials within MCM to gain an understanding of their position in relation to poaching. The interviews conducted rather focussed on those who are working ‘on the ground’.

As I was reliant on my key informant for contact with the poachers, the number of interviews with poachers was limited. While it seemed as though my questions were willingly answered, the fact that I was inquiring about individuals’ illegal activities may have caused some respondents to censor their answers in some way. Others were up front about their opinions and stated that they were even happy to have their real names used in my report.

The scope of the research limits the generalisability of the research findings. The narrow focus on a specific sub-sector of fishers within Hangberg means that generalising the findings as representative of the entire community would be inaccurate.

Many qualitative researchers take the findings and analysis of their data back to the respondents in order to validate their work. This was not attempted for this research due to time constraints; however, the discussions with the key informant did serve to validate some of the findings of the research.
Vulnerability can be well defined and the processes involved in root causes and dynamic pressures are reasonably well understood in many circumstances. However, by the admission of the authors, it is difficult to make reliable connections (or causal linkages) between unsafe conditions, dynamic pressures and root causes (Wisner et al., 2004). Therefore, while I have made connections and causal linkages of explanation between the components of the progression of vulnerability, these can not be seen as simple, straightforward or definite.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS OF THE HISTORIC DESK REVIEW

4.1 Introduction

The findings from the historic desk review highlights the historical (pre-1994) marginalisation of subsistence fishers in South Africa and Hangberg in particular. The post-1994 history shows how with legal and policy changes, many of the fishers of Hangberg have still failed to access legal rights due to the problems in accessing limited-commercial or subsistence sector quotas, the conservation of marine resources in Hout Bay and the new long-term rights being issued.

4.2 History pre-1994

The root causes of vulnerability are often located in the history of a group of people. This section will trace the history of subsistence fishers in South Africa up to 1994. Where literature is available the history of Hangberg will be described.

"Archaeological evidence suggests that subsistence fishers have been active on the South African coast for many thousands of years" (Clark et al., 2002: 431). It is believed that people on the West coast were exploiting inter-tidal resources for 50 000 years and 100 000 years on the East and South coasts. Fishing in Hout Bay can be traced back to the late Stone Age, the Khoi-Khoi were the first people to fish there (Isaacs, 2003: 127).

The colonisation of South Africa had a profound impact on the subsistence fishers, especially those in the Cape. Those formerly classified as "Coloured"\(^6\) played a

---

\(^6\) South Africa's past means that we are forced to consider racial categories. "African" refers to indigenous inhabitants whose ancestors' presence in the region pre-dated the arrival of European and other settlers; "Coloured" refers to people of mixed race origin; "White" refers to descendants of European settlers; "Black" refers inclusively, in the manner of Black Consciousness (BC), to all South Africans who are not "White" (Isaacs, 2003: 16).
dominant role in the fishing sector in the Western Cape prior to the onset of industrial fishing. However, the development of the fishing industry (1900’s) and the introduction of the discriminating apartheid legislation resulted in the systematic exclusion of Coloured and African subsistence fishers from legal access to resources (Sowman, forthcoming). Government involvement in the fishing industry began in 1944 with the Fisheries Development Corporation, based on the Fisheries Development Act of 1944. Support was given to White Afrikaners by the government in the form of infrastructure for fishing and processing (Isaacs, 2003: 127). Despite these facts, Coloured and African subsistence and small-scale fishers continued to harvest resources either illegally or under the regulations meant for recreational fishers (Sowman, forthcoming). While Coloured and African fishers were excluded from legal fishing rights, they were also forced to live in certain areas as per the Apartheid legislation. The Hangberg fishing village is the outcome of the forced removals of Coloured people from the Hout Bay village under the Group Areas Act. The township was never large enough to accommodate all the people who were forced off their homes and farms; the overcrowding resulted in a large number of “squatters” (Greene, 1991). The zoning of the Hout Bay fishing community above the harbour was mainly to make room for tourist development and businesses. These laws left a community, that was once thriving and vibrant, impoverished with minimum resources and recreational facilities (Isaacs, 2003: 128).

After 45 years of apartheid and 300 years of colonial rule, resource management has been marked by injustice and left with a legacy of inequality. Laws and policies (e.g. The Land Act of 1913 and The Group Areas Act of 1950) denied South Africa’s Black citizens access to the coastal natural resources (Hauck and Sowman, 2003). These legal developments left many traditional subsistence fishers without legal access to marine resources and living in overcrowded settlements that were politically marginalised and without voice.

4.3 History post-1994
4.3.1 Subsistence fisheries in South Africa
The idea to create a separate subsistence category came in 1994 based on the idea that fishing was the entitlement of many poor communities. The ANC promised ‘the upliftment of impoverished coastal communities through improved access to marine
resources’ (ANC, 1994: 104). The community quota system was introduced as an attempt to provide legal quotas and support to communities living on the coast. The quotas were given to Fishers’s Community Trusts (FCT). However, the system did not benefit those most in need of support due to mismanagement and corruption. It was only the elite of the communities that benefited (Isaacs, 2003). Subsistence fishers were recognised formally as a distinct group in the MLRA (Section 1 (Iv)) as "a natural person who regularly catches fish for personal consumption or for the consumption for his or her dependent, including one who engages from time to time in the local sale or barter of excess catch, but does not include a person who engages on a substantial scale in the sale of fish on a commercial basis". While this was a positive step towards legal access to marine resource for marginalised fishers, there were a number of problems in realising this right in practice. Due to the government’s previous focus on the commercial fishing sector, they were not equipped to deal with or regulate this new sector. The SFTG was appointed to advise on the future management of the subsistence fisheries sector (Sowman, forthcoming). One of the tasks of the SFTG was to provide a revised definition for subsistence fishers. The current definition according to the SFTG is "subsistence fishers are poor people who personally harvest marine resources as a source of food or to sell them to meet the basic needs of food security; they operate on or near to the shore or in estuaries, live in close proximity to the resource, consume or sell the resources locally, use low technology gear (often as part of a long standing community based or cultural practise), and the kinds of resources they harvest generate only sufficient returns to meet the basic needs of food security" (Branch et al., 2002: 481).

4.3.2 The limited-commercial sector
The SFTG also proposed the introduction of a small-scale commercial fishing sector to cater for those who would like to ‘graduate’ from subsistence fishing. Commercial fishers “sell for profit that meets more than basic needs; operate where resources occur, sell anywhere; employ staff; gear and processing can be high-tech; high value resources; managed by Total Allowable Catch (TAC) or Total Allowable Effort (TAE)” (Branch et al., 2002: 484). Small-scale commercial fishers should live on or close to coast (<20 km from sea), and have a history of involvement in fishing (10 years for individuals, 50 years for communities). Owners must be involved in the day-to-day running of the business i.e. hands-on involvement in harvesting or processing.
There should be limits to the size of the group, company or cooperative to qualify as "small scale" (Branch et al., 2002). To this end, the government passed a regulation under the MLRA that provided for a limited-commercial fishing sector. Even these revised definitions have not solved the problem. Diversification of resource use and sale of catches has made subsistence fishers closer to what is considered a commercial fisher. "What was once two clearly distinct groups of fishers has now been blurred into a long continuum ranging from extremely poor people, who personally harvest marine resources for their own use, through to wealthy businessmen who harvest, process and sell marine resources purely for profit" (Clark et al., 2002: 434).

4.3.3 Problems in accessing legal quotas
There remain a number of problems which prevent the legislation from being manifest into real rights of access to marine resources for many marginalised fishers. The major stumbling block is that MCM have been slow to implement the recommendations made by the SFTG. Their interpretation of the term subsistence fishers is more on a scientific, species-oriented approach rather than a people-centred approach. The SFTG recommended certain low-value species as suitable for subsistence harvesting; however, in many areas subsistence fishers have historically harvested other high-value species such as WCRL and Abalone (especially on the West Coast). In the absence of low-value species in certain areas, MCM have assumed that there are no subsistence fishers there and have not issued any subsistence permits (e.g. Western Cape). "Many of the fishers on the lower end of the scale are clearly very vulnerable and require protection in order to survive. However, any special dispensation or even special concessions afforded to the true subsistence fishers could quite easily become a loophole for unscrupulous poachers or for opportunistic commercial or recreational fishers" (Clark et al., 2002: 434). This was seen by the unsuccessful trial period of issuing subsistence permits for WCRL and abalone during the 2000-2001 season. The SFTG recommendations and classification system have been inconsistently applied in the country. In the Eastern Cape, subsistence exemptions have been issued under section 81 of the MLRA; while in KZN only recreational permits have been issued. "No subsistence fishers have been recognised along the west and south coasts of South Africa. This is of grave concern given the levels of food insecurity found in fisher households in these regions. While poaching threatens certain resources such as abalone, the lack of clarity regarding
procedures to gain legal access to resources, and the tardiness with which exemptions and permits are issued, is exacerbating poaching and heightening frustration among small-scale fishers” (Sowman, forthcoming pp 13).

Another problem in accessing legal rights to the limited-commercial sector is the application process which is expensive, unclear and complex. Lack of education and skills among fishers meant that they had to rely on consultants and other to assist with the application process. As mentioned previously, education levels in Hout Bay are relatively low. The result was that community leaders and elites (who are better informed, politically connected and economically astute) used their positions of power to con fishers out of money or to secure quotas for themselves (Isaacs, 2003). The cost of application for limited-commercial quotas was between R7000 and R500 which was non-refundable regardless of success or size of quota allocated; this resulted in the exclusion of the poorest fishers. While these quotas have had a positive impact on the socio-economic circumstances of those who were successful; research has shown that the allocation system failed to provide for the poor historically disadvantaged fishers who have traditionally derived a livelihood from the sea (Sowman, forthcoming). The process of securing a legal quota is further complicated by the *ad hoc* manner in which the MCM awards quotas and the lack of transparency and clear information available.

### 4.3.4 The conservation of marine resources in Hout Bay

The exploitation of marine living resources along the Cape Peninsula coastline represents a major or sole source of income and/or food for people as well as an outlet for recreation and leisure. Unfortunately the intensity of harvesting has exceeded the capacity of marine species to replace themselves and many are locally and regionally over-exploited. The Table Bay WCRL closed area extends from Melkbos Point (beacon MB1) to Die Josie (near Chapmans Peak – MB2) and extends 12 nautical miles offshore. No rock lobster may be caught in this area (DEAT, 2004). The degradation of the in-shore coastline is another cause for concern and has prompted the motivation for the Cape Peninsula MPA. The marine and coastal ecosystems need to be protected from further exploitation, given a chance to recover and the overexploitation of fish must be reduced (CPMPA, 2002).
In June 2004 the TMNP MPA was declared. The MPA surrounds the whole of the Cape Peninsula and includes 6 Sanctuary or “no-take zones” (See Figure 3 below).

![Map of the TMNP MPA](image)

**Figure 3: The TMNP MPA**

The goals of the MPA include: to protect the marine environment and the marine biodiversity; to allow over-exploited fish populations to recover and protect breeding stocks of economically important species; to reduce conflict between competing users of the MPA; and to encourage economic opportunities for previously disadvantaged communities in the vicinity of the MPA. The MPA consists of two types of zones: *Sanctuary Zones* and *Controlled Zones* (CPMPA, 2002).

One of these Sanctuary zones (Karbonkelberg Restricted Zone) extends from the Sentinel in Hout Bay to Oudekraal and extends 3.3 nautical miles offshore at the widest point (DEAT, 2004) (See Figure 4 below).
The Sanctuary zones are managed to protect biodiversity and to allow for non-consumptive activities. All fishing is prohibited in the Sanctuary Zone. Subsistence fishing may occur with a permit in the controlled zone. Voluntary compliance with regulation will be encouraged through education and awareness programmes (CPMPA, 2002). The no-take policy in MPA’s is a recommendation from the SFTG; the report states that the general rule should be that no subsistence harvesting should be allowed in MPA’s (Harris et al., 2002).

4.3.5 Long-term fishing rights
The MCM awarded fishing rights for the limited-commercial and commercial sectors in 2001. Successful applicants were issued medium-term rights of 4 years. The problem with these rights was that companies were reluctant to invest significantly in the industry without long-term rights. Currently, MCM are issuing (in August, September and October 2005) long-term (8-15 year) rights. MCM are concerned about finding the balance between sustainability, social justice and economic benefits of marine resources in the context of such long-term rights. These long-term rights are controversial because they leave no room for newcomers into the industry (Sowman,
pers, comm.). This will increase the vulnerability of fishers as they will be forced to fish illegally for the next 15 years if they do not secure a quota.

4.4 Summary
Simply, MCM has prioritised commercial and recreational fisheries over subsistence fisheries because of pressure from the established fishing companies and a lack of capacity; effectively sidelining the interests of poor fishers and undermining their opportunities to enhance food security (Cardoso, 2004). The only legal way to access marine resources in the Western Cape is through commercial or recreational sectors. The commercial and limited-commercial sectors are simply out of reach for the majority of the poor fishers.

CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS OF THE FIELD RESEARCH
5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents a discussion of the results of the interviews conducted with the poachers and the authorities, including observations made while in the field. The responses are divided into the different parts of the PAR. The progression of vulnerability (root causes, dynamic pressures and unsafe conditions) interacts with external pressures to produce everyday hazards for individuals involved in poaching. These everyday hazards have a significant impact on the individuals and their households; this is discussed in the section on household consequences.
5.2 ROOT CAUSES

The root causes of the vulnerability faced by the Hangberg fishers is socio-politically constructed and can be explained by their political marginalisation and lack of employment opportunities.

5.2.1 Political marginalisation in Hangberg

In Hangberg, the above mentioned history of colonialism and apartheid has left the community politically marginalised. The result is low education levels, high unemployment levels, drug and alcohol abuse and health problems (See 1.2). The high unemployment levels in Hangberg highlight the limited economic opportunities of South Africa’s historically marginalised communities. These underlying root causes combine to leave the people of Hangberg ‘invisible’ and vulnerable due to their lack of political leverage in terms of accessing essential resources.

This ‘invisibility’ means that they are vulnerable to issues such food insecurity because of inadequate livelihoods opportunities. Their marginalised livelihoods are not resistant to shocks and stresses because the community is poor and has limited alternatives. Wisner et al. (2004) explain that the poor are vulnerable because they suffer relations of exploitation, unequal bargaining and discrimination within the political economy, and because of the historical reasons that their homes and livelihoods are situated in resource-poor areas. Or in the case of Hangberg, that their political marginalisation has meant that their traditional livelihood has been deemed illegal.

The political marginalisation of this coloured community came up in many interviews. One group of respondents felt particularly strongly that they had been ignored on a racial basis. They claimed that the government’s transformation strategy of Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) was a racial remark and should be replaced by Poor Economic Empowerment – “it should be poor empowerment, for all races”. They felt that the government was only catering for Black people in their transformation process and thus excluding the indigenous Khoi-Khoi people of Hout Bay from access to fishing rights – “the indigenous people are not getting the rights

7 Deemed illegal by the state
and access to the ocean”. However, the same group of poachers felt that the people of Hout Bay were “too quiet, we do not protest enough”; this was explained by the fact that “they leave us to poach, to keep us quiet”. The combination of the community not voicing their opinions and grievances strongly enough with the political marginalisation on the part of the government has left the community, and individuals within it, without the leverage to secure legal rights – and thus extremely vulnerable.

There is a strong feeling of anger towards the government due to the perception that there is corruption in the government. Many Coloured people in Hout Bay feel as though the government made many promises to them that have not been fulfilled. This was especially in terms of providing jobs, housing and access to marine resources. The post-1994 restructuring of the fishing industry did not benefit those whom it was supposed to benefit. As root causes reflect the distribution of power in a society, those people who are economically marginal (such as urban squatters) tend to be of marginal importance to those who hold economic and political power. This political marginalisation creates a source of vulnerability for such groups and can be related to the Hangberg community. Their access to resources and livelihoods is less secure and more likely to generate higher levels of vulnerability. In Hangberg, this is illustrated by the large number of fishers who have no legal rights to marine resources and are therefore poaching (Blaikie et al., 1994).

5.2.2 Unemployment in Hangberg

"The government needs to look at job creation" – (CMC, MCM)

"Unemployment is a big thing in the ghetto” – respondent

Unemployment stands out as an extremely important driver of vulnerability in Hangberg. All of the poachers spoke about the fact that there were no jobs available and that they simply had “no choice” or option other than to poach. As one respondent told me, “many of the guys have matric, but there is no work available”. Those that did have some source of income from other jobs said that it was very part-time or sporadic work that could not be relied upon for a suitable standard of living. This lack of access to waged employment leaves the economically active population of Hangberg without the financial resources with which to legally support their dependents or to secure legal rights to fishing.
While the view that there were no/limited jobs available to the people of Hangberg was held by both poachers and authorities, there was a feeling from one official that the people of Hangberg were not taking the opportunities that were available. This official felt the there was an attitude problem within the community that was preventing them from getting work on big boats or at the harbour because they “have a false pride” and felt that the wages were too low. The poachers also spoke about the low wages offered for such jobs and blamed foreigners for driving down the wages as they worked as extremely cheap labour – “the land is overflowing with foreigners...they are cheap labour...and the wages go down because they work for nothing”. This political issue of foreigners in South Africa only served to increase the poachers’ dissatisfaction towards the government, which was perceived as inefficient and corrupt.

5.2.3 Summary
The historical political marginalisation of the people of Hangberg, the current corruption in government and the resulting unemployment issues can be seen as the root causes. The manifestation of these root causes is that the traditional bona fide fishers of Hangberg have not been able to access legal access to the marine resources that they were historically reliant on (reasons discussed below in dynamic pressures). The result is that the fishers are economically vulnerable in terms of disposable income and vulnerable in terms of physical danger and are left in a position with limited alternatives.

5.3 DYNAMIC PRESSURES
There are three main dynamic pressures that translate the root causes into unsafe conditions. These are: the inability of the poachers in Hangberg to secure legal rights to harvest marine resources (historically and in the future); the difficulty in making a living from small-scale legal fishing; and the rock lobster closed area and MPA surrounding Hout Bay.

5.3.1 Inability to secure legal rights in Hangberg
The reasons that many fishers have not secured quotas to fish legally can be explained by the expensive, unclear and complex process involved in application for such rights.
These problems are compounded by the lack of political representation and leverage afforded to the most vulnerable fishers in Hangberg.

"There were too many papers, many of the fishers are illiterate" – respondent.
The low education levels of many of the fishers in Hangberg left them without the skills to apply for such quotas on their own. Many of the poachers stated that they had not completed school, some had not had any education past Std. 2. Very few had studied further than Matric level. They also stated that their parents were illiterate which left their fathers (who were also fishers) without a chance to apply for quotas. The result of this was that it left the door open for "consultants" to help the fishers to complete the application forms for exorbitant fees. Many of these so called consultants either conned people out of their money, or used their status as traditional fishers to secure a legal quota for a company in which the fishers had extremely limited shares. Many of the poachers I spoke to complained of such stories having happened to them or someone they knew.

"Give us what belongs to us...we have been robbed" – respondent.
There was a feeling of anger and mistrust towards those more educated members of the community who held the quotas but “had never been to sea in their lives” and “did not even know what crayfish are”; and were not allowing their quotas to benefit the community as a whole. This highlights the lack of political representation of the bona fide and poorest members of the fishing community who are the most vulnerable. As Isaacs (2003) points out “their perception of the redistribution is that it was unfair and often benefited friends of the ANC” (her emphasis, pg 129). Since many fishers did not benefit from the restructuring of the fishing industry, they justify their poaching due to this lack of access to resources (Isaacs, 2003).

Another stumbling block for the success of the limited-commercial sector was that the application was extremely expensive and simply out of reach for some fishers.
The application for legal rights requires a payment; for some quotas the fee is as much as R7000 (pers comm. OM TMNP MPA). This money represents a significant sum for a poor individual. One respondent, who was going to apply for the experimental crayfish quotas in the 2000-2001 season, spent the R5 that was to accompany his application on food because he had not eaten properly for two days. Other
respondents claimed that the application was very expensive for them and that it was very risky to apply considering the money was non-refundable if the application was not successful. This financial risk and the complicated requirements which accompany an application led to many of the respondents simply not applying for legal quotas and fishing illegally instead.

During the time of the research, MCM was in the process of offering and accepting applications for the issuing of long-term fishing rights (between 8-15 years). The rationale behind the issuing of such long-term rights is to create stability within the fishing industry and to provide “fishers and fishing companies with the certainty that they require to invest in new vessels, develop new products and entrench South Africa’s reputation as a reliable source of high quality seafood products” (Kleinschmidt, H., 2005). As mentioned previously, these long-term rights are controversial because while on the one hand they do provide stability to the industry, on the other hand they exclude unsuccessful applicants for a significant period of time. The aim of these long-term rights is to provide equitable access to marine resources for those who were excluded in the last round of quotas (CMCI MCM, pers. comm., 2005). The problem with this is that for many who have applied, only a small percentage will be successful – of the 6000 applications received for individual quotas only 2500 will be successful. As the CMCI from MCM put it: “it’s like a lottery…it’s a matter of luck”.

While the authorities claim that the application forms are much easier to understand and more user friendly than the last ones, many of the poachers who have applied, or attempted to apply did not agree. On inspection it seems as though the forms are clear and well laid out. However, the number of annexures needed to accompany the form makes it an extremely difficult and expensive process, especially in the light of travel costs associated with obtaining these documents. The forms were given out two weeks prior to the hand-in date and MCM was very strict in terms of the cut-off time for hand-ins. One respondent arrived with his completed application five minutes late but was refused when he tried to hand it in.

Another problem for poachers with the application for long-term rights is the fact that it is essential to provide evidence of previous involvement in the fishing industry. For
many of the poachers who have never had a legal right to fish, any evidence of involvement would amount to implicating themselves as poachers. Despite this, most of the respondents had applied for the rights and said that most of the illegal fishers in Hangberg had as well. The outcome of this round of rights allocations is going to be crucial to the future of poaching in Hangberg. There was a strong sentiment among those who had applied that there would be a reaction if they were excluded again.

"All my hopes and mind is set on this, if the government does not give me (a legal right) now, then it is wrong... if they don't give it to me, I'm going to burn things... I have many years of experience, now I'm getting hurt" — A respondent on his feelings towards the long-term rights.

The implications are that those who are unsuccessful would be committed to fishing illegally for the next 8-15 years, and they would be joined by those who decided to enter the fishing industry in Hangberg in the next 8-15 years. In light of the limited job prospects in Hout Bay, this is an extremely significant number of people.

5.3.2 The difficulties of making living with recreational and small-scale fishing

The regulations regarding recreational fishing do not allow for any of the catch to be legally sold. For WCRL the daily bag limit is 4 per permit holder only in season (15 November to 31 January). No person shall buy, barter, sell, transport or offer for sale any WCRL which is caught with a recreational permit (DEAT, 2004). This means that legally, the only thing to do is to personally consume the rock lobster. While the new definitions for subsistence fishing in the MLRA and according to the SFTG do allow for the sale or bartering of part of the catch, MCM have not allowed the people of Hangberg to be termed subsistence fishers and can therefore not legally fish and sell their catch unless they have a limited-commercial quota. Respondents stated that the costs involved in travelling to other areas to fish with a recreational permit made the trip not financially viable for most fishers. The costs included transport for the fishers and the boats, fuel for the boats and the general running costs of owning a boat.

A number of respondents mentioned that there are difficulties in making sufficient money when fishing with a small legal quota. Firstly, there are significant costs
involved in owning a boat. These include the costs for transporting the boat, licensing
the boat, general maintenance of the boat, fuel for the boat and paying for the permit.
Secondly, it is not guaranteed that you will catch fish and any catch must be split
between all the crew members. Exacerbating this problem is the “harassment” by
MCM. It was claimed that MCM officials would approach these boats while they
were out at sea and thus chase away any fish that were close to the boat. The feeling
was that the authorities should leave the fishers in peace while they were out fishing
and rather check their permits and their catch on exiting and entering the harbour.
“These are unnecessary difficulties – then people have to go looking for fish again”.
This “harassment” by the authorities and the resulting lack of catch was cited by a
number of respondents as to why even those with small legal quotas were poaching –
“to put some food on the table”.

5.3.3 The WCRL closed area and the MPA
The main source of income for fishers in Hangberg comes from the sale of WCRL.
Therefore the rock lobster closed area has prohibited the people of Hangberg from
legally accessing this resource for many years (recreationally and commercially). The
problem of legal access to marine resources was further compounded by the
establishment of the TMNP MPA and the Karbonkelberg Sanctuary zone.

The ecological importance of these sanctuary zones is clear in terms of sustainability
and biodiversity and has been discussed previously (see 4.3.4). However, another of
the stated goals of the MPA is to “encourage economic opportunities for previously
disadvantaged communities in the vicinity of the Cape Peninsula MPA” (CPMPA,
2002: 7). The consequence of the development of the Karbonkelberg Sanctuary zone
was that linefish were no longer allowed to be caught recreationally around Hangberg
(pers comm. OM TMNP MPA., 2005). This meant that those who were previously
fishing linefish with a recreational permit were no longer allowed to do so. On the one
hand it was surprising, that there was no major opposition to the proposed MPA by
the fishers or any other organisation (OM TMNP MPA, pers. comm., 2005). On the
other hand, it may be explained by the fact that it would not have made a difference to
the regulations regarding WCRL, this being the most financially important catch for
the poachers.
This development has not been seen as an “economic opportunity” for the community, and has rather made it more difficult for the local fishers to make a living from the ocean. MCM does very little in terms of education and awareness in Hangberg around the importance of the MPA and rather focuses its efforts on policing the area. It is clear that the goal of protecting the marine environment within the MPA has been prioritised over the goal of encouraging economic opportunities for previously disadvantaged communities. The OM TMNP MPA told me that he believes “the success of the MPA depends on enforcement”.

While the SFTG report recommends that no fishing should be allowed in a MPA, it goes on to say that possible exceptions to this no-take policy should be considered in individual cases, and only if the area has been used historically (>50 years) for subsistence or small-scale commercial fishing, particularly where fishers are harvesting culturally significant resources (Harris et al., 2002). As there have been subsistence fishers active in Hout Bay for longer than 50 years, it could be argued that the subsistence harvesting of WCRL should exempt from the no-take policy of the MPA.

5.3.4 Summary

Without political representation or leverage, education or financial resources the marginalised fishers in Hangberg have had little chance of securing a legal quota, historically and currently. Combining this with the difficulties faced in legally fishing (recreationally or commercially) and the strict protection of significant marine resources in Hout Bay leaves the fishers without alternatives to an illegal livelihood. These policy and bureaucratic difficulties can be seen as the dynamic pressures that drive the politically marginal poor fishers into a “particular form of insecurity” (Blaikie et al., 1994) – in this case the unsafe condition of a dangerous livelihood.

5.4 UNSAFE CONDITIONS

The physical manifestation of the dynamic pressures is the specific forms of vulnerability faced by the fishers. When issues of danger and safety were mentioned in the interviews, responses generally fell into two categories; the danger of being caught by the authorities while poaching and the physical dangers associated with poaching.
5.4.1 The Authorities as a Danger

"The dangers are the inspectors and police and law enforcement" – respondent. When the subject of the dangers associated with fishing was mentioned, the initial response of most respondents was to mention the danger of being caught by the authorities in the act. The policing of marine resources is the responsibility of MCM within the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. MCM in turn have contracted SANParks and specifically TMNP to manage the MPA (pers comm., OM TMNP MPA., 2005). The Marine Rangers of the TMNP MPA go on daily patrols to the Restricted Areas in the MPA in search of poachers. MCM has Marine Conservation Inspectors that patrol the areas in which they are stationed. MCM also make use of a number of research vessels to help their anti-poaching activities as well as a dedicated anti-poaching vessel (the Pelagus) which travels around the MPA’s of the Western Cape making both day and night patrols. During the time of research the vessel was stationed in Hout Bay. The captain of the boat said that the amount of poaching in an area was directly related to the presence of the boat and that poaching increased as soon as the boat moved out of an area. The police and the public are also involved to a lesser extent in the policing of poaching. Poachers felt that the presence of the authorities made their activities unsafe as the consequences of getting caught are serious for a poacher. These consequences will be discussed in further detail in the following section (See 5.6).

Another risk in terms of getting caught is related to the sale of the poached goods. As the sale of recreationally caught species is also prohibited, it is dangerous for the poachers to offer any fish for sale.

5.4.2 Physical Dangers

The presence of the authorities is much stronger during the day. It is only the Pelagus or the research vessels that go out at night, and not every night. The result is that most poaching takes place during the night. Another reason cited for poaching at night is that crayfish like the dark and are more active at night, thus improving the catches. While the chances of being caught are decreased and the catches improve, the physical danger of poaching increases during the night. The poachers never use any light while out at sea and are therefore at risk from hitting rocks or other vessels.
There are a number of factors that exacerbate this risk. Firstly, the vessels used by the fishers are small row boats only big enough for two people; these boats can easily be capsized by hitting an object or a swell. Secondly, there are no safety standards or regulations for these boats. The poachers generally do not wear life-jackets as these are bulky, restrict movement, are very visible and are expensive to purchase. No other safety standards such as pyrotechnics (flares) are used. It was also mentioned that some of the poachers could not swim or were not very strong swimmers. Thirdly, some of the poachers partake in drinking alcohol or consuming drugs before going to sea. While the use of substance can be a confidence enhancer for the poachers, it would seriously increase their risk of death or injury in the case of an accident. The use and/or abuse of substances must also be seen in the context of the social situation within the community where it has been shown to be an issue (Isaacs, 2003). One respondent specifically highlighted the seriousness of the problems faced in Hangberg in terms of alcohol and drug abuse. The link between drugs and poaching was highlighted by the authorities and the poachers. The story that surfaced was that certain drug merchants within the community were also involved in poaching activities. They would hire young men to work on their boats and would pay them in drugs; or the men would inevitably end up spending their money on drugs.

Similar physical dangers face those poachers who are fishing from the shore. The dangers associated with this are slipping off the rocks and getting injured or washed out to sea and drowned. Another danger facing poachers is conflict between groups of poachers. Some of the respondents spoke about “bad elements in ‘the game’ (poaching)”. These bad elements were cited as mainly being gangsters from outside of Hout Bay. It was claimed that they would fight, stab and murder people to get their catch if it had been a good one.

Another source of violence mentioned was the violence between poachers and the authorities. Many poachers claimed that the authorities were very physically and verbally abusive towards them when they were caught. The reports on violence from poachers towards the authorities were conflicting and unclear. The Marine Rangers claimed that the poachers would throw rocks at them or run into the settlement where they would be joined by other members of the community in attacking them. Other authorities claimed that reports of violence from poachers towards the authorities
were untrue and that any conflict between the two groups was instigated by the authorities.

5.5 EXTERNAL PRESSURES
There are a number of external factors which combine with the progression of vulnerability of the poachers to produce an ‘everyday disaster’ or a serious risk or consequence for a household. These are the policing of marine resource poaching by the authorities and the weather. The policing by authorities has been discussed above (See 5.4.1).

5.5.1 The Weather
The weather plays an extremely important role in the poaching of marine resources. While the authorities implied that there was poaching taking place on a daily basis in Hout Bay, the poachers claimed that their activities were strictly weather permitting. The waves and the weather were closely monitored by the poachers “who know how to read the conditions”. They would usually poach when it was deemed to be safe conditions. During winter, bad conditions prevail, making it especially difficult to go out. However, it was stated that some of the poachers would try their luck even in bad conditions. Another source of concern for poachers was the sudden change in weather or swell conditions when they were out at sea. They usually came in as soon as the conditions changed for the worse.

5.6 EVERYDAY RISKS AND HOUSEHOLD CONSEQUENCES
Risks, hazards and consequences, like unsafe conditions, relate to the policing by authorities and to the physical realities and dangers of poaching.

5.6.1 Legal Consequences
The consequences of getting caught are numerous and are dependent on the number of species that the poachers have taken. Firstly, and most commonly, the poachers have no marine resources on them and are issued with a fine or a warning for being in a restricted area (usually R300). Secondly, the poachers are caught with some resources and are fined and have their catch and/or equipment confiscated. Thirdly, the poachers are fined, have their equipment and boat confiscated and are arrested for a serious offence. The Offence Register and the Exhibit Register at the MPA Offices
show that the number of people who have been caught for poaching in Hout Bay since March is around 30 and the number of arrests has been six. The number of arrests in the TMNP MPA since March this year is 51 people. Most of the poachers said that they have been caught at least once, and many have been caught on numerous occasions. One poacher had just finished serving a three and a half year sentence for poaching when he was interviewed.

5.6.2 Physical Consequences

"This is a dangerous game – like chess" – a respondent on his livelihood.

The physical consequences for poachers involved in an accident while at work are injury or death. Poachers may be injured from falling and slipping on the rocks or being assaulted by other poachers or the authorities. The risk of death is related to falling off the rocks or out of the boat and drowning, or falling out of the boat, getting hypothermia and dying as a consequence of this condition. The figures given during interviews as to the number of drowning per year varied from 4 to 15. The CMCI from MCM said that there had been five deaths from drowning already this year (in September). At the time of the interview the search was underway for two poachers whose boat had been found out at sea and they had been reported missing by their families. Many of the poachers that I interviewed spoke of close friends or family members who had lost their lives while poaching. Most recently one poacher said “my cousin died on the rocks two months ago, many people lose their lives on the rocks”. The poachers spoke very strongly about the fact that they were “forced" to “put their lives at risk” in order to survive.

5.6.3 Household Consequences

“As disaster specialists begin to recognise the importance of small disasters on the lives, assets, livelihoods and incomes of people, the distinction between risks from disasters and risks from everyday hazards begins to lessen” (Bull-Kamanga et al., 2003). For the poachers of Hangberg, these everyday hazards have a significant impact on their lives, assets, livelihoods and income. The consequences of being caught, physical injury and death are not only significant for the individual concerned but also for the household of the individual.

---

8 People felt that they were forced into poaching as there was simply no legal alternative afforded to them. (See root causes and dynamic pressures.)
5.6.3.1 Getting caught
The financial implications of a fine or the confiscation of equipment are serious for the poacher and the household. The immediate consequence of a fine is the loss of disposable income which would have been used for household expenses such as food, clothing or school fees. Many poachers spoke about family members “going to bed with an empty stomach” when they were unable to provide food.

Confiscation of boat or equipment means that not only is the individual not able to make an income, they have to re-invest money into their operation to get more equipment. It was spoken about as “starting from the beginning again”.

Another consequence of getting caught is the possibility of arrest and/or imprisonment. The seriousness of being arrested can be shown by the impact this can have on an individual and a household. An individual who is arrested and imprisoned will end up with a criminal record; this has negative implications for the future job opportunities of that individual. The respondent that had recently been released from a jail sentence spoke of looking for a job and being turned down because “people don’t want to give you work if you are a criminal”. The household would lose the income previously provided by the individual who is arrested. Considering that many of the respondents claimed to be the sole breadwinner in their household, the loss of that income would have a serious consequence on the functioning of the household.

5.6.3.2 Injury
Financial costs associated with an injury at work would be the full medical expenses (obviously there is no financial compensation for being ‘injured at work’ if you are a poacher) and the future loss of income while the individual is recovering or if they are unable to poach again in the future.

5.6.3.3 Death
The death of a poacher has a severe impact on a household where the income they provided was significant. The family would have to find alternative sources of income or ways to survive. This could push other household members into illegal and/or
dangerous livelihoods as a consequence. The emotional stress associated with loss of a family member would place even greater strain on the family.

5.7 SUMMARY OF PAR
The root causes of political marginalisation, unemployment and limited livelihood opportunities place the subsistence fishers of Hangberg in a position of vulnerability in terms of securing legal rights to marine resources. The dynamic pressures are the environmental, legal and bureaucratic complications involved; which, combined with the root causes prohibit them from realising these rights. The result is that the fishers have to operate illegally, at night, thus placing themselves in unsafe conditions. The combination of these conditions and an external pressure such as bad weather or the authorities leads to an ‘everyday risk’ and consequences for the individual and their household.

5.8 ADAPTATION TO RISK
The subsistence fishers of Hangberg are powerless to change the root causes, dynamic pressures or external pressures that increase their vulnerability and risk. Instead, their adaptations to risk are focussed on trying to minimise the unsafe conditions by avoiding the authorities, avoiding physical injuries and diversifying their sources of income.

5.8.1 Avoiding the authorities
“They have lots of ways...they are well organised” – OM TMNP MPA
The poachers have developed a number of methods and techniques for avoiding the authorities. Most importantly, the poachers need to know the movements of the anti-poaching vessel and the research boat. The authorities claimed that the poachers send down “lookouts” to the harbour on bicycles to see whether the vessels are still there or not and to report on the activities of the authorities. Once the poachers are out at sea, a lookout will be posted on top of the “Sentinel” mountain or at the harbour to alert the poachers if the authorities are leaving to go on a patrol. In the past, if the lookout was on top of the Sentinel they would let off a flare to signal that the vessels were leaving the harbour. However, today the use of cell phones is much more common as a means of communication.
If these ‘early-warning systems’ fail and the poachers are approached by authorities they attempted to either hide their catch in bags or throw it back. The consequences of being caught are determined by the number of illegal species that have been caught so the poachers try to ensure that they do not have anything on them. In order to throw the authorities off they often hide ‘decoy bags’ with nothing in them.

5.8.2 Avoiding physical injury

The physical injuries associated with poaching are most often related to bad weather. Poachers stated that their activities were strictly weather permitting. They would consult with the more experienced fishers about the conditions and simply not go out if the conditions were not right. In terms of safety equipment there is very little being used – some people wear lifejackets occasionally, and diving suits are getting more popular with those that can afford them. In response to the risk of being attacked while poaching, most poachers form part of a ‘crew’ of 2-6 people who usually work together. Many poachers also arm themselves with knives while they are at work.

5.8.3 Diversifying sources of income

In the context of a weather dependent, dangerous livelihood, alternative sources of income are extremely important for a household in case the fishing does not provide enough food or money. “This ‘livelihood diversification’ refers to a households attempt to reduce its vulnerability by having more than one livelihood activity” (de Satgé et al., 2002: 11). Approximately 75% of respondents had some other source of income apart from their poaching activities. However, just over half of these sources of income were legal and none of them were regular, except in the case of government grants. The legal work obtained was generally sporadic day work, often unskilled and informal, such as cutting and selling wood, gardening, or working for friends or relatives. The illegal sources of income were having a games shop⁹, selling alcohol and selling drugs¹⁰. These stories correspond closely with the findings in the SFTG report (See 1.3). Nearly one third of the respondents’ households were receiving some form of government grant, either child grants or pensions.

---

⁹ A game shop consists of a pool table and arcade games in the dwelling. These are often not owned by the dwelling owner but rented out to them.
¹⁰ Selling ‘dagga’ (Marijuana) was mentioned by one respondent only, however, through observation during the interviews it was clear that a number of other respondents were also selling dagga.
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

"Hout Bay is a sad and strange story – the only thing the guys know is to walk into the ocean and fish – to put food on the table. The government is imposing rules and not giving them other options" – OM TMNP MPA.

6.1.1 Introduction

This study has aimed to highlight root causes and dynamic pressures that underpin the illegal fishing activities in Hangberg, while at the same time, to show the importance of subsistence fishing to the overall livelihoods of these households. It also aimed to identify the vulnerabilities and risks related to poaching and how external pressures transform these vulnerabilities into risk for a household or individual. Finally, it aimed to analyse the impact of an ‘everyday hazard’ on the household level. The findings show that subsistence fishing is not only important in terms of food and income but also in terms of cultural heritage and identity. The unsafe conditions in which these fishers operate leave them vulnerability to physical, legal and financial consequences on the individual and household level.

6.1.2 Complexity

The issue of access to marine resources in Hout Bay is extremely complex. The interaction and relationship between the environmental, political, racial, bureaucratic and social components (root causes and dynamic pressures) of the issue are inextricable. Furthermore, the number of components related to this issue has led to the multiple dimensions of vulnerability of the poachers in Hangberg. In a way, the situation in Hangberg represents a microcosm of the larger problem of finding a balance between sustainability, conservation and social justice which is being faced on the global scale in relation to many precious resources. The tensions arise as conflict emerges over the importance of preserving the future of the earth and at the same time meeting peoples’ needs and livelihoods at present. Conservation ethics in South Africa have historically had a clear ecological focus. While changes in environmental policy have been significant, the transition out of this paradigm into a more people-centred socially just paradigm is a complex and slow one. In the fishing industry it has been clear that changes in policy are not enough. The question of implementation needs to be critically examined and addressed. MCM’s
implementation of subsistence fisheries has been species-oriented, inconsistent and fraught with corruption. The need to build capacity and to develop a strategic perspective on implementation within MCM is clear. In order to successfully implement a subsistence fisheries sector there needs to be a clearer understanding of: who the poachers are; the sustainability of their activities; and the positive social aspect of poaching.

6.1.3 Who are the poachers?

"It's in the blood" – respondent.

All of the poachers that I interviewed had been fishing since they were young boys (aged 10 – 16) and they had been taught to fish by their fathers. They felt strongly that they were from fishing families and a fishing village/community and that their activities were a way of preserving their cultural and social identity. They had all been fishing for between 13 and 40 years. A number of poachers mentioned that they were simply fishers, doing what their fathers had done, and their fathers before that. They spoke about a feeling they got when out at sea, a love for the ocean that went beyond the money they would earn. The oldest of the respondents, who is no longer poaching, spoke about the life of a fisherman in depth. “It is a hard life…I am struggling…I can’t afford the school fees…I am the only one working”. He also mentioned his feelings towards stopping fishing: “I have been fishing my whole life, I would rather die at sea…when fishing is in you – you will never stop”.

A number of the poachers claimed that it was their God-given right to be fishing in Hout Bay. They felt that the government had no right to place restrictions on the activities that their families and forefathers had been historically involved in. The authorities do not agree that it is their right to be fishing there. The CMCI of MCM feels that God gave people laws, and that there need to be laws regarding the ocean and marine resources in order to ensure that there is something left for future generations (CMCI MCM, pers. comm., 2005). The OM TMNP MPA suggests that the people of Hangberg do not have God-given rights to the marine resources in Hout Bay, but rather that they should be given preference to access rights to the available quotas (OM TMNP MPA, pers. comm., 2005).
The authorities claim that there is a distinction between two types of poachers in Hangberg. There are the older poachers who are just poaching to have some food and to survive; and then there are the younger poachers who are part of syndicates who are involved in larger scale poaching and gang- and drug related-activities. There is a certain amount of understanding and empathy for the first group of poachers from the authorities. “They are not all criminals or drug smugglers, they are just people” (CMCI MCM, pers. comm., 2005). Some of the poachers feel that there is no such clear distinction between such groups. It was explained to me that all poachers start out poaching for survival in the light of no other option for income. Some of the poachers who have a “business sense” or “entrepreneurial skill” end up investing their money in other side businesses such as running a shebeen\textsuperscript{11} or selling drugs. Their investing in other illegal activities was explained by the fact that their livelihoods were already criminalised by ‘the system’, and therefore the next step was to further their illegal activities. This ‘livelihoods diversification’ has been discussed in a previous section (See 5.7.3).

\textbf{6.1.4 Sustainability of the resources related to poaching}

The question of sustainability of the fisheries resources is critical to finding a workable solution to the issue. While this research can by no means answer this question, it does highlight certain important aspects of sustainability. The aim of the rock lobster closed area is to protect the breeding ground of the species. Unregulated poaching of WCRL in berry\textsuperscript{12} or undersized species poses a threat to the sustainability of the species. Many of the poachers claimed that they were careful so as not to take such species, and that their nets did not allow them to catch undersized species. Furthermore, as part of their indigenous belief system as Khoi-Khoi subsistence fishers, they clearly felt that their activities were weather dependent, and thus nature would limit their catches and thus maintain the necessary balance. However, it was conceded that poaching by certain groups was ‘a bit out of hand’ and that there was some disrespect towards marine resources. It is clear from the \textit{exhibit register} and the \textit{offence register} that many undersized and in berry species were being poached. The authorities felt that the poachers were definitely having a significant impact on the

\textsuperscript{11} Illegal liquor outlet
\textsuperscript{12} When they are carrying eggs
marine resources even though they claim that MCM does not have an accurate picture of the scale of poaching.

The future of the scale of poaching in Hangberg will hinge on the outcome of the long-term rights allocations. While the authorities believe that their increased efforts in policing marine resources will decrease the number of poachers, the poachers feel that if they are not allocated legal rights they will have no other option but to poach, and their numbers will increase. It is clear, however, that both the poachers and the authorities feel that subsistence harvesting of marine resources by the people of Hangberg would serve as a sustainable solution to the problem.

6.1.5 Positive social facet of poaching

"Guys have stopped killing and hurting and raping, there is a lower crime rate because of the poaching" – respondent.

While poaching is illegal and extremely risky, it can be seen in a positive light. A number of poachers mentioned to me that they were poaching as a means to stay away from a life of crime and violence. In light of the fact there are seriously limited employment opportunities in Hout Bay and Cape Town in general, poaching is certainly a more positive choice than other illegal occupations such as theft, gangsterism and drug dealing. This is not to say that all poachers are choosing to poach because they do not have anything to do with other illegal activities – the link has already been made – but rather they are choosing a livelihood option that under different political, environmental and social circumstances could be considered legal. Exploring this idea further in the interviews highlighted the fact that many young men who were becoming involved in other serious crimes turned to poaching as a means to escape from that life – an opportunity not afforded to many young men in other parts of Cape Town. In a sense, the poachers are weighing up the risk of poaching against other types of crime, and in the context of a ‘fishing village’, poaching is the logical choice. One respondent explained that “fishing is a way to bring people back down to the level they are supposed to be on, to get them off the street, drugs and other crimes”.

6.1.6 Subsistence fishing
“It is only labelled as poaching by ‘the system’ – we see ourselves as subsistence fishermen” – respondent.

The questions of whether the poachers are subsistence fishers; or if Hangberg is a subsistence fishing community are extremely difficult to answer. The SFTG report has grappled with a label for urban fishers. Being part of a cash economy urban fishers sell most of their catch (especially high value species such as WCRL); whether or not they can be termed “subsistence fishers” is not clear, but they are extremely vulnerable (Branch et al., 2002). The feeling from many of the poachers was that they are bona fide subsistence fishers, and what they are doing is not just a way to make some money, but rather a part of their cultural heritage as members of a fishing village.

MCM’s current focus on the issuing of long-term limited-commercial rights suggests that they are trying to provide an opportunity for historically disadvantaged fishers through this channel and not through subsistence fishing. However, MCM will only be issuing long-term rights to 2500 people while 6000 have applied (for Cluster C\textsuperscript{13}). This suggests that many will again be excluded from legal fishing rights. The CMCI of MCM told me that there was the idea to open up subsistence fishing in Hout Bay a while ago; this ended when the area was declared a MPA (CMCI MCM, pers. comm., 2005). It does not seem like a possibility anymore. This is unfortunate as those who are most closely involved in the poaching activities in Hout Bay (poachers and authorities) feel that some form of subsistence rights would be the best solution to the issue of legal fishing rights.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS
6.2.1 Further research

In order to determine if the implementation of a subsistence fisheries sector would be feasible, further empirical scientific research would be needed. The number of species being harvested by the poachers and its impact on the sustainability of the resource would need to be clearly determined to ascertain whether the continued harvesting of resources would have a detrimental effect.

\textsuperscript{13} Species are divided into clusters A, B, C and D. WCRL falls into cluster C.
6.2.2 Possible solutions?

My research aim was not to find a workable solution to the issue of illegal fishing; and indeed I feel that obtaining a balance between social justice, the sustainability of marine resources and ensuring economic benefits from fishing is extremely complicated. However, during my fieldwork the topic of what to do about the situation did surface on numerous occasions. The feeling from both poachers and authorities was that a form of subsistence fishing in Hout Bay could solve many of the problems experienced at present. It was suggested that MCM issue subsistence permits to all the *bona fide* fishers in Hangberg\(^{14}\) who do not have legal permits already, allowing them to catch five crayfish everyday. It was also suggested that MCM set up a co-operative in Hout Bay where the subsistence fishers could legally sell their catch. This would also provide these for sale to the local communities at a reasonable price, and also sell to other markets such as restaurants. In this way MCM would be able to monitor the catch and it is believed this would decrease the amount of illegal fishing, and thus decrease the number of species being harvested in the MPA. The locals would look after the resource it they had a vested interest in its preservation and would protect it from outside poachers. One poacher claimed that he would rather have a subsistence permit where he could catch 5 crayfish a day – and have all the other people who make a living from the sea also have that same opportunity – than have a quota. His reasoning was that the subsistence system is simply more fair and equitable and it leaves the space within this fishing village for newcomers to enter the industry and older fishers to retire – instead of closing the industry for the next 8 – 15 years, while the quota system “sidelines too many people”.

My personal opinion is that a sustainable subsistence fisheries sector could be implemented in Hout Bay. However, to achieve this, there needs to be coming together of the interests of the poachers and the authorities. Some form of ‘round table’ discussion is necessary to create a system that is mutually beneficial. The key factor here is to ensure that the poachers are given an authoritative voice with which they can express their historical and cultural claim to harvesting marine resources. It is clear that both the poachers and the authorities know how the other party operates;

\(^{14}\) This would not be a straightforward process, however, using the experience and knowledge of the local authorities and fishers it would be possible to identify all those who make a living from the sea.
out of this it is possible to find a workable solution that allows the poachers to legally fish and sell their catch and allows MCM to monitor the catch and ensure ecological stability of the MPA.

Further work is also necessary to educate community members around the importance of ensuring sustainability of marine resources. The authorities recognise that their organisations are not doing enough in terms of education around the importance of conserving the resources and the benefits of the MPA. However, they recognise that education would not “stop a man who has no food from poaching”. The feeling from the CMCI of MCM was that any education needed to accompany job creation by the government. She said that “the main issue is a socio-economic problem which MCM can’t solve” (pers comm., 2005). However, Sowman argues that although MCM’s focus is on fisheries management, it is also required to align its activities and procedures to complement national priorities such as poverty alleviation and addressing food insecurity. “Consequently, where poor and vulnerable fishers need to harvest resources for food or as a contribution for livelihoods, but are unable to do so due to limits on the resources, government is obliged to facilitate the exploration of alternative livelihood opportunities” (Sowman, forthcoming pp 23). Therefore, part of a workable solution needs to incorporate the community as a whole, in providing education, job creation and the introduction of a subsistence fishing sector in Hout Bay.
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APPENDIX 2: INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal Details
- Where do you live?
- Who do you live with? (How many males, females, adults and children?)
- How long have you been living there? Where were you before that?
- How old are you?
- Where did you go to school? What education have you received?

Fishing activities
- How long have you been fishing for? How old were you when you began?
- Have you ever had a legal right to fish? During the experimental 2000/2001 season? Have you applied for a quota? What happened? Unsuccessful?
- How do you feel about the government’s role in providing legal access to fishing rights? Why have so many not got legal rights?
- How often do you go illegally fishing? As possible or only when you need fish/income?
- What do you do with the catch? Sell or consume? Which species are sold/consumed?
- Do you fish alone or in a group?
- What dangers do you face as a fisherman? What factors increases these dangers? (What conditions makes fishing more dangerous?) How have these dangers changed since you started fishing?
- What do you do to decrease these dangers? Safety? Not going out?
- Why do you still fish knowing these dangers?
- What happens if you get caught? What are the consequences for the household?
- Do you think this fisheries resources is going to last? Have the catches got smaller?
- Do you take undersize fish, or is there an unspoken rule against it?
- What do you think about the MPA? How has this changed your fishing activities?
- How do you feel about the new long-term rights being issued? Have you applied? What was the application process like?

Household/livelihoods information
- Do you have any other job? Part-time or full time?
- Are any other people in the house employed? What work?
- Other sources of income? Legal or illegal?
- Grants from the government?
- What do you spend the money on from the fishing?
- What does the household do when you cannot go fishing?
APPENDIX 3: LIFE HISTORY QUESTIONNAIRE

Conducted with those that have been involved in poaching and fishing for over 30 years – to determine the changes in the fishing and poaching industry.

**Personal Details**
- Where do you live?
- Who do you live with? (How many males, females, adults and children?)
- How long have you been living there? Where were you before that?
- How old are you?
- Where did you go to school? What education have you received?

**Fishing activities**
- How long have you been fishing for? How old were you when you began?
- How did you first become involved in fishing? Who taught you?
- Have been involved in working for a commercial fishing company?
- Have you ever had a legal right to fish? During the experimental 2000/2001 season? Have you applied for a limited-commercial quota? What happened?
- How do you feel about the government’s role in providing legal access to fishing rights? Why have so many not got legal rights?
- How often do you go fishing illegally? As possible or only when you need fish/income? In the past?
- What do you do with the catch? Sell or consume? Which species are sold/consumed?
- Do you fish alone or in a group?
- What dangers do you face as an illegal fisherman? What factors increases these dangers? (What conditions makes fishing more dangerous?) How have these dangers changed since you started fishing?
- What do you do to decrease these dangers? Safety? Not going out?
- Why do you still fish knowing these dangers?
- What happens if you get caught? What are the consequences for the household?
- Do you think this fisheries resources is going to last? Have the catches got smaller?
- Do you take undersize fish, or is there an unspoken rule against it?
- What do you think about the MPA? How has this changed your fishing activities?
- How do you feel about the new long-term rights being issued? Have you applied? What was the application process like?
- Approximately how many people are fishing illegally? Are they traditional fishers or commercial fishers or gang related fishers?
- How have the numbers of illegal fishers changed?
- How has the role/attitude of the authorities changed?
- How have the risks/dangers changed?
- How have the catches changed?

**Household/livelihoods information**
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• Do you have any other job?
• Are any other people in the house employed? What work?
• Other sources of income? Legal or illegal?
• Grants from the government?
• What do you spend the money on from the fishing?
• What does the household do when you cannot go fishing?

APPENDIX 4: INSTITUTIONAL INTERVIEW

Personal Details
• Name:
• Job Title?
• Job Description?
• Years at the job? Before that?

Fishing
• Is the poaching having a significant, negative impact on the fisheries resource?
• What about the impact of commercial fisheries?
• Are there any other environmental problems associated with the poaching?
• What is the ultimate aim of MCM in relation to the poaching situation?
  o Completely stop it?
  o Police it so it is regulated?
• Some of the poachers feel that they are traditional fishers, only taking what is their god given right; they only do it at night because it has been made illegal. How do you respond to this?
• Do you think that MCM has made access to legal rights within the grasp of traditional fishers?
• What are the dangers that the fishers face as illegal fishers?
• What measures do they take in response to these dangers?
• What happens to a fisherman once he is caught? How do you decide on the punishment, whether to confiscate, fine or arrest?
• Violence between poachers and authorities?
• Are the numbers of poachers increasing? Approximately how many poachers are there?
• Are the poachers all from Hout bay or are some out of town?
• What do you think the poachers are poaching for? Consumption? Selling? Export? Large-scale gang related?
• Is MCM or SANParks involved in empowering the fishing communities in the peninsula?
• Are there any real alternatives? What is the legal solution?
  o What about a subsistence fisheries sector? Will/Should it ever be tried again?
  o In the light of no other jobs, could you ever see it as a positive thing that keeps young men out of gangs and serious crimes?
• Ever been the idea of co-managing the subsistence fishing resources in Hangberg?
- Education and awareness around the importance of the MPA?
- To the future? What are the upcoming plans and goals for the MCM in relation to illegal fishing?
- A story that sums up the situation?
- Can I access any records as to how many people have been arrested/fined/imprisoned for illegal fishing? In Hout bay specifically.

CAPTAIN OF *PELAGUS*
- How often do you go out at night?
- How do you hear about poachers going out? Public?
- Relate a story about catching poachers.