

Geography from the Margins

Tero Mustonen (ed.)



Snowchange Discussion Paper # 17

Photo: Eero Murtomäki

A photograph of a forest path. The path is narrow and made of dirt, winding through a dense forest of tall, thin trees. The ground is covered in green moss and low-lying vegetation. The trees are mostly evergreens, and the lighting is soft, suggesting a shaded forest environment.

Contents

- 3 *Tero Mustonen* Geography from the Margins
- 5 *Anne Buttner* Interdependence
- 6 *Jules Pretty* Cultural Resilience at the Margins
- 8 *Gunhild Setten* Marginal(ising) geographies
- 10 *Kenneth R. Olwig* Marginalia: Siida and the Alta Petroglyphs
– a Fractal Alternative to Cartographic Imperialism?
- 16 *Michael Jones and Venke Åsheim Olsen*
The contribution of Kristian Nissen (1879–1968) to
knowledge of cultural and geographical margins in the north
- 19 *Matthew Sawatzky* Marginalization in Canadian
Forest Use

Geography from the Margins

Tero Mustonen

Geography from the Margins collects together essays and scientific texts that have been written in honour of the 60th anniversary of Professor of Geography Ari Lehtinen at University of Eastern Finland. They celebrate the writings, lifework and academic approaches of Professor Ari Aukusti Lehtinen in the context of human geography.

Professor Lehtinen turned 60 in October 2017. Professor Lehtinen is one of the leading Nordic scholars on for example human geography, social theory, the European Greenbelt between Norway, Finland and Russia, the taiga traditional livelihoods and Indigenous communities in the Russian boreal as well as Finland. He has been a close supporter of the Snowchange Cooperative for over a decade. Snowchange is honoured to be able to publish a range of original English-language texts connected with the celebration of Professor Lehtinen as a part of our Discussion Paper series.

These papers alongside Finnish original scientific texts were released in the Finnish language book “Marginaalien maantiede” (Semi, Tanskanen and Mustonen 2017) on 30th September 2017. The editors felt that the invited English-language materials should be made available to international readers.

The common thread for these invited essays is the concept of ‘Geography from the Margins’. They are thought-provoking forum pieces that challenge the scholars of human geography and the readers to discover innovative thinking from the “margins”. The exact positioning of a “margin” in cultural studies and human geography is left rather open. Editors are very thankful to all participating scholars.

Questions forming the meta-level approach in these essays include for example

- *What are the space, relevance and role of these ‘marginalized’ geographies from the peripheries?*
- *What is the role of for example culturally endemic Sámi geographical time-space concepts and their transferability to power languages?*
- *How could we ensure a culturally balanced and meaningful dialogue within the geographical disciplines on these marginalized voices?*
- *Who is marginalized in human geography?*

The essays included in this Discussion Paper are

1. “Interdependence” by Anne Buttimer
2. Cultural Resilience at the Margins by Jules Pretty
3. Marginalia: Siida and the Alta Petroglyphs – a Fractal Alternative to Cartographic Imperialism? By Kenneth R. Olwig
4. Marginal(ising) geographies, Gunhild Setten
5. The contribution of Kristian Nissen (1879-1968) to knowledge of cultural and geographical margins in the north by Michael Jones and Venke Åsheim Olsen
6. Marginalization in Canadian Forest Use by Matthew Sawatzky

A low-angle photograph looking up at several evergreen trees heavily laden with snow. The branches are dark against the bright blue sky, and the snow is thick and white, covering the needles and hanging from the branches. The perspective is from below, looking up through the canopy of the trees.

References

Semi, Jussi, Tanskanen, Minna and Mustonen, Tero. Marginaalien maantiede. Snowchange Cooperative: Kontiolahti, 2017.

About the contributors:

Late Anne Buttimer was Professor Emerita of Geography at University College, Dublin, Ireland

Jules Pretty is a Professor of Environment and Society & Deputy Vice-Chancellor at the University of Essex, UK

Kenneth R. Olwig is professor of landscape architecture at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden

Gunhild Setten is Professor at the Department of Geography, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

Michael Jones is a Professor Emeritus from the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

Venke Åsheim Olsen is an Ethnologist from Norway

Matthew Sawatzky, Ph D, is a researcher affiliated with the University of Eastern Finland. He is originally from Canada.

Interdependence

Anne Buttimer

'The farther and more deeply we penetrate into matter; by means of increasingly powerful methods,' Teilhard de Chardin once remarked, 'the more we are confounded by the interdependence of its parts. It is impossible to cut into this network, to isolate a portion, without it becoming frayed and unravelled at all its edges.'

Interdependence - in life and in thought - lies at the heart of Ali Lehtinen's scholarship. Reciprocity of core and periphery, of centrality and marginality, of home and horizon: with such themes he sheds innovative light on Europe and its northern peripheries, revealing fresh insight into the potentially creative tensions within and among them.

Furthermore, he points directly toward the fundamental interdependence of two modes of knowing: the outward thrust of analytical endeavour and the homeward thrust of critical reflection on meaning. The appeal for heightened awareness of these tensions constitutes a major challenge for scholars globally and especially for geographers.

For this latter challenge, dear Ari, we all owe you an enormous debt of gratitude, affection and admiration.

Cultural Resilience at the Margins

Jules Pretty, University of Essex, UK

The notion of the inevitable benefits of all material progress is a modern invention. Hunters and foragers, many farmers and herders too, tend not to hold that their current community is any better than those of the past or at other places. Past and future are no more or less valued than current time. But economic development has too easily justified the losses of both species and special places. Our environmental problems are thus human problems. Disconnection from the land, in the form of non-regular contact, already has the capacity to damage and even destroy cultures. Something important remains elusive to many moderns. It is much happiness. The proportion of people in industrialised countries describing themselves as happy has not changed since the middle of the 20th century, despite a trebling of per capita wealth.

Evolutionary history is framed by losses and gains. The same goes for humans and our cultures. Ways of living emerged that were adapted to local ecosystems. Wild places, farms and forests, grasslands and gardens: none were invariant. And whether hunter or farmer, we changed things, and in return our minds have been shaped by the land. Then came the industrial revolution, the invention of machines that released abundant energy from coal and oil. Then consumer culture transformed the old equations about people and land. Global connectedness now illuminates the upsides of consumption, and aspirations are converging. But now came environmental and social side-effects, so serious they threaten this finite planet's capacity to resource all our wants. Conventional economic growth encourages a race to the top of consumption, even though many people currently have no prospects of escaping poverty or hunger. We still call this progress.

There is growing acknowledgement that cul-

turally-created landscapes are worthy of identification and protection. Conservation, though, does not only derive from an intention to conserve. It can arise from belief systems that are embodied in a diversity of social institutions. The great majority of non-industrial societies that have succeeded in protecting the productivity of their ecosystems have done so primarily through the use of local cultural mechanisms. One of the keys to success is the manifestation of nature as spiritual, culturally-powerful symbols that command a sense of respect, and are, in some cases, revered by society. Many cultures have independently evolved informal regulations, norms and social taboos that govern the respectful treatment of nature, and which have evolved into forms of environmental ethics (such as in the protection of sacred groves). Non-market based institutions co-evolved with specific ecosystems over time and act to define locally-acceptable practices and behaviours, and in some cases, have a greater influence than external market signals.

Humans have a long history of developing regimes and rules to protect and preserve natural places in a steady state. These diverse and location-specific rule systems form informal institutional frameworks within communities, legitimated by shared values and appropriate behaviours. Where these systems are robust, they can maintain the productivity and diversity of the natural environment without the need for formal legal enforcement sanctions. Compliance derives from informal internally-derived community sanctions, such as moral influence from elders. Socially-embedded norms and institutions therefore arise from a combination of local knowledge bases, cultural belief systems and distinct worldviews.

These contextual systems of collective action are intimately linked to the land upon which they

are based and, subsequently, are enormously diverse. They govern the use of resources across a wide range of contexts, from forests to fisheries, demonstrating remarkable diversity and flexibility. How humans know the world, therefore, governs behaviour and practices that in turn shape landscapes, which form a cultural archive of human endeavours. Amidst a diversity of cultures comes a diversity of meanings, leading to a diversity of actions, and providing an array of biodiversity outcomes. This nature-culture continuum or interconnection has existed through the past and into the present, and therefore should be sustained in the future.

It is evident that human and environment systems are intimately linked in ways that are only just being appreciated, and certain cultural and ecological components are necessary to ensure system resilience. However, due to recent and intense periods of diversity loss (both biological and cultural), there is now a growing recognition that human and ecological systems are more vulnerable than formerly predicted. There are a number of common cultural dimensions that are present where there is high resilience irrespective of local ecological, social or political circumstances:

1. Intersection of technologies and knowledge results in internalizing technologies that build natural capital and produce and use high ecological literacy;
2. Social structure is typified by high social capital, latticeworks of relations, heterarchies rather than hierarchies, and regular intergenerational contact;
3. Personal behaviours and choices are characterized by mixed diets and adequate calories, physically activity levels that maintain health, and regular access to land and nature;
4. Presence of internal beliefs, where strong cultural, spiritual or religious norms and beliefs differentiate one culture from another;
5. Presence of adaptive policies and management, where practices can adapt to conditions and thus tend to be emergent.

Human cultures retaining, or striving to regain, connections with the local environment could be improving their own resilience in light of the many pressures they face, including global climate change. There are inextricable links between ecological and cultural systems, comprising the social institutions of a community, but also the worldviews, identity, values, cultural practices and behaviours that make a community or group distinct. Where communities have succeeded in sustaining cultures and beliefs, there are lessons that can be learned, with emergent approaches that can be used by other communities around the world. Going beyond the current boundaries between disciplines, understandings, cultures, paradigms, worldviews, languages and institutional frameworks could help to overcome these divides, as well as offer hope for a planet under many threats.

References

- Pretty J. 2002. *Agri-Culture*. Earthscan, London
Pretty J. 2014. *The Edge of Extinction*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca

Marginal(ising) geographies

Gunhild Setten

Department of Geography, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim

“This morning, 12th of Feb. [20]04 in Joensuu it was -26°C: the river ‘Pielinen’ was still ‘free’ [from ice] – as always, but it was perhaps too cold to bicycle: face is ‘burning’ now, when returning inside. Ari”

Enclosed in an envelope, and written on the back of a photograph of the river, this greeting was sent to me from Ari Lehtinen, now more than 13 years ago. At the time, Ari and I were conversing over what might be termed ‘marginal(ising) geographies’, i.e. geographies from the margins, and geographies working to marginalise. Simply put, we were both critically concerned, in a broad sense, with the who, how, why and what of dialogues in (international) human geography and the conditions under which dialogues could and did take place. We were writing from what we perceived to be margins, both spatially (eastern Finland and central Norway) and linguistically (being native speakers of Finnish and Norwegian respectively). Through the lens of marginalisation, Ari communicated his concerns in studies of e.g. the geopolitics of the Finnish-Russian Greenbelt and of indigenous Sámi people, while I at the time undertook a critical study of the disciplinary works of *The Dictionary of Human Geography*. Clearly drawing on very different empirical materials and realities, we were joined by a motivation to say something important about in- and exclusionary geographies.

As I now re-visit my conversations with Ari, I also re-visit some of the processes through which the discipline operates to marginalize. It is a fact that there are processes that position us differently and unevenly, and they often work through topics, approaches, terms, languages, journals and calls for papers, and across scales. At the time, *The Dictionary of Human Geography* encapsulated the

degree to which geography could marginalize. The study of *The Dictionary*, claimed to be a path-breaking guide to human geography as a whole, taught me that *The Dictionary* was just as situated and politicized as any other narration of the discipline’s cognitive domain, and hence ridden with all sorts of exclusionary effects. I was particularly struck by how the notion of ‘landscape’ – a key idea in the discipline – was narrated through four subsequent editions, i.e. the ways alternatives to a visual understanding of landscape was largely being ignored. This came, however, as not too much of a surprise – and not really the point. What did surprise me, though, was that nobody had paid the *The Dictionary* any critical attention as an acclaimed authoritative reference work, apart from a few book reviews, at a time when the disciplinary politics of ‘international’ human geography was rather hotly debated.

Throughout the 2000s, quite a few geographers found themselves to be marginalized in and by their own discipline as evidenced in various publications and conference sessions. Voices coming out of places such as Eastern and Southern Europe, South America and Scandinavia, i.e. out with the Anglophone world, were particularly loud, very much reflecting the problematic fact that English has become the *lingua franca* of ‘international’ geography. But also geographers writing from Australia – in English – expressed a sense of being marginalized. A common thread running through a number of these critical interventions was a feeling of somehow being reduced to a case study of something rather than being seen as making a substantial theoretical contribution. In blunt terms, works not coming out of British-American geography, were not seen as important (enough).

What I observe, though, is that the critical

self-examination that took place a decade ago has to a large extent quieted down – my own engagement included. A couple of speculations over this relative silence are thus called for, and they relate to the conditions under which we do geography, hence suggesting that conditions have changed over the last decade, both internal and external to the discipline. First, the political context of universities has changed. Disciplines – and universities – are assessed and ranked for ‘quality’, societal and scientific ‘impact’. The understanding of quality and impact is, however, not static, but rather shaped by shifting policies. Stakes have become high as funding follows excellence and impact. So, is there no time and energy left for ‘internal affairs’?

Second, we circulate our knowledge differently. The internet can start – and has started – to trouble the conventional notions of centre-periphery through the use of for example personal webpages, ResearchGate and Google translate. Quality and impact is, in fact, also increasingly assessed through the differing ways scholars demonstrate community engagement and responsibility. So, new spaces are carved for more and other voices and practices.

There is no doubt that the world experiences more upheaval than ever before and that a general global unrest impacts on the discipline, i.e. on the questions we ask, the courses we teach and the language with which we speak to fellow geographers as well as to students, politicians, media and other sciences. So, being a geographer in a context of environmental and climate changes, and when causes and effects of migration are fundamentally challenging all of us, forces the question of what geography can bring to the table by way of having an impact on the world in which we live. For that we need multiple voices and vocabularies, and not only those of the Anglophone world, yet we also need to be able to speak to and understand each other. The diversity of perspectives in geography today is a strength, not because they provide us with a more accurate understanding of the world, but they enable us to ask different questions of the world as well as of each other. Hopefully, they also lead to interpretations that offer a range of other possible worlds.

Marginalia: Siida and the Alta Petroglyphs – a Fractal Alternative to Cartographic Imperialism?

Kenneth R. Olwig

This is in every respect a marginal essay, not the least because I am writing about a subject at the very margins of my expertise. Yet, I hope someone (perhaps Ari Lehtinen?), or others with the right expertise, will read this and perhaps move this idea further, perhaps in collaboration?¹

Introduction:

Margins are the places in the modernized world where forms of life, and the ideas of place they bear, are allowed to continue existing, at the same time as core areas are marching to the drum of a progress that offers a spatial infinitude of distant promises whose fulfillment always seem to lie just beyond the horizon. Since the Renaissance this dream of progress has been a creature of the Ptolemaic map, and the scenic forms of landscape representation that derive from it (Olwig 2002). The map, and with it the scenic landscape, is duplicitous because the surface that you see is an illusory space that seems “real,” but is, in fact, structured by an underlying Euclidean geometric spatial frame which, by definition, is divorced from the life world of the landscapes of places in which we live (see also Ingold 1993, Olwig 2017)

¹ This article is based upon personal field research undertaken together with the anthropologist Sally Anderson in Kautokeino and Alta, Sámeland in the spring of 2014. I owe considerable debt to Sally, who is as much a knowledgeable participant as an observer of the area. I also owe inspiration to the ideas of Tim Ingold, with whom I shared an experience of Inari, and who clearly has learned much from his stays amongst the Sami and their reindeer. Finally, thanks to Ari Lehtinen, who awoke my interest in the arctic north with his dissertation on Nordic Natures. The theory propounded here is my own, as far as I know, but if others have reached the same conclusions I would like to learn where I can read about this.

Thus, following Euclid, a line is a conceptual ideal that is so thin that it can only exist in heavens of the imagination, just as a point is so small that it disappears, leaving only the smile of the reason that brought it into being (Euclid 2013 (orig. c. 300 BC)). The great forte of this map, and the scenic landscape, however, is that it is survey-able, and hence map-able, assuming that the earth is a perfect globe (which it is not) (Olwig 2011), and that it is scalable, thus creating an easy means of recording, en miniature, the privatized properties that surveyors slice out of the commons, and that imperial states slice out of colonized spaces as their territory.

But this scale is an illusion because it creates a spatial common denominator which makes no sense in the life world (Marston 2000). “Nature,” for example, cannot be treated as a “kingdom” enclosable within its own territorial borders anymore than an anthill can be viewed as analogous to a city (Olwig 2016). And this is perhaps nowhere clearer at the landscapes of domination (Lehtinen 2008) in the circumpolar reaches of Europe where various imperial states have imposed mapped territorial boundaries which the Sámi and their reindeer (or is it the reindeer and their Sámi?) transgress according to customary practices that defy Euclidian linearity (Paine 1994). The Sámi, I would argue, do not march to a different spatial drummer. They don’t march to any drummer.

But is there an abstractable logos behind the Sámi/reindeer pattern of movement?

Perhaps.

I will suggest here that this might be the principles of fractal geometry <Stewart, 2001 #2646>.



Drawing by Albrecht Dürer, (1471–1582) showing the use of techniques derived from cartographic surveying to create a perspectival drawing. The same quadratric Euclidean geometric structure underlying there map in Figure 3) now reappears as the underlying structure of a perspectival illusion that reduces the bodily and organic to the geometric.



This map shows an area of Sámi siida that stretches from the Swedish coast near Umeå across the border to Norway, illustrating how mapped imperial state boundaries conflict with ancient customary patterns of Sámi/ reindeer seasonal movement. Photo: Kenneth R. Olwi

Siida

In Inari, in the heart of the Sámi Area in Finland there is a museum called “Siida” that, according to its website, is a central meeting place and a window on Sámi culture and the diverse nature of Northern Lapland (Lehtinen, 1991; Lehtinen, 2008>. According to the Sámi scholar, Mikkel Nils Sara: “Siida principles are ancient in origin. The main elements of the siida are the individuals (in Sámi *siidda olbmot*); the husbandry units (*baikedoalut*); the collective and the herding unit (*siidadoallu*); the siida territory, resources, and infrastructure (*orohagat/siidavuoddu*); and the semi-nomadic or nomadic lifestyle in accordance with the flow of the seasons (*johtaladdan*)” (Sara 2009: 157, see also Whitaker 1955: 54).

It is also, as the Inari example suggests, a word for cultural and natural heritage. Siida unifies many of the phenomena that cartographic reasoning would divide into space, place, nature and polity, and hence resembles what the ancient Greeks meant by *choros*, which is to say a notion of place that is not defined by geometry as location in space, but determined by the practices of polity, and its animals and plants, in different interconnected places (Whitaker 1955, Olwig 2008, Kymäläinen and Lehtinen 2010).

But how can one represent this multiplicity of places if one is not to use the conventions of cartography or perspective, which reduce place to an area in an abstract and ideal uniform space?

Perhaps the answer is to be found with the Alta petroglyphs?

The Alta petroglyphs

In Alta, in what is now West Finnmark in Northern Norway, there is an area of petroglyphs that are believed to date from 4800–2700 B.C. (Helskog 2014). They show simplified, sticklike, figures of groups of people herding/hunting reindeer that have been carved into the glacial rock that border the sea.



Alta Petroglyphs. Photo: Sally Anderson

The present-day Sámi siida in this area are incorporated into a seasonal movement between places in the area of upland Kautokeino in the winter and summer grazing along the coast and islands in the area of Alta. In this way the reindeer can escape the biting insects of the summer highlands, at the same time as their highland pasturage is allowed to regenerate, and one can imagine that this seasonal migration pattern can have applied just as well in 4800–2700 B.C. There is little or no genetic difference between a wild reindeer and a tame reindeer (as opposed to, for example, wild and tame sheep) (Whitaker 1955: 55). The difference lies primarily in whether or not people are actively “herding” (or following) them, or hunting them along the reindeer’s accustomed migration routes, or some combination of the two along a herding/hunting continuum.

One can imagine that differing groups of reindeer herders/hunters in 4800–2700 B.C. had their customary hunting grounds, much as Native Americans have had in historical memory, and much as the Sámi have their Siida, which is a term designating both a group of people and the places/*choros* through which their herds pause and move (Whitaker 1955: 55).



The underlying structure of the “map”/“landscape” topography visible on the Alta petroglyphs was scoured by the same glacial movement that scoured the macro topography of the area between Kautokeino and Alta.

Photo taken by Bjørn Christian Tørrissen (uspn@wikipedia) in August 2004 in Alta, Norway.



This map shows conflicted “boundaries” between several Sámi siida in an area near Kautokeino in a situation where one siida is down sizing the herd and others are expanding. Spatial conflict arises because the herds do not respect the sharp lines of mapped boundaries when sharing pastures. This conflicts with notions of fixed private landed property in Euclidean space that the map generates, as opposed to the customary Sámi notion of an evolving reindeer herd as wealth. Photo: Kenneth R. Olwig



Reindeer near Kautokeino, photographed in the characteristic slanting sun of the Arctic, which brings out the contour lines in both the stone and the topography (and the snow!), repeating patterns in a manner that is similar to fractal geometry. Photo: Erling Berger.



The sharp Euclidean boundaries on the map of Sámi siida in Figure on page 13 are hard to find in this photo from the same area. Photo: Kenneth R.Olwig

Petroglyphic fractal maps?

The rock upon which the Alta petroglyphs have been carved have been scoured and striated by the same glaciers that scoured the ridges and valleys through which rivers like the Alta run, and which the reindeer follow, and the Sámi following the reindeer follow, on their path from Kautokeino to the sea and back again. This means that the long lines running through the Siida(land)scape leading from Kautokeino to the sea move in the same direction, and have been carved by the same geological forces, as those that have scoured the rock upon which the petroglyphs have been carved (on lines in the landscape see Ingold 2007, Ingold 2015). Seen with the slanting arctic sun the striations in the rocks look much like the river valleys leading from Kautokeino to the sea look from elevated points along the route.

Perhaps, then, the Alta petroglyphs can be regarded as a kind of non-Ptolemaic map, in which the Euclidean lines of latitude and longitude have been replaced by the striations made by the glaciers, thus allowing the hunters/herders of 4800–2700 B.C. to imagine the ancient equivalent of their siida as carved into the rock? This, however, is not a map based upon Euclidean abstractions that have imperially been imposed upon the earth envisioned as a globe. It rather seems based upon the repetitive fractal principles that govern many patterns in nature, from the flames of the Sami campfire to the flakes of the snow in which they live their lives (Stewart, 2001).

These, thus, are patterns that are part and parcel of the fabric of that earth, and the life of a people, and “their” animals, who do not dichotomize place and space, culture and nature. Thus, they do not impose ridged Euclidean linear boundaries on their choros, but rather flexibly adapt their siida to an ever changing environment (on this northern nature see Lehtinen 1991).

Bibliography

- Euclid (2013 (orig. c. 300 BC)). *Elements*. Worcester, MA, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Clark University.
- Helskog, K. (2014). *Communicating with the World of Beings: World Heritage rock art sites in Alta, Arctic Norway*. Oxford, Oxbow Books.
- Ingold, T. (1993). “The Temporality of Landscape.” *World Archaeology* 25(2): 152-172.
- (2007). *Lines: A Brief History*. New York, Routledge.
- (2015). *The Life of Lines*. London, Routledge.
- Kymäläinen, P. and A. A. Lehtinen (2010). “Chora in Current Geographical Thought: Places of Co-Design and Re-Membering.” *Geografisk Annaler, Series B: Human Geography* 92B(3): 251-261.
- Lehtinen, A. A. (1991). “Northern Natures.” *Fennia* 169(1): 57-169.
- (2008). *Landscapes of Domination: Living in and off the Forests in Eastern Finland. Nordic Landscapes: Region and Belonging on the Northern Edge of Europe*. M. Jones and K.R. Olwig, eds. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press 458-482.
- Marston, S. A. (2000). “The social construction of scale.” *Progress in Human Geography* 24(2): 219-242.
- Olwig, K. R. (2002). *Landscape, Place and the State of Progress. Progress: Geographical Essays*. R. D. Sack, ed. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press: 22-60.
- (2008). “Has “Geography” always been modern?: choros, (non)representation, performance, and the landscape.” *Environment and Planning A* 40: 1843-1861.
- (2011). “The Earth is Not a Globe: Landscape versus the ‘Globalist’ Agenda.” *Landscape Research* 36(4): 401-415.
- (2016). “Virtual Enclosure, Ecosystem Services, Landscape’s Character and the “Rewilding” of the Commons: The “Lake District” Case.” *Landscape Research* 41(2): 253-264.
- (2017). “Geese, Elves and the Duplicitous, “Diabolical” Landscaped Space of Reactionary-Modernism: The Cases of Holgersson, Hågerstrand, and Lorenz” *GeoHumanities* 3(1): 1-24.
- Paine, R. (1994). *Herds of the Tundra: A Portrait of Saami Reindeer Pastoralism*. Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Sara, M. N. (2009). “Siida and traditional Sami reindeer herding knowledge.” *Northern Review* (Spring): 153-178.
- Stewart, I. (2001). *What Shape is a Snowflake? Magical Numbers in Nature*. London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Whitaker, I. (1955). *Social Relations in a Nomadic Lappish Community*. Oslo, Norsk Folkemuseum.

The contribution of Kristian Nissen (1879–1968) to knowledge of cultural and geographical margins in the north

Michael Jones and Venke Åsheim Olsen

Kristian Nissen was a Norwegian priest, reindeer inspector, historian, ethnographer, and geographer. He made significant contributions to Saami ethnography and to the cultural history and geography of marginal regions in Fennoscandia. He contributed to knowledge of the northern peripheries of Norway and Finland as a multicultural region. He corresponded with Finnish and Swedish scholars, especially on Saami topics. He published articles and pioneered maps on reindeer-herding. He later published articles on the history of cartography in Norway and the Nordic countries, showing the development of mapping in Europe's northern periphery. This essay provides a brief introduction to Kristian Nissen's work.¹

Nissen was born in Kristiania (Oslo) in 1879 and died there in 1968. He came from a family of churchmen and academics. His father, Per Schjelderup Nissen (1844–1930), worked at the Geographical Survey of Norway, and became director 1900–1906. Kristian accompanied his father during the 1896–1897 marking of Norway's boundary with Russia and Finland.

From age 15, he published articles on contemporary international affairs. His first parish was Karasjok in Finnmark, 1903–1913. Here he was active in local politics, particularly school affairs, agricultural improvement and conditions for Saami reindeer-herders, and became mayor 1908–1910. He served on the Norwegian-Swedish Reindeer Commission 1909–1910 and 1911–1912. He was the first reindeer-herding inspector for Norway 1912–1926. In this capacity, he attended the first assembly of Norwegian and Swedish Saami in Trondheim in 1917. He was secretary for the Norwegian delegation in reindeer-grazing negotiations with Sweden 1913–1919 and with Finland 1920–21. He was Norwegian commissioner

for the boundary inspection between Norway and Finland in 1925 and again in 1950. He was dean for Tromsø Cathedral 1926–1936, and parish priest at Lier, near Oslo, 1936–1949. From 1951, he was custodian for and lived at Polhøgda, the former home of Fridtjof Nansen (1861–1930), taken over by the Norwegian Geographical Society in 1947; here he was engaged to continue Nansen's cartographical-historical studies of northern and Arctic regions. During his long career, he contributed to government reports on reindeer-herding, and wrote numerous articles on Saami culture, church history, and history of cartography, in newspapers, scholarly journals, regional historical yearbooks, and encyclopedias, often illustrated with his own maps and photographs..

By royal resolution of 1848, priests serving in certain parishes in central and north Norway were to take courses in Saami (*lappisk*) and Finnish (*kvænsk*). Nissen did so as part of his theological studies, completed in 1903, as well as studying Latin, Greek, and Hebraic. He also knew the major modern European languages, and began studying Russian privately in the 1920s. A broad linguistic knowledge was an advantage for investigating sources and place-names in historical documents and maps, especially from multilingual northern Fennoscandia.

This was the period when Finnish-Ugrian linguistics developed into an internationally prestigious research field in Finland under Emil Nestor Setälä (1864–1935). Setälä was theoretically influential for leading lappologists (non-Saami academic researchers of Saami language, customs, and material culture) in Norway and Sweden. These included Just Qvigstad (1853–1957), who taught Saami and Finnish at Tromsø Seminary from 1878, Karl Bernhard Wiklund (1868–1934)

in Uppsala, and Konrad Nielsen (1875–1953) in Oslo, who completed his doctoral dissertation at Helsinki University in 1903. Nielsen taught Nissen Finnish and Saami. Nielsen had been appointed in 1899 as successor to the theologian and linguist Jens Andreas Friis (1821–1896), a student under Elias Lönnrot (1802–1884) in Kaajani in 1849.

Nissen followed in the steps of theologians and lappologists Qvigstad and Nielsen. Interpretation of biblical and other texts gave valuable competence for critical interpretation of textual form, content, translation and even handwriting in Nissen's later career. Their methods involved collection of ethnographic material through research journeys and fieldwork, and collection, copying and publication of historical documents identified through archive studies, alongside publication of linguistic, ethnographic and historical works. The lappologists constituted a paradigmatic community of research. Nissen's active correspondence within the network of lappologists included Setälä, Isak Fellman (1841–1919), Samuli Pauluharju (1875–1944), and Toivo Immanuel Itkonen (1891–1968) in Finland.

Politically, conflicts between reindeer-herders and farmers in Norway and the international negotiations over cross-boundary nomadic movements became linked to the debate over Saami origins. Nissen's first substantive scholarly article on Saami and reindeer-herding in Norway was a lecture published in the Norwegian Geographical Society's yearbook in 1916. Here he referred to the prevailing idea that the Saami had originally migrated from the east and hence were not an indigenous population. Geographer and ethnographer Yngvar Nielsen (1843–1898) had put forward the theory (today discredited) that the Saami had migrated to central and south Norway in recent historical time. However, Nissen wondered how saga accounts of Saami presence and possible Saami place-names in south Norway could be accounted for. For this article he made a pioneering statistical map in colour showing reindeer-herding districts, size of reindeer flocks, and seasonal movements of herds from one district to another, including transboundary movements from Sweden. Other

early articles dealt with reindeer ear-marks, reindeer lichen, Saami arts and crafts, and the oldest evidence for Saami in the south.

Nissen had close contacts with reindeer-herders throughout Norway and was invited in the early 1920s, along with Qvigstad and Konrad Nielsen, to join the research programme on Saami culture at the newly established Institute of Comparative Research in Human Culture in Oslo. Nissen's task was to investigate the geographical extent, historical background, and physical-geographical preconditions of reindeer-herding. He concluded that nomadic reindeer-herding was an advanced adaptation to nature and the most effective form of resource use in specific physical-geographical niches. However, it should give way in areas advantageous for other uses such as agriculture. His views were in many ways representative of the times, based on evolutionary and utilitarian notions of the relative benefits of different livelihoods.

In Finnish and Norwegian newspapers in 1923, Nissen criticized demands of ultra-nationalistic Finns that Finnmark and Norrbotten should become Finnish territory. He also commented in detail the manuscript on Finnmark's political history, published in 1923 by Oscar Albert Johnsen (1876–1954), dealing with Norway's borders with Finland, Sweden and Russia. Nissen's critical and explanatory comments concerned maps, place-names, ethnonyms, and some Norwegian historians' doubtful views on Norwegian territorial rights to Kola.

Nissen initiated the publication of the 1742–1745 border examination records of Major Peter Schnitler (1690–1751). Nissen published an extensive commentary, presenting the history of border negotiations between Norway and Sweden, and a detailed analysis of Schnitler's maps and other unpublished cartographical sources, demonstrating analytical competence and cartographical skills.² Nissen wrote a number of other important articles on Norwegian cartographical history. However, his draft manuscript presenting a systematic history of Norway's cartography remained unpublished. His ideas were typical of his time: a conception

of continual progress to the better and a concern with national cartography, but also the Nordic contribution to European cartographical history.

Nissen's scholarly work has been characterized as multifaceted, thorough, and based on detailed and accurate research. Although he was criticized for collecting material without always bringing it to publication, his valuable contribution frequently remained hidden. Yet his extensive correspondence with other scholars, his thoroughness, and detailed knowledge of historical sources and terminology greatly benefited the wider research communities of both lappologists and historians of cartography.

Notes

1. In addition to the references in the literature list, this essay is based on Kristian Nissen's correspondence and other private papers, including his annotated draft bibliography 1894-1943, in the National Archives of Norway, Oslo (archive reference: PA 888 Kristian Nissen), as well as correspondence in K.B. Wiklund's private archive in Carolina Rediviva, Department of Manuscripts and Music, Uppsala University Library. An updated but not fully comprehensive bibliography can be found via BIBSYS on oria.no.
2. A collection of historical documents initially published in 1909 by Qvigstad and Wiklund for Norwegian-Swedish reindeer-grazing investigations were included in Volume II (published 1929), which they edited jointly and for which Qvigstad compiled the place-name register. Volume I, edited by Nissen and theologian Ingolf Kvamen (1908-2000), did not appear until 1962, for which Kvamen compiled the registers of place-names and persons. (Volume III, edited by historian Lars Ivar Hansen and linguist Tom Schmidt, appeared in 1985.)

Literature

- Aarseth, Bjørn. 2003. Nissen, Nils Kristian. *Norsk Biografisk Leksikon*, vol. 6, pp. 524-525. Oslo: Kunnskapsforlaget.
- Bøckman, Peter Wilhelm. 1969. Domprost Kristian Nissen. *Årbok for Den Norske Kirke*, vol. 17-18, pp. 186-188. Oslo: Forlaget Land og Kirke.
- Gjessing, Gutorm. 1969. Minnetale over sokneprest Kristian Nissen. *Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo: Årbok 1968*, pp. 159-164.
- Hansen, Lars Ivar, & Tom Schmidt (Eds.). 1985. *Major Peter Schnitlers grenseeksaminasjonsprotokoller 1742–1745*, vol. III. Oslo: Kjeldeskriftfondet.
- Johnsen, Oscar Albert. 1923. *Finmarkens politiske historie: Aktmæssig fremstillet*. Videnskapsselskapets Skrifter, II. Hist-filos. Klasse 1922 No. 3. Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad.
- Kolsrud, Oluf. 1949. Nissen, Nils Kristian. *Norsk Biografisk Leksikon*, vol. X, pp. 165-167. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Kyllingstad, Jon Røyne. 2008. "Menneskeåndens universalitet": *Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning 1917-1940: Ideene, institusjonen og forskningen*. Avhandling for graden ph.d. Det humanistiske fakultet, Universitetet i Oslo. Oslo: Unipub.
- Nissen, Kristian. 2016. Lapper og ren i Norge. *Det Norske Geografiske Selskabs Aarbok*, vol. XXIV-XXVII, pp. 45-110 + kartbilag. Kristiania: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Nissen, Kristian, & Ingolf Kvamen (Eds.). 1962. *Major Peter Schnitlers grenseeksaminasjonsprotokoller 1742–1745*, vol. I. Oslo: Kjeldeskriftfondet.
- Qvigstad, J. & K.B. Wiklund (Eds.). 1929. *Major Peter Schnitlers grenseeksaminasjonsprotokoller 1742–1745*, vol. II. Oslo: Kjeldeskriftfondet.
- Steen, Adolf. 1968. Domprost Kristian Nissen til minne. *Vår kirke i nord: Årbok for Hålogaland 1968* (vol. 20), pp. 103-106. Bodø: Bispedømmerådene i Hålogaland.

Marginalization in Canadian Forest Use

Matthew Sawatzky

Canadian forest use has long been dominated by industrial forestry. Recent decades have, however, witnessed challenges from other forms of forest use and significant shifts have occurred as the forest industry transitions towards sustainable forest management (SFM) (Rytteri & Sawatzky 2013). This transition has partially succeeded, though conflicts still arise (e.g. Braun 2002). Luckert & Boxall (2008: 277) claim that problems in SFM stem from the, “fundamental mismatch between the property rights that have been conveyed to private firms operating on public forest lands and what the policy frameworks of certification and C&I [criteria & indicators] are expected to deliver.” While contributing to conflicts, the problem actually begins with different perceptions of forests (Sawatzky 2013). As we perceive a forest we begin thinking about what it is (*its essence*) and how we should use it (*our intentionality*). Once put into practice on the landscape, activities are prioritized in policy, leading to conflict and, if entrenched in behavior over time, marginalization.

Marginalization can be approached as a phenomenological problem, which means there is no single point of origin because the world is always already there for us to experience (Merleau-Ponty 1945, vii), and use a process of distillation to reveal and describe the truths of our lived experiences (Merleau-Ponty 1945, ix). Merleau-Ponty’s concept of the chiasm is helpful in this process because it refers to relationships of intertwining. People, places and things are both subject and object, essence and existence, and their reversibility

is a critical element (Merleau-Ponty 1964, 130). Using the mathematical symbols $>$ and $<$ to represent binocular vision, Lawlor (2003) illustrates how two individuals looking at the same thing form an X where their gazes meet. This meeting point is the chiasm. It may be a place of convergence or divergence because each individual only perceives part of the whole due to their different *positionalities* (identity and location in relation to the “thing” perceived). The chiasm is consequently an inherently geographic concept - a gap or space in which we simultaneously engage the world and others. This is where marginalization occurs and becomes manifest, first as sentiments, then as words (Lehtinen 2011) and relations (Kortelainen 2008), and finally as the structures and processes that Luckert & Boxall (2008) refer to.

Perception is affected by intentionality, or the manner in which our bodies are “geared onto the world” (Merleau-Ponty 1945, 292-293). Mobility allows us to change our perspective and positionality, or others can change them for us through interactions. Relocation shifts our positionality, and sometimes our intentionality, helping us to understand what and why others perceive and use the forest differently; though none of us will ever have a complete, objective understanding of an other (Merleau-Ponty 1945, 346). Intentionalities and positionalities are thus formed in a reciprocal process.

* * *

ACTOR	INTENTIONALITY
Government	Multiple use
Forest Industry	Commodity
First Nations	Holistic (subsistence, traditional cultures and spirituality, medicine...)
Environmentalists	Preservation
Tourists	Recreation

* **Table 1.** Principal actors and their primary intentionalities towards forests (from Sawatzky 2013)

Table 1 above shows the main intentionalities of Canadian forest stakeholders. They are not, however, equally weighted in the politics that govern forest use; a fact which has led to industrial forestry marginalizing other actors. As an example, I will use the case of industrial forestry in Eastern Manitoba, which began in the late 19th century (Howlett 1989) in conjunction with federal and provincial legislation granting private companies control over large tracts of forest in exchange for establishing mills to generate wealth from natural resources (Ross 1997). The paper mill in Pine Falls was established in 1927 as the Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company when much of the area's primary forests had been logged, leaving mainly smaller diameter trees (Historic Resources Branch 2000: 28). The mill was eventually bought by the Abitibi Paper Company (later Abitibi-Price) before the employees formed the Pine Falls Paper Company and bought the mill in 1994. In 1998 the mill was purchased by Tembec and, in 2007, it was certified by FSC. But in 2009 Tembec locked out its employees over a labour dispute and permanently closed the mill in 2010. It has since been sold and dismantled.

Throughout its lifecycle, the mill's *intentionality*, the way it did forestry, was primarily about profit maximization and exports, a longstanding Canadian tradition when it comes to natural resources (McKenzie 2014). Rytteri & Sawatzky (2013) highlight the mill's different phases of industrial forestry (cut and run to sustained yield to SFM) and challenges from other stakeholders. Most of these challenges began at the end of the sustained yield era and during the emergence of

SFM as Canadians became increasingly aware of environmental and indigenous issues. These shifts are the result of changes in the perceptions of what a forest is and they affected the positionality of stakeholders as new actors moved towards the center of forest use.

One potential starting point for SFM in Eastern Manitoba is the creation of the Manitoba Model Forest (MMF) in 1993 as part of the Canadian Model Forest Program (Sinclair et al., 1998: 6). Under the program the mill became a partner in a multi-stakeholder affair where the MMF's role was to conduct research, and facilitate communication and decision making (*Ibid.*: 2). However, the creation of the Pine Falls Paper Company (PFPC) in 1994 truly marked this new era in forest use as local employees risked it all in an effort to save their jobs and community at a time when the industry was facing serious challenges (Beckley & Krogman 2002: 192). Their hopes were that local control over natural resources would result in local benefits (Beckley & Sprenger 1995: 42) and the new company actively participated with the MMF. This was also the period when the majority of social science studies were conducted in the area (see MMF 2017).

Despite the initial impetus given to SFM by the PFPC and MMF, industrial forestry in the area marginalized actors until the very end. While the SFM practices put into place beginning in the mid-1990s successfully changed the positionalities of various stakeholders, they failed to alter their perceptions and intentionalities, which resulted in feelings of marginalization. To illustrate this I



Intact wilderness forests close to Lytton, British Columbia, Canada. Photo: Tero Mustonen

will rely on the studies conducted at the beginning of the mill's SFM period and my previous work in the area. The marginalization experienced by stakeholders took many forms, including social, economic, environmental and technological. For example, a study on forest dependence found that different communities around the mill were dependent on different types of forestry related activities and in 1981 forest services and harvesting accounted for 10% of the employment in one First Nation but by 1991 these jobs had disappeared due to technological advancements (Beckley & Sprenger 1995: 38). I will focus on the mill's social marginalization of other stakeholders.

Social marginalization here refers to the exclusion, complication or limitation of participation in forest governance and use. Forest management license 01 (FML), created in 1979, gave the mill

owner exclusive rights to nearly a million hectares of land and smaller companies had to deal with or work for the company if they wanted to work in the area. Historically, the public was given no say as to how, when, where and why areas were logged and company foresters were *de facto* kings of the forest (Beckley et al. 1999a: 3; Sawatzky 2013: 56, 154), effectively marginalizing other stakeholders.

The development of SFM in the 1990s was supposed to address this issue. There was an explosion of interest in forestry by social scientists and policy change (e.g. Beckley et al. 1999b) and the industry was increasingly challenged by other stakeholders as perceptions changed (Rytteri & Sawatzky 2013). In their report on the MME, an area which overlapped much of the FML controlled by the PFPC, Beckley & Boxall (1996: 6) recommended that the newly formed company

“Conduct open houses, round tables, focus groups and listening sessions”, “reach out to more distant stakeholder[s]” and educate its staff about Aboriginal culture and values (*Ibid.*: 8), increase transparency (*Ibid.*: 13) and conduct meetings in local communities (*Ibid.*: 19). The PFPC and its successor, Tembec, implemented these suggestions in their operations, but feelings of social marginalization proliferated and were readily visible a decade later (Pitkänen et al. 2011; Rytteri & Sawatzky 2013; Sawatzky 2013).

The SFM practiced at the mill took a step in the right direction by incorporating a wider array of stakeholder values and forest uses through its participation with the MMF. Advisory committees were established on topics ranging from woodland caribou and moose management to stakeholder values and this process increased awareness and understanding of other perspectives (Sinclair et al. 1998: v-vi). This report also stated that through the MMF’s research and inclusion of other stakeholders the PFPC changed its logging methods and increased its concern for other actors and communities (*Ibid.*: 15-16). However, there was also a common perception that the PFPC remained the most influential actor in the area when it came to decision making, even more than the provincial government (*Ibid.*: 8, 24).

Among other problems, the report found significant challenges with communication, including the idea that the most controversial topics were avoided (*Ibid.*: 10). There was also a troubling lack of participation by First Nations and many of the projects related to First Nations were considered to be failures (*Ibid.*: 9, 15). Complicating the situation was the fact the MMF’s offices were attached to the PFPC’s office, which led to perceptions of a conflict of interest, and too much focus on science and technology instead of social issues (*Ibid.*: 18, 19). The report, published the same year that Tembec bought the mill from the PFPC, stated that after years of working with the PFPC, no one had, “changed their perception fundamentally” (*Ibid.*: 24). In this regard, community forestry had failed.

When Tembec took over the mill it quickly committed to certifying all of its operations

through FSC. Forest certification was developing quickly at that time and the company committed itself to better SFM practices, including developing better relationships with First Nations and environmentalists (FSC 2017). Tembec also sought to create a joint venture sawmill and forest management company with local First Nations, but the softwood lumber dispute with the USA put an end to the project (Cash 2006; Sawatzky 2013: 57).

A decade after Tembec purchased the mill many stakeholders held similar perceptions to those expressed during the PFPC era, especially regarding the decision making structure, communication, the inability to properly address certain topics, like whether or not the company should be harvesting in certain areas (*Ibid.*: 170), and the MMF’s office location (*Ibid.*: 2013: 47, 87). Additionally, stakeholders without a vested financial interest in the forest had been told that their opinions did not matter, (*Ibid.*: 87), there was a lack of government representation during meetings (*Ibid.*: 92, 180), consultation with First Nations was being defined by Tembec (*Ibid.*: 117-118), linguistic issues relating regarding how information was presented to stakeholders were still present (*Ibid.*: 52) and the MMF’s focus on science for forestry (*Ibid.*: 169).

The enduring perceptions presented above are based on personal statements of feelings throughout the SFM period of forest use in Eastern Manitoba and can be interpreted as proof that the marginalization of stakeholders continues through SFM. While both the PFPC and Tembec obviously made efforts to work with the public and manage the forest for a more diverse set of values and uses, they were unable to stop marginalizing stakeholders. This brings us to the question of why social marginalization persisted during the SFM era of the mill in Pine Falls.

The introduction of SFM essentially shifted the positionalities of the actors, pulling the company a little further away from the centre of forest use and pushing other actors a little closer to it. But it failed to move the industry far enough away to change its perception of forests and its intentionality. We need to return to the creation of the PFPC

to begin to understand why. Beckley & Krogman's (2002) study of the buyout highlights some important elements. First, the employee buyout required an external investor, "a retired paper company executive" (*Ibid.*: 191) who purchased nearly one quarter of the company's shares. Second, the buyout resulted in a period of great social cohesion within the community of Pine Falls employees drew together to buy the mill and then local ownership brought feelings of pride as economic prosperity ensued when the newsprint market rebounded immediately after their purchase, allowing the company to reinvest in the mill and the town. Third, the euphoria eventually dissipated due to "unmet expectations regarding workplace democracy" as the employees found themselves in unfamiliar territory with local managers controlling the decision making process and receiving greater financial returns from their shares (*Ibid.* 201-202).

The employees who bought the mill had all learned *how to do forestry* under Abitibi-Price and the external investor came from an industrial forestry background. Thus, while it is possible that a radical change in ownership, like an employee buyout, provides the necessary energy and direction to completely change the positionality and intentionality of a company, that did not occur in Pine Falls because that was not the main reason why the employees bought the mill. They bought it to save their jobs and community. They were looking to establish *continuity*. Consequently, the mill's intentionality towards forest use remained largely intact during the transition from Abitibi-Price to the PFPC - they were still there to make money by making paper and exporting it.

SFM thus became a tool to improve its relationships with other stakeholders through activities with the MMF while making limited changes to operating procedures. Some positive aspects did arise from the adoption of SFM practices. For example, the adoption of variable retention logging instead of clear-cutting (Sawatzky 2013: 60) and some relationship building did take place through the advisory committees. Yet it failed to

address long standing problems of marginalization. The information produced by the MMF continued to focus on how to log better while the social effects of industrial forestry were minimized. Additionally, the wealth of information produced on social values and the necessity to include other stakeholders in decision making and not just consultation was never fully implemented.

The main issue here is that the perceptions and positionalities of the actors involved did not evolve enough to change their intentionalities. The PFPC and then Tembec sought to preserve jobs and a way of life through SFM, the MMF was unable to fully implementing the recommendations of its social science because of its close ties to the company and stakeholder participation at the decision-making level proved too difficult to implement. Perhaps it is a question of incremental change and the true potential of SFM is still to come. Until then, we need more research on the social effects of industrial forestry to address marginalization.

Reference List

- Beckley, Thomas & Sprenger, Audrey (1995). Social, Political and Cultural Dimensions of Forest-Dependence: The Communities of the Lower Winnipeg Basin. *The Rural Development Institute*, Brandon University. RDI Report Series 1995-1.
- Beckley, Thomas & Boxall, Peter (1996). Who will decide the fate of the forest?: Recommendations regarding the incorporation of stakeholder values into resource decision-making in the Manitoba Model Forest. Report prepared for Manitoba Model Forest Inc. 6.6.2017 <http://www.manitobamodelforest.net/publications/Who%20will%20decide%20the%20fate%20of%20the%20forest%20-%20Incorporating%20Stakeholder%20Values%2095-2-2.pdf>
- Beckley, Thomas, Boxall, Peter, Just, Leslie & Wellstead, Adam (1999a). Forest stakeholder attitudes and values: selected social science contributions. *Northern Forestry Centre Information Report NOR-X-362*, Canadian Forest Service, Edmonton, Alberta.
- Beckley, Thomas, Boxall, Peter, Just, Leslie & Wellstead, Adam (1999b). Forest stakeholder attitudes and values: an annotated bibliography. *Northern Forestry Centre Information Report NOR-X-365*, Canadian Forest Service, Edmonton, Alberta.

- Beckley, Thomas & Krogman, Naomi (2002). Social Consequences of Employee/Management Buyouts: Two Canadian Examples From the Forest Sector. *Rural Sociology* 67:2, 183-207.
- Braun, Bruce (2002). *The Intemperate Rainforest: Nature, Culture and Power on Canada's West Coast*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Cash, Martin (2006). Bands seek share in plant: 13 First Nations negotiating for 25% ownership of strand-board project. *Winnipeg Free Press* 25.05.2006. 6.6.2017 http://manitobawildlands.org/forests_mb_ind_ainsworth.htm
- FSC. (2017). *FSC Canada*. 30.5.2017, <https://ca.fsc.org/en-ca>
- Historic Resources Branch. (2000). *The lumber industry in Manitoba*. 6.06.2017, https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/hrb/pdf/lumber_industry_in_manitoba.pdf
- Howlett, Michael (1989). The Forest Industry on the Prairies: Opportunities and Constraints to Future Development. *Prairie Forum* 14:2, 233-257.
- Kortelainen, Jarmo (2008). Performing the green market – creating space: emergence of the green consumer in the Russian woodlands. *Environment and Planning A* 40: 1294-1311.
- Lawlor, Leonard (2003). Essence and Language: The Rupture in Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy. 6.6.2017, <http://o-p-o-phenomenology.org/pragueessaylist.html>.
- Lehtinen, Ari (2011). From relations to dissociations in spatial thinking: Sámi 'geographers' and the promise of concentric geographies. *Fennia* 189:2, 14-30.
- Luckert, Marty & Boxall, Peter (2008). Institutional vacuums in Canadian forest policy: Can criteria and indicators and certification of sustainable forest management fill the void? *The Forestry Chronicle* 84:6,277-284.
- McKenzie, Francine (2014). Faith, fear, and free trade. *International Journal* 69:2, 233-245.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice (1945). *Phenomenology of Perception*. (translated 1958, reprinted 2006). Routledge, Oxon and New York.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice (1964). *The Visible and the Invisible*. (translated 1968, published 1968) Northwestern University Press, Evanston.
- MMF. 2017. *Manitoba Model Forest Publications*. 30.05.2017, <http://www.manitobamodelforest.net/publications.html>
- Pitkänen, Kati, Puhakka, Riikka, & Sawatzky, Matthew (2011). The role of nature in the place meanings and practices of cottage owners in northern environments. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift* 65:3, 175-187.
- Ross, Monique (1997). A history of forest legislation in Canada 1867-1996. *Canadian Institute of Resources Law*. Calgary, Canada.
- Rytteri, Teijo & Sawatzky, Matthew (2013). Forest Access Regimes: An Analysis of the Time and Space of Forest Use in Southeast Manitoba. *Native Studies Review* 22:1-2, 83-112.
- Sawatzky, Matthew (2013). *Voices in the Woods: A Study of Forest Use in Eastern Manitoba*. Dissertations in Social Sciences and Business Studies No 55. Juvenus Print, Tampere.
- Sinclair, John Smith, Doreen & Bidinost, Angela (1998). Results of the Survey of Views on Manitoba Model Forest Activities Aimed at Achieving Sustainable Forest Management. Report prepared for Manitoba Model Forest Inc. Project 96-2-45. 6.6.2017 <http://www.manitobamodelforest.net/publications/Survey%20Results%20-%20Views%20on%20Achieving%20SFM%20MBMF%2096-2-45.pdf>