

October 15, 1994

An Essay Commissioned by
the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples,
Ottawa, Canada

***A THOUSAND YEARS:
INDIGENOUS PEOPLES
AND NORTHERN EUROPEANS***

— **2ND ED., COMPLETELY REVISED AND EXPANDED** —

by Peter Jull

DEDICATED TO THE LATE SALLY WEAVER,
POLITICAL ANTHROPOLOGIST
IN CANADA, NORWAY & AUSTRALIA

"Strange sights have I had a while ago. I beheld Norway as I looked westward from the mountains. It then came to my mind that many a day I had been happy in that land; and then I had a vision: I saw all districts of Trondheim, and then of all Norway; and as long as that vision lasted I saw even farther, until I saw all the world, both land and sea. I recognized clearly the places I had before been to and seen. And as clearly I saw places I had not seen before — some that I had heard about as well as such that I had not heard spoken of, both places inhabited and uninhabited, as far as the world extends." The bishop said that this vision was... most remarkable.

King Olaf Haraldsson (Saint Olaf) riding to his death in battle at Stiklastad, near Trondheim, July 1030 AD, here translated by Lee Hollander from the SAGA OF KING OLAF HARALDSSON THE SAINT by Snorri Sturluson (c. 1200)

Peter Jull
PO Box 5075
Kenmore East, Qld.
AUSTRALIA 4069

fax 61-7-378-2440

EXECUTIVE
A Thousand Years:
Indigenous Peoples and Northern Europeans
2nd edition (Completely Revised and Expanded)
BY PETER JULL

It is inevitably difficult and even unfair to compare different social histories, different intellectual traditions, and differing cultures such as Scandinavia and Canada in a brief summary. However, what follows is an attempt to do just that.

There are approximately 75,000 Sami living in Norway (50,000), Sweden (17,000), Finland (6,000), and Russia (2,000). These numbers are unreliable because of past discrimination which has made many Sami reluctant to claim their heritage.

The modern Norwegian indigenous policy history is an archetypal tale. A first official commission tried to raise various matters and was ignored. When an environmental and indigenous rights row erupted over a Northern hydro-electric power project, confrontation and political backlash led the government hastily to name two commissions, one on indigenous rights and the other on indigenous culture. Against all odds, the first commission reached a consensus for a constitutional amendment, an indigenous parliament, and other matters. The government accepted most of these proposals, and some of the proposals of the culture commission. Research on specific regional indigenous rights dragged on, with the indigenous movement, incredibly, refraining from discussing or debating the subject for 13 years. In quiet times the experts at last reported that the indigenous people had no rights. No uproar followed, and the public, having had no lead from indigenous leaders or national debate, did not react. The indigenous leaders, who 20 years earlier had pioneered world indigenous international cooperation to promote indigenous rights, remained largely silent. Although now well-travelled, they were apparently not at all informed about these most basic elements of indigenous life around the world, the universal dispossession tying together all indigenous peoples. (This story does not have a happy ending.)

Only on the Arctic Ocean coast and in the Northern interior are Sami a significant population percentage. In those areas there are some predominantly Sami townships. The border area where Norway, Sweden, and Finland meet is the Sami heartland, but Sami live throughout Northern Scandinavia which they have occupied since time immemorial.

Sami living conditions in Scandinavia are the same as those of their non-Sami neighbours. These countries enjoy the highest living standards in the world. Even on the rugged remote coasts of Norway the quality of all private and public facilities is first-rate, to the shame of countries like Canada which claim to combat regional disparities as a national priority.

In Russia the Sami face imminent extinction as a culture and society. Canadians should act on the recommendations recently made jointly by the Inuit Circumpolar Conference and Canadian Arctic Resources Committee to help them.

The post-war national Sami rights movement in Scandinavia developed somewhat earlier than did its Canadian equivalent, but has achieved less of what Canada's indigenous peoples regard as the main agenda. (There were important Sami ethno-political movements as early as the turn of the century.) The major innovations in recent Sami policy have been creation of Sami Parliaments with advisory status in the three Scandinavian countries, and an interpretation of international law (Article 27 of the Civil and Political Rights Convention of 1966) which requires national governments to guarantee to indigenous peoples the material basis of their culture such as lands, freshwater, seas, and resources. This interpretation has resulted in a Norwegian constitutional amendment on Sami, i.e.,

It is the responsibility of the authorities of the State [i.e., the Kingdom of Norway] to create conditions enabling the Sami people to preserve and develop its language, culture, and way of life.

Modern conveniences, material well-being, lack of skin colour differences, a thousand years of contact with Scandinavian settlers coming into their lands, and up to 200 years of sometimes cruel assimilationist pressure have not ended the determination of Sami to maintain their distinct culture; to secure land, freshwater, and marine rights; and to recover autonomous political identity exercised through self-government. Identity, power, and rights, *as well as* economic equality, are universal indigenous needs.

As in Canada, the racial and cultural mixing of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples, or *métissage*, has sometimes created tremendous social and cultural anxiety and confusion for individuals and communities. Political tensions between Sami-identifying people on the one hand and those who are more mixed or who have lived in areas subject to more assimilationist pressure, have undermined and embittered the Norwegian Sami rights movement. Each side misunderstood or over-reacted to the other's motives, and then drifted irreparably apart. As a result, all Sami have been disadvantaged. (For *métissage* and ethno-regions see pp. 16-17, & 41-45.)

Métissage should not be seen as some evil category of fate befalling those who are insufficiently culturally proud, as has been implied in various circles in Canada, but a normal socio-historical process of cultural relations between peoples as much as one of genetic mixing. Policy-making and ethno-politics in Canada have had an implied underlying premise that legal fences could protect one ethnically and culturally distinct people from another. The reality is that contact and mutual influence flow freely between peoples despite these safeguards. The real question is how to support and sustain regional indigenous cultural communities, and to understand and design public policies suitable to their needs.

Despite its key role in maintaining strong Sami cultural visibility through long years of alternating assimilationist pressure and sheer neglect by outsiders, an indigenous way of life such as reindeer herding — or Inuit sea mammal or Plains Indian buffalo hunting — may become a trap. The indigenous people in such lifestyles attract regulation and regimentation, despite the fact that the survival of such ways of life in their traditional form depended on flexibility and adaptability. Other indigenous people living lives less romanticised by outsiders — and more subject to settlement and development pressure or assimilation — may have no less significant cultural traditions and needs; may have no less capacity for ethno-cultural renewal; and may represent the sort of flexible accommodation to complex external pressures which has been the reason for indigenous survival everywhere. As Sea Sami (Coastal Sami) have shown, such realities and needs require creative policy responses no less than do those which outsiders view as "traditional".

Even in strong nation-states where ethnicity and regionalism are discouraged by public policy, resurgent indigenous peoples may "indigenise" regional politics, culture, and society in parts of those nation-states to such an extent that unique new regional cultures emerge. This is occurring in Sapmi today (as in much of Northern Canada even before regional claims settlements).

Problems of environmental and renewable resource management have reached crisis proportions in all Northern countries and pose fundamental threats to the survival of indigenous cultures. In Scandinavia and North-Western Russia there are threats from everything from nuclear dumping to Chernobyl to road-building to forest regulation, all these denying formerly productive eco-systems to indigenous use, while rationalist and centralist planners design "solutions" which further reduce or disrupt indigenous resource use and management. Sami, as well as non-Sami academics, have identified the problems (which closely correspond to research and policy initiatives like *co-management* underway in Canada), but are not yet winning their battles with government.

The Scandinavian progressive spirit is rightly renowned in many social policy areas but has not yet been much evident in issues of cultural pluralism such as the majority's relations with Sami. This again refutes the assumption of many governments that contemporary indigenous ethno-political protests are merely a function of socio-economic problems.

The Sami Parliaments represent much of the active Sami community and are the primary Sami bodies with which Canadian indigenous peoples should establish contact. (For Sami Parliaments see pp. 31-36, & 45-46.)

The roles of Norwegian and Swedish Sami parliaments in national policy-making are too recent to compare with the informal impact of Canadian indigenous associations, but Sami do not yet have the degree of actual political power of Canadian indigenous bodies.

What is more, the Sami Parliaments are generally seen by Scandinavian élites as a substitute for the self-government and land rights which are the basic demands of Canadian indigenous peoples.

Indigenous peoples in Canada must consider the Sami Parliament model very carefully. There are several key questions.

1. The whole point of indigenous self-government in Canada has been (1) to enable local and regional indigenous cultures to run their own affairs in culturally appropriate ways and (2) to manage as much of their traditional territories as possible. The people who fought so hard for those powers are not going to hand them over willingly to national bodies where majorities from other indigenous cultures and other indigenous territories make decisions for them. The ideologues who wish for stronger pan-indigenous entities with wide powers do not yet speak for the political heartland of Canada's indigenous peoples, and perhaps never will.
2. Inuit, Indian First Nations, and Métis have fought hard for years to achieve government powers within defined territories, and to achieve government-to-government relations between their own representative bodies and the federal government (and existing territorial and provincial governments, too). That, after all, is the way Canadian federalism works. One or more elected national indigenous parliaments would have a higher level of legitimacy on national issues because elected nationally, but would be much less accountable to the individual self-governing indigenous territories across Canada. Unless such parliaments had very limited powers (in which case, why would anyone wish to become a member? or bother voting?), they would simply get in the way of such government-to-government relations. Non-indigenous government officials could ask for no better divide-and-rule situation than having indigenous politicians in national and regional bodies fighting each other over the right to decide policy and programs. This is a structural problem which has nothing to do with culture — exactly the same considerations would apply to any people of any race or continent.
3. What would be the powers appropriate to a national indigenous parliament? What functions might it best discharge in place of local and regional indigenous governments? Perhaps it could manage urban services for indigenous peoples. (Would all indigenous people, even in the High Arctic and rural areas, also vote for it in that case?) Perhaps it could handle international work. (Canadian Inuit have found the Inuit Circumpolar Conference works well because responsive to their four main regions, and indigenous home rule governments in both Alaska and Greenland have made clear they wish to keep a close rein on ICC in relation to their countries.) Should it handle broadcasting, or cultural matters? Those are already managed in a decentralised way across the country. If there were

special problems or crises which indigenous peoples thought were best handled nationally, they would surely call a national council or leaders' summit as they do now, and as they have apparently done in times of war or other crises since time immemorial. Creating specialised national bodies to facilitate regional work on certain matters is one thing; a need for another layer of indigenous government, when regions already can handle both Ottawa and the world *just fine, thanks*, is quite another.

4. Canada's indigenous organisations at national and provincial level have done much to create the policy climate and public support in which local and regional agreements on rights and self-government have been possible. The great victories of the indigenous peoples of Canada were probably impossible without them. There may be a danger in assuming, however, that there is an infinite number of political agendas or new institutions to be pursued at national level at this time. If we forever look for another body to create, or another agenda item for regional or national organisations to fight for in constitutional gatherings, may we not be simply creating more confusion, fragmenting power and energies, and putting off the day of tackling the hard issues, the issues which plague indigenous individuals, families, and communities today?

Indigenous policy and political reform require a visible, articulate, and politically adept national indigenous political lobby. The lack of such a presence in Scandinavia, except in rare moments like the Alta dispute 15 years ago, or today when Sami Parliaments are meeting, has rendered Sami rights and political agendas all but invisible in comparison with Canada or Australia.

The problems, politics, and progress of Sea Sami (Coastal Sami) are relevant to the problems facing indigenous coastal peoples everywhere. A network of marine indigenous peoples is needed internationally, and could initially include Coastal Sami, Canadian Inuit, British Columbia coastal First Nations, Coastal Aborigines in Australia, and Torres Strait Islanders, all of whom are at comparable stages of political renewal and policy struggle in respect of regional, marine, and coastal issues. The Inuit Circumpolar Conference already has some working contacts with Sami and could initiate further contacts.

Research and recent experience in coastal North Norway have revealed the flaws and injustice of fishing and marine policies set by outsiders, and also the prevalence and value of local Sami and non-Sami experience and expertise. These revelations are very relevant to the search of governments and BC Indian First Nations, Inuit, and others for workable marine policies and decision-making structures.

National governments must take responsibility for initiating and leading indigenous policy change within the nation-state. Regional or other sub-national authorities (e.g., Canadian provinces, Australian states, Norwegian *fylker*) are much more resistant to

reform and beholden to development interests which conflict directly with indigenous rights interests.

Nordic faith in the role of studies, expertise, and formal processes in public administration amounts to a secular religion adhered to with the stubbornness of former Pietism. Although this respect for expertise can sometimes provide short-cuts through political debate, as in implementation of the 1984 Sami Rights Committee report in Norway, it has generally not provided Sami with the outcomes they would wish, e.g., the misplaced faith of Sami in the 13-year work of that Committee's experts on land rights in Finnmark. Wider public discussion over a length of time, as in Canada, can yield more political support and public understanding.

The lack of indigenous consensus on principal political goals has weakened Sami as it has weakened other indigenous peoples where it has occurred. Despite the fact that Scandinavian countries no less than Canada are usually governed by parties holding 50% public support or less, the non-indigenous community typically demands a high level of consensus among minorities before it is willing to consider reforms.

Despite their important role in founding indigenous internationalism in the early 1970s to press for land, sea, and water rights, Sami leaders appear to have "lost the plot" in recent years, unable to contend effectively with the rejection of those rights by nation-state authorities. This raises important questions about the value and purpose of international indigenous work as now practised. That is, "first world" indigenous peoples are well networked — in the Northern hemisphere, at least — and are all well stocked with political, legal, and constitutional experience and other useful precedents. They first got together to learn from and support each other; now when they have so much to learn and share, too often they don't! (Pp. 52-55.)

All European-peopled countries, including Canada and Australia, have wrestled to revise their policies towards alien indigenous cultures because they have seen these policies (with a little help from their friends abroad) to have been morally wrong. They have then sought for reforms within the existing logic and structures of their own national cultures. Where this has succeeded (Canada, USA, Australia, New Zealand, Denmark) it has inevitably required some pragmatic slips twixt cup and lip, but in Scandinavia, except for the work of Carsten Smith, the rigid logic of the system and the stubbornness of its official priests have seemed to defeat reform.

The refusal of the Scandinavian governments to date to accept Sami rights in respect of territory and livelihoods which have long been the basis of Sami culture represent a major threat to the protection of indigenous peoples all over the world. If the most socially "progressive" countries will not live up to such obligations, nastier governments elsewhere are given a convenient precedent.

Internationalisation of indigenous ethno-politics has been a significant force for political change in the North American arctic (i.e., Canada, Alaska, Greenland), but less so in Northern Europe. Sami might well find useful the North American experience in which Inuit and Dene, in particular, have redefined the Arctic and Arctic policy in the national consciousness.

A voluntary indigenous code of conduct for international indigenous contacts, cooperation, and travel is desirable. Its two purposes would be to remove some unacceptable features such as indigenous condescension and other mischief-making abroad, and to encourage purposeful and productive international work. Once drafted in Canada such a code or guidelines could be shared with indigenous groups abroad for possible wider adoption.

Applied and practice-oriented information forums and exchange networks, as well as research on politics and policies, are needed by indigenous people — that is, by their politicians, political organisations, and the local and regional governments which they form — and could be facilitated by bodies committed to working with them such as the International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee (CARC), and academic research centres like the University of Tromsø and the North Australia Research Unit (NARU). Cooperation between Sami and Canadian indigenous peoples in these matters is desirable and would confer many benefits in both directions.

Some of today's Sami leaders have modified their political agendas in practice and chosen to cooperate quietly with and leave reform to national governments. This has apparently been a trade-off for some official recognition and high-profile positions for Sami. This same recent period saw the Scandinavian governments fail and/or refuse to recognise Sami rights to land, freshwater, and coastal waters after creating special bodies to consider those very matters. All this raises serious questions about Sami political strategy, and creates a political vacuum which is unlikely to remain long unfilled. Meanwhile, some tangible threats such as the arrival of a mining company's test drilling rig in Sapmi have triggered Sami political reflexes. Such collisions may be a clue to the likely political future.

Quebec's difficulties in reconciling Francophone ethno-nationalism with the aspirations of Inuit and Indian First Nations might be studied in relation to Norway's past and present. One may hope that a secessionist Quebec and rump Canada would be as cool and enlightened in agreeing on their respective boundaries in Inuit and Indian territory as were the Dano-Norwegian and Swedish Crowns in 1751 in Sapmi, basing their agreements on indigenous land use, culture, custom, preferences, and mutual non-belligerence.

Three overall conclusions may be drawn from the Sami experience.

1. Contacts and cooperation with indigenous peoples internationally and within countries are needed by all indigenous groups to freshen and renew their own work, share the experience and expertise of their successes with others in need, and maintain indigenous rights standards world-wide (and thus pressure on governments at home).
2. In order to survive and flourish, indigenous peoples must organise their political agendas around the restoration of viable regional societies with inclusive membership (as in the Northern Canadian regional agreements such as Nunavut and the impending British Columbia regional treaties). Much more than defensive legal categories and "perimeter fencing" are needed to protect and promote indigenous society.
3. Just as legal work was the key to Canadian indigenous success in the past, other studies and research, especially in the social sciences, have a huge potential role to play in the future of all indigenous peoples. Comparative studies within and between countries are particularly urgent.

The Sami rights issue is an important one for the three Scandinavian countries, although they do not yet seem to recognise the fact. If they continue to fail to accommodate Sami rights in the traditional Sami homeland, rights whose historical and moral basis must be patently obvious to anyone (except redneck settlers in those areas, of course), they will lose credibility and authority in world affairs where their moral leadership coupled with their domestic social achievements have long given them an influence far beyond that normally obtainable by such small countries. One may only hope that their many human rights activists, their foreign ministries, and a vigorous Sami movement will convince their Cabinets of the importance of such action.

Note: Other recommendations are found in the text.

PREFACE

The first edition of this paper was written in the first half of 1993. Although I had hoped and expected to be able to make a fresh visit to Scandinavia before writing it, that was not possible, despite attempts to obtain funds. Although I had maintained contact with Scandinavian literature and scholars as best I could since my last visit in 1986, as well as with general political events and Sami politics, I did not feel comfortable with the lack of a refresher visit.

That first edition of the paper focussed on the heated debates and crisis of public confidence in resource *management* policies on the Arctic coast of Sapmi, as Lapland is called by Sami (the Lapps) themselves. From mid-1993 new crises in Sapmi emerged: for Canadians the more familiar issues of indigenous land, sea, and resource *rights*, and matters relating to or resulting from rights dispute. In November 1993 the University of Tromsø Centre for Sami Studies flew me to Tromsø to participate in a major conference on indigenous self-determination, and ill though I was — not from a return to Northern hemisphere cold after seven years spent in the sub-equatorial and sub-tropical world, but from a chill in Bangkok airport's all-too-efficient air conditioning — I visited and re-visited some Sami districts during my 2½-week stay, talked with many people, and caught up on some of the developments in a field about which I had been writing for many years.

This 2nd edition is essentially a new paper. It raises new issues because of events occurring since the first version was written, and revises or expands some issues dealt with in the 1st edition in response to additional documentation. There were also requests for elaboration on some points by some who read the first version. I have also dropped tangential material from the 1st version. In places where I have nothing to add to sources readily available in Canada, e.g., on Sweden and Russia, I have simply indicated rather than summarised them.

Length is a major limitation. My three previous monographs on Sami issues have been 49, 57, and 100 pages respectively; were more narrowly focussed in their subject matter; discussed a single country only; and did not contain the many pages of references found in this paper. The best I can do here is provide a sketch, note a few points of special interest, provide plenty of references to aid further inquiry by those interested, and, most importantly, provide in Parts III, IV, and V of the paper some summary perceptions for readers unlikely to go further into Scandinavian indigenous questions.

In the preparation of both versions of the paper I have been overwhelmingly dependent on my friend Terje Brantenberg at the University of Tromsø in obtaining papers, news, contacts, advice, and bits of factual detail. However, he has been discreet, and the responsibility for interpretation and conclusions is purely my own. Also, I have been greatly helped in my travels and learning in the North over many years by Harald Gaski and Ivar Björklund, both now resident in Tromsø.

The "References & Useful Reading" section at the end is recommended to all those seriously interested in the subjects here. I have drawn on these sources for all that is written here, and in some cases drawn on them for many years, although I have not attempted to source every comment or thought in the text. Reference listings are recognition of what I owe their authors. There are many other items I did not list because I did not think they would be relevant or useful to Canadian inquirers, or because I have not yet had the time to go into a subject sufficiently as to enable me to make rounded summary comments, e.g., on details of *kommune* and *fylke* level service delivery and equalisation, a most important subject.

A three-dimensional map is uniquely useful as an aid to teaching, but relies on an exaggerated topography to illustrate mountain ranges and valleys. Even Mount Everest would be almost unnoticed if a true scale were adopted. I have been pained by certain cautious officials in Ottawa in times past and certain academics in Australia in times present who believe that virtually any generalisation or vivid phrase is misleading. They apparently prefer to be chastely and unreadably correct, or self-effacingly subjunctive and qualified. Some of them confuse moderation and the middle ground with mediocrity and muddle. Academic writing styles are mannered, learned, the subject of convention, and contrived; they are no more natural or logical than other verbal styles, be they advertising copy, Nashville, limericks, or political bombast. Unfortunately there are those who attribute to such academic styles an intrinsic value and authority, confusing their own club rules with human reality and Truth. My purpose here is not to feign careful wisdom, but to communicate the important distinctions and features of Sami political contexts for intelligent indigenous and non-indigenous readers in English-speaking countries.

I would like to say something about Norway. I had studied, lived, married, and learned something of the language in that country before I ever saw the Sami North or became informed about contemporary Sami issues. That happened only in 1981 when I made contact through the good offices of the International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) and specifically the late Helge Kleivan in Copenhagen, Eva Solem in Oslo, and Terje Brantenberg in Tromsø. The Quebec Inuit, for whom I then worked, were struggling to implement a political settlement bred of confrontation over hydro-electric power projects in their caribou grazing hinterland and were alarmed that the Norwegian government and its agencies were imposing a hydro-electric power project on Sami reindeer lands. Mark R. Gordon (whose wide world-view I have characterised by the same quote from Saint Olaf which serves as an epigraph to this paper, coincidentally) was particularly anxious to know more about the Sami-hydro-reindeer mix (Jull 1992, 301). We found the Norwegian case relevant to Canadian indigenous interests in 1981, and I then published two brief accounts at the time ("Native Rights and Constitution: Norway's parallel with Canada", *Globe & Mail*, May 4, 1981; & Jull 1981, 50). In his role as national Inuit constitutional coordinator, Mark Gordon then sponsored a written report and month-long visit to Canada the next year by a Norwegian political anthropologist who was expert on Sami policy (Solem

1982). Three years later, when Quebec hydro-electric dam fluctuations drowned in one fell swoop some 10,000 caribou migrating through Inuit territory, Mark and I flew to meet Sami reindeer herding notables in Copenhagen. Mark had a thick wad of glossy snapshots of the Northern Quebec landscape littered with dead caribou whose clean-up he had been coordinating. As talk went on it became clear that both sides had many more interests and experiences to share than merely hydro-electric power projects; that the whole range of indigenous strivings, anxieties, and needs were comparable.

Most Norwegians, like most Canadians, have a handful of prejudices or at least preconceived notions about the North and its indigenous peoples, while rarely having first-hand acquaintance. Officials in Oslo no less than Ottawa, and Canadians and Norwegians of all stripes travelling or living abroad, are usually spectacularly uninformed about the North of their countries, but often no less determined to tell outsiders what they think about it. I do not love Canada any the less for regarding some of its Northern and indigenous policies as foolish, wrong, or deplorable. Neither do I feel for Norway any the less regard, affection, and commitment because I am sometimes critical of Northern or Sami policy. Norwegians are a small country and unique culture who have endured occupation and foreign rule for most of the last thousand years, and as recently as 1945. They are sometimes sensitive to outsiders' comments. This paper is written by a friend and admirer of the Scandinavian countries, and of their achievement of the highest general standards of civil life and community values in human history. Such standards are achieved by criticism, discussion, and reform, not by self-congratulation. After all, a disdain for cant — to a degree quite unimaginable in the public life of North America or Australia! — is one of the Scandinavians' best qualities.

It has become evident in recent years that the whole question of comparative experience, its uses, and importance cannot be taken for granted, even in those circles like indigenous groups who might be thought to be most sophisticated in such matters. In this paper I have not only pointed out developments abroad which may or should interest Canadians, but have highlighted the process of comparative study and indigenous international networking itself. I have had rather a lot to say about those subjects in recent times because I fear that much of the early promise and present needs of indigenous internationalism are being lost through facile and premature self-satisfaction in some indigenous organisations who should know better; failure to use the remarkable opportunities which have been put before indigenous peoples and their friends in recent decades by technology, transportation systems, available grants, and lowered costs; and a tendency to forget the purpose of the long and difficult struggle to develop international linkages. (In addition to the comments in this paper, see also Jull 1991b; 1991c; 1993a; 1993c; 1993d; 1994a; 1994b; 1994c; 1994d; 1994e; & 1994f.) The failure of some Sami leaders who talked with ease about indigenous land rights at the opening of the internationalist indigenous era 20 years ago has been the biggest single example worrying me. Like a rabbit in the headlights they now face the unilateral extinguishment or denial of indigenous title by Scandinavian governments in their own home areas. Canadian indigenous groups have not been free of fault in this regard, either. In my darkest

moments I have thought that if "first world" nation-state governments had wanted to neutralise indigenous internationalism, the best way they could have done so was to provide travel for indigenous leaders. Such leaders may turn up as living proof that the government at home is progressive and relaxed in sponsoring them — admittedly a sometimes valuable goad to other countries who would not dare let oppressed indigenous minorities speak! — and then turn to boasting about all they have achieved at home. Groups still disadvantaged hearing, or worse, being patronised by, such sleek representatives from the "first world" are sometimes unable to distinguish them from bad old European colonialists.

I especially wish to thank Dr. Frank Cassidy and Heather Neufeldt of Victoria, British Columbia, both working for the Royal Commission, for their guidance, assistance, suggestions, understanding, patience, and accessibility. Working on a far continent creates inevitable difficulties of coordination and contact.

When I was informed of the possibility of this study, I advised the Royal Commission that I would undertake it only if Sally Weaver refused or was unable to do it. She and I also communicated directly on the subject. Soon after that I was shocked to learn that she had died. Although we were friends in Canada, we always managed to miss each other when travelling and working in Outback Australia and the Arctic Coast of Lapland, sometimes only by moments. As Canada's first and foremost political anthropologist, a person whose commitment and energy inspired many others in both indigenous and non-indigenous communities, Sally Weaver is missed. This study is dedicated to her.

PETER JULL,
Brisbane, January, 1995.

**A THOUSAND YEARS:
INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND NORTHERN EUROPEANS**
2ND EDITION, COMPLETELY REVISED AND EXPANDED
by Peter Jull

PART I — INTRODUCTION

*All of this happened while I was walking around starving in Christiania
[i.e., Oslo] — that strange city no one escapes from until it has left its
mark on him...*

OPENING PARAGRAPH OF *HUNGER*, KNUT HAMSUN, 1890

The Nordic¹ countries — Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, and Iceland — have long provided great interest for Canadians concerned with public policy (e.g., Manitoba 1971). Especially in respect of social issues, labour markets, public planning, and balanced development, the Nordics have shown a humane and workable example to other countries. One would wish that Canada, Australia, Russia, and others today were less fixated on the USA, an example of little except itself whether in its glories or weaknesses, and studied the socio-politics and public policy of the Nordic Council member countries instead.

Little attention has been paid to Nordic experience with indigenous peoples. These include the Inuit of Greenland (Nuttall 1994); the Norse-descended Faroese and their rocky North Atlantic islands (West 1972; Jackson 1979); and Sami (the Lapps) of Norway, Sweden, and Finland. Except for a few individual researchers and the former circumpolar studies unit in the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND), much too little has been done, although there is more material available in scattered sources (e.g., studies of North Atlantic fishing coasts) than one might imagine. There is no need here to consider the Åland Islands associated with Finland, or the Denmark-Germany agreements concerning the Danish and German cross-border minorities in Schleswig-Holstein, although both are useful examples of political and social accommodation of minority peoples (summarised in Smith *et al.* 1990). One group of special interest, one whose fate and social conditions today are interwoven with those of Coastal Sami, are the Kvens, i.e., Finnish migrants to the Arctic Coast (Niemi n.d.).

¹ — Nordic is not a synonym for "northern" in English, nor does *Petit Robert* (1990) allow it such meaning in French. However, that sense has begun to slip confusingly into contemporary Canadian English and French. Its formally accepted meaning, its contemporary political meaning, and the meaning used throughout this study is "that pertaining to related peoples and languages of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Iceland, and Finland".

One must also remember that the Scandinavian peoples were active traders and settlers, no less than Viking raiders, in the period from 600 to 1100 AD. They moved into the North Atlantic islands and reached the coast of Canada, with experts today viewing the Icelandic-Norwegian base at L'Anse aux Meadows on the Northern tip of Newfoundland as more likely a staging area from which they explored the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Atlantic coastal areas to the South and West, than a real settlement (Jones 1986). Recent research indicates that they were active in the North Atlantic up to 200 years earlier than conventional historical dating has assumed (Hermanns-Audardottir 1992). They were also active in the lands South and East of the Baltic, and had well established trading routes through what are now the Baltic states, Western Russia, and the Ukraine, as far as Constantinople. In other words, it is possible to know a great deal about the Scandinavians of the era of their initial push North into the Sami heartland from data of many sorts — eyewitness accounts such as church records, heroic poetry, archeological evidence, inscriptions and graffiti, etc. New regional research in various fields, especially at such institutions as the Tromsø Museum and the University of Tromsø, as well as global research in historical climatology and other subjects, is providing more detail all the time, although often raising as many new questions as answers. It is also important to remember that England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales and their cultures have all been shaped in part by cultural and linguistic as well as genetic influences from Norway and Denmark (Loyn 1977).

The histories of indigenous-non-indigenous relations which are proving so important in revising national social and political attitudes and outcomes in Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and the USA are only in their infancy in Scandinavia, although one in particular, Björklund's *Fjordfolket i Kvænangen* (1985), about the historical social processes in one large Finnmark fjord, has created a stir at home and should be a high priority for translation into English. Also, the newly published and prize-winning history of North Norway in two volumes will, one may hope, have a major impact on Norwegian attitudes (Drivenes *et al.* 1994, Vols 1&2). Sami informally report that the two World Council of Indigenous Peoples assemblies held in the Scandinavian North in recent decades — in Kiruna (Sweden) and Tromsø — have helped improve regional attitudes to the once-despised Sami.

Although the Greenlanders have become somewhat known in Canada thanks to the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Sami have remained almost unknown. An exception was the aftermath of Chernobyl when there was some attention to the environmental damage done to Sami herds and territory and a much-publicised visit to Canada by Sami herders.

"Northern development" and cross-cultural tensions between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples have a thousand years of recorded history in Northern Scandinavia. Many of us grew up with maps and globes designating that whole region as Lapland (called Sapmi in the Sami language, a term used below). In fact, many Canadians of the author's generation could more easily locate Lapland on the map than

accurately distinguish Norway, Sweden, and Finland. Information provided today by Scandinavians in Canada is not always reliable, being often based on old prejudices, out-of-date information, or glib assumptions of Nordic superiority and success. The reality on the ground is much more complex than such assumptions or one-liners, not surprisingly, and is full of interest and importance for Canadians, both indigenous and non-indigenous.

Fortunately there are now reliable sources in English on Scandinavian indigenous issues. Some of these are readily available and deal with the up-front issues of rights, often written by persons familiar with Canadian indigenous conditions. Such are Jull 1984; Brantenberg 1985; IWGIA 1987; Jull 1988b; Brantenberg 1991; Korsmo 1992a; Thuen 1992; Sillanpaa 1992a; Sillanpaa 1992b; Korsmo 1993; Brantenberg 1993; & Beach 1994. The Sami Institute has published a brief history of Sami and their political bodies in English as an illustrated handbook, a useful book which deserves to be known to all indigenous bodies in Canada (Sami Instituhtta 1990b). Information sheets distributed by embassies are often useful, e.g., Helander 1992 and Eronn 1993.

COMPARATIVE POLITICAL STUDIES

Comparative studies have a bad name. A large portion of the population think of them either as excuses for foreign travel by self-indulgent élites such as Members of Parliament or summering scholars, or as shameful kowtowing to the pretensions of foreigners. A sub-category of the latter group resent the idea that foreign experience can be relevant to our own situation at all.

Virtually all areas of knowledge are international. Subjects like indigenous rights — and human rights generally — are primarily driven by international standards. These standards result from international debate as well as accumulated progressive national experiences. However, while we may be glad to learn from Americans or Europeans of the ill effects of some medication or nuclear fallout, we are more resentful when some of our comfortable assumptions, especially social and cultural prejudices, are challenged. In literature from Australia, where comparative studies are a way of life for policy officials and social science academics, some of the clearest statements have been made on the value of comparative work (e.g., Alexander & Galligan 1992b; Jackson 1992). It is worth quoting from Jackson's paragraphs headed "Reform" (Jackson 1992, 16):

Accurate description and valid explanations lay the groundwork for reform of institutions and changes in public policy in most democratic countries. There is a vital link between the search to expand knowledge and efforts to develop broader social goals and public purposes such as the promotion of liberty, order and justice.

Political science is more than just an intellectual discipline; it is also an ethical one. The impetus to promote political reform — in the sense of peaceful enhancement of liberty, justice and democracy — is intrinsic to the profession. As political scientists, we strive to learn how things work in practice. Our research findings may show a gap between the reality and the ideal of how things ought to work. Once a gap is indicated, few political scientists will be satisfied with the *status quo*, and are likely to become deeply committed to reform of aspects of the political system.

Because the intellectual culture and social assumptions of Canada and the Nordic countries are both strangely different and comfortably similar, they make for stimulating comparisons. One of the most evident differences is the genuine Nordic will to remove major socio-economic disparities, in contrast with the five Anglo-American democracies. In Northern Scandinavia one sees none of the shocking indigenous living conditions all too typical of Canada's Mid-North or Outback Australia.

It must be stressed that comparative studies are more than an attempt to steal, *holus-bolus*, the experience of one country and impose it on another. Some ideas may be more easily grasped than others, although it is important to assure oneself that contexts do not make them divergent in fact. An enthusiastic Northwest Territories report on a trip to Scandinavia eulogised certain aspects of government assistance to business, the authors unaware that the full government regulatory context in Sapmi was one which their delegation would fiercely oppose if anyone dared suggest it for Canada (NWT Business Council 1986).

Part IV of this report, titled "Lessons of the Sami Case", avoids details such as the language policy provisions recently legislated in Norway, despite the fact that these have proven extremely interesting to Canadian governments and indigenous groups (SCC 1985; Norway 1987b). Instead, an attempt is made to reach a deeper layer where we find the dynamic elements underlying hinterland socio-politics — a search for universals, where striking elements may be found to teach us how to make better policies and politics (see also Jull 1991a, 33-41) — and to note one or two specific matters which are unlikely to reach Canadians otherwise.

PART II — THE MAIN ISSUES

... [Ogilvie] observed, that Scotland had a great many noble wild prospects. JOHNSON. 'I believe, Sir, you have a great many. Norway, too, has noble wild prospects; and Lapland is remarkable for prodigious noble wild prospects. But, Sir, let me tell you, the noblest prospect which a Scotchman ever sees, is the high road that leads him to England!'

SAMUEL JOHNSON QUOTED AT PAGES 301-302 OF BOSWELL'S *LIFE OF JOHNSON* [1791], ED. CHAPMAN, INTRO. ROGERS, THE WORLD'S CLASSICS, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1980.

A GENERALISATION

If one may make a generalisation to help situate Canadians in an unfamiliar landscape, it is that

in Canada, socially and economically marginalised indigenous peoples across the country are negotiating formal arrangements for autonomy, self-government, and resource rights (including lands and seas) which will, among other things, address persistent socio-economic disadvantage, while

in Sapmi, an indigenous population, undifferentiated in its high living standards from others in its heartland region, is wrestling with the meaning of its history, culture, identity, and political options in three of the world's wealthiest and most insistently egalitarian societies.

That these latter conflicts can be painful and even life-threatening is attested in the recent work of Sami scholars like Vigdis Stordahl.

It is probably futile to resist the inclination of politicians and officials — whether indigenous or non-indigenous — to talk about the experience of others in terms of who is "behind" or "ahead" of whom. Although that is a mischievous (and misleading) perspective, it seems inevitable. Therefore, we may say that, overall, the Sami are *ahead* of indigenous Canadians in their socio-economic conditions and in the complexity of their cross-cultural relations with national majority societies, but *behind* in national political clout, public recognition, impact on general public opinion, moves towards self-government, and achievement of land and resource rights. It may be added that relative Sami disadvantages could disappear quickly if new institutions of Sami politicisation and emerging world standards in indigenous rights, including ILO Convention 169, apply pressure.

WHAT CANADA TO COMPARE?

There are two basic models for indigenous rights and governance in Canada, what we may call the Northern Model and Southern Model. The Northern Model is primarily an expansive outward-looking quest for sharing wide powers with senior governments for the overall management and control of events in large territories (land, freshwater, and sea) in parts of the country where indigenous peoples do not feel themselves to be under immediate demographic threat and where there is a relatively relaxed attitude towards the rights and interests of permanent non-indigenous residents. Actual or impending regional agreements to settle indigenous claims along these lines are found in the Yukon, Northwest Territories, Northern Quebec, and Labrador, i.e., more than half of Canada's area. The Southern Model is necessarily more defensive: here indigenous peoples retain the last remnants of their traditional territory, usually very small areas, and seek the strongest rights in law and ownership, with hopes of later expanding from these bastions. Such cases are often Indian reserves or Indian government models based on such reserves. Future claims and self-government settlements or treaties in the provincial North and British Columbia may involve important features of both Northern and Southern Models (and may face difficulties in resolving tensions between those two rather different approaches).

Indigenous reserve lands in the Canadian sense are not found in Scandinavia. Sami survive socially and culturally as individuals and families in touch with other such people in urban areas, in rural areas surrounded by Scandinavian neighbours, or in some few "Sami districts" such as half a dozen *kommune* (township) districts of North Norway which retain a significant proportion of Sami and a Sami character. Therefore, it is most useful for Canadians to think of relating Sami experience to (1) the Territorial and Provincial North, (2) Métis and non-status Indians, and (3) general indigenous policies and rights recognition in Canada. Each of these categories is discussed below.

Of concern to all indigenous peoples in Canada, however, must be the looming prospect of new constitutions for Quebec and the "Rest of Canada", arrangements agreed either in the attempt to save or replace the present Canada. We may see a newly sovereign Quebec which views indigenous nations such as Inuit, Crees, *et al.* as opponents of its own ethno-national agenda; a rump Canada bitter towards ethnic and regional rights of all kinds following Quebec's secession; or a Canada and Quebec of regional power-brokers trying to create a new Canada and a new national federation *minus* some features which those regions or their current governments resent under existing arrangements, e.g., indigenous land rights, indigenous self-government, or territorial governments holding nearly half the national land and resources for a handful of residents. Any of those outcomes could threaten to undo all that Canada's indigenous peoples have achieved politically and legally in the past 30 years. Then the laws, precedents, and interpretations of international rights established or emerging among Sami — or Maori, or Torres Strait Islanders, or Aborigines, or Alaskan Natives — could become very much more relevant to Inuit, Indians, and Métis than they seem today. If a new Quebec

established European-style legal and political arrangements, for example, it might well look to Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland for precedents, as has been a habit of Québécois intellectuals for decades. Sami experience could then become directly important to Canadians.

(1) RESPECTIVE NORTHLANDS

Canada's North aroused much public and official concern during the mid-late 1980s, as in the 1950s, because of the region's location *vis-à-vis* the Soviet Union and possible Soviet-American nuclear or conventional warfare. In both cases the hottest issue seemed to be whether Canada's ally and protector, the USA, was taking liberties with the punctilio of Canadian sovereign rights. In an actual outbreak of war such concerns might have evaporated within minutes, of course.

Sapmi, on the other hand, gives Norway, alone of NATO members, a land frontier and sea frontier with Russia/USSR. What is more, that Russian border area, the Kola Peninsula, is the most heavily armed on earth. Not only are Russian nuclear missile-firing and nuclear-powered submarine fleets based there, but also units of amphibious combat forces. For what possible purpose but an invasion of Northern Scandinavia could these troops be used? ask Scandinavian strategic studies specialists (e.g., Sollie 1986). The USSR had occupied Eastern Finnmark in the later stages of World War II, their mere advance throwing back the Germans who burned or blew up every shed, pole, and cow in the North. Given the atrocities committed by the Germans against Soviet prisoners in the North, the Germans had good reason to flee. Many people in Northern Scandinavia regarded, and regard, the USSR as their liberator. Earlier Finland was invaded by the USSR and lost much of its territory, but managed to survive through remarkable courage and skillful diplomacy. Sweden, as ever, was neutral — more neutral towards some than towards others, complain Norwegians who resent what they see as tacit Swedish accommodation of German invaders. (Sweden, as the power among the Nordic countries, is the perpetual butt of the resentments and rivalries of the others.)

By Canadian standards, Northern Scandinavia is very small. All Sweden, reckoned a large country in Europe, is nearly 20% smaller than Baffin Island. Norway is nearly 40% smaller than Baffin. With Northern Scandinavia having already been a zone of furious warfare in the lifetime of many Northerners alive today, sensitivity to Cold War strategies was natural. The notorious American Maritime Strategy which so distressed many Canadians in the late 1980s would have seen American battle fleets arriving off Tromsø and fighting their way into the Barents Sea against the full might of Soviet nuclear and naval forces. Such considerations bred the usual paranoia and conspiracy theories on all sides, while the Oslo spy trial of leading Norwegian diplomat Arne Treholt in the mid-1980s revealed a number of disquieting Abbott-and-Costello-style spy capers in Northern Norway (before the trial was closed to the public).

In Canada as late as 1986 some serious scholars were denying that the Arctic existed as a region, i.e., before the release of the Simard-Hockin Report and a new urgency given to discussions of Canada in the Arctic (Simard & Hockin 1986; CARC 1988; Jull 1988a; Robertson *et al.* 1988). Arctic experts were more interested in ice, polar bears, and ocean currents than messy social and ethno-cultural issues. The political issues of most heated and immediate concern to governments were unresolved jurisdictional boundaries at sea, e.g., in Canada's North-West Passage and the Barents Sea. The Norwegians have not always been enthusiastic about including the Northern mainland in discussions of Northern issues, even denying to Canadians that they had any Northern Development problems by locating the North offshore! Canada, too, has had senior officials in Ottawa stoutly denying to foreign dignitaries in the second half of the 1980s that Northern peoples and their push for claims settlements and self-government were more than silly whims which would soon pass.

The most striking thing about the Scandinavian North for Canadians — apart from dramatic landscapes and the midnight sun — is the high quality of infrastructure, public services, private housing, and general living conditions. Here is no remote hardship post, but rather modern communities fully integrated into the national and international life of the time and well connected by fine paved roads, local and national air services, coastal shipping (the ports are ice-free all year thanks to the Gulf Stream), and railways reaching at least the more Southerly areas of Northern Scandinavia. This degree of integration of the region into the national socio-economic pattern has been largely a post-war phenomenon. Sidsel Saugestad's *Partners in Enterprise*, a study of the real life and recent historical social development of Norwegian coast fishing communities, is an exquisite existential analysis of these changes (Saugestad 1988). Of course, many Canadians would be no less surprised to find how "modern" and accessible the NWT, Yukon, and other areas of the Canadian Mid-North are today.

What struck me no less forcefully on my return to North Norway in late 1993 was the civic culture. Having been so long outcast in the Anglo-Saxon world where the Thatcher and Reagan wars on public institutions and civil values in favour of personal advantage had permeated the values of even usually middle-road Canada and Labor Australia, it was a pleasant shock. There were vigorous debates on all manner of public policies and outcomes, of course, but also the general conviction that solutions were a shared enterprise, that there were shared values and institutions worth honouring, and that society should work well (and for all). As in Canada's Northwest Territories, better solutions are possible in such places because of the quality of the political culture, even though old prejudices remain, and not least ethno-cultural prejudices.

These matters are of great importance, the more so as new societies are being created in Northern hinterlands elsewhere — in Nunavut, where a Nunavut Implementation Commission is working; in Torres Strait; in Aboriginal areas of Northern and Western Australia; in Greenland and Alaska and Russia. To some extent those new societies are a reaction to, and rejection of, the old *liberal development model*. I have lately urged

that the old problems and new needs of such ethno-regions should be the highest priority of political work and research (Jull 1992b). North Norway is the most mature such hinterland region and should play a large role in Canadian or Australian comparative research agendas.

(2) *MÉTISSAGE*

With "Lappishness" regarded as a mark of backwardness and inferiority till recent times, and in Norway even considered a threat to national security which church and civil authorities combined to reduce, it is not surprising that Sami have been wary in certain times and places of identifying themselves (Eidheim 1971; Eriksen & Niemi 1981). The material blessings of modern social democracy in the North, bringing fine housing, services, many jobs, and vast regional subsidies, were provided on a non-ethnic basis. Was not this the way of the future, replacing old categories of ethnic and social prejudice? The result has been, as in parts of Canada, that indigenous peoples outside strongly traditional core areas — Indian reserves in Canada or Sami reindeer herding areas of Scandinavia — have been reluctant to identify as Sami. Even Inuit areas, e.g., Labrador, did not always escape such problems, and it is noteworthy that scholars like Kleivan and Brantenberg schooled in North Norway have written some of the most important modern scholarly studies on Labrador Inuit and their complex ethno-cultural and social relationship with Settlers there (e.g., Kleivan 1966; Brantenberg & Brantenberg 1984).

As Sally Weaver wrote when comparing Canadian Métis and Sami in her lectures delivered in North Norway,

[It] can be seen that both Sami and the Metis are self-identifying minorities in that there are no legal state categories for them *in toto*, both have lived interspersed in communities with non-Sami and non-Metis people for generations, both currently lack exclusive territory and land rights, both historically had recognized land rights which are no longer acknowledged by the nation-state, both are usually treated in government programs as regular citizens living in 'rural', 'regional', or 'peripheral' areas of the countries, both lack local government structures of their own (in contrast to status Indian band councils), both have formal national organizations which are funded *and* recognized by the governments, and both experience the problems attending the lack of an institutionalized focus in government to deal with their demands *as Sami* and *as Metis*. (Weaver 1983, 115)

The question of enrolment for the Sami Parliament voter list has become a major social and political issue by requiring Sami to come forward. Indeed, the fear of social and political backlash caused the creation in Norway of Samenes Landsforbund (SLF), a Sami association created to oppose Sami rights. SLF has certainly added a unique dimension to ethno-political debates and has provided much comfort along the way to the

redneck Norwegian element opposed to Sami rights. (More recently, however, SLF has contributed a great deal to the rights agenda itself, i.e., coastal and sea rights. Its organisational structure appears to be now dissolving in its own internal contradictions and populist politics.)

The social conflicts over Sami identity are felt by individuals and communities. Many individuals are deeply conflicted, and people on the Norwegian coast who are Sami or part-Sami may resent what they see as the reindeer herders' hijacking of Sami identity and culture — a resentment which provided much of the fuel for SLF. Sometimes whole coastal settlements have risen in the morning Norwegian and gone to bed Sami after formal and express political acts of conversion and return to their roots. Björklund's moving study of the historical social processes in the life of one Finnmark fjord township has had far wider impact than in that area alone, and local Sami there have emotionally thanked him for "giving us back our history" (Björklund 1985).

North Norwegian scholars have been moving increasingly into study of the "construction" of indigenous and non-indigenous identity. This is a phenomenon which raises many painful questions for individuals, risks reinforcing majority disdain for minorities, and raises ethical questions in ethnic relations which Canadians may wish to handle with care. On the other hand, it may also be interpreted as part of a growing world-wide study of the origins of nationalism and nations, with significant potential for helping us resolve future tensions between peoples and political entities in an overcrowded and economically unjust world. Canadian scholars have begun wrestling with some of these ethical questions (Dyck & Waldram 1993) while others have begun vigorously challenging indigenous statements of culture and identity (Boldt 1993b).

On the whole, however, indigenous heritage is a growing source of pride in Northern Scandinavia, as in Canada. It would appear that there is much to be gained from a sharing of experience and research between the two countries. Canadian realisation that this is not an exotic or trivial issue could be hastened thereby. In both countries all the hard questions about the implications of métissage for public policy remain to be answered. Other countries like Australia and New Zealand might also be included in any conferences or network on such matters.

(3) GENERAL INDIGENOUS POLICY

The broad national questions of recognition of the first inhabitants in law, political structures, and administration should be obvious areas for Canadian-Scandinavian interchange. Because Scandinavian authorities have been slow to acknowledge that there is a problem or that Sami are other than fancy-dress Norwegians or Swedes, discussion has not always been easy. Today Inuit internationalism and other initiatives of Circumpolar contact and cooperation have broken down some of that reserve. Nonetheless, there is much Scandinavian self-esteem bound up in the view that everything is for the best in Scandinavia, the best of all possible worlds.

THE STORY IN BRIEF

The air of harmony and reasonableness which Canadians are apt to think they see in Scandinavian public affairs is not the whole story. Fundamental national debates and social conflicts have shaped the modern Nordic world, as an accessible new introduction to the region usefully reminds us (Griffiths 1991). Social, cultural, and political progress, so well achieved in so many areas of national life, has been hard-won. Great wars and powerful neighbours as much as *dirigiste* political traditions have made Scandinavians more accepting of government intervention and leadership in society than has been the case among Anglo-Saxons. Nevertheless, there is growing recognition of some fundamental shared visions among Scandinavians and Canadians as evidenced by the rapidly growing Scandinavian interest in recent Canadian fiction and in exchanges of indigenous and non-indigenous art.

Two-thirds of the c. 75,000 Sami live in Norway, and a quarter in Sweden, with most of the small remainder in Finland. Kola has about 2000 Sami according to both Russian official and Sami sources (Sokolova, Novikova & Ssorin-Chaikov 1993; Fenge & Reimer 1994b). However, figures are often unreliable. With the flowering of Sami identity and pride in Norway, numbers there are dramatically increasing. Sami culture is no longer the badge of shame or embarrassment it could be in times past. The overwhelming Sami population is in Norway, and Norway has proven the leader in progressive reform (with Sweden and Finland usually following after). Most of the following discussion is about Norway.

In the 1950s a Norwegian official commission was established to consider Sami rights, but despite its substantial recommendations, there was little government response (Solem 1982). About the same time a disappointing Canadian inquiry into the Indian Act was taking place, and today Sweden seems to have re-run this futile experience.

There is nothing like Sami government anywhere in Sapmi. However, in Troms and Finnmark counties of North Norway some townships have predominant Sami population, and this can confer some language and culture rights under the Sami Language Act. That new Act is supposed to make a Sami education available to all Sami children wherever numbers warrant (SCC 1985; Norway 1987b). Any progress on self-government will depend on the ability of the Sami Parliaments in the three countries to convince national governments of reform in that direction. The Sami Parliaments themselves are national elected advisory bodies (see Part III below).

Norway's Sami are organised in three major organisations. NSR (Norwegian Sami Association) is an aboriginal rights organisation comparable to national or regional Canadian indigenous political associations. Despite its capable leadership, the very breadth of its membership has sometimes made it more a broad front than a battering ram of change. In the first Norwegian Sami Parliament elections, held in 1989, NSR won outright control. In the 1993 elections NSR was again victorious. Its long-time leader,

Ole Henrik Magga, leads the Sami Parliament. His strong profile and articulate leadership have become the clearest expression of Sami rights on the Norwegian scene.

NRL, Norske Reindrifstamers Landsforbund, is an industry lobby which negotiates economic agreements and industry standards of all sorts for Sami reindeer-herders with the Norwegian government. (Such industry lobbies are an important element in the Nordic corporatist government system.) NRL is a purely Sami body, although some critics charge that in recent years it has put its economic role ahead of its implicit role as a socio-cultural organisation.

SLF, Samenes Landsforbund, a largely Coastal Sami body, has been mentioned already. Founded to *oppose* Sami rights which, it feared, would cause a Norwegian backlash against Sami, it has evolved into a strong voice for aboriginal rights in the coastal zone (see Brantenberg 1985; SLF 1985; Jull 1988b, 18-20, 53-70; Brantenberg 1991). Nevertheless, along the way the misunderstandings and sometimes bloody-minded opposition of SLF to NSR has deeply embittered Sami politics and done incalculable harm to the Sami rights cause.

The Nordic Sami Council brought together the Norwegian Sami with those from Sweden and Finland, and has now been renamed simply Sami Council to include Sami from Russia. This body has been active in the creation and development of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples, and has even played a role assisting Nordic governments in delivering foreign aid programs to indigenous peoples on other continents (e.g., Latin America). Sami and the Nordic governments have been vigorously working internationally to end genocide, displacement, and other anti-indigenous measures in Latin American countries, and are very active in trying to publicise and change such policies. The awarding by the Norwegian Parliament of the Nobel Peace Prize to Guatemalan Indian activist, Rigoberta Menchu, was a characteristic gesture. What is more affecting is the warmth with which Ms. Menchu is received and attended by Sami leaders and the Northern Scandinavian community in general during her visits there. In recent years the Canadian government has joined with the Nordic nations in active world human rights work, including indigenous rights; at the same time the Inuit movement through the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC) has been increasingly in touch with Sami leaders on shared interests such as international rights and environmental issues (AILS 1991a; 1991b; 1991c). The Canadian government appointment in October 1994 of long-time Inuit and Circumpolar leader Mary Simon as the country's first Circumpolar Ambassador should facilitate Canadian official and indigenous contacts with Sami and Northern Scandinavia (Canada 1994).²

² — The best comment on her appointment may have been the first two sentences of the front-page report in *Nunatsiaq News*, Nunavut's principal newspaper, October 28, 1994, by Lisa Gregoire, "Simon gets new post as Arctic ambassador":

If you do the work long enough, eventually you'll get the job.

Mary Simon, who has been acting as an informal Arctic ambassador for years, was given that official title last week by Canada's Foreign Affairs Minister André Ouellet and Indian Affairs Minister Ron Irwin.

The most important progress to date in Scandinavia is the work of Carsten Smith and the Sami Rights Committee leading to and from its 1984 first report (Smith *et al.* 1984; 1990; Jull 1984; Smith 1987; 1992b; 1992c). Resulting from this report was a 1988 amendment to the Norwegian constitution, reading:

It is the responsibility of the authorities of the State [i.e., the Kingdom of Norway] to create conditions enabling the Sami people to preserve and develop its language, culture, and way of life. (Helander 1992).

Central to the 1984 report was the discussion on Article 27 of the 1966 Civil and Political Rights convention of the United Nations (Smith 1987; Smith *et al.* 1990). The report establishes that the protection of culture which national governments like Norway or Canada must guarantee to territorially-based minorities such as Sami, Inuit, or North American Indian First Nations, includes the material base of that culture, i.e., land, freshwater, seas, living species, etc. It also clearly distinguishes between indigenous minorities who have such rights and later immigrants who do not.

In a further crucial conclusion the same report insists that a country like Norway which has an indigenous culture within its borders carries a special responsibility for the maintenance and future of that society. This would apply to the Inuit, First Nations, and Métis peoples of Canada no less. It is interesting to reflect on how such a concept might have altered provincial and federal Northern Development policies.

The 1984 report also recommended a *Sami Act* which includes creation of the Sami Parliament, another reform now legislated (Norway 1987a). The Sami Parliament, initially an advisory body only, nonetheless should be consulted by Parliament and government administration on Sami-related issues. It can raise and recommend anything, and was assumed from the outset to be a body which would acquire more powers over time. The national Norwegian parliament, Storting, must now receive a report and debate Sami policy at regular intervals. (Further discussion of the Sami Parliament is found in Part III. below.)

The Sami Culture Committee report in Norway has been no less significant, tackling as it has the basic question of Norway's national mono-culture and insisting that, in fact, the country has two founding nations, Sami and Norwegian (SCC 1985; Jull 1988b, 40-52). Needless to say, this sort of formulation did not come easily to be accepted by all Norwegians. As Helander (1992) begins her Norwegian government information statement,

An ethnic minority and a separate people, but Norwegian citizens too. This is how Norway officially defines the country's Sami ethnic minority. But this has not always been the case.

In Sweden today we see a state which is socially progressive but which has been unable to overcome ingrained habits of uniformity and centralism to accept Sami rights and aspirations on anything like adequate minimum terms. That painful story is detailed in Jahreskog 1982; Korsmo 1991, Korsmo 1992b, Korsmo 1993, Torp 1992b, and Cramer 1994. It deserves reading by all those who assume that a government and people who are socially progressive are, therefore, progressive on minority issues. The failure of Sweden and its social democratic tradition in this matter could be usefully contrasted to the success of Denmark *vis-à-vis* Inuit and Norway *vis-à-vis* Sami, surely a most useful study if only someone would undertake it. Korsmo (1992a) compares American and Swedish experience usefully, finding that the usual political science assumptions about their relative responsiveness to social issues are reversed in the matter of indigenous rights. Cultural studies scholars might also usefully compare evolving Norwegian and Swedish public relations hand-outs on Sami from over the years, e.g., Norway 1973; Norway 1976; and Helander 1992, and Sweden 1975; Swedish Institute 1979; 1984; Sweden 1984; and Eronn 1993, for insights as to the actual state of affairs — that is, as *meta*-communication.

All that should be said here is that while Sweden and Finland have a strong centralist tradition in public administration and political culture, Norway has regionalist, historical, and cultural sensitivities which strongly modify centralist habits (and which appear refreshing to Canadians with their own decentralist outlook). Nevertheless, the notion of strong, purposeful and morally superior government is strong in Norway, too, as a revealing matter-of-fact note in an article on local government demonstrates:

For an activist government, as is the case in Norway, it is preferable to rule under a constitution that permits parliament to redesign local government to improve the latter's performance of nationally mandated tasks. Local self-government is enhanced because of the central government's power to make local governments more responsible to local constituencies. In the absence of a powerful central government, local governments can fall prey to minorities who are able to invoke constitutional arguments to defend an institutional status quo against the political will of regional or national majorities. (Kvavik 1984, note 4).

This contradictory comment says a great deal that the outsider approaching Scandinavian politics and policy needs to know.

Sami in the three countries live in well-defined eco-regions, affectingly described from the South to the North by Nickul (1977). Their modern political struggles have centred on

- the pressure on these regions by forestry, hydro-electric power development, road-building, mining, settlement, etc., all compounded by insufficient protection for Sami use and rights, and

- socio-cultural pressure on Sami social ways, language, and identity by Scandinavian culture, society, and government.

There is a considerable literature in English on problems in the first category, but rather less on the second. One in the second category, however, Eidheim's *Aspects of the Lappish Minority Situation* (1971), is a classic which anyone involved with indigenous issues anywhere should read.

The history of resource management in the North has many dimensions. One of these is the recent scholarly recognition, not yet much reflected in public policy, that large-scale national management may be quite irrelevant to the needs and realities of the local fisheries which provide the backbone of life in many areas (Nilsen forthcoming; Björklund 1991; Maurstad 1992; Pedersen 1989; 1992; Eythorsson 1993). Norway has a population which has always prided itself on its attachment to environmental values, long before the word "environment" - *miljø* in Norwegian, i.e., *milieu* — became fashionable among world élites. The reconciliation of social, economic, natural and other values in physical development planning has been long established — but then, how did fiascoes like the Alta case (Paine 1982; Brantenberg 1985; Lindal & Sunde 1981) and the North coastal fishery troubles (Brantenberg 1991; Nilsen forthcoming; Pedersen 1992) take place? The "tragedy of the commons" debate, pitting traditional Sami reindeer herding society against the rationalist planners so beloved of Scandinavian political and policy culture, is more clearly drawn than it has been to date in Canada and may be the wave of the North American and world future (e.g., Henriksen 1985; Björklund 1988). North Norway's land, sea, and resource policies in the next years, into which mix the land, freshwater, and inshore rights of Sami are being formally injected by the Sami Parliament and the Sami Right Committee, will be of particular interest. The Committee's former chairman, Carsten Smith, has developed ideas in relation to both land and sea, and has encouraged much creative thinking which has now begun to shape public policy (e.g., Brantenberg 1991, 119-123; Jull 1993c).

The many inter-related problems of the Coastal or Sea Sami, the recent marine and coastal policy crisis which had polarised North Norwegians generally against the national authorities (with whom they had previously had a close partnership), and the remarkable evolution of SLF and Sami rights consciousness and cultural identity in the coastal zone, make for a fascinating study (e.g., Pedersen 1992; Jull 1988b, 18-20, 53-70; Jull 1993c, 18-28). The similarities with Labrador and parts of the British Columbia coast are especially evident. Such parallels have been noted by various Canadian scholars, e.g., Robert Paine, Raoul Andersen, and the late Sally Weaver.

The politics and policy of hydro-electric power development are obvious areas for shared Canadian and Scandinavian research and comparative work. It is surprising that there has not been more consultation between Inuit and provincial Indian First Nations battling hydro power in Canada on the one hand, and Sami who have so much experience of the same issue in Scandinavia.

Now another item has emerged. While Dene and Inuit try to come to grips with diamond finds on the Dene-Nunavut border, the same companies are also active in North Norway, Sweden, and Finland, and have a past in Australia where the aftermath of diamond mining and other development in the East Kimberley region has fuelled many regional Aboriginal problems, fine studies, and a movement for Canadian style-regional agreements on indigenous land rights and environmental protection (Coombs *et al.* 1989; Dixon & Dillon 1990). Sami have begun to be concerned, the more so as the Norwegian government has exhibited some confusion and lack of communication on the diamond issue and on mining rights issues generally in Sami territory, while both Sami and other residents of Norway have learned more from Australian newspaper clippings about mining company plans and interests than from local sources. What is more, an informal network of researchers already exists: in the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, Ottawa; the North Australia Research Unit, Darwin; and the University of Tromsø. One may hope that such an opportunity for Sami cooperation with indigenous peoples in Canada (and Australia) will not be let slip.

Chernobyl presented Sapmi with a particular problem (e.g., Paine 1992). Suddenly the Sami were uniquely vulnerable, their food chain of land and water poisoned, their whole culture under direct threat, including wild talk of the state slaughtering Sami herds, while their Scandinavian neighbours in the same townships were unaffected because their food came from "down South". It was a very poignant moment, one in which Sami felt both invisible and helpless. Sami leaders visited Canada during this period and drew much sympathetic attention to their situation. There was even some well-publicised, but never very serious, talk of Sami herders and herds relocating to the fresher fields of Northern Canada.

There is no land claim settlement in Sapmi today. The best chance to prepare one has been a fiasco (Brantenberg 1993; Brantenberg & Minde 1994). The Norwegian Sami Rights Committee began the task in 1980 through a sub-group made up entirely of Norwegians, i.e., with no Sami. For reasons which are not yet clear, key Sami leaders promised that they and their organisations would not discuss land rights until the "group of experts", as Norwegians call it, made their report. Like Horton the Elephant, the Sami leaders sat grimly through 13 years of snow and sleet and summer sun, and through the rise and fall of Norwegian prime ministers and governments, and through the transformation of world standards by world practice and through the writing of new world standards like ILO 169 and the Draft Declaration... silently. In mid-1993 the conclusions were leaked and caused disquiet before being finally released at year's end (Norway 1993c). The conclusion of the study is that Sami have no rights because there is a government in Norway which governs in all parts of the country. That is, the argument which was rejected in the Marshall cases of the early 19th century in the US Supreme Court, by the Canadian Supreme court in *Calder* in 1973, and by the Australian High Court in *Mabo* in 1992 — that the existence and actions of a law-making power in the territory where Sami claimed land title eliminates their ancient title — was advanced as the basis of this decision. As in the Anglo-Saxon cases, too, there appears not to have

been a "clear and plain" extinguishment of title. Inevitably, some apologists for the Sami Rights Committee experts have tried to turn a difference in British and Nordic legal systems into a moral evasion.

Norway is a small country. Everyone who matters is likely to be having lunch within a couple of block along Karl Johan in Oslo on any given day — admittedly with a few escaped to one or two fjordside and mountaintop eateries, pleasant for their views and relief from the gaze of their colleagues. Professional élites and politicians whose coalitions come and go are all well acquainted. Élites are all Norwegian, without the mix of backgrounds one finds in Vancouver or Ottawa, let alone Montreal or Toronto, and without such a multi-polar society as Canada or Australia.

The small scale of the Scandinavian countries and their relative ethno-cultural homogeneity have had many advantages, but in matters of social and cultural pluralism, may work against easy progress. It appears that the mature generation of Sami leaders have, in large part, opted to win the respect and favour of the close-knit Scandinavian societies rather than confront them, to prove that the discriminatory labels of the past do not apply and that Sami are no less able to hold responsible positions than other residents of these countries. Such a strategy indicates the sort of problems which Sami have experienced. Whether or not it also indicates a very early stage in the development of Sami ethno-politics in relation to the nation-state remains to be seen. The fact is that the Scandinavian governments have had a very quiet life in respect of Sami, the Alta confrontation apart. Instead of using the past decades of Sami socio-political emergence to adjust to the reality of bi-culturalism and Sami rights, those governments have simply used congenial and familiar official practices such as expert committees and political management to reinforce their own resistance to accommodation of Sami cultural and political imperatives. The exception has been the early Sami Rights Committee work in Norway under the gifted — one may now more accurately say "inspired" — chairmanship of Carsten Smith resulting in its first report in 1984 and the implementation, also in Norway, of Sami cultural measures following the Sami Culture Committee work. Sweden and Finland have not lacked for sensible recommendations, but have lacked the political will or socio-political urgency to act on them.

Meanwhile, Scandinavian governments have been active in championing the case of indigenous peoples elsewhere in the world. Guatemalan Indians, Australian Aborigines, North American Indians — all of these and many more receive deserved and earnest sympathy and support. This is not really hypocrisy because Scandinavians know little of Sami. Sami have never mobilised capital-city publicity or established the sort of day-in, day-out contacts with significant national élites which have been the key to Canadian indigenous political successes since the late 1960s. Nor have the Sami Parliaments yet had great impact on policy-making. Ole Henrik Magga, the Norwegian Sami leader, finds himself frequently reminding government through press interviews that on some or other important issue for Sami the Sami Parliament has not been consulted. Any new body in any official network takes time to have an impact on "the system", so this

problem may not be entirely surprising. Also, the international lawyers and foreign affairs officials in Scandinavia are sometimes significantly in advance of domestic lawyers and officialdom in their appreciation of indigenous needs and the requirements of international standards for national practice. Canadian officialdom, on the other hand, has accepted much indigenous reform progress at home but has an unfortunate reputation abroad for obfuscation and denial in international forums, being apparently anxious to set no precedent which an independence-minded Quebec could cite in support of greater recognition as an autonomy.

The fact that the Sami leadership has opted by and large for a discreet and respectful approach to the in-bred, homogeneous, and sometimes self-satisfied Scandinavian political élite has been a success for some individuals, but less so for Sami as a community. The Sami community leaders, many of whom hold responsible and important professional and official positions now, may have provided some useful role models and won some respect for their people, but representation within the Establishment is a very different thing from altering the Establishment's decisions. By that latter standard the Sami have not been successful to date.

There was an ironic end to the November 1993 Sami-organised conference in Tromsø, *International Indigenous Politics and Self-Government*. With many of the notables of the Sami leadership from the three Scandinavian countries present, Sami historian Henry Minde asked rhetorically from the podium, as he wound up the large three-day gathering, whether Carsten Smith, now Chief Justice (and a speaker at the conference), was the only person in Norway really committed to Sami rights.

HOW CULTURES MET

The entire North of the Scandinavian region, and adjoining areas of Russia to the White Sea coast, were truly Sami territory until recent historic times. The petroglyphs of the North Norwegian coast provide wonderfully vivid insights into the old culture and its evolution. At a later stage the modern Europeans, presumably today's Norwegians, also moved along the more accessible outer coasts following the fishery. A first clear glimpse of Sami-Norwegian relations is provided by Ottar, a contemporary of England's King Alfred (died 899 AD) who settled near present-day Tromsø and had extensive dealings with the Sami in that region and right around the North coast to the White Sea. The text of his report to King Alfred is found in Jones 1984, 158-162; and Jones 1986, 251-254.

A recent film made by Sami, *The Pathfinder*, has won celebrity and respect as well as popularity world-wide. (I first saw it in Darwin.) It retells a famous Sami story of a Norse raiding party indiscriminately killing Sami in the Middle Ages, events by no means atypical (Christiansen 1980). Whether demanding tax tributes or adoption of Christianity, the violence of the "Vikings" could be an annual event in coastal and interior Sapmi. (Of course, indigenous persons alive today can remember such

occurrences in various parts of Australia.) It may be some comfort to know that the Sami were often a match for the intruders, thanks to knowledge of their country and use of their own technology, as happens in the film. The story goes some way to understanding the sometimes poisoned Sami-Norwegian relations of today.

Attitudes may be deduced from two elements in the Sagas, those compendia of history and attitudes which provide the "heroic literature" of Northern European peoples. Many sagas record youthful visits by their heroes to the far North — to Lapland or Finnmark, to use two of their names for Sapmi — in the period c. 900-1100 AD. The story of Norway's life in those times is most memorably recreated or reconstructed in the great work of Snorri Sturluson, c. 1200 AD, *Heimskringla* (Sturluson 1964). We are told that the land is full of magic, and so it seems to any visitor today as the midnight sun wheels around the sky giving ever-shifting colours and shadows to the fjord- and mountain-scapes. Frequently the young hero is "ensorcelled by a Finnish witch", which means, in plain English, he "had a brief encounter with a Sami girl". The land is always full of wonders, as well as sorcerers. Indeed, the "magic king" of the Norse tradition, the very real King Olaf Tryggvason (who was the king who launched Leif Eriksen on his voyage to America) pursued a band of sorcerers through the ferocious Saltstraumen tidal rip and killed them near today's Bodö — after they had played havoc with his kingdom down South. Much earlier the king who is said to have united Norway, c. 900 AD, King Harald Fairhair (Hårfagre), was so enchanted with his "Finnish witch" that he is said to have lived with the corpse after her death, bringing awful misfortunes upon himself.

Another source of insight for Sapmi, also found in sagas and in more recent studies, shows us the Norwegians faced with Inuit in Greenland and Canada, c. 1000-1500 AD, as well as early Algonquians in Newfoundland and Labrador (Gad 1971; Kleivan 1984; Jones 1986). A migration wave of Inuit was moving into Northern Greenland at about the same time the Norse were settling in the South-West corner of that country, c. 985 AD. The Norse were culturally confident, disdained the indigenous people, never thought to extend their new-fangled Christianity to them (while having mixed success in spreading it among their own Norse family members), and, most importantly, refused to adopt indigenous technology or other ideas. The striking patterns of Icelandic sweaters, fashionable in our own time, appear to have been borrowed by the Norse from the Greenland (and Canadian?) Inuit, but are the only clear such borrowing. Norse cultural arrogance had tragic results. They huddled in their ill-suited accommodation through long dark arctic winters and insistently followed old ways, while the newcomer Inuit not only had appropriate technology but were curious and ready to borrow anything they could from the Norse. The climate worsened and forced various adaptations on the Inuit, but the Norse did not adapt — and they perished. Their last few remnants straggled back to Iceland or were adopted by the Inuit, according to Greenland Inuit tales. Others of the Norse died fighting, and not only against Inuit. There are credible stories in Greenland of Inuit rescuing Norse families and adopting them after European pirates in the late Middle Ages attacked the Norse on their Greenland coasts. (This also reminds

us that a handful of Norse were by no means the only Europeans in the North-West Atlantic before Columbus!)

The first known European to land in what is now Canada, Leif Eriksen, took pains to establish his right on the New World's shores to call a parliament and oversee settlement at some future time. A whole continent lay before him for "northern development", and "Southern" development, too, for that matter. His family defended this right, established on the northern tip of Newfoundland, at L'Anse aux Meadows, in a series of murders of suspected Norse interlopers within a few years of his first landing. It is interesting to note that in this first of Canada's known constitutional processes, the Europeans quite excluded the indigenous peoples and any consideration of their rights. There was another first: Leif apparently had his sister, Freydis, perpetrator of the Canadian murders in defence of his rights, stay out of sight in a remote area of the Greenland Norse settlement while using his authority as head of that community — after the death of Erik the Red, his father — to keep the murders from being brought up for judgment and punishment at the Thing (Parliament), the first-recorded European cover-up in the New World.

In these two instances from the old lore we can perhaps gain some insight into the processes by which Norwegians approached Sapmi. On the one hand it was a mysterious and difficult land, full of exotic qualities and attractions, but quite outside their experience so they attributed magic and other frightening qualities to it — *at least so long as they did not feel confident in their own numbers or power*. Their attitudes toward Sami and Inuit were inevitably ethno-centric and arrogantly superior, despite the fact that they were world travellers. But they did not even have sufficient good sense to learn from these better adapted peoples how to survive! We will never know how many sensible Norse there were, but surely there were some who, like their descendants today, slid happily into indigenous life.

Perhaps it would do all of us good to re-read Tacitus (1979). There we find the sophisticated Roman's disdain for native ways among, *mirabile dictu*, our ancestral Irish, Welsh, Scottish, English, Frankish, Dutch, Danish, and German communities. His criticisms of our brutish ways, and his occasional affection for our flashes of childish goodness, sound much like observations made about indigenous peoples in Canada until recent years, and on other peoples and continents by European visitors.

REGIONAL COMMUNITIES, WORLD EMPIRE

The North in Norway today consists of two regionalisms overlapping in place: a regional North Norwegian identity which has a heavy Sami socio-cultural component, and distinct Sami regionalisms. These two categories of regionalism have much in common. Both are responses in space and time to local history, recent acute economic difficulties, often apparently insensitive or arbitrary government policy (coupled not so paradoxically with regional dependence on the public sector!), and to land, marine and other resource cycles and management. Both are now increasingly defining themselves through active politics — regional politics in the one case and ethno-regional politics in the other — and myths which feed these (Brantenberg, Hauan & Knutsen 1994).

In some cases the Northern Norwegian region finds itself a victim, as well as opposing the "mainstream" culture of the Norwegian nation. That such North-South regional perspectives are not all one way was evident in 1985. On the national holiday, May 17, national daytime television news from Oslo began with an item that there had *not* been violence or arrests overnight in Tromsø. I.e., there had *not* been a news story. This is what psychologists call "the power of negative thinking". At any rate, Tromsø had acquired a certain national reputation.

Regionalism in North Norway faces serious obstacles. These obstacles may do more to encourage regional dissidence than to dampen it. In Norway's corporatist state system where formal occupation and industry groupings play dominant roles in public policy and the economy, Northerners are at a distinct disadvantage, outnumbered in, e.g., the fishermen's association (Nilsen 1985). To date they have not found the township or county councils a sufficient base for regional politics. In this context the new Sami Parliament is potentially important because it is activist, can raise any matters it wishes, is heavily Northern in composition, and is concerned with the fundamental issues of government spending, government policy, and primary industry. Sami may well be able to play a regional leadership role which enables them to win friends and political support among the non-Sami community — and among those many Sami who have not yet chosen to accept Sami identity as a central part of their life.

If Sami have advantages of distinct language and culture in some areas, and significant local institutions, as well as ethnically-defined associations including the major political associations of the Sami Council, NSR, NRL, and SLF, they also have divisions and distinctions which to date have prevented them from concerting their potential power. With their own political institution, the Sami Parliament, and growing consensus on fundamental issues of regional life such as resource management and the rights of local people to priority benefit from resources, they face not so much *political* challenges as changes in the world around them.

The idea of a Euro-Arctic region (FNI 1992; Norway 1993a) promoted by the Norwegian government could see North Norway no longer so much a favoured Norwegian hinterland

as a small place between larger markets and economic powers, namely Russia and the Scandinavian countries. It would not so much benefit North Norway, fear some Northerners, as become a branch plant or launching pad for Southern Norwegian businessmen exploiting the large nearby Russian market. Although they have been included in talks, Sami leaders have had fears about the larger implications.

Norway's Southern élites have again promoted membership in the European Community, now renamed the European Union, as they did in 1972. A Europe which aims for profit maximisation by strong business groups, while tolerating massacre of women and children in Yugoslavia and the rise of racist violence against black-haired people in Northern and Western Europe, is not for everyone. North Norway has a strong tradition of support for oppressed peoples and classes.

Norway's November 1994 referendum rejection of the EU was as much a regional issue as a national one. By far the strongest opposition was in the North, where high voter turnouts and Finnmark's nearly 75% No, Troms' 72%, and Nordland's 71% made the point clear. The next highest No vote was in Nord-Trøndelag, a region adjacent to Nordland on the South, with 64% No. In Oslo, on the other hand, the vote was 2-1 Yes (*Aftenposten* Resultat-Ekstra, 30-11-94).

Northern regionalism poses problems for the Norwegian government. Prime Minister Brundtland's enthusiastic support for North Norwegian whaling alongside her world leadership on ecologically sustainable development through the Brundtland Report was seen by some as manoeuvring to win support for the EU in the North (Norway 1993b). In the 1989 Norwegian election the regional voter revolt in the North against decades of Labor hegemony saw her lose office. (She later returned to power when the Centre-Right coalition government collapsed.)

But matters other than high politics count more in North Norway. This is not a new ersatz social culture as is found in many parts of Canada's provincial and territorial North. True, one can sometimes spot the newcomers and Southern-bred élites (Jull 1991a, 9), but there is a more enduring Northern society with long roots in Sami, Finnish, and Norwegian cultures. In a public building as chaste as Bodö's airport, for instance, one is in no doubt that this is a *Northern* air terminal, just as one feels it in Churchill or Iqaluit; what is more, the art on display in airports like Bodö and Tromsö, like that in Greenland or parts of outback Australia, speaks of an old tradition with distinctively indigenous roots, even if partly merged today with European contemporary styles and techniques. In some places like Kautokeino, of course, even the most ignorant visitor will not fail to see that this is as definitely an indigenous society with indigenous way of life as Golden Lake or Iglulik.

What is the future for these overlapping regions of North Norway?

A *first* scenario, which this author discounts, despite the fears of some Sami, is that the main Sami areas, or Sapmi generally, will be homogenised into a general Norwegian/European mush. Even if Norway had entered the European Community, Sami would have found friends, allies, and resources there for their regional and cultural distinctiveness — and probably even more support than they would normally find in Norway. International attention works wonders on national conscience in relation to indigenous hinterlands! Norway's largely mono-cultural self-image and strictly puritanical devotion to schemes of rationalist improvement, all of which give the lie to the belief that a purely secular state has succeeded the old Lutheran one, are *not* typical of Western Europe today. Sami may find, as Inuit have done, that their best friends are far afield.

A *second* and more likely possibility is a strong Sami regional core straddling the Norwegian, Swedish and Finnish borders with some shared Sami institutions, although the full multi-national polity proposed by the late legal scholar, Grahl-Madsen (1986), may be very remote.

A *third* outcome could be a strongly identified Sami core area in inner Finnmark and in the major Sami fjords of the North, sharing institutions among themselves, and linked with some institutions of neighbouring Sami in Sweden and Finland (and Russia?). Sami research and broadcasting are already tri-nationally institutionalised.

A *fourth* outcome which could accompany either the second or third could see stronger Samicisation among individuals, neighbourhoods, and hamlets outside the core Sami areas, i.e., in predominantly *Norwegian*-identifying areas of the North, encouraged by the strongly Sami districts nearby to strengthen rather than forget their identity. On the basis of Canada's Acadian and Franco-Ontarien experience, areas adjacent to Quebec, it seems likely that other Sami near the Sami core districts would organise more effectively to defend and promote their Sami identity.

A *fifth* outcome would see a virtual political divorce, with the major towns and some townships being Norwegian-identifying, albeit with large Sami populations who might receive many public services from a special Sami health, education, welfare, and culture system, and a rural Sami-based system of townships or districts with culturally appropriate public services. A dual or separated system is not very difficult to implement in practice, and has occurred elsewhere in the "first world" where language, religious, or ethnic groups are mixed heterogeneously.

A *sixth* outcome would be a stage beyond Nos. 2, 3, and 4, when, for practical reasons, either Sami in Sami core areas and marginal Sami areas, or Norwegian-identifying Northerners (who may be lapsed Sami, or Finns, or Norwegians), decided that a new regional political settlement was necessary or desirable. Just as Alaska, Greenland, and Nunavut have designed new state and home rule constitutions in recent decades, and as the rest of the Northwest Territories is working on, and as the British Columbia treaty

areas will do, so Norwegians and Sami could develop more appropriate regional arrangements in cooperation with Oslo. This is not a separatist option but rather a renewal of *fylke-kommune* structures more suited to Northern regional needs. To put the matter negatively, whatever the horror of Norwegian policy-makers at any thought of regionalism (a word some Norwegians confuse with *separatism*), further economic, ethnic, resource management, and land ownership tensions in North Norway in the shadow of an unpredictable and militaristic Russia could force the national government to initiate a regional ethno-political, land, sea, and resource settlement. This is what federal governments did in Northern Canada and Northern Australia in recent decades, what Congress did in Alaska with the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, what the Danes did in the Faroes in the late 1940s, and what the Australian government has begun in Torres Strait in 1994 with creation of the Torres Strait Regional Authority in response to the Islanders' political demands.

For skittish Scandinavians it may be worth quoting Canada's two recent federalist champions, Prime Ministers Trudeau and Mulroney on such matters. Prime Minister Mulroney flew North to be in Iqaluit on May 25, 1993, to sign a huge new self-governing Northern territory into being, with distinct Inuit language and culture, saying on that occasion,

In the course of this transition [to establishment of the Nunavut government], we will redraft the map of Canada — indeed of North America. But our collective achievement is far more than a simple exercise in cartography. It is, at its core, an act of nation-building. Step by step, agreement by agreement, we are advancing toward a set of common goals: strengthening the economic, social and political foundations of the North, and enriching an ancient and cherished culture... We are forging a new partnership — a real partnership — not only between the Government of Canada and the future government of Nunavut, but between Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal Canadians. From the new climate of confidence that this settlement will engender in the North, all Canadians will benefit. ... As the dreams of your ancestors become reality, the future of this country is strengthened. (Mulroney 1993)

It is not easy to imagine a Norwegian prime minister doing something similar in the near future. Such is the conservatism of public administration in Norway that the authorities can be strangely resistant to needs and reforms staring them in the face. Some authors call this Scandinavian phenomenon "policy innovation and institutional stability" (Castles 1976). Well-deserved pride in social achievement and economic modernisation, and sheer national habit and habitual rationalism, may sometimes blind them to imperatives of pluralism. Therefore we may quote Trudeau, the great enemy of separatism and nationalism, not on Nunavut, which he supported, but on the whole question of ethno-territorial political accommodations.

Native self-government...can proceed without debates over peoplehood, and in principle, Canadians have nothing to fear from this development. Indeed, the possibility that the aboriginal community may win constitutional entrenchment of the right to self-government is the most positive aspect of the latest round of constitutional negotiations [i.e., in late 1992]. In 1982 the federal government fought for native rights and over the objections of the provinces succeeded in passing amendments confirming existing treaty rights and committing the First Ministers [i.e., Prime Minister and Premiers] to hold a series of federal and provincial conferences on the issue of native self-government. We invited aboriginal leaders to attend these conferences so that for the first time they could approach elected politicians as equals. ... Work on self-government was well advanced when we left office in 1984.

No demons will be unleashed by natives running their reserves, by land claims settlements that give local bands wide discretion over health, education and other municipal services, or by the natural evolution of the Yukon and Northwest Territories into provinces. Land claims are especially important. ... To reduce their dependence on government assistance [the aboriginal] land base should be greatly increased so that natives can enjoy higher rents from resources like timber sales or mineral rights. (Axworthy & Trudeau 1992, 28)

FINLAND

A useful general introduction to Finnish Sami is provided by Siuruainen and Aikio (1977), in *The Lapps in Finland: the population, their livelihood and their culture*, available from Finnish embassies. This might be best read with another 1977 title, by Nickul, with its evocative descriptions of Finnish Sami regional cultures. An excellent brief publication of the federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa, by Kaisa Korpijaako-Labba (1993), updates her landmark 1989 thesis on Sami rights in Finland (and Sweden) with some comments on developments and debate since. For more detail on the Sami Parliament in Finland one may turn to Aikio (1987) and Sillanpaa (1992a).

What follows here is drawn from Korpijaako-Labba (1993). Her description of the current debate within Finland, especially Northern Finland, has a familiar ring, complete with the belief of the local non-Sami that the rights debate is just an urban liberal beat-up on good rural folk, and, besides, who are the "real" Sami, anyway? (Korpijaako-Labba 1993, 29-32) Korpijaako-Labba herself has heavily altered the debate by retrieving court records and demolishing the comfortable belief that Sami were nomadic folk with no established rights. (The vast documentation she has unearthed will enable the reconstruction of a full picture of Sami community life.) She shows not only that Sami had full and definite rights, but that these were consistently upheld by Swedish courts in Sweden-Finland for centuries.

In the eyes of the judicial system of the majority culture, the land and water rights of the Sami did not remain on a *sui generis* level only; the judicial system of Sweden, as administered in Lapland, had expanded to internalize and encompass the distinctive land use and related principles of the Sami... . (Korpijaako-Labba 1993, 3)

She also shows that a 1673 enactment permitting colonisation in Lapland was not at all, nor was seen to be at the time, the repudiation of Sami rights it has been interpreted to be more recently. In fact, she comments repeatedly on bizarre and unhistorical constructions placed on documents to deny Sami their rights:

it is indisputably clear that earlier interpretations pertaining to Sami rights were not based on accurate information related to this issue but rather on speculation, mistakes and other inaccuracies. (Korpijaako-Labba 1993, 15)

It was largely in the 19th century when Finland was handed over to Russia, when courts no longer regularly travelled North, and new laws were introduced that the Sami were, in effect, dispossessed. Meanwhile,

The Sami themselves have long felt that it is of crucial importance to have their land and water rights clarified. Land use conflicts between the Sami and other northern residents have taken place for centuries. However, projects associated with industrialization and mass tourism, that could have a serious impact on the environment only began to take place in Lapland after the Second World War. (Korpijaako-Labba 1993, 3)

As for policy today,

at this point in time, the Finnish state does not acknowledge that the Sami have any title or even individually protected rights of use to any areas of land and water in northern Finland. (Korpijaako-Labba 1993, 17)

In recent years the Finnish government has been studying ILO Convention 169, whose Article 14 reads,

The rights of ownership and possession of the peoples concerned over the lands which they traditionally occupy shall be recognised.

Korpijaako-Labba (1993, 26) quotes a Finnish official study of this problem as saying,

If Finland were to ratify the Convention, it would have to guarantee the rights of the Sami associated with lands traditionally inhabited and owned by them and their rights associated with the use of natural resources in these lands to a greater

extent than is provided by legislation currently in force. (Korpijaako-Labba 1993, 26)

It was in the 1970s that Sami rights emerged as an issue, sparked by concerns over the parcelling out of rights to water in northern municipalities. Korpijaako-Labba sees the Sami Parliament as having played a decisive role in keeping the issue before the public since. (She also provides a useful summary of the proposed Sami Act of 1990, which she believes will have to be passed in some form very like the original text if Finland is to get off the hook on indigenous rights, on pages 27-29.)

PART III

PARLIAMENTS OF FISH

*Come, come, my Muse, and we will s-sing
A merry, merry roundelay
For M-much—Cuckoo—In—the Clouds,³
The happy town that's born today!
(THE BIRDS, ARISTOPHANES, 414 BC)*

*"Thus syngen smale foules for thy sake:
Now welcome, somer, with thy sonne softe,
That has this wintres wedres overshake. ...
And driven away the longe nyghtes blake!"
(THE PARLIAMENT OF FOWL, CHAUCER, 1370)*

On the coast of Northernmost Europe, the coast which curves from the North Atlantic past North Cape to face the North-East Passage, situating Norwegian cities farther East than Istanbul, crowded posters of fish — the many and varied sea creatures of the Norwegian and Barents Seas — are found more habitually in public buildings than the Fathers of Confederation ever were in Canada. Waiting for interviews, or cups of coffee to be brought by smiling staff, or papers to be dug out from files and copied, the overseas visitor will find himself studying these fishy personages rather frequently, bemused by their Latin, Norwegian, and sometimes British names (as opposed to North American English), and comprehending very little except that there are plenty of fish in that ocean. In reality the fish, like Canadian nation-builders, have been rather scarcer of late.

The Sami Parliament in Norway was first elected in 1989 and promptly had to concern itself with the crisis in the fisheries of the fjords, coast, and deep sea of the Arctic Coast. This crisis was not simply a crisis for Sami, of course, but for all residents of the coastal area and, indirectly, for the whole economy of the North. It gave the Sami an opportunity to make their new Parliament a credible regional voice.

Meanwhile, the issue of whether or not the Sami Parliaments would be worthwhile models for indigenous peoples in Canada has become an unlikely agenda item in Canada. Therefore it may be useful to give it some context.

The issue of indigenous assemblies is not new in Canada. It has been considered and utilised by Indian First Nations and Métis in the development of their national political bodies. In early 1981 the national Inuit leaders asked for a note on the concept, apparently for the possible purpose of re-organising Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (Jull

³ — Often translated into English as *Cloud-cuckoo-land*, this translation by D. Barrett in Penguin paperback.

1981b). That note was written and circulated, but no action has ever been taken on it or on any similar concept, to my knowledge, although the subject has re-surfaced once or twice since then for discussion among the Inuit leadership group. In other words, even the Inuit who share language, culture, and daily livelihoods of fishing, and sea mammal and caribou hunting, mixed with some local and regional service sector employment, a reasonably homogeneous society across the Northern third of Canada, have not yet been won to the concept.

There are two further matters which need pointing out in this discussion. The first is that the centre of gravity of indigenous politics lies at local/regional level, not national level. The indigenous ethno-regions in Canada already deal as defined entities with senior governments, one to one, whether formally and informally, and negotiate policies and programs (and land/sea rights) on that basis. They only join in larger coalition campaigns when the need arises, e.g., to fight for national constitutional amendments. They even undertake international work on their own, e.g., the Quebec Crees, or send their own representatives to join larger groups abroad, e.g., the composite Indian lobby in London in the early 1980s opposing patriation of the Canadian Constitution. If indigenous peoples are becoming self-governing units — already self-contained ethnic nations elaborating their internal governance and with the capacity and will to do their own international work — why would they need a national parliament? To facilitate and add its voice to local and regional demands, perhaps — but to wield powers of its own? Any such powers would *diminish* the powers of the indigenous nation concerned. For example, Nunavut will deal directly with the federal government, just as British Columbia or Quebec do. Why create another body in between, one which would contain a majority of non-Nunavut members and be accountable to people other than Nunavut Inuit?

The second matter is a difference between Scandinavia and Canada. In Scandinavia many indigenous leaders and Sami Parliament members are professionals and white-collar salary earners in a country where social and economic conditions have been provided fairly to all by strong centralised welfare-state governments. Their relaxed and trusting approach to the governing system is reflected in establishment of the Norwegian Sami Parliament — oral inquiries of staff and some principals revealed that no serious thought had been given to structures, staffing, program management, etc. beforehand. It was simply taken for granted. Well spoken, well schooled, well work-skilled Sami — all fluent in Norwegian, in addition to their varying Sami language skills — would simply slot into an élite hierarchy and become part of one of the most progressive governing systems on earth.

In Canada, on the other hand, young Inuit, Indians and Métis, often with minimal education (or education in the maximum security units of Western Canada penitentiaries), and usually with great verbal panache even when functionally illiterate, have had to fight for their people all the way up from the bottom. A bright school-child might begin a political career by representing frightened non-English-speaking band members or Inuit

elders in appeals to the local white welfare officer. The lack of sufficient public services and infrastructure, the frequent inappropriateness of what programs did exist, and discrimination and cross-cultural misunderstanding formed the training ground and field of combat of indigenous politicians in Canada from their earliest lives. They grew up in a world where government dominated every aspect of their lives, and yet where government was totally inadequate or oppressive. The search for self-government was always very tangible for Canada's indigenous leaders: nothing dignified or sublime about it, no political science theories for most of them, and just direct hard-hitting spokesmanship. Indeed, that is why the televised constitutional conferences in the mid-1980s were such a success: a Canadian public used to the fudge, muddle, and subjunctives of white political leaders suddenly heard the primary eloquence of Jim Sinclair, James Gosnell, and John Amagoalik⁴ upstaging them. Like Lincoln born in a log cabin in Illinois, these men, and the many women in the indigenous delegations... these were the *real* citizens of the country. Canadians knew it, and felt it. Small wonder that white politicians quickly lost interest in holding any more televised conferences "with the natives"!

One could almost say, crudely, that whereas Canada's indigenous leaders are trying to remove marginal territories and public administration from the neglectful care of a populist and decentralised society into their own control, some Sami leaders seem to be trying to join the upper echelons of élitist hierarchical societies as discreet and respectful members.

In other words, as we approach the issue of whether or not the Sami Parliaments have the potential to be models for Canada, we must understand that

- unlike Canadian indigenous peoples, the Sami do not have geographically-defined or other ethno-political structures based on tribal cultures already in existence or under negotiation (although they may use the Sami Parliaments to try to obtain such structures in future), and
- Sami leaders have a different notion of what government means and of their place in it.

In Canada the indigenous peoples seek to replace and rebuild the structures of governance from the bottom up with the help of constitutional recognition from the top down; in Scandinavia the Sami Parliamentarians seem to be joining an existing system and hoping to add Sami dimensions to policy (although it is too early to make many generalisations about their approach). A reverse parallel might be in historical North American and European labour movements. The European movements fought for basic political rights and much else, whereas the North American workers had basic political rights and have usually fought for better wage and working conditions.

⁴ — In the mid-1980s these were the leaders of Saskatchewan Métis, Nishga first nation, and Canadian Inuit respectively.

At the beginning of November 1984 an important conference on Sami Parliaments was held in Copenhagen, its proceedings later published (IWGIA 1987). The late Mark R. Gordon and I flew over to take part. We heard Pekka Aikio's moving and sardonic presentation on the limitations of the Finnish Sami Parliament, the first one, established in 1973 (Aikio 1987). Sillanpaa's useful published summary and comparison of the Sami Parliaments makes a clear summary comment, also made vividly by Aikio at the 1984 conference:

The Sami Parliament [of Finland] has no direct powers of decision-making; it can only decide when to meet and where. (Sillanpaa 1992a, 4)

The 1984 conference was dominated, however, by the work of the Norwegian Sami Rights Committee and its chairman, Carsten Smith, who made a clear presentation on that report and on the Sami Parliament concept as recommended for Norway (Smith 1987). The report had only been out for six months at that time and Smith brought bundles of an English translation of the summary of the report, since made available through Norwegian embassies (Smith *et al.* 1984). A heated discussion took place after Vigdis Stordahl, a Sami social scientist and long-time political activist from Karasjok (who has many indigenous and other friends in Canada), made a strongly critical speech about the Sami Parliament concept (Stordahl 1987a). The fact that from the outset there was such a strong and critical outlook towards the Sami Parliament will presumably dog it. That is, if and when it fails to make progress on important issues, Sami may not simply say "Change the Sami MPs!", but "Change (or replace) the Sami Parliament!" Nonetheless, despite the disappointment of the weak Finnish Sami parliament voiced in 1984 by its leader, Pekka Aikio, more recently Dr. Korpijaako-Labba (1993, 21-22) has told us that it has at least given Sami issues the profile necessary for government action.

There are, in reality, three main powers of the three Sami Parliaments.

1. As elected public bodies they have a certain moral authority in the eyes of national governments and élites.

In Canada the National Chief of the Assembly of First Nations and the national Inuit president, for instance, have the same moral authority, while their executives and boards have less direct, but still elected, authority.

2. They have the power to raise and discuss any issue they wish.

Canada's indigenous organisations have the same power and, not being confined by formal routines and procedures, or by regular pre-scheduled meetings, can move very quickly on issues, although the realities of regional and cultural politics may slow them down.

3. The Sami Parliaments have a theoretical right to be consulted by governments on issues affecting Sami.

Indigenous organisations in Canada have established such a "right" at national level, *in fact*, and to date it is much more adhered to than the supposed right of the Sami Parliaments. The Sami Parliaments' influence may increase and improve when officials and national bodies become used to their existence, one may hope.

In addition to these matters, the Canadian indigenous associations have had more freedom to hire staff (i.e., they are outside public service regulation), and usually have more money to spend as they wish, etc., than the Sami Parliaments. As Beach says,

Like its sister assemblies in Norway and Finland, the Swedish *Sameting* [Sami Parliament] is a department of government, subject to government directives and, besides some administrative duties, in possession of only advisory status. (Beach 1994, 200)

Sillanpaa sums up his report on the Sami Parliaments thus:

The Sami of the three Nordic countries are aware of the land claims option as practised in Canada but have not indicated that they intend to pursue this same course of action in the foreseeable future. The Sami in the three countries emphasize a strengthening of their usufructuary rights to the land they occupy and have demanded to be consulted on any land-use decisions affecting their homeland areas. (Sillanpaa 1992a, 19)

They will have to keep on demanding: the Norwegian government has made various decisions in the past year or two on forest administration and mining without any such consultation, to the anger of Sami Parliament leader Ole Henrik Magga and others. Indeed, these moves have been seen by some as quick official transactions to provide a "paper trail" to legitimise the dispossession of Sami by the Norwegian Crown in keeping with the notorious 1993 reports of the Sami Rights Committee (personal communications). Certainly this latter view is precisely what Canadian lawyers and indigenous people would think of such goings-on, although Norwegian political culture has managed until now to maintain an air of innocence about such things.

The Sami Parliaments provide for election of representatives not only from the core Sami districts in the North, but also from the rest of the country, so that urban Sami are not disenfranchised. Indeed, urban indigenous peoples would seem to be the main beneficiaries from a Sami Parliament-type body in Canada.

However, the most important point of the Sami Parliaments cannot be compared with any Canadian experience! That is the importance to Sami and to other Scandinavian citizens of the element of recognition and formal status which the Sami Parliament has given,

something which has no parallel in Canada. Canada has honoured and dishonoured treaties and the Royal Proclamation and successive Indian Acts and the Constitution, as well as recognised distinct indigenous lands, however inadequately, for over 200 years. Sami have been well-nigh invisible in the past century and a half. Therefore, when Canadian indigenous leaders talk to Sami politicians they will usually hear enthusiasm and pride expressed for the Sami Parliaments. *The fact remains that the Sami Parliaments have not yet begun to achieve anything like the program and policy impact, or the regional and national political influence, of the major indigenous organisations in Canada.*

The Sami Parliament model must, therefore, be considered very circumspectly. In their present form, and on the basis of their present experience, the Sami Parliaments have little to recommend them to Canadian indigenous peoples. Their experience will continue to be interesting and worth watching, and they may evolve into significant indigenous political institutions. All indigenous political experience has lessons for all indigenous groups, but not necessarily as a specific model to be copied. There are several key questions for indigenous peoples in Canada to consider about the Sami Parliaments.

1. The whole point of indigenous self-government in Canada has been (1) to enable local and regional indigenous cultures to have the running of their own affairs in culturally appropriate ways and (2) to manage as much of their own people's traditional territories as possible. The people who fought so hard for those powers are not going to hand them over willingly to national bodies where majorities from other indigenous cultures and other indigenous territories make decisions for them. The ideologues who wish for stronger pan-indigenous entities with wide powers do not yet speak for the political heartland of Canada's indigenous peoples, and perhaps never will.
2. Inuit, Indian First Nations, and Métis have fought hard for years to achieve government powers within defined territories, and to achieve government-to-government relations between their own representative bodies and the federal government (and existing territorial and provincial governments, too). That, after all, is the way Canadian federalism works. One or more elected national indigenous parliaments would have a higher level of legitimacy on national issues because elected nationally, but would be much less accountable to the individual self-governing indigenous territories across Canada. Unless such parliaments had very limited powers (in which case, why would anyone wish to become a member? or bother voting?), they would simply get in the way of such government-to-government relations. Non-indigenous government officials could ask for no better divide-and-rule situation than having indigenous politicians in national and regional bodies fighting each other over the right to decide policy and programs. This is a structural problem which has nothing to do

with culture — exactly the same considerations would apply to any people of any race or continent.

3. What would be the powers appropriate to a national indigenous parliament? What functions might it best discharge in place of the local and regional indigenous governments? Perhaps it could manage urban services for indigenous peoples. (Would all indigenous people, even in the High Arctic and rural areas, also vote in that case?) Perhaps it could handle international work. (The Inuit have found the Inuit Circumpolar Conference works well because responsive to their four main regions, although indigenous home rule governments in both Alaska and Greenland have made clear that they wish to keep a close rein on ICC in relation to their countries.) Should it handle broadcasting, or cultural matters? Those are already managed in a decentralised way across the country. If there were special problems or crises which indigenous peoples thought were best handled nationally, they would surely call a national council or leaders' summit as they do now, and as they have apparently done in times of war or other crises since time immemorial.
4. Canada's indigenous organisations at national and provincial level have done much to create the policy climate and public support in which local and regional agreements on rights and self-government have been possible. The great victories of the indigenous peoples of Canada were probably impossible without them. There may be a danger in assuming, however, that there is an infinite number of political agendas or new institutions to be pursued at national level at this time. If we forever look for another body to create, or another agenda item for regional or national organisations to fight for in constitutional gatherings, may we not be simply creating more confusion, fragmenting power and energies, putting off the day of tackling the hard issues, the issues which plague indigenous individuals, families, and communities today?

Sami Parliaments seem to make sense in Scandinavia, although they were created by non-Sami for the Sami. Canada's direct political negotiations between indigenous representatives and the country's non-indigenous political leaders in recent years on policy and institutional reform are unknown in Scandinavia, to date. In Greenland, on the other hand, Inuit had various sets of both *de facto* and full-scale political negotiations with Denmark through the 1970s to achieve the home rule arrangements. Of course, the Sami Parliaments themselves may now take up such negotiating roles, and there has been persistent talk that they might someday acquire certain powers in respect of certain lands, although they have nothing like that now. In Scandinavia the Sami Parliaments are a first step; they are not being grafted onto a regionally dispersed land rights and self-government model as some people now propose for Canada. To date they do not anything of substance to recommend them to Canadians.

Unless such bodies as the Sami Parliaments in Canada were to have clear and defined powers so they would not blunder into the path, or complicate the governance, of individual indigenous First Nations or Inuit governments, each such government with its own territorial base, they seem unworkable. In Canada some dispersed people might wish such a national or virtually national body if they did not have a prospect of effective local and regional governments on territories of their own — then it *might* make sense, and *might* work. However, it is otherwise difficult to see any value in a Sami Parliament model for Canada, and difficult to imagine local and regional indigenous support for a transformation of existing national associations into any such bodies if those bodies were to have real decision-making power in respect of the many indigenous peoples, cultures, and territories across Canada.

Beach (1994) provides an excellent brief discussion of each of the three Sami Parliaments and some political context. Sillanpaa has done an excellent brief summary of the Sami Parliaments (1992a). These materials should be obtained by those in Canada interested in this subject. Meanwhile, Sillanpaa's sub-title, "Towards Self-Government", is a hopeful phrase like "to the stars" in Air Force mottos: it is unlikely of fulfilment any time in the near future.

PART IV

LESSONS OF THE SAMI CASE

*La Nature est un temple où de vivants piliers
Laisser parfois sortir de confuses paroles;
L'homme y passe à travers des forêts de symboles
Qui l'observent avec des regards familiers.*

"CORRESPONDANCES", BAUDELAIRE, 1857

Specific lessons from the Sami experience may strike Canadians especially forcibly. These are drawn not only from the foregoing material but from the wider experience reflected in the References at the end of this paper. These lessons or conclusions are stated briefly in the following numbered points and then discussed in more detail after. (Three further and wider general conclusions are found in the final section of Part V, below.)

1. A government commitment to equal personal and public standards of living for an indigenous population can succeed in practice, and has succeeded in the Nordic countries. Canada, Australia, and the USA have notably failed this test, but are often inclined to blame the victims.
2. Modern conveniences, material well-being, lack of skin colour differences, a thousand years of contact with Scandinavian settlers coming into their lands, and up to 200 years of sometimes cruel assimilationist pressure have not ended the determination of Sami to maintain their distinct culture; to secure land, freshwater, and marine rights; and to recover autonomous political identity exercised through self-government. Identity, power, and rights, *as well as* economic equality, are universal indigenous needs.
3. As in Canada, the racial and cultural mixing of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples, or *métissage*, has sometimes created tremendous social and cultural anxiety and confusion for individuals and communities. Political tensions between Sami-identifying people on the one hand and those who are more mixed or who have lived in areas subject to more assimilationist pressure, have undermined and embittered the Norwegian Sami rights movement. Each side misunderstood or over-reacted to the other's motives, and then drifted irreparably apart. As a result, all Sami have been disadvantaged.

4. Métissage should not be seen as some evil category of fate befalling those who are insufficiently culturally proud, as has been implied in various circles in Canada, but a normal socio-historical process of cultural relations between peoples as much as one of genetic mixing. Policy-making and ethno-politics in Canada have had an implied underlying premise that legal fences could protect one ethnically and culturally distinct people from another. The reality is that contact and mutual influence flow freely between peoples despite these safeguards. The real question is how to support and sustain regional indigenous cultural communities, and to understand and design public policies suitable to their needs.
5. Despite its key role in maintaining strong Sami cultural visibility through long years of alternating assimilationist pressure and sheer neglect by outsiders, an indigenous way of life such as reindeer herding, no less than Inuit sea mammal or Plains Indian buffalo hunting, may become a trap. The indigenous people in such lifestyles attract regulation and regimentation, despite the fact that the survival of such ways of life in their traditional form depended on flexibility and adaptability. Other indigenous people living lives less romanticised by outsiders — and more subject to settlement and development pressure or assimilation — may have no less significant cultural traditions and needs; may have no less capacity for ethno-cultural renewal; and may represent the sort of flexible accommodation to complex external pressures which has been the reason for indigenous survival. As Sea Sami (Coastal Sami) have shown, such realities and needs require creative policy responses no less than do those which outsiders view as "traditional".
6. Even in strong nation-states where ethnicity and regionalism are discouraged by public policy, resurgent indigenous peoples may "indigenise" regional politics, culture, and society in parts of those nation-states to such an extent that unique new regional cultures emerge. This is occurring in Sapmi today (as in much of Northern Canada even before regional claims settlements).
7. Problems of environmental and renewable resource management have reached crisis proportions in all Northern countries and pose fundamental threats to the survival of indigenous cultures. In Scandinavia and North-Western Russia there are threats from everything from nuclear dumping to Chernobyl to road-building to forest regulation, all these denying formerly productive eco-systems to indigenous use, as well as the centralist and rationalist policy planners who design "solutions" which further reduce or disrupt indigenous resource use and management. Sami, as well as non-Sami academics, have identified the problems (which

closely correspond to research and policy initiatives like co-management underway in Canada), but are not yet winning their battles with government.

8. The Scandinavian progressive spirit is rightly renowned in many social policy areas but has not yet been much evident in issues of cultural pluralism such as the majority's relations with Sami. This again refutes the assumption of many governments that contemporary indigenous ethno-political protests are merely a function of socio-economic problems.
9. The Sami Parliaments represent much of the active Sami community and are the primary Sami bodies with which Canadian indigenous peoples should establish contact.
10. The roles of Norwegian and Swedish Sami parliaments in national policy-making are too recent to compare with the informal impact of Canadian indigenous associations, but Sami do not yet have the degree of actual political power of Canadian indigenous bodies. What is more, the Sami Parliaments are generally seen by Scandinavian élites as a substitute for the self-government and land rights which are the basic demands of Canadian indigenous political activism.
11. Policy and political reform require a visible, articulate, and politically adept national indigenous political lobby. The lack of such a presence in Scandinavia, except in rare moments like the Alta dispute or when the Sami Parliament is meeting, has rendered Sami rights and political agendas all but invisible in comparison with Canada or Australia.
12. The problems, politics, and progress of Sea Sami or Coastal Sami are relevant to the problems facing indigenous coastal peoples everywhere. A network of marine indigenous peoples is needed internationally, and could initially include Coastal Sami, Canadian Inuit, British Columbia coastal First Nations, Coastal Aborigines in Australia, and Torres Strait Islanders, all of whom are at comparable stages of political renewal and policy struggle in respect of regional, marine, and coastal issues. The Inuit Circumpolar Conference already has some working contacts with Sami and could initiate such contacts.
13. Research and recent experience in coastal North Norway have revealed the flaws and injustice of fishing and marine policies set by outsiders, and also the prevalence and value of Sami and other local experience and expertise. These revelations are very relevant to the search of governments and BC Indian First Nations, Inuit, and others for workable marine policies and decision-making structures.

14. National governments must take responsibility for initiating and leading indigenous policy change within the nation-state. Regional or other sub-national authorities (e.g., Canadian provinces, Australian states, Norwegian *fylker*) are much more resistant to reform and beholden to development interests which conflict directly with indigenous rights interests.
15. Nordic faith in the role of studies, expertise, and formal processes in public administration amounts to a secular religion adhered to with the stubbornness of former Pietism. Although this greater respect for expertise can sometimes provide short-cuts through political debate, as in implementation of the 1984 Sami Rights Committee report in Norway, it has generally not provided Sami with the outcomes they would wish, e.g., the misplaced faith of Sami in the 13-year work of that Committee's experts on land rights in Finnmark. Wider public discussion over a length of time, as in Canada, can yield more political support and public understanding.
16. The lack of indigenous consensus on principal political goals has weakened Sami as it has weakened other indigenous peoples where it has occurred. Despite the fact that Scandinavian countries no less than Canada are usually governed by parties holding 50% public support or less, the non-indigenous community typically demands a high level of consensus among minorities before it is willing to consider reforms.
17. Despite their important role in founding indigenous internationalism in the early 1970s to press for land, sea, and water rights, Sami leaders appear to have "lost the plot" in recent years, unable to contend effectively with the rejection of those rights by nation-state authorities. This raises important questions about the value and purpose of international indigenous work as now practised. That is, "first world" indigenous peoples are well networked — in the Northern hemisphere, at least — and are all well stocked with political, legal, and constitutional experience and other useful precedents. They first got together to learn from and support each other; now when they have so much to learn and share, too often they don't!
18. All European-peopled countries, including Canada and Australia, have wrestled to revise their policies towards alien indigenous cultures because they have seen these policies (with a little help from their friends abroad) to have been morally wrong. They have then sought for reforms within the existing logic and structures of their own cultures. Where this has succeeded (Canada, USA, Australia, New Zealand, Denmark) it has inevitably required a few pragmatic slips twixt cup and lip, but in

Scandinavia, except for the work of Carsten Smith, the rigid logic of the system and the stubbornness of its official priests have defeated reform.

19. The refusal of the Scandinavian governments to date to accept Sami rights in respect of territory and livelihoods which have long been the basis of Sami culture represents a major threat to the protection of indigenous peoples all over the world. If the most socially "progressive" countries will not live up to such obligations, nastier governments elsewhere are given a convenient precedent.
20. Internationalisation of indigenous ethno-politics has been a significant force for political change in the North American arctic (i.e., Canada, Alaska, Greenland), but less so in Northern Europe. Sami might well find useful the North American experience in which Inuit and Dene, in particular, have redefined the Arctic and Arctic policy in the national consciousness.
21. A voluntary indigenous code of conduct for international indigenous contacts, cooperation, and travel is desirable. Its two purposes would be to remove some unacceptable features such as condescension and other mischief-making abroad, and to encourage purposeful and productive international work. Once drafted in Canada such a code or guidelines could be shared with indigenous groups abroad for possible wider adoption.
22. Applied and practice-oriented information forums and exchange networks, as well as research on politics and policies, are needed by indigenous people — that is, by their politicians, political organisations, and the local and regional governments which they form — and could be facilitated by bodies committed to working with them such as the International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee (CARC), and academic research centres like the University of Tromsø and the North Australia Research Unit (NARU). Cooperation between Sami and Canadian indigenous peoples in these matters is desirable and would confer many benefits in both directions.

These matters require additional comment.

1. Equalisation of public services in Scandinavia has been achieved by determined general programs rather than specifically indigenous ones. The mechanism in Norway has been a national equalisation program, something which should be familiar as a concept to Canadians with their many programs and recent constitutional commitment to

tackle regional disparities. The need to rebuild Finnmark and North Troms after the German scorched-earth retreat in 1944 necessitated such a program on a large scale. In Scandinavia the programs to achieve greater equity in social outcomes have had costs in indigenous culture loss, although not apparently on the scale of Greenland or Northern Canada where such "modernisation" schemes did much to fuel the modern indigenous political movements. Nevertheless, Nordic popular sentiment favouring *equity* has often had a colloquial interpretation as *uniformity*, to the cost of Sami and recent immigrants. This may be changing today, paradoxically, in the easy cosmopolitan popular culture sweeping all parts of Europe, with traditional stereotypes blurred amid greater personal travel and a wide variety of styles, fashion, expression. Economic downturns apart, the high moral pressure which Nordic governments, public figures, and media places on citizens in matters of human rights has incalculable impact. At any rate, the notion that indigenous people living for generations in marginal circumstances on the fringe of European settlement cannot absorb large-scale material social improvements is decisively disproved.

2. *The failure to assimilate Sami* in Northern Scandinavia is something which Canadians, Australians, and others should ponder, confident as they often are that indigenous autonomy demands are a backward step or a short-term expedient on the road to ultimate assimilation. The crude pressures of earlier national policy to enforce obedience or conformity among Sami, and the failure of a thousand years of European lifestyles to overwhelm Sami ethnic identification, are significant. In recent immigrant populations such as Canada and Australia there seems a particular predilection for assimilation and homogenisation, the creation of a new nationality, however much élite rhetoric and minority wishful thinking favour multi-culturalism and social mosaics. The Scandinavian experience dispels the notion that such outcomes are the probable historical fate of indigenous peoples. It is in line with both Canadian indigenous proposals and Scandinavian experience to opt, instead, for the betterment of the collective life and reinforcement of collective identity of indigenous peoples as the way to assuage historical grievances and to meet contemporary needs.

3, 4, 5, & 6. *Cross-cultural relations and ethno-regions* deserve far more attention in Canada and in Scandinavia than they have had to date. The fact is that in both countries indigenous cultures have survived and flourished in some areas without any help (and sometimes much hindrance) from government, while regulation and setting aside of lands have not in themselves guaranteed the strength or well-being of indigenous communities. The complex legal and cultural arrangements for Sami herding society are not protecting that society from the pressures of Scandinavian society and development, while the diffuse, undisciplined, and evolving ethno-regional awareness of Coastal Sami is a groping towards a strong new social culture. So we must look beyond mere legal rights, regulation, and the elaboration of structures for approaches to governance. We must not simply ask, "How do we put a secure fence around what remains of a once-strong and

wide-ranging society?", but "How can we ensure that the regional indigenous community has the means to flourish once again? What assistance can modern technology, the social sciences, politico-administrative experience, and public policy reforms provide? What can we learn from peoples overseas like the Sami, Greenlanders, Alaskan Natives, Australian Aborigines, Maori, and Torres Strait Islanders, all of whom are engrossed in their own ethno-regional and cross-cultural relations redefinition? What implications for the future of governance and national unity within the frontiers of what we call Canada may be strong indigenous ethno-regional communities?"

Canada is notorious abroad for the punitive legal divisions which successive versions of the Indian Act imposed on related peoples. What is less known abroad is that many indigenous people themselves have come to accept these artificially contrived regulations as social, cultural, and even moral categories. However, the recent Northern Canada *regional agreements* (as Australian indigenous peoples, officials, and researchers call Canada's comprehensive land claims settlements) have returned to more inclusive definitions of indigenous communities, removing many of the evils of social division and slanging across legal definitional boundaries. Such approaches are in line with the view in the Royal Commission paper, *Partners in Confederation*. Referring to Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, that paper says,

In effect, Section 35 serves to confirm and entrench the status of Aboriginal peoples as original partners in Confederation [i.e., Canada's term for the federal union launched in 1867]. The rights guaranteed in section 35 are largely collective rights, held by groups rather than individuals. These groups are political units that became associated with the Crown at definite historical periods, whether through treaties or other less formal arrangements. Section 35 not only entrenches the particular rights of these communities, it also reaffirms and guarantees their status as distinct constitutional entities.

So, the phrase "aboriginal peoples" in section 35 does not refer to groups characterized by their racial make-up. Rather, it designates historically defined political units, which often have mixed compositions and include individuals of varied racial origins. Of course, just as the people of the province of Quebec are predominantly French in extraction and those in the province of Nova Scotia predominantly British, most members of Aboriginal nations trace their lineage in whole or part to pre-contact America. However, just as people of Irish, Italian, or other origins are Quebeckers and people of Chinese or African descent are Nova Scotians, there is no reason why a person of Huron or French ancestry cannot be a full-fledged member of the Five Nations. The question of whether individuals qualify for membership in an Aboriginal group depends not on their racial origins, but on the group's rules concerning citizenship. This question, like any other question of citizenship, can turn on a variety of factors, such as parentage, continuing affiliation, self-identification, adoptive status, residence and

so on. In our view, however, it cannot legitimately depend on genetic characteristics as such. (RCAP 1993, 29-30)

Sami have nothing like the Indian Act to segregate them and, like Métis or Inuit in Canada, choose themselves, in large part. Their culture is no less strong for all that, and, indeed, if legal and territorial segregation anywhere was intended to deny access to outside cultural elements, it has not succeeded. Therefore it may be more useful here not to talk about the necessary minimum defences which peoples require in Southern Canada to hold on to the remnants of their traditional territories and cultural status — an obvious necessity — but to look outward to the future of viable indigenous communities.

What sort of arrangements are possible, or workable? How can indigenous and non-indigenous peoples share regions where they are already mixed together in the settlement pattern? What should they share and what should they attempt to divide between them? There are proposals and some agreements already reached available from many sources, including Reindeer Sami and Coastal Sami, not to mention the many recent claims settlement experiences in Canada, and other regional trial and error projects in Canada.

A country like Mexico may be one extreme. Although there are distinct Indian communities, the whole country and its culture are permeated with Indian tradition no less than Indian genes.

Also, the news media misleadingly talk about the peasants of the Peruvian Andes and political movements among them without noting that these are descendants of ancient Indian civilisations whose achievements continue to astonish visitors today; they are people with a deep cultural identity and world-view which has little in common with the European rulers in the capital. However, here we are talking about the means by which affluent contemporary states — the most affluent on earth — can and should provide for indigenous collectivities.

If we consider the BC regional treaty areas, the various regional "treaties" (i.e., claims settlements) already in place or being negotiated across Canada's provincial and territorial North, the Métis of the Prairie provinces, the Alaskan Native claims settlement regions, Greenland, the homelands of Russia's indigenous Northern and Siberian peoples, Australian Aborigines, Torres Strait Islanders, and the Sami regions of coast, riverland, and interior, we are talking about regional peoples with cultural and political aspirations. The degree of genetic mixing which may have taken place among them is irrelevant. Some individuals who may be partly indigenous-descended in these regions identify as indigenous and some do not. The fact is that in all areas there is a critical mass of those who maintain indigenous culture and who are a self-identifying community. The question posed by the Sea Sami or by the Reindeer Sami inland is the same as that which faced the designers and negotiators of Nunavut, and which now faces the BC Indian First

Nations: How and what to provide for the survival, strengthening, and well-being of a people and region as unique societies now and for the future?

It may be more useful to decide what the regional society needs in order to flourish and *then* consider what legal, administrative, and other measures are required to achieve it, than to spend years struggling to build walls around indigenous society. No amount of defences will save an indigenous community from its own weakness, while strong regional cultures will hardly need such defences at all. This is not an argument against the ongoing struggle for indigenous rights; rather, it is the assertion that many other things are no less important for the indigenous future. A danger in Canada today is that the past generation of indigenous leadership has done its work so well in focussing debate and public policy on the forms of legal and political structures that critics may now with some justification say they have neglected the contents. Such a backlash could play into the hands of those in government who like to imagine that socio-economic programs and a little hard work are all that is needed for indigenous peoples to be "just like other Canadians".

Policy in Southern Canada has not generally accepted that whole regions and their indigenous cultures should be organising principles. No clearer example of this can be found than in the federal Indian Government Bill of 1984 (Bill C-52) with its clear preference for the individual reserve community. Many of the powers proposed in that Bill, especially the second list available only to those who were deemed ready, would surely be more effectively organised in larger ethno-regional groupings. While there are some reserves which are quite able to support region-like political and culture communities such as the several Mohawk communities, many other reserves are not, while many more would benefit from regional political cooperation with other indigenous communities related by culture, history, or advantage. The benefits of regional agreements have been most obvious in the North where there is a relative lack of close non-indigenous settlement, land ownership, and industrial development. The search now underway for regional political and territorial agreements expressed in treaties in British Columbia may be the best chance Canada has to move intelligently into regional outcomes. The demographic and economic realities of that large resource-rich jurisdiction with its scattered non-indigenous towns and cities should provide a model for other parts of the world. For instance, Northern Scandinavia and the North, Centre, and West of Australia are particularly in need of such new arrangements. It is ironic that some Australians, notably Donna Craig and her study team, and several indigenous groups, have been quicker to conceptualise the real meaning of the Canadian experience in this matter than Canadians themselves (Richardson, Craig & Boer 1994a; 1994b). See the *Appendix*, below, for an illustration of how Canadian experience could create a bionic Sami claims and political settlement in North Norway.

If Canadian indigenous peoples, their organisations and their experts, government policy-makers, and the academic community are not to remain hostage to the fragmented approaches, the fencing or Maginot Line mentality on rights, and the divide-and-rule possibilities which the current situation hands to governments, discussion of regional

solutions must begin. The logical and most effective start would be some conferences or workshops on the theme, "Regional Identity, Regional Needs, and Regional Solutions". Sea Sami, BC Coastal First Nations, Inuit (from Labrador, the Inuvialuit region, Nunavik [Northern Quebec], and Nunavut), Torres Strait Islanders, and Maori would make logical partners in a conference on coastal contexts, for instance. Also, the indigenous peoples of Northern Canada who have already made regional agreements might explore together what they have learned and what more needs to be done in a conference with Sami, British Columbia First Nations, Australian Aboriginal, and Torres Strait Islander representatives, such a forum concentrating on general governance and resource management experience rather than more particular issues.

Much more understanding of social processes and cross-cultural relations is needed, and the Norwegian social anthropologists, having long specialised in such matters both in the Sami areas and abroad, may be able to help. Many of them have already spent longer or shorter periods in Canada. By pretending that laws like the Indian Act solve the problem, we have simply ignored the realities of social change, so that polemics like Boldt's (1993a; 1993b) may merely bruise feelings rather than stimulate useful and even necessary discussion. If present arrangements and old-fashioned defensiveness are failing to provide to indigenous peoples the cultural security they seek, such policies nonetheless often keep them disadvantaged. Even if many Southern reserves wish to maintain the *status quo*, demographic realities provide more expansive opportunities in some 75% of Canada's land-mass, as they do or have already done in Northern Scandinavia, and parts of other countries like Australia, New Zealand, USA, Greenland, and Russia. The question today is whether we imagine only a nervous future for small indigenous communities clinging to the edge of survival, or whether we dare to believe in strong and prosperous indigenous nations living in their territories and establishing themselves as significant elements in the life of this continent and others. Can the day really be far off when an international council of such indigenous nations and peoples meets annually to formulate its own international proposals and demands, issue its own criticism of national governments for failing to live up to international rights standards, approve a state-of-the-world-environment report card, send inquiry teams and film crews to those countries where genocide or other outrages are feared, send delegations to national capitals to remonstrate with military dictators or crazed ancients who oppress their peoples, and finalise agreements for the coming year's programs of joint research, travelling art exhibitions and performances, and emergency relief? Already indigenous people have become a world conscience (or canaries in the mine) for the world environment. Such an outbreak of modest agendas and sensible work might shame some nation-state governments into more mature internationalism!

7. *Environmental fallout*, both literal and figurative, has been more sharp and dramatic among the Sami than in Northern Canada to date. Nevertheless, Canadian warnings about the deterioration of the Arctic environment indicate that crises may soon occur. The Chernobyl fallout uniquely singled out the Sami population for its impact because of

their reliance on the regional food chain, unlike Scandinavians whose store-bought foods come from elsewhere. The collision of state planning and indigenous tradition in both fisheries and reindeer herding, together with the "tragedy of the commons" ethic, have threatened the livelihoods and socio-cultural traditions of the Sami. Hydro-electric power development as in the Alta case has highlighted opposing notions of Northern development, as well as further impinging on the Sami heartland. Forestry and road-building also have significant impacts. As yet the aboriginal claims of Sami are unresolved. Whereas social discrimination has not crushed the Sami spirit, as noted in point No. 2 above, the loss of access to and productivity of lands and waters threatens to be more dire. The contents of recent Canadian comprehensive "land" claims settlements such as the Nunavut agreement provide new mechanisms to deal with environment and resources comprehensively, while the Scandinavian situation resembles the problems of indigenous peoples living in Canada's provincial Northlands and other rural areas.

8. *Political ideologies of social progress* in modern European-peopled countries are no guarantee of understanding or action on indigenous or other minority rights issues. Doctrines of equality may work against respect for pluralism as has happened in Scandinavia. Indeed, the two-part *Dædalus* journal colloquium of the mid-1980s on the Nordic countries identified pluralism as their greatest contemporary socio-cultural challenge (*Dædalus* 1984a; 1984b). A Sami conference delegate once told this author that her organisation would much rather fight a bad capitalist business corporation any day of the week than a self-righteous Swedish social democratic government because the former were much more open to persuasion and compromise. Some Sami are bitter about the delays by Scandinavian governments in recent decades in accepting Sami identity and status while those same governments have promoted indigenous rights abroad. Many would also say that public and official attitudes today have not greatly changed. The work of the Sami Parliaments and future debates on Sami land, freshwater, and sea rights may well bring about the society-wide discussion needed to change such attitudes.

9 & 10. *The Sami parliaments* with their formal roles in Scandinavian governance do not yet have anything like the power to participate in national decision-making fought for and now won by Canada's national indigenous organisations like Inuit Tapirisat and the Assembly of First Nations (e.g., Aikio 1987; Stordahl 1987a). Nor do the Scandinavian countries have governing systems centred on executive federalism as does Canada — a system in whose highest structures Canadian indigenous leaders have participated so effectively in recent years. It seems probable that the Sami parliaments' powers will develop further in coming years. Nevertheless, in the Sami heartland many people seek Sami-controlled regional government. The same is true in Australia where Aboriginal- and Islander-controlled elected regional councils advise the government administration. Canadian indigenous peoples have already shown that they prefer self-government at home to influence in a distant capital city. Indeed, it is unlikely that there are indigenous

people anywhere on earth who would feel otherwise! The Sami Parliament style of structure may ultimately prove very effective, but Canadian indigenous people should best view it for now only as a possible future add-on to their growing self-government and government-to-government networks (and one they would have to define and confine carefully!). Its advantages relative to current Canadian practice evaporate on examination in the light of the differences in political culture between our countries.

An unfortunate example of misleading advocacy is found in a recent Ottawa newspaper article. There Len Sillanpaa, who has made himself useful in recent years in Ottawa by summarising the Scandinavians' formal progress in indigenous policy (Sillanpaa 1992a; 1992b), goes rather further.

Among the many demands for self-determination espoused by aboriginal groups are proposals for the creation of special representative bodies that can enable them to conduct a dialogue with the larger state. The Nordic countries have taken steps in this regard with considerable success. What is going on there might provide an interesting model for Canadians considering such solutions (Sillanpaa 1993).

This view reveals either a misunderstanding of the Scandinavian models or of Canadian indigenous politics. Even the quotes offered by Sami leaders are curiously stilted and out of character, the sort of thing which bemused Scandinavians receiving foreign visitors in quasi-formal context might politely say, but which may not — and in this case do not — reflect the general reality of Sami politics, Sami-state relations, or the frequently expressed views of these politicians themselves.

The truth of the matter is stated, instead, by Professor Doug Sanders, a Canadian held in very high regard in Scandinavia:

The Sami Parliament has characteristics that would immediately be rejected by most Indian leaders in North America. (Sanders 1990, 8)

In the Scandinavian nation-states there is great formality in political processes compared with the knockabout style of North American politics. In this context the Sami parliaments may be a most important step, representing significant recognition of a sort. Unfortunately some Sami involved over-estimate this, mistaking symbolism for power. However, many Sami Parliament supporters will only judge these bodies successful if they can deliver real land and sea rights and some form of actual self-government as is emerging in Nunavut and First Nations government models in Canada.

11. A national indigenous visibility with a generally coherent and consistent aboriginal rights agenda has been the decisive difference in Canadian indigenous political and policy reforms of recent years. This is especially evident when comparison is made with

other countries like Norway or Australia. Despite the fact that Sami have been better educated, with more sophisticated work experience and skills in the majority society than other "first world" indigenous peoples, they have been late in achieving political recognition for indigenous rights, autonomy, and self-government agendas. It seems likely that the main role of the Sami Parliaments will be to do the kind of lobbying, more formally, that Canada's national, provincial, and territorial associations have done with creative informality since the end of the 1960s to create the policy and public climate needed for reform.

12 & 13. *The Sea Sami* have a modern tale full of pathos (Eidheim 1971; SLF 1985; Jull 1988b, 53-70; Pedersen 1989; Pedersen 1992; Jull 1993c, 18-28; Nilsen forthcoming). They have suffered assimilationist national socio-cultural policy, resource management policies which have disregarded their needs and conditions, marine environmental disaster, persistent discrimination from Norwegians, and a Sami rights movement which has seemed to many of them to be controlled by élites and inland Sami contemptuous of their realities and identities. Despite this, or because of it, they have struggled to form their own political movement which first created havoc in Sami affairs and then created a new sense of Sea Sami rights and needs, finally succumbing to the logical contradictions inherent in the SLF movement, but bequeathing a strong coastal agenda to others.

Researchers like Björklund (1991), Maurstad (1992), and Eythorsson (1993) have been illuminating how local realities give the lie to the assumptions underlying national fisheries policy, and how Sami and other local fishers⁵ have the knowledge and will to manage things rather better. Their work is most relevant to the studies promoted in Canada by Pinkerton (1989) and Inglis (1993).

In 1993 I took to North Norway copies of a report I had written for the Australian government sketching Canadian Inuit coastal and marine politics and policies (Jull 1993c). It also contained other Canadian experience, notably the Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy and co-management experience, and drew on several years of involvement in the political and marine rights agenda of the Torres Strait Islanders and their Marine Strategy (see Mulrennan 1994). Sami and Norwegian researchers and political activists were anxious for interviews and a seminar, which we held. Fortunately I had taken along various Canadian documents which were soon being copied and circulated. Also there for a conference was the Torres Strait Islanders' political leader, Getano Lui Jr., so the University of Tromsø organised a visit to a Sami fjord township for a group of us to have further discussions. Chairman Lui reported on his visit in a national radio lecture on his return to Australia, a lecture which soon appeared in a published volume which has had considerable impact in Australia (Lui 1994). While such fortuitous encounters are always rewarding, they highlight what tremendous value a more coherent program of exchanges and cooperation would have. Inuit and coastal BC First nations worked well

⁵ — *Homo sapiens*, not *martes pennanti*.

together during the 1985-86 federal land claims policy review, and they should now work together again to share their marine aspirations and experience not only with each other, but also with the Sea Sami, and with the Torres Strait Islanders and Aborigines of Australia. Each of the five peoples — Sami, Northwest Coast Indian First Nations, Canadian Inuit, Torres Strait Islanders and Coastal Aboriginal groups — has some unique experience and projects underway, some particular victories and disappointments, and the experience and staff necessary to participate effectively in cooperative contacts. Every one of the peoples mentioned would benefit a great deal from such contacts in their struggles for better marine outcomes at home.

14. *Purposeful national indigenous policy*, even when it has gone off the track as in Sweden, has been the necessary basis of political reforms benefiting Sami. At the same time, the uniformist cast which effective national equality policies have acquired in the popular imagination — a mood evident to even a casual visitor to Scandinavia — has made it difficult for national governments to come to terms with indigenous demands for pluralism. Norway, a country which has strong regional cultural identities despite the powerful centralist state apparatus typical of the Nordic countries, has made most progress and seems likely to continue to be the trend-setter in Sami reform for Sweden and Finland.

In Norway, for example, the Labour stranglehold on Northern politics meant that a redneck element could effectively defy the progress of Sami rights (Minde 1984). In order to achieve progress, the national Labour party during the leadership of Ms. Brundtland has used its clout to bring the Northern Labour barons around. Failure at the regional level is typical of all "first world" countries, as well as some "third world" countries in South-east Asia: the more progressive spirits at national level may be stymied by local and regional reactionaries. For that same reason, also, the British government reserved certain powers in respect of indigenous peoples to itself in colonial days, and handed these to Canada's national government at independence in the hope that Ottawa would be more respectful of indigenous rights than would be the settlement and development interests pressing on provincial capitals.

15. *Faith in studies, expertise and formality* are the sorts of European qualities which are often most visible to visitors from the New World of North America or Australia. The positive side of this has been a more appropriate role for systematic research in policy-making, notably in Greenland, and attention to realities and needs, e.g., through social science research, than has been the case in Canada's federal Northern and Indian Affairs administration (despite DIAND's long-standing and high quality in-house studies and research capacity!). In Canada there has been a "Real men don't need research!" mentality in government administration, although Baby Boom recruitment seems to have overcome the extremes of this problem. To most Canadian indigenous groups and many officials, the faith in invisible formal processes to generate policy outcomes in

Scandinavia would seem both inexplicable and alarmingly ingenuous. On the other hand, one of this author's friends who most despises North American ways has brought the finest high-pressure Washington-style lobbying to bear for a Sami organisation with devastatingly effective results for the organisation's policy and political agendas.

The Scandinavian and Sami social scientists and language scholars are doing fine work which is not only often unique but would be valuable to Canadian social scientists and indigenous organisations if they were more aware of it. Apart from fortuitous contacts at conferences, there is a tremendous lack here, although things are much improving, thanks to indigenous initiative (see No. 22 below). In the 1970s the Scandinavians had a long lead on North Americans in their use of research and planning, but the explosion of environmentalism and indigenous rights, the latter as much posing a moral and social critique of European society as a whole as merely pushing its own agenda, has seen North American overhaul them in many matters. Indeed, at times it seems that Scandinavian public policy, especially in Northern and Sami matters, is dangerously ossified.

To achieve real change in policy usually requires a real change in public, or at least élite, perceptions. This requires debate. Australian reformers were often too quiet and cautious, as if believing they could slip a new attitude towards blacks over the heads of an unsuspecting public like lassoing a skittish buck. In fact it was the impact of the *Mabo* decision which forced a national debate, and it has been a by and large intelligent debate with the rednecks quickly isolating themselves. Canadians usually make major changes only with thorough, even interminable and numbing, debate (for which reason I enjoy Australia's more "can do" style). There is no question that the core-funded regional and national indigenous associations in Canada prepared the public through years of demands and political controversy, and that this was the necessary prelude to the major social and constitutional changes which began in the late 1970s.

16. *Sami political divisions* have not only been between some Sea Sami and Reindeer Sami organisations. Often leading Sami politicians are committed to one or other Norwegian political party, and the parties have even sought to enter the Sami Parliament, unsuccessfully but for the Labour intellectual, Steinar Pedersen (whose writings I have drawn on here and elsewhere). The conflicting social experiences of Sami individuals or communities and the recent Norwegianisation campaigns have left many Sami divided. For some the idea of identifying as Sami has no more than a private cultural appeal, or is simply not worth the trouble it might cause in social relations with Norwegians. This sort of fracturing has not been a big factor in Canadian indigenous politics, but is more like Australian Aboriginal socio-politics.

As noted in No. 11, some of these political problems could have been, and perhaps will be, addressed by a vigorous national Sami political presence. The Canadian indigenous organisations core-funded since c. 1970 have maintained in every Canadian federal, provincial, and territorial capital a strong public awareness of indigenous demands and

needs, and have made sure that policy-makers were kept up to date. Something similar, albeit more informal, is emerging in Australia, although the regional press there is only episodically won over.

17. *Some Sami leaders have lost the plot on rights*, a subject discussed in more detail in Part V.

18. *National pride* in indigenous rights matters is as baneful as in other areas of policy. Canada has rediscovered laws and documents which were always in front of its eyes in order for its courts and politicians to elegantly retreat behind a cloud of dust and flim-flam on indigenous rights. Judge Marshall reconciled irreconcilable elements in the USA in his great judgments of the early 19th century — and he was the Chief Justice, at that. The Danes in Greenland's home rule legislation reconcile national unity and Greenland particularity simply by saying they both operate, although nobody pretends to know what this gracious fudge means in the matter where it counts, i.e., natural resources. Australia's High Court re-interpreted the law in *Mabo* in 1992, while New Zealanders have had a fresh look at the Treaty of Waitangi and discovered the meaning it had not had for well over a century. On the other hand, Sweden falls at the first hurdle whenever it attempts to look again at Sami rights (as Korsmo, Beach and others have shown), and the Norwegian experts in their 1993 Sami Rights Committee report have been too clever by half in accommodating *raison d'état* ahead of Norway's national and international principle. (In fairness, there have been some indications that the powers that be in Oslo have recognised the report to be a dead cat and they may be tiptoeing discreetly away from it.) Finland had made some reasonable policy accommodations in respect of Sami before Norway and Sweden became really active in the field, but such measures do not now impress in the era of indigenous *rights* as opposed to policies.

19. *Land/sea rights inaction in Scandinavia* sits oddly with the activism the Scandinavian governments have shown in aid of oppressed indigenous peoples elsewhere in the world. One may hope that the Scandinavian foreign ministries, who are often well advanced in such matters compared to the civil ministries, may prod their governments.

The issue will not go away. In a new publication for the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People (1994-2003), the United Nations reports a Sami Council representative's 1992 speech at the opening of the International Year in December 1992 in which she singles out "the land rights of the Saami nation in the Russian Federation and Sweden." (United Nations 1994, 34-35) Later, in a section prominently displayed, "The Saami Experience", two critical comments are made about Scandinavian policy: the relatively powerless Swedish Sami Parliament has been promised more powers over time by the government, and,

Despite these hard-won achievements [i.e., creation of the Sami Parliaments], still not solved is the question of rights to the lands and waters which the Saami have traditionally occupied and used for their livelihood in Finland. (United Nations 1994, 68)

The Nordic countries have invested so much diplomatic energy in the fight for minority rights abroad, from Guatemala to East Timor and Africa, that they must be assumed to be ready to do the right thing at home. The infamous 1993 report of the Sami Rights Committee in Norway is, after all, a background report. There remains scope for the Committee to find its way back to the sensible path. When the 1991 MacEachern decision in British Columbia was gleefully picked up in countries like Australia where interest groups were anxious to reverse land rights progress, in Canada itself both the British Columbia and federal governments were sensible enough not to act on it, recognising that the decision was unhelpful and could damage hard-won indigenous-government reconciliation and progress. (That stand was further vindicated in 1993 by the BC Court of Appeal, as it happens.) The Scandinavian governments will surely have to adopt a similar view and move forward on Sami rights if they wish to have their admirable vigilance on international minority issues taken seriously any longer in the world.

20. *Internationalisation* has been discussed elsewhere for the Royal Commission (Jull 1993a) and at length in a forthcoming book by Mary Simon and me. To put the matter briefly, the Inuit, and other Northern indigenous peoples in Canada (with such leading advocates as Georges Erasmus), first replaced the Southerners' view of the Empty North with a more complex picture of regional cultures and local/regional eco-systems covering all but the farthest High Arctic Islands (which were, nevertheless, entirely settled and hunted by Inuit in earlier centuries, according to archeologists). This was a major development because until then the North had seemed to non-indigenous Canadians only unformed matter awaiting the genius and will of settlers to transform into a booming part of the industrial world.

The second phase of this transformation was the Circumpolar movement. Here the North was no longer a poor or lacking Northward extension of Europeanised Southern Canada, but a front-row member of a different international world altogether, the countries and peoples living around the Arctic Ocean. This "discovery", by Inuit particularly, at last gave substance to the Canadian cliché that we are a Northern or Arctic country. This new East-West Circumpolar identity is only now being worked out, but in recognition of the Inuit initiative in this matter the Canadian government has been a firm supporter of indigenous peoples as partners in Circumpolar international relations. The appointment of Mary Simon as Arctic Ambassador is an indication of that recognition, as well as of her personal qualities.

Sami have a different conception of the North than their Scandinavian capital city élites. Their art, yoik, and other forms of expression already have had an impact. There is no reason why they could not replace the doubtful concept of a Euro-Arctic in North Norway with a Sami Arctic.

21. *A code of indigenous international conduct* is discussed in Part V.

22. *Indigenous-participant research* and study approaches, such as through conferences bringing indigenous practitioners, their staff, academics, officials, and outside experts together are needed in Canada, in Sapmi, between the two regions, and in general. This is the more urgent because much of the insight into and motivation for political change in Sapmi is coming from social research and social researchers, both Sami and Scandinavian. Indeed, this is so in all the major areas of socio-political and socio-cultural change *except*, it seems, self-government. However, in November 1993 the several Sami Parliaments and other prominent Sami figures joined with overseas indigenous representatives and experts to discuss political experience and self-government (e.g., Jull 1993d).

The pace of indigenous politics and the politicisation of all issues in indigenous-government relations require a rather harder edge and different test of applicability than is fairly requested of social scientists in Canada. Indeed, even some of the members of the research community most familiar and trusted in indigenous circles evidently have delicate consciences in these matters and are not always easy with the roles they may be called on to play (Dyck & Waldram 1993). It is desirable that indigenous communities and organisations, and their active practitioners, play key roles in research ventures. Indigenous organisations often have a sort of *entrée* which officials and institutional researchers do not, something always amusingly evident in Greenland where Canadian Inuit and their friends are welcome everywhere while others tread warily and may not always be received at all. Canada has more experience of the mixed indigenous-practitioner-academic-official gathering than, say, Australians, and all sides are tolerant enough to make such events work well. (The difference between Canada and Australia may be that in Canada many academics are rushing to catch up with the "native movement" which made its early gains without many of them and are therefore eager to be agreeable in exchange for acceptance, while in Australia the academics for so long had all the running to themselves as "experts" consulted by governments, who could not imagine consulting Aborigines themselves, that the academics may now sometimes feel they are being pushed aside in favour of less worthy sorts and non-indigenous *arrivistes*.)

Comparative studies more generally are an assistance to better governance (Jull 1991c). Indigenous ethno-politics needs its own studies in political science and public administration, as experts like Dr. Frank Cassidy of the University of Victoria have been

developing. Even in the Northwest Territories which has so often been a leader in ethno-regionalism the literature in which indigenous politics are really accepted and incorporated into scholarship is sparse. One may hope that academics do not spend too much time fretfully musing on their own morals as in a recent compendium (Dyck & Waldram 1993), but rather see and join in the excitement of helping to create new societies. It is ironic that the 1492-1992 revisionism and remorse so totally failed to notice that after 500 years the vision of a New World was becoming reality in indigenous territories across Northern Canada, and was winning over the descendants of European settlers to new social pluralism, cross-cultural values, environmental respect, and politico-administrative accommodation.

Attention must be given to a sort of Northern Civics, the development of ethno-regional political and social studies which can be taught (Jull 1992b). There is a desperate need for such materials, as I learned while assisting in the preparation and teaching of groups of Inuit from Nunavut and Quebec. There are new — and new kinds of — sub-national political cultures emerging in Canada, of which Nunavut is merely the largest, but unlike Nunavut not all are equipped with school systems, language bureaux, training colleges, etc. There is a need to develop materials to assist in the massive training and education programs which are required to enable indigenous peoples truly to run their own affairs by having the knowledge to do so in the world of Canadian federalism and public administration.

PART V
WHEN WE DEAD AWAKEN!
Når vi døde vågner

It is my strong belief that a people desiring self-determination cannot and should not wait for the colonizing state to somehow, through a flash of benevolence, grant the desired self government mechanisms. If self-determination is the goal of a people, they must go out and work for it — and work hard. We have shown that it can be done through negotiation. I hope that others with similar aspirations will use their strength in similar manners.

In other words: self-determination has to be a result of the struggle of the indigenous peoples themselves. If we do not fight for Self-determination ourselves, we do not deserve it.

LARS EMIL JOHANSEN, PREMIER OF GREENLAND, SPEAKING TO
ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER REPRESENTATIVES IN
CAIRNS, QUEENSLAND, JULY 27, 1994, AT A WORKSHOP ON
REGIONAL AGREEMENTS.

INTERNATIONALISATION

In November 1973 the real beginning of indigenous internationalism occurred at the Arctic Peoples Conference in Copenhagen (Kleivan 1992). Organised by Greenland Inuit working with the International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) — an independent body headquartered in Copenhagen and which publishes research documents, a newsletter, and an annual review on the state of the world's indigenous peoples — the conference brought together Sami, Inuit from Greenland and Canada, and Yukon and Northwest Territories Indian First Nations and Métis. Many of the Sami representatives at that gathering remain prominent figures in Sami politics today.

As an observer in the gallery, I was impressed most of all by the excitement of Inuit, Dene, and Métis as they discovered that although they were isolated and marginalised in every sense at home, here were other people who also lived on Arctic coasts or in the interior, and who had similar stories of frustration and similar campaigns to right old wrongs. The situation was alike, also, in that all these peoples had governments back home who, far from oppressing them, were now suffocating them with Euro-centric goodness. These policies were splitting the generations, killing off tradition, and re-organising old ways of life into new welfare-laden replicas of the wholesome urban ways of the post-war Atlantic Alliance. On the other hand, when the Arctic peoples

spoke to their governments about their desire for control of the land, the governing of their regions, and the need for different schooling and social services, well... such matters were just too difficult, it seemed.

Much has happened since those first days of indigenous internationalism. The Copenhagen meeting led quite directly to the 1975 founding of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples by Chief George Manuel and Marie Marule on Nuu-chah-nulth lands near Port Alberni, BC, and the 1977 founding of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference by Eben Hopson, Mayor of the North Slope Borough, in Barrow, Alaska. There have been many international conferences of indigenous peoples since. Most well-known of these are the yearly mid-year gatherings of the world's indigenous peoples in Geneva to put their case, negotiate change, and seek new friends at the United Nations. There have been books of comparative studies published, surveys of international regions such as the Arctic, and collections on indigenous peoples (Jull & Roberts 1991; Jull 1991a; Osherenko & Young 1989; Dahl 1993; & MRG 1994). The Inuit Circumpolar Conference, in particular, has had an impact on Canadian policy and perceptions, making Canada more at home in the Arctic as a region. Researchers, politicians, community groups, and special purpose organisations concerned with everything from alcohol to zoogeography now visit or communicate with each other.

While all this is fine, it does not necessarily have any impact on the basic policies and politics which were the initial purpose of indigenous contact and cooperation. In many cases those basic needs remain to be fulfilled. While indigenous peoples in Canada may sometimes be too untrusting even when they have won their battles, Sami have been the opposite. In the matter of land, sea, and resource rights, some of their leaders who should know better have been mute or paralysed in the face of, e.g., the 1993 Sami Rights Committee reports in Norway (Norway 1993c). Admittedly, many Sami leaders are full-time professionals, academics, or policy officials, and only part-time Sami leaders. Core funding and other programs have made it possible for many Canadian indigenous leaders to be such, full-time. Nonetheless, the fact that Sami have been so blatantly confronted on land, water, and sea rights, the fundamental issue of indigenous politics world-wide, and in a country like Norway or Sweden which preaches indigenous rights compliance to others, seems incredible.

It would seem that some leaders have ended *their* Sami struggle. Perhaps for this generation of fighters it all came down to acceptance, symbolised in the King's opening of the first Sami Parliament. What greater mark of respect? The King came North to the Sami. Years earlier when Sami leaders had said they were too busy — and out of pocket — to go South for a public dinner with the King, they were rubbished by some Sami who went out and founded SLF in protest. *They* would not say "Nei!" to the King, was all their cry. Perhaps we crude North Americans are not so engrossed in table manners. At any rate, what is clear is that many Sami regard the Sami Parliaments and such symbolic recognition of recent years as a major achievement. Who can blame

them? It was not till 1947 that Jackie Robinson became the first black Major League baseball player — and he had certainly not waited a thousand years!

Nonetheless, it seems strange that Sami who had talked so glibly about their rights for so long were non-plussed when the moment came to speak about them. The 13 years of silence may be inexplicable, but when the moment came for debate, they were silent (Brantenberg 1993; Brantenberg & Minde 1994). It remained to various students and academics, both Sami and Norwegian, to gather documents and note that the issues on which the Sami Rights Committee "experts" had come unstuck were ones which Anglo-Saxon courts had been dealing with in our own time and earlier. Suddenly the Canadian decisions like *Calder* and *Sparrow*, and the newest landmark decision, Australia's 1992 *Mabo*, were being photocopied and discussed in *ad hoc* study groups and lectures around North Norway. Any of us who were in the vicinity were asked to give seminars and empty our brief-cases into eager hands by the photo-copy machine.

The agenda for the next wave of Sami leaders seems clear. They have to begin again the struggle, a struggle which many of us had thought the generation in power were already fighting these past many years: recognition of traditional land, water, and sea rights, and some actual power over some actual programs and territory.

How do articulate, intelligent, and well-travelled leaders lose their grasp of the basic issues? In the Sami case there has been a tendency to patronise the under-privileged of other lands (and to assume that everyone except themselves is under-privileged). The confident view that they have had nothing to learn is the most insidious thing, and by no means unique to a handful of Sami notables. All indigenous politicians and organisations can become so caught up in their own struggles, their own cleverness, their own hard-won victories, and their own in-group agendas that they feel self-sufficient. Unfortunately political relations are not so simple. Federal ministers and their teams in Ottawa enjoy nothing so much as chewing up and spitting out the ill-prepared or shoot-from-the-hip types among those who come to them on business from provincial capitals or pressure groups. Knowledge and preparation, which are necessary for a real grasp of available options and, therefore, possible negotiated outcomes, count for everything. Indigenous leaders in no country have the back-up which the most foolish of national ministers has. Indigenous leaders must make sure that they have as much knowledge as possible.

Since most of that necessary knowledge does not exist anywhere on paper, it must be created. It can be created by exchange visits to other peoples, as long as someone is assigned to gather documents and take notes (and follow up on confusing or missed points). It can also be created by having staff or outside researchers (including academics) undertake studies and study visits. Such knowledge provides the precedents which are necessary to undermine government resistance to new ideas, but no less importantly they provide insights and inspiration, and stimulate fresh thinking. I have never talked to any indigenous person, whether a national leader or the lowliest local

drone, who has not returned from contact with overseas indigenous persons or places excited and bubbling with new ideas. Political science has been the white man's business to date, but what must be accumulated now is an indigenous discipline of political science and public administration.

Governments and public opinion already operate in a climate of international public consensus. The standards which "first world" governments must meet in human rights, especially in respect of non-European minorities, are very high. The presumption that European peoples must atone for the sins of colonialism and imperialism remains strong among the non-European countries, what is more. Furthermore, the "first world" (OECD-member) countries have the strong economies, liberal democratic political systems, educated publics, and egalitarian social values which facilitate social justice. Canadian, Scandinavian, and other "first world" governments are very sensitive and vulnerable to international criticism. It delights them to have Sami or other leaders travelling abroad and publicising the progressive policies at home. Likewise, they become very unhappy when they are criticised abroad by representatives of their indigenous minorities.

Of course, the more people overseas are aware of and interested in an indigenous situation in Canada or Norway, the more pressure the Canadian and Norwegian governments will be under to meet the expectations of the world in doing the right thing. Developing such potential support at all times is important, and can then be drawn on when governments at home try to wind back indigenous rights.

Indigenous peoples have a responsibility to themselves and to each other when they travel, however. They must use such precious opportunities, not so long ago impossible for them, to collect information and useful ideas and make these available to the people back home. It is not enough to return home simply with jet-lag, a hangover, and a flush of excitement. It is important to communicate what has been learned and heard, and to do so preferably in some durable form such as a written report, audio tape, or video.

A no less important travel responsibility is to take along some information — documents, publications, videos, or a prepared presentation — which one can present at one's destination. Indigenous groups everywhere are thirsty for information about political struggles and rights to territory and resources. One may also be able to take information on a professional specialty such as one's health work, teaching, or fishing. Other peoples need inspiration, too — and often they simply need hope. Hope, that is, that change is possible, that governments can be brought to change, that reactionary public opinion can be overcome, that it is possible to achieve reform without having to take up arms.

This brings up a particularly sensitive point. Sometimes representatives of indigenous groups travelling abroad carry their own domestic squabbles with them. Like the missionaries of old who fought European religious wars through the uncomprehending peoples of other continents, we can be no less ridiculous today. Canadian travellers may

sneer at the Quebec claims settlement or Nunavut, or Indian Treaties, or anything else when they are overseas, but they are doing a great injustice to their hearers. Indigenous peoples need inspiration and hope because all of them on all continents have frustrating difficulties as minorities. It is one thing to promote our own particular model of progress, but we should present the cases in our own countries as *both/and*, not as *either/or*. Both Nunavut and some other indigenous government scheme are promising, we should say, rather than "The Sechelt model is all wrong..." blah-blah-blah. Besides, every political model has been developed by a people with similar end goals in mind; when we attack someone else's model, we usually don't have our facts right, for one thing, and we almost always are lacking an understanding of *why* those other people chose the model they did. I have seen quite a lot of this happen in Australia with ill-informed comments by Canadians on Canadian indigenous experience, and I have seen Australian indigenous groups deflated in their hopes and Australian rednecks delighted when one or other Canadian dumps on some other Canadian indigenous achievement.

It would be helpful if the Royal Commission or some appropriate body could develop a code of conduct or set of guidelines to make indigenous international work more effective. It could be circulated for discussion and recommended for voluntary adoption by indigenous organisations and communities. The gift of foreign travel is one of the few high-quality and under-used political resources indigenous peoples have today; there is a pressing need for it to be both purposeful and responsible. Meanwhile, as parents used to say, "If you can't say anything nice, don't say anything at all!"

CONCLUSIONS

The Scandinavian countries, and, indeed, all the Nordic countries — i.e., Greenland, Iceland, the Faroes, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland — share significant political and social values with Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. While Canadians tend to think in terms of their priority relations being with the political and economic heartland of the USA and with the leading powers of Western Europe, this may be an old habit of wartime allies and the laziness of proximity. For indigenous peoples and their home territories, especially Northern hinterlands, the smaller Nordic countries and Alaska are logical fields for closer contact and ongoing cooperation by Canadians, as are New Zealand and Australia.

Such a proposal does not imply that Canada should be looking for smaller countries to bully, as one American critic has apparently seriously maintained.⁶ Rather, it is a matter of shared interests, values, and purposes. The USA would be grand to have aboard, but experience in, e.g., Arctic cooperation and world human rights, not to mention larger multi-lateral projects of internationalism after both world wars and in more recent years, shows that it is unlikely to endorse any but its own initiatives and unlikely to follow through when interest or commitment is expressed.

The great triumph of Scandinavian indigenous policy has been the improvement of personal and community social conditions, and the provision of facilities and services to the same standard for all citizens, i.e., the highest in the world. This was done on a regional and egalitarian rather than ethno-cultural basis, but its doing has shown up the failure and pettifogging of predominantly Anglo-Saxon countries like Canada and Australia in facing the same issue.

The great failure of Scandinavian policy has been the way in which governments and their "experts" have repeatedly proven unable to recognise the plain fact of Sami life: that the Sami have lived in and been the principal occupants of large tracts of Northern Europe since the Ice Age. Bad enough that today's Sami leaders sometimes seem unable to tackle their governments effectively on this issue. Worse is the philosophical and legal sleight-of-hand Scandinavian governments use to deny land, freshwater, and sea rights to Sami — a gift to all governments everywhere who would dispossess indigenous peoples! There is no point in Scandinavian leaders sanctimoniously condemning Guatemala or Indonesia while they achieve the same denial of rights at home without even calling upon the help of the army. Formally and informally, Canadians and all other friends of Scandinavia and of indigenous peoples must impress upon Stockholm, Helsinki, and Oslo, in that order of urgency, that their domestic indigenous policies are a threat to indigenous minorities all over the world.

⁶ — Friendship moves me to leave this otherwise excellent innovator nameless and unreferenced, although those in Circumpolar work may recall his published remarks.

The problem has been that Scandinavians, like Canadians and other peoples before them, have been faced with two clashing imperatives: realisation that their treatment of indigenous peoples has been unjust, and an autistic ritual of looking for all solutions within their own constructed systems. All cultures have a weakness for believing that their particular way of doing things is the Truth, rather than simply one socially and historically derived construct, but where two cultures must negotiate mutually satisfactory relations, such ethno-centricity is especially unhelpful. The Norwegian Sami Rights Committee of 1984, like the Marshall US court of the early 19th century, and the high courts of Canada, New Zealand, and Australia since the 1970s, had to go somewhat beyond those constructions, using creative fictions and slicing Gordian knots. On the other hand, the Alta dispute, some of the discussion around the 1993 legal report on Finnmark Sami rights, and Sweden's repeated failures to embrace Sami rights have revealed a Scandinavian passion for comforting consistency and legalism at the expense of justice.

Despite being modern urban-centred societies which avow pluralism, the Scandinavian countries continue to have problems with the notion of distinct indigenous cultures. That is, recognition that indigenous cultures have rights of autonomy and are not merely backward people clinging to an uneconomic (read: non-industrial) past has not yet pervaded national consciousness or public policy, despite considerable moral leadership on the issue by some Norwegian élites. Canadians have very little to learn from general Scandinavian approaches in such matters, having made much genuine progress in recent decades. (Of course, one must remain sceptical of many non-indigenous Canadians' recent enthusiasm for all things indigenous, a mood which may be as likely to last as a June snow-shower, but legal, policy, and program change have been substantial all the same, as well as the great and generally positive attention shown by information and communications media.) Of course, the fine work of Sami health professionals, educators, linguists and literature scholars, the reindeer industry lobbies, *et al.*, deserves to be better known in Canada and to find Canadian partners for information-sharing and project cooperation.

Quebec's difficulties in reconciling Francophone ethno-nationalism with the aspirations of Inuit and Indian First Nations might be studied in relation to Norway's past and present. One may hope that a secessionist Quebec and rump Canada would be as cool and enlightened in agreeing on their respective boundaries in Inuit and Indian territory as were the Dano-Norwegian and Swedish Crowns in 1751 in Sapmi, basing their agreements on indigenous land use, culture, custom, preferences, and mutual non-belligerence (Smith *et al.* 1990).

The current Russian Sami experience is one of *de facto* ethnocide.⁷ That is, although Russia's Sami are not being systematically physically exterminated, everything which makes them Sami and which makes them able to cohere and survive as a people is made daily more difficult if not impossible. Representatives of the Inuit Circumpolar

⁷ — They are not alone in this among the indigenous peoples of Russia, of course.

Conference and Canadian Arctic Resources Committee have been trying to draw this to Canadian public attention and to obtain official support for action — action which neatly fits into several categories of existing Canadian Circumpolar commitments and which could be initiated at once (Fenge & Reimer 1994a; 1994b). Just as government in Russia has imploded, there seems to be total uncertainty about the status of the framework Bill drawn up for the Russian federal parliament, a national indigenous constitutional framework which might interest Canada's indigenous peoples as a possible model (Sokolova, Novikova & Ssorin-Chaikov 1993). This Bill would nest the indigenous peoples and their autonomous territories within Russian national unity, while laying out the clear constitutional principles which that country must observe in recognising them and their territories. It could well provide a rough model for national Canadian legislation implementing a self-government and aboriginal rights constitutional clause or political accord, or for additional clauses added to and elaborating Section 35 of the *Constitution Act 1982*. It is ironic that such contemporary Russian thinking is based in part on the Russian understanding of Canadian and American experience.

Some indigenous politicians in Scandinavia, like some in North America and Australia, are making a pact with the Devil. By accepting the more tangible (and petty) pretensions of the nation-state in exchange for a few medals, invitations to state dinners, Nobel prize receptions, National Arts Centre galas, and appointment to a national board or committee, indigenous peoples are giving the nation-state the gift of legitimacy for its indigenous policies. Nowhere in Scandinavia has there been a *Calder* or *Sparrow* or *Mabo* decision, but governments maintain the legal doctrines which those decisions overturned in Canada and Australia. Nowhere are there Northern land and sea claims negotiations, but primary resource, infrastructure, planning, and settlement developments are all daily crushing the Sami and their lifeways into ever diminishing and unsustainable enclaves or niches. Nowhere is there a hint of self-government, although sometimes the Sami Parliaments are misrepresented as being forms of that. And nowhere do indigenous leaders sit down and negotiate constitutional reform with the nation-state leaders. (The Norwegian constitutional amendment, like most indigenous reforms, was bestowed by progressive Norwegians.) Of course, if this general state of affairs is what Sami want, there can be no argument with it. Where I may be confused is that I have heard many of those same politicians demand those same rights and recognition — in 1973 in Copenhagen when the international indigenous movement began, and in 1975 beside an autumn fjord in British Columbia where the World Council of Indigenous Peoples was born, and in 1982 on the Saskatchewan prairie at the World Assembly of First Nations. Also, Sami, Inuit, and Russian indigenous leaders meeting as the Arctic Indigenous Leaders Summit in 1991, a meeting linked to the gathering of Arctic governments on the environment, first commended those governments for their Circumpolar initiative (AILS 1991a) and then laid down several principles, the first of which was:

Indigenous peoples must be granted exclusive and collective rights to lands and resources for subsistence purposes, which is seen as the only way to avoid conflicts with sport and commercial activities. (AILS 1991b, 1)

Sami are not alone in revisionism. On May 1 the old-timers of the labour movement march around Northern Scandinavian cities, deferentially acknowledging various national monuments and symbols before turning to their own movement's concerns and rituals. It seems that these aging notables — often now viewed as conservatives or even reactionaries by the young, and who, in turn, may refuse to have the young and the indigenous marching with them — were once thought, or thought themselves, adventurously radical. Despite this show of deference to the state, their forms of patriotism may strike mainstream urban Scandinavians as merely quaint, or absurd. Labour, however, has won its battles and transformed society and can afford to be sentimental. The Sami have not.

There are three macro-conclusions to be drawn from recent Sami experience.

1. Contacts and cooperation with indigenous peoples internationally and within countries are needed by all indigenous groups to freshen and renew their own work, share the experience and expertise of their successes with others in need, and maintain indigenous rights standards world-wide (and thus pressure on governments at home).
2. In order to survive and flourish, indigenous peoples must organise their political agendas around the restoration of viable regional societies with inclusive membership (as in the Northern Canadian regional agreements such as Nunavut and the impending British Columbia regional treaties). Much more than defensive legal categories and perimeter fencing are needed to protect and promote indigenous society.
3. Just as legal work was the key to Canadian indigenous success in the past, studies and research, especially in the social sciences, have a huge potential role to play in the future of all indigenous peoples. Comparative studies within and between countries are particularly urgent.

There are many new pressures on "first world" governments, and at the Millennium we may say that indigenous peoples face as many threats to their future as they have ever done before. This time the threats are more insidious than settlers with guns or bulldozers clearing forests. There is no indigenous people anywhere, however successful, who yet have the best political answers in all fields, although there are many who shut out the ideas and experience of others. An expensive hotel suite and a good speaking voice do not make one the equal of governments which are equipped with legions of experts and access to unlimited power and resources. In the famous comment

of Benjamin Franklin at the moment of signing America's revolutionary Declaration of Independence, "We must indeed all hang together, or, most assuredly, we shall all hang separately."

APPENDIX

Extract from pages 20-24 of *Make mad the guilty & appal the free! Indigenous Land/Sea Rights Outcomes in Norway and Canada*, Unpublished paper for Sami and Norwegian researchers and commentators in North Norway, January 27, 1994.

NOTE: This material was provided to friends in North Norway in answer to their question, How might Canadian indigenous peoples today resolve the sorts of issues of unrecognised land, river, and sea rights which confront the Sami? The result would be the ideal agreement, just as each Canadian regional claims settlement has built on each previous one. The assumption was that one would draw on indigenous politics and law as established or accepted in principle at the time the request was made in early 1994. Australian researchers Donna Craig and her team have done the same with Canada's Northern claims settlements and applied them in that country (e.g., Richardson, Craig & Boer 1994a; 1994b), fuelling what is virtually a new indigenous movement for Regional Agreements. In Canada itself the harried teams of indigenous negotiators did not always have the benefit of such precedents or broad comparisons. Of course, the list of items below is hypothetical, a master-list only, and it is unlikely that any single agreement would need or could achieve every one of these elements.

*

F – A CANADIAN-STYLE AGREEMENT FOR NORTH NORWAY?

At precisely the moment of greatest need, Norwegian official processes and Sami leadership, both, appear to have lost touch with the dynamics and current status of "first world" indigenous rights. Unfortunately the international experience is that however wise a government may think itself, or confident an indigenous leadership may be, cross-cultural political relations follow archetypal patterns without regard to country or continent. Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it, as the saying goes.

Twenty years ago the idea of land claims and sea claims seemed totally outrageous to most Canadians. Today indigenous peoples and governments have negotiated or are negotiating such settlements for considerably more than half of Canada. (The Nunavut claims settlement area alone is one-fifth of all Canada.) These include areas rich in mineral and oil/gas resources, and areas in which non-indigenous settlers have lived for generations. The land claims settlements have no precedent in Canadian or Anglo-Saxon tradition; they are *sui generis*. Neither the Indian treaties of old, nor the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) of 1971, although the latter was an important stimulus to Canadians, is more than a very rough antecedent. Just as

Canadians have changed and improved the Alaska model, so Norwegians may develop something new after studying the Canadian models.

On fundamental issues of indigenous rights, Canadian governments provide funding to enable the indigenous peoples affected to hire their own legal and other experts to prepare a detailed case for negotiation with government. In land claims negotiations this is considered a loan, and is deducted from the final compensation payment which accompanies the final agreement. In the Nunavut case these accumulated loans advanced by government to enable the Inuit to prepare and negotiate their claims totalled \$40 million (\$40,000,000 Canadian).

Each claim is negotiated by teams of indigenous people, both elected leaders and hired staff, as well as non-indigenous experts as required. Claims may involve a combination of lawyers who are part of the indigenous staff and lawyers from outside law firms, numbering from 2 or 3 to 20 or more at critical moments. Indigenous groups in Canada have drawn heavily on university-based legal experts in land/sea rights work, self-government development, and constitutional negotiations, as well as in environment and resource development disputes with government.

Although Canadian governments may reject certain claims, they would certainly not reject the claims of, e.g., the Sami of Nordland, Troms, and Finnmark. Canadian comprehensive claims to date have taken government between 5-17 years to negotiate. Each new claims settlement has drawn on the good and bad experience of the preceding claims — in other words, the experience of government and indigenous teams has been cumulative.

The Norwegian government should rejoice in the fact that it had no constitutionally guaranteed provincial governments to negotiate with. In Canada the Yukon and Northwest Territories have been easiest to deal with because Ottawa can simply over-rule them, and has done so, whereas indigenous claims in the Provinces have been more difficult. However, as Ottawa has done in respect of Northern territory interests, Norway would take into account the views of local (*kommune*) and regional (*fylke*) authorities.

For negotiation and final settlement, Sami might wish to divide themselves into more than one region. However, they should keep in mind that the more divided they become, the less political influence they may have. In Canadian experience the individual local groups have wished to retain significant political power and significant control over local lands, waters and resources. Sami might prefer to ensure such local autonomy as part of wider regional claims, rather than divide their regional influence.

The contents of a final Sami Agreement package would contain many items. Translating the Canadian experience to date into North Norway's conditions, a Sami Agreement could have the following characteristics.

1. Important Sami lands, as well as vital fjord and near-shore marine areas, would be designated for exclusive Sami use (and for exclusive Sami ownership or sole Sami management). The criteria might be emotional or religious significance, environmental, recreation, or social use, camping or other settlement purposes, etc., in addition to resource harvesting uses, or habitat or species protection. Sami would be able to license non-Sami use of lands and waters, e.g., for renting holiday cabins, tourist lodges, etc., and impose the terms for such use.
2. Joint Sami-Crown resource management bodies would be created. These would determine and manage land, and designated fjord and coastal marine areas, wildlife, the natural environment, development project terms and conditions, and the preparation of comprehensive land-use (including marine-use) plans for the whole of traditional Sami territory, including areas inhabited by non-Sami. Long-term non-urban non-Sami settlers would be accommodated either by excluding certain areas from such management or including settler representatives when local management issues directly affected them. The decisions of such bodies would be final except where a Minister in Oslo overturned a decision within a short time period for clearly stated reasons falling within a few categories such as conservation of species, national security, etc.
3. A revenue sharing agreement with Sami for development or use of resources in their traditional territory would be negotiated. Such revenues would be for collective Sami use and benefit. Sami would also be able to choose promising mineral developments for ownership and revenue benefits.
4. The reindeer herding administration would become a joint Sami-Crown agency with equal shares in decision-making, as well as hiring preferences for Sami.
5. National parks and nature reserves would be created, and an agreement made laying out the procedures for creating future parks and reserves. Parks and reserves would allow Sami continued harvesting of flora and fauna, except where utterly contrary to the purpose of the reserve, and would give Sami preference for jobs created.
6. Non-Sami resource harvesting rights (notably local fishing, hunting, gathering) would be phased out, e.g., through buying rights/licenses or restricting rights to living users whose descendants would not inherit such rights.
7. The payment of a large sum as compensation for damage and loss of land, waters, and resources, would be made by the Crown. This sum would be used exclusively as a capital fund for development (i.e., Sami employment and economic projects, and to make large stake-holding investments in significant regional enterprises, e.g., *Hurtigrute*). The fund would be administered by a

- purely Sami agency directly accountable to the whole Sami community. The directors and executive members would be elected by Sami.
8. A definition of who is Sami for entitlement to benefits, including land and sea rights, would have to be negotiated. This would be similar to the definition used for registration to vote for the Sami Parliament.
 9. Economic and employment preferences similar to the exclusive Sami reindeer herding rights would be adopted in other primary industries. (Indigenous people have long held exclusive hunting rights in Northern Canada.) There might also be preferences for Sami enterprises in bidding on public contracts (e.g., road repair, construction, cleaning and repairing public buildings, etc.). A Sami collective or company bid might be chosen if it were up to 15% higher than competing non-Sami bids.
 10. Regional Sami education, health and social service boards which would be created to manage facilities and hire teachers (nurses, social workers, doctors, and other staff) in Sami areas, as well as serving urban Sami populations.
 11. Sami areas or rural townships would be created or re-designated as Sami local government districts. There would also be a higher, regional, Sami government to manage public services, facilities, and territory within the townships, as well as other regional lands (subject to the local and regional governments' division of power with the Sami land and resource management boards).
 12. New settlements, or the moving of parts or the whole of some existing ones to form new Sami communities would be provided for, where desired and as agreed in the overall Sami Agreement with the Crown.
 13. "Catch-up" programs for the upgrading or provision of facilities, e.g., community airstrips, community centres, harbours, etc. where these were inadequate, might be agreed and could involve a Crown commitment to special funding over a 5- to 10-year period. (The generally high standards of Norwegian public services in all parts of the country might make this little needed.) Special facilities such as headquarters buildings for the Sami regional authority and improvements to a Sami "capital" might also be required.
 14. There would be guarantees for the use, teaching, and development of Sami language as the main language of Sami areas alongside Norwegian (which would also be taught). The Greenland Home Rule model makes Inuktitut (Greenlandic) the main language but maintains rights and teaching for Danish.
 15. An implementation body and process would be established by the Sami Agreement to enable Sami and the Crown jointly to plan and phase in the new

- arrangements so as to ensure a smooth administrative transfer and no disruption of public services.
16. The lands making up the Sami Agreement Region would not necessarily be contiguous, but could be separated by areas of non-Sami settlement or alternative uses, or even be a patchwork. It is important to note that some powers, such as those in No. 2 and No. 3 above, would apply for areas outside as well as within Sami lands and waters.
 17. Sami would continue to receive all public services and benefits of Norwegian citizenship on the same basis as other citizens of Norway. This is important to state clearly in the Agreement because during the transition period government departments are apt to be confused and withdraw or deny some services, as happened at times in Canada.
 18. Special work and executive training programs would be set up before the Agreement came into force to help ensure that qualified Sami can fill the new jobs created by the Agreement and the bodies created by the Agreement.
 19. The Crown would require Sami, as part of the land and sea rights agreement, to make no further claims based on aboriginal land or sea rights. Of course, this would not deny further evolution in arrangements through normal political processes, including the work of the new management boards and local/regional governments. (Canadian indigenous peoples have been seeking an alternative to this "extinguishment", and the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples is expected to put forward some new ideas on the subject.)
 20. A vote of all adult Sami who are to be recognised as beneficiaries of the Agreement would be required before the Agreement could become law. (Greenland also held a referendum in 1979 on the terms of the Home Rule Act.)
 21. The Norwegian Constitution would be amended to say that the North Norway Sami Agreement was part of the fundamental law of Norway; that it may not be changed by the Crown without consent of the Sami; and that the provisions of the Sami Agreement take precedence in Norwegian law over other rights in Norwegian law (so that a non-Sami could not use Norwegian human rights law to challenge Sami rights [e.g., fishing rights] negotiated by Sami as part of the Sami Agreement).

There are many other possibilities. **It would be naive to propose this list as the only approach in Norway, but it may serve as a sort of standard or check-list against which Sami may measure other alternatives.** Sami have the best educated and best trained work force, including many high professionals, of "first world" indigenous peoples, and Norway probably has, along with Denmark, the most progressive

government in respect of social policies. So, the rest of us expect great things and worthy precedents from Sami-Norwegian political and rights inter-action.

*

REFERENCES & USEFUL READING:

- Aarseth B, 1978. *The Sami People*, Norsk Folkmuseum & Tromsø Museum.
- Afanasjeva N & Rantala L, 1993. *Programme of Aid to the Russian Sami*, Sami Council, Utsjoki, Finland.
- Aikio P, 1987. "Experience Drawn from the Finnish Sami Parliament" in IWGIA 1987, 91-102.
- Aikio P, 1990. *The Circumpolar Peoples and the Protection of Arctic Environment*, Sami Delegation Conference Paper for presentation in Yellowknife, NWT, April 1990.
- AILS, 1991a. *Declaration of the Arctic Indigenous Leaders Summit*, Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Nordic Saami Council & USSR Association of Northern Small Peoples, Hörsholm, Denmark, June 20, 1991.
- AILS, 1991b. *Statement on Subsistence, the Traditional and Direct Dependence on Renewable Resources*, Arctic Indigenous Leaders Summit, Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Nordic Saami Council & USSR Association of Northern Small Peoples, Hörsholm, Denmark, June 20, 1991.
- AILS, 1991c. *Statement on Renewable Resource Harvesting*, Arctic Indigenous Leaders Summit, Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Nordic Saami Council & USSR Association of Northern Small Peoples, Hörsholm, Denmark, June 20, 1991.
- Alexander M & Galligan B, 1992a. *Comparative Political Studies: Australia and Canada*, Pitman Longman Cheshire, Melbourne.
- Alexander M & Galligan B, 1992b. "Australian and Canadian Comparative Political Studies", in Alexander & Galligan 1992a, 1-11.
- Andersen M, 1986. "The Saami: Reindeer-Breeders of Norwegian Lapland", *News of Norway*, Vol 43, No 8, 59-62. [This is the same person, Christian name Myrdene, as Anderson M, 1978, despite variant *-sen* and *-son*.]
- Andersen R *et al.*, 1992. *Norwegian Small Type Whaling in Cultural Perspective*, Norwegian College of Fisheries (NFH), Tromsø.
- Anderson M, 1978. "Mobility and Bilingualism in North Norway", *Ethnos*, 1978:3-4, 178-192.

- Anderson M, 1978. *Primary Social Units in Saami Ethnoecology: Resource Management in Norwegian Lapland*, Institute for the Study of Social Change, Purdue University, Indiana. [This is the same person, Christian name Myrdene, as Andersen M, 1986, despite variant *-sen* and *-son*.]
- Anderson M, 1978. *The Saami in Norway: An Analysis of the Current Minority Situation in Historical Perspective*, Unpublished monograph, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa.
- Andrén N, 1964. *Government & Politics in the Nordic Countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden*, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm.
- Archer C & Maxwell S (eds), 1980. *The Nordic Model: Studies in Public Policy Innovation*, Gower, Farnborough, UK.
- Arima EY, 1983. *The West Coast People: The Nootka of Vancouver Island and Cape Flattery*, British Columbia Provincial Museum Special Publication No. 6, Victoria.
- Arnesen AG, 1987. "Theory and Practice" [in Self-Determination and Indigenous Rights], in IWGIA 1987, 145-153.
- Axworthy TS & Trudeau PE, 1992. "The Tempest Bursting: Canada in 1992", in *Towards a Just Society: The Trudeau Years*, ed. TS Axworthy and PE Trudeau, 2nd ed., Penguin, Toronto, 7-50.
- Bagge S, 1989. "State Building in Medieval Norway: The Origin of the State", *Forum for utviklingsstudier*, 1989 issue No. 2, 129-146.
- Bankes N, Fenge T, & Kalff S, 1993. "Toward Sustainable Development in Canada's Arctic: Policies and International Relations", in Maule CJ & Hampson FO (eds), *Global Jeopardy: Canada Among Nations, 1993-94*, Carleton University Press, Ottawa, 170-189.
- Barth F (ed), 1972. *The Role of the Entrepreneur in Social Change in Northern Norway*, Universitetsforlaget, Bergen-Oslo-Tromsø.
- Barth F, 1969. "Introduction", *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, ed. F. Barth, Universitetsforlaget, Bergen-Oslo, 9-39.
- Beach H, 1977. *The Swedish Lapps — Their Minority Problems*, Draft study for Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa.

- Beach H, 1980. "Swedish Rational Herd Management: Unexpressed Premises and Unforeseen Consequences", *Proceedings, 2nd International Reindeer/Caribou Symposium*, Røros, Norway, 1979, 700-704.
- Beach H, 1983. "A Swedish Dilemma: Saami Rights and the Welfare State", *Production pastorale et société*, bulletin de l'équipe écologie et anthropologie des sociétés pastorales, No. 12 printemps 1983, 9-17.
- Beach H, 1994. "The Saami of Lapland", *Polar Peoples: Self-determination and Development*, edited by Minority Rights Group, Minority Rights Publications, London, 147-205.
- Beaglehole JC, 1974. *The life of Captain James Cook*, Black, London.
- Beckmann L, 1994. "Marine Conservation in the Canadian Arctic", *Northern Perspectives*, Vol. 22, Nos. 2-3 (Summer-Fall 1994), Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, Ottawa, 33-39.
- Berg PO, 1988. "Sector Versus region: The Stalemate of Norwegian Regional Development Policies in the 1980s", in Byron 1988, 161-172.
- Bjerkli B, 1991. "Cultural Change in Rural Norway and the Promise of Diverging Norms and Values", Nordlands Forskning Working Paper 1105/91, Mørkved, Norway.
- Björklund I, 1985. *Fjordfolket i Kvænangen*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Björklund I, 1988. "Sami reindeer pastoralism as an indigenous resource management system in Northern Norway — a contribution to the common property debate", in Freeman MMR & Carbyn LN (eds), 1998, *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management in Northern Regions*, IUCN Commission on Ecology and Boreal Institute for Northern Studies, Edmonton.
- Björklund I, 1991. "Property in common, common property or private property: Norwegian fishery management in a Sami coastal area", in *North Atlantic Studies*, Vol 3, No 1, Aarhus, Denmark, 41-45.
- Blichfeldt G (ed), 1993. *11 Essays on Whales and Man*, High North Alliance, Reine i Lofoten, Norway.
- Boldt M, 1993a. "Leadership", *Surviving as INDIANS: The Challenge of Self-Government*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 117-166.

- Boldt M, 1993b. "Culture", *Surviving as INDIANS: The Challenge of Self-Government*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 167-221.
- Brantenberg A & Brantenberg T, 1984. "Coastal Northern Labrador After 1950", in *Volume 5: The Arctic*, in *The Handbook of North American Indians*, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 689-699.
- Brantenberg OT & Minde H, 1994. "Are Sami nothing but common Northerners? Aboriginal and common rights to Crown land in Finnmark County", English translation of Norwegian text, Institute for Social Sciences, University of Tromsø, for *Aftenposten*, Oslo, and *Nordlys*, Tromsø, January 21, 1994.
- Brantenberg OT, 1985. "The Alta-Kautokeino Conflict: Saami Reindeer Herding and Ethnopolitics", in Brøsted *et al.* 1985, 23-48.
- Brantenberg OT, 1990. "Why should a book on the history of a local community in Northern Norway be translated and published in English?", Unpublished review of Ivar Björklund's *Fjordfolket i Kvænangen*, North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, August 22, 1990.
- Brantenberg OT, 1991. "Norway: Constructing Indigenous Self-Government in a Nation-State", in Jull & Roberts 1991, 66-128.
- Brantenberg OT, 1993. "The end of 13 Years of Silence: The Sami Land Rights Issue in Norway", *IWGIA Newsletter*, No. 4/1993 (October-December), International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs, Copenhagen, 26-40.
- Brantenberg OT, Hauan MA & Knutsen NM, 1994. "Myter om Nord-Norge og nordlendingen gjennom tidene", *Nordnorsk Kulturhistorie: Det gjenstridige landet, Vol. 1*, ed. Drivenes E-A, Hauan MA & Wold HA, Gyldendal, Oslo, 386-405.
- Brøsted J *et al.*, 1985. *Native Power: The Quest for Autonomy and Nationhood of Indigenous Peoples*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Brox O *et al.*, 1993. *Nord-Norge — sett fra luften*, Text, maps and aerial photos, Hjemmets Bokforlag, [Oslo?].
- Brundtland GH *et al.*, 1987a. *Our Common Future: The Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*, Oxford University Press.
- Brundtland GH, 1987b. "The Politics of Oil: A View from Norway", Lecture by Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland at Harvard University, *Norway Documentation*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo.

- Byron R (ed), 1988. *Public Policy and the Periphery: Problems and Prospects in Marginal Regions*, International Society for the Study of Marginal Regions, Belfast [printed in Halifax, NS].
- Canada, 1931. *Exchange of Notes (August 8, 1930, and November 5, 1930) regarding the Recognition by the Norwegian Government of the Sovereignty of His Majesty over the Sverdrup Islands*, Treaty Series, 1930, No. 17, Dominion of Canada, King's Printer, Ottawa.
- Canada, 1994. "Ouellet and Irwin announce first Circumpolar Ambassador", *News Release* No. 209, Government of Canada, October 20, 1994.
- CARC, 1981. *Native Rights in Norway, being Northern Perspectives*, Vol 9, No 3, Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, Ottawa.
- CARC, 1988. "Canada's Interests in the International Arctic", *Changing Times, Challenging Agendas: Economic and Political Issues in Canada's North*, Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, Ottawa, 109-159.
- Carlsen J, 1990. "Scandinavian reflections on the Canadian Arctic: The Oslo Conference", *ICCS Contact*, Vol 9 No 2 (Autumn 1990), International Council for Canadian Studies, Ottawa, 17-19.
- Cassidy F (ed), 1991. *Aboriginal Self-Determination*, Proceedings of a conference held September 30-October 3, 1990, Oolichan Books, Lantzville, and Institute for Research on Public Policy, Halifax.
- Castles FG, 1976. "Policy Innovation and Institutional Stability in Sweden", *British Journal of Political Science* **6**: 203-216.
- Charta 79, 1982. *The Sami People and Human Rights*, Charta 79, Oslo.
- Christiansen E, 1980. *The Northern Crusade: the Baltic and the Catholic Frontier, 1100-1525*, Macmillan, London.
- Clark Rt Hon J, 1987. Speech by the Right Honourable Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs, to the Norway-Canada Conference on Circumpolar Issues, Tromsø, December 9, 1987.
- Coombs HC, 1994. *Aboriginal Autonomy: Issues and Strategies*, Cambridge University Press.

- Coombs HC, McCann H, Ross H & Williams NM, 1989. *Land of Promises: Aborigines and Development in the East Kimberley*, Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies (CRES), Australian National University, and Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra.
- Corbett H, 1993. "Towards a New Partnership", Conference paper for *International Indigenous Politics and Self-Government*, Sami Centre, University of Tromsø, November 1993.
- Cramer T, 1994. "Sami Legal Rights Cleansing in Scandinavia", *IWGIA Indigenous Affairs*, Copenhagen, No. 3/94, 52-55.
- Dædalus*, 1984a. *The Nordic Enigma*, being *Dædalus, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Vol. 113, No. 1, Winter 1984.
- Dædalus*, 1984b: *Nordic Voices*, being *Dædalus, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Vol. 113, No 2, Spring 1984.
- Dahl J *et al.*, 1990. *Indigenous Peoples of the Soviet North*, International Working Group for Indig Affairs (IWGIA), Copenhagen.
- Dahl J, 1993. *Indigenous Peoples of the Arctic*, Nordic Council, Copenhagen.
- Dalland Ö, n.d. [1981?]. "Judicial Treatment of the Alta Development — Justice For Whom?", Photocopied paper on the Norwegian Supreme court decision by the Alta-Kautokeino movement, Oslo.
- DFO, 1992a. "Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy: Backgrounder I: The Program", *Backgrounder*, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, June 1992.
- DFO, 1992b. "Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy: Backgrounder II: The Context", *Backgrounder*, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, June 1992.
- DFO, 1992c. "Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy: Backgrounder III: Native Groups Participate in Management, Enhancement", *Backgrounder*, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, June 1992.
- Dixon RA & Dillon MC (eds), 1990. *Aborigines and diamond mining: the politics of resource development in the East Kimberley*, University of Western Australia Press, Perth.
- Dodson M, 1993. *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commission: First Report*, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, Commonwealth of Australia, Sydney.

- Drivenes E-A, Hauan MA & Wold HA (eds), 1994. *Nordnorsk Kulturhistorie: Det gjenstridige landet, Vol. 1*, Gyldendal, Oslo.
- Drivenes E-A, Hauan MA & Wold HA (eds), 1994. *Nordnorsk Kulturhistorie: Det mangfoldige folket, Vol. 2*, Gyldendal, Oslo.
- Dyck N & Waldram JB (eds), 1993. *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.
- Eide A, 1985. "Indigenous Populations and Human Rights: The United Nations Efforts at Mid-way", in Brösted *et al.* 1985, 196-212.
- Eidheim H, 1971. *Aspects of the Lappish Minority Situation*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Eidheim H, 1992. *Stages in the Development of Sami Selfhood*, Working Paper No. 7, Department of Social Anthropology, University of Oslo.
- Eidheim H, n.d. [early-mid 1980s]. "Indigenous Peoples and the State", Photocopied paper, Institute of Social Anthropology, University of Oslo.
- Eliade M, 1964. *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Enoksen R & Antonsen S, 1993. "Fysiske overgrep: samisk hverdag på Kola", *Nordlys*, Tromsø, November 11, 1993.
- Enoksen R, 1986. "Norge og Canada har mye å lære av hverandre", *Nordlys*, March 26, 1986.
- Eriksen H, 1985. "The Legal Status of the Sami in Norway", *German Yearbook of International Law*, Vol. 28, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin.
- Eriksen KE & Niemi E, 1981. "The Finnish menace. Boundary problems and minority policy in the North (1870-1940)", *Den finske fare: Sikkerhetsproblemer og minoritetspolitikk i nord 1860-1940*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo, 1981, 352-374.
- Eriksen TH, 1991. "Ethnicity versus Nationalism", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol 28, No 3, 263-278.
- Eronn R, 1993. "The Sami Indigenous People of the North", *Current Sweden*, No. 397, The Swedish Institute, Stockholm.
- Eythorsson E, 1993. "Sami Fjord Fishermen and the State: Traditional Knowledge and Resource Management in Northern Norway", in Inglis 1993, 133-142.

- Falkenberg J, n.d. "From nomadism to permanent settlement among the Sami of the Røros region (1890s-1940s)", Journal article or book chapter, source unknown, 34-48.
- Fenge T & Reimer C, 1994a. "The Kola Sami", Report for the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee & Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Ottawa.
- Fenge T & Reimer C, 1994b. "Russian Sami: Rising up again", *Arctic Circle*, Fall/Winter Issue, November 1994 [Final issue, alas!], 22-25.
- Finland, 1991a. *Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy*, Foreign Ministry of Finland, Helsinki.
- FNI, 1992. "Cooperation in the Barents Sea Region: Problems and Prospects", Background memorandum prepared by the Fridtjof Nansen Institute for the Norwegian Foreign Ministry in connection with the expert conference in Kirkenes, Norway, 26-27 September, 1992.
- Forsyth J, 1992. *A History of the Peoples of Siberia: Russia's North Asian Colony, 1581-1990*, Cambridge University Press.
- FPRO, 1978. "The Norwegian decision against entry into the European Economic Community: The referendum of September 24, 1972", Chapter IV, *Understanding referenda: six histories*, Federal-Provincial Relations Office & Canadian Unity Information Office, Ottawa, 21-26.
- Frøysnes T, 1986. "The Arctic Challenge: Political, Legal and Economic Implications of Recent Developments in the High North: A Norwegian Perspective", Presentation by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Conference on *Sovereignty, Security and the Arctic*, York University, Toronto.
- Gad F, 1971. *The History of Greenland, I, Earliest Times to 1700*, trans. E Dupont, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.
- Gaski H, 1988. "The Free Sounds of the *Joik* in Writing: Some observations on early and more recent Sami literature", *News from the Top of the World: Norwegian Literature Today*, No. 1, Oslo.
- Gaski H, 1991. "Sami and the Native Identity — searching in aboriginal literature", Lecture at the 1991 American Studies Seminar, Sörmarka, Norway, November 1991.

- Gaski H, n.d. [1985/7]. "The burden of a Sami woman", Introduction to and translation of poems by Rauni Magga Lukkari, Manuscript, Institute of Language and Literature (ISL), University of Tromsø.
- Gaski H, n.d. [early 1990s]. "The Sami People — the 'White Indians' of Scandinavia", Paper for presentation in English-speaking countries, Institute of Languages and Literature, University of Tromsø.
- Ginjirrang Mala & ADVYZ, 1994. *An Indigenous Marine Protection Strategy for Manbuynga ga Rulyapa or the Arafura Sea*, Prepared by the Ginjirrang Mala with the assistance of ADVYZ for the Northern Land Council and Ocean Rescue 2000, Darwin, November 1994.
- Grahl-Madsen A, 1986. "Introduction: The Sami Convention", in Harhoff *et al.* (eds) 1986, 2-11.
- Grahl-Madsen A, 1988. "Towards a Saami Convention?", *Nordic Journal on Human Rights*, No. 4, 1988.
- Griffiths T, 1991. *Scandinavia*, Wakefield, Adelaide.
- Gullestad M, 1986. "Equality and Marital Love: The Norwegian Case as an Illustration of a General Western Dilemma", *Social Analysis*, No. 19, August 1986, 40-53.
- Gullestad M, 1986. "Symbolic 'Fences' in Urban Norwegian Neighbourhoods", *Ethnos*, Vol 51, No 1-2, 52-70.
- Gullestad M, 1989. "Small facts and large issues: The anthropology of contemporary Scandinavian society", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Volume 18, 1989.
- Gullestad M, 1992. *The Art of Social Relations: Essays on Culture, Social Action and Everyday Life in Modern Norway*, Scandinavian University Press, Oslo.
- Hansen JC, 1989. "Norway: the turnaround which turned around", *Counterurbanization: the changing pace and nature of population deconcentration*, ed. AG Champion, Arnold (Hodder & Stoughton), London.
- Harhoff F *et al* (eds), 1982. *The Small Nations of the North in International and Constitutional Law: The Mariehamn Seminar, 1980*, being *Nordic Journal of International Law* (Copenhagen) Vol 51, Nos 1-2.
- Harhoff F *et al* (eds), 1985. *The Small Nations of the North in International and Constitutional Law: The Torshavn Seminar, 1983*, being *Nordic Journal of International Law* (Copenhagen) Vol 54, Nos 1-2.

- Harhoff F *et al* (eds), 1986. *The Small Nations of the North in International and Constitutional Law: The Kautokeino Seminar, 1985*, being *Nordic Journal of International Law* (Copenhagen) Vol 55, Nos 1-2.
- Hastrup K, 1984. "Defining A Society: The Icelandic Free State Between Two Worlds", *Scandinavian Studies*, Vol 56, No 3 (Summer 1984), 235-255.
- Hastrup K, 1985. *Culture and History in Medieval Iceland: An Anthropological Analysis of History and Mentality*, Oxford University Press.
- Helander E, 1992. *The Sami of Norway*, Information Article, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo.
- Henriksen G, [1990?]. "The Experience of Social Worth as a Force in Inter-Ethnic Relations", Draft paper, University of Bergen,
- Henriksen G, 1970. "Norske rettigheter i det kanadiske arktis?", *Aftenposten*, Oslo, September 16, 1970.
- Henriksen G, 1985. "Norwegian Administration and the Saami Community in Helgeland", in Brösted *et al.* 1985, 137-154.
- Hermanns-Audardottir M, 1992. "The beginning of settlement in Iceland from an archaeological point of view", *Acta Borealia*, Vol. 9, 1992:2, 85-135.
- Hoel AH, Jentoft S & Mikalsen KH, 1991. *Problems of User-Group Participation in Norwegian Fisheries Management*, Occasional Paper No 56, Institute of Social Sciences (ISV), University of Tromsø, March 1991.
- Hoel AH, n.d. "Small Scale Fishing and Social Science in Northwest Europe", Unpublished and unpaginated paper, Norwegian College of Fisheries Science, University of Tromsø.
- Hoëm A, 1989. "The Modernization Process Among Indigenous Peoples: The Samii Case", Unpublished paper, University of Oslo.
- Högmo A, 1992. "The Vanished is a Dream: Social and Cultural Change in North Norwegian Local Communities", Nordlands Forskning Working Paper No. 4/92, Mörkved, Norway.
- Hyvönen V & Korpijaakko K, 1979. "The Legal Status of the Lapps in Land and Water Law", *Scandinavian Studies in Law* 1979, 109-129.

- Inglis J (ed), 1993. *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*, International Program on Traditional Knowledge, Canadian Museum of Nature and International Development Research Centre, Ottawa.
- ISK, 1967. *Lapps and Norsemen in Olden Times*, Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- IWGIA Oslo, 1981. "Norway: Sami Rights and the Alta-Kautokeino Case", *IWGIA Newsletter*, No. 27, June 1981, 63-76.
- IWGIA, 1987. *Self determination and Indigenous Peoples: Sami Rights and Northern Perspectives*, Proceedings of Seminar organised by Oslo and Copenhagen Local Groups of the International Working Group for Indig Affairs (held in Copenhagen, November 1984), Copenhagen.
- Jackson A, 1979. "Socioeconomic change in the Faroes", in Andersen R (ed), *North Atlantic Maritime Cultures: Anthropological Essays on Changing Adaptations*, Mouton, The Hague, 31-64.
- Jackson RJ, 1992. "Australian and Canadian Comparative Political Research", in Alexander & Galligan 1992a, 12-26.
- Jahreskog B (ed), 1982. *The Sami National Minority in Sweden*, Rättsfonden (The Legal Rights Foundation), Stockholm.
- Jentoft S & Kristoffersen T, 1988. "Fishermen's Self-Management: The Case of the Lofoten Fishery", in Byron 1988, 222-235.
- Jentoft S & Mikalsen KH, 1992. "Regulating Fjord Fisheries: Folk Management or Interest Group Politics?", Paper for Society for Applied Anthropology, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Jentoft S, 1989. "Resource Management: Should the Fishermen Take Over?", Conference Paper for PROSPERO workshop *Human Aspects of Fisheries Management* (May 1989), Institute of Social Sciences, University of Tromsø.
- Johansen LE, 1994. "Presentation at the *Workshop on Regional Agreements in Northern Australia: Aboriginal Strategies for Land Use, Management, Resource and Environmental Issues*", Presentation by Honourable Lars Emil Johansen, Premier of Greenland, Macquarie University Law School [& Cape York Land Council], Cairns, Queensland, July 27, 1994.
- Jones G, 1984. *A History of the Vikings* (2nd ed), Oxford University Press.
- Jones G, 1986. *The Norse Atlantic Saga* (2nd ed), Oxford University Press.

- Jull P & Roberts S, 1991. *The Challenge of Northern Regions*, Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin.
- Jull P, 1981a. "Aboriginal Peoples and Political Change in the North Atlantic Area", in *Journal of Canadian Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 41-52.
- Jull P, 1981b. "The Concept of an Inuit 'Parliament'", Memorandum for the Inuit Committee on National Issues, Montreal, June 11, 1981.
- Jull P, 1984. *Norway: a report on current developments in aboriginal policy*, Corporate Policy Branch, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa.
- Jull P, 1988a. "Canadian Policy and Perspective in the Circumpolar North", in *Changing Times, Challenging Agendas: Economic and Political Issues in Canada's North*, Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, Ottawa, 140-159.
- Jull P, 1988b. *Lapland: the Native North in Norway*, Government of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife.
- Jull P, 1991a. *The Politics of Northern Frontiers*, Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin.
- Jull P, 1991b. "Outback Internationalism: New Linkages in Northern Development", in Jull & Roberts 1991, 284-289.
- Jull P, 1991c. *A Guide for Australian Research into Northern Regions and Indigenous Policy in North America and Europe*, Discussion Paper No. 3, Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin.
- Jull P, 1992a. "Remembering Mark Gordon", *The Northern Review*, No. 8/9, Summer 1992, Whitehorse, 257-303.
- Jull P, 1992b. "The need for northern knowledge and research", in *Australian Library Review*, Vol. 9, No. 1, February 1992, 3-11.
- Jull P, 1993a. *Them Eskimo Mob: International Implications of Nunavut*, An Essay Commissioned by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (Research — the North), Ottawa, June 15, 1993.
- Jull P, 1993b. "Indigenous Political Progress: Scandinavia and the Inuit Lands", *Self-Determination for Aboriginal Peoples*, University of New South Wales 1993 Symposium, Sydney, August 28, 1993, 24-32.

- Jull P, 1993c. *A Sea Change: Overseas Indigenous-Government Relations in the Coastal Zone*, Resource Assessment Commission, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.
- Jull P, 1993d. "Indigenous Self-Government: Emerging 'First World' Experience", Paper for Conference, *International Indigenous Politics and Self-Government*, Sami Centre, University of Tromsø, Norway, November 11, 1993, 34 pages.
- Jull P, 1994a. "Mabo politics in a 'first world' context", in Goot M & Rowse T (eds), *Make a Better Offer: The Politics of Mabo*, Pluto Press, Sydney, 203-216.
- Jull P, 1994b. "Indigenous Progress Abroad: Self-Determination, Sovereignty and Self-Government", *Social Alternatives*, Vol 13, No 1, April 1994 (University of Queensland), 25-28.
- Jull P, 1994c. *Inventing and Re-Inventing the North in Canada: Inuit-European Relations, 1000-2001 AD*, Working Paper for the Canadian Office, Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Ottawa, March 1994, 101 pages.
- Jull P, 1994d. *Make mad the guilty & appal the free! Indigenous Land/Sea Rights Outcomes in Norway and Canada*, Unpublished paper for Sami and Norwegian researchers and commentators in North Norway, January 27, 1994.
- Jull P, 1994e. "Comparative Studies: Their Use for Indigenous Social Justice", A note for use by the Office of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission, Commonwealth of Australia, October 6, 1994.
- Jull P, 1994f. "Dreaming in Black and White: An Australian Northern Policy", Draft for *The Northern Review*, Canada, November 3, 1994, 10 pages.
- Jull P, 1994g. "Territorial Peoples, Territorial Solutions: 'First World' Experience with Indigenous Rights", Paper for Short Course (Dec 1-3/94) of the National Native Title Tribunal, *Native Title: An Opportunity for Understanding*, Commonwealth of Australia, Perth, December 1, 1994.
- Kjellberg F & Taylor JG, 1983. *Recent Trends in Scandinavian Local Government*, Photocopied paper, Institute of Political Science, University of Oslo, March 1983.
- Kleivan H, 1966. *The Eskimos of Northeast Labrador: A History of Eskimo-White Relations, 1771-1955*, Norsk Polarinstitut, Oslo.

- Kleivan I, 1984. "History of Norse Greenland", in *Volume 5: The Arctic*, in *The Handbook of North American Indians*, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, 549-555.
- Kleivan I, 1992. "The Arctic Peoples' Conference in Copenhagen, November 22-25, 1973", *Études Inuit Studies*, Vol. 16 (1-2), 1992, 227-236.
- Korpijaako-Labba K, 1993. *Legal Rights of the Sami in Finland During the Period of the Swedish Rule: A Survey of the Past, Thoughts on the Future*, Circumpolar and Scientific Affairs Publication Series, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa.
- Korsmo F, 1991. "The Swedish Sami Rights Commission: Economic Interests and Legal Rights", Paper for Conference on Indigenous People in Remote Regions, 3-5 July 1991, University of Victoria, British Columbia.
- Korsmo F, 1992. *Empowerment or Termination? Native Rights and Resource Regimes in Alaska and Swedish Lapland*, PhD Thesis, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- Korsmo FL, 1992. "Worn-Out Privileges, Invigorated Rights: The Swedish Saami in the European Community", Paper for Conference on *Sweden and the New Europe*, University of Washington, Seattle, November 1992.
- Korsmo FL, 1993. "Swedish Policy and Saami Rights", *The Northern Review*, No. 11 (Winter 1993), Whitehorse, 32-55.
- Kvavik R, 1984. "Redesigning Local Government in Norway: An Experiment in Democracy", *Scandinavian Studies*, Vol. 56, No. 4, 333-350.
- Lindal Å & Sunde H (eds), 1981. *Alta Pictures: 12 years' struggle for The Alta-Kautokeino Watercourse*, Bilingual edition (English trans. KE Myrland), Pax Forlag, Oslo.
- Ljungkvist T, 1988. "The Swedish Saami Rights Committee", *Nordic Journal of International Law*, Vol. 57, No. 3, 247-250.
- Loyn HR, 1977. *The Vikings in Britain*, Batsford, London.
- Lui G, 1994. "A Torres Strait perspective", in *Voices from the Land: 1993 Boyer Lectures*, Australian Broadcasting Corporation, Sydney, 62-75.
- Lundestad G (ed), 1994. *The Fall of Great Powers: Peace, Stability, and Legitimacy*, Oxford University Press.

- Lyck L *et al* (eds), 1988. *The Small Nations of the North in International and Constitutional Law: The Greenland Seminar, 1987*, being *Nordic Journal of International Law* (Copenhagen) Vol 57, No 3.
- Manitoba, 1971. *Government Services to Citizens in Scandinavian Countries*, Manitoba Department of Health and Social Development, Winnipeg.
- Mathiesen P, 1985. "Arctic Science Policy and Development from the point of view of a North Norwegian University", Paper for Conference on Arctic Science Policy & Development, Fairbanks, Alaska, August 1985.
- Mathiesen P, 1990. "Ethnicity as Pattern: Past and Present", *Acta Borealia*, 1:1990, 5-13.
- Mathiesen P, Holm-Olsen I-M, Söbstad T, & Bratrein HD, 1986. "The Helgöy Project: An Interdisciplinary Study of Past Eco-Ethno Processes in the Helgöy Region, Northern Troms, Norway", *Norwegian Archeology Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2, 77-117.
- Maurstad A & Sundet JH, 1994. "Improving the link between science and management: drawing upon local fishers' experience", Conference paper, Norwegian College of Fishery Science, University of Tromsø, Norway, September 1994.
- Maurstad A, 1992. "Closing the Commons — Opening the 'Tragedy': Regulating North Norwegian Small-Scale Fishing", Paper for the 3rd Common Property Conference, International Association for the Study of Common Property, Washington, DC, September 17-20, 1992.
- Meløe J, 1988. "The Two Landscapes of Northern Norway", *Inquiry*, 31, 387-401.
- Meløe J, 1993. "Words and Objects", Printed article in workbook *Kystseminaret*, ISV, University of Tromsø.
- Minde H, 1984. "The Sami Movement, the Norwegian Labour Party and Sami Rights", Trans. K Madsen, Paper for XVIth International Congress of Historical Science, Stuttgart (1985).
- Minde H, 1991. "A Century of Research into Saami Rights", in *Historisk tidsskrift: the Norwegian Journal of History*, 1991:4.
- Minde H, 1992. "The Development of Social Anthropological, Sociological and Historical Research into the Post-War Saami Society of Norway", Paper for Conference of Arctic Social Sciences, October 1992, Université Laval, Québec.

- Morton N, 1980. "The politics of non-renewable resource development in Greenland, North Norway and Svalbard", *Polar Record*, Vol 20, No 126, 215-230.
- MRG, 1994. *Polar Peoples: Self-determination and Development*, edited by Minority Rights Group, Minority Rights Publications, London.
- Mulrennan M & Hanssen N (eds), 1994. *Marine Strategy for Torres Strait: Policy Directions*, Australian National University North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, and Island Coordinating Council, Torres Strait.
- Mulroney B, 1993. "Nunavut Land Claim Agreement Signing Ceremony", Notes for an Address by Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, Iqaluit, NWT, May 25, 1993, Office of the Prime Minister, Ottawa.
- NAC, 1984. *Sami Art*, Catalogue for Ottawa exhibition, Nordic Arts Centre, Helsinki.
- Nesheim A, 1981. "The Lapps of Norway and their history", Information newsletter published by Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo, September 1981.
- Nickul K, 1977. *The Lappish Nation: Citizens of Four Countries*, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Niemi E, n.d. [1988 or later?]. "The Kvens in Vadsö, Northern Norway, 1850-1940", *Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe, 1850-1940*, ed. M Engman *et al.*, Ethnic Identity in Urban Europe, Volume VIII, European Science Foundation, New York University Press & Dartmouth, 131-157.
- Nilsen R, 1985. "Corporatism and Sectoral Dynamics: Numerical and Corporate Influence in Two Political Systems", Paper for Workshop on *Corporatism in Mediterranean [!] Europe* (Barcelona), University of Tromsø.
- Nilsen R, 1987. "Occupational Adaptions [*sic*] and Regional Development in Fjord Districts in Northern Norway", Paper for Regional Science Association Conference, Athens, August 1987.
- Nilsen R, 1990. "Development Traits and Development Problems in a Resource Based Region: Northern Norway", Printed paper, Nordic section, Regional Science Association, c/o ISV, University of Tromsø.

- Nilsen R, forthcoming. "The Coastal Survivors: Industrialization and Local Adaptations in the Northern Norwegian Fisheries", *Arctic*, Journal of the Arctic Institute of North America.
- Nordic Sami Council, 1984. "Sami People of Scandinavia: Sami Political Program", *Indigenous World/El Mundo Indigena* (San Francisco) Vol 3, No 1, 1984, 5.
- Norway, 1973. *The Lapps of Norway*, Information newsletter published by Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo.
- Norway, 1976. *Domestic Reindeer Management in Norway*, Information document, Oslo.
- Norway, 1982. "Supreme Court rules Alta development legal", *News of Norway*, Vol 39, No 4, March 26, 1982, 20-22.
- Norway, 1984. "Nordic Cooperation", Information handout, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo.
- Norway, 1987a. *Sami Act*, English translation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo.
- Norway, 1987b. *Sami Language Act*, English translation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo.
- Norway, 1992. "First Report for the period ending 30 June 1992, made by the Government of Norway...[on ILO] Convention No. 169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, 1989", Government of Norway, Oslo.
- Norway, 1993a. "Declaration: Cooperation in the Barents Euro-Arctic Region. Conference of Foreign Ministers in Kirkenes, 11.1.1993", Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo.
- Norway, 1993b. "Norway Resumes Traditional Small-Type Coastal Whaling", *News of Norway*, Vol. 50, No. 5, Royal Norwegian Embassy, Washington, DC, 1-2.
- Norway, 1993c. *Rett til og forvaltning av land og vann i Finnmark: Bakgrunnsmateriale for Samerettsutvalget, NOU 1993:34*, Sami Rights Committee, Oslo.
- NSR, 1980. *Samid Ædnan*, English-language Inform bulletin, Norwegian Sami Association (NSR).
- Nuttall M, 1994. "Greenland: Emergence of an Inuit Homeland", in MRG 1994, 1-28.

- NWT Business Council, 1986. *Nordic Tour, May 13-22, 1986*, Report of the Northwest Territories Business Council.
- Nystö NJ, 1992. "The administration of Sami interests in the 1990s", in *Sami Instituhta* 1992, 10-11.
- Odner K, 1992. "Ethnicity and Traditions in Northern Fenno-Scandinavia. 'Finns and terfinns' ten years after", *Acta Borealia*, Vol. 9, 1992:2, 21-36.
- OND, 1994. *Towards the Development of A NORTHERN AUSTRALIA SOCIAL JUSTICE STRATEGY, FINAL REPORT*, Office of Northern Development, Commonwealth Department of Housing and Regional Development, Darwin, March 1994.
- Örvik N & Patterson KR (eds), 1976. *The North in Transition*, Centre for International Relations, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.
- Örvik N (ed), 1978a. *Scandinavian Security: Challenge and Response*, Centre for International Relations, Queen's University, Kingston.
- Örvik N, 1978b. "Norwegian Security: Deterrence and Defence", in Örvik 1978a, 56-81.
- Osherenko G & Young OR, 1989. *The Age of the Arctic: Hot Conflicts and Cold Realities*, Cambridge University Press.
- Osherenko G, 1989. "Developments in International Environmental Law: Will they help or hinder Arctic peoples?", *Nordic Journal of International Law*, Vol 58, Nos 3-4, 321-346.
- Paine R, 1957. *Coast Lapp Society I: A study of the neighbourhood in Revsbotn Fjord*, Tromsø Museums Skrifter, Vol. IV, No. 2.
- Paine R, 1965. *Coast Lapp Society II: A Study of Economic Development and Social Values*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Paine R, 1982. *Dam a River, Damn a People? Saami (Lapp) Livelihood and the Alta/Kautokeino Hydro-electric Project and the Norwegian Parliament*, IWGIA Document 45, International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs, Copenhagen.
- Paine R, 1987. "Trails of Saami Self-Consciousness", *Anthropologica*, XXIX (1987), 169-188.

- Paine R, 1992a. "'Chernobyl' reaches Norway: the accident, science, and the threat to cultural knowledge", *Public Understand. Sci.* 1 261-280.
- Paine R, 1992b. "Social Construction of the 'Tragedy of the Commons' and Saami Reindeer Pastoralism", *Acta Borealia*, Vol. 9, 1992:2, 3-20.
- Paine R, 1994. "Night Village and the Coming of Men of the Word: The Supernatural as a Source of Meaning among Coastal Saami", *Journal of American Folklore*, 107 (425), 343-363.
- Paine R, n.d. [1983 or later]. "The Saami Action Group in Norway: 1979-81", Draft for publication, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's.
- Pedersen S, 1987. "The Lappcodicil of 1751 — Magna Charta of the Sami?", *Mennesker og Rettigheter*, Vol 5, No. 3, Institute of Human Rights, Oslo.
- Pedersen S, 1989. "Modern Technology and the Devastation of the Resource Base of the Coastal Saami", *Nordic Perspectives on Arctic Cultural and Political Ecology*, Center for Arctic Cultural Research, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden, 61-71.
- Pedersen S, 1991. "State or Saami Ownership of land in Finnmark? Some remarks on Saami rights and historical evidence", *Readings in Saami History, Culture and Language II*, ed. R. Kvist, Center for Arctic Cultural Research, Umeå University, 69-84.
- Pedersen S, 1992. "The Coastal Sami of Norway", Symposium paper for *Man and the Barents Sea Ecosystem*, Arctic Centre, University of Groningen, November 19-20, 1992.
- Pinkerton E (ed), 1989. *Co-Operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management and Community Development*, University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.
- RAC, 1993. "The Role of Indigenous People", *Coastal Zone Inquiry: Final Report*, Resource Assessment Commission, Commonwealth of Australia, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 165-189.
- RCAP, 1993. *Partners in Confederation: Aboriginal Peoples, Self-Government, and the Constitution*, Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Ottawa.
- Reiersen JE, n.d. [1984/5?]. "The Consequences of Petrochemical Activity for Regional Development in Northern Norway", *GeoJournal* (Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, Wiesbaden) Vol 2, No 3, 273-278.

- Reimer C, 1994. "Moving Toward Co-operation: Inuit Circumpolar Policies and the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy", *Northern Perspectives*, Vol 21, No 4, (Winter 1993-1994), Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, Ottawa, 22-26.
- Richardson BJ, Craig D, & Boer B, 1994a. "Indigenous Peoples and Environmental Management: A Review of Canadian Regional Agreements and Their Potential Application to Australia — Part 1", *Environmental and Planning Law Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 4, August 1994, 320-343.
- Richardson BJ, Craig D, & Boer B, 1994b. "Indigenous Peoples and Environmental Management: A Review of Canadian Regional Agreements and Their Potential Application to Australia — Part 2", *Environmental and Planning Law Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 5, October 1994, 357-381.
- Robertson RG *et al.*, 1988. *The North and Canada's International Relations*, Canadian Institute of International Affairs, Toronto, & Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, Ottawa.
- Ruong I, 1967. *The Lapps in Sweden*, The Swedish Institute, Stockholm.
- Rydving H, 1993. *The End of Drum-Time: Religious Change among the Lule Saami, 1670s-1740s*, being *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Historia Religionum 12*, University of Uppsala.
- Sametinget, [1992?] *The Sami Assembly*, Glossy handout in English and Spanish, Sametinget [The Sami Parliament], Karasjok.
- Sami Aigi, 1981. English-language supplement, *Sami Aigi* (Karasjok), No. 3, January 16, 1981.
- Sami Instituhta, 1990a. *Diehtogiisa*, No 1/90, English-edition newsletter from the Nordic Saami Institute, Kautokeino.
- Sami Instituhta, 1992. *Diehtogiisa*, No 1/92, English-edition newsletter from the Nordic Saami Institute, Kautokeino.
- Sami Instituhtta, 1990b. *The Sami People*, Karasjok.
- Sami Institute, 1975. "The Sami People in Finland, Norway and Sweden", Report to the Founding Conference of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples, Port Alberni, BC.

- Sami Parliament, 1994. *Supplementary report regarding Convention No. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, 1989*, The Parliamentary Council of the Sami Parliament, Karasjok, Norway, October 17, 1994.
- Sanders D, 1990. "The Sami Parliament in Norway", *Canadian Native Law Reporter*, 1990:1, 7-8.
- Sanders D, 1993a. "Self-Determination and Indigenous Peoples", *Modern Law of Self-Determination*, ed. C. Tomuschat, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Amsterdam, 55-81.
- Sanders D, 1993b. "State Practice and the United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples", Conference paper for *International Indigenous Politics and Self-Government*, Sami Centre, University of Tromsø, November 1993.
- Saugestad S, 1982. "Social Democracy and Racism: Strange Bedfellows in the Alta-Kautokeino Case", Paper for Meeting of the American Ethnological Society, *The Prospect for Plural Societies*, Photocopy, ISV, University of Tromsø.
- Saugestad S, 1983. "Re-codification of Centre and Periphery", *Centre-Periphery: Theory and Practice*, ed. JC Hansen, J Naustdalid & J Sewel, Proceedings of 6th International Seminar on Marginal Regions, Sogn and Fjordane Regional College, Sogndal, Norway.
- Saugestad S, 1983. "The Emergence of a Regional Identity", *Antropolognytt*, Vol. 5, No. 2-3, 67-79.
- Saugestad S, 1988. *Partners in Enterprise: The Social Organisation of Paid and Unpaid Labour: Case Studies of Household Viability in Northern Norway*, Bound and Photocopied Monograph, Institute of Social Science, University of Tromsø.
- SCC, 1985. *Aboriginal Rights to Culture, Language and Education*, Translation of the official summary of the Norwegian Sami Culture Committee first report, Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Ottawa, September 6, 1985.
- Sillanpaa L, 1992a. *The Development of Sami Assemblies in Fennoscandia: Towards Aboriginal [sic] Self-Government*, Circumpolar Affairs, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa.
- Sillanpaa L, 1992b. *Impact of International Law on Indigenous Rights in Northern Europe*, Circumpolar Affairs, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa.

- Sillanpaa L, 1993. "Self-rule Sami-style works in Nordic nations", *Ottawa Citizen*, February 2, 1993.
- Simard J-M & Hockin T, 1986. "A Northern Dimension for Canada's Foreign Policy", *Independence and Internationalism: Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons on Canada's International Relations*, Ottawa, June 1986, 127-135.
- Siuruainen E & Aikio P, 1977. *The Lapps in Finland: the population, their livelihood and their culture*, Society for the Promotion of Lapp Culture Series no. 39, Helsinki.
- Sletten V, n.d. [1970s?]. *Five Northern Countries Pull Together*, Nordic Council.
- SLF, 1985. *Aboriginal Coastal Rights in Norway*, Translated documentation of SLF (Samenes Landsforbund), Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Ottawa, September 1, 1985.
- Smith C *et al.*, 1984. *Summary of the First Report from the Norwegian Sami Rights Committee*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo.
- Smith C *et al.*, 1990. *Chapter 6 of the Report by the Sami Rights Committee [1984], Norwegian Official Reports (NOU) No. 1984:18*, Unofficial English translation by G Nyquist and R Craig, Oslo.
- Smith C, 1987. "The Sami Rights Committee: An Exposition", in IWGIA 1987, 15-55.
- Smith C, 1992a. *Rettstenkning i samtiden*, Universtetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Smith C, 1992b. "Saami Parliament and Saami Rights — a Minority's History Changing Today's Constitution", in Smith 1992a, 220-231.
- Smith C, 1992c. "Indigenous Peoples and the State: Some Basic Legal Principles Seen From A Nordic Point of View", in Smith 1992a, 181-187.
- Smyth D, 1993. *A Voice In All Places: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Interests in Australia's Coastal Zone (Revised Edition)*, Resource Assessment Commission, Canberra.
- Sokolova ZP, Novikova NI & Ssorin-Chaikov NV, 1993. "Anthropologists writing a juridical text: issues and contexts", with Draft "Law of the Russian Federation: Foundations of the legal status of indigenous peoples of the Russian North", [Saint Petersburg? Moscow? Novosibirsk?]

- Solem E, 1982. *Historical, Legal and Current Political Issues Among the Sami (Lapps) of Norway*, Prepared for the Inuit Committee on National Issues, Ottawa.
- Solem E, 1987. "Norway in the Circumpolar World: Some Socio-Economic and Geostrategic Considerations", Paper for Symposium International sur l'Avenir du Nord quebécois, Amos, Quebec, November 1987. [This is Erik Solem of the Canadian defence department, not to be confused with the Erik Solem who sentenced Quisling to death and wrote the most important pre-contemporary study on Sami rights, nor with Eva Solem, author of the preceding item for Canadian Inuit and niece of Judge Erik Solem.]
- Sollie F, 1986. "Nordic Perspectives on East-West Security Issues in the Arctic", Paper for Conference on *Sovereignty, Security and the Arctic*, York University, Toronto, May 1986.
- Sollie F, 1989. "L'importance politique et stratégique de l'Arctique: une perspective norvégienne", *Études internationales*, Vol. XX, No. 1, Université Laval, 71-96.
- SOU, 1986. *Samernas folkrättsliga ställning*, Statens offentliga utredningar, Document 1986:36, Justitiedepartementet, Stockholm.
- Stålvant C-E, 1988. "Nordic Political Co-operation", *Nordic Journal of International Law*, Vol 57, No 4, 442-456.
- Stenseth NC, 1991. "Sustainable Development and Traditional Land Use in Norway", *UNESCO MAB Northern Sciences Network: report of the meeting in Rovaniemi, Finland, September 1990*, ed. A-L Sippola & EF Roots, Rovaniemi, 1991.
- Stenseth NC, Trandem N & Kristiansen G (eds), 1991. *Forvaltning av våre fellesressurser: Finnmarksvidda og Barentshavet i et lokalt og globalt perspektiv*, MAB [Man and Biosphere Program, UNESCO] & Ad Notam, Oslo.
- Stordahl V, 1987a. "Samething and Sami Committees — a Useful Political and Administrative Solution for the Sami in Norway?", in *IWGIA 1987*, 57-70.
- Stordahl V, 1987b. "The difficult, but challenging, complexity of contemporary Saami reality — comments on Robert Paine's article "Trails of Saami Self-Consciousness", *Anthropologica*, XXIX (1987), 189-194.
- Stordahl V, 1989. "Sami Political Coffee Break", *Utposten, Blad for almenn- og samfunnsmedisin*, Vol. 18. No 1, Revised conference paper, Karasjok.
- Stordahl V, 1991. "Ethnic Integration and Identity Management — Discourses of Sami Self-Awareness", *North Atlantic Studies*, Vol 3, No 1, Aarhus, Denmark, 25-30.

- Stordahl V, 1993. "How to be a real Sami? Ethnic identity in a context of (inter)national integration", *Études Inuit Studies*, Vol 17, No 1, 127-130.
- Sturluson S, 1964. *Heimskringla: History of the Kings of Norway*, trans. Lee M. Hollander, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Svensson TG, 1986. "Ethnopolitics among the Sami in Scandinavia: A basic strategy toward local autonomy", *Arctic*, Vol 39, No 3 (September 1986), 208-215
- Sverre K, 1985. "Indigenous Populations and Human Rights: The International Problem from a Nordic Point of View", in Brösted *et al.* 1985, 188-195.
- Sweden, 1975. "Summary" in English, from a report to the Swedish Parliament by a commission on Sami policy, SOU 1975:99, Stockholm.
- Sweden, 1984. "FN:s arbetsgrupp för urbefolkningar", Memo to Secretary-General, Centre of Human Rights, United Nations, Geneva, from L. Magnuson, Legal Affairs, Swedish foreign ministry, May 22, 1984.
- Swedish Institute, 1979. *The Lapps in Sweden*, Fact Sheets on Sweden, Swedish Institute, Stockholm.
- Swedish Institute, 1984. *The Lapps in Sweden*, Fact Sheets on Sweden, Swedish Institute, Stockholm.
- Tacitus C, 1979. *The Agricola and The Germania*, Trans. Mattingly, Rev. Handford, Penguin, London.
- The Economist, 1987. *The Nordic alternative*, A Survey of Finland, Norway and Sweden, November 21, 1987 issue.
- The Economist, 1990. *A change of course*, A survey of the Swedish economy, March 3, 1990 issue.
- Thomasson L, 1978. "Swedish Government Policies on the Lapps", *Current Sweden*, No. 180, The Swedish Institute, Stockholm.
- Thuen T, [1988]. "The Ethnic Dimension in Future Arctic Cultural Research: Some anthropological viewpoints", *Nordic Perspectives on Arctic Cultural and Political Ecology*, ed. N Broadbent, Miscellaneous Publications No. 9, Umeå University.
- Thuen T, 1982a. *Meaning and Transaction in Sami Ethnopolitics*, Photocopied monograph, ISV, University of Tromsø.

- Thuen T, 1982b. "The Sami in Norway: Ethnic interests and the segmentary state", Paper for *The Prospects for Plural Societies*, American Ethnological Society Conference, Lexington, Kentucky, April 1982.
- Thuen T, 1985a. "Acculturation and ethnic survival? Some problems in the study of so-called 'Norwegianized' Sami communities", *Acta Borealia* (Tromsö) Vol 1, No 2, 29-45.
- Thuen T, 1985b. "Ethnicity and Culture: The problem of political identification in the struggle for Sami rights in Norway", Paper for the ISSMR International Seminar on Marginal Regions, Galway, July 1985.
- Thuen T, 1989. "'Mixed' decent [*sic*] and ethnogenesis — some comparative considerations of contact situations in the north", *Acta Borealia*, 1:1989, 52-71.
- Thuen T, 1990. "Recollections of the past and categories of the present: A comment on the relationship of memory and social structure", *Acta Borealia*, 1:1990, 25-39.
- Thuen T, 1992. *Quest for Equality: Norway and the Sami Challenge*, Bound monograph, University of Tromsö, Norway.
- Torp E, 1992a. "Sami Rights in a Political and Social Context", *Nordic Arctic Research on Contemporary Arctic Problems*, ed. L. Lyck, Proceedings from Nordic Arctic Research Forum Symposium 1992, [city?], 85-92.
- Torp E, 1992b. "Sami Bill up in Smoke — discourse strategies within Sami ethnopolitics in Sweden", Photocopied paper, Högskolan i Östersund.
- United Nations, 1994. *Seeds of A New Partnership: Indigenous Peoples and the United Nations*, New York.
- Urbanczyk P, 1992. *Medieval Arctic Norway*, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warszawa.
- Vakhtin N, 1993. "Indigenous Peoples of the Russian Far North: Land Rights and the Environment", Paper for United Nations consultations on indigenous peoples, Institute of Linguistic Research, Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg.
- Vakhtin N, 1994. "Native Peoples of the Russian Far North", in MRG 1994, 29-80.
- Valen H, 1986. "A time of change for Norway", *News of Norway* (Norwegian Embassy, Washington) Vol 43, No 5, 33-35.

- Valkeapää N-A, 1983. *Greetings from Lappland: The Sami — Europe's Forgotten People*, trans. B. Wahl, Zed Press, London.
- Vorren Ö, 1967. "The Modern Lapps", Printed conference paper, Tromsø Museum.
- Weaver S, 1983. "Lecture 4", Unpublished special series, Institute of Social Sciences (ISV), University of Tromsø.
- West J, 1972. *Faroe: the Emergence of a Nation*, Hurst, London, and Eriksson, New York.
- Westerlund EA, Berthelsen T & Berteig L, n.d. [1983-6]. "Cesium¹³⁷ body burdens in Norwegian Lapps", Photocopied report of the National Institute of Radiation Hygiene, Österås, Norway.
- Zaslow M, 1981. "Administering the Arctic Islands 1880-1940: Policemen, Missionaries, Fur Traders", *A Century of Canada's Arctic Islands, 1880-1980*, ed. M. Zaslow, Royal Society of Canada, Ottawa, 61-78.