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A comparative analysis of indigenous peoples' interests
and national park issues in arctic Sweden.

Despite a number of high-profile joint-managed national parks, in Australia there are substantial unresolved issues between indigenous interests and conservation agencies. Conservation agencies have done little comparative international research. This period of Fellowship travel was to commence international field research on comparative analyses of indigenous peoples' interests and national park issues. The focus was investigation and analysis of the Swedish environment agency’s policy history and outcomes concerning Saami people's [indigenous Scandinavians] use of national parks in the Laponia World Heritage Area for reindeer herding, hunting and gathering, and other cultural activities. Sweden has a highly comparable economic and social profile to Australia, and similar proportions of national park estate and indigenous populations to Australia. Policy frameworks have been evolving since 1971.

Research in Sweden had two broad components. One focused on collaboration with Swedish academic researchers and review of the published material, much of which is available only in Sweden. The other was primary field research with Saami reindeer herders in and around the Laponia World Heritage Area in arctic Sweden.

My research confirmed that, while the physical landscapes of ‘remote’ Australia and Sweden may be vastly different, the policy and political landscapes, particularly for indigenous peoples, have many similarities. The Western concept of national parks, which usually defines people as visitors who ‘take only photographs and leave only footprints’, does not sit comfortably with indigenous peoples’ understandings and use of their homelands, where the marks of their use and habitation are something to be treasured and celebrated. In both Australia and Sweden, national governments use the presence of indigenous peoples as part of their marketing strategies for tourism activities in the respective World Heritage Areas. In both countries relations between indigenous people and those governments are often characterized by mistrust and suspicion. Effective management of the these World Heritage Areas requires equitable sharing of power and resources – this is not clearly evident in either country, but most obviously failing in Sweden.

I established effective networks with both indigenous people and academics. Senior academics at Uppsala (Professor Hugh Beach), and the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (Professor Oje Danell) were extremely helpful. In the mountains, the Kuoljok and Påve families were welcoming, supportive and helpful, in spite of the intensive demands of reindeer herding work and tourist activities. Collaborative work will continue with a further field visit by me to Sweden in December 2004/January 2005, and visits to Australia by Swedish researchers in mid 2005. The University of Wollongong will host the visit of the Swedish research team in 2005, including presentations of seminars for indigenous, university and conservation agency audiences.

One comparative research paper is in review, to be published as a chapter in a book on First Nations’ responses to risk and resistance in globalization. Other publications are in preparation. I am also investigating the possibilities for international student exchanges between indigenous tertiary students in Australia and Sweden.
PROGRAMME

Uppsala 21 – 30 June 2004
Uppsala University:
- Collaborative research with Professor Hugh Beach.
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU):
- Collaborative research with Professor Öje Danell.

Laponia World Heritage Area, Swedish Arctic: 2 – 12 July
Staloluokta, Saltaluokta, Pietsjaure Saami communities:
- Field research, landscape analysis, and discussions with Saami reindeer herders and Swedish tourists on management of the World Heritage Area.

Jokkmokk 13 – 15 July
- Ájtte Museum:
  - Discussions with several research staff and Saami representatives,
  - Discussions with Taiga Rescue Centre staff,
  - Archival and library research.

Uppsala 16 – 24 July
- Further research, preparation of conference paper, documentation of field research

Trondheim, Norway 26 – 30 July
Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU):
- Presentation of paper to the XI World Congress of Rural Sociology;
- Extensive participation in the First Nations Working Group which prepared and implemented the First Nations’ contribution to this conference;
- Field visit to mountain farms bordering new national parks.
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THE TRIP

Uppsala
My research within Sweden began with two intensive interviews with leading Swedish academic
researchers, Professors Hugh Beach (Uppsala University) and Öje Danell (Swedish University of
Agricultural Sciences). Hugh’s research focus is similar to mine, analyzing relationships between
indigenous peoples and the state, especially through interactions related to environment and
conservation. Öje’s research is on reindeer biology and husbandry, but also the economics of
Saami reindeer herding. Both have long term research in areas within the Laponia World Heritage
Area. These collaborations established a context for my understanding of Saami reindeer herders
and the World Heritage Area, as well as giving me specific introductions to individual Saami families
in the mountains.

Laponia World Heritage Area
The Laponia World Heritage Area (WHA) was designated in 1996. Laponia is entirely within the
Swedish arctic. There are 690 World Heritage objects and places throughout the world. Of these, 23
are designated for both their natural values and their cultural values. Within that group, only four are
listed for their cultural significance for contemporary indigenous people. Those four are: Uluru Kata
Tjuta National Park and Kakadu National Park (Australia), Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)
and the Laponia WHA (Sweden). Laponia covers 9,400 square kilometers of forest, mountains and
marsh, and has signs of human occupation dating to the end of the last Ice Age 8,000 years ago. It
includes Sarek, Padjelanta, Muddus and Stora Sjöfallet National Parks, Sjaunja and Stubba Nature
Reserves, Tjuldvágge, the Rapa Delta and Sulidälbmá. It also encompasses seven Saami čearrus
(‘villages’): Basta čearru, Unna čearuš, Sirkas, Jähkågasska, Tuorpon, Luokta-Mavas and the
Gällivare forest Saami village. A Saami ‘village’ is not a settlement or town, but the geographic
region in which each Saami group has the ancestral right to graze reindeer, as well as being an
economic and social grouping.

The Saami are the indigenous people of Fenno-Scandinavia, whose homelands (called ‘Sapmi’)
stretch across the north of Norway, Sweden, Finland and the Kola Peninsula of Russia. While they
are recognized as indigenous people in all those countries, they have widely varying legislative
rights in each nation. In Sweden, only 10 percent of Saami are now reindeer herders, grouped
within 51 Saami ‘villages’. There are about 300 reindeer herders in the seven Saami villages in
Laponia, who keep around 50,000 reindeer in Laponia and adjacent areas. All together, there are
about 250,000 reindeer herded by Saami in Sweden.

I visited three Saami communities representing two ‘villages’: Sirkas and Tuorpon. Saltaluokta and
Pietsjaure are both Sirkas mountain communities, and Staloluokta is a Tuorpon mountain
community. At each place, Saami had recently arrived from their winter homes, following the
reindeer up into the mountains. These are all relatively ‘remote’ communities which have no road
access. At each place I discussed my research issues with Saami families, and also interviewed
Swedish tourists and others. I walked extensively in the surrounding mountain landscapes, and
stayed in Saami accommodation. At Pietsjaure and Saltoluokta I was accompanied by my partner
and two children (aged five and seven). Having my family present was very effective in quickly
establishing friendly and relaxed relationships with our Saami hosts (who also often had their young
children with them). Some issues which are of significant concern to the people I met with and other
Saami reindeer herders are briefly discussed below.

Naturvårdsverket, the Swedish conservation agency, has a stated conservation goal of supporting
the increase of large predatory species within Sweden. These predators include bear, lynx,
wolverine, wolf and eagle, and significant prey for each of these species is reindeer. A system of
compensation for reindeer lost to predators is in place, but is widely regarded as highly inadequate.
Saami are prevented by law from hunting these predators, and Saami have been jailed for doing so.
In addition, Saami have previously had special rights to hunt small game species on particular lands
as part of their indigenous rights, but these rights have recently been eliminated, so that all Swedes
can now hunt these species.

Reindeer herding has evolved, under pressure from the state, into its current ‘rational’ form,
meaning that efficient economic return is the primary goal. This has led to increasing
mechanization, including the use of motorbikes and snowmobiles, and decreasing emphasis on
‘non-economic’ returns from reindeer such as milk, transport and handcraft products. These non-
economic products have significant cultural value, as well as allowing a more diversified output to
counter drops in profit from particular products at any time. Mechanisation has led to accusations of environmental damage, and a questioning of the ‘authenticity’ of Saami reindeer activities.

The mountains within Laponia have been a destination for nature tourism since before the turn of the last century. This tourist use is increasing, with one of the attractions being the presence of reindeer and the physical evidence of Saami culture. Many Saami wish to harness this interest to their economic advantage, by providing accommodation, interpretation and other services to tourists. As Saami culture is one of the reasons for Laponia’s listing as a World Heritage Area, Saami consider it reasonable that they have a significant part in this economic activity. However, the regional administrative bodies and non-Saami businesses are also interested in accessing these economic advantages, and do not acknowledge that Saami should have special access.

These issues, and others, have recently prompted Saami representatives to communicate with UNESCO indicating that they no longer support the Swedish government’s management processes for Laponia, as they do not believe Saami have appropriate and meaningful input.

**Ájtte Museum, Jokkmokk**

After fieldwork in the mountains, I spent several days in Jokkmokk. The Ájtte ‘Mountain and Saami Museum’ includes a major research facility and library, as well as interpretive displays. Ájtte staff generously provided research space, and helped track down a large body of literature. Jokkmokk is a centre for tourism in the region, and Saami culture as a focus for tourism activities is very evident. As indicated above, the economic return to Saami from this tourist interest is not necessarily optimum.

**Trondheim**

I presented interim findings from my research to a First Nations Working Group session at the **XI World Congress of Rural Sociology** at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway. This working group included Norwegian and Swedish Saami reindeer herders, as well as indigenous and non-indigenous people from Hawaii, New Zealand, Australia and America. From Trondheim, I also carried out brief field research into the relationship between Norwegian mountain farms, Saami rights and conservation policy.

Discussions at Trondheim explored the varying rights of Saami reindeer herders across the four nation states of their homelands, and ‘pan-Saami’ activity as well as global links between different indigenous groups. My own presentation considered parallels and differences in the management of Laponia and Uluru-Kata Tjuta World Heritage Area in Australia. The Working Group is intended to continue and expand its work in a number of fora in the future.
My partner (Eva) and daughter (Ruby) inside the turf *goahte* we stayed in at Pietsjaure – the earth floor is covered in birch leaves, moose hides and reindeer hides.

Slugga, a symmetrical mountain of great spiritual significance to Saami, photographed at midnight, with a turf *goahte* in the foreground, and the lake at Pietsjaure.
ANALYSIS

Introduction

Neither Sweden nor Australia has constitutional recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples (in contrast to, for example, Norway and Canada). While in Sweden, Saami usufructuary rights may be eroding, they have essentially the same socio-economic status as other Swedes. In Australia Aboriginal people have regained ownership rights to 15-18% of the land area, but have a huge disparity in socio-economic status from other Australians.

Policy trajectories

The establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872 in the United States set the basis for one major component of the conservation movement: ‘protected areas’ or national parks. The other major component, regulatory approaches, has developed steadily since the 1970s. I will focus primarily on the protected area component.

At the V World Parks Congress, the 2003 United Nations List of Protected Areas was released. This document lists over 100,000 protected area sites, which cover 18.8 million hectares, or over 11% of the Earth’s land surface. This is more than that under permanent arable crops. The rate of increase accelerated markedly from the 1970s.

Australia has been an active and early creator of national parks, with Royal National Park declared almost simultaneously to Yellowstone, and 8% of the country in protected areas. In Australia, each state and the federal government have specific national park agencies dedicated to providing visitor and conservation management. Sweden has been a European leader, with Europe’s first national parks in 1909, and around 8% of the land area as protected area.

The ‘Yellowstone model’ for parks applies in both Sweden and Australia: precise boundaries, state owned, and with people present as visitors only. Globally, the last decade has seen significant change in approaches to protected areas and conservation policy, with new models developed to strengthen local peoples’ influence, and provide a spectrum of tenures and policy instruments for conservation. In Australia this has been expressed in joint-managed national parks, including World Heritage Areas (Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Kakadu National Parks). In Sweden there is not an explicit expression of changing global agendas.

Approximately parallel to the international policy focus on the creation of protected areas, there was also a major focus on indigenous peoples’ rights. In Australia, the Northern Territory Land Rights Act was gazetted in 1975. The court cases which were to culminate in the High Court Mabo decision and the Native Title Act began in the late 1970s. In Scandinavia, the 1970s saw rapid development of policy concerning Saami. In Sweden the Reindeer Herding Act of 1971, with subsequent revisions, has been the basis for Saami policy through into the twenty first century.

Residual Lands

Despite the national and global focus on protected areas, significant research indicates that conservation is largely a ‘residual’ landuse, which often overlaps and conflicts with another residual landuse, the remaining lands owned or accessed by indigenous peoples.

Conservation lands are not primarily representative of biodiversity distribution or rare species habitats, they are representative of areas that are not required for other purposes. In Australia and many other nations, government conservation and environment agencies are relatively minor players in the politics of government, and other agencies with influence over land management (such as urban planning, natural resources and agriculture) dominate decisions about land use.

For Australia overall, national park lands are inverse to ‘land use potential’. Earlier work in the USA also identified this phenomenon, using the expression ‘the worthless lands thesis’. While for both countries there is also a historic trend to conserving areas of high scenic value, which often correspond to ruggedness or low potential for other land uses, it is the prioritisation of other land uses which has been the primary determining factor.
For Sweden, four national parks (Sarek, Stora Sjöfallet, Muddus and Padjelanta) constituted 83% of the total national park area of Sweden in 2003 – these are all in the mountains (high scenic value and low landuse potential), and north of the Arctic Circle. Research for other countries, both Western and non-Western, indicates similar patterns. Conservation has generally been residual to other competing land uses, and this broad process is continuing.

In Australia, a key factor in this situation is the particular Western construction of 'conservation'. Once parks are gazetted, they are generally accepted as representing 'nature', meaning that the land outside them (both state and private) is available to be used in ways which do not have to consider the sustainability of their natural values, because those are already 'looked after' in the national parks. Private property rights in Australia are strongly defended: 'trespassers will be prosecuted' is a common sign. Similarly, the difficulty of creating legislation to control large scale tree clearing on private farms indicates the strength of landowners, who have successfully argued for decades for their right to clear land, largely irrespective of the environmental impact.

This contrasts with Sweden, where the concept of allemansrätt has enshrined the right of public access across private property, as well as allowing wild harvest rights for certain plants. These rights are available to all Swedes, irrespective of tenure and indigeneity. A potential consequence of allemansrätten is a reduction in visitor pressure in national parks: when the population has the right to roam freely across the whole countryside, there is less need to make national parks the focus of nature tourism. The other significant consequence is the responsibilities that are linked to the rights: there is a strong Swedish environmental ethic, in part a product of allemansrätten: taking care of the country to which you have access. This may be a partial explanation for the lack of a specific national park agency in Sweden: a strong environmental ethic, a distribution of impacts across more terrain, and the involvement of other organizations in providing visitor facilities, means there is perhaps less need for a management agency.

Residual Rights

The areas where national parks are concentrated, in Australia and in Sweden, are coincident with the areas where indigenous peoples continue to have rights. In Sweden, protected areas situated within Saami reindeer herding territories are 94% of the total national park area of the country. In Australia, Aboriginal native title rights are likely to persist in very many national parks, and a number of parks have been successfully claimed under land rights legislation. National parks also coincide with many aspects of Aboriginal cultural heritage, including archaeological sites, artifacts, and sacred and ceremonial places.

In both countries, the remaining areas of state-owned land ('Kronomark' in Sweden, 'Crown land' in Australia) are disputed between the state and indigenous peoples. In Sweden, Saami assert that the state has no documentation of any process to gain title to Saami lands. In Australia, Crown lands are explicitly available for claim by land rights and native title legislation. In both countries these remaining state lands are also typically where new national parks are designated, because there is no cost to their acquisition, an important factor when budgets are severely limited.

Limits to the Western paradigm, and learning from indigenous peoples

It is important to note that the conservation lands referred to so far are, in both Sweden and Australia, quite clearly cultural landscapes. They have cultural significance for their indigenous peoples, but they are also created, shaped, by cultural forces, human activities. Eight thousand years of reindeer grazing, and more recently, centuries of organized herding with 250,000 reindeer, have unquestionably shaped the ecological characteristics of the mountain and forest landscapes of northern Sweden. Western conservation models have essentially ignored this, but there is now increasing evidence of the need to engage with indigenous issues and indigenous ways of interrelating and influencing the environment.

Reindeer have been in Laponia since the last glaciation, and have been semi-domesticated by Saami for centuries. Vegetation complexity is influenced by reindeer grazing, and large carnivores are dependent on reindeer for prey. Conservation objectives, such as increasing the numbers of large

\[1\] The whole Swedish landscape obviously has a long history of human interaction with other cultural groups as well as Saami, and there are contemporary debates about what is a 'natural' landscape.
carnivores, become linked to Saami reindeer herding rights, as all reindeer in Laponia are owned by Saami.

**Complementarity**

Indigenous relationships to land are typically on the ground, situated and engaged. The Western, state controlled, conservation relationship to land is separated, abstract and remotely-sensed. In the context of conservation, this research is about the relationships between these two sets of people, and their various relationships to land, and about rethinking these relationships.

In both countries, settler-indigenous relationships are characterized by conflict, and nature-human relationships are characterized by 'command and control' processes of resource management. Western forms of knowledge have been dominant and exclusive. The outcomes are serious environmental problems and serious problems of social conflict and exclusion. While combining complementary Western ways of knowing with indigenous ways of knowing can create innovative solutions, there are problems in taking aspects of knowledge out of the context in which they are contextualized.

It is possible that this can be addressed geographically. Supporting conditions where there are localized opportunities for the expression of indigenous knowledge, with access to information derived from Western sources (for example, remote sensing, large scale species surveys), may create effective solutions to environmental and social issues. Indigenous people apply adaptive, ancient responses to local situations affected by modern problems, but in landscapes shaped by millennia of cultural continuity.

Conservation landscapes are excellent potential sites for rethinking the relationship between settler/indigenous, and nature/society. Successful meetings between dominant and indigenous societies require casting off a relationship based on a hierarchy of difference. Instead, these sites create an opportunity to explore a complementarity between world views. Complementarity is expressed through beliefs, in knowledge, in geographic scale, and in capacity.

Negotiations about the meanings and control of conservation landscapes can proceed past hegemonic assumptions and policy inadequacies. Agreed on-ground outcomes can respond to both sets of worldviews: values and beliefs can be different but respected. Valuing place, and people's relationship to place, is a key component.

Processes for ensuring indigenous peoples have the right to make decisions about their lands and cultural processes are an essential element. If the state wants a particular outcome from indigenous territories, then there needs to be some fair exchange, and a cooperative system for implementing decisions and supporting the cultural processes involved. In Laponia, a conservation goal of increasing the numbers of large carnivores means agreed, appropriate compensation; cooperative assessment of reindeer losses to Saami; and a clear picture of how this will be managed over time. In Australia, a conservation goal which includes the creation of national parks on Aboriginal territories may mean negotiating compensation for a restrictive use of the land while maintaining appropriate wild harvest rights, underpinned by collaborative research on appropriate harvest regimes for different species.

**Conclusions**

I am interested in the possibilities of institutional learning, and in situations that require respect for different cultural approaches. In cross-cultural conservation situations, the concept of complementarity may create tools to use in the changed and changing social and ecological environments of the twenty first century. Recent global changes in conservation paradigms are unevenly implemented in different countries, and international comparative research may present opportunities for new processes of innovative governance, supported by global agendas.

Co-operative conservation approaches between indigenous peoples and the state create sites for institutional transformation for both parties. Moving past the rigidity and passivity of state institutions and engaging with the responsiveness of indigenous social structures may lead to effective responses to pressing conservation problems. Moving beyond the intensely local knowledge base of indigenous societies and engaging with larger scale data and issues may lead to effective responses to urgent social challenges. Innovative, rights-based approaches in rural/indigenous landscapes can address conservation and indigenous issues, linking social change (attitudes/paradigms) to
innovative governance. Local indigenous inclusion in governance can be achieved. Acknowledgement of other forms of knowledge can lead to ways to develop useful relationships between different forms of knowledge, leading to new on-ground outcomes.

(References available on request)
RECOMMENDATIONS

Co-management arrangements between indigenous peoples and conservation agencies are a significant feature of national park management in many parts of the world. The outcomes, both for conservation and for indigenous peoples, vary widely. In many places a notion persists that co-management is about teaching indigenous peoples how to ‘manage’ national parks in the Western scientific sense. In contrast, many indigenous peoples believe that it is Western science trained park managers and policy makers who need to begin to understand indigenous ways of relating to the environment. This conflict provides an opportunity for both parties to learn new, complementary approaches, but also suggests that there may well be times and places where indigenous peoples should have sole ‘management’ and control over their ancestral lands.

From experiences in Sweden and Australia, I would make the following general recommendations:

- Australian and Swedish conservation agencies need to implement the recommendations of the V World Parks Congress (WPC) relevant to these issues, particularly WPC Recommendations 24, 25 and 26, which all consider issues of strengthening the rights of indigenous peoples concerning protected areas;
- In the light of research which indicates that the Western concept of national parks has some serious flaws, conservation agencies need to actively consider new and innovative forms of conservation ‘protection’, including acknowledging the role that indigenous peoples’ management of land contributes to conservation objectives;
- There should be clear formal roles for indigenous peoples in the development of policy about co-management and management of national parks in general within government conservation agencies;
- Provision of adequate resources for indigenous groups is critical to success in negotiations.

Specific recommendations are that:

- The University of Wollongong continue with discussions to develop indigenous student exchanges between Australia and Sweden (and other indigenous nations);
- Further collaboration between researchers in Scandinavia and Australia is implemented.

Since the completion of the Churchill Fellowship, the University of Wollongong has supported the initial development of a new project, ‘Arctic to Outback’, intended to facilitate a number of these recommendations, and to further support ongoing collaborations between researchers and indigenous people in Scandinavia and Australia. This collaboration is also being supported by Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park.
APPENDIX

OUTCOMES
Outcomes completed within the Fellowship period:
• collaboration with research academics at Uppsala, Äjtte, SLU and NTNU;
• collection of fieldwork data;
• establishment of basis for ongoing collaboration;
• presentation of paper to XI World Congress of Rural Sociology.

Outcomes implemented since return:
• incorporation of research findings into teaching programs at University of Wollongong;
• presentations of interim findings at University of Wollongong;
• peer-reviewed research publications (1 in review, others in preparation);
• research trip to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (comparative World Heritage Area);
• further research funding grant awarded (UIC International Links Grant 2004).

Outcome still in preparation:
• further peer-reviewed publications;
• presentation of findings to the NSW Department of Environment and Heritage Aboriginal Co-
  management Working Group;
• collaboration with Swedish researchers visiting Australia in 2005/2006;
• development of longer-term academic exchanges;
• development of indigenous student exchanges (as appropriate);
• submission of further research applications for ongoing international collaborative research
  and student exchange.