

Suggested citation:

Sarkki, S., Heikkinen, H.I., & A Löf. 2021. Reindeer herders as stakeholders or right-holders? Introducing a social equity-based conceptualization relevant for indigenous and local communities. In: Nordic Perspectives on the Responsible Development of the Arctic: Pathways to Action. Editor: Douglas C. Nord. Pp. 271-292. Springer Polar Sciences, Switzerland. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52324-4_13

LINK to publisher's www pages for final version: <https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783030523237>

Reindeer herders as stakeholders or right-holders? Introducing a social equity-based conceptualization relevant for indigenous and local communities

Simo Sarkki^{1,2} simo.sarkki@oulu.fi, Hannu I. Heikkinen¹, hannu.i.heikkinen@oulu.fi, Annette Löf^{2,3} annette.lof@slu.se.

¹ Cultural Anthropology Programme, PO Box 1000, FI-90014 University of Oulu, Finland.

² Várdduo – Centre for Sámi Research, Umeå University, Sweden.

³ Division of Environmental Communication, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala, Sweden

Abstract

The stakeholder concept has dominated academic discussions for a number of years and has functioned as a normative guide for natural resource management. However, there are at least three characteristics in stakeholder approaches: 1) all-inclusivity; 2) prioritization of economic interests; 3) ahistorical view on rights, which risk continued marginalization of indigenous people and traditional livelihood practitioners despite of the intention to nurture indigenous and local participation by acknowledging them as stakeholders. We propose, in the context of natural resource governance, to address these biases by recognising indigenous and local traditional livelihood practitioners as rights-holders. We examine in turn: 1) how to conceptualise rights-holders in governance through a social equity perspective 2) why indigenous and local traditional livelihood practitioners should be considered as rights-holders instead of stakeholders, and 3) some of the implications and tensions associated with considering traditional livelihood practitioners, including both indigenous and non-indigenous groups and individuals, as rights-holders. We illustrate and examine these questions in a case study of reindeer herding in Finland. In Finland, today, reindeer herding is practiced by both Sámi and Finn herders and, based on a social equity perspective, both groups can be considered rights-holders if we acknowledge reindeer herding as a traditional livelihood practice. As traditional livelihood practitioners, herder have their whole way of life at stake and ultimately depend on access to land. In addition, herders have (had) detailed systems of customary rights preceding effective state-based governance in the north. Such institutions are particularly pronounced for Sami reindeer herders but are applicable to both groups. Our conceptualisation of rights-holders thus recognises herders as

categorically different from stakeholders, whose stakes are typically economic. It provides an incentive to increase the efforts of recognizing and treating herders as rights-holders in land use governance and thereby addresses some of the apparent gaps when it comes to implementation of indigenous rights and rights to participation in environmental governance. In this essay we also discuss differences in rights between Sámi and ethnic Finn reindeer herders and some of the conceptual and practical tensions that arise as a consequence of our approach. We conclude that efforts to recognise and reframe herders as rights-holders rather than stakeholders in land use governance are important and a potential tool to increase social equity of land use for reindeer herders.

Keywords: Finland, Reindeer herding, Sámi people, Social equity, Land use, Governance, Rights-holders, Stakeholders

1. Introduction

How can we govern our natural resources in responsible and sustainable ways while ensuring the acceptance of those immediately concerned and dependent on said resources and lands? This delicate matter lies at the heart of political discussions on development – globally, regionally, nationally as well as locally. The idea of a “stakeholder” is one of the most widely used and policy relevant concepts to inform who should take part in decisions on natural resource governance (e.g. Reed et al. 2009). However, how to determine exactly who has a legitimate seat at the table has proven a difficult task (Billgren and Holmén 2007; Luyet et al. 2012). In this paper we introduce an alternative concept of *rights-holders* that can be used in the context of land use governance. We discuss why reindeer herders in Finland should be considered as “rights-holders” rather than “stakeholders” and how this can help us to understand both the rationale for who should have a legitimate seat at the table in land use governance and decision-making and how land use governance can move in a direction of increased social equity for reindeer herders.

1.1 A critical view on the stakeholder concept

The concept of a “stakeholder” is used to identify actors to be included in negotiations characterised by deliberative democracy (Elster 1998) and in various forms of collaborative management and participatory practices (Senecah 2004, Reed 2008, Luyet et al. 2012). As an established approach,

informing theory as well as policy practice, it includes various forms of stakeholder theories and their application, notably in so-called “stakeholder analysis” (SA) (Grimble and Wellard 1997; Billgren and Holmén 2007). Here, stakeholders are broadly defined as anyone with an interest in and/or power over certain decisions (Howlett & Nagu 1997; Reed et al. 2009). While SA has contributed with tools to map diverging interests and stakes of actors, thus bringing power asymmetries and societal diversity to the fore in natural resource management (Billgren and Holmén 2007), SA provides little advice on how to deal with such differences and disagreements when they emerge. In the words of Grimble and Wellard: *“Whilst SA is a powerful tool for problem analysis and for illuminating the interests of the under-represented, it cannot, in itself, provide answers to problems or guarantee representation. In fact, SA mirrors the groupings and interests of society and in itself does not try to make changes...”* (1997, p.188-189).

Indigenous and local communities are increasingly considered as stakeholders with an objective to promote their interests and opportunities for participation in environmental governance (e.g. CIFOR 15 Oct 2018; CBD 17 Jan 2020; UNFCCC 2020). Yet, this stakeholder perspective on indigenous and local participation is clearly not sufficient in itself for at least three reasons. First, assuming that all stakeholders have similar types of interests and degree of influence entails a risk of making the idea of a stakeholder an “all-inclusive” concept without sufficiently addressing the different situations and positions of the diverse stakeholders (e.g. Howlett & Nagu 1997; Reed et al.2009). The position of indigenous peoples in environmental governance is typically characterised by large power asymmetries, structural oppression and discrimination need specific attention and redress (see also Banerjee 2000; von der Porten and de Loë 2014). Second, the concept of a stakeholder tends to prioritise economic interests and suggests that such interests can, without great difficulty, be quantified, compensated and weighed against each other (Grimble & Wellard 1997; Billgren and Holmén 2007). However, indigenous and local communities typically have multiple interests that

go beyond simply economic ones. In particular, they include socio-cultural interests and values associated with lands and land use along with economic interests (Daskon & Binns 2010). Third, necessary historical contextualisation and understanding of indigenous and local customary rights is occasionally neglected when identifying “stakeholders” and in considering their positions in land use negotiations (see Ojha et al. 2010; FAO 2016). Therefore, a reconceptualization of indigenous and local communities as relevant actors in land use governance is needed.

1.2 Indigenous and local people as rights-holders

To address these shortcomings, we propose to use the concept of “rights-holders” instead of “stakeholders”. We argue that this is one way of highlighting the particular status of indigenous people and local communities in the context of land use governance. In this context, it is important to note that indigenous people have recognised rights and are, thereby, formally considered as rights-holders (Ulfstein 2004; Wiessner 2011; Larsen et al. 2017). The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (A/RES/61/295) adopted on 13 Sep. 2007, defines these indigenous rights as follows:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired.
2. Indigenous peoples have the right to own, use, develop and control the lands, territories and resources that they possess by reason of traditional ownership or other traditional occupation or use, as well as those which they have otherwise acquired. (UNDRIP, Article 26)

While UNDRIP is a “soft law” declaration, and thus not a binding legal instrument, it is commonly held to reflect a globally recognized minimum level of indigenous rights that can serve as a guide for nation-to-nation negotiations (Wiessner 2011). Explicit efforts to highlight previously

unacknowledged rights are plentiful throughout the globe as well as in the Nordic region. They occur at highest possible political levels, including within the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UN PFII 2016), but many challenges still remain in terms of how indigenous rights are implemented in policy and governance practices throughout the globe.

In environmental policy and legal discourses “*indigenous and local communities*” (e.g. CIFOR 15 Oct 2018; CBD 17 Jan 2020; UNFCCC2020) are sometimes treated in tandem. Typically, this discourse suggests that indigenous and other local groups strongly and explicitly depend on natural resources and land. It suggests that they often live in rural and marginalised conditions and usually within small-scale local communities. This clearly demonstrates certain difficulties in the categorization of different types of land user groups. In this essay, we explore the rights-holders concept in the context of reindeer herding in Finland where we approach reindeer herding as a specific case of a traditional livelihood practice. Reindeer herding, which in Finland is practiced both by indigenous Sámi and ethnic Finns, is thus used here as an example to develop the idea of “rights-holders” in conjunction with indigenous and non-indigenous traditional livelihood practitioners. We also critically reflect upon some of the challenges associated with our traditional livelihood-based definition of rights-holders.

1.3 Reindeer herders as stakeholders or rights-holders

An important justification for recognizing reindeer herders as rights-holders is linked to their extensive historical and cultural continuity in land use. The Arctic has, for centuries, been inhabited by peoples and communities that have successfully adapted their livelihoods to local environmental conditions. These livelihoods are typically diverse, intimately linked to nature and rely on the use of rather large land and water areas. The combination of different subsistence practices, such as

reindeer herding, hunting and fishing, has also been, and still is, of utmost importance for many Arctic peoples, including the indigenous Sámi (Larsen et al. 2015).

When it comes to land use governance in northern Fennoscandia, most of the land there constitutes reindeer grazing area where herders have recognised land rights to graze their animals. From an established stakeholder-based view, herders, thus, should naturally be considered as stakeholders in land use discussions and decisions. Yet, we know from cases across Fennoscandia, that the actual participation of herders in such discussions, and their ability to influence decisions on matters that concern them, has been quite limited. In fact, Sámi actors and reindeer herders often remain marginalised in relation to other land users in many natural resource planning and decision-making processes (Sandström & Widmark 2007; Naum & Nordin 2013; Lehtola 2015; Ojala & Nordin 2015; Löf 2016; Sarkki et al. 2016; Larsen & Raitio 2019). The explanations offered for this situation are multifaceted in character and include, for example, poor institutional design (Sandström & Widmark 2007), colonial path dependency (Lawrence 2014; Löf 2016) and the continuing tensions between the economic interest of states and indigenous rights, cultures and livelihoods. These are often accompanied by an assumption that herders are not particularly impacted by other land use activities (e.g. Koivurova et al. 2015) or when they are, that they are able to adapt (Löf 2013; 2014). The growing number of unresolved land and natural resource related conflicts (Larsen and Raitio 2019) as well as repeated and outright violations of Sámi and human rights in northern Fennoscandia suggest otherwise (e.g. United Nations, 9 August 2016).

Reindeer herding is often recognised as *traditional*, which emphasises the strong link to cultural and territorial continuity. For indigenous peoples, the concept of traditional livelihood also entails

specific legal recognition¹. A necessary foundation for the continuation of these locally valued practices, is the widespread recognition of their rights of access to land and water – both on paper and in practice. When these rights are compromised, it creates profound difficulties for indigenous people seeking to practice and sustain livelihoods that their people and communities have relied on for generations (Oskal et al. 2009). Reindeer herding as a traditional practice is of particular importance for the indigenous Sámi people. It is also a traditional livelihood practiced by some ethnic Finns in northern Finland.

Reindeer herding has developed over long periods of time, and through its practice various land rights have been established. This means that today, compared to many other land uses, reindeer herding operates under special legal circumstances (Allard 2015). However, many private and public actors often fail to recognise these. There is, instead, a strong tendency to treat reindeer herding as an interest on par with other land use practices in usual governance interactions (e.g. Löff 2014). This failure to recognise the herders' special rights and their historical use of the land, alongside existing power asymmetries and differences in vulnerabilities and dependency among different actors in the governance landscape, can partly be attributed to a stakeholder norm. It also risks, in our view, increasing and continued marginalisation of the herders.

In this chapter, we will use the concept of social equity (McDermott et al. 2013) to develop justifications for why indigenous Sámi and ethnic Finn herders should therefore be conceptualised as rights-holders instead of stakeholders in governance interactions. The concepts of social equity and rights-holders work well with one another because both concepts emphasise that assuming equal rights and positions among all actors can actually marginalize the disadvantaged groups even further.

¹ See for example the United Nations Human Rights Committee and its stance reflected in General comment No. 23:

3.2. The enjoyment of the rights to which Article 27 relates does not prejudice the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State party. At the same time, one or other aspect of the rights of individuals protected under that article for example, to enjoy a particular culture may consist in a way of life which is closely associated with territory and use of its resources. This may particularly be true of members of indigenous communities constituting a minority.

1.4 Objectives, research questions and a road map

The overall objective of this essay is to provide justifications for why reindeer herders should be considered as rights-holders in land use governance. From the outset of this inquiry we wish to make clear that when we talk about rights-holders we do so primarily from a conceptual and governance perspective and not as legal scholars. We seek to provide new points of departure for analyses of natural resource policy and practice, but do not in any way intend to question or downplay the importance of established legal rights. From a reindeer herding livelihood point of view, we recognise however that the formal legal recognition of such rights has hitherto produced only limited results when it comes to influence over land use policy and governance practices. We thus stress the need to complement the formal legal understanding and recognition of rights-holders with one based on governance praxis.

This paper considers three conceptual research questions: 1) What does it mean to conceptualize rights-holders from a social equity point of view? 2) Why should indigenous and local traditional livelihood practitioners be considered as rights-holders instead of stakeholders? and 3) What are the implications and tensions associated with considering both indigenous and non-indigenous traditional livelihood practitioners as rights-holders? These questions are examined through a case study of both Sámi reindeer herding and ethnic Finn reindeer herding in Finland.

Section 2 of the chapter develops our conceptual understanding of rights-holders based on social equity. The section concludes with identifying three empirical research questions to help address the shortcomings associated with the stakeholder concept. Section 3 of this essay outlines how formal governance of land use treats reindeer herding in Finland. It suggests why both Sámi and ethnic Finn herders should be considered as rights-holders instead of stakeholders. Section 4 of this chapter discusses the two conceptual questions: 1) What are the justifications for using the concept of rights-holder in the case of traditional livelihoods? and 2) What are the tensions between indigenous based and traditional livelihood-based definitions of rights-holder? Finally, Section 5 concludes the

essay and provides some additional food for thought regarding the further application and development of the rights-holders concept.

2. Conceptual background

2.1 Normative and instrumental rationales for identifying and engaging with stakeholders

There are two dominating rationales for defining who is a stakeholder: the normative and the instrumental (Reed et al. 2009). The normative rationale is often based on the idea of justice as distributive result (the fair distribution of benefits and burdens) and a procedural process (actors can influence on decisions concerning their lives) (see Rawls 1971). Traditionally, the idea of who is to be considered as a stakeholder rests, according to Reed on two linked concepts: interest (Distribution) and influence (Procedure). Thereby, anyone who has an interest regarding a certain decision and who or can or should influence the decision, is to be considered as a stakeholder (Reed et al. 2009). The normative rationale, in the case of indigenous and local traditional livelihood practitioners, implies that they have a right to participate in decisions concerning their lives, and that they have a right to enjoy the benefits derived their indigenous homeland or lands where the local communities have lived often for generations. The instrumental rationale for engagement is linked to policy makers recognizing certain actors as rights-holders in order to satisfy high-level political principles in the making of legitimate decisions (see Wesselink et al. 2011). In conclusion, the normative rationale stems from a fundamental requirement in governance for enhanced social justice and social equity. The instrumental rationale emerges from the needs of decision makers. In this chapter we focus mostly on the normative rationale, but also discuss certain tensions between normative and instrumental rationales later in Section 4.1.

2.2 Social equity and rights-holders

The normative rationale for treating an actor as a stakeholder or as a rights-holder can be seen to be linked to the idea social equity. The notion of social equity is both relative and context specific, meaning that those more impacted by decisions should also enjoy more rights (McDermott et al. 2013). The social equity concept proposes that groups who are not responsible for producing impacts (e.g. by land use change and climate change), but who are affected by the impacts, should be compensated or have the possibility of influencing decision making so as to mitigate these impacts. This can be done through affirmative governance actions on par with the level of impact. Affirmative governance actions aim to enhance position of disadvantaged groups by giving them more power in decision-making, by using compensation schemes, or other means to empower the minority groups by “positive discrimination” or “positive actions” (McDermott et al., 2013; McKendry, 2016; Sarkki et al., 2017). As a consequence, the concept of social equity is sensitive to asymmetric histories, values, cultures, dependencies and livelihoods. It points out that social equity does not emerge by considering all actors and interests similarly. Social equity is commonly based on three key dimensions: recognition, distribution and procedure (McDermott et al. 2013; Pascual et al. 2014). We apply these dimensions to fit to our consideration of reindeer herders as rights-holders as explained below.

First, the dimension of recognition as applied to rights-holders aims to cope with the challenge of all-inclusive definition of stakeholders by realising that some actors, like reindeer herders, should be recognized as having special rights to the lands. This recognition is justified via the traditional livelihood the herders practice, and due to having particular interests dependent on access to land making herders particularly vulnerable to competing land uses. The dimension of recognition answers the question of *how* rights-holders are acknowledged in governance practices. As such, recognition is an additional dimension to those of interests and influence (Distribution; Procedure) that are central to developing rationales for *who* is to consider as a stakeholder or as a rights-holders, and *why*. Adding the *how* question has an added value by also suggesting that political

recognition may be instrumental. For instance, states may be pressured to politically recognize indigenous rights advocated by international agreements. Therefore, visible political recognition can help policy makers to tick a box and argue that indigenous rights are well covered.

Second, the dimension of distribution, as applied to rights-holders, stresses that prioritization of economic interests while neglecting various dependencies and socio-cultural aspects associated with relations to land that may be relevant to indigenous and local communities. Traditional livelihoods, such as reindeer herding, are by definition, linked to cultural values. It has been noted that: *“The key characteristic of traditional culture is the ‘generational-transformation’ of knowledge, beliefs, values, customs and norms. This is fundamental for preserving societal values for the future and strengthening a community’s sustainability and security”* (Daskon & Binns 2010: 497). Here we emphasize that traditional livelihoods are part of indigenous and local ways of life and highly dependent on access to land.

This particular dependence on land is also linked to the reality that many indigenous people do not have an “exit option”. This means that they cannot move to other areas if their homelands or practice of traditional livelihood become unavailable (see Oskal 2009; Löf 2013). As a consequence, the interests in land use on the part of traditional livelihood practitioners are far more than economic, and the severity of these interests is intensified by a high level of dependency on the lands where their traditional livelihoods are practiced. The particular kinds of interests and values highlighted here justifies *why* the indigenous and local traditional livelihood practitioners should be recognised and treated as rights-holders.

Third, the process dimension of social equity as applied to rights-holders stresses the fact that the lack of attention to historical conditions by stakeholder approaches neglects existing or previously-existing customary rights (e.g. Ojha et al. 2010; FAO 2016). We emphasize the historical aspects in relation to procedure, because current state-based environmental governance arrangements do not usually indicate whether some group has legitimate rights to land, but, instead, simply reflect power

relationships in modern societies. However, indigenous and local systems for self-governance have, in many cases, and existed successfully prior to state (Ostrom 1990). Therefore, to get a grasp on what is relevant for traditional livelihood practitioners it is necessary to look at previously existing systems of self-governance of the land and customary rights (see Fondahl et al. 2015; Von der Porten et al. 2015). In conclusion, a focus on historical self-governance systems further aids in answering the normative question *why* indigenous and local traditional livelihood practitioners should be considered as rights-holders.

2.3 Social equity and research questions

This essay aims at furthering our understanding of how rights-holders can be conceptualised from a social equity perspective. In particular, it seeks to provide insight into two conceptual research questions: 1) Why should indigenous and local traditional livelihood practitioners be considered as rights-holders instead of stakeholders? and 2) What are the complexities and tensions associated with considering both indigenous and non-indigenous traditional livelihood practitioners as rights-holders? We draw on the above discussion regarding social equity to operationalize these questions. We examine the two dimensions of social equity, Distribution and Procedure, to provide justifications for why herders should be considered as rights-holders instead of stakeholders. We also consider how the third dimension, Recognition, provides an overview of how herders are considered as rights-holders with particular rights. We have designed Section 3 of this chapter to address the three shortcomings of the existing stakeholder approach: 1. Its all-inclusivity character; 2. Its prioritization of economic interests; 3. Its ahistorical view of rights. Each shortcoming is addressed by specific empirical questions to guide our case study on reindeer herding. The framework for this investigation is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Three shortcomings in stakeholder approaches that are linked to dimensions of social equity and provide research questions tailored to the case study of reindeer herding.

Shortcomings in stakeholder approaches	Dimensions of social equity	Examples of questions that can be employed in a social equity approach to rights-holders
An all-inclusive definition of stakeholder does not recognize and/or address asymmetries in rights, vulnerabilities and stakes	Recognition	How are the particular rights of reindeer herders as indigenous people and traditional livelihood practitioners recognized in policy and governance? Do they have a special position among other stakeholders?
Prioritization of economic interests over other values	Distribution	What is special about the stakes, interests and values related to reindeer herding?
Lack of attention to historical rights	Procedure	What has been the historical influence of herders on land use rights? What kind of historical self-governance arrangements and customary rights herders have existed?

3. Reindeer herders as rights-holders? The case of Finland

In Finland, reindeer herding is practiced both by the Sámi and by ethnic Finns. In both cases, they draw on long-standing traditions. The reindeer herding area in Finland is currently divided into 54 Reindeer Herding Cooperatives (RHC) (paliskunta), which have their own leaders and practices (Reindeer Herders' Association 2020). State-owned lands form the majority of the reindeer herding area in Finland, but reindeer also have the right to graze on privately held lands (e.g. Heikkinen 2002). The reindeer herding region covers the northernmost third of Finland. It is divided by a clear border between reindeer herding region in the north, and non-reindeer area in the south. Sápmi, the homeland of the indigenous Sámi people, encompasses the territory of northern Norway, Sweden, Finland and the Kola Peninsula in eastern Russia. In the territory of Finland, Sápmi covers the

northernmost municipalities of Finland, and the northern most one third of the reindeer herding region. The municipalities of Enontekiö, Inari and Utsjoki, and part of Sodankylä in Finland are located in Sápmi.

Both Sámi and ethnic Finn reindeer herding practices have been traditionally based on natural pastures. Because of the growth of other competing land use practices, reindeer in Finland are sometimes given supplementary fodder either in corrals or in the wild during the winter or in calving time. In some cases, especially in the southern reindeer herding area, reindeer are kept within fences over the winter season primarily due to a lack of old-growth forest winter pastures. Sometimes this is also due to the threat of large carnivore predation. In 2018-2019 there were 4,354 reindeer owners in Finland from which a bit less than one third live in Sápmi (1220). There are 184,934 reindeer in breeding stock from which around one third (71,109) graze in Sápmi (Annual statistics of Reindeer Herder's Association 2020). These numbers are complicated by that part of reindeer herders in Sápmi are ethnic Finns, and part of reindeer herders outside Sápmi are Sámi.

3.1 How reindeer herders are recognized politically and legally?

In Finland, both Sámi and Finn herders are recognized as groups, who are covered by affirmative laws and governance arrangements. However, Sámi herders' rights are, additionally, strengthened by international agreements and the development of indigenous rights under international law that, at least in theory, should have concrete implications on land use governance in Sápmi. For example, recent negotiations around the Nordic Sámi Convention, and the implementation of the Akwé-Kon guidelines under the Convention on Biological Diversity, are concrete examples of how Sámi herders' land rights and their rights to practice their culture are interpreted and realized in regional and local land use governance and practice. In addition, according to Finnish law, the northernmost RHCs in the reindeer herding area are defined as areas specifically intended for reindeer herding (in

Finnish: “erityisesti poronhoitoa varten tarkoitettu alue”). According to the Finnish Reindeer Husbandry Act of 1990, the land in this area may not be used in a manner that significantly hinders reindeer herding practices (Reindeer Husbandry Act, 848/1990; amendments up to 54/2000 included).

In addition to the Reindeer Husbandry Act there are additional sets of laws in Finland affecting a number of dimensions of reindeer herding. Apart from the Act of the Sami Parliament (974/1995) that sets specific prerequisites of herding in Sápmi, there is also legislation that applies to all herders and aims to enhance conditions for reindeer herding. It covers such areas as:

- Subsidies for reindeer herding and nature-based livelihoods (Act 2011/986)
- Compensation for predator damages (Game Animal Damages Act 27.2.2009/15)
- Compensation for weather-related damages (987/2011 and 655/2016)
- Obligations to consult and consolidate with herding (Act on Metsähallitus 234/2016)
- Obligations to consult and consolidate with herding with respect to mining (Mining Act 621/2011)
- Obligations to consult and consolidate with herding with respect to water use (Water Act 587/2011)

These laws suggest that all herders are already, to some extent, recognized as rights-holders by the political system in Finland. For example, the subsidies and compensations that are provided are meant to balance benefits and burdens resulting from increasing predators, weather damages and traffic. This enhances social equity in distribution for reindeer herders. Furthermore, the legislation on parks and recreation, mining and water all specifically mention reindeer herding and the need to include herders in decision making in matters that concern them. At face value, then, these can be seen as measures that enhance social equity in decision making processes that relate to reindeer herders. Yet, it is another question whether in practice, this political recognition and laws are able to ensure social equity of land use for herders as seen from their perspective.

Basically, the existence of these laws and regulations imply that both Sámi and ethnic Finn reindeer herders are, to some extent, recognized as rights-holders through their practice of a traditional livelihood. Their historical, cultural and territorial rights have, however, also led to some governance challenges. Should governance recognize and treat Sámi herders and Finn herders as two groups, with the same livelihood, but differential rights and status of recognition? This question is especially complicated in some municipalities, for example Sodankylä, which includes both Sámi and Finn herders. In addition, some national parks, like Pallas-Ylläs, which is located partly in Sápmi. This complicates land use decision-making processes, which seek to acknowledge both Sámi and ethnic Finn herders.

In conclusion, it is clear that Sámi herders within Finland are politically and legally recognized as indigenous people under international and domestic law who hold specific rights to their homelands. Ethnic Finn herders are recognized by national law as traditional livelihood practitioners and, thus, they possess rights to practice their livelihood. Whether these dual types of recognitions are actually translated into socially equitable land use practice and governance for herders in Finland is however debatable.

3.2 A whole way of life at stake

The Sámi culture and way of life has developed in close connection to the environment and nature-based livelihoods. Reindeer herding is an essential part of the Sami cultural identity and an important way of life for many Sámi people. Likewise, the Sámi languages have strong connections to reindeer herding. As a consequence, basic Sámi human rights are linked to their ability to practice Sámi culture via reindeer herding (see for example United Nations, 9 August 2016).

As noted above, land use activities, policies and governance have a more severe impact on reindeer herders compared to many other actors because the former do not have a real “exit” opportunity (Komu 2020; on Sweden see Löf 2013; 2014). Sámi herders cannot leave reindeer herding without

far-reaching consequences including the loss of their cultural and ancestral connections to the land as well as the potential loss of their land titles. These losses apply not only to the herders, themselves, but also for their descendants to come. Nor can herders freely choose to “enter” herding in other locations as access is largely restricted in practice. When land provides not only a livelihood, but a way of life, and is seen as the foundation of a people’s rights, the consequences of growing environmental and societal changes increases the magnitude of their impact. When herding practices change as a consequence, the basis for their social relations within their communities also change (cf. Heikkinen et.al. 2007).

Many northern Finns also consider reindeer herding as an essential part of their way of life and cultural heritage (Kortessalmi 2008). Ethnic Finn reindeer herding communities are also feeling rather closed in and lacking an “exit” as joining another herding community requires their local acceptance. Symbolically joining to a herding community happens thru accepting your reindeer earmark and reindeer ownership in a new community. As a response, many of these herders have adapted to loss of grazing lands by providing supplementary fodder for their reindeer.

Supplementary feeding has emerged as an unwanted, but necessary, adaptation to their loss of lands, particularly in the southern reindeer herding area in Finland (See Horstkotte et al. forthcoming).

In conclusion, traditional livelihood practitioners have their whole ways of lives at stake when it comes to land use governance and development. Their stakes are categorically different than of those stakeholders with mainly economic interests. This implies that the issue of distribution of benefits and burdens becomes complicated, as it is difficult to put monetary value on culture, social relations and maintaining traditions. Therefore, we apply the concept of “rights-holders” to reindeer herders to acknowledge their specific kinds of dependencies of their livelihood, and the way of life that comes with it.

3.3 Internal governance arrangements

Traditional Sámi livelihoods have been nature-based, including reindeer herding, hunting and fishing. Reindeer herding has, in different forms, been practiced for many centuries by the Sámi and the cultural importance of the reindeer extend even farther back than that (see Holand et al. this volume). Historically, Sámi reindeer herders have maintained pasture circulation systems that extended from current Finnish Lapland to northern Norway. Each Sámi reindeer Siida – a flexible coalition of herder families of the region – had their own specific pasture areas (Pennanen & Näkkäläjärvi 2003). In addition, the Sámi Siidas provided the basis for customary rights of families within certain areas. Thus, in many instances, lands that may have at one time been viewed as “unoccupied” by the government of the nation-state were actually governed by a Siida system of self-governance operated by the Sámi to enhance sustainability (Cf. Tegengren 1952; Manker 1953).

It is likely that northern Finnish peasants learned the practice of reindeer husbandry from the southern Sámi as early as the 18th century, as taxation and inheritance record indicate (Kortesalmi 2008). Kortesalmi (2008) has proposed a theory on how Finnish semi-livelihood northern peasants developed a “Paliskunta” (Reindeer Herding Cooperative) system, from the forest Sámi (at the time called Kemi Lapps). Village and forest-based small scale reindeer herding practices were adopted by them. This included the herding related vocabulary of the Kemi Sámi language in the Kemi-river basin. It is apparent that the supposed “wilderness” of northern Finland has never been “wild” and has been under human influences. Both the Sámi and the ethnic Finn inhabitants had informally agreed on rights to certain lands in order to practice herding, hunting and fishing, which latter formed the basis for recognised customary rights. These designations still can be seen in documents found in several government archives (Tegengren 1952, Kortesalmi 2008; Mustonen 2017).

It is clear that both the Siida system and the Reindeer Herding Cooperative system functioned well before the coming of state-based governance. Due to historical circumstances and cultural

amalgamations over time, many herding families and communities in contemporary Finland developed from mixed origins. A common denominator of reindeer herding among both Sámi and Finns is that both groups consider that they each hold undeniable customary communal land use rights based on generational engagement in reindeer husbandry.

In addition to having well-defined rights and responsibilities with respect to the land, it is also an important aspect of self-governance to identify who is accepted as a community member and who is not. Reindeer herding in Finland is an exclusively held occupation and in practice, family or marital relations are necessary to own reindeer and to join any herding community. In the case of Sámi, membership is based on self-identification, but this must be recognized by the community. Therefore, the community ultimately controls who can practice reindeer herding in a given area. Regarding ethnic Finns, access to a reindeer herding livelihood is open in theory, according to the law, but limited in practice due to similar customary practices (such as needed local acceptance to be part of local herding community – *paliskunta* - for joining communal herding efforts, and controlling accepted reindeer ear marks i.e. locally recognized reindeer ownership) (Heikkinen 2002; Heikkinen 2006).

In conclusion, exploring the concept of rights-holders, in the case of reindeer herding, highlights the importance of historical and cultural continuity in traditional livelihoods. Herders have had self-governance arrangements for defining land use rights that preceded state-based governance. Elements of this form of self-governance we can still find in current legislation. The existence of such informal and internal processes can be considered as an indication that a group can be considered as rights-holders. This relates to the process dimension of the social equity concept by acknowledging that the “rights-holders” have had their own processes to grant rights and to establish land use practises in certain geographical locations.

4. Discussion

Based on our case study of reindeer herding in Finland we shall move on to consider the two important research questions in the next sections of the essay: Should both Sámi and ethnic Finn herders be treated as rights-holders? Are there some tensions associated with including both indigenous and local communities in our approach to rights-holders?

4.1 Why should all herders be considered as rights-holders instead of stakeholders?

Our case study revealed several normative explanations for why herders should not only be recognized, but also treated, as rights-holders in land use governance. Our case study evolved around two key normative justifications. The first of these was that while stakeholder approaches prioritize economic values (Billgren and Holmén 2007), traditional livelihood practitioners have other categories of concern (c.f. Daskon & Binns 2010). Adkins et al. (2016: 351) note in relation indigenous people in Canada that “*there may be situations where no level of payment can compensate for the impact to the community’s way of life*” (see also Horstkotte et al. forthcoming, for a similar discussion). With respect to reindeer herding, indigenous Sámi herders depend upon the availability of lands on which to sustain their culture as well as earning an income. The Sámi ethnic identity and even language are linked to reindeer herding. For Sámi and ethnic Finn herders, social relations, intergenerational continuity in a traditional profession, and respect for a way of life are all connected to herding. Therefore, there are particular characteristics of the distributive interests of reindeer herders with respect to land use decisions that justify considering herders as rights-holders instead of stakeholders. It is suggested that acknowledging the reindeer herders’ particular interests, and using these as a basis for considering herders as rights-holders, can help to address some of the shortcoming in stakeholder approaches to natural resource management that tend to be linked to a prioritization of economic interests. The shortcomings of a stakeholder approach to natural resources are regularly reflected in land use governance. This can be seen, for example, in cases where large and highly remunerative land uses are compared to low-profit

reindeer herding. The latter tend to be placed in an inferior position to the former when only economic indicators are used to justify land use decisions.

The second of these justifications arises from the lack of consideration given to the specific histories of a people when thinking of who is a stakeholder as compared to a rights-holder. Stakeholder concept tends not to recognize indigenous and local customary rights (see Ojha et al. 2010; FAO 2016). Yet, we emphasise that a rights-holder conceptualization suggests the need to recognize the historical connections of indigenous peoples to their homelands by granting them special rights (Fondahl et al. 2015; Von der Porten et al. 2015). Reindeer herders have had self-governance arrangements that define land use rights well before the advent of state-based governance. This highlights the historical fact that the herders have had strong influence on land use rights in practice.

We connected these histories to dimension of Procedure within social equity theory. This historical view on the process was chosen because the colonial state-based practices cannot be held as a fundamental basis for land rights, especially in indigenous lands. The land claims and usage rights granted by states are not to be equated with detailed systems of customary rights that have functioned long before state intrusion into the lands in question. The reality that customary land rights preceded state-based governance is therefore important to understand when thinking about who is a rights-holder. Our definition of herders as rights-holders is based on the historical continuity of the traditional livelihood, and insists on addressing the shortcoming in stakeholder approaches that lack historical understanding of the evolvement of customary rights.

It has been observed that the allocation of benefits and burdens within natural resource management are often themselves characterised by uneven power relations in resource valuation that is linked to indigenous cultures in the Arctic (Snyder et al. 2003). This highlights the reality that two key determinants in the established stakeholder definition, interest (Distribution) and influence

(Procedure), are highly interlinked. For traditional stakeholder approaches, one determinant is enough for defining someone as a stakeholder (e.g. Reed et al. 2009). When it comes to rights-holder definition we consider Distribution and Procedure as interlinked, and tied to the third dimension of social equity: Recognition (see Pascual et al. 2014). Therefore, we suggest that reindeer herding needs to be *recognized* as a traditional livelihood. Herders, as rights-holders, should have a central role in the *procedures* related to defining what are the key issues in the *distribution* of benefits and burdens resulting from the land use. This is important so as to avoid the dominance of interests by stakeholders with mainly shorter-term economic interests over those of herders with longer-term perspectives and rights. Recognizing herders as rights-holders can help to cope with the shortcoming in stakeholder approaches that equate actors that embody asymmetrical rights, vulnerabilities, histories and stakes.

We briefly outlined above how reindeer herders are recognized by current land use policies and practices. Such recognition can be based on a normative rationale that seeks to promote indigenous rights and rights of reindeer herders as traditional livelihood practitioners. However, this political recognition may be also instrumental (Reed et al. 2009), meaning that the political recognition is based on the needs of administrations to be perceived as making legitimate decisions, instead of genuinely seeking ways to empower those whose rights are recognized (Wesselink et al. 2011). This instrumental rationale seems to be reflected in the fact that reindeer herders have been included or asked to participate, in almost every land use decision making process in Northern Finland.

However, they seldom have any significant impact on these decisions and may lack the resources to participate in decision-making in a way that Finnish laws would expect (See Sarkki 2011; Sarkki et al. 2016; Heikkinen et al. 2011; 2012; 2016; Landauer & Komendantova 2018; Raitio 2013). To continuously frame herders as “stakeholders” rather than “rights-holders” may become a vehicle for the continued marginalization of indigenous people, like the Sámi, and traditional livelihood practitioners, like the ethnic Finn herders in northern rural Finland. In this chapter, we have outlined

some key issues regarding how the rights of herders are politically recognized, but to examine how and whether this recognition translates in concrete land use decisions, processes and practices is beyond the scope for this essay.

4.2 Possible tensions between Indigenous and local communities as “rights-holders”

We have suggested above that both Sámi and ethnic Finn herders should be considered as rights-holders. Yet, to make full sense of the rights of both groups, we need now to discuss some tensions associated with indigenous-based and traditional livelihood-based definitions of rights-holders. To start with, we strongly concur with international actions that seek to acknowledge and strengthen indigenous peoples’ legitimate rights to their homelands (e.g. Ulfstein 2004; UN 2007; Wiessner 2011; Larsen et al. 2017). Indigenous land rights are, and should be, different than of those of other local groups. In the case of the Sámi, reindeer herding is connected to ethnic identity, language and to the preservation of culture via traditional way of life. Sápmi, as the Sámi homeland, creates possibilities for self-governance. It also sets responsibilities for Nordic nation states to recognize Sámi rights to their homeland and to also implement this political recognition at a practical level. The land is tied to traditional livelihoods such as reindeer herding. Herding is further connected to ethnic identity. Therefore, access to land can be considered as a basic human right for the Sámi and many other indigenous peoples.

The present essay has considered not only the indigenous rights of Sámi herders, but also the status of ethnic Finn herders as potential “rights-holders” as a result of their practice of reindeer herding as a traditional livelihood. As was discussed earlier, ethnic Finn herders also have a historical connection with reindeer herding. Like the Sámi, their way of life is also at stake as new encroachments on the reindeer-herding areas increase. However, the ethnic Finn herders do not depend on land rights or reindeer herding for their ethnic identity, language or the preservation of

their cultural identity as an ethnic minority. Therefore, ethnic Finn herders do not have the same grounds as the Sámi to make claims for self-governance. Below we discuss some perspectives to make greater sense of how the status of a “rights-holder” can be better understood and applied in a nuanced way to both indigenous peoples and traditional livelihood practitioners.

Caution needs to be practiced when defining a group as a “rights-holder”, since an unacceptable definition may increase tensions among local people. If everyone is considered as equal rights-holders, then no one has special position, even if that status could be justified. While recognizing legitimate divergences, the rights-holder conceptualization encounters the challenge of nurturing a peaceful co-existence at the local level between those granted a status of rights-holder and those who are not. Therefore, the rights-holder definition is not best understood in black or white, yes or no terms. Instead, it is better understood as a spectrum representing on one end, stakeholders with recently emerged economic interests (not “rights-holders”) and indigenous peoples, like the Sámi, practising traditional livelihoods on their homelands (definite “rights-holders”) on the other end. Those who are not indigenous peoples, like the ethnic Finns, but who also pursue traditional livelihoods on the land are closer to this second end of the spectrum. With these considerations in mind, we can offer both formal indigenous rights-based, and traditional livelihood-based definitions of a right holder. Each of these come with specific benefits and challenges that are noted in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Benefits and challenges of rights holders based on indigenous and traditional livelihood-based definitions.

Rights-Holder	Benefits	Challenges
Based on an indigenous-based definition	A clear recognition of uniqueness of indigenous people, their identities and their legitimate rights on the homelands.	May create undesired tensions within heterogeneous local communities.

Based on traditional livelihood-based definition	Can recognize also other marginalized groups and respect these peoples' historical and cultural links to lands, even without an indigenous identity.	May end up compromising indigenous rights by equating them with those of non-indigenous local people
--	--	--

Table 2 highlights that the main features of the rights-holder concept. However, the dual definitions may be contentious. This suggests that there are various issues that need to be considered when conceptualizing and determining who is a “rights-holder.” We emphasise, here, that neither policy-makers nor scientists can either “invent” or “un-invent” rights that indigenous people hold on their ancestral lands *or* the rights of traditional livelihood practitioners on land where they have operated based on customary rights. The lack of political recognition of some groups’ rights to land does not necessarily mean that they would not have legitimate historical claims to certain lands. In addition, self-recognition by a group having special rights to certain lands may be an indication that they should be considered as rights-holders. In certain cases, it might be necessary to develop additional means to guarantee true equity in land use decisions so as to avoid having specific group benefits being watered down by an overly inclusive definition of a “rights-holder”.

5. Conclusion

In the present essay, we have explored the “rights-holder” concept using the three dimensions of social equity, Recognition, Distribution and Procedure, and applied it on both indigenous and traditional livelihood cases of reindeer herding in Fennoscandia. We believe that our definition of rights-holders and its application to reindeer herding can help to empower indigenous and local communities. It can also assist in highlighting possible gaps and shortcomings in current land use governance. If the concept of “rights-holders” is not used, and indigenous and local people continue

to be defined primarily as “stakeholders”, it is likely that they will continue to be marginalized in land use decision-making processes and in the development of natural resource practices preferred by the majority society. Therefore, we recommend that society should recognize and treat reindeer herders as rights-holders. This would help to enhance social equity within land use policy development and in management practices that affect reindeer herders. Based on considerations related to having one’s way of life at stake and securing acknowledgment of historical customary rights to one’s land, we can conclude that both herders, Sámi and ethnic Finns, should be recognized as rights-holders instead of stakeholders in the future development of both natural resource policy and land use governance.

While promoting the use of a “rights-holders” concept we do acknowledge that the careless use of rights-holder terminology may lead to certain unintended consequences. Similarly, applying a too inclusive definition may compromise the integrity of some indigenous rights. Therefore, indigenous peoples should be recognized as particular groups of rights-holders that depend on their homelands for their culture and ethnic identity. In certain instances, it might be better to secure rights of other local communities by other means than expanding the inclusiveness of the rights-holder concept. On the other hand, a too exclusive definition of a rights-holder may end marginalizing non-indigenous local people who practice traditional livelihoods in similar circumstances. A necessary effort to strike a balance in the term’s application seems to be required. In conclusion, we recommend that we add the concept of “rights-holders” to the vocabulary used by policymakers, scientists, and indigenous and local communities in discussing their concerns regarding land use. But as always, a degree of caution and sensitivity needs to be followed in its application due to complex context specific situations involving diverse cultures, multiple histories, and divergent vulnerabilities and dependencies linked to land use and land rights. In certain cases, it might be necessary to develop other means of guaranteeing equity in land use decisions than broadening too much the definition of rights-holders.

Acknowledgements

This paper was supported by Nordforsk under two of its Nordic Centres of Excellence: Reindeer husbandry in a Globalizing North – resilience adaptations and pathways for actions (ReiGN: project number 76915), and Resource Extraction and Sustainable Arctic Communities (REXSAC: project number 76938) as well as by the University of Oulu under the Transformation and Social Innovation for Sustainable Arctic Communities (TransArct) project.

References

- Adkins, S., B Gray, K. Macnab, G. Nettleton. 2016. Calculating the incalculable. Principles for compensating impacts to aboriginal title. *Alberta Law Review* 54: 351-381.
- Allard, C., & S. F. Skogvang (eds.) 2015. *Indigenous Rights in Scandinavia: Autonomous Sami Law*. USA, England: Ashgate, Juris Divesritas, Pp. 233.
- Banerjee SB. 2000. Whose Land Is It Anyway? National Interest, Indigenous Stakeholders, and Colonial Discourses: The Case of the Jabiluka Uranium Mine. *Organization & Environment* 13:1, pp. 3-38.
- Billgren, Charlotte and Holmén, Hans (2008), 'Approaching reality: Comparing stakeholder analysis and cultural theory in the context of natural resource management', *Land use policy*, 25 (4), 550-62.
- CBD 17 Jan 2020. Working Group on Article 8(j). Convention on Biological Diversity. Available at: <https://www.cbd.int/convention/wg8j.shtml>
- CIFOR 15 Oct 2018. Securing rights of indigenous peoples and local communities may curb global warming. Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). At: <https://www.cgiar.org/news-events/news/securing-rights-indigenous-peoples-local-communities-may-curb-global-warming/>
- Daskon, C and T. Binns. 2010. Culture, tradition and sustainable rural livelihoods: exploring the culture–development interface in Kandy, Sri Lanka. *Community Development Journal* 45: 494–517. doi:10.1093/cdj/bsp019
- Elster, Jon. 1998. *Deliberative democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- FAO 2016. *Governing Tenure Rights to Commons: A guide to support the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security*. FAO, Rome.
- Fondahl, G., V. Filippova, and L. Mack. 2015. Indigenous Peoples in the New Arctic. *The New Arctic*, eds. B. Evengård et al., 7 – 22. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-17602-4_2

- Grimble, Robin and Wellard, Kate (1997), 'Stakeholder methodologies in natural resource management: a review of principles, contexts, experiences and opportunities', *Agricultural systems*, 55 (2), 173-93.
- Heikkinen, H. (2002) *Sopeutumisen mallit - Poronhoidon adaptaatio jälkiteolliseen toimintaympäristöön Suomen läntisellä poronhoitoalueella 1980-2000. (Models of Adaptation – Adaptation of Reindeer Herding to the Post-industrial Environment in the Finnish Western Reindeer Herding Area 1980 – 2000. Only in Finnish) PhD. Diss. University of Oulu. Finnish Literature Society. Hakapaino.*
- Heikkinen, H. 2006. Neo-entrepreneurship as an Adaptation Model of Reindeer Herding in Finland. In *Nomadic Peoples. Special Issue; Humans and Reindeer on the Move*. Ed. by Florian Stammer and Hugh Beach. *Berghahn Journals (NS) Volume 10 No.2 2006*. 187-208.
- Heikkinen, H.I., É. Lepy, S. Sarkki, & T. Komu. 2016. Challenges in acquiring a social licence to mine in the globalising Arctic. *Polar Record* 52(4): 399-411. doi:10.1017/S0032247413000843.
- Heikkinen, H.I., Lakomäki, S. & Baldrige J. 2007. The dimensions of sustainability and the neo-entrepreneurial adaptation strategies in reindeer herding in Finland. *The Journal of Ecological Anthropology* 11: 25 – 42.
- Heikkinen, H.I., S. Sarkki, & M. Nuttall. 2012. Users or producers of ecosystem services? A scenario exercise for integrating conservation and reindeer herding in northeast Finland. *Pastoralism: Research, Policy and Practice* 2:11.
- Horstkotte, Tim, Élise Lépy, Camilla Risvoll. Contributing authors (in alphabetical order): Svein Morten Eilertsen, Hannu I. Heikkinen, Grete K. Hovelsrud, Mia Landauer, Annette Löf, Anna Omazic, Majken Paulsen, Antti-Juhani Pekkarinen Simo Sarkki, Morten Tryland, Birgitta Åhman. 2020. Sharing knowledge and experiences on challenges and opportunities with supplementary feeding in Fennoscandian reindeer husbandry
- Howlett, D.J.B. and Nagu, J. 1997. Planning Centre, University of Bradford, United Kingdom. *Agriculture Project Planning in Tanzania. Institute of Development Management Mzumbe, Tanzania and Development Project.*
- Koivurova, T., Masloboev, V., Hossain, K., Nygaard, V., Petrétei, A., & Vinogradova, S. 2015. Legal protection of Sami traditional livelihoods from the adverse impacts of mining: a comparison of the level of protection enjoyed by Sami in their four home states. *Arctic Review*, 6(1).
- Komu, T. 2020. Pursuing the good life in the North : examining the coexistence of reindeer herding, extractive industries and nature-based tourism in northern Fennoscandia. PhD Dissertation, University of Oulu. *Acta Universitatis Ouluensis. B, Humaniora.*
- Kortessalmi, J.J., 2008. *Poronhoidon synty ja kehitys Suomessa. Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura Helsinki.*
- Larsen, J. N. & G. Fondahl. 2015. *Arctic Human Development Report: Regional Processes and Global Linkages. Nordic Council of Ministers, Nordic Council of Ministers Secretariat.*
- Larsen, R. K., & Raitio, K. 2019. Implementing the State Duty to Consult in Land and Resource Decisions: Perspectives from Sami Communities and Swedish State Officials. *Arctic Review*, 10, 4-23.

- Larsen, R. K., Raitio, K., Stinnerbom, M., & Wik-Karlsson, J. (2017). Sami-state collaboration in the governance of cumulative effects assessment: A critical action research approach. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 64, 67-76.
- Lawrence, R. 2014. Internal colonisation and Indigenous resource sovereignty: wind power developments on traditional Saami lands. *Environment and Planning D*. 32: 1036–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d9012>
- Lehtola, V-P. 2015. Sámi Histories, Colonialism, and Finland. *Arctic Anthropology* 52: 22–36.
- Luyet, Vincent, et al. 2012. A framework to implement stakeholder participation in environmental projects. *Journal of environmental management*, 111, 213-19.
- Löf, A. 2014. Challenging Adaptability: Analysing the Governance of Reindeer Husbandry in Sweden, Doctoral thesis (Umeå University).
- Löf, A. 2016. Locking in and locking out: a critical analysis of the governance of reindeer husbandry in Sweden. *Critical Policy Studies*, 10 (4), 426-47.
- Löf, A. 2013. Examining limits and barriers to climate change adaptation in an Indigenous reindeer herding community. *Climate and development*, 5(4), 328-339.
- Manker Ernst 1953. The Nomadism of the Swedish Mountain Lapps. The Siidas and their migratory routes in 1945. Nordiska Museet: Acta Lapponica VII. Hugo Gebers Forlag, Stockholm.
- McDermott, M., Mahanty, S., Schreckenberg, K., 2013. Examining equity: a multi-dimensional framework for assessing equity in payments for ecosystem services. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 33, 416–427.
- McKendry, C., 2016. Cities and the challenge of multiscale climate justice: climate governance and social equity in Chicago, Birmingham, and Vancouver. *Local Environ.* 21 (11), 1354–1371. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2015.1116064>.
- Mustonen, T. 2017. Endemic time-spaces of Finland: from wilderness lands to ‘vacant production spaces’. *Fennia - International Journal of Geography*, 195(1), 5-24. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.58971>
- Naum, M., and J. Nordin (eds.) 2013. *Scandinavian Colonialism and the Rise of Modernity*. New York: Springer.
- Ojala, C.-G., and J.M. Nordin. 2015. Mining Sápmi: colonial histories, Sámi archaeology, and the exploitation of natural resources in northern Sweden. *Arctic Anthropology* 52: 6-21.
- Ojha, H.R., N.S. Paudel, M.R. Banjade, C. McDougall, J. Cameron. 2010. The deliberative scientist: Integrating science and politics in forest resource governance in Nepal. In: German, L., J. Ramisch, R. Verma. 2010. *Beyond the Biophysical: Knowledge, Culture, and Power in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management*. Springer Science & Business Media, 301 pages.
- Oskal, A., J. M. Turi, S. D. Mathiesen and P. Burgess (eds.) (2009), *Ealát. Reindeer Herders' Voice: Reindeer herding, traditional knowledge and adaptation to climate change and loss of grazing land* (Alta: International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry).

- Ostrom, E. 1990 (2015). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (Canto Classics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
doi:10.1017/CBO9781316423936
- Pascual, U., J. Phelps, E. Garmendia, K. Brown, E. Corbera, A. Martin, E. Gomez-Baggethun, R. Muradian. 2014. Social Equity Matters in Payments for Ecosystem Services, *BioScience*, 64: 1027–1036, <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biu146>
- Pennanen, J., K. Näkkäljärvi. 2003. *Siiddastallan : from Lapp communities to modern Sámi life*. Siida Sámi museum.
- Rawls, J. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. MA: Harvard University Press.
- Reed, M. S. 2008. Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. *Biological Conservation* 141: 2417-2431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2008.07.014>.
- Reed, M.S., Anil Graves, Norman Dandy, Helena Posthumus, Klaus Hubacek, Joe Morris, Christina Prell, Claire H. Quinn, Lindsay C. Stringer. 2009. Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90: 1933-1949. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2009.01.001>.
- Reindeer herders' association 2020. Reindeer herding cooperatives. <https://paliskunnat.fi/reindeer/reindeer-herding/cooperatives/> Accessed 14.2.2020.
- Sandstöm, C., & C. Widmark. 2007. Stakeholders' perceptions of consultations as tools for co-management -- A case study of the forestry and reindeer herding sectors in northern Sweden. *Forest policy and economics* 10: 25-35.
- Sarkki, S., 2011. *The Site Strikes Back: Multi-level Forest Governance and Participation in Northern Finland* (PhD thesis) Universitatis Ouluensis, pp. 1–111.
- Sarkki, S., H. I. Heikkinen, V-P Herva, & J. Saarinen. 2018. Myths on local use of natural resources and social equity of land use governance: Reindeer herding in Finland. *Land Use Policy* 77: 322–331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.05.055>
- Sarkki, S., Jokinen, S., Nijnik, M., Zahvoyska, L., Abraham, E.M., Alados, C.L., Bellamy, C., Bratanova-Dontcheva, S., Grunewald, K., Kollar, J., Krajčí, J., Kyriazopoulos, A.P., La Porta, N., Monteiro, A.T., Munoz-Rojas, J., Parpan, T., Sing, L., Smith, M., Sutinen (+), M.-L., Tolvanen, A., Zhyla, T., 2017. Social equity in governance of ecosystem services: synthesis from European treeline areas. *Clim. Res.* 73, 31–44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/cr01441>.
- Sarkki, S., T. Komu, H.I. Heikkinen, N. Acosta García, É. Lépy, & V-P. Herva. 2016. Applying a Synthetic Approach to the Resilience of Finnish Reindeer Herding as a Changing Livelihood. *Ecology & Society* 21(4):14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-08819-210414>
- Senecah, S. L. (2004). The trinity of voice: The role of practical theory in planning and evaluating the effectiveness of environmental participatory processes. *Communication and public participation in environmental decision making*, 13-33.
- Snyder, Robert; Williams, Daniel R.; Peterson, George. 2003. Culture loss and sense of place in resource valuation: Economics, anthropology and indigenous cultures. In: Jentoft, S.; Minde, H.; Nilsen, R., eds. *Indigenous peoples: resource management and global rights*. Delft, The Netherlands: Eburon Academic Publishers, Pp. 107-123.

- Tegengren Helmer 1952. En Utdöd lappkultur i Kemi lappmark, studier i Nordfinlands kolonisationshistoria. Åbo Akademi. Åbo.
- Ulfstein, G. 2004. Indigenous peoples' right to lands. Max Planck Yearbook of United Nation's Law. 8: 1-48.
- UN (2007), United Nations General Assembly Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf (Accessed 10 December 2011)
- UNFCCC 2020. Introduction to the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP). United Nations, Climate Change. At: <https://unfccc.int/LCIPP>
- United Nations, 9 August 2016. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples on the human rights situation of the Sami people in the Sápmi region of Norway, Sweden and Finland. A/HRC/33/42/Add.3. At: <http://www.unsr.vtaulicorpuz.org/site/index.php/en/documents/country-reports/155-report-sapmi-2016>
- UN PFII. 2016. Suggestions for the High Level Political Forum's consideration to ensure that Indigenous Peoples are not left behind in the 2030 Agenda. Prepared in May 2016, by the Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Division of Social Policy and Development, UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. At: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=30022&nr=198&menu=3170>
- von der Porten, S. and R. C. de Loë. 2014. How collaborative approaches to environmental problem solving view indigenous peoples: A systematic review. *Society & Natural Resources* 27(10): 1040-1056.
- Von der Porten, S., De Loë, R., Plummer, R., 2015. Collaborative environmental governance and indigenous peoples: recommendations for practice. *Environ. Pract.* 17 (2), 134–144. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S146604661500006X>.
- Wesselink, A., Paavola, J., Fritsch, O., & Renn, O. (2011). Rationales for Public Participation in Environmental Policy and Governance: Practitioners' Perspectives. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 43(11), 2688–2704. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a44161>
- Wiessner, S. 2011. The cultural rights of indigenous peoples: achievements and continuing challenges. *European Journal of International Law* 22.1: 121-140.