3 Choices and omissions of knowledge and social impact in Finnish committee reports on Sami policies

Jukka Nyyssönen

(7845 words)

Introduction

In Finland, the involvement of scholars in politics has been particularly strong: scholars and professors have occupied positions in high politics, produced research that was meant as a direct comment on topical political debates, and been active in civil society (Häggman, 2012). In addition to advising high politics and acting in civil society, the Finnish committee institution, a third emerging venue for social engagement from the late nineteenth century onwards, has provided yet another potential channel for scholars to act as state experts (Karlsson, 2000), and to gain a voice in state politics. The committee institution has its origins in the need for scholarly, objective knowledge in the service of the development of society. The committee institution was established in Finland as part of a corporatist mode of governance, defined here as an institutionalized mode of cooperation and negotiation between the state and different interest organizations: a regulated mode of interest-group representation within the governmental system (Borg, 1990; Helander, 1984; Ulvevadet, 2015). One of the aims of corporatism is to provide, but not guarantee, a voice for interest organizations in state governance, and thereby maintain harmony and avoid conflict in society (Raitio, 2008; Ulvevadet 2015).

Committees are nominated by the government to produce an expert report and suggestions regarding policy in a chosen social matter. They have formed an integral part of the government of Finland, helping the governmental system to plan the future and develop different administrative branches, plan new social policy and new legislation, and offer external expert advice to the administrative system. Committees have been viewed as a means of providing a say for all political parties, numerous experts, all regions, language groups, age groups and different interest groups, as well as both gender groups (Numminen, 1999). Committees nominated to address the Sami social condition directly, or which have dealt with Sami issues in depth as part of some larger theme (seven in total, published between 1905 and 1990; the abbreviation “CR” – Committee Report – and a year of publication are used in main text citations) form the source material and topic of this article. One factor common to most of the committees studied here is that they have all addressed a “long-overdue” issues of the Sami/Lapland: they reflect the marginality of the issue in general in Finnish administration.

The committee institution was intended to de-politicize difficult political issues (Karlsson, 2000). As Veli-Pekka Lehtola has criticized, experts producing knowledge, and the officials who make the decision either to omit or to implement that knowledge, are always situated, rather than impartial: they carry with them their own backgrounds and attitudes, they work under different external pressures (Lehtola, 2015) and they are affected by the dominant social and political discourses of their time, as well as by the political and administrative culture within which they operate (Nyyssönen, 2011). Lehtola has identified "key experts", mostly Finnish local officials, those who were the most involved in committee work, and has analysed their personal backgrounds and the viewpoints that guided their actions. According to Lehtola, the knowledge which these experts produced of Sami issues in Finland was a complex conglomeration of facts, ideas, beliefs and attitudes fetched from a number of sources, which were always scientific but sometimes repeated old stereotypes of Sami-ness, both positive and negative (Lehtola, 2012).

In this study, the committee reports are seen as a site of competing social agendas and as a site for different voices struggling to be heard; of lesser interest on this occasion is the other site of power, the implementation or the results of these authoritative utterances of knowledge. This is due to the nature of the Finnish committee history in Sami issues, where aspects of non-implementation are in fact more tangible – an issue which will be touched upon briefly later in this article. The main question is: what kind of functions and aims has the knowledge chosen for inclusion in the committee reports served at different times? The case used to illuminate these functions is the presentation of settlement history in the committee reports. Secondly, I have studied the choice of experts and scientific disciplines: these choices include mechanisms of omission and ways of framing the questions addressed in a way that conforms to state projects and/or state principles. Has the knowledge produced by the Sami been heard? How has the state machinery dealt with the voices from Sami civic and scholarly society?

The method followed charts how knowledge is transferred from one forum to another (research report – committee report – policy formation) by the use of metaphor. Metaphors (of the Sami) play an important part in the formation of scientific theories, since metaphors carry cultural notions and perceptions as pre-conditioning, pre-defining and integrating linguistic images of the research object. The metaphors also reveal the societal meanings attached to the phenomenon and, for example, how the research object is situated in relation to the speaker and researcher (Väliverronen, 1996). At least four kinds of metaphors of the Sami are detectable: as a subject facing modernization, as a citizen with identical rights, as a citizen with insufficient rights and as a member of an indigenous minority lacking special/particular rights. How the production of these metaphors illustrates the larger paradigm change in the knowledge production, and in Finnish Sami politics, is the central theme in this article.

The earliest committees – scientific knowledge in the service of nation-building

The first Finnish committee to deal with Sami issues was nominated in 1905. The committee's task was to study economic conditions in Lapland. The committee used reports produced by local officials, police chiefs and relevant ministries as the first choice of source. The statistics, which were produced on the basis of reports and questionnaires, soon turned out to be insufficient, and as a result, the committee turned to local people for information and data. Sub-committees comprising committee members were formed and sent to do fieldwork and organize public hearings among the local population. The local officials used in the first round were of Finnish origin, while two Sami officials were chosen because of their official standing, not because of their ethnicity. The aim of the committee was to examine how the traditional means of living prevalent in Lapland, reindeer herding and cattle raising, could be made more effective, and how to develop them. As such, these aims were rather modest, and as Veli-Pekka Lehtola has argued, the committee avoided aggressive modernization rhetoric towards the Sami; new settlement was not advocated, for example, in order to tone down the conflicts between reindeer herding and other livelihoods. (Lehtola, 2012)

The representation of the settlement history of Lapland echoed the general perception, cultivated in Lappological research, that the Sami had been subjected to foreign rule from the days of the "Birkarlians" (a population with Crown-given taxation, and trading rights with the Sami from the Middle Ages), and that as a result they had "fled" to the north. This narrative of Sami history matched the dominant idea of the Sami as "pure" Lapps, who were "humble" and prone to "escape in the face of the stronger"; it was a narrative that the settlement history and the current region they populated seemed, in a circulatory manner, to prove. In ethnic and cultural encounters between the Finns and the Sami, it was the weaker one who was prone to assimilation. At the same time, the committee report did attribute to the Sami some level of agency; by fleeing, they had preserved their traditional means of living and had begun to adjust their traditional means of living to the sedentary way of life. Generally, the relation between the settlers and the Sami was described as one of a diffusion of agricultural forms, a process in which the Finns showed no indication of accommodating their lifestyle to the new surroundings. The committee report included a more substantial chapter on the judicio-cameralistic history of Finnish and Sami settlement, based on official sources, writings and notes by local Finnish officials, and the few statistics on the subject; this was supported by a discussion on conditions for agriculture, based on agricultural science (CR 1905). Otherwise, no references were made to scientific knowledge. Agricultural science was a favoured and rapidly-growing branch of science in a Finland that was

still quite agricultural and striving for self-sufficiency in food production through its intensification. This branch was backed by a segment of state administration, generous state investment, numerous independent and state-financed research institutes, and an organizational field covering most of the country (Tapio, 2000). The depiction of reindeer herding was neutral (with the exception of a short discussion on reindeer theft, and the disturbances caused by Norwegian and Swedish stocks before the border closures), focusing on the organization and utility of this subsistence. Nor is the matter-of-fact tone disrupted in the discussion of the damage caused by reindeer to forests and agriculture, and the conflicts between subsistence forms (CR 1905).

As for reindeer herding, the report's rhetoric remained mostly the same: the committee wished to protect and develop it. In the hearings that followed the first report, and the higher we go in the administrative hierarchies, the discourse on agricultural settlement became more dominant. Agriculture and raising cattle were promoted as the most reliable sources of subsistence in Lapland. The follow-up consultative committee recommended a full-scale modernization of agriculture in order to enable a more effective usage of economic possibilities and to integrate Lapland tightly, and on equal terms, with the national economy. The harvest of the forests was one of the attractions. In the follow-up report, a strict positivistic paradigm in gathering knowledge and knowledge production dominated the report. Local knowledge was approached in a more flexible manner and was ultimately overruled if required, or if it broke with more informed aims voiced by the officials. The general rationale behind the committees was to hinder pauperization and to keep the region economically viable. The most tangible result of the committee was the new road construction projects (CR 1905; Lehtola, 2012). The metaphor for the Sami was that of a governed and definitely lower, humble subject on the way to becoming modern.

As the next committee (1938) was convening, the Educational Association of Lapland (Lapin Sivistysseura, est. 1932), a civil society organization, airing pro-Sami views, suggested that the committee's main objective should be to secure and conserve the way of life of the Lapp population. However, the cultural protection of the Sami was taken as just one amongst other questions within the larger task of producing a strategic plan and a programme for the new province of Lapland (est. 1938). The development of the economy of the region was a central task for the committee, as was the topical question of a protection plan for the Skolt Sami. Members of the committee included Tuomo and L.I. Itkonen, both well-known Finnish experts on Sami culture and society, but whose voices were overwhelmed by that of MP Lauri Kaijalainen, a politician from Lapland. The experience from the fieldwork undertaken by the committee, which became a guiding principle for the advocated policy, was that the Sami encountered did not appear "oppressed". Kaijalainen used the opportunity to deny such

conceptions by referring to (favoured) voices in the field requesting teaching in the Finnish language. The policy endorsed by the committee was that the Sami should not be differentiated from the rest of Lapland's population, for example by giving them special rights. Instead, they would need to be brought closer to the dominant society and the state, without which the population would suffer and remain as "sights for the tourists". Without integration, the Sami would not be able to enjoy the fruits of Finnish modernity, but would instead adhere to the injurious old ways, of which the Skolt Sami were perceived as an example. As a result of Kaijalainen's hard line, the committee did not advocate any special measures for traditional Sami livelihoods. Instead, the committee emphasized language and teaching issues, and the role of traditional means of living – of which the "potato committee" favoured agriculture and forestry. Ideas regarding cultural protection were not advocated, in the end: the programme of road building was the one most meticulously implemented, rather than, for example, those concerning education issues (CR 1938; Lehtola, 2012).

The sources of knowledge on which the committee's views were constructed were almost identical to those of the 1905 committee – official sources and local hearings. Natural sciences (geology, geography, research on peatlands, climatology, botany, demography, forestry science, even a short passage on epidemiology) had grown in importance and supported agricultural science, an important source of knowledge for the implementation of the committee's agricultural programme. A short passage on settlement history combined the ideas of withdrawing to the north and an ongoing assimilation into sedentary Finnish ways, justifying the committee's agricultural programme. The low effectiveness and low productivity of agriculture in the region, as well as the loose, non-sedentary workforce and organization of the work, were identified as the main problems within the region. As a solution, the committee recommended the sedentarization of the settlement and workforce, servicing effective and improved agriculture. Agriculture was represented as the region's main subsistence, and further research was suggested to support the expansion of agriculture. An emphasis on agricultural education and counselling shifted the rhetoric to being supportive of modernization, including a modernization of reindeer herding – in the committee's view, reindeer herding was significant in many ways: it needed to continue, but in a developed form, supported by experiments and research, and in ways that did not hamper the development of other, more advanced forms of subsistence and livelihood (CR 1938).

Scientific agricultural knowledge provided a way of framing the problems ravaging Lapland province, and the solution lay in the dominance of agriculture. This, the strongest tendency and discourse in reports pre-dating the Second World War, builds on a long thought tradition in Sami policies dating from the eighteenth century onwards (Hiltunen, 2006). In Finland, during the pre-war era, the peasant ideal was the nation-bearing discourse and ideology, which would secure societal peace from internal and external threats, and serve as a morally upraising ideal. The other

discourse that may be discerned was concerned with the pre-modern condition of the Province, its economy and the means of living practised there. All this also influenced the report's conceptions of the Sami, causing them to be considered mainly as objects of a state-administered modernization and Finnicization. One category of knowledge omitted was Lappological knowledge, in the sense that it played a very minor role in the reasoning of the committee (CR 1938). Antiquarian knowledge of the old Sami traditions produced in the human sciences did not suit the forward-looking agendas of the committees.

The institutional setting, choice of experts and politicians, as well as the general nationalist climate of the 1930s, did not support any other kinds of discourses. The metaphor relating to the Sami might be a lower Sami in transition towards the modern, and in need of elevation in the hierarchies. Such an elevation would better serve their condition and the interests of the nation. Another metaphor is of the Sami enjoying sufficient rights through the inclusion afforded by Finnish citizenship. But what about after the war, as the political climate changed towards more "democratic" values and policies, and important changes were made in the recruitment and composition of the committees?

The Sami join the committees

The "Committee on Sami issues" (1952) was established after an unsuccessful effort to appoint a Sami ombudsman in the state administration. Half of its members were Sami, including reindeer herder Oula Aikio, tradesman J.E. Jomppanen and Antti Outakoski, who died during the work of the committee. The aim was formulated as follows: "To secure the future of the Lapps in the economic and educational field." The committee was ground-breaking, in the sense that it introduced the term Sami to the state administration, produced an early language-based definition of the Sami and proposed a separate Sami area. The Sami were to be given more say in reindeer-herding administration and a seat in the state administration. Exemption from military service, their own state bureau, Sami municipal administration, their own Sami fund, as well as a Sami law, were among the demands made (CR 1952; Lehtola, 2012).

The sources of knowledge had not changed tremendously: experts and local people, field trips, statistics gathered from local sources, and local officials and reindeer herders. However, unlike before, this time Sami people, too, sent numerous letters to the committee and these were specially noted by the committee. Accordingly, the greatest difference between previous

committees and the new one was the space and weight accorded to the Sami, which actually lifted their voices up from the position of those governed, or from state-articulated citizenship. Another change concerned representations of traditional Sami subsistence and cultural forms: the lower socio-economic position was re-coded from signs of lower racial rank and primitiveness to a foundation for a developing culture. The problem occupying the researchers and anthropologists at the time – socio-economic development and its relation to Sami societies – was discussed from a pragmatic and cultural point of view: if the "backward" people were denied this, the denial would expose them to exploitation, and a loss of culture and human dignity (CR 1952). In this line of reasoning, the committee came close to a metaphor of the Sami being in need of special rights, but also cultural protection.

In this report, settlement history, written by geodesist, committee member and leading advocate of the Sami in Finland, Karl Nickul, begins with a documentation of the Sami presence in Finland proper and in the historical sources dating from the sixteenth century onwards. The Sami had been pushed away and withdrawn in the face of the settlement, which was to be restricted or stopped. The basic phases of the "classical" settlement history are not substituted, but they are coded differently to those of previous reports. A narrative of oppression is constructed by the representation of an insufficient protection of law, as well as the increasing conflict over resources and areas as hostile expansion. Taxation and other influences appear morally and economically negative to the Sami, who, peaceful people that they are, withdraw from a wish to avoid conflict with the settlers and continue their subsistence based on hunting, thus sustaining their dignity. Sami rationality is elevated to the centre, while the settlers are blamed for not understanding its subtleties. Sami complaints to the Crown about encroachments on "their lands" are reported, and the way in which the siidas could grant settlers access to their territory. Agriculture is represented as an unwise, unsustainable subsistence form in Lapland. This turn in the construction of the settlement history was based on an unspecified study by T.I. Itkonen, meaning that natural sciences had given way to human sciences. The Sami were to be prioritized in the usage of the natural resources, but the majority population should not be allowed to expand their living space. The implementation of the Finnish land use and settlement legislation was to be stopped immediately (CR 1952; Lehtola, 2012). Balancing between agency and victimhood, the dominant take on the report stresses the lack of rights and cultural safety for the Sami.

Results consisted of minor openings in the school sector, but the report was otherwise "forgotten". Lehtola claims, relying on Nickul, that the committee was a means of the state administration getting rid of the Sami question and the suggested concrete measures without actually doing anything: Nickul lobbied the state administration, and forced himself close to them, so he might have known this, but the demands and programmes were definitely radical for

their time – according to historian Samuli Aikio, the government ignored the report deliberately, due to the impossibility of its success (Aikio cited in Lehtola, 2012, pp. 430-439).

Due to the inactivity of the state in Sami policies in Finland, the next Sami committee, which published its report in 1973, had to take up the same issues as the 1952 committee. This committee was chaired by the departmental head of the Ministry of labour, Asko Oinas, but there were numerous Sami members in the group: herder Oula Aikio, teacher Reidar Suomenrinne, chief shop steward Matti Sverloff, teacher Nils Aslak Valkeapää, herder Uula A. Länsman, herder Aslak Magga and teacher Iisko Sara. Besides Sara, Valkeapää and secretary Pekka Aikio, all the Sami members and many of the experts belonged to the first activist generation, not to the emerging new generation of young Sami activists. The Sami majority among the members reflects a new phase in the Sami movement, and their access to the committee was an exceptional moment of progressive sentiment in the state administration.

The committee emphasized its own knowledge production, which had grown in scale and methodological sophistication. The committee made a research political statement, criticizing the way in which existing academic research had concentrated on "theoretical" issues, of interest only within its own sphere, and neglecting the concrete needs of the Sami communities. The more democratic research published in the report was used to show how modernization lagged behind in the Sami domicile, as did the increase in income among the Sami, by comparison with the majority population in the Sami domicile, and especially with that of the industrialized south (CR 1973, pp. 1, 40, 57-58). This report embodies the metaphor of the Sami lacking rights to the fullest extent.

A major part of the research was undertaken by a Sami research project on behalf of the North Ostrobothnian Student Organization at the University of Helsinki, and a study on taxation conducted by the Department of Geography at the University of Oulu. Studies were often preliminary, based on their own research or intensive interviews. Studies and short reports on the socio-economic situation of the Sami were inspired by social sciences, where settlement was only one of the factors covered (by Eino Siuruainen). Other reports included a study of the linguistic situation among the Sami, and access to services, housing, wealth, etc. The experts heard by the committee were mostly Finnish, but among them were some Sami herders or experts on fishing. The tone of writing in the research appendix was typical of the time, in its search for defects in the socio-economic situation from the Sami point of view, which was the most important transformation in the committee reports so far. The perception of the Sami had shifted from a pre-modern, withdrawn folk to citizens with similar rights, who eagerly demanded that these rights be fulfilled: in the actual report, a victim narrative is constructed through the increasing industrial-

technological and cultural-linguistic intrusion into the domicile of the Sami, an "original population of our land" and a minority engaged in inter-Nordic cooperation with other Sami groups; the narrative is interrupted by recognizing the recent progress of the committees working on the education language issue.

Another slight tension is detectable in the claims of improving the infrastructure and social services, relying on the source of the industrial push threatening the Sami. The aim of the report was the general improvement of Sami economic and social conditions. The over-arching representative strategy is one of diminishing space for traditional means of living and troubled Sami subsistence. References were made to the protection of the minorities by the UN and UNESCO, as well as to an emerging environmental crisis in the form of the limits of natural resources, and to the way in which future Sami means of living were reliant on those resources (CR 1973a; CR 1973b).

The settlement history, which merged with judicial history in the committee report, concentrated on the long pre-historical presence of the Sami, and on Crown-acknowledged rights to the lands, as well as the Crown's administrative intrusion into these lands. The narrative is one of Crown-protected usufructuary rights and taxation, which the Sami had interpreted as full ownership of the land, being integrated into the emerging new property rights and land taxation system. The Sami, however, lacked the status of an indigenous population, and the special protection of law, such as in Sweden after the taxed mountain case (on-going court case at the time), where the exclusive usage right of lands above the cultivation border was granted to the Sami. One of the scholars who was challenged was legal scholar Kyösti Haataja; according to him, certain Sami rights would have been annulled in the Decree of 1683 on forests. The committee was of the opinion that that the decree did not apply to mountainous and unpopulated areas in Lapland: no rights of the Sami were annulled, and they were further protected and acknowledged in eighteenth-century legislation, in the Statutes of the Lapp Bailiff (Lapinvoudin ohjesääntö) of 1760. The establishment of state ownership of the land not only clarified the land ownership between state and private owners: it encroached on "Sami rights", which went unrecognized, and did not result in Sami land ownership, due to the Finnish conception of land use forms equipping one for ownership. One writer (most likely Nils Aslak Valkeapää) managed to include two mentions of the fundamental error in thinking with regard to land: the resulting Sami forms of landownership were foreign to the Sami, who were only interested in utilizing land products, not the land itself, the ownership of which was incomprehensible to them. The chapter as a whole was written by a lawyer, or someone with an interest in law: an educated guess would be Heikki Hyvärinen, who was one of the committee's permanent experts. Professor of Law Veikko O. Hyvönen is referred to in connection with the issue of "unclarified" rights (CR 1973a).

These totally new ways of framing Sami issues were already evident in 1952, but it was in 1973 that they were fully set to use. The settlement history's potential for claiming and disputing land rights was articulated. This shift in research interest is an indication of a larger paradigmatic shift in knowledge production, from Lappological studies to Sami studies, in the service of Sami interests; another aspect of the paradigmatic shift, that of the Sami taking an active part in the research themselves, remained unfinished: the knowledge producers engaged in the work were still predominantly Finnish. This might reflect the issue taken up by the committee, as well: the uneven distribution of the fruits of modernization, and the lower educational level and lower number of Sami scholars.

The committee leaned towards global discourses and resources, the UN and UNESCO, environmental concerns and the general "progressive" sentiments of the era. This was partially successful. In addition to improvements in higher and vocational education, as well as in the Sami media, the most tangible result was the establishment of the first self-governing organ of the Sami in the Nordic countries, the Sami Delegation (1973), to fulfil the Sami's need to govern their own issues in the name of democracy (CR 1985; Lehtola, 2005). This may be taken as an indication of working in earnest to improve the situation of weaker, powerless elements of society. In the slightly longer run, other issues, which changed the way of thinking about politics, began to dominate in Finnish society: the national thinking on politics was imbued with global environmental issues.

The era, and the Sami, are ecologized

As early as the 1970s, but especially in the 1980s, Finnish state discourses became "thoroughly" ecologized. The global discourse on ecological threats became a truly powerful discourse, affecting everyday lives at grass roots level and, as a result, administrative structures (Ministry of the Environment, Ympäristöministeriö. Kahelin, 1991, p. 252). This breakthrough did not overthrow the imperatives of national security (regulating the threat from the Soviet Union) or the national economy (and the connected economic growth at every level of society), but it did have consequences in the thinking on the Sami. This also became evident in the committee reports produced from the 1980s onwards.

The “Committee on Sami Culture” (1985) had the broad task of developing and supporting (no longer protecting) Sami cultures (no longer in the singular). The committee was led by curator Martti Linkola from The Finnish Heritage Agency (Museovirasto), and had renowned scholars as experts, rather than as members. M.Sc. (Social Sciences) Ulla Aikio-Puoskari acted as (informal) secretary for the committee. The committee benefited from the multi-volume study “Lappi” (1983-1985), edited by Linkola, to which many committee experts contributed (CR 1985; Lehtola, personal communication). A new knowledge category was introduced: newly-emerging environmental research on the intensification of the use of the natural resources of Lapland highlighted the siida as an example of the last surviving ancient ecological form of adaptation. This survival was represented as proof of the environmentally sound subsistence form of the hunting-gathering society, and of later Sami subsistence forms as well. The dependence on and adaptation to the environment, the emphasis on the land/environment in the siida-people/siida-land scheme on behalf of the Skolt Sami, as well as Sami wisdom in the use of natural resources, were all fetched from professor of geography and expert on the Skolt Sami Väinö Tanner (and Karl Nickul). In this report, in an emerging scholarly discourse that stressed environmental issues, the Sami relationship with and dependence on nature were coded as positive (CR 1985; Massa, 1983). This turn reflected a broader change within Sami studies, especially in the environmental sciences in Finland, which were growing to be less state-oriented and more Sami-friendly: during this era, the “greening” of parts of Finnish scholarly discourses cleared space to represent Sami ecological knowledge positively and as a knowledge category in its own right. One reason for this was the coming of age of scholars growing up during the 1960s and 1970s in radicalizing, post-Marxist contexts and obtaining scholarly positions in the 1980s (Nyyssönen, 2019). In the report and in 1980s environmental research in general, however, the knowledge of Sami adaptation forms was mostly sourced from the old Lappological studies, while local forms of knowledge were not yet utilized in extenso.

The narrative produced of the settlement history is one of Crown/State expansion, which is explained in a circulatory manner by the innate logic and strength of the same. Lappmarks were annexed to the estate system proper, due to power political struggles and the need for an internal consolidation of the Crown/State. No direct references are produced in the passage dealing with this issue, but the Finnish historian Pentti Virrankoski, an authority on the history of Lapland, is one of the scholars mentioned elsewhere in the report. The narrative is Crown/State-centred and omits the Sami from the political constellation. The Sami are mentioned as those who assimilate in the southern Lappmarks, and who integrate within the system by establishing estates in the northernmost siidas. The closing of the state borders resulted in “smashing” the traditional areal system, due to “unnatural” border demarcations. The resulting chaos in the Norwegian pastures is represented as a major disturbance, which the dynamic and adaptable subsistence form managed to resolve in the end. As such, the knowledge is up-to-date and quite sober in specifying both the limits and the potential of Sami historical agency between the seventeenth and twentieth

centuries, a period of tightening Crown control over the Lappmarks. The narrative stresses the "crumbling", i.e. the loss of Sami rights to the Lappmarks, since the legal foundation for the establishment of state lands is deemed to have been nonexistent, which exposed the lands to industrial usage. Only settlers and those Sami who had adapted to the agrarian, Finnish way of life received any confirmation of their land rights in the "great partition" (isojako) of the 1920s, a project separating the privately-owned lands and the residual Crown/state lands, labelled in the report as an act of state-led colonialism (CR 1985, pp. 25-60).

Concerning cultural history, the approach was still top-down, concerned with majority cultural influences taken up and modified by the Sami (not the other way around). This was most likely input from a more senior, post-Lappologist Linkola (Lehtola, personal communication). Material for the report was compiled from various sources, directly from organizations and official sources, as well as from numerous scholars, both older Lappologists and younger-generation researchers. Linguists Nils Jernsletten and Pekka Sammallahti, as well as H. Laitinen, an expert on the Sami yoik, and Heikki J. Hyvärinen are referred to, and Sami historians Samuli Aikio and Veli-Pekka Lehtola appear as authorities concerning issues of Sami culture and literature. A group of researchers with Sami origins, or close connections to the Sami movement and organizations, was beginning to emerge – they were used and referred to more extensively than before in the reports. The 1973 report is used as a source for factual, statistical knowledge and for the definition of the Sami (CR 1985).

In the report drafting a language law, the tendency to recruit Sami scholars continued: among the academic members and experts, some of them students at that time, were Pekka Aikio, Helvi Nuorgam-Poutasuo, Irja Seurujärvi-Kari, Esko Aikio, Ulla Aikio-Puoskari and Anni-Siiri Länsman. The factor that had disintegrated, dispersed and made Sami culture and languages vulnerable was the industrial intrusion into the Sami domicile – an effort to use the ecological discourses of the 1980s is evident, resulting in an effort to consolidate a new ethnically and ecologically progressive interpretation of settlement history. The discourse on the Sami language was alarmist: one of the threatened languages, a people under threat of assimilation and in need of stern protection, a way of talking that had become typical in the 1970s on this topical issue. This notion was based on studies in linguistics and a study undertaken by the Sami Delegation on the usage of official services in Utsjoki. The committee referred to "research on" and "studies on" land rights, which would have proved the old landownership rights for the Sami (CR 1987, pp. 29-30). This was to become routine in the statements and reports made by the Sami. The metaphor was still, as with the Cultural committee, one of the Sami lacking rights.

The wilderness committee (1988) stands out in many ways as a disruption to the narrative of increasing Sami participation in knowledge production: a significant majority of the committee members and experts were non-Sami, and there was only one Sami among the authors of the studies cited in the report (Pekka Aikio, also a member of the committee, who lodged a dissenting statement in the report). The report is notorious for excluding Sami ecological and judicial knowledge completely. The committee attracted considerable visibility, not because of the Sami issues, but because of the then topical forestry dispute, where ecological questions dominated the debate. The Sami wished to raise issues of reindeer herding and legal problems, articulated as in whose lands the loggings were going to take place. Both issues were neglected: in the spirit of consensus, the committee decided not to include the question of landownership in its agenda at all. Elsewhere, during the dispute, the Sami used research on pasture ecology, which was most favourable to reindeer herding, but which was a new and debated sub-branch of forestry science, one of the key sciences behind the prosperity of Finland, and one producing dominant truths of the "wisdom" behind the forestry practices of Finland (Leikola, 2000; Rytteri, 2005). The new "radical" branch of forestry research, which seriously questioned the aforementioned truths, was not taken into account by the committee, trying to find a balance between conservation and the (clearly favoured) use of the wilderness forests. Forestry was to be sustainable, in the sense that the aim was to log the largest sustainable amount of timber from the forests, including those in the far north (CR 1988).

The committee report to which the highest expectations were attached by the Sami political elite was the 1990 report drafting a Sami law and "returning" the land rights to the Sami within a re-established Lapp village system. In the introduction the committee was already stressing the co-administrative form of the system, and how the Finns living in the region would keep their right to a means of living intact, revealing the need to act cautiously in the matter, which was beginning to be debated at that time. The knowledge used was judicial history and numerous branches of the law, while the most extensive platform was given to a newly-published doctoral thesis by Kaisa Korpijaakko, and to the ILO Convention 169, the latter used only sparingly, not to its full capacity. The historical reasoning on the property rights possessed by the Sami was based on studies by Korpijaakko and Heikki J. Hyvärinen. According to them, the property rights were fully comparable to those of the peasants proper, south of the Lapp border. The land had been owned by the individual Lapp as taxed estate, as hereditary lands, not as Crown estates (CR 1990).

The report may be viewed as an effort to formalize the metaphor of the Sami lacking rights as Indigenous People(s). These expectations were not fulfilled, however, and the negative reception of proposals made in the committee report resulted in a turning-point in the way that governmental officials related to the Sami question. State officials began now to repeat that the

principle of equal treatment for all the folk groups up in the north restricted the realization of particularistic Sami rights; this was especially the case concerning land rights. The challenge of international judicial tools, and the need to change domestic legislation to match the standard of international conventions, was earlier referred as an aim, but began increasingly to be articulated as a hindrance to the realization of Sami rights (Nyyssönen, 2018). This "hindrance" was expressed in a series of studies and reports on land rights published over the following decades, a process which there is no room to explore further here.

Conclusions

The committee drafting the Sami Law in 1990 noted how the earlier committees working on the land ownership issue in the Lappmarks had treated the Sami rights to land and water as ceased rights, unclarified rights (which did not hinder taking different actions with regard to the land), or just took a legalistic view of the existing property rights of the state as their starting-point (CR 1990, 29-33). This is illustrative of the position of the committee institution and the existing knowledge of the old Sami rights in Finland in the twentieth century: the committee institution echoed the judicial practices and discourses of the state, which constituted a strong systemic barrier (Meehan et al., 2018).

A committee institution is not a single interface, but a process by which knowledge is negotiated through complex procedures and chosen for implementation, or omitted (Bergholm, 2009; Meehan et al., 2018). Linking research with policy is neither linear nor singular: a plurality of science–policy interfaces are produced by local social orders and global hegemonic ideas and practices, which expose the real-life constraints of decision-makers, consisting of competing priorities, institutional capacity, socioeconomic differences and power asymmetries on multiple scales. In the state machinery, knowledge may not fit organizational priorities or political imperatives (Meehan et al., 2018). The state actors had to deal with Sami voices becoming more demanding and coherent, while the global impulses, (agricultural) modernization, the movement for the rights of the Indigenous Peoples and the environmental movement supported the local voices only partially. The parameters of state-articulated citizenship have so far prevailed in the negotiations within this governmental branch.

The internal set-up of the committees added to this complexity. The role of the secretaries (Nickul in 1952, Pekka Aikio in 1973 and Aikio-Puoskari in 1985) requires further research,

since their impact has been hidden, but was potentially significant in the actual, physical writing of the report. In 1952, the voice of Nickul was loud in the report, but the control of the texts may have become more stringent, the closer we come to the present time. The texts were discussed by the committee members, who were responsible for the committee recommendations, but who were also involved in other engagements – the "Lappi" edition, for example – and the secretarial load might therefore exceed their mandate, for very mundane reasons (Lehtola, personal communication).

At the level of the metaphors used, a progression of the Sami entering into full citizenship, and beyond, is discernible. But as early as the late 1980s, the boundaries of the political system were encountered in Sami ethnopolitics. In addition, transformations in the knowledge policy interfaces had served the cause of the Sami only occasionally to this date. The most significant exception was the establishment of the Sami Delegation in 1973, in part as a result of the committee working on Sami matters, which guided Sami ethnopolitics long into the 1990s (for more detail, see Lehtola, 2005). In general, though, the frames of the state guided the implementation of knowledge: in the pre-war era, by framing Sami issues as issues relating to Finnish state-building and modernization and, the closer we get to the present time, by using procedural means to question particuralist claims, inspired by international sources of law. The choice of certain preferred disciplines has had the same effect, willingly or unwillingly. The choice of dynamic agricultural studies over humanistic studies of the old, dubious ways of a folk up north was meant to bring about a change in these ways. The choice of environmental and forestry studies (1988) over studies of Sami Law demonstrates a preference concerning the risks and issues to be handled: interpretations of legal history produced by researchers favouring the Sami did not have the desired effect, but were later questioned, due to their alleged bias (see the article by Lehtola in this edition).

It is very seldom that the research done by researchers of Sami origin would have been implemented, aside from the work of linguists. The performative aspect of knowledge produced within the institution has been weak (Gustafsson & Lidskog, 2018), partly due to a choice of disciplines with weak epistemic power and usage value: human sciences, for example, have a poor capacity for implementation (Thomas, 1994), and the Lappologists had at worst voiced similar ideas of the Sami being in need of development to those of earlier reports. Epistemic power defines how social, environmental, cultural and other problems are understood, and how we act upon them. Performative knowledge both represents and constitutes the (legal) problem at one and the same time, and successfully reifies historical abstract phenomena into the common language of everyday political structures. In the case of the committees studied here, policy relevance was not attained, since knowledge produced by and under the guidance of the Sami organs did not align with the dominant problem-framings, and the doubt in the matter resonated

with general sentiments in the key ministries (Turnhout et al., 2016; Tuulentie, 2001). Thus, the studies on law and forestry were omitted.

As mentioned in the Introduction, the epistemology of the state has long built on an expectancy of, and acted upon, a dominant regime of evidence of *objective knowledge*. This form of knowledge assumes a nonpolitical science–policy interface (Meehan et al., 2018). As already pointed out by Lehtola, this has, unsurprisingly, turned out to be impossible, since the institutional setting is embedded in the political system and omissions of knowledge have had political consequences. In the final analysis, it is the Sami disappointment with and critique of the non-implementation which has turned this "nonpolitical" venue into a field of social voices demanding political potency, with matching rights.

Bibliography:

Official documents:

CR 1905: Komitealta Lapinmaan taloudellisten olojen tutkimista varten, Komiteanmietintö N:o 3 1905.

CR 1938: Lapin komiteanmietintö N:o 8/1938, Lapin taloudelliset olot ja niiden kehittäminen.

CR 1952: Saamelaisasiain komitean mietintö 1952, N:o 12.

CR 1973a: Saamelaiskomitean mietintö 1973:46.

CR 1973b: Saamelaiskomitean mietintö 1973:46, Liite: Tutkimusraportit.

CR 1985: Saamelaiskulttuuritoimikunnan mietintö, Komiteanmietintö 1985:66.

CR 1987: Saamelaisten kielilaki, Saamelaisvaltuuskunnan ehdotus laiksi saamen kielen käyttämisestä viranomaisissa, Komiteanmietintö 1987:60.

CR 1988: Erämaakomitean mietintö 1988:39.

CR 1990: Saamelaisasiain neuvottelukunnan mietintö 1, 1990:32, Ehdotus saamelaislaiksi ja erinäisten lakien muuttamiseksi.

Bibliography:

Bergholm, T. (2009). The making of the Finnish model. *Scandinavian Journal of History, 34*(1), 29-48.

Borg, O. (1990). Neo-corporatism and incomes policy: The Finnish case. In J. Sundberg & S. Berglund (Eds.), *Finnish democracy* (pp. 141-153). The Finnish Political Science Association.

Gustafsson, K. M. & Lidskog, R. (2018). Organizing international experts: IPBES's efforts to gain epistemic authority. *Environmental Sociology, 4*(4), 445-456.

Helander, V. (1984). Corporatism or quasicorporatism: The development of prices policy mechanism in Finland from 1968 to 1978. In H. Paloheimo (Ed.), *Politics in the era of corporatism and planning* (pp. 47-92). The Finnish Political Science Association.

Hiltunen, M. (2006). Tiivistelmä tutkimuksesta Maailma maailmojen välissä, Enontekiön asukkaat, elinkeinot ja maanhallinta 1550-1808. In *Lapinmaan maaoikeudet, Yhteenveto ja tiivistelmä Lapinmaan maaoikeudet-tutkimuksesta*. Oikeusministeriön julkaisuja 2006:8. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:952-466-295-7, accessed 22.08.2018.

Häggman, K. (2012). *Sanojen talossa: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura 1890-luvulta talvisotaan*. SKS.

Kahelin, J. (1991). Marginaalisesta ympäristöpolitiikasta ekokulttuuriin. In I. Massa & R. Sairinen (Eds.), *Ympäristökysymys, Ympäristöuhkien haaste yhteiskunnalle* (pp. 248-259). Gaudeamus.

Karlsson, C. (2000). En expert i staten. In C. Karlsson, *Vetenskap som politikk, K.B. Wiklund, staten och samerna under 1900-talets första hälft* (pp. 9-40). Skrifter från forskningsprogrammet Kulturgräns Norr 25.

Lehtola, V.-P. (2005). *Saamelaisten parlamentti, Suomen saamelaisvaltuuskunta 1973-1995 ja Saamelaiskäräjät 1996-2003*. Saamelaiskäräjät.

Lehtola, V.-P. (2012). *Saamelaiset suomalaiset, Kohtaamisia 1896-1953*. SKS.

Lehtola, V.-P. (2015). *Saamelaiskiista, Sortaako Suomi alkuperäiskansaansa?* Into Kustannus.

Leikola, M. (2000). Metsätieteet. In P. Tommila et al. (Eds.), *Suomen tieteen historia 3, Luonnontieteet, lääketieteet ja tekniset tieteet* (pp. 126-201). WSOY.

Massa, I. (1983). *Ihminen ja Lapin luonto, Lapin luonnonkäytön historiaa*. Suomen Antropologinen Seura.

Meehan, K., Klenk, N. L. & Mendez, F. (2018). The geopolitics of climate knowledge mobilization: Transdisciplinary research at the science-policy interface(s) in the Americas. *Science, Technology, & Human Values, 43*(5), 759-784.

Numminen, J. (1999). Valtioneuvosto. In J. Selovuori (Ed.), *Valta ja byrokratia Suomessa 1809-1998* (pp. 41-76), Edita & Prime Minister's office.

Nyyssönen, J. (2011). Principles and practice in Finnish policies towards the Sámi people. In G. Minnerup & P. Solberg (Eds.), *First world, First Nations: Internal colonialism and Indigenous self-determination in Northern Europe and Australia* (pp. 80-96). Sussex Academic Press.

Nyyssönen, J. (2018). Saamelaispolitiikka itsenäisessä Suomessa – kriittinen synteesi. *Faravid, 45*(1), 63-78.

Nyyssönen, J. (2019). Cultural heritage of the Sami in Finnish national histories 1894-2009. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 15*(4), 340-348.

Raitio, K. (2008). *"You can't please everyone": Conflict management practices, frames, and institutions in Finnish state forests* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Joensuu].

Rytteri, T. (2005). Metsätalouden arvot ja oikeutus. In H. Roiko-Jokela (Ed.), *Metsien pääomat, Metsä taloudellisena, kulttuurisena mediailmiönä keskiajalta EU-aikaan* (pp. 209-222). Minerva-kustannus.

Tapio, E. (2000). Maatalous- ja elintarviketieteet. In P. Tommila et al. (Eds.), *Suomen tieteen historia 3, Luonnontieteet, lääketieteet ja tekniset tieteet* (pp. 313-401). WSOY.

Thomas, N. (1994). *Colonialism's culture: Anthropology, travel and government*. Polity Press.

Turnhout, E., Dewulf, A. & Hulme, M. (2016). What does policy-relevant global environmental knowledge do? The cases of climate and biodiversity. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 18*, 65-72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2015.09.004

Tuulentie, S. (2001). *Meidän vähemmistömme, Valtaväestön retoriikat saamelaisten oikeuksista käydyissä keskusteluissa*. SKS.

Ulvevadet, B. (2015). En reindriftsnæring i endring: Organisering, politikk, deltakelse og legitimitet. In Bjørn Bjerkli & Per Selle (Eds.), *Samepolitikkens utvikling* (pp. 122-147). Gyldendal Akademisk.

Väliverronen, E. (1996). *Ympäristöuhkan anatomia, Tiede, mediat ja metsän sairaskertomus*. Vastapaino.

Other sources:

Personal communication: Professor Veli-Pekka Lehtola, 13.09.2020.