

that when you were actually out on a boat, or are these things people just happen to mention?

RA: It depended on who you were with. If you turned the hatch cover upside down, you'd hear about it or if you said pig or something like that. With some people, it's a half joking kind of thing, but it's a normal topic of conversation that comes up.

[End of side one, tape two.]

This is Jennifer Murray. It's March 12th, 1987. This is my second interview with Dick Allen.

JM: Let's finish up on the chaotic times of the 1960's with the foreign fishing vessels still off the coast. Did the government try to help the New England Fishing Industry?

RA: In general, I would say not directly. Certainly they didn't support the 200 mile limit. The official government position was opposed to that. Right up until the time the bill was signed, we weren't sure whether it was going to be signed or not.

JM: Why?

RA: There were international considerations, different interpretations of international law, the military's needs around the world and what kind of precedence would be set. In the various international commissions that were set up, there would be a lot of room for different opinions on how helpful the government was, how fast they moved, how strong their

positions were. We certainly, in the industry, didn't feel like they did enough to protect our interests. I think that's always going to be a relative judgement. They were balancing off a lot of different concerns. Fishermen, I think, remain pretty convinced that the government is not very supportive. That continues right up until the present day if you look at the Administration's budget proposals for the National Marine Fisheries Service. They're talking about cuts of not quite in half, but \$170 million down to \$99 million for conservation and statistical gathering and things for the fishery. At one time, and probably still to some degree, fishermen tend to use the term State Department as meaning the government. They kind of view it as the enemy because it was largely the State Department that was opposed to the 200 mile limit. I think that gets transferred into just being a general feeling against the government.

JM: How readily did fishermen themselves get involved?

RA: There again, that's always a real relative thing, even when you get a big issue. The 200 mile limit probably brought fishermen together and made them as active as any issue has in my memory at least. Even at that, I would say the actual numbers of fishermen who were actively involved and actively supportive -- rather than just voicing support -- was still a

pretty small percentage.

JM: You said that you were involved in a lot of the ICNAF deliberations before the 200 mile limit was finally put into effect. What were some of those deliberations about? The military question and those things you just spoke of?

RA: No. Those were strictly on fisheries conservation issues, what kind of quotas should be applied, what the allocation among the different countries should be and questions of that nature.

JM: Were there allocations then?

RA: There were. In the last few years of ICNAF, they started to get into country quotas. They had an overall quota and then country quotas within that for different species on Georges Bank and the Southern New England area.

JM: How did that effect a place like Newport?

RA: They also had some mesh size regulations. What effected an area like Newport the most would have been the mesh size regulations. I don't know (thinking back that far) whether there was ever a time when U. S. fishermen had to stop fishing because their quotas were reached under ICNAF rules. It may have been, but I'm not aware that it was a serious problem.

JM: What species did those mesh sizes effect?

RA: Largely groundfish -- cod, haddock, yellowtail

flounders.

JM: How did they respond to the mesh size regulations?

RA: I don't know. It's going back a while. It was a time when I was just getting involved in things. It's hard for me to say.

JM: The 200 mile limit was passed in 1976 and put into effect in 1977. Could you explain what that covered?

RA: What it did was move the fisheries jurisdiction of the U. S. out from twelve miles to two hundred miles off the coast. There's some question as to whether that constitutes ownership of the resources. I think most people would agree it's not ownership of the resources. [It's] management authority, but in effect, it gave control to the United States over who was going to fish in the area and how much they were going to catch, what kind of rules were going to be put on the harvesting of the fisheries. What the fisherman was looking for was to get rid of the foreign fleets. What a lot of other people were looking for, particularly people in the bureaucracy, was a management system that would protect the resources and manage fishermen regardless of whether they were foreign fishermen or domestic fishermen. What we ended up with was something that was a mix. It began a process of getting rid of the foreign fleets, but it also put in a system of domestic management -- a regional council system that we

operate under today. That's brought about a lot of changes in how domestic fisheries are conducted -- a lot more rules and regulations under which fishermen have to operate.

JM: What bureaucracy wanted the management?

RA: There are a lot of people in the National Marine Fisheries Service, the State Department, a lot of academics. It's kind of a good old boy network in the government that's not necessarily one bureaucracy, but it's people who have worked in a number of different bureaucracies or in the academic community. It's kind of a fisheries bureaucratic community. Most of those people were involved in the development of that system.

JM: Did they want the management for ecological reasons? I'm sure that's pretty complicated.

RA: Yes it is. I think there were some that certainly had a legitimate concern for the resources and felt that just getting rid of the foreigners was not the answer to conserving the resources -- that domestic fishermen would be able to deplete the resources as well as the foreigners had. I think there were probably some that saw some opportunities for themselves to have positions in whatever system was put up. That, I think, was just a general tendency in the bureaucracy to keep building the bureaucracy. They just saw a new opportunity coming. People in

the bureaucracy still complain that the number of fishermen have kept growing and boats and the whole industry has grown, but that the federal budget has grown even more than that has. I don't think you can blame the fishermen for that. It was almost like the 200 mile bill was a bureaucratic employment bill that created a whole new system and new rationale and justification for more people doing more with the fisheries at the government level.

JM: A lot of people seem to think that the government is more of a pain than the foreigners [chuckles].

RA: Well, that's a natural reaction, I think. My own view is that a lot of this was necessary. I don't believe the system is by any means perfected yet, but we do need to have some kind of measures to regulate domestic fishermen as well.

JM: Do you think the domestic fishermen had much of an advance idea that they would be regulated so stringently?

RA: I think, in general, they had no concept of what would be involved. Sometimes I think the objections or the complaints are much more vocal than what's really required. There's just a tendency to react and complain. I think, overall, we're a lot better off with the system we have now without the foreign fleets than we were when we had the foreign fleets.

JM: What, in your mind, are the most important

consequences of that limit?

RA: I think reducing the foreign fishing pressure is probably the number one benefit to it. I think the domestic management system is a good one, but as I said, it needs a lot more development and a lot more fine tuning and some of it not so fine, probably. We've got a long way to go. It's only been ten years since we've tried this. It was a whole different concept in regulation and management. There are not many examples to go by in other fields or industries where you have an appointed body that represents the industry and private constituency as well as the states all joining together to try to come up with the regulations that apply to the industry. It's just a whole new way of operating. We've probably had some mistakes and tried things new ways and are still in a learning process. I think eventually it'll work out to everyone's benefit.

JM: Do you think the banks were more enthusiastic about giving fishermen money?

RA: No question about it. Although that whole process, I'm not sure where it would have gone without the 200 mile limit. Even prior to the 200 mile limit, you were finding economists and academic economists who were taking an interest in the fishing industry and trying to make a case of the fisherman as a businessman. Banks used to give fishermen loans on

their boats like they were car loans -- very short term loans, installment-type loans. It was a real effort to overcome that and give them longer term mortgages on boats. That was a process that was already happening when the 200 mile limit came along. The 200 mile limit was a highly visible thing and people picked up on it. The banks certainly got more interested in making fishing vessel loans. You got a lot of outside investors that were attracted to it. You got a lot of people putting together what turned out to be investment scams or tax dodges that have all pretty much gone by the board now. The whole atmosphere that went along with the 200 mile limit contributed to all of those things. We did have a big investment boom that occurred during the period immediately after the 200 mile limit. That, in some ways, helped some people. A lot of people made money on it, but in the long term, it's created some problems as well.

JM: So on one hand, there was regulation to prevent depletion and on the other hand, there's this growth. How did those two . . . ?

RA: When you say there was regulation to prevent depletion, that was the intent. One of the things we've seen is that the system has not really been able to prevent depletion. We've lived with a continuing low level of production of some of our



major fisheries. That's what some people view as one of the failures of the 200 mile limit or the legislation and the system that was set up. That, coupled with this growth -- it would be one thing if you had real growth in the stocks to support the growth in the number of boats and the investment, but in fact, in many cases, we've seen a real increase in the number of boats without an increase in the stocks. So the catch per boat has actually gone down. People are real concerned about this -- more and more boats all the time. In fact, a project that Atlantic Offshore is working on now looks at matching capital to resources in the fish harvesting industry. The subtitle is, "Limited Entry and Alternatives." Limited Entry has been one of the most controversial subjects in the fisheries. The academics and the bureaucrats have generally favored putting limits on the number of fishing licenses that are available -- limit the number of people in boats that could go out as a way for them to match how many people should be there considering the amount of resources that are available. Most fishermen have generally opposed that concept, feeling that it's a free enterprise system -- if somebody wants to get in the business and try it and see if they can make it, they should have the right to do that. More and more, the fishermen themselves are saying that there has to be

some kind of control or damper on it because there just doesn't seem to be any end to the number of boats that will keep coming into a fishery. It's largely because the attraction [is that] fishermen don't fish for fish, they fish for dollars. The amount of dollars changes without real consequence to the amount of the resource. As demand grows or new technology comes along to make it cheaper to catch the fish, then people can make more money at it so they keep putting more and more effort into it. I think most fishermen would agree that we're at a point where it just doesn't do any good to keep putting more effort into it. You just keep splitting up the pie more and more. Beyond that, I think more and more fishermen are agreeing that fishing pressure is capable of keeping the resources at a low point. If we just keep having more and more pressure, it makes it harder to bring the resources back.

JM: How would you go about keeping new people from . . . ?

RA: We really don't want to keep new people from coming into the business. That's one of the real objections to limited entry. But there are systems that can be looked at that would tend to control the number of boats without saying, "You can go fishing and you can't go fishing." We don't want to create a wealthy, privileged class of people who have fishing licenses and then a class of people who aren't able

to get them unless they have a lot of money and buy them from one of these people. There are a number of methods. One of the reasons we undertook this project was because this debate has been going on for years and years and people view it as an either or. Either have an open access fishery or a limited entry fishery. We think there's a whole range of options from open access with investment incentives, which is what we actually have now. There are various programs to help people get into the business and provide them with low cost loans and allow them to accumulate money and tax deferred funds and things. That stimulates investments as did the general tax law with the investment tax credit. You can start from that extreme and then you could look at an open access system that didn't have those incentives. You could create disincentives to make it less desirable for people to get into the business.

JM: Like what?

RA: You could put a tax on fishing effort.

JM: On everybody, or just new people?

RA: Well, either way. However you wanted to design the system. That's the thing. There are so many different options that people haven't looked at. What we're trying to do with this project is open people's minds up to new ideas and different options rather than just an either/or situation.

JM: Who's minds are you trying to open up?

RA: Everyone's [chuckles]. The fishermen's, the bureaucrats, the academics, the investors, lawyers, bankers, everyone who has an impact on investment in the fishing industry.

JM: An extensive project, I'm sure. Could you be more specific about fishing for dollars rather than fish?

RA: The end result that a fisherman is looking for, <sup>or</sup> are other businessmen in general, is what he ends up with for money at the end of the year. If fish is scarce, but because they're scarce they're high in price and the fisherman comes out with the same amount of money at the end of the year, then to him there's no real depletion. It's a balance between price and volume. He can either catch a lot of fish and get cheap money for them, or he can catch a few fish and get a lot of money for them. In fact, in some cases it's probably easier and cheaper for the fisherman if he's fishing on small quantities of fish. It just doesn't take the amount of labor, it doesn't take as large a boat. All his expenses may go down if he's fishing on fewer fish. It doesn't take as much ice and things like that. That's really what the fisherman tends to look at -- the value that he's receiving, not the volume that he's catching.

JM: But he never knows from day to day. How can he plan on how much money he's going to get? Isn't that a

little difficult?

RA: That's part of fishing. People are not in the business if they have to know from day to day how much they're going to get. They have an expectation of what a day might be, but more importantly, they look at the end of the year. That's what really counts. That's why some people don't really stick at it or you get crewmen that are paid on a share basis. They may work for a long time without making any money and they start to get nervous and upset and maybe quit. When, if they'd have stuck with it, by the end of the year, they might have made pretty good money. Some fisheries have seasons that are involved, so you may have to go through a long, slow time, then you make quite a bit of money in a short time. If you're in the business over a long period of time, you get used to those kinds of cycles.

JM: How is fishing for a lot of different kinds of fish tied into that?

RA: Fishermen in this area, particularly Newport and Point Judith, tend to switch off to different species more than they do in other areas. They tend to go for the ones that give them the highest value. The combination of the volume they can catch and the money they receive for them comes out the best for them. In other ports, there's more of a tradition of fishing on whatever they happen to specialize in,

perhaps it's cod or haddock. Or they might have a combination of species -- cod, haddock and flounders that they go for -- but if there happens to be a lot of squid around, they wouldn't go for squid, butterfish or scup. Where in this area, if the fishermen know there's a lot of scup around and they're worth some money, they'll go for scup. If the price of scup drops and there's squid around and they can make money doing that, they would go for squid, they'll go for flounders -- whatever happens to be both available and worth something.

JM: Their boats are capable of switching from one kind of fishing to another, or is it basically the same?

RA: There's some difference in the gear, depending on which fishery you're talking about. There's also a knowledge requirement that goes along with it. What's probably more important than the difference in the gear, is the willingness to invest the time to learn about the different species and accumulate the knowledge that lets you go for them.

JM: How long has that been the norm for a place like Newport?

RA: As far as I know, it's been the case since I've been involved in the business. It's not a real new development.

JM: What about enforcement of the 200 mile limit?

RA: I think some people have the idea that you have to

patrol the 200 mile line. The 200 mile line is meaningless because it's so far out and off the continental shelf that there's no fishing that really takes place there. There's some tuna longlining, but that's not under the Act anyway. Tuna isn't under the 200 mile limit. So, there's no real need to patrol the 200 mile line as such. People aren't going to be just outside of it trying to get inside of it. That's not a concern. The concern is for the people that you allow in -- whether they abide by the regulations that you set up. For some time, there was quite a bit of concern about whether the foreign vessels we allowed to fish in our zone were abiding by our regulations. We pretty much insisted that they carry U.S. observers. One of the continuing battles was to get a hundred percent observer coverage on the foreign vessels. That eventually came about. Particularly as the number of foreign boats diminished, it was easier to get observers on all of them. I think we ended up with pretty good control over that. Also, at the same time, we were getting rid of the foreign boats so it wasn't as much of a problem. The other issue in enforcement is enforcement on domestic vessels. That's a big concern. It's a particular concern of mine. I'm the chairman of the New England Council's Enforcement Committee. Most fishermen would agree that

enforcement is not adequate. However you feel about regulations -- whether you feel they're good or bad -- I think most people would agree that if you have a regulation, in order for it to be meaningful, it has to be enforced. If it isn't, then the people who violate the regulation profit by it, while the people who go along with it are going behind in a relative sense competitively. We think there's a real need to improve enforcement and we're doing some different things to try to improve that.

JM: What's the difference between the New England Council and the Rhode Island Council?

RA: The New Council's authority is over species that are primarily caught in Federal waters, outside three miles. The Rhode Island Council's primary authority is for fish that are caught within three miles.

JM: How much more serious are the gear conflicts now with all the new technology than they were when you started out?

RA: Gear conflicts, when we started, were probably more foreign trawlers towing up U. S. fixed gear. Then there was a recognition that there would be problems between U.S. trawlers and U. S. fixed gear. As the foreign vessels diminished, it turned into more and more a domestic conflict. With both fleets increasing all the time -- both the fixed gear fleet increasing and the trawler fleet -- there's been more



and more of a potential for conflict. There are still gear conflicts. If you have a gear conflict, it's a big issue to you. It costs you money and it's aggravating. On an individual basis, any gear conflict is just as important today as it was fifteen years ago. If you consider the increase in the fleets and compare that to the number of gear conflicts, what we've done has probably been helpful. The work of Atlantic Offshore in bringing the two groups together, has probably been helpful in keeping the situation from being any worse than it is.

JM: Is that what you meant when you said it sometimes is the way you go about solving the problems?

RA: There's always a tendency to take your own side of an issue and push it and impose it on the other side and get what you want at the expense of the other side. More and more negotiators are realizing that in order to reach any successful resolution to a problem, you have to consider both sides and come up with a solution that is better for both sides, not just good for one side and bad for the other side. Particularly offshore, you can't really impose rules and regulations on one type of fisherman because you don't have the enforcement. So if it's not done in a cooperative way, it almost surely won't work.

JM: What happens to someone out there whose investment gets towed up or destroyed by someone else?

RA: Most gear conflicts don't result in the loss of all of somebody's investment. It's a piece of it, depending on the severity of the case. It may be a small piece or a large piece. They have a number of options. They can either go directly to the party if they know who destroyed it. They can go to them and seek redress -- which very seldom happens, if ever. There's a government Gear Compensation Fund that they can go to to put in a claim. That's a fund that was created from foreign fishing fees. Fishermen can put in for their lost gear and get repaid for it, at least in part. Or they could take somebody to court if they knew who did it. They could take them to court and try to recover that way, but that hasn't been done.

[End of side two, tape two.]

RA: The Gear Compensation Fund is not just for fixed-gear fishermen, it's for any fisherman that loses his gear because of the actions of another vessel. A trawler fisherman could put in a claim because he got into some lobster gear that wasn't where it should have been. But that's very rare.

JM: But there isn't any compensation for all the time that person's lost?

RA: There's no compensation for time. There's compensation for twenty-five percent of lost income.

JM: Is it usually accidental?

RA: It's a combination. It's real hard to pin down. Accidental gear conflicts people recognize as being a part of the business. If everybody's trying to do their best, then those would be kind of livable because they wouldn't get carried very far. It's the one where you get the feeling that the people just don't care. They're the ones that really create the hard feelings and the serious losses.

JM: What about retaliations?

RA: Very difficult. Nobody wants to escalate the conflict usually. You hear a lot of talk about retaliation, but you don't really see much of it.

JM: What are the major issues besides the ones that we've spoken about, that you're dealing with at Atlantic Offshore and the New England Fisheries Management Council?

RA: The conservation issue is number one both in the minds of our members and in the activities that we participate in. Certainly at the Council it is. We did a survey last year that pointed that out. The one thing most of the members agreed on as their first concern was conservation of the resources. Beyond that, we're involved in an effort to get a countervailing duty on Canadian codfish. There's a widespread feeling that the subsidies the Canadian government gives to its fishing industry cause them to be able to send fish down here at a lower price (a

subsidized price). That hurts our prices; therefore, it hurts our industry. The offshore oil issue is one that's been off and on with us. We were heavily involved in that during the mid 1970's when the first lease sales were coming up and the exploration off the coast -- both off the mid-Atlantic and on Georges Bank. Then that kind of died off. Now there's renewed interest and renewed lease sales.

JM: That's in the Canadian portion?

RA: That's a separate issue that the Canadians are talking about leasing. Our government has recently put out a couple of new calls for nominations to get the oil industry interested in doing something on the east coast again. That whole offshore oil issue will be heating up again. That's what tends to happen. You think you've fought one battle and put it behind you and all of a sudden, you have to go out and dredge everything out again. Every one of these calls that the government puts out, they require you to submit new information. Whether it's the same as what you submitted before, they don't keep it on record and automatically consider it. You have to resubmit it. A lot of time and work goes into that.

JM: Didn't you go over to the North Sea and see what the effect of drilling or exploration was over there?

RA: Yes. Back in 1975, I was involved in a project with the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution that was

sponsored by the American Petroleum Institute among others. It was titled, "Impact of Offshore Petroleum Development on the Fishing Industry." For part of that, I went to the North Sea and looked at what was happening over there. It was clear that there was a substantial impact. Some of the things that we found over there never really developed here because it never got going that good, but there's always that potential. I think those types of efforts made a real impact on how development took place over here -- some of the changes that we made in the areas that were offered for lease. I don't know if I mentioned the congressional moratorium on the lobster canyons offshore that was put into place was really as a result of the early work we did.

JM: What are your major concerns about activity out on the Georges Bank?

RA: We have a long-term ecological concern, but that's very difficult to pin down and it's not one that we feel we're going to win on. We're not going to stop all oil drilling because of that concern. You have to attack it in its pieces -- OCS operating orders, what kind of materials the drilling platforms can let go overboard in what kind of concentrations -- we try to back up the people who are working on those issues. The question of debris that's thrown over that can get in fishermen's nets and destroy their

gear; the question of seismic vessels towing their cables and transducers and transponders around and entangling in fishermen's gear, getting into conflicts with fishermen, we've been involved in that and we've become kind of a clearing house for that effort. A lot of the seismic people get in touch with us before coming into an area to find out what's going on there. We'll try to put them in touch with the fishermen and facilitate communications between the oil people and the fishing industry people. We have dealt primarily with these conflicts, the immediate impact on the individual fisherman, these kind of physical interactions. If there's going to be an ecological problem, it will be a long term one that a lot of today's fishermen will not even be affected by. [They] will never know that they were affected by it, but when you get a platform that sets down in a particular area where a fisherman's gear is or you get seismic boats running back and forth through his gear, those are things that cost him money on a day to day basis. We've tried to be helpful in those areas.

JM: Politics gets all tied up in that, I bet.

RA: The government is one of the major players, of course, in that.

JM: Does it boil down a lot of times to who has the most money and time to research their point of view and

get it out?

RA: It does, but I think there is a lot of sentiment in favor of the fishing industry that helps to counteract that. If we had to compete strictly on a time and money basis, there's no way we'd get anywhere. [You] still have to come up with some good reasoning and some rational positions and participate. It all takes a lot of time and money. In comparison to what the oil industry and the government are spending, of course, it's miniscule. Its impact goes beyond just that kind of evaluation.

JM: Who finances your working on things like this?

RA: Most of it is strictly member financing and the fund raising activities we have. That project I worked on with Woods Hole was financed by the American Petroleum Institute and some other foundations that were involved in that. On a day to day basis and overall, it's the membership dues that pay for these things.

JM: Why isn't the whole ecological story of that area enough to keep them out of there?

RA: They would say it's not going to hurt the ecological system. They could say, "Look at the Gulf of Mexico, we've helped it." Fish production has gone up, shrimp production has gone up with the development of offshore oil, so how can you make any case that it's going to hurt anything?

JM: Turning to management of specific species, how have the fishermen, during the time you've been actively involved in all of this, felt about recommendations made by scientists?

RA: There's a general disdain for scientific opinion, but I think it's largely based on the fact that the scientists and the fishermen very seldom, if ever, talk to each other. A fisherman's view of science is largely one statement that doesn't make sense to him that gets repeated from fisherman to fisherman and becomes an example of how little the scientists know and how far out of touch they are with the real world. In some cases, that's probably true. They don't really know what's going on. In other cases, they may know a lot more than the fisherman knows about a particular sphere or interaction. The two aren't talking to each other, so they don't benefit from the knowledge that each one has. There's a lot of knowledge that the fisherman has that would be helpful to the scientists. Likewise, the scientists have studied a lot of things and know a lot about the resources that the fisherman should be exposed to, but the mechanism just really isn't there to provide that kind of interchange.

JM: The specific thing that I think of having to do with that is the striped bass controversy here. Have you gotten involved in that?



RA: I did for a while, then I made a conscious decision to get out of it because I didn't see any hope.

JM: Really?

RA: For me personally, it was just kind of a dead end street. I was not involved in the fishery. It was just out of general interest in the issues that affect fishermen. I was getting involved in trying to deal with the offshore fisheries and their issues and then to get involved with the striped bass issue was just a losing cause for me. So I tried to back off from it and watched it from a distance.

JM: What do you think the future holds as far as the conflict between the sports fishermen in a local area like this and the local fishing community?

RA: The sport fishermen certainly have the numbers. Over time, I think they will erode the position of the commercial fishermen and restrict them more and more. I think the commercial fishermen, as a whole, are making a mistake not to take more of an initiative in both working together amongst themselves and working together with the sport fishermen. I don't know how much of a help that would be. I know on the West Coast, in California in particular, one of the more successful, broad-based commercial fishermen's groups also does a lot with the sport fishing groups. They work on a lot of common issues and work together on a lot of things. I think that helps to tone down the

conflict quite a bit, but they still have real serious conflicts because there are always real way-out sport fishermen's groups that don't want to hear anything, don't want to work together. They just have a goal of putting the commercial fisherman out of business. I'm not sure what the long term result of that will be. There's a concept that there's something better about catching a fish for sport rather than catching it for food production and providing it to the consumer. I don't think the fishing industry has done enough to get the message across of the service we provide. It requires, also, a high degree of responsibility on the part of the fishing industry and willingness to make changes in the way they operate if it appears that it's not a real good conservative way to operate. It's one of those issues that there isn't a lot of right and wrong or black and white about. I would hope that the fishing industry can find a way to maintain its activity and work things out with the sports fishermen and get the public to recognize the service.

JM: By the service, what do you mean?

RA: There are a lot of people who can't catch their own fish. They need the commercial fishermen to go out and catch them. Most of the fish eaten in the country is eaten in restaurants. You have to have a

commercial fishing industry to go out and supply that fish. I've been thinking about having some bumper stickers printed up that say, "Commercial fishermen: America's seafood suppliers." A lot of people go in the supermarket, they see the fish in the package, and they don't think where that had to come from -- that that was swimming around the ocean and somebody had to put a net around it, process it and get it to the market. This desire to eat more fish -- if people want to eat more fish and they're not going to catch it themselves, somebody has to supply it.

JM: Which will lead to people eating more fish? How's that going to affect all the regulations?

RA: I think there are ways that the production of fish can actually be increased. It is a complex decision-making process. It's a socio-economic concern. Most people tend to look at it as a technical-scientific thing. They can study the fish, find out how old they are and how many are being caught, how many should be caught, and then make their decision. That's not the way the decisions are made in this system and never will be. You could say it would be easy enough to change the system and make strictly technical decisions, but we operate in a political environment and we're always going to have politicians representing social and economic concerns. I think we need to give a lot more

attention to the socio-economic environment in which fisheries' management decisions are made. If we can do that, I think we can make a lot of progress in naturally increasing the production of fish.

JM: Do you think it's a good idea to start educating people to eat a lot of different kinds of fish than a limited number? Do you think that's likely?

RA: Yes, I think that's happening all the time. The trouble with it, in our society, is that those developments can sometimes take place much faster than the system can respond. Again, if something becomes a craze or a fad, you can deplete a resource just on that basis alone in a very short time and the system can't respond quickly enough to conserve that resource and provide for its long-term productivity. You might get a pop out of it. What we call an under-utilized fishery, may all of a sudden, almost overnight, become over-utilized and depleted. We just don't have the system in place that can prevent that. I'm a little skeptical of undertaking too many large-scale promotion programs or fisheries development projects. In many cases, they come back on us.

JM: When has it?

RA: Not so much in this area as down in the Gulf of Mexico with the Red Drum when Chef what's-his-name came out with blackened redfish. This is still a

question, I think, whether that resource is really depleted or not, but it certainly generated a lot of hysteria between the sports fishermen and the commercial fishermen, the scientific community and everybody. All of a sudden, we've got another crisis. Whether it's real or imagined, we do have a management crisis that's resulted in a lot of turmoil in that whole area among the different groups involved.

JM: You work on issues all up and down the Atlantic Coast. Do you have to travel around to all these different places for local meetings, or do they come to you?

RA: We've tried to do a combination of both. It's one thing that we're really weak in. It's very difficult to cover the extensive geographic area that we do. Our stronghold is really in Southern New England, and we get progressively thinner as you go towards the outer boundaries. I actually used to do a lot more traveling to each port. I do a lot of traveling now, but it's more to national meetings and council meetings, things like that, rather than to the ports to actually talk to fishermen. That again, is another natural progression that takes place that has both its advantages and disadvantages. If you watch what happens when a fisherman becomes active in public policy, usually he's talking to all his

friends and people in the fishing community and he knows what they think and he carries that message to whatever the appropriate body that he sees needs to hear about it. As he does that, he's asked to participate in more of these bodies and to serve on them. More of his time becomes taken with attending the meetings of these bodies and traveling to those. The more active he becomes and the more recognized he becomes, the more he's asked to do at higher and higher levels, the less and less time he has to maintain his contacts with the people who he originally was with and knew what they were thinking. So he tends to become remote from the original reason that he started doing this. On the one hand, he's doing good for these people if he knows enough and maintains their real cause at heart. He's just carrying it on to more and more influential levels. On the other hand, if he's away from it too long, there's a tendency to see the views that are presented by the government and the scientists and everybody else, so you have to moderate your views. It's easy when you're only listening to the fishermen and you're yelling at everybody else. Your position is clear, you don't have to make any modifications to it, you don't have to compromise with anybody, you're just ranting and raving at the system and how bad it is and how nobody else knows anything, why don't they

listen to the fishermen? The more you get into these situations, you understand that's not a viable position to maintain. You can't just keep ranting and raving against the system because now you're part of the system and you recognize that all the other parts have their valid points of view as well. So you modify your position which makes the fishermen think you're going soft or you're selling out on them or things like that.

JM: That's tough.

RA: Yes, it is. [Chuckles] Particularly if you get on something like the New England Council where you have to vote. It's one thing if you can keep quiet about some things and speak out on others. You can kind of pick and choose, thinking about who your constituency is and where people stand. But if you're on a decision-making body, a regulatory body, and you have to take a vote, in some cases, you're going to have to vote against certain groups or for certain groups and you're going to antagonize people.

JM: That's a big responsibility to all those other people.

[End of side one, tape three.]

Third interview. March 20, 1987.

JM: The last time we talked, you spoke about the