

ARTIKKEL 2

Mainna lágiin galget siiddat joatkahuvvat?
Siidda sulladallama gažaldagat
Sámi dieđalaš áigečála. 2/2010. s.25-56.

Translated to English:

In What Ways Are Siidas to be Continued? On Getting
to Know the Siidas whereabouts

Mikkel Nils Sara

Mainna lágiin galget siiddat joatkahuvvat?

Siidda sulladallama gažaldagat

MIKKEL NILS SARA

Sámi allaskuvla

Siidasáгат

Siiddastaladettiin lea juo boares vierus leamaš ságastallan erenoamážit bohccuid birra, ságastallan mii lea rabas buot siidda olbmuide ja masa sii áinnas servet berošteaddjin, guhtege vuogis mielde. Sáhka sáhtta leat nugo mat guodohanvuoruid gaskkas, go leat guorahallame mañemus dieđuid ja lagamus bargamušaid gaskavuodaid. Sáhka dat-tege viidu lassi dieđuid ja vásihusaid ovdanbuktimin, mat sáhttet guoskat juogaládje bargguide mat leat vuordime. Paine (1970: 54), gean čalbmái dat ságastallamat leat čuohcán geahčemeahttumin, lea gávnnan daid vuos čájehit ahte vuhtiiváldojuvvo juohke doaibmi bargi geatnegasvuolta ja vuoigatvuolta dahkat mearrádusaid iežas árvoštallama vuodul. Dasto ságastallamat leat vuohkin dáhkidit ahte guhtege mearrádus váldo nu buriid ja ollu dieđuid vuodul go vejolaš. Fikret Berkes ja Mina K. Berkes (2009: 8), geat leaba mearkkašan sullasaš ságastallamiid leame inuihtalaš bivdiin, juohkiba daid sisdoalu ja doaimma golmma oassái: osolaččaid mihttema dieđuid gártadeapmi, dieđuid juogadeapmi eará osolaččaiguin ja oktasaš jurddamálle hábmen (mii lea dahkkon iežaset giela sániid ja doahpágiid vehkiin). Go dal dieid čujuhusaid geahččá oktan, sáhtta dadjat ahte dat speadjalastet dili mas osolaččat hálddašit dieđuideaset, dovdamušaideaset ja máhtuideaset. Nuppeládje sáhtta dadjat ahte sii hálldusteaset atnet vugiid hálddašit dieđuid ja soahpat ipmárdusvugiid, ja iešheanalis dahkat mearrádusaideaset ja olláshuhtit doaimmaideaset.

Badjeolbmot, ja dávjá veahá vuorraset geardi sis, lávejit šuohkihit ahte vare livčče beassan baicca boazoságaid hupmat, eaige daid ollu muosehuhtti ságaid mat gaskkalduhttet bohcco ja bohcco dili dovdama. Dás áiggošin govvidit Norgga beali guovddáš boazosámi guovlluid siiddastalliid rahčamušaid fas «beassat siiddaid ala»¹. Ballu lea ahte in nákke dahkat dan, go artihkalahámi gáibádusat teavstta čorgatvuhtii

1 Dadjanvuogi lean luoikkahan dadjanvuogis «beassat bohccuid ala», man ipmirdan birgejumi nare bohccuid gártadeapmin.

ja bohtosiid buvttadeapmái leat sakka eambo bealdolágánat go dálá siidaáššiid biedggisteami dili.

Dutkamuša lahkonanvuogit siidii

Dutkamis lea gažaldat, movt lahkoniit guđege áššái dehe osolažžii das mii gullá badjeolbmuid eallinláhkáii? Dás ovddemus gažaldat lea, geasa ja man várás dutkama fuomášumit galget leat? Siidaáššiid dáfus lea omd. ain nu ahte vissis mearrádusaid, mat leat dehálaččat siiddaide, šaddet dahkat olggobeali ášahusat, ležžet dal vuoigatvuođaid čilgejeaddji, almmolaš hálddahaslaš dehe eará ášahusat. Dán dili lea dárbu dulkojeaddji bargguide mat leat heivehuvvon dáid ášahusaid vugiide logahallat ja oazžut alceseseaset ovdanbuktojuvvot dieđuid. Diet lea goitge muhtin muddui maiddáii dutkama doaimma. Diekkár dili lea čájehuvvon ahte bohtosiidda sakka váikkuha dat geavaha go dutki ovdagihtii ášahan kategorijaid dehe vuođđodoahpágiid vai bissu go oskkáldassan dutkojuvvon dili dieđuide dainna lágiin ahte hukse kategorijaid ja guorahallanvugiid daid vuođul. Brantenberg (1999) addá ovdamearkkaid dása sámi vuoigatvuođa áššiid ja konkrehtalaš diggeáššii čilgejumiin. Kvalitatiivva dutkan mii hukse teorehtalaš kategorijaid ja čilgenvugiid njuolgut daid dieđuide mat bohtet ovdan nugo omd. siiddastallamis (gč. maid Charmaz 2006), lea sakka dehálaš sámi siida- ja boazodoallodutkamis. Dainna diehtelasat ii leat nugo mat kvantitatiivva dutkan oalát hilgojuvvon siiddaid dáfus, muhto diet dutkanvuohtki dárbbaha kategorijaid, doahpágiid ja áddejumi čorgema (teorijaid) maid kvalitatiivva dutkan álgoviđe lea skihkidan.

Badjeolbmuid eallin- ja ealáhuslágiid birra lea áiggiid čađa doaimmahuvvon ollu dutkan, maida leat sápmelaččat liigudan ja rábidan dieđuid ja saji dilistaset. Servvodatfága lea mu fágasuorgi. Dán dutkansuorggi dáfus leat juo mealgat áiggi dás ovdal ovddiduvvon moaitevaš gažaldagat, nugo gean várás ja gean ávkki olámuddui sápmelaččaid dutkan lea doaimmahuvvon? Dađistaga lea biologalaš dutkan váldán lassáneaddji saji das makkár dieđut adnojit vuođđun hálddahaslaš ja boazodoallopoltihtkalaš mearrádusaide. Das leat maiddáii badjeolbmuid váldán alceseseaset válddi loahpalaččat mearridit mii lea ekologalaš guoddevašvuohta boazoealuid dáfus (gč. omd. Jentoft 1998: 112–115). Muittuhan moaitagiid maid Keskitalo (1994 (1976)) lea sápmelaččaid dili dáfus ovddidan oalle áigá juo, ja maid váldoáššálaččat ipmirdan dánin: Politihtkalaš ja institušuvnnaš fámu stuora erohusa

dilis lea oarjemáilmmi dieđalaš bargovuohki ja diehtohuksen doaimman valljodatvárrin stuorit álbmogii ja biehttalan unnit álbmoga beassamis ieš ovdanbuktit loahpalaš čilgejumi váttisvuodáideaset ja gaskavuodáideaset birra. Diet cuiggodeapmi ii dáidde vuos albma ládje čalغان buohkaide. Dása heive vel lasihit moaitagiid maid Agrawal (2002) lea ovddidan das movt dieđalaš oktavuodáin meannuduvvojit álgoálbmogiid dieđut (ja máhtut), maid válđoáššálaččat ipmirdan ná: Álgoálbmogiid dieđut adnojit anolaš diehtun dušše ja easka dalle go diehtagiid iežaset čilgejumiiguin ja proseassaiguin leat áshuvvon doallevaš diehtun, ja dan seammás maid leat sirrejuvvon dákka dan álbmogis ja dilis gos dieđut vulge. Fápmu hábme dieđuid láhkásis, ja diekkár vuohki logahallat álgoálbmogiid árbevirolaš dieđuid ii iešalddis veahket buoridit álgoálbmogiid dili.

Dán artihkkalis čálán siidasága siidda sáhkán, muhto liikká ferten miedihit ahte artihkkalhápmi ii sáhte leat jur siidasága hámis. Liikká navddán siidasáhkán, muhto ferten dalle dán cealkit: Dát ii dáhpáhuva nammija siiddain, go dain leat nammija siidaguimmežat geat galget beassat ráfis guorahallat áššideaset. Mun ieš gulán maid vissis siiddi, muhto dás ii leat das sáhka. Dát lea jurddahuvvon siidan masa gullet iešguđet nammija siiddaid siiddastallit ja earát geain lea beroštupmi searvat siskkáldas ságastallamii siidda hábmema ja sealluheami birra. Dán ságas leat álgun vissis dieđut ja mihttemat, ja dieđus maid árvoštallamat daid olis. Datte eai leat mahkkege loahpalaš mearrádušat das movt boahhte vuoru olbmot galget guođohit siidda. Mearrádušat maid guhtege dađistaga dahká dan ságastallama vuodul mii čađa áiggi doalahuvvo siidda birra, hábmejit obalohká siidda, nugo nammija siiddaidge. Nuppeládje daddjon, siida hápmahuvvá proseassaiguin ovdalii go olggobeali ja loahpalaš mearrádušaguin das mii dat siida oktiibuot galgá leat dehe makkár eará vuodđodoahpágiiguin dan galgá sáhttit ovddastit. Ságastaladettiin siidda lea lohpi árvalit ođđa kategoriijaid ja doahpágiid, go suige buot dat mat mis leat, dat leat oktii árvaluvvon ja geahččaluvvon. Gáibáduš lea dattege ahte dát fertejit veaddját dákka siidaságas. Jus dat doibmet bures, de leat fas fárus hábmeme iežamet jurddamálliid siidda birra.

Jus mat dal livččen leamaš boares vieru siidaságastallama olis, de goitge livččen galgat suige dás juo loahpahit, jus in ovdal. Čálidettiin osolaččat datte leat earáládje ja njozebut ollálagaid, ja dan dihte maid ferten joatkit guhkit sáhkavuorui. Dás fievrredan siidasáhkii maiddái čálalaš bargguid mat dan rádjái mealgat muddui leat bisson olggobealde dan sága. Áigumuš lea vuolgahit siidaságastallama dáid dieđuid

olis nai. Váikkususat ja deangasat maid olggobeali koloniserejeaddji máilbmi lea buktán áiggiid čađa leat maiddá sakka dagahan siidda muddahuvvama ja muhtomin rievadan siidda. Dán nai áiggi deaivvadeamet olggobeali máilmmiin váikkuhit siiddaide, eai dušše njuolgut oinnolaš beliide, muhto maid das movt eará giella ja dan vuohki hukset ipmárdusaid sáhtta váikkuhit iežamet jurddamálle siidabirraseamet birra (Kuokkanen 2009).

Odđa ja earálágán siidaságat

Nuppelágán siidasáhka lea sáhka siidda birra siidan. Siiddaid siskkáldas ja gaskasaš sáhka siidda birra, erenoamážit manemus moaddelogi jagi, lea ollu jorran das makkár hehttehusaid ja válljenváriid olggobeali mearrádusat ja váikkususat leat dahkan siiddaide ja siiddastallamii. Eanas lea dás sáhka leamaš das movt eiseválddiid ásahan ovttagat, ja muhtun muddui eanangáržžidemiid čáhkkenárbbut, leat dahkan badjeolbmuid iešstivrejeaddji ja iešmuddejeaddji vuoigatvuodaid ja geatnegasvuodaid ovdii, dehe čorga siidadoalu ovdii. Buohtalagaid dieinna vuolggahuvvui loahppa 1980-jagiid dutkamiid bokte maiddá dieđalaš ja boazodoalu čujuheaddji sáhka ja nákkáhallas daid gohčoduvvon searvevalljodatváriid birra, masa serve iešguđetlágán dieđasurggiid ovddasteaddjit (Brox 1989; Stenseth – Trandem – Kristiansen 1991). Guohtundili ja bohcco biologalaš goziheami ovdanbuktimiid ja searvevalljodatváriid spealloteorehtalaš lahkonaŋvugiid bokte (gč. Riseth (2009) čilgehusa daid birra) leavvá maiddá almmolašvuhtii govva das movt oktiibuot lea «boazodoalu» dilli ja manne dat lea nu (Kosmo 1991). Oba dien ságas lea Kárásjohka ja Guovdageaidnu doaibman ovdamearkan ja dutkkahassan. Servvodatfágaid dáfus dás dattege ovddastuvvojit moadde goabatlágán lahkonaŋvuogi, mas nuppit atnet ahte sápmelaččaid pastoralismma eai fáhte čilgehusráhkkanusat mat vigget dan nai fátmastit stuorit ságastallamii oktasaš valljodagaid hálldašeami birra. Das fertejit sápmelaččaid iežaset vuogit bargat bohccuideasetguin ja hálldašit eatnamiiddiset leat vuodđun (Paine 1992; Bjørklund 1999). Oanehaččat daddjon: Ságastallamat bohcco ja boazodoalu birra mealgat muddui leat gártama teorehtalaš kategoriijaid vuodul mat guđdet siidda ja siidaságaid olggobeallái, ja dien olggobeallásaš ságas ferte muittuhuvvot ahte siiddat duodai ain leat.

Dien sáhkadilis ovddidit boazodoalloeiseválddit odđa distriktajuohkinevttohusa Finnmárkku dáfus, mii adno dárbbaslažžan jus galget máhttit áhpaseappot ovddidit

eiseválddiid mihtu dahkat boazodoalu ekologalaččat ja ekonomalaččat guoddevažžan (Hætta – Sara – Rushfeldt 1994). Eaktun evttohussii lea ain eiseválddiid boares riekteipmárdus ahte guođohanriekti lea sápmelaččaid kollektiivvalaš vuoigatvuohta ja dan sáhttet eiseválddit mealgat muddui reguleret. Jurdda distriktrarájiiguin lea ása-hit sihke hálddahus- ja guođuhanriekterájiid (Ravna 2008: 372–375). Erenoamážit Guovdageainnu ja Kárašjoga badjeolbmuid ságain vástiduvvo namuhuvvon evttohus čujuhemiin siidda ja siidavuogádaga čovdosa. Duogážin vástádussii leat olbmuid iežaset oami siidaságit ja siidavásihusat, muhto dieđalaš ságastallan lea gal maid ollán sidjiide erenoamážit fellesbeite-sáni² ja dasa gullevaš ipmárdusvuogi bokte. Alddeset beaivválaš ságain adno doaba dárogiela hámiinis, dego duodaštussan dasa ahte dat lea sisa fievrereduvvon sátni man mearkkašupmái eai oro heivehallame cealkit makkárge árbevirolaččat adnon sámegeilsáni. Movt dal de leažžá, badjeolbmuid oaivilat mannet viidábut servviideaset bokte eiseválddiide, ja leat álgun bargguide oažžut láhkamearrádusaid mat dohkkehit ja vuhtiiváldet siidda Norgga bealde.

Norgga bealde lea siida dohkkehuvvon láhkadoaban 2007 boazodoallolagas, ja dakko bokte lea láhčchon sadi čorget siidaššiid ja fastain duoknadit rahtasan sávn-njiid siidavuogádagas. Dás lea ain ollu bargu ja rahčamušat vuordagis, muhto siidda sága dilli lea dál mealgat muddui rievdan. Gitta dien rádjái lea boazodoallopolitihkalaš áššiin, ja nu maiddái dutkamis, dajakeahtta jorran čuovvovaš miellduheaddji gažaldat: Iigo sápmelaččaide leat vejolaš ja buoremus bargat dehe eai go dat juo bargga bohccuiguin almmá siidda haga? Dušše dat go gažaldat baicca livččii njuolgut jerron, livččii dahkan ságastallama earálágánin. Gažaldat dastán livččii cuigen sápmelačča, bohcco ja siidda oktiigullevašvuhtii ja manin guhtege diein lea veaddján dakka dien oktiigullevašvuodas. Sápmelaččaid beaivválaš boazobarggut leat áiggiid čada doaimmahuvvon siiddaid olis. Seammas lea boazu álo eallán ja johtáladdan siidda olis. Ilbmudusat nugo mat masttadeamit, mastadeamit, geahčadeamit, geažotbealjít, rátkkašeamit, spáillihat, fleskkit, sirdimat, johtimat, čohkkemat, čeahkkaneamit ja nu ain eambo gullet siiddaid doaimmaide ja dáhpáhusaide (Bull – Oskal – Sara 2001). Siida lea badjeolbmuide álohii leamaš áigequovdil dainna go lea álohii leamaš dárbbášlaš ásahus oažžut barguid ja doaimmaid ollašuvvat. Ja dien doaimmadilis doibmet siidaságaid doahpagat bargamušaid dádjadeapmin ja njuolggadussan.

2 Jorgaluvvon sámegeilli gártá das sátni *oktasá guohtun* dehe *searveguohtun*.

Siidda otná riektesuodjalus

Siidda bistevasvuolta otnázi ja čuožžovašvuolta otná dilis gullá sihke dasa go lea doalahuvvon muddahuvvamiin ja rievdamiin eallevažžan buolvvas bulvii don doloža rájis, go lea ain doaimmas beaivválaš birgejumi barggaid ollašuttimis ja dasa nai go lea guhká leamaš dovdamiehtumin riikkaeiseválddiid láhkasuoji ja hálddašvugiid huksetettiin. Norgga bealde lea dál dilli rievdan. Siida lea dohkkehuvvon ja definerejuvvon lága olis. Láhkalávdegoddi muitala leamaš hástalus dahkat njuolggadusaid mat heivejit daid iešguđet siidaortnegiidda, mat eai galgga menddo čavgadit mearridit, muhto eai nuge luvvosat ahte eai duohtadilis sisttisdoala vuoigatvuođalaš mearrádusaid (NOU 2001:35: 10–11, 96–97). Dás lea, nugo oaidnit, sáhka njuolggadusaid birra. Dat galget čilget siiddaid vuoigatvuođaid eatnamiidda, dásset ealuid sturrodagaid, čujuhit siidda osolašvuođa vugiid ja nu maid osolaččaid geatnegasvuođaid ja vuoigatvuođaid. Dás lea sáhka siidda institušuvnnaš beliin, doaimmain mat čorgejit njuolggadusaid (gč. Jentoft 1998: 64–80). Nu sáhtá dadjat ahte siida oazžu saji valljodatváriid hálddašeddji institušuvdnan lága ja almmolaš stivrejumi vuogádagas, mas ain bisuhuvvojit distrivttat ja regiovnat.³ Duogáš jurdda ja vejolašvuođat leat das go siiddat ja siidavuogádat galget ieža leat fárus viidát barggus hábmets ja ollašuttit njuolggadusaid siidda iešstivrejumi láhkái. Dattege sáhtá dás bárti šaddat jus mat almmolaš hálddahus ja stivren heiveha siidda iežas stivrenteknologiijai ja dahká siidda institušuvnnaš subjeaktan (doahpagat maid Staunes (2007: 252) geavaha) mii galgá dahkkot gulolažžan alldeset ásahan jurddamállii ekologalaš ja ekonomalaš dássádallamiid (dehe guoddevašvuođa) birra. Dás siiddas leat vuordimis deaivvadeamit almmolaš hálddahusain ja stivrenásahusai-guin, mas čuožžilit vuordámušaid soahpameahttunvuođat.

Duogáš čujuhussan dasa manne Norggabeali boazodoalloláhkalávdegoddi oaidná dárbbu ja áiggi dál suddjet siidda ja dan eananvuoigatvuođaid ja iešstivrema, sáhtá oktiibuot lohkat dan go boazodoallu ovddasta sierralágán sámi eallinvuogi ja go dađistaga lea sihke álbmotriekti ja sisriikkalaš riektedoahttaleapmi ovdánan nana doarjjan dán eallinvuohkái ja siidda vuoigatvuođaide. Manemus moattilogi jagis lea riikkaidgaskasaš álbmotrievtti ovdáneapmi dađistaga gártan oidnosii doarjjan un- nitálbmogiid ja álgoálbmogiid vuoigatvuođaid ja iešmearrideami rahčamušaide.

3 Dieid almmolaš hálddahuslaš ásahusaid dáfus doalahan loatnasátnehámiid dan dihte go dat lea álgovide ásahuvvon gohčodusaiguin, *distrikt* ja *område*, maid ii sáhte jorgalit sámegielsániiguin, nugo mat sániin *orohat*, mas ovdal lea leamaš eará, iežaslagán mearkkašupmi.

Álbmotrievtti ollu iešguđet beliid ja gažaldagaid fárrui maiddá gullá gažaldat, guđe ládje suddjejit dát siidda? Dákkár gažaldaga dáfus lea goit siidasága dáfus dehálaš vuos oaidnit ahte siida lea olbmuid ealáhuslági ja birgejumi gaskaoapmi, muhto seammás dat lea vassis vuohki movt olbmot bargadettiin ealáhuslágiset ásahtit gaskavuodaid eará olbmuide, ealliide, eatnamiidda ja ilmmiide. Dás lea dakkár dievasvuolta man geažil siidda sáhtta oaidnit guoskkahuvvon oba muddui daiguin sátnejuhkkojuvvon eallinlahkkeosiiguin mat bohtet ovdan šiehtadusaid, julggaštusaid ja cealkámušaid teavsttain. Diekkár juoguiguin, maid eará gielat ja jurddaevttuid leat addán, sáhtta fertet mannat alldeset mohkkás dulkongeainnuid oažžut duodáštuvvot siidda suodjalusa. Diesa bohtá nugo mat sátni ja doaba kultuvra, mii lea sámegillii ja sápmelaččaid ipmárdussii leamaš amas. Diet eaktuda álgoviđe guovttejuogu mii lea dábálaš erenoamážit oarjemáilbmin gohčoduvvon birrasiin, ja bohtá ovdan nugo mat engelasgielat sániiguin culture ja nature. Dat mielddisbuktá maid dan ahte ii sáni nature ge sáhte álkjit jorgalit sámegillii, nugo dat adno doaban fáhtet juoidá eará go culture. Diekkár earalágánvuolta vuodđodoahpagiid dáfus ii gula dušše sámegillii ja sápmelaččaide, muhto maiddá ollu iešguđetlágán álgoálbmogiidda. Nu leat ge juo eará dutkit ovdal čujuhan diekkár doabaváttisvuodaide: «Oččodettiin stáhtaid suodjalusa lea álgoálbmogiidda leamaš unnimus vuostehágu geaidnu dohkkehit eatnamiid, kultuvrra ja diehtaga sirrema iešguđetlágán láhkagullelaš kategoriijaide (vuodđodoahpagiidda) mat nu galget suodjaluvvot sirrejuvvon riikkaidgaskasaš reaidduiguin ja sirrejuvvon stáhtaráđđehusgaskasaš ráhkkanusaiguin»⁴ (Barsh 1999: 15). Diekkár váttisvuolta lea maid gullan nugo mat Ovtastuvvan našuvnnaid (ON) Siviila ja politihkalaš vuoigatvuodaid konvenšuvnna 27. artihkkalii, mii davviriikkain lea nannosit siskiduvvon riikkaid iežaset lágaide. Dát artihkal oainnat gieldá stáhtaid dagaheamis unnitlohkui gullelaš olbmuid massit vuoigatvuodaset searválagaid iežaset olbmuiguin návddašit kultuvrraset, dovddastit ja dagolaččat dohttalit religiovnaset (oskkoldagaset), dehe atnit gielaset. Dás šaddá dieđusge eahpádus vuos das mii dat kultuvra lea, ja movt dat doalahuvvo buorrin olbmuide? ON Olmmošvuoigatvuodakommišuvnna dulkonvugiid vuodul lea dađistaga čielgan ahte konvenšuvdna suodjala sihke ovttaskas olbmuid ja olmmošjoavkkuid immateriálalaš

4 Artihkalčáli jorgalan sámegillii dán: «The path of least resistance for indigenous peoples seeking state protection is to accept a separation of land, culture, and science into separate legal categories, to be protected under separate international instruments and through separate intergovernmental mechanisms» (Barsh 1999: 15).

ja materiálaš kultuvrra. Dát kommišuvdna lea 1994:s čielgasit cealkán ahte kultuvra bohtá ovdan mángga hámis, das maiddá sierralágán eallinvuohkin mii lea gitalagaid eatnamiid valljodagaid anuin, erenoamážit álgoálbmogiid diliid dáfus (Lile 2008; NOU 2007:13, bind A). Dien vuodul sáhtá dadjat ahte siida lea suodjaluvvon sápmelaččaid eallinvuohkin, ja das ii dárbbat sirret mii lea kultuvra ja mii lea ealáhusláhki. Dulkonvuohki mearridage de maid movt riikkaid vuodđoláhkamearrádusaid, mat dáhkidit sámi kultuvrra seailuheami ja ovddideami, ferte ipmirdit.

Earret olmmošvuoigatvuodaid konvenšuvnnaid, lea láhkabarggadettiin maid čujuhuvvon ILO-konvenšuvdna nr. 169, mii lea erenoamážit álgoálbmogiid birra ja man Norga lei vuolláičállán juo 1990:s (NOU 2001:35). Vaikko dán konvenšuvnna mearrádusat eai leat earágo muhtun muddui inkorporerejuvvon dehe siskiduvvon Norgga riektái (Boazodoallolága ja Finnmárkkulága bokte), de dat daddjon presumšuvdnaprinsihppa dahká ahte riikka riektehoiddu muđuige galgá nu guhkás go vejolaš dulkot soahpavažžan álbmotrivttiin (NOU 2007:13, bind A). ILO-konvenšuvdna nr. 169 mearrádusaid dáfus dieđus lea, gehčcon siidasága olis, seamma dáistalus iešgudet vuodđodoahpágiiguin ja movt daid dulkot dan obbalaš dillái maid siida dahká. Dás šaddet gažaldagat das mat ja movt konvenšuvnna mearrádusat dávistit siidaberoštumiid. Guovddáš gažaldat lea nugo mat mii lea institušuvdna, dehe mii lea ásahus (nugo sámegeilat veršuvnna lea jorgaluvvon)? Okta vuohki lahkoniit gažaldagaide mat veaddjájit konvenšuvnna olis, lea nugo mat: Konvenšuvnna bokte galget ankke siidda institušuvnnalaš bealit suddjejuvot ja vuhtiiváldojuvot. Dat sáhttet leat nugo mat bohccuid gullevašvuoda merkenvuogádat, siiddaid orohagaid doahhtaleapmi ja eará siidagaskaš gulahallanvuogit mat bisuhit siidavuogádaga. Siidda sáhtá čilget aivve diekkár beliid vuodul, ja nu maiddá iežas siidda čilget ja vuhtiiváldit čoagganan institušuvdnan. Dákkár čilgejuvot sáhtá seammás doaibmat siidda váillidussan. Nubbi vuohki lahkoniit gažaldagaide lea nugo mat: Siida lea viidát go dan institušuvnnalaš bealit. Dás sáhtá ovdamearkan čujuhit ahte siida lea maid dutkojuvvon sosialiserema oktavuoda latnjan (Nergård 2006). Ja livččii sáhtán čilgejuvot maiddá johtti «báikkálaš servvodahkan» mii bohtá ovdan lágis mielde ja masa čatnahuuvvá olbmuid gullevašvuolta (identitehta), giella, jurddamállet ja obanassii eallinvuohki. Nu sáhtá ipmirdit ahte siidii gullá visolohkáii dat go konvenšuvdna buorrindohkkeha álbmogiid rahčamušaid oazžut čilgejuvot eananrivttiideaset ja hálddusteaset atnit ásahusaideaset, eallinvugiideaset, birgejumiset, gullevašvuodaset, gielaset ja oskkuset stáhtaid siste gos ellet (ILO-konvenšuvdna 2003: 10).

Álbmotrievttis leat álgoálbmotvuoigatvuođat, nugo dat mat gullet iešmearri-deapmái, ain ovdáneame čielgaseabbon ja dárkileabbon ođđa bargguiguin. Okta dáin lea Julggaštus eamiálbmogiid vuoigatvuođaid birra, maid ON válđočoahkkin mearridii 2007:s. Nubbi eará fas lea evttohuvvon Davviriikkalaš sámekonvenšuvdna. Vaikko dás lea vuos sáhka julggaštusas ja evttohuvvon konvenšuvnnas, de dat čilgejit álbmotrievtti dulkoma ja vieruid ovdánan dásiid. Dárkiletvuođa dáfus sáhtta ovdamearkan namuhit ahte goappeš diet dokumeanttat geassiba ovdan ahte álgoálbmogat ja sápmelaččat galget beassat bisuhit, ovddidit, alcceaset ávkin atnit ja oažžut dohkkehuvvot árbevirolaš dieđuideaset ja máhtuideaset, jurddahanvugiideaset ja dieđavugiideaset. Go diekkár beliid laktá sápmelaččaid vuoigatvuođaide hálddusteaset atnit ja ovdánahttit eatnamiiddiset ja daidda gullelaš valljodagaideaset, ja das maiddái buot álbmogiidda gullelaš iešmearrideami vuoigatvuođaide (Henriksen 2008), de lea das čuvgehus dan birra nai movt iešheanalis doaibmi siiddaid galgat geahččalit suodjalit álbmotrievtti bokte. Dás datte in áiggo suorgásit álbmotrievtti viidáset ságastallamii.

Mas mii diehtit siidda ...

Dás bajilčálacealkka geažida guovttelágán lahkonanvuogi. Dás sáhttit dadjat vuos ná: Mas mii diehtit dan, lea danne go ... (mas de čuvvot čilgehusat). Dás čujuhuvvo dat mii maid láve gohčoduvvot epistemologijian, mii erenoamážit čujuha dieđalaš diehtima vuođu ja lávkkiid. De sáhttit maid dadjat ná Mas mii diehtit dan, danne go ... (mas de čuvvot eahpádusat). Dás čujuhuvvo dat go álo lea gažaldat leago dieđu doarvi, muhto liikká ollu dat go čalbmi vállje, mii dieđaságastallamis maid lea daddjon dan mađe garrasit go: «Bagadallan ii goassege sáhte leat dego dat mii lea bagadallojuvvon – buot eanemus, bagadallan ii sáhte leat dat mii lea bagadallojuvvon»⁵ (Bateson – Bateson 1988: 151).

Mas-mii-diehtimiin sáhttit guorrat mánggaid geainnuid siidii. Diet geainnut dolvot min siiddaid iešgudeťlágán osiide ja oaidninmuttuide. Mun lean válljen dieid geainnuid sirret dáinna lágiin:

5 Artihkalčálalli jorgalan sámegeillii dán: «A description can never resemble the thing described – above all, the description can never *be* the thing described» (Bateson – Bateson 1988: 151).

- Dutkanvuđđosaš čállagat mat erenoamážit váldet ovdan daid beliid siiddas mat leat dutkiide leamaš olámuttus iešguđetládje ja maid sii leat giedahallan.
- Čálalaš gáldut mat eai váldde ovdan dehe dievvaseappot oainne siidda, muhto maid bokte sáhtttá časkkahallat siidda.
- Boares sámi máidnasat ja mitalusat mat leat áimmuin juogo čálalaš, njálmmálaš dehe goappeš hámis.
- Olbmuid dálá njálmmálaš čilgehusat, mitalusat ja muittut iežaset dehe ovd-dit buolvvaid fearániid, vásuid ja vávuid birra.
- Oahpásnuvvan doaibmevaš siidadiliide, mas leat muitaleaddjin sihke olbmuid ságastallamat, elliid luondu ja eatnamiid, dálkkiid ja ilmmiid vásihusat ja dovddiidusat.

Dán artihkkalis lean váldán sáhkavuodu ja atnán ávkki buot diein diehtogainnuin. Dasto vel lean atnán ávkki dieđalaš bargguid teorehtalaš ságastallamiin, maid dieđakritihkalaš doaimma vuodđun maiddái leat leamaš álgoálbmogiid earálágán jurddahanvuogit. Dása de boahťa lasáhussan ahte ii vel dáid bargovugiiguin ge nákke čoaggit jierpmi mii vuoksu dievvasit čilget siidda. Mii lea olámuttus lea geahči mainna álggahit sága siidda vuodđojurdaga ja oktasaš jurddamálliid birra. Ieš dát sáhka ferte fas leat dakkár mii lea ráddjejuvvon ja jurddahuvvon doaibmat iešguđege sáhkadilis. Dás lean, nugo ovdalis lean čilgen, välljen dan leat siidasullasaš viidát fátmasteaddji sáhkan, goitge osolaččaid dáfus.

Mas mii diehtit dutkama ja čálalaš gálduid bokte ...

Riektedutki Erik Solem lea gávnnahan ahte badjeolbmuid siidavuogádat lea vuolgán álgovide siidavuogádagas, muhto heivehuvvon boazoealuid doallamii (Solem 1970 (1933): 106). Boazoealuid stuorrun lea dávjá čujuhuvvon válđoáššin dien molsahuvvamis ja seammás duogáš eaktun nuppi boatkkagii dehe molsahuvvamii, man áššin leat eambo eatnamat go iešalddis eallinvuogit. Boares siidarájiid rihkkuma váidalusain vuohttit dan mii nuppeládje lea leamaš mihtilmas molsahuvvan siidda joatkevašvuodas (Jebens 1993: 383; Pedersen 1994: 52–63). Go dal diet lea namuhuvvon, de veadjá sáhttit dadjat dálá siidasáhkii leame liikka dehálaš dehe dehálet jearrat, mat leat baicca joatkevašvuoda mihtilmas bealit? Dás čuvvot moadde árvalusa čálalaš gálduid ja otná siidasága čujuhusain.

Dološ siiddat, mat girjjiin leat gohčoduvvon bivdosiidan, leat ain diehttevasas anjke dutkamiid bokte mat leat vuodđun atnán vurkkoduvvon čálalaš gálduid (Solem 1970 (1933); Tegengren 1952 ja 1977; Nickul 1977; Vorren 1978a ja 1989) dehe mañemus doaibmi siiddaid mat ain eanasmuddui sulastahte daid ovdalet siiddaid (Tanner 1929; Nickul 1948). Dáid vuodul lea vejolaš ovdanbuktit diehtun ahte siiddain ledje iežaset eatnamat, sirrejuvnon boares vieru eananrájiiguin mat ledje ránnjasiiddaid gaskka. Muđui dát eatnamat, čázit ja valljodatvárit mat ledje rájiid siste, eai visot adnon searveoapmin, muhto muhtun ráji dain berre bearrašat buolvvas bulvii. Fas eará valljodatvárit, mat gáibide eanet olbmuid searaid jus galge olihit ávkki, ledje fas searvevalljodahkan ja seammás maid ledje oassin das mii dagai siidaservvoštallama dárbbu. Mañjelet siiddaide, maid muhtomin lávejit gohčoduvvot boazosiidan, lea maiddá leamaš dehálaš alcceseaset doalahit sierra eatnamiid. 1700-jagiid siste lea juo čielga ipmárdus das gos siiddain leat alldeset johtingeainnut ja orohagat, ja badjeolbmot maid ovddidit gáibádusaid oazžut riikkaeiseválddiid nai formálalaččat dohkkehit boares anu ja vieru siidaeananjuohkimiid (Schnitler 1929; Smith 1938). Dás sáhtta jurddahit sáhkkan leamaš dušše boazoorohagaid, muhto seammás leat dieđut mat čujuhit dan ahte dalá johttisápmelaččat gehčče sihke ealáda bohccuide ja bivdovejolašvuodaid válljedettiin siiddastallanbáikkiid ja goađastallansajiid (Lilienskiold 1942 (1698)).

Boarráseamos siiddaid dieđut leat adnon duogáš diehtun sámi eananvuoigatvuoda áššiid čielggadanbargguin mañemus áiggiid, ja leat nu šaddan iešguđetládje áigeovdilin obalohkái sápmelaččaid guovdu. Dás datte in áiggo guorastit dien luotta otnáži. Baicca lean mihtten makkár čálalaš dieđuid leat dalá siiddastalli badjeolbmot ohcalan, anjke sii geat gullet guovddáš ja eanasmuttu boazosámi guovluide Norgga bealde. Sin mielas galggaše erenoamážit dieđut mat čájehit boazosiiddaid eatnamiid čanastagaiguin. Dás dieđusge sáhtta jurddahit ahte lea dan dihte go eananvuoigatvuodaid čilgema barggut leat leamaš boađeboadi Finnmárkkus. Nuppi dáfus sáhtta fas dadjat ahte dieidda beliide ii livčče leamaš beroštupmi jus dat eai livčče dávistan sáhkavuodu ja dehálašvuoda árvvoštallama mii lea siiddain. Servvodatfágalaš ságastallamiin lea «báikkálaš servvodat», ja das báikkálašvuoha, leamaš guovddáš vuodđodoaba. Johttisámi siiddaide leat báikkít dušše oasis olles sin eananviidodagas. Báikkálašvuoda ságas sii álkit sáhttet báhcit eret, dehe sii garcastuvvojit juogalágán mahkášbáikkálaš gullelašvuhtii. Jus galggaš báikkálaš servvodaga doahpagii buohtalas doaba mii buorebut ovddasta siidda, de livččii dat

duovdatlaš servvodat. Duovdatlaš ovttagada huksen, dehe movt iešguđetlágán ja guhkálaga eatnamat dahket sierra ovttagada, lea vuđolaš siidda erenomášvuoda ipmárdussii. Boares bivdosiiddaid rájes lea gitta 1950 sulaide áigegaska man dáfus eai leat dahkkon mahkkege dutkamiid dehe diehtočohkkenbargguid mat dievvaseappot buvttáše ovdan boazosiiddaid duovdatlašvuoda, dehe daid orohagaid ja johtolagaid. Dás váilot ollu dieđut boazosiiddaid birra. Čálalaš gálduid bokte boahá ovdan ahte 1800-jagiid rádjegiddemiid ja čuovvovaš rojahusaid maŋŋil leat siiddat fas sajáiduvvame, ja olbmuide ja bohccuide lea čielga ášši goal guđege siidda geasse- ja dálveorohagat leat (Solem 1970 (1933): 190–191). Datte easka maŋŋel nuppi máilmmisoađi almmuhuvvojit etnográfalaš barggut mat sakka dievvasit čájehit siiddaid orohagaid ja johtingeainnuid, ja velá rájiid orohagaid gaskka (Manker 1953; Vorren 1962). Finnmarkkus leat erenoamážit Vorrena girjiit leamaš divdna anus sihke siidagaskasaš ságastallamiin ja čielggadanbargguin siiddaid eananvuoigatvuodaid birra (Fløtten – Ravna – Päiviö 2002; Hætta et al. 2003 ja 2004). Stuora beroštupmi diehtit ovdalaš nammija siiddaid lea maid duogážin dasa go maŋemus áiggiid leat almmuhuvvon arkiivadieđut dáid birra (Bull 2005; Sara 2006a ja 2006b). Namuhuvvon girjjálaš gálduid ja dálá siidasága vuodul árvalan dása vuosttaš vuodđodoahpaga siidii gullevažžan: *duovdatlašvuohhta*.

Muđui leat maŋemus 50–60 jagis almmuhuvvon sosialantropologalaš dutkanbarggut mat erenoamážit váldet ovdan siiddaid dahkamiid olmmošgaskavuodalaš minstariid ja muddenváriid (Whitaker 1955; Pehrson 1964; Paine 1964). Dása sáhtán lasihit iežan muitalusa: Go lean geahččalan dahkat siidda eambo oinnolaš ásaheasan almmolašvuodas ja almmolaš riektedohkkeheadji vuogádagas, de lean geavahan maiddá dieid girjiid diehtun ja duodáštussan čájehan várás siidda maiddá olmmošgaskavuodalaš organisašuvdnan (Sara 2001). Dieid ja maiddá duoid ovdabealde namuhuvvon čálalaš gálduid čoahkkáigeasu vuodul lasihan dás nuppi ja dán vuoru oahppáset vuodđodoahpaga siidda dáfus: *siidaguimmešvuohhta*. Diet lea dakkár doaba man gollosis leat dán áiggi ollu gažaldagat maid birra lea siiddain ollu sáhka. Norgga bealde láchkamearrádusa doalloovttadat ja dasa gullevaš hálldahuslaš vuogádat moadjudii boares vieru siidaguimmešvuoda. Ođđa láchkaevttohus rabai siidaosolašvuoda ásaheamiin siidii juogalágán vejolašvuoda soahpamiin ieš eambo hálddašit láchkaásahan ovttagada. Loahpalaš láchkamearrádus goitge fas nuppástuhtii soahpama eavttuid liigemearrádusain dan birra movt galgá juohkit boazologu unnideami siidda siste jus ieža eai soabat. Dákkár mearrádus váikkuha siidda

soahpanvejolašvuodaide, ja ieš ovddida iežas anu, dat šaddá iešollašuhhti einnostus-
san (Jentoft 1998: 88). Dáinna lágiin lea siidaoassi, eallooasi mearkašumiin, váldime
siidaguimmešvuoda saji. Láhkamearrádus gievruda siiddasiskkáldas gilvobeali, mii
buot geažimusas sáhtttá váikkuhit sierrasiiddastallama. Siiddain lea álo leamaš juoga
dásšen sierastallama ja searvedoaimmaid gaskka. Viidon sierastallan sáhtttá goanjidit
siidda siskkáldas searvedoaimmaid ovdánavejolašvuodaide.

Manjel ovddabealde namuhuvvon bargguid leat almmuhuvvon barggut mat
čájehit siiddaid vuhtiváldámušaid ja bargovugiid bohccuid dáfus leame earálágánin
go olggobeali čielggadeddjiid, eiseválddiid ja maiddá muhtun dutkiid ráhkadan
govahusaid das makkár boazodoallu lea dehe galggašii leat (Bjørklund – Brantenberg
1981; Paine 1994; Kalstad 1997; Brantenberg 1999; Forbes et al. 2006; Tyler et
al. 2006; Joks et al. 2006; Ravna 2008). Badjeolbmuid oami-iežaset máhtut ja
beroštumit, ja siidaboazodoalu čujuhusat, gessojuvvojit ovdan vuhtiváldámuššan
ja mealgat muddui vástádussan dasa go nugo mat eanangáržžideamit, dálkkádagat
ja maiddá eiseválddiid hálddašeapmi ja stivren leat gártame rásehussan ovdalaččas
doaibmi boazodoallo- ja siidavugiide. Ná geahčastagat dáidda vugiide dehe sámi
boazodoallomáhtolaš geahčastagat adnojit veahkkin vávjevaččat guorahallat
dieđalaččat, hálddahuslaččat ja politihkalaččat meannuduvvon boazodoalloáššiid.
Dáid bargguid bohtosat ja rávvagat čujuhit sámi árbevirolaš máhtuid ja ipmárdu-
said obalohká, ja maiddá siidavuogádaga erenoamážit, doallevuodđun boahhtevas
sámi boazodoalu ovdánahttimii. Dáid čálalaš bargguid ja dálá siidasága vuodul
lasihan goalmát vuodđodoahpaga siidii gullevažžan: *máhtolašvuohhta*. Dása gullet
siidaháldosaš mihttemat, dovddiidusat, hárváneamit ja jurddamállet dehe vuđolaš ip-
márdusvuogit. Dieid eambo gieđahalan dás manjelis.

Čálalaš gálduid searvá namuhan girjjiid maid ovdalaš boazosápmelaččat dehe
badjeolbmot leat čállán (Skum 1955; Turi 1987 (1910); Pirak 1993 (1937); Hætta
– Bær 1958). Dáin čállosiin adnojit sánit nugo *siida*, *orohat* ja *johtolat* dego buot
lohkkit ipmirdivčče mat dát leat. Čilgejumit leat baicca siiddaid bargguid, vieruid ja
fearániid birra, muhtomin eatnamiid ja olbmuid namaid čujuhusaid mielde. Čalliide
orru siida leame diehttelasat addon eaktu, ja visot dáhpáhusat ja gullevaš osolaččat
leat dan siste. Dáidda girjjiide lasihan Nils Oskalis goit erenoamážit dan oasi su girjjis
mii lea sámegillii boazolihku ja olmmošlašvuoda birra (1995: 83–111). Mángga dá-
fus dát čállosat *leat* siidasáгат. Buot dehálaččamus oahppa siidaságain lea ahte siidda
eai mearrit dušše njuolggadusat ja organisašuvnnalaš sárggastagat. Siida mealgat

muddui mearriduvvo ja seailu siiddastallamiin, dehe proseassaiguin mat dađi mielde dollet ja hábmejit siidda. Seamma dán fuomášupmái sáhtta dát sámi girjjálašvuohta doaibmat muittuhussan, dat čujuha beaivválaš iešbisuheami, sierra jurddamáilmmi ja iešhutkevaš ovdánahttima doaimma sakka dehálaš vuohkin bisuhit siidda. Dán vuodul lasihan vel ovtta vuodđodoahpaga mainna siidda fáhtet: *siiddastallan*.

Diedalaš čállosiin láve dáphi čujuhit jearahallamiidda, geardduhit muhtun ceal-kaga dehe čilgehusa, ja de guorahallat daid vissis analyhtalaš lahkonaivugiin. Dás lean dien muhtun ládje jorgalan ruovttogežiid. Dás lean atnán duogáš siidaságaid vuodđun rehkenastit ja juohkit dieđuid, ja čorget daid vuodđodoahpagiidda mat sáhttet soabahit čielgaset jurddamálle das mii siida lea. Čuovvovaččat válddán ovdan siiddaid ja dálá almmolaš boazodoallogovahallama gaskasaš sátnádallama. Dan badjeolbmot mángga dáfus gehččet sátnádallamin mii guoská siiddastallama máhtuide ja iešmearrideami eavttuide. Nuppi bealde diet sáhka fas lea ovddiduvvon erenoamážit ekologalaš guoddevašvuođa gažaldahkan. Das áiggun moaitevaččat lahkoniid dieđavuđđosaš jurddaráhkkanausaide mat bohtet ovdan dien sátnádallamis. Dás eai leat dušše siiddastallit geat ovddidit vávjevaš ságaid, muhto diedalaš ságastallamis lea maid ovddiduvvon kritihkka dan vuogi vuostá movt nugo mat biologat leat váldán alcesseaset válddi ovddastit gohčoduvvon luonddu. Dán čállošis doalahan iežan das movt dieđasuorggit bohtet ovdan siiddastalliid deaivvademiin boazodoalu stivrenvuogádaga olis, iige das leat dobbelet, siskkáldas dieđakritihkalaš áigumuš.

Dálá siidda deaivvadeamit – teorehtalaš lahkonaivuohtit

Man ollu bohccuid dárbbaha bearaš dasa vai galgá sáhttit dábálaš bures birget? Diet lea juo doložis leamaš dávjá jerrojuvvon gažaldat (gč. omd. Solem 1970 (1933): 184; Skjenneberg – Slagsvold 1968: 258; Holand 2003: 203; NOU 2001:35: 179). Iešalddis orru dat govttolaš ja vigihis gažaldat. Datte dat fas lea vuolggahan dehe goitge leamaš bárrahis fárus vuolggahaeme rehkenastimiid ja čuovvovaš mearrádu-said mat dađistaga gártet njuolggadussan ja dainna lágiin maid gáržžádussan báikki ja siidda iešgieđaineaset ja iešáigáseaset vuolggahuvvon čovdašuvvamiidda. Boazodoalu almmolaš hálddahusa bokte leat iešguđet fágasurvggiid diehtovuogit gársan lagabuiidda dohko gos váikkuheaddji mearrádušat dahkkojit, nugo mat biologat ja ekonomat. Vissis diehtovuogádaga välljema fárus leat beasatkeahhtá maid politihkalaš välljemat das makkár boazodoalu mii dáhttut (Kalstad 1998). Čielggadeamit ja

dutkamat huksejit ekonomalaš ja čuovvovaš ekologalaš modeallaid mat atnui váldojit almmolaš stivrenásahusaid reaidun. Dás eai leat šat sáhkan dušše rehketbihtát, muhto modeallat maiguin mearriduvvojit mat leat olbmuid ovttagat, eallit, ealliid gálvvolaš ávki olbmuid ja ealliid jahkásaš šaddan ja laskan eananšattuid vuimmiin. Dát doaimma buktá ođđa teorehtalaš vuoddu ja doahpagaidd, obanassii ođđa giela, mainna lahkoniit bohccuide ja boazodollui (Paine 1994; Heikkilä 2006). Áigumuš lea geahččat boazodoalu ealáhussan, muhto dasa gullevaš dagolaš árvoštallan dagaha badjesámi ealáhuslági rievdat dakka geahččanvuogi hápmái (Jentoft 1998: 88). Dakka dainna váivviin dat juo buktet vuogádaga hálddašemi jurddahanvuogi ja bidjet dan ovdalii ovdalaš gaskavuodalaš guoddevašvuoda dehe dadistaga doaimmadettiin árvoštallama jurddahanvuogi. Dieinna vuosttaš vugiin atnet dievas modeallaid (nugo eanemus bastevaš bohtosiid modeallaid) loguid deaivilvuoda eaktun dan sadjai go duoinna manit vugiin mihttešii sulaid ja muddešii dađi mielde go dastánaga ođđa dieđut gártet (Hornborg 1996; Scott 2006; Berkes – Berkes 2008).

Siidda deaivvadeapmi eiseválddalaš hálddašemiin ja dutkamiin lea obalohkái dahkan gažaldagaid mat gusket vuodalaš jurddahanvugiid erohusaide. Dat leat dakkár gažaldagat mat leat váldon ovdan dieđateorehtalaš nákkáhallamis nai, ja dainna lágiin lea maid nugo politihkalaš ekologijja bokte ovddiduvvon kritihkka oarjemáilmmi dieđáárbevieruid vuostá. Oasit dán kritihkas leat dakkárat mat gusket namuhuvvon dillái go siiddat doaimmaideasetguin ja jurddahanvugiideasetguin deaivvadit dutkamiin. Dás sáhtá omd. geassit ovdan Latour (2004: 9–52, 231–232) kritihka das go čujuha oarjemáilmmi diehtagiid modernistalaš jurddahanvugiideasetguin sirren olmuin ja dahkan olggobeallasažžan buot dan maid gohčodit *natuvran*⁶. Dás lea viidáset áshuvvon dábalaš olbmuid garvvitkeahhtá moski kultuvrras *natuvrii*. Jurddahanvuohki lea čehpet hutkojuvvon navdit dutkiid áidna olmmožin geat besset dohko nuppebeallái viežžat dieđuid mat ovddastit *natuvrra* albmaduoda. Nu lea dutkiide dehe ekspearittaide, alldeset dieđuid háhkama ja duodaštusa vugiid bokte, addon visot váldi hálddustaset atnit doallevaš dieđuid, ja eará olbmot leat massán válddi olihit albmaduoda doppe olgun. Álgoviđe geaidnu beassat eret dákkár dilis lea vuosttaldit dákkár jurddahanvuogi guovttejuogu ja hilgut *natuvrra*. Sámi siidda dáfus dat ráva ii mávsse earágo ahte ii galgga váldit atnui dákkár guovttejuogu. Vuosttaš

6 Mun merken dien loatnasátnin go sámegeilas ii leat alldis doaba mas lea seamma sisdoallu (sátni *luondu* adno siiddastaladettiin eará mearkkašumiin), seamma ládje go sámegeilas ii leat alldis leamaš doaba *kultuvra*.

buoretvuohta das lea ahte ii oba čuovvol ge dákkáraš doalvvuheaddji ja dávjá jer-rojuvvon gažaldagaid nugo: Galgá go boazodoalu bealuštit dainna go lea ealáhus vai dainna go lea dehálaš kulturguoddi sápmelaččaide? Vástáduš dása lea ahte dát lea eallinláhki valljodatváriidisguin, máhtuidisguin, vieruidisguin ja visot daiguin mat dasa gullet. Ii dat leat juogo duot dehe dot.

Dás sáhtá jurddahit ahte dutkan ja dutkanvuđđosaš almmolaš hálddašeapmi lea sirreme bohcco badjeolbmoss ja dasto čoaggime iežas beallái dieđuid. Daid vuodul de áiggošii bagadallat, váikkuhit ja hábmet boazodoalu doaimmaheami vuodđojurdagiid ja -vugiid. Dattege sáhtá jearrat, leago bohcco sirren badjeolbmoss oba vejolašge? Leago rievttat dadjat ahte dutkan buktá ovdan baicca *rangifer tarandus*⁷ eallin mainna badjeolmmoš galgá bargat, muhto mii seammás ii gula sutnje dehe lea sirrejuvvon eret sus? Dás jurddahan nugo mat biologalaš dutkama mii čujuha goddái, goddiluvvon bohccui, bohccui ja gesáhii šládjan, muhto maiddái boazodoalodutkama mii geahččá bohcco aivve eallišládjan, ja maid álkit beassá dahkat gohčodusaiguin nugo mat *reinsdyr* ja *reindeer*. Boazu datte fas lea sirremeahttun badjeolbmoss, goitge jus sámi jurddahanvuohki galgá leat vuodđun. Dákkár sirremeahttunvuoda sáhtá maid oaidnit Latour (2004) vástádušas oarjemáilmmi jurddagovvii mii sirre servvodaga (masa gullet aivve olbmot) ja olggobeali máilmmi (masa gullet buot mat eai leat olbmot). Su nuppelágán čilgehusas máilmmi ollu iešguđetlágánat bohtet ovdan oktiigullevažžan, namalassii olbmuid ja earáid searvevuohčan⁸. Ovdan boahtimiin lea diet searvevuohča muhtunlágán árvalus mii lea buorebut dehe heajubut celkon dehe artikulerejuvvon, muhto liikká lea dát árvalus álo goitge oktiigullevažvuohča dehe searvevuohča: «... viso dieid árvalusaid fárus leat reaiddut mat sáhttet lagadit dakka alldeset dadjamašaid, muhto daid fárus leat maid alldeset giellavánit, eahpádušat das man oskkáldasat dehe jáhkehahttit leat alldeset dađistaga ovddasteamit»⁹ (Latour 2004: 166). Siidaságain čilgejuvvo bohcco ja sápmelačča oktavuohča ná: Badjeolmmoš hupmá boazoságaid, ii aktonassii iežas hutkamiin ja ráhkademiin, muhto maiddái bohcco oahpaheami váikkuhemiin. Dasa de sáhtán lasihit: Boazu boahá ovdan fárrolaga siidda olbmuiguin, ii goassege loahpalaš mearrádussan dehe diehtun das mii dat oktiibuot lea, muhto dađistaga árvalussan siidda dahkevaš

7 *Rangifer tarandus* lea gesáha, bohcco, gotti latiinna namma.

8 Association of humans and non-humans (Latour 2004: 70).

9 Artihkalčállii jorgalan sámegeallii dán: «... each of these propositions is accompanied by instruments capable of transposing what it says, but also by its own speech impediment, its uncertainties about the faithfulness of the representation» (Latour 2004: 166).

doaimmaid bokte. Dás dieđusge sáhtáši jurddahit praktihkalaš dutkama nai, reaid-
duiguin ja vugiiguin maid dat geavaha, veadjit ain eambo oahpásnuvvat bohccui ja
nu lasihit dieđu loarráset árvalusa oliheami várás. Dát dutkan datte de gal ferte diktit
mannat buot áigumušaid doalahit ja geavahit *natuvrra* jurdaga (Latour 2004: 25).
Boazu ja badjeolmmoš leaba álo fárrolaga, goappešagat siidda osolaččat.

Siidda joatkevašvuođa vuodut

Leat go vuosttažettiin olbmuid ja dihto valljodatváriid dássádallamat siidda
joatkevašvuođa eaktun? Nugo ovddabealde namuhuvvon, de leat diekkár rehke-
nastimat šaddan vuodđun ekonomalaš ja ekologalaš modeallaide goitge dasa movt
galggašii dáhkidit boazodoalu ealáhussan. Dát leat fas vuodđun plánarahčamušaide
mat eaktudit vuogádaga, mas leat standardiserejuvvon birgenlágít ja elliid objektivi-
seren agro-pastorala (dehe eanandoalloguođoheadđji) industriija vuogi mielde.
Diet eavttut lea guhkin eret árbevirolaš guođuhedđjiin ja bivdiin earret eará das
go sis leat olbmuid gaskavuodát ja olbmuid ja elliid gaskavuodát sullasaččat vassis
áššiid dáfus, dehe dat eai leat áibbas sierralágánat (Ingold 2006: 75). Nuba diekkár
vuogádatdássádallamat sáhttet leat minsttarin muddet vassis meari olbmuide diet-
nasa vassis ekonomalaš ja ekologalaš rehkettihtá eavttuid vuodul. Diet olbmot dat-
tege eai dárbbat dahkat eaige daga siidda dainna. Siidda ii sáhte gádjut olggobealde
ráhkaduvvon ja rehkenastojuvvon modeallaiguin, go siidda ii sáhte gádjut alddis
eret. Nuppi dáfus dieđus fas sáhtá lohkat: Go duohta bearrá, de goitge leat olbmo
ovddemus dárbbut hui konkrehtalaš áššit mat gáibidit fuomášumi. Nu viidáset orru
govttolaš suitit olbmuide vuodđodárbašiid dáhádusa. Dasto de maid orrot olbmuid
ja dihto valljodatváriid dássádallamat ovddemus áššit siidda joatkevašvuhtii, go olb-
muid haga ii joatkahuva siida. Ferten mieđihit iežan maid álgobáliid navdán bad-
jeolbmuid dájádiliin, nugo sierra báikki ceggedettiin dehe eará siidii sirddidettiin,
árvoštallan dien mállet dássádallama. Dien navdimii dieđusge lea váikkuhan dat
go otná dilis leat diekkár gažaldagat gártan boazodoalu váldogažaldahkan almmolaš
ságastallamis mediain. Dattege badjeolbmuid mitalusain eai boađe ovdan diekkár
modeallalágán árvoštallamat iežaset siidagullevašvuođa gártama ja sajáiduvvama
birra. Olbmot baicca njuolgut váldet vuhtii birraseaset mánggabealatvuođa ja iežaset
árjjaid, eaige bargga liigebargguid ráhkadit modeallaid alcceseaset oahpisteaddjin
(Ingold 2006: 164). Benjaminsen (2009) lea davvi Afrihká ovdamearkkain čujuhan

movt dat gohčoduvvon *vátnaváriid skuvlla*¹⁰ dutkit áigejuovdilin leat dahkan gažaldagaid mat gullet valljodagaid juoksumii ja ribademiide. Dien skuvlla dutkama fas lea politihkalaš ekologijja moaitán. Earret eará lea daddjon ahte vátnaváriid jurddavuohki lea geavahuvvon geafes guovlluid váttisvuodaid birra, dahkan nugo guođuheddiid (dehe pastoralisttaid) ráđeheapmin ja valljodagaid bilideaddjin, ja adnon ággan čuorvut olggobeali ekspearnttaid boahitit čoavdit váttisvuodaid. Diet sulastahte dan go oktasaš valljodagaid dieđalaš ja politihkalaš ságastallama vuodul ovddiduvvui ballu ahte boazosápmelaččat bilistit guohtoneatnamiid ja danne eiseválddit fertejit mannat gaskii (geahča ovddabealde čilgehusa oktan čujuhusaiguin). Diet leat gažaldagat ja vástádusmálet mat eai dáidde loahpahuvvon oalát, muhto sáhttet čuožžilit otná dilis nai.

Áiggiid čađa lea leamaš nu ahte dilit leat dađistaga rievddadan. Goitge jahkodagat leat čađat dahkan iešguđet valljodaváriid rievddadeami. Maiddái boazoealut leat muhtun jagiid mannan sakka manás. Badjeolbmuid muittus leat rievddademiid vásihusat áimmuin. Iežaset siiddaásuiduvvama ja siiddastallama muitalusain lea álo dattege fas máhtolašvuohka duogáš čilgehussan. Máhttu, dehe sáhtta dadjat máhtovuodđu, lea dego čuočča gođđosis, nugo leat dat earáge vuodut. Vuodđu lea dat mii joatkahuvvá buolvvas bulvii (Bull – Oskal – Sara 2001: 322–324). Siiddaid joatkevašvuoda nie dahket siidavuodđu (mii joatká guđege siidda duovdatlašvuoda), vuodđoolbmot (mat jotket siidaguimmešvuoda) ja máhtovuodđu (mii joatká máhtolašvuoda), dehe njuolggabut visot dieid oktiigulleašvuohka siiddastallama bokte.

Máhtovuodđu

Máhtovuodđu, mii maid sáhtta daddjot árbevirolaš máhtun, lea iešalddis dakkár man birra siidasáгат álo leat leamaš. Dán áiggi lea diet bealli olbmuid eallinlágis, erenoamážit álgoálbmogiid oktavuodas, šaddan sáhkavuodđun máilmmiviidosas dieđalaš ja politihkalaš ságastallamis. Siidaságaid máhttosáhka ná lea gártan oassin viidát ságas, ja dien oktavuoda dilis dás lagabut guorahalan muhtun oasáža boazosiiddaid máhtovuodđu gažaldagain.

Máhtovuodđu lea dieđalaš ságastallama oktavuodain čilgejuvnon nugo mat dakkárin masa gullet gártan dieđut, čehppodagat, bargovuogit ja obanassii duogáš

10 *Knapphetsskolen* (Benjaminsen 2009: 154).

jurddahanvuogit (kosmologijja) mat viidáset fievrreduvvot buolvvaid servvoštallamiin ja ovttasbargguin (buohtastahte Berkes 2008: 7), ja guđege buolvvat dainna vuoduin heivehit ja háhket alcceseaset máhtuid birget dan dilis mii sidjiide gártá. Rievtti mielde lea máhttu dušše okta mángga sániin maid lean válljen, go dat čujuha nákcii ollašuttit doaimma mii dal leažžá. Go leat siidaságain anus nu ollu sánit mat čujuhit dáid beliid, de lea dat mearkan dasa man stuora beroštupmi lea čadnon ollu lávkkiiide «ollesoahppan» olbmo rádjái. Dás namuhan vearbahámis nugo mat: diehtit, oahpásnuvvat, oahppahuvvat, hárvánit, máhttit, dovddiidit, dovdat. Dán oahppamii leat sámi vierus oanehis ja seammás sakka gáibideaddji rávvagat:

- Gula, oainne ja dárkko máid boarráseapput muitalit ja movt dat barget.
- Ieš mihte, árvoštala, vávje ja fuobmá.

Dát lea bargevaš ja mannevaš vuohki oahppat ja ipmirdit, mas lea eaktun ahte máhttu gártá oktasažžan dannego buot osolaččat barget ja gulahallet fárrrolaga doaimmaineaset. Sámegeias muđui ii leat sáhka dušše ipmirdeamis ja áddemis, muhto fihttemis ja dádjadeamis nai. Das lea maid dadjanvuohki nugo ahte olmmoš galggašii dádjadit jurddahit. Jurdda dehe lagat iskan ja guorahallan nu ii leat dárbbus ovdalis dehe bajábealde dádjadeami. Mat de dahket dádjadeami? Sátni ieš geažida gozuid ja ávvira. Dieid neavvagiid vuodul sáhttit miehtat dutkiide geat leat cealkán ahte oahppan ii leat dieđuid addin, muhto baicca ávvira atnima oahpaheapmi (Gibson 1979: 254; Ingold 2006: 167).¹¹ Nu sáhtta maid lohkat sániid ja doahpagiid ovdal leat gozuid bajideaddjin go gárvves vuohkin čilget máid mearkkašit ja movt bargat. Dasa lassin leat doahpagat rahpasat odđa dieđuide oaidnemiin, gullamiin ja dovddiidemiin, maiguin guđege doahpaga sisdoallu doalahuvvo ja muddejuvvo. Ipmárdus dasto hábmejuvvo ja doalahuvvo giela vehkiin, go giella dahká sániid ja doahpagiid (Berkes – Berkes 2009: 8). Siidda doaimmaid dákkár čilgehusa mielde ii oahpa ja ipmirdišgoađe dušše muitalusaiguin ja jearahallamiin, muhto dasa fertejit maid sánit ja doahpagat oazžut sisdoalu vásihemiin, oahpásnuvvamiin ja dovddiidemiin.

Dán čilgehussii siidadili oahppama ja máhttovuodu goziheami birra, áiggun dás vel lasihit ovttá fuomášumi Latour (2004: 194) vuodul: Siidda oktavuhtii gullet dieđus maid gielahis ovttadagat dehe leahkimat (eksisteanssat). Diet dehe oasit

¹¹ *Learning is not a transmission of information, but an 'education of attention'* (Gibson 1979: 254; Ingold 2006: 167).

diein sáhttet olgguštuvvot muitaleami dehe čilgejumi ovddasteamis. Mihttedettiin ja mearridettiin maid vuhtiiváldit, guođđit mii álo juoidá olggobeallái ja ovdalii bidjat eará. Álo livččii vel juoga vuhtii váldit. Dalle lea vejolaš ahte diet olggobeallásaččat bohtet ruovttoluotta gáibidit oasiset ja sajiset. Čoavddusin diesa lea *oahppama gávvan*¹², mas eai leat eará dáhkádusat go oahppama buorrevohta, mii eaktuda ahte mii diktit diekkár olggobeallásaččaid muosehuhttit iežamet ja geardovaččat árvoštallat iežamet oahppama buorrevođa. Dát máksá maid dan ahte jus mat siida manaha čurbošemi dehe eahpelihkostuvvama vuoigatvuođa, de sáhtta maid massit muosehuvvama ja dárkuma dáidduid ja nu maid máhttohálddaseami, máhttoovdáneami ja iešstivrejumi návccaid. Siiddaid máhttovuođus leat nuppi dáfus dieđut ja máhtut mat adnojit áimmuin buolvvas bulvii, ja nuppi dáfus fas ávžžuhus juohkehažžii divdna ieš mihttet, fuomášit, vávjit ja árvoštallat. Dákkár máhttovuođu geažil lea juohke buolva bearran iešbirgejumi ja iešstivrejumi, maid ii ábut manahit gosage jus galgá siida joatkahuvvat.

Siidda duogáš jurddahanvuogi ovdamearka

Boazu lea leamaš siidda oassi ja osolaš guhkit áiggi vuollái. Gielladutkamiin lea sátni *boazu* gurrojuvvon gohčoduvvon proto-fínno-permalaš giellaáigái, ja nu sáhtta daddjot leat ankke sullii 5500 jagi boaris (Sammallahti 1998: 120–121). Sápmelaččaid muitalanvirruu gullá maid muitalus movt goddi lea Áhčešeani árbi ja boazu gis Njávšešeani árbi (gč. Qvigstad 1927–1929 II: 228–229, 326–329). Áhčešeatni irrudii bohccuidis goddin irradeaktillis meannudanvugiinis, ja Njávšešeatni boazuiduvai go litnásit giedahalai bohccuidis. Muitalus ii čilge dan, maid ovddabealde namuhuvvon girjji muitalusbajilčála geažida, ahte boazu lei álggos, ja das šadde gottit. Dat baicca čilge dan ahte boazu sáhtta šaddat goddin dehe goddiluvvat, muhto goddi ii sáhte šaddat boazun (dat lea geavvan masa ii leat sámegeielas sátni, go dat ii geava). Goddi ii leat lodjudahhti boazun, čilgejit maid dološ áiggi muitalusat mat ain leat muittus siidaságain. Boazu datte sáhtta goddiluvvat jus dás ii doalahuvvo vissislágán okta-vuohta bohcco ja sápmelačča gaskka.

Gottit ja bohccot leat fysiologalaččat ovttalágán eallit ja dat mii sirre dieid lea dat mii gohčoduvvo alldeset *luondun*. Ovttalágán fysiologalaš eallivuodas leat suorgásan luonddut mat mángga dáfus leat goabbatlágánat, vaikko eará dáfus fas leat

12 *Learning curve* (Latour 2004: 194).

ovttalágánat. Leat maid gártan muhtun hápmeeerohusat maid sápmelaččat hárvánan oaidnimiin leat máhttán mihttet ja eret. Goabbatlágán luondu ja hápmi leat gártan vásihuvvon gaskavuodas olbmui. Siidadilis adno ja ipmirduvvo sátni *luondu* álo leame juogaman luondu, ja dat boahtá ovdan gaskavuodaid bokte, nugo olbmo ja bohcco, bohcco ja bohcco, dálkki ja bohcco, eatnamiid ja bohcco ja nu ain. Boazu ja bohcco luondu lea nie soabadus siiddastalli sápmelaččain. Makkár soabadus dat dasto lea? Nugo ovdalis namuhuvvon, de ákkastallá Ingold (2006: 72–75) ahte pastoralisttain dehe árbevirolaš guođuheddjiin, nugo mat badjeolbmui, sulastit olbmuid iežaset gaskavuodat ja olbmuid ja elliid gaskavuodat vassis áššiid dáfus. Nugo elliid ja olbmuid gaskavuodat, nu maid olbmuid gaskavuodat. Son oaivvilda ahte árbevirolaš guođuheddjiid dáfus leat diet bajit mearridan- ja gohččunválddi hámis¹³, vuolit ferte jeagadit vaikko vel vuostemielain nai. Nu galggašii de badjeolmmoš váldán bohcco ollásit iežas stivrenválddi vuollái, ja seammalágán jurddamálliin leat sus muhtun olbmot gohčostahkan. Boazodoalu dološ vuodđomuitalus datte árvala ahte gaskavuodta lea soabadus. Nu de galggaše siidda olbmuid gaskavuodat nai vuodđuduvvon soahpamiin. Dáikko sáhttá čujuhit dasa ahte Paine (1970) lea dutkamiinnis nannen siidaguimmežiid ovttadássásašvuoda leame guovddáš áššin johttisápmelaččaid siiddain. Son cealká ahte siidaguimmežiid gaskkas leat soahpanvuodđosaš gaskavuodat (Paine 1970: 56)¹⁴. Dainna eavttuin ahte olbmo ja olbmo gaskavuodta speadjalastá olbmo ja bohcco gaskavuoda, nanne diet olbmo ja bohcco gaskavuoda soabadussan. Dása leat maid doarjjan sámi muitalusat sápmelačča ja su lagas elliid gaskavuodaid birra. Leat gis eará eallit, maid sápmelaš fas lea bivdán. Sin ja sápmelačča gaskavuodaid birra leat eará muitalusat ja neavvagat, nugo mahkáš guovžža ja gumppe birra. Dieid beliid, maid lean guoskkahan eará čállosiin (Sara 2003 ja 2009), in áiggo juste dás guorahallat, muhto dat nai gullet siidda duogáš jurddahanvuohká.

Go dološ siiddat, main ledje dušše čoranare bohccot ja ollu ávkki ožžo gottis, rivde eallosiidan, de ferteje maid rievdat siiddaid eananjuogut. Gažaldat lea, gii dat rievda-dii daid, ledje go dat olbmot mat ovdagihtii hutke juoguid maidda heivehe bohccuid johtáladdama? Siida de livččii aktonassii olbmo ásahus, ja olmmoš livččii ásahettiin ovdagihtii govahallan dehe modealla ráhkadan das makkár boazoeallu lea ja movt olmmoš dan stivre. Diet lea čilgehusvuohki mii ii heive jurdagii ahte sápmelaš ferte soabadallat bohccuin. Soabadallama čilgehusa mielde ferte leat iešalddis siida nai

13 Ingoldas *domination*.

14 Paines *contractual relations*.

olbmo ja bohcco soabadus. Dáinna lágiin ferte siidavuoddu dehe siidda sajít, báikkít, johtolagat ja orohagat gártan siidda lahttun dađistaga go olbmot ohppe mat boazoealut leat, bohccot eallun ohppe eatnamiid ja olbmot fas bohccuid bokte ohppe eatnamiid. Siida dasto eatnamiiddisguin sáhtta adnot bohcco, eatnamiid ja sápmelačča soabadussan. Eahpitkeahhtá lea boazu seammago olmmoš dakkár mii oahppá eatnamiid ja dáhttu jagis jahkái jorggihit oahpes eatnamiidda guđege áiggi. Diet lea muitaluvvon ovdal siidda vuoddočilgehussan (Solem 1970 (1933): 190–191), ja dat doalahuvvo ain odne siidda olbmuid ságain ja čilgehussain. Siiddain ipmirduvvojít bohccot heaggan guhtege, ja eallun fárrolavuodaineaset. Nu siidasáгат dievvasepmosit ovddastit bohcco boazun. Dat galget siidda olis oazžut heggii ja eallit fárrolaga buot lágiideaset mielde movt bohccot lea eallán iežaset duovdagiin. Go dan besset, de doalahit bohccot luonddusteaset ja geahpedit boazovázzi barggu. Bohcco oaivilat šaddet oahppásat ja ipmirdahttit boazovázzi. Nuppi dáfus bohccot ohppet dan movt boazovázzi buktá oaiviliiddis ovdan. Dát oktiibuot dahká siiddastallama lihkestuvvat eanas áiggi, siidda olbmuid, bohccuid ja eatnamiid gaskavuodaid dáfus.

Siidasoabadallamat datte eai leat dušše siidda siskkáldas lahtuid gaskka, muhto maiddá siiddaid gaskka. Lea leamaš juo siidda boares vierru soahpat ja doalahit siiddaid gaskasaš eananrájiid (Vorren 1989). Dat leat leamaš gaskavuodát maiguin leat gozihan siidadoalu čorgatvuoda. Dán áiggi, ankke eiseválddiid distriktastivrenvuogi boazodoalu digaštallamis Finnmárkkus, lea leamaš sáhka das gii ovddasta siidda siidagaskasaš áššiin. Muhtun badjeolbmot leat ákkastallamiin, eambbogat fas dahkevaččat, doalahan dan ahte lea boazu mii ovddasta siidda. Badjeolmmoš ferte dušše čuovvut bohcco. Earát fas leat dasa vástidan ahte ii sáhte bohccuide hoigat ovddasvástádusa ja siva das go siidda siskkáldas soahpamušat ja čorga siidadoallu ii leat lihkestuvvan. Alddeset čilgenmálle sáhtta dadjat leame mihtteme eatnamiid guoddevašvuoda dađistaga gaskavuodaiguin ja dan sáhtta oanehaččat dáinna lágiin refereret:¹⁵ Siiddastallama eahpelihkestuvvama dehe *siiddalmasvuoda* váldodovdomearokat leat duivilat ja boazonággásat. Boazu lea dakkár mii dáhttu čuvvudit oahpes bohccuid ja oahpes biellojienaid, muhto *duivil* liikká lea ovddemus ja eanemus olbmo váttisvuolta. Olbmot dáhttot iežaset mearokat bohccuid leat čoahkis iežaset hálddus, ja iežaset sieiva beroštumiid dihte galggaše siiddaset ovddastit siidagaskasaš čorgatvuoda gulahallamis. *Boazonákkis* gis ovddemusat čuoheá boh-

15 Badjeolbmuid ságain ja čilgemiin lea eambo mitalusa ja vissis diliid čujuhusa málle, muhto dás lean diekkár ságaid oanidan oanehis čilgenmállii.

cuide, go dat hedjonit guhkebuš áiggi boazonággásis. Boazu váldá ovddasvástádusa ja ieš vástida boazonággása nugo mat miesehisvuodain ja ealu maŋás mannamiin. Anáš dal olmmoš dien maiddá iežas váttisvuohtan dehe ii, de bohcco hedjoneamis boahá rádji gokko olbmo gaskavuolta bohccuin šaddagoahá rihkkovažžan bohcco ahtanuššamii (dehe boares muitalusaid olbmo ja bohcco soahpamii). Olbmo ovddasvástádus dás vuolga das go dahká sága bohcco birra dehe hupmá bohcco ovddas nuppi siidda giellahálddašeadji ovddasteddjiiguin. Siiddaid gaskasaš guhallamat leat oassin ehtalaš gažaldagaid árvoštallamiin ja siiddaid gaskasaš soabadusat eai juoge dušše sierra eananviidodagaid, muhto maiddá ehtalaš gažaldagaid čoavddehahti ovddasvástádussan guđege siidii iežaset siskkáldas soabadusain. Nu čorgejuvvo bohccuideaset álššaid mihttema ja boazonággása ášši guđege siidda iežas sierra áššin, iige biđejuvvo «boazodoalu» áššin nugo siidavailevaš ságasteamis lea dahkkon.

Sáhkabinnáža birastahttin

Dát sáhka lea dal dahkan njáikkaid ja cakkahatmohkiid, muhtomin lean ferten dušše rasttidit luottaidda mat dolvot olggos fieskkis, muhto jáhkán goitge ahte eanas sáhka lea giedas. Duohtavuodas lea nu ahte siidda olbmui ii leat dat buoredilli beassat dušše ovttá ravdda gohkket. Siidavuogádaga čohkkemis leat áššit mat olgolet máilmmis leat biđejuvvon iešguđet fágasurggiide, mat geavahit duogáš jurddahanvugiideaset ja vuodđodoahpagiidiset giedahaladettiin deaivvadeamiid siiddaiguin. Nuppebealde fas almmolaš ja maiddá dieđalaš ságastallamis, álkidit govaset, biddjo boazodoallu dehe vel boazodoalloaláhus čujuhussan iešguđetlágán áššiide ja gažaldagaide. Dat lea mahkáš ráddjejuvvon ja ovttastuvvon sierra servvodoatoassin vissis mállet áššiid vuodul. Dákkár sáhkavugiiguin lea bahá láhppit siiddaid ceggema ja dan movt dat galggašii doaimmahuvvot dakka siiddaid iežaset gažaldagaid ja vuoruhemiid vuodul.

Dás lea goitge boahán áigi birastahttit dán sága. Oaláš ášši dán ságas lea bargu fastain ásahtit siidda joatkevaččat iešstivrejeaddjin. Dasa lea álbmotrievtti ovdáneapmi doarjjan ja dan dáidá ain fertet geavahit veahkkin čilget ja nannet siidda iešstivrejumi. Norgga bealde lea siida ja siidda iešstivrejupmi prinsihpalaččat dohkkehuvvon lágas, muhto iešalddis dat ii dáhkkit siidda. Dás duohko šaddá sáhka das movt siida ja siidda iešstivrejupmi dahkevaččat ollašuvvá. Guđege vuoru olmmoš ferte ieš mihttet, árvoštallat, vávjit ja fuobmát áššiid gozihettiinis. Dás lean anjke árvalan njeallje

vuodđodoahpaga sáhkaraðan¹⁶, maid anán govttolažžan árvalit iešguðet diehto-geainnuid guorramiin ja časkkahallamiin.

Vuosttaš ravda lea masa lean gávnnaðan gohčodusa *duovdatlašvuohta*. Čorget dan ravdda lea čilget guðege siidda siidavuoðu, masa ovddemusat gullá čilget siiddaid gaskasaš rájiid, muhto masa sáhtá maid gullat čilget eará valljodatvárrer- ja eananvuoigatvuoðaid Finnmárkkulága olis. Dát lea dakkár ášši mii lea gesson ovdan juo 1990-jagiid, ja badjeolbmot leat dan rájes bájuhan dán ovddemus vuoru hoahppoáššin, muhto unnán konkrehtalaš lea dáhpáhuðvan dán nuppelot jagis. Ášši lea badjeolbmuid mielas dehálaš, go birrajagi eatnamiid hálddašeapmi dahká dehálaččamus eavttu siidda ieštivrejumi lihkestuvvami. Jus siida eahpelihkostuvvá, ja dat ii dáhpáhuva iežas duovdatlašvuoða meriid ja vejolašvuoðaid eavttuin, de dat ii leat siidda eahpelihkostuvvan. Olggos guvlui dat goitge sáhtá gehčot siidda ja siidavuogádaga eahpelihkostuvvamin, ja luvvet lága duogáš sakka stivrejeddji gaskaomiid. Diet lea siiddaid ballu otná dilis.

Nubbi ravda lea maid gohčodan *siidaguimmešvuohta*. Go siidavuoðdu ii leat čielggas, de diehttelasat ii leat siidaguimmežiid vuoddu ge čielggas. Siidaguimmežat leat dán dilis darvánan dakkár *status quo* dillái, mii lea rievtti mielde boares boazodoallolága vuððosaš distrikta- ja doalloovttadatminsttar. Eahpečielga duovdatlašvuohta hehte siidda čielggosnaga árvoštallat báikevuoðuid ja iešguðet olbmuid osolašvuoða, ja das maid movt sáhtáii siida lasihit iežas birgenvuoðu searvedoaimmaiguin ja siidda olbmuid gártaduvvon máhtuiguin ja návccaiguin.

Goalmmát ravda lea *máhtolašvuohta*. Dás vuos lea máhttovuoðu, dehe árbevirolaš máhtuid, áimmahuššama ja anu vuhtii váldámuš. Dása gullá vuos dahkevaččat máhttit ollašuttit siidda doaimmaid ja áigumušaid. Nuppebealde dás leat fas duogáš jurddaeavttut dehe jurddahanvuoigit mat leat lagaduvvon midjiide muitalusaideamet bokte. Máhttogažaldagat badjánit earálágán jurddaeavttuid deaivvadeami olis, nugo daid mat almmolaš hálddašeami fárus leat ášševuoðđun mearrádu-saide mat váikkuhit siiddaid. Gažaldat dás lea vuos siskkáldas: Jáhkkit go mii duodas máhttovuðdoseamet lávžeboalu dahkamis Áhčešeani lávžegihppui. Jus dan dahkat, de lea das álgu doaimmahit ja bealuštit ieštivrejumi. Dat ii mávsse dan ahte siidda diedut, máhtut ja dovdamat leat aivve ávdát ja láitemeahttumat, muhto baicca dan

16 Sáni *sáhkaraðan* lean ráhkadan *ravdda* ipmárdusain mii boahtá ovdan sánis *ealloravda*, man lahka guoðoheaddji lea goalnjadettiin ja man sáhtá caggat nai, muhto son ii guoðohettiin goassege mana ealu sisa.

ahte siiddain lea vuoigatvuohta dađistaga oahppamiin geahččalit buorebut deaivat ja ieža dárkut iežaset oahppama buorre vuoda. Dien vuoigatvuođa ollái gullá maid rabasvuohta váldit atnui dutkanbohtosiid siidda iežas eavttuid mielde.

Njealját ravda lea *siiddastallan*, mii lea maid njunušravda. Siiddastallamis bohtá siida ovdan olbmo, bohcco ja eatnamiid soabadussan. Dat lea dakkár soabadus mii fertte dađistaga ođastuvvot, maiddái dađistaga siidagaskasaš gulahallamiiguin. Siiddastallan lea maid duogážin dasa go lean čállán dán artihkkala nugo lean dahkan. Boares siidaságaid oahppa muitala eaktun, nugo maid dahket vissis dieđakritihkalaš lahknanvuogit, namalassii ahte sáhkasearvvi olbmot, geaidda siiddastallan gullá, galget juo álgu rájes dohkkehuvvon ja buoremus dáhtu mielde vuhtii váldon sága servvolažžan ja iešmearrideaddjin vuorustaset.

Gáldut

Dutkanmateriála

Dutki materiála mii lea čálalaš ja njálmmálaš gálduin čohkkejuvvon, jorgaluvvon sámegillii ja almmuhuvvon lohkamuššan Sámi allaskuvllas:

Sara, Mikkel Nils 2003: *Gumpe, sápmelaš ja boazu*. SA-raporta/SH-rapport nr. 3. Sámi allaskuvla.

————— 2006a: *Guovdageainnu boazodoalu siiddastallan áiggiid čada*. SA-raporta/SH-rapport nr. 1, Sámi allaskuvla.

————— 2006b: *Nissena jearahallamat Suomabealde*. SA-raporta/SH-rapport nr. 2, Sámi allaskuvla.

Dutki materiála mii lea čálalaš ja njálmmálaš gálduin ja vásihusvuđđosaš čálástahkan čohkkejuvvon, muhto ii leat almmuhuvvon.

Girjjálašvuohta

AGRAWAL, ARUN 2002: Indigenous knowledge and the politics of classification. – *International Social Science Journal* 173, September 2002 «Indigenous knowledge», s. 287–297. Blackwell Publishing/UNESCO.

BARSH, RUSSEL LAWRENCE 1999: How Do You Patent a Landscape? The Perils of Dichotomizing Cultural and Intellectual Property. – *International Journal of Cultural Property* Vol 8, No. 1, s. 14–47.

- BATESON, GREGORY – BATESON, MARY CATHERINE 1988: *Angels Fear: Towards an Epistemology of the Sacred*. Toronto: Bantam Books.
- BENJAMINSEN, TOR. A. 2009: Klima og konflikter i Sahel – eller politikk og vitenskap ved klimaets nullpunkt. – *Internasjonal politikk* [årgang 67], nr. 2, s. 151–172. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget – NUPI.
- BERKES, FIKRET 2008: *Sacred Ecology*. New York – London: Routledge.
- BERKES, FIKRET – BERKES, MINA K. 2009: Ecological Complexity, Fuzzy Logic and Holism In Indigenous Knowledge. – *Futures* Volume 41, Issue 1, February 2009, s. 6–12.
- BJØRKLUND, IVAR – BRANTENBERG, TERJE 1981: *Samisk reindrift – norske inngrep. Om Altaelva, reindrift og samisk kultur*. Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- BJØRKLUND, IVAR (doaim.) 1999: *Norsk ressursforvaltning og samiske rettighetsforhold. Om statlig styring, allmenningens tragedie og lokale sedvaner i Sápmi*. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.
- BRANTENBERG, TERJE 1999: Samisk sedvane og norsk rett. – Ivar Bjørklund (doaim.), *Norsk ressursforvaltning og samiske rettighetsforhold. Om statlig styring, allmenningens tragedie og lokale sedvaner i Sápmi* s. 158–181. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.
- BROX, OTTAR 1989: *Kan bygdenæringene bli lønnsomme*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- BULL, KIRSTI STRØM – OSKAL, NILS – SARA, MIKKEL NILS 2001: *Reindriften i Finnmark. Retthistorie 1852–1960*. Oslo: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.
- BULL, KIRSTI STRØM 2005: *Reinbyer i Finnmark på begynnelsen av 1900-tallet: dokumenter fra Riksarkivet*. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta.
- CHARMAZ, KATHY 2006: *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications.
- FLØTTEN, INGRID RØSTAD – RAVNA, ØYVIND – PÄIVIÖ, NILS JOHAN 2002: *Utredning om reinbeiterettigheter. Vinterbeiteområdene i Vest-Finnmark*. Alta: Reindriftsforvaltningen.
- FORBES ET AL. 2006 = FORBES, BRUCE C. – BÖLTER, MANFRED – MÜLLER-WILLE, LUDGER – HUKKINEN, JANNE – MÜLLER, FELIX – GUNSLAY, NICOLAS – KONSTANTINOV, YULIAN (doaim.) 2006: *Reindeer Management in Northernmost Europe*. Ecological Studies, Vol. 184. Berlin – Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- GIBSON, JAMES. J. 1979: *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- HEIKKILÄ, LYDIA 2006: Comparison of Indigenous and Scientific Perceptions of Reindeer Management. – B. C. Forbes, M. Bölter, L. Müller-Wille, J. Hukkinen, F. Müller, N. Gunslay, Y. Konstantinov (doaim.): *Reindeer Management in Northernmost Europe*, 73–93. Ecological Studies, Vol. 184. Berlin – Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.

- HENRIKSEN, JOHN B. (doaim.) 2008: *Samisk selvbestemmelse – innhold og gjennomføring*. Gáldu čála: Tidsskrift for urfolks rettigheter 2/2008. Guovdageaidnu: Gáldu.
- HOLAND, ØYSTEIN 2003: *Reindrift – samisk næring i brytning mellom tradisjon og produksjon*. Oslo: GAN Forlag.
- HORNBORG, ALF 1996: Ecology as Semiotics: Outlines of a Contextualist Paradigm for Human Ecology. – Philippe Descola – Gísli Pálsson (doaim.), *Nature and Society: Anthropological Perspectives* s. 45–62. London: Routledge.
- HÆTTA, LARS – BÆR, ANDERS 1958: *Muitalusat*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- HÆTTA, JOHAN INGVALD – SARA, OLE K. – RUSHFELDT, IVAR 1994: *Reindriften i Finnmark. Lovgivning og distriktsinndeling. Forslag til ny distriktsinndeling i Finnmark*. Alta: Reindriftsadministrasjonen.
- HÆTTA, JOHAN INGVALD – BALTO, INGOLF – IMS, ANDERS AARTHUN – KOSMO, ANSGAR 2003: *Evttohus – Ođđa orohatrájit Buolbmágis ja Kárášjogas*. Alta: Boazodoallohállddahus.
- HÆTTA, JOHAN INGVALD – BALTO, INGOLF – IMS, ANDERS AARTHUN – KOSMO, ANSGAR 2004: *Evttohus ođđa orohatrájiid birra Kárášjoga oarjjabealde*. Alta: Boazodoallohállddahus.
- ILO-KONVENŠUVDNA 2003: *Giehtagirji: ILO-konvenšuvdna nr 169 – eamiálbmogiid ja čearddalaš álbmogiid hárrái (1989)*. Guovdageaidnu: Gáldu. [Álgopublikašuvnda]: *ILO Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples 1989 (No. 169): A Manual*. Geneva: International Labour Office..
- INGOLD, TIM 2006: *The Perception of the Environment. Essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London – New York: Routledge.
- JEBENS, OTTO 1993: Om bruk og rettsopfatning i Finnmark under historisk synsvinkel. – NOU 1993:34 *Rett til forvaltning av land og vann i Finnmarks* s. 382–399. Oslo: Statens forvaltningstjeneste.
- JENTOFT, SVEIN 1998: *Almenningens komedie. Medforvaltning i fiskeri og reindrift*. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.
- JOKS ET AL. 2006 = JOKS, SOLVEIG – MAGGA, OLE HENRIK – MATHIESEN, SVEIN D. – HENRIKSEN, ISAK MATHIS 2006: *Reintallet i Vest-Finnmark. Forskningsbasert vurdering av prosessen rundt fastsettelse av høyeste reintall i Vest-Finnmark*. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi allaskuvla.
- KALSTAD, JOHAN KLEMET HÆTTA 1997: *Reindriftpolitikk og samisk kultur – en uløselig konflikt? En studie av reindriftilpasninger og moderne reindriftpolitikk*. [Doavttergrádbargu]. Tromsø: Universitetet i Tromsø.
- KALSTAD, JOHAN KLEMET HÆTTA 1998: Pastoralism and Management of Commons Land in Saami Districts. – Svein Jentoft (doaim.): *Commons in Cold Climate*. Paris, New York: Unesco Parthenon.

- KESKITALO, ALF ISAK 1994 (1976): *Research as an Inter-Ethnic Relation*. Dieđut 7/1994 – Arctic Centre Reports 11. Guovdageaidnu – Rovaniemi: Sámi Instituhtta – Arctic Centre, University of Lapland. [Vuosttaš gearddi almmuhuvvon: *Acta Borealia* B. Humanoria 1976 No. 13, s. 15–42. Tromsø: Tromsø Museum.]
- KOSMO, ANSGAR 1991: Hvorfor har vi for mange rein? – *Reindriftnytt* 2, s. 24–26.
- KUOKKANEN, RAUNA 2009: *Boaris dego eana – eamiálbmogiid diehtu, filosofiját ja dutkan*. Kárášjohka: ČálliidLágádus.
- LATOUR, BRUNO 2004: *Politics of Nature. How to bring the sciences into democracy*. London: Harvard University Press.
- LILE, HADI K. 2008: *ON olmmošvuoigatvuođat ja álgoálbmotvuoigatvuođat. Oahpis-teapmi erenoamážit sámi vuoigatvuođaide*. Gáldu čála 1/2008. Guovdageaidnu: Gáldu.
- LILIENSKIOLD, HANS 1942 (1698): *Finnmark omkring 1700*. Vol. II. Speculum Boreale. Nord-norske samlinger. Oslo: Etnografisk Museum.
- MANKER, ERNST 1953: *The Nomadism of Swedish Mountain Lapps*. Acta Lapponica VII. Stockholm: Hugo Gebers förlag.
- NERGÅRD, JENS IVAR 2006: *Den levende erfaring. En studie i samisk kunnskapstradisjon*. Oslo: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.
- NICKUL, KALLE 1948: *The Skolt Lapp Community Suenjelsijd during the year 1938*. Acta Lapponica V. Stockholm: Hugo Gebers förlag.
- 1977: Skoltsitans arkiv. – K. Bergsland (doaim.), *Samenes og sameområdenes rettslige stilling historisk belyst. Foredrag og diskusjoner på symposium avholdt 7.-9. november 1973*. Oslo – Bergen – Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- NOU 2001:35: *Forslag til endringer i reindriftsloven*. Oslo: Departementenes servicesenter, Informasjonsforvaltning.
- NOU 2007:13 BIND A: *Den nye sameretten*. Oslo: Departementenes servicesenter, Informasjonsforvaltning.
- OSKAL, NILS 1995: *Det rette, det gode og reinlykken*. [Doavttergrádabargu]. Tromsø: Universitetet i Tromsø.
- PAINE, ROBERT 1964: Herding and Husbandry: Two Basic Distinctions in the Analysis of Reindeer Management. – *Folk* 6 (1): 83–88. København: København.
- 1970: Lappish Decisions, Partnerships, Information Management and Sanctions. A Nomadic Pastoral Adaptation. – *Ethnology* vol IX s. 52–67.
- 1992: Social Construction of the ‘Tragedy of the Commons’ and Saami Reindeer Pastoralism. – *Acta Borealia* 1992:2 s. 3–20.
- 1994: *Herds of the Tundra*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

- PEDERSEN, STEINAR 1994: Bruken av land og vann i Finnmark inntil første verdenskrig. – NOU 1994:21 *Bruk av land og vann i Finnmark i historisk perspektiv. Bakgrunnsmateriale for Samerettsutvalget*. Oslo: Statens forvaltningstjeneste.
- PEHRSON, ROBERT N. 1964: *The Bilateral Network of Social Relations in Könkämä Lapp District*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- PIRAK, ANTA 1993 (1937): *Jáhhte sáme viessom*. Kristiansund N: Th. Blaasværs Forlag.
- QVIGSTAD, JUST 1927–1929: *Lappiske eventyr og sagn I, II, III, IV*. Oslo: Institutt for sammenlignende kulturforskning.
- RAVNA, ØYVIND 2008: *Rettsutgreiing og bruksordning i reindriftsområder. En undersøkelse med henblikk på bruk av jordskiftelovgivningens virkemidler*. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- RISETH, JAN ÅGE 2009: *Modernization and pasture degradation. A comparative study of two Sámi reindeer pasture regions in Norway 1960–1990*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
- SAMMALLAHTI, PEKKA 1998: *The Saami Languages. An Introduction*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji OS.
- SARA, MIKKEL NILS 2001: *Boazu lea biekká buorri*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.
- 2009: Siida and Traditional Sámi Reindeer Herding Knowledge. – *The Northern Review* 30, s. 153–178. Canada: Yukon College.
- SCHNITLER, PETER 1929: Grenseeksaminasjonsprotokoller. – J. Qvigstad – K. B. Wiklund (doaim.), *Major Peter Schnitlers grenseeksaminasjonsprotokoller*. Bind I, II, III. Kjeldeskriftfondet. Oslo: Grøndahl & Søns Boktrykkeri.
- SCOTT, COLIN 2006: Spirit and Practical Knowledge in the Person of the Bear among Wemindji Cree Hunters. – *Etnos* 71: 1, s. 51–66. Stockholm: Museum of Ethnography.
- SKJENNEBERG, SVEN – SLAGSVOLD, LARS 1968: *Reindriften og dens naturgrunnlag*. Oslo – Bergen – Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- SKUM, NILS. N. 1955: *Valla renar*. Acta Lapponica 10. Uppsala: Nordiska Museet.
- SMITH, PETER LORENZ 1938: *Kautokeino og Kautokeinolappene*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- SOLEM, ERIK 1970 (1933): *Lappiske rettsstudier*. Oslo – Bergen – Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- STAUNES, DORTHE 2007: Subversive analysestrategier – eller Governmentality i kjole, fjerboa og sari. – Jette Kofoed – Dorte Staunes (doaim.), *14 fortellinger om magt, modstand og mennerskers tilblivelse* s. 252–268. København: Danmarks Pædagogiske Universitetsforlag.

- STENSETH, NILS CHRISTIAN – TRANDEM, NINA – KRISTIANSEN, GØRIL (doaim.) 1991: *Forvaltning av våre fellesressurser: Finnmarksvidda og Barentshaveti et lokalt perspekti*. Oslo: Ad Notam.
- TANNER, VÄINÖ 1929: *Antropogeografiska studier inom Petsamo-området*. Fennia 49, 4. Helsingfors.
- TEGENGREN, HELMER 1952: *En utdöd lappkultur i Kemi Lappmark. Studier i Nordfinlands kolonisationshistoria*. Acta Academiae Aboensis 19:4. Åbo.
- 1977: Samernas i Kemi Lappmark rätt till bäverfänge. – K. Bergsland (doaim.), *Samenes og sameområdenes rettslige stilling historisk belyst. Foredrag og diskusjoner på symposium avholdt 7.-9 november 1973* s. 34–55. Oslo – Bergen – Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- TURI, JOHAN 1987 (1910): *Muitalus sámiiid birra*. Johkamohkki: Sámi Girjiti.
- TYLER ET AL. 2006 = TYLER, N.J.C. – TURI, J.M. – SUNDSET, M.A. – BULL, K. STRØM – SARA, M.N. – REINERT, E. – OSKAL, N. – NELLEMAN, C. – MCCARTHY, J.J. – MATHIESEN, S.D. – MARTELLO, M.L. – MAGGA, O.H. – HOVELSRUD, G.K. – HANSEN-BAUER, I. – EIRA, N.I. – EIRA, I.M.G. – CORELL R.W. 2006: Saami reindeer husbandry under climate change: testing a generalised framework for vulnerability studies on the sub-Arctic social-ecological system. – *Global Environmental change* 17, Issue 2, May 2007 s. 191–206.
- VORREN, ØRNULV 1962: *Finnmarkssamenes nomadisme I og II*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- 1978a: Siida-områder på «Sør-Fieldit» under veidekulturens siste fase. – *Kultur på karrig jord. Festskrift til Asbjørn Nesheim* s. 259–274. Oslo: Norsk Folkemuseum.
- 1978b: Bosetning og ressursutnyttning. – NOU 1978:18A: *Finnmarksvidda. Natur-kultur* s. 144–181. Oslo – Bergen – Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- 1989: Veidekulturens arealfordeling, siidagrenser og ressursutnyttning i Samelands nordøstlige strøk. – B. Aarseth (doaim.), *Grenser i Sameland*. Oslo: Norsk Folkemuseum.
- WHITAKER, IAN 1955: *Social relations in a nomadic Lappish community*. Oslo: Norsk Folkemuseum.

How is the *siida* going to continue?

The *siida* (plural: *siiddat*) is of both ancient and contemporary interest. *Siiddat* were and remain local Sami communities, which thanks to written sources, we know met and negotiated with trades people and representatives of neighbouring and southern powers centuries ago. The *siida* even predates these written sources. Nowadays *siiddat* primarily organize the day-to-day practices of reindeer herding and *siiddat* have undergone major changes primarily due to the growing influence from outside.

The main features of this institutions continuity are the existence of *siida* territories, the membership of Sami families in the *siida* through generations, the membership also of their animals, and traditional Sami knowledge. Reindeer, or rather in Sami, *boazu*, has at all times been a member of the *siida*. Reindeer constituted a minor part of the *siida* in earlier times, but have been growing in importance over the last three or four centuries. The relations between reindeer as *boazu* and the Sami reindeer herder is used as an example to demonstrate elements of the traditional knowledge of reindeer herding Sami and their worldview. The reindeer herding Sami way of thinking stands for a day-to-day relation to questions of sustainability and ethics, which I term 'a *siida* way of thinking', as opposed to the economic and ecological modelling encountered in official and administrative thinking and direction.

A focus needs to be placed on a clarification of *siida* land rights, moreover on a protection and realization of the *siida* right to self-determination in internal affairs, thereby acknowledging the importance and relevance of traditional Sami knowledge. This is decisive for the continuation of the Sami *siida* system.

MIKKEL NILS SARA

mikkel-nils.sara@samiskhs.no

Sámi University College

In What Ways Are Siidas to be Continued? On Getting to Know the Siidas whereabouts¹

Mikkel Nils Sara
Sámi allaskuvla

Siida-talk

As part of a siida, it has always been the tradition to talk and exchange news, particularly about the reindeer, and this talk is open to all members of the siida; talk in which they gladly participate as interested parties, each in his own way. This talk may be between the various herding watches, where they analyze the latest data or information, and discuss the work at hand. The talk invariably extends to include the presentation of additional knowledge and experiences which may in some way have a bearing on the tasks awaiting them. Paine (1970: 54) noticed these talks. For him they appeared as endless conversations. He found that they show, first and foremost, that the duty and right of each herder to make decisions on the basis of his own assessments is both heard and respected. Furthermore, these talks are a way of ensuring that each decision is made on the basis of the most accurate and the greatest amount of available information. Fikret Berkes and Mina K Berkes (2009: 8), who have noted similar talks among Inuit hunters, divide them with respect to content and function into three categories: (1) accumulation of information as a result of continued observation, (2) the sharing of knowledge with other participants, and (3) the formation of a collective mental model (all this being language-based rather than numbers-based). When considering these factors together as one, it may be said that they reflect the environment in which the participants manage their knowledge.² In other words, it may be said that with their competence, they employ strategies for managing data and agree upon models of understanding, make independent decisions, and execute their tasks.

Reindeer-herders, especially those of the older generation, often lament wistfully that they wish they could just talk about the reindeer rather than all those irritating topics that interrupt the topic of the reindeer and being familiar with its circumstances. In this regard, I would have liked to describe the efforts of the siida-keeping fraternity of Norway's main herding areas to again "get onto the topic of siidas."³ I hope that the following text will shed light on different aspects of these efforts despite the fact that the article form differs from how siida matters traditionally have been addressed, i.e. scattered across the landscape as the herds are.

¹ The original Sámi title contains the herding term *sulladallan* (gerund). Cf. K. Nielsen (1932-1962/1979): *sulladallat* (verb) "remain near so that one can keep a fairly watch on the movements of the reindeer and interfere if necessary", cf. *olis* (postposition) "staying so near (to the reindeer) that one can keep an eye on them, *bohccuid olis leat* (...) be within the grazing area (denotes not such a close relationship that the verb *sulladallat*)." On the other side, terms like *geahččat* and *guođohit* denote a closer relationship to the herd.

² The original Sámi text contains different terms for knowledge, *diehtu* (knowledge as information), *dovdamuš* (the emotional and recognising aspect of knowledge) and *máhttu* (competence and skills)

³ I have borrowed this expression from the phrase *beassat bohccuid* ala "get onto reindeer," which I understand to mean, acquiring a herd large enough to be able to make a living.

Research approach to siida

Thus, the questions are: What methods or approaches should be employed in the study of the siida and how does one approach each aspect or member with respect to the reindeer-herders' way of life? The question is, first and foremost, for whom and to what end should the findings of the study be? In regard to siida affairs, it is, for example, still the case that certain decisions which are important for the siidas are made by outside authorities, whether it be those concerned with the definition or clarification of rights, official administration, or others. In such a situation, interpretation is required, then it is adapted to the methods of the authorities in question, both in order to present the data and to be able to brief them (the authorities) on the facts. This is to some extent also the function of research. In such circumstances, it has been shown that results are heavily influenced by whether the researcher uses previously established categories – basic concepts – or whether they stay with tried and trusted research material in such a way as to construct categories and research methods on the basis of this material. Brantenberg (1999) gives examples of this in clarifying cases of Sami rights as well as specific court cases. Qualitative research that constructs theoretical categories and methods of definition directly from the available data, as in e.g. *siiddastallan* (keeping/running a siida) (see also Charmaz 2006), is very important in Sami siida and reindeer-herding research. This is, of course, not to say that quantitative research has been totally rejected with regard to the siidas, but this method of research requires the organization of categories, concepts and theories, originally systematized through qualitative research.

The life and livelihood of reindeer-herders has throughout the years been extensively researched, and the reindeer-herders have themselves also contributed information as well as allowed access to others who wish to do research on reindeer or the herders' way of life. Social science is my specialist subject. A number of years ago, critical questions were asked about this discipline, for example: For whom and for whose benefit was research on Sami reindeer-herders being conducted? Biological research has gradually come to occupy a greater share of the type of data in which administrative and political decisions on herding are based. Here, the administrators have ultimately taken the authority away from the reindeer-herding community to decide what constitutes ecological sustainability with respect to the reindeer herds (see e.g. Jentoft 1998: 112 – 115). I would like to remind the reader of the criticism voiced many years ago by Keskitalo (1994 (1976) with regard to the Sami people's situation, and which I understand principally as the following: there is a great difference in political and institutional power between, on the one hand, western scientific practices and the mountain of collected data for the benefit of the majority population, and on the other, a betrayed minority people's ability to put forward the final theory of their problems and relations. This rebuke has probably not yet fully dawned on everyone. To this, it is perhaps appropriate to add the criticism made by Agrawal (2002) of the ways in scientific contexts that indigenous peoples' knowledge is treated, which I understand principally as the following: indigenous peoples' knowledge is considered useful knowledge when – and only when – it has been submitted to scientific explanations and processes in order to establish pieces of it as reliable data, while at the same time it is separated from the people and circumstances from which it originated. Power moulds data to its own type and form, and this way of enumerating indigenous peoples' traditional data does not, in itself, help improve indigenous peoples' situation.

In this article, I write about siida matters in ways of siida-talk, though I must admit that the form of the article cannot exactly take the form of siida-talk. Despite this, I have called it siida-talk, but importantly: this does not take place in a particular siida, as it is the members of that particular siida who should be left to investigate their own affairs in their own good time.

I also belong to a particular siida, but this has nothing to do with that. This is an imagined siida to which belong the various different members of this said siida, as well as others who are interested in taking part in an internal discussion about the form and continued existence of the siida. This discussion has, as its starting-point, certain information and observations or making of mental notes as well as, of course, assessments on the basis of these. There are though, no final decisions on how the people on the next watch should manage the siida. Decisions that each person makes over the course of time on the basis of this ongoing discussion about the siida are what forms the siida, just like and including any other particular siida. In other words, the siida is formed by processes rather than by external and final decisions on what the siida should actually be or with what other basic concepts it may represent. When discussing the siida, it is quite in order to suggest new categories and concepts, since all the ones we have from before were probably once suggested and tried. The prerequisite is, however, that they must be pertinent to the discussion. If they work, then they contribute to form our way of thinking about the siida.

If I had now been making my point as part of the old siida-talk tradition, then I would certainly have had to have concluded by now, if not before this point. With writing, however, the participants/interlocutors are different and communication is slower, so for this reason I have to continue with this more extended contribution. In addition, I am introducing literature about siidas to the siida-talk, something which has until now remained to a large extent outside the remit of the “talk.” My intention is to start a siida discussion or debate on the basis of this type of knowledge as well. Influences from the outside colonial world have, through the ages, also led to restrictions and sometimes changes in the siida. Also present-day interaction with the outside world has an effect on the siidas; not only in direct, visible ways, but also in the way of another language, and the manner in which it builds perceptions, can affect our own way of thinking about our own siida environment (Kuokkanen 2009).

New and different siida-talk

Another kind of siida-talk is to talk about the siida as a siida. Particularly over the past twenty to thirty years, the siidas’ internal and reciprocal talk has been about the siida, much of which has dealt with what impediments and what options external decisions and influences have been left to the siida and its members. The talk has mostly been about how entities established by the authorities and, to a certain extent, also space requirements due to land restriction have adversely affected reindeer-herders’ autonomous and self-regulating rights and obligations; in other words, the smooth running of the siida. Parallel to this – in connection with studies carried out towards the end of the 1980s – a scientific and herding related discussion was set in motion leading to arguments over so-called common resources which involved representatives of the various different scientific disciplines (Brox 1989; Stenseth – Trandem – Kristiansen 1991). Through the presentation of grazing-conditions, biological monitoring of reindeer and common-resource game-theoretical approaches (see Riseth [2009] for explanation), an image of the situation for reindeer-herding and the reasons for that situation reached the public domain (Kosmo 1991). Karasjok and Kautokeino came to represent both the focus of the discussion and the object of research. Regarding the social sciences, numerous and diverse approaches were represented; some of these approaches were grounded in the idea that the pastoralism of the Sami was not captured by explanatory constructs seeking to incorporate it into a greater discussion about the administration of common resources. Here, the basis has to be the Sami’s own methods of working with their reindeer and managing their lands (Paine 1992; Bjørklund 1999). Briefly stated, the discussions about

reindeer and reindeer-herding are, to a certain degree, based on the creation of theoretical categories that exclude the siida and siida-talk, and it is from this “excluded” discussion that one must be reminded that siidas really do still exist.

At this point in the historical discussion, the authorities charged with the administration of reindeer-herding put forward a proposal for the division of districts in Finnmark which they considered necessary to more effectively promote the authorities’ aim of making reindeer-herding ecologically and economically sustainable (Hætta – Sara – Rushfeldt 1994). The fundamental premise of the proposal is still the authorities’ own time-honoured interpretation of rights, that the right to herd reindeer is the collective right of the Sami, and to a great extent, subject to regulation by the authorities. The idea of the district-division is to establish both administrative and herding right boundaries (Ravna 2008: 372 -375). Especially in Kautokeino and Karasjok herding talk, the aforementioned proposal corresponded to an intended solution for the siida and the siida-system. The background for this was people’s own siida-talk and siida-experience, although the scientific discussion has also reached them particularly through the word *fellesbeite* (collective pasture) together with the perception that the term conveys. In their own daily conversations, the concept is used in its Norwegian form, as if to confirm that it is a word that has been introduced and to whose meaning they do not appear comfortable appropriating any traditional words traditionally used by the Sami. Whatever the case may be, the reindeer-herders’ opinions were communicated through their associations to the authorities and became the start of a process to get legal-recognition and acceptance for the siida in Norway.

In Norway, the siida was recognized as a legal concept in the 2007 Reindeer-herding Act and with it the ground was laid for the resolution of siida-affairs and the reparation of split seams in the siida-system. There is still a lot of work to be done and much effort still required, but to a great extent siida-talk’s circumstances have changed. Up until that point in 2007, when it came to matters concerning reindeer-herding policy and thus also in research, the following question had been in circulation: Isn’t it possible and better for the Sami and don’t they already work with their reindeer without the siida? If the question had just been asked directly it would have created a different discussion or debate. The question would then have pointed out the interdependency of the Sami, reindeer and the siida, and why each one of them has been important to that interdependency. The Sami people’s daily work with the reindeer has always been carried out together with the siida. By the same token, the reindeer have always lived and moved or migrated together with the siida. Phenomena such as mixture, or partial mixture, of herds, watching over the herd (in the summer), unmarked calves, separation of herds, castrated animals, hard packed areas of snow (due to grazing), moving the herd, migrations, round-ups etc., are all part of the operations and occurrences pertinent to the siida (Bull – Oskal – Sara 2001). The siida has always been relevant for reindeer-herders, since it has always been a necessary foundation for the execution of tasks and functions. It is in this work-situation that the concepts of the siida-talk function as a means of instruction and as a means to understanding the various tasks.

The siida’s present legal status

The siida’s durability up to the present day and its steadfastness in today’s world is due to the following: to it being maintained as a vital entity from generation to generation through adaptation and change since time immemorial; to its continued daily functioning in the execution of work as part of a livelihood and finally; to it having been absent from, and

unknown to, the state authorities' legislation and bureaucracy. In Norway the situation has now changed. The siida is recognized and defined into law. The judicial-committee has told about the challenges they had when they had to draw up regulations applicable to the various aspects and arrangements of the siida, since these could not be too restrictive, but neither could they be so lax that they contained, in effect, no legal power or protection (NOU 2001:35 10–11, 96-97). This has all to do with regulations, as we see it. These should define the siida's rights to the land, keep herd size in check, and indicate modes of membership as well as members' rights and duties. This has to do with the institutional aspects of the siida -- the functions that clarify regulations (see Jentoft 1998: 64-80). It may be said that the siida acquires status as an institution of resource-management in law as well as in the system of official government in which the districts and the regions were maintained. The idea behind this is that the siidas and siida-systems should themselves be further involved in the work to shape and implement regulations that would make the siida more autonomous. This might, however, have unfortunate consequences if, for example, official administration and government imposes its own government-technocracy on the siida, making it into an institutional subject (terms used by Staunes [2007: 252]) sympathetic to their own established ideas on ecological and economic moderation (or sustainability). Here, the siida can expect encounters with both official administrative and government bodies from which arise disagreements on expectations.

The underlying reason as to why the committee responsible for legislation on reindeer-herding in Norway now found it necessary and timely to protect the siida, together with its land-rights and autonomy, can basically be summarized in the following: reindeer-herding particularly represents a Sami way of life, and compliance with both international and national law had steadily progressed to the point where it constituted strong support for that way of life and the rights of the siida. During recent decades, the advancement in international law has gradually come to form a visible support for minority and indigenous peoples' rights and their fight for self-determination. Along with all the various aspects and questions of international law, comes the question: In what way do these protect the siida? In regard to such a question, at least with respect to siida-talk, it is important to see the siida not just as people's livelihood and means of subsistence, but also and at the same time, as the particular way in which these people, in the course of making their living, establish a connection to other people, to animals, to the land and to the elements. It is due to this holistic comprehensiveness that the siida may be seen to be affected, to a tremendous extent, by the "word-compartmentalized" elements of life and livelihood that appear in the texts of agreements, declarations and statements. With such compartmentalization, introduced by other languages and ideologies, one may be forced to enter onto a convoluted path of interpretation in order to get proof of the siida's protected status. In addition, there is also the word and concept of "culture," which has always been foreign to the language and understanding of the Sami since it presupposes a fundamental dichotomy/duality, common in the so-called western world and which appears, for instance, in the English words "culture" and "nature." This means that even the word – "nature" – in its use as a concept denoting something other than culture, may not easily be translated into Sami. Such differences, with respect to fundamental concepts apply not only to the Sami and their language, but also to many other indigenous peoples. This problem of concepts has also previously been pointed out by other researchers, for example Barsh: "The path of least resistance for indigenous peoples seeking state protection is to accept a separation of land, culture and science into separate legal categories, to be protected under separate international instruments and through separate intergovernmental mechanisms" (1999: 15). This same problem has also arisen in connection with article 27 of The United Nations (UN) Convention on civil and

political rights, which the Nordic countries have firmly incorporated in their own national legislation. This article, you see, prohibits states from causing individuals who belong to a minority group to lose their right to enjoy their culture, profess and actively practice their religion (system of beliefs), or use their language in fellowship with their own people. Of course, then question is what that culture is and how is it best maintained for the good of the people. Based on the interpretation of The UN Commission on Human Rights, it is clear that the Convention protects the immaterial and material culture of both individual persons and groups. In 1994, the Commission has clearly stated that culture has many forms of expression, including diverse ways of life and being closely tied to the use of land resources which is particularly relevant with respect to the situation of indigenous peoples (Lile 2008; NOU 2007:13, volume 1). On this basis it can be said that the siida is protected as a Sami way of life without the need to separate culture and livelihood. It is the method of interpretation that governs how national constitutional laws guaranteeing the conservation and promotion of Sami culture is to be understood.

Apart from the conventions on human rights, in works on legislation there is also reference made to the ILO-convention nr. 169, which deals especially with indigenous peoples and which Norway signed as early as 1990 (NOU 2001: 35). Although the articles of this convention have only been incorporated to a degree in Norwegian law (through the Reindeer-herding Act and the Finnmark Act), the so-called presumption principle means that other national legislation should, as far as possible, be interpreted in accordance with international law (NOU 2007: 13, volume 1). In regard to the articles of ILO Convention nr. 169, we face, in relation to siida-talk, the same struggle with various basic concepts and how to make them applicable to the siida's holistic self-concept. Here, the questions are about which articles of the convention correspond to the interests of the siida and in what way. The central question is what an institution is, or what is an "ásahus" (as it has been rendered in the Sami language version). One way to approach these questions of such importance in relation to the convention is, for instance, to say that at least the institutional aspects of the siida should be protected and recognized through the convention. These may include such things as the system for indicating reindeer-ownership, the siidas' seasonal grazing configuration, as well as other methods of inter-siida communication that maintain the siida-system. The siida may be defined purely on the basis of things such as these, as well as the definition and recognition of one's own siida as an institution of assembly. Such a definition may, at the same time, function as a limitation of the siida. Another way of approaching the questions is, for instance, that the siida extends further than its institutional aspects. It should be pointed out here that the siida has also been studied as an example of a socialization-space (Nergård 2006). It could also be defined as a mobile/peripatetic local community, to which people's identity, language, ideology and general way of life are tied. Thus, it may be understood that the siida encompasses the whole gamete, since the convention recognizes peoples' right to have their land claims resolved and the their aspirations to exercise control over their own institutions, ways of life and economic development and to maintain and develop their identities, languages and religions, within the framework of the States in which they live (ILO-Convention 2003: 10).

International law contains indigenous peoples' rights, for instance, those pertinent to self-determination, defined more clearly and in greater detail in new pieces of legislation, of which one example is the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which the UN General Assembly adopted in 2007. Yet another is the proposed Nordic Sami Convention. Although we are only dealing with a declaration and a proposed convention in this regard, they nevertheless demonstrate further development in interpretation and standards of international law. More specifically, it should be noted that both the aforementioned documents emphasize

that indigenous peoples and the Sami have the right to maintain, develop, exploit for their own benefit, and gain recognition for, their own knowledge, their own philosophies, and their own sciences. These aspects also should be considered alongside the Sami rights to dispose of and decide their own priorities of development concerning their own lands and accompanying natural-resources, as well as the right to self-determination, which is the right of all peoples (Henriksen 2008). Together, this contributes to inform us about how international law can be interpreted to protect independently functioning siidas. I do not, however, here wish to digress into a further discussion on international law.

How we know the siida...

Here, the above title hints at an ambiguous method of approach.⁴ We might first say: How we know that, it is because ... (followed by explanations). What is referred to here is what is usually known as epistemology, which refers particularly to the basis and steps of scientific knowledge. We could also say: How we know that, because... (followed by doubts). What is referred to here is a question of whether there is enough information, but there is still always as much as the eye selects, or stated even more strongly by Bateson-Bateson: "A description can never resemble the thing described – above all, the description can never be the thing described" (1988: 151).

Using our "how-we-know," we can follow many roads to the siida. These roads will lead us to the siida's various different elements and perspectives. I have chosen to divide these roads in the following way:

- Research-based writing that especially highlights those aspects of the siida that have, in various ways, been accessible to scientists/researchers and which they have dealt with.
- Written sources that do not explicitly focus on the siida, but through which it is possible to trace it.
- Old Sami fables and stories that exist either in written or oral form, or both.
- Present-day people's oral explanations/descriptions, stories and recollections of their own or previous generations' experiences of incidents, events and occurrences.
- Familiarization with the circumstances of a functioning siida, where the narrator speaks both through people's conversations as well as through the impressions of the animals' disposition, the terrain and the weather and the elements or spheres.

In this article, it is my turn to speak and I have made use of all these avenues of information. Furthermore, I have made use of scientific work in theoretical discussions. Indigenous peoples' alternative ways of thinking have also functioned as the basis of a critique of science. It should be added that even when using all these methods, it is still not possible to achieve an insight fully capable of defining the siida. What is possible, however, is to pick up a thread with which to start a discussion on the basic idea of the siida and on its common way of thinking. The discussion itself must be limited though, as it is intended to function on all the various levels. In this regard I have, as previously explained, chosen to keep it to a roughly siida-sized discussion, at least with respect to the members

⁴ The Sami phrase "mas mii diehtit" can be expressed either as an assertion or a question without changing the word order.

How we know through research and written sources ...

Former district recorder in Finnmark Erik Solem found that the siida-model employed by reindeer-herders probably has its origins in the ancient siida-system, but has been adapted for the purpose of keeping large herds of reindeer (Solem 1970 [1933]: 106). The expansion of these herds is often referred to as the main factor in the change, while at the same time, forming the background for yet another break or change whose factors had more to do with the land than with the way of life itself. From complaints about infringements of old siida-boundaries, furthermore, we see signs of that which has been characteristic of the continuity of the modified siida (Jebens 1993: 383; Pedersen 1994: 52-63). This having been mentioned, it could be said that for the purposes of this present siida-talk, it is just as important, if not more important, to ask rather what are the characteristic aspects of the continuity? There follows a number of suggestions from both written sources and present-day siida-talk references.

In literature the ancient siidas are called hunting-siidas and today we still have an awareness of them through studies based on archive sources (Solem 1970 (1933); Tegengren 1952 and 1977; Nickul 1977; Vorren 1978 and 1989) or from the last functioning siidas that, for the most part, still resembled those former siidas (Tanner 1929; Nickul 1948). On the basis of these studies, it is possible to postulate that the siidas had their own land, separated from neighbouring siidas by time-honoured boundaries. The land, water and natural-resources that lay within these boundaries were not considered entirely as common property, since some portion was passed on by families as a legacy, from generation to generation. Yet other natural resources, whose exploitation required greater manpower, were otherwise considered common-resources constituting, at the same time, part of that which made membership of a siida necessary. It has also been important for the later siidas, sometimes known as reindeer-siidas, to keep separate land for themselves. In the 1700s, there was already a clear understanding of where the siidas' migration routes and grazing lands were, and reindeer herders present claims to the national authorities for formal recognition of ancient use and custom, with respect to the division of siida-lands, are to a large extent based on this understanding (Schnitler 1929; Smith 1938). It might be thought that in this matter everything revolved around grazing-land, but there also exists reports indicating that more recent nomadic Sami considered both pasture for the reindeer and hunting potential in choosing siida locations and dwelling places (Lilienskiold 1942 [1698]).

The oldest existing data on the siidas has recently been used as background information in the clarification of Sami land rights, and has thus become, in various ways, a topic of current interest for the Sami as a whole. I do not, however, intend to follow that particular route right up to the present day. I have, rather, noted what kind of written data has been sought by the reindeer herders of present-day siidas, at least by those belonging to the predominant herding regions of Norway. In particular they are seeking data that shows reindeer-siidas' ties to land. Of course, it may be assumed that this is due to the imminent completion of work on the clarification of land rights in Finnmark. On the other hand, it may be said that there would not have been so much interest in these matters had they not corresponded to themes and priorities within the siidas. In sociological studies, local community, and thus locality, has been a central basic concept. To the siidas of the nomadic Sami, locations are merely part of the whole of their land-area, so in discussions about locality they can easily get left out, or their identity can get relegated to a sort of pseudo-local status. If there were a concept that could possibly serve as a parallel to the concept of local community that would better

represent the siida, then it would be “territorial”⁵ community. The construction of the unit of territoriality, or of how the various different and extensive areas of land constitute a separate unit, is fundamental for understanding the peculiarity of the siida. From the old hunting-siidas up to roughly the 1950s is a period of time that has not been dealt with by any study of collected data able to present, in a more comprehensive manner, this essential territorial characteristic of reindeer siidas, or their various grazing lands and migration routes. There is a great lack of data on reindeer siidas. It appears, from written sources, that following the border closures in the mid 1800s and the subsequent calamitous disturbances, siidas were getting settled again, and it was clear both to the people and to the reindeer where each siida had its summer and winter grazing (Solem 1970 (1933): 190-191). Even so, it was only after WWII that comprehensive ethnographic studies were published, showing the siidas’ grazing areas and migration routes, as well as the boundaries between grazing areas (Manker 1953; Vorren 1962). Vorren’s studies in particular have been in constant use in Finnmark, both in inter-siida discussions as well as in work on clarification of the siidas’ land-rights (Fløtten – Ravna – Päiviö 2002; Hætta et al. 2003 and 2004). The great interest in finding out about a particular siida in previous times was also the background for the recent publication of archive-material on this matter (Bull 2005; Sara 2006a and 2006b). On the basis of the above mentioned literary sources as well as present-day siida-talk, I would strongly suggest the first basic concept of siida-identity: *duovdatlašvuohta* (territoriality).

Apart from this, during the past 50-60 years, there have been social-anthropological studies published that take up the issue of siida modified patterns of inter-personal relations in particular (Whitaker 1955; Pehrson 1964; Paine 1964). To this I can add my own contribution: In trying to make the siida a more visible institution, both in the public domain as well as in the bodies able to grant legal recognition, I have also used and benefited from these works to demonstrate the organizational aspects of siida or siida as also being an organization of inter-personal relations (Sara 2001). On the basis of these as well as a summary of the aforementioned written sources, I shall here add another, this time more familiar basic concept with respect to the siida: *siidaguimmešvuohta* (siida-fellowship). This is the kind of concept whose composition contains many questions about which there is much discussion in today’s siidas. In Norway, the legally designated herding unit together with its administrative system broke up the traditional siida-fellowship. New proposed legislation, through the establishment of the so-called siida part, opened up the possibility that the siida itself could, by agreement, have a greater say in the administration of the unit/entity established by this legislation. The bill that was finally passed, however, changed the terms of the agreement through an amendment which was about how a reduction in the number of reindeer was to be shared within the siida in cases where the members were not be able to agree among themselves. Such legislation affects the siida’s ability to agree and to promote and develop its own use, and it becomes a self-fulfilling prophesy (Jentoft 1998: 88). In this way, part of the siida, in the sense of part of the herd, is taking the place of siida fellowship. The legislation strengthens competition within the siida, which in the most extreme cases can lead to the practice of running a separate siida. Siidas have always maintained a kind of balance between separate/private practice and common activities. Extensive private practice can hinder or occupy space that could be taken up by the development potential of the siida’s internal common activities.

Subsequent to the aforementioned works, other works were published showing the considerations and pastoral practices of the siidato be different from assumptions given by

⁵ The Sámi term ”duovdda” could also be interpreted as region, tract, parts or habitat

outsiders, the authorities and even by some researchers, as to how reindeer herding is, or should be (Bjørklund – Brantenberg 1981; Paine 1994; Kalstad 1997; Brantenberg 1999; Forbes et al. 2006; Tyler et al. 2006; Joks et al. 2006; Ravna 2008). Reindeer herders' own knowledge and interests, as well as references to siida herding are put forward as a consideration, and to a certain extent, as the answer to such things as loss of land, climate, and even the authorities' administration and government becoming a strain on former functional herding and siida specific methods. A view on these methods, or rather, an expert reindeer herding view is useful as help in critically assessing scientifically, administratively, and politically processed reindeer herding affairs. The results of these studies and recommendations point to Sami traditional knowledge and understanding in general, as well as to the siida system, in particular as the mainstay of the future development of Sami reindeer herding. On the basis of these written studies as well as current siida-talk, I now add a third fundamental concept relevant to the siida: *mahtolašvuotta* (competence, expertise). Under the umbrella of this concept, belong such things as, awareness of siida-housekeeping, acquaintance, adaptation and world view. These I shall deal with later in the article.

Among the written sources, I mention books written by former reindeer herders (Skum 1955; Turi 1987 (1910); Pirak 1993 (1937); Hætta – Bær 1958). In these writings, words such as, siida, seasonal grazing land, and migration route are used as if everyone knew what they meant. The explanations are, rather, of siida-activities, customs and occurrences, sometimes of the names of land or terrain and people in the references. To the writers, the siida seems to be used as a natural term of reference, and all events and rightful members are within its bounds. To these books, I add one written by Nils Oskal, more specifically, part of his work whose topics are *boazoliikka* and *olmmošlašvuotta* (reindeer-luck and good-relations) (1995: 83-111). In many respects, these writings are siida-talks. The most important lesson in siida-talk is that the siida is not only defined by rules on organizational lines. The siida is, to a great extent, defined by and survives through *siiddastallat* (keeping/running a siida), or by the processes that constantly maintain and shape it. Perhaps the above mentioned Sami literature can act as a reminder of this realization, as it points to a daily self-maintenance, a separate realm of thought and a self-inventing development as an extremely important way of sustaining the siida. On this basis, I shall add one more fundamental concept with which to “grasp” the siida: *siidastallan* (siida-keeping).

Scientific articles have a habit of referring to interviews, some phrase or definition is repeated and the answers are then researched using certain analytical techniques. Here, I have in a way turned this around. I have used background siida-talk as the basis for collecting and dividing the data, as well as organizing it according to fundamental concepts that might lead to a clearer model/idea of what the siida is. I shall now deal with the dispute between the siidas and the current official portrayal of reindeer herding. In many respects, the herders see this as a dispute that involves their competence in running the siidas as well as the terms of self-determination. On the other hand, the discussion has been presented specifically as a question of ecological sustainability. I shall here apply a critical approach to the science-based constructs that appear in this dispute. It is not only participating siida members who have put forward critical arguments, since criticism has also been forthcoming from scientific quarters on the manner in which biologists, for instance, have assumed the authority to speak for so-called nature. In this article, I shall call attention to the way that the sciences present themselves in their meeting with siida-members on the regulation of reindeer-herding.

Today's siida-meetings – theoretical approaches

How many reindeer does a family need in order to be able to make a reasonable living? That is a question that has been repeatedly asked for as long as anyone can remember (see e.g. Solem 1970 (1933): 184; Skjenneberg Slagsvold 1968: 258; Holand 2003: 203; NOU 2001:35: 179). This in itself seems to be a reasonable and innocent enough question. However, it has led to, or at least been a contributing factor in, leading to sums being made and numbers being crunched with subsequent decisions being made, which gradually turned into regulations and thus also restrictions on both local and siida initiatives to find their own solutions in their own time. By way of the official reindeer-herding administration, the ways of knowing of the various different branches of science have steadily forced their way ever closer to where influential decisions are made, e.g. biologists and economists. Along with the choice of a certain knowledge system, follow inevitable political choices about the kind of reindeer-herding we want (Kalstad 1998). Studies and reports lead to the construction of economic and subsequently ecological models, which are then used as the instrument of official government institutions. Thus, we are no longer just talking about a few sums, but about models that are used to decide what people's units are, the number of animals, the animals' worth to the people as a commodity and the animals' annual growth and reproduction on plant-nutrition. This activity brings with it a new theoretical basis and new concepts, in effect, a new language with which to approach reindeer and reindeer-herding (Paine 1994; Heikkilä 2006). The intention is to view reindeer-herding as a livelihood, but the accompanying practical mode of evaluation causes the nomadic Sami way of life to change, that is, to be in conformity with that particular way of looking at things (Jentoft 1998: 88). At the same time the aforementioned models have already introduced a systemic administrative way of thinking, putting it ahead of the former relational sustainability or ways of doing estimates and judgments in a continuous and active relationship with the natural environment. With the first of these methods, complete models are used, (such as the maximum sustaining yield modelling) in terms of the targeting of numbers, while with the latter, there would be observance of approximates and adjustment according to whatever new data might come to light (Hornborg 1996; Scott 2006; Berkes – Berkes 2008).

The siida's encounters with the authorities' administration and with scientific research have, generally speaking, brought up questions that touch on fundamental differences between the respective ways of thinking. These are the type of questions that have even been dealt with in scientific-theoretical theses, and therefore there has also been criticism voiced in political ecology circles of western scientific tradition. Part of this criticism has been the kind that touches on the aforementioned situation in which the siidas, with their mode of operation and way of thinking, come up against scientific research. Here, one could mention e.g. Latour (2004: 9-52 231-232) who, in his critique, points to western sciences with their modernistic ideology as having separated from humans and externalized everything that might be termed "nature." As a result, an unavoidable impasse between culture and nature has been established among ordinary people. This modernistic way of thinking has been cleverly devised to consider researchers/scientists as the only people able to go over to the other side and bring findings that represent the true essence of nature. Thus, scientists or experts, through (political) epistemology, have been given complete authority to be the keepers of valid data, while other people, on the outside, and have lost the authority to access true reality. An initial way out of this kind of situation is to oppose this sort of dichotomous thinking and reject nature. As far as the siida is concerned, all this can be interpreted as nothing more than dissuasion against adopting or accepting this kind of dichotomy/duality. Here, the best thing is not even to go along with or be diverted by these frequent questions, such as: Should

reindeer-herding be defended because it is a livelihood or because it is an important transmitter of culture for the Sami? The answer to that is that it is a way of life with its own resources, its own knowledge, and its own traditions and with everything else that goes along with these. It is not one thing or the other.

In this it may be thought that research and research-based official administration is separating the reindeer from the herder and thereby accumulating resources of data on its own side. On this basis, it intends to guide, influence and shape the underlying ideas and methods involved in the execution of reindeer-herding. One might ask, however, whether the separation of reindeer and herder is even possible. Are there, rather, grounds for saying that research is putting forward *Rangifer Tarandus* as an animal with which the herder is to work, but which at the same time does not belong to him or is separated from him? In this regard, I am thinking of biological research, for instance, which refers to *goddi* (wild-reindeer), *goddiluvvon boazu* (semi-domesticated reindeer that has become wild), *boazu* (semi-domesticated reindeer) and *gesát* (domesticated reindeer) as one species, but also of reindeer-herding research, which views *boazu* as purely a species of animal, which it is easily able to do with designations such as *reinsdyr* and reindeer. *Boazu* (semi-domesticated reindeer) on the other hand, is inseparable from the reindeer-herder, certainly according to the Sami way of thinking. This kind of inseparability can also be seen from Latour's (2004) answer to the western idea of separating society (to which only humans belong) from the outside world (to which everything non-human belongs). In his very different explanation, the world's great variety and diversity is represented as associations, i.e. associations of humans and non-humans. These associations constitute in their representation a sort of proposition, more or less well articulated, but nevertheless, a proposition that is still always an association; "each of these propositions is accompanied by instruments capable of transposing what it says, but also by its own speech impediment, its own uncertainties about the faithfulness of the representation" (Latour 2004: 166). In *siida*-talk, the connection between reindeer and the Sami is described thus: The reindeer-herder talks reindeer-talk, not of his own invention or construction, but influenced by the reindeer's teaching. To this I can add: The reindeer appears together with the members of the *siida*, never as the finite definition of what it actually is, but as a constant proposition through the practical operation of the *siida*. The same, of course, could also be said about practical science and the instruments and methods it employs. It might be capable of providing an even greater insight into the reindeer (*boazu*), thus increasing the available data with the purpose of achieving a clearer proposition. This science, however, must then relinquish any ambitions of maintaining and using the idea of nature (Latour 2004: 25). The reindeer and the reindeer-herder are always together, both of them partners or associates in the *siida*.

The foundations of the *siida*'s continuity

Is the premise of the *siida*'s continuity first and foremost the balances between humans and a certain natural resource? As previously mentioned, such calculations have become the basis of economic and ecological models, at least with respect to how reindeer-herding should be recognized as a livelihood. They form the basis of plans requiring a system whose standardized means of subsistence and animal objectification are in accordance with industrial agro-pastoral methods. These conditions are far from herders and hunters, for apart from anything else, inter-human relations and human-animal relations are similar in certain respects, or at least, they are not completely separate (Ingold 2006: 75). The aforementioned

type of systemic equilibrium might be the way of moderating, to a certain extent, people's earnings on the basis of certain economic and ecological calculations. However, neither do these people need to create nor do they create a siida for this reason. The siida cannot be saved by the use of externally constructed and calculated models, since the siida cannot be saved from itself. On the other hand, one could also say: when it comes down to it, a person's most pressing needs are quite specific and requiring of attention. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to afford people the security of their basic needs. So such equilibrium between humans and certain natural resources would seem to be the factor foremost in the continuity of the siida, since without humans, the siida cannot be continued.

I must admit that regarding certain repeated situations for the reindeer-herder, such as when putting up a separate household or moving to another siida, I have also contemplated the construction of an assessment or evaluation model for this mode of equilibrium. This idea was, of course, influenced by the fact that such questions have become the principle points of reindeer-herding related public discussion in today's media. However, such model-like assessments do not appear in the herders' own accounts of their initial membership of the siida and of their place in it. People simply take into consideration both the multi-faceted nature of their environment and their own physical resources, and do not waste energy on extra work constructing models for their own instruction (Ingold 2006: 164). Benjaminsen (2009) has pointed out, using examples from North Africa, how scientists from the so-called scarcity-school⁶ have made question concerning the sufficiency and plunder of natural resources a matter of current interest. However, this school's research has been criticized in political ecology circles. It has been said, among other things, that scarcity thinking and discourse has been used about the problems of poor areas, that it has turned herders (or pastoralists) into helpless destroyers of resources as well as that it has been used as a pretext for calling in outside experts to solve the problems. This is very similar to when, on the basis of a common resource-scientific and political debate, the concern was expressed that Sami reindeer-herders were destroying grazing land and because of this the authorities would have to intervene (see above explanation with references). This is a pattern of questions and answers that is probably not yet at an end, and may, indeed, appear during the current situation as well.

Throughout time, it has been the case that circumstances have steadily changed. The various years have certainly always caused various different changes in the natural resources and this also applies to the reindeer herds which, in some years, get severely depleted. For the herders, the changes experienced in such years are still vivid in their memory. In their own accounts of establishing and running a siida, however, it is always knowledge and expertise that constitute the explanatory backdrop. Knowledge, or one could say the knowledge-base, is like the warp in cloth, as is the case with other bases. The base⁷ is that which continues from generation to generation (Bull – Oskal – Sara 2001: 322-324). The continuity of the siidas thus consists of the siida-base (which continues each siida's regional/territorial identity), basic people (who continue the siida-fellowship) and the knowledge-base (which continues the expertise), or more straightforwardly, all of these together represent association through the keeping and running of the siida.

⁶ Knapphetskolen (Benjaminsen 2009: 154)

⁷ The Sámi concept is *vuodđu*

The knowledge-base

The knowledge-base, which might also be termed traditional knowledge, is itself what siida-talk has always been about. Nowadays, this is part of people's lives, and has with regard to indigenous peoples in particular, become the basis of global scientific and political discussions. The topic of knowledge in siida-talk has become part of a wider discussion, and in this connection, I shall here further investigate one aspect of the questions concerning the siidas' knowledge-base.

Knowledge-base is, in the context of scientific discussion, defined as: a cumulative body of knowledge, practice and belief, evolving by adaptive processes and handed down through generations by cultural transmission (Berkes, 2008:7), and every generation that has this knowledge-base acquires and adapts additional knowledge in order to survive and prosper in a given environment. In truth, knowledge⁸ is one word that I have chosen from among many, as it refers to the capacity to realize any function or activity. The fact that there are so many of such words in use in siida-talk is a sign of how much stock is placed in all the many steps involved in serving an apprenticeship. I mention here, as an example, verbs such as: *diehtit* (know, know about, knowledge as information), *oahpásnuvvat* (become acquainted with, proficient in, experienced in), *oahppahuvvat* (become acquainted with, make the acquaintance of, get an insight into), *hárjánit* (become accustomed, become expert), *máhttit* (be able, speaking of ability, knowledge as competence and skills), *dovddiidit* (begin in earnest to know, notice, feel, experience), *dovdat* (know, perceive, sense, the emotional and recognising aspect of knowledge). To help someone acquire this knowledge, Sami tradition has the following brief but demanding advice: listen, watch and take note of what your elders tell you and of how they work; for your part, observe, evaluate, be critical and discover. This is a practicing and travelling method of learning and understanding, which has, as its premises, that this knowledge becomes a common knowledge as all members work and communicate together in co-operation. The Sami language, in addition to the words for understanding (*ipmirdit*, *áddet*) also has in its repertoire *fihttet* and *dádjadit* (understanding as ability to imagine, foresee, envisage, find one's way), and there are also expressions such as: "a person should envisage where to direct his/her thoughts." What then determines one's ability to imagine or envisage (*dádjadit*)? The word itself hints at awareness and attentiveness. On the basis of this siida Sámi advice, we can acknowledge that theorists are in accordance with Sámi view of learning when stating that: learning is not a transmission of information, but an "education of attention" (Gibson 1979: 254; Ingold 2006: 167). One could also say that the words and concepts function more as a means of raising awareness than as a ready-made method of explaining meaning or giving instruction. In addition, the concepts are open to new information through sight, sound and perception, with which the content of each concept is maintained and modified. Understanding is then formed and maintained with the help of the language, since it is language that makes words and concepts (Berkes – Berkes 2009: 8). According to this definition, one cannot learn or start to understand the activities and operation of the siida purely through accounts and interviews, thus, the meaning and content of words and concepts must also be grasped through experience, recognition, and continued processes of getting to know.

To this textual translation of the learning and knowledge-base awareness of siida-life, I should like to add one further note based on Latour (2004: 194): the sphere of the siida also includes beings that do not speak. These, or parts of them, may be excluded from the representation of

⁸ The sámi concept is *máhttu*

the account. When considering and deciding what to include, we always leave something out in favour of something else. There is always something else to consider. There is then always the possibility that those excluded will return to demand their part and their place. The solution to this is the learning curve which has nothing more to commend it than the quality of learning, which requires that we allow those excluded to disturb us and that we repeatedly assess the quality of our own learning. This also means that if the *siida*, for instance, loses the right to make mistakes or to fail, then it may also lose its ability to be disturbed and to carefully observe, and thereby also its ability to manage and advance knowledge as well as its capacity for self-government. Part of the *siidas'* knowledge-base is, on the one hand, the conservation and transmission of information and knowledge from generation to generation. On the other hand it is an encouragement and incentive to individual and independent scrutiny, discovery and assessment. Thanks to this knowledge-base, each generation has inherited self-sufficiency and self-government, which it cannot afford to lose if the *siida* is to continue.

An aspect of *siida* world view

The reindeer has been a part and a member of the *siida* for a very long time. According to linguistic research, the word *boazu* (semi-domesticated reindeer) has been traced back to the so-called Proto-Finno-Permic period, and thus can be said to be roughly 5500 years old (Sammallahti 1998: 120-121). The Sami story-telling tradition also includes the tale of how the *goddi* (wild reindeer) is the legacy of *Áhcešeatni*, while the *boazu* (semi-domesticated reindeer) is the legacy of *Njávešeatni* (see Qvigstad 1927-1929 II: 228-229, 326-329). *Áhcešeatni* frightened her reindeer so much with her brutal and reckless behaviour that they became wild (*goddi*) and *Njávešeatni* kept her reindeer because she handled them with such care. The story does not explain what the title of the tale in the above mentioned book hints at, that the *boazu* came first, and that *goddi* is descended from it. It explains rather, that *boazu* can become *goddi*, but that *goddi* cannot become *boazu* (this is an occurrence for which there is no word in the Sami language, since it does not occur). *Goddi* cannot be tamed or domesticated into a *boazu*, a fact confirmed by ancient Sámi stories still remembered as a part of *siida*-talk. *Boazu* though, can become *goddi* if the connection is not maintained between it and the Sami.

Goddi and *boazu* are physiologically identical animals, and that which separates them is what is termed their nature. From one physiological example have sprung “natures” that are, in many respects, different in character, though in other respects they are identical. There have also evolved certain differences in form that the Sami, with their trained eye, are able to recognize and distinguish. The difference in “nature” and form has come about through a prolonged contact with humans. In the *siida*-environment, the word nature is always used and understood as being the nature of something or other, which appears through a relation to something or someone else, such as human and reindeer, reindeer and reindeer, weather and reindeer, land/terrain and reindeer etc. The reindeer and its nature is thus a contract with the Sami *siida*-members. What sort of contract is it then? As previously mentioned, Ingold (2006: 72-75) argues that pastoralists or traditional herders, such as reindeer-herding Sami, equate inter-human relations and human – animal relations in some respects; as with animal – human relations, so also with inter-human relations. He understands traditional herders' relation with the animals in their herd as domination. They, to his knowledge, may rank the animals below humans hierarchically, but they relate to their animals on the premise that the animals are endowed with powers of autonomous action which have to be overcome. So the herder has

then, presumably, taken the reindeer completely under his control, in the same way that some people are subjected to the will of others. In contrast to this understanding, the Sami reindeer herder's own ancient foundation-narrative, suggests that the relationship is a contract. So the siida members' relations are then also, presumably, founded on agreement. Here, one could refer to the fact that Paine (1970) has, with his research, found equality among siida-fellows as being a central feature of nomadic Sami siidas. He states that siida-partners have contractual relations (Paine 1970: 56)¹⁴. Given that inter-human relations mirror human and reindeer relations, this reinforces human and reindeer relations as a contract. This is also supported by tales about the Sami and their close relationship to animals. There are, though, other animals that the Sami have hunted. Their relations to the Sami are dealt with in other tales and fables, such as the ones about the bear and the wolf. Those aspects, which I have touched on in other articles (Sara 2003 and 2009), will not be investigated in any more detail here, but they also form a part of the siida world view.

When ancient siidas, which only had a small herd of reindeer (*boazu*) but which exploited wild reindeer (*goddi*) to a greater extent, changed into herding siidas, then the land divisions also had to change. The question is: who changed them and was it people who beforehand devised the divisions to which they adapted the movements of the reindeer? The siida would then be a human institution on its own, and the humans, when instituting it, would have imagined beforehand, or constructed a model of what the reindeer herd is like and how to control it. This is an explanation that is not consistent with the idea that the Sami have to "enter into a contract" with the reindeer. According to the contract explanation, the siida in itself must also be a contract between human and reindeer. The siida base therefore, or the siida places⁹, areas¹⁰, migration-routes and seasonal grazing land must have gradually become part of the siida as humans learned what the needs and behaviour of bigger herds are, as the reindeer forming a part of a bigger herd adapted itself and became familiar with the land or terrain and as humans became familiar with the land or terrain by observing the reindeer and the herd. Thus, the siida, together with its land, may be considered a contract between land, reindeer and the Sami. The reindeer is, undoubtedly, in the same way as humans, a type of being that becomes familiar with land, and from year to year, desires to return to the land it knows and where it is accustomed to being at different times. This has been recounted before, as a basic definition of the siida (Solem 1970 [1933]: 190-191), and it is held to even today both in discussions among siida-folk and in explanations. In the siida, reindeer are perceived both as individual animals and as a herd. Thus, siida-talk provides the most complete representation of reindeer as such (i.e. as *boazu*). Reindeer shall, as part of the siida, be sustained and live together, according to their kind, in the way reindeer have lived in their own tracts of land. When allowed to do this, then reindeer are in their natural state and facilitate the work of the herder. The needs and will of the reindeer become more familiar to the herder, and correspondingly, the reindeer learn to recognize how the herder makes his will known. All of this together, results in the successful functioning of the siida with respect to the relations between the siida-members, the reindeer, and the land.

Siida-agreements, however, are not just made internally between members of the siida, but also between siidas. It has always been an old siida tradition to agree upon and maintain inter-siida boundaries (Vorren 1989). It has been with the help of such relations, that monitoring of good siida-keeping has been possible. Nowadays, at least in the arguments over the authorities' district management regime for herding in Finnmark, the discussion has been about who represents the siida in inter-siida matters. Some reindeer-herding Sami have in

⁹ Like *goahtesajit* (campgrounds), *livvasajit* (the herd's resting places)

¹⁰ Like *guottetbáikkit* (calving grounds), *ragatbáikkit* (rutting grounds)

words maintained that it is the reindeer that represents the siida, yet others in practice. The herder only has to follow the reindeer. Yet others have responded that the reindeer cannot be held responsible or blamed when the siidas' own internal agreements and operations are not successful. Their mode of explanation can be said to be a constant observation of relational sustainability of the land together with its reliant factors, and may be briefly summed up thus:¹¹

The main characteristics of unsuccessful siida-keeping or excessive density of siidas are disorder and overcrowding of reindeer. Reindeer do like to follow familiar reindeer and familiar bell-sounds, but disorder is still, first and foremost, a problem for humans. Humans like to keep their own marked reindeer together, under their control, and it is therefore in their interest that their siidas should seek to promote and maintain good siida-keeping practices in any inter-siida communication. Overcrowding, on the other hand, affects, first and foremost the reindeer, since they deteriorate if subjected to overcrowding for any length of time. The reindeer assumes responsibility and responds to the overcrowding with lack of calves and depletion of the herd. Whether humans also consider this as their problem or not, the deterioration of the reindeer reaches a point at which the relations between humans and reindeer become strained and threaten the wellbeing of the reindeer (or the human – reindeer pact of the old stories). The humans' responsibility here consists of the fact that they discuss the reindeer, or speak for the reindeer in conversations with representatives of other siidas. Inter-siida communication is a part of the assessment of ethical questions, and agreements between siidas do not just divide areas of land, but also ethical questions as a dischargeable responsibility for each siida in their own internal contracts. The task of observing the reindeer's stamina and physical state and the problem of overcrowding can thus be resolved as a specific matter for each particular siida, rather than being broadcast as a reindeer-herding affair, as has been the case with the discussion on the failings of the siida.

Rounding off a bit of a discussion

This discussion has projected itself in one direction and turned back to head off ideas bolting off in another, sometimes I have just had to cross tracks leading out from the main topic, but I believe that the discussion is in hand, at least for the most part. In truth, members of the siida do not have the luxury of being able to take care of just one edge of the herd. In the "round-up" of the siida-system, there are matters that in the outside world are spread over various different specialist fields, which employ their underlying premises of thought and basic concepts in their dealings and meetings with the siidas. On the other hand, in both official and scientific discussion, they simplify the picture, reindeer husbandry or rather the reindeer herding industry is set as a point of reference for various different matters and questions. It is on the basis of certain features, as it were, limited and unified into a separate section of society. With this type of discussion, it is easy to lose sight of the siida and of how it is supposed to operate based on its own questions and priorities.

However, the time has come to round off this discussion. The theme of this discussion has been the work involved in re-establishing the siida as a continuing self-governing unit. This is supported by advances in International Law, which may still have to be used to help clarify and strengthen siida-autonomy. In Norway, the siida and siida-autonomy is, in principle, recognized in law, but this in itself does not secure the siida. From now on, the discussion will

¹¹ In discussions between herders, their point of reference is more likely to be stories/accounts and certain situations or circumstances, but I have shortened this discussion to a brief summary.

be of how the siida and siida-autonomy is to be realized in practice. Each person must, as when herding, himself observe, evaluate, be critical and take note of matters on his watch. I have suggested here four basic concepts as “edges” of the discussion¹², which I consider reasonable to suggest in following and tracking the various different paths of information.

The first edge is the one to which I have assigned the designation *duovdatlašvuohhta* (territoriality). To tidy this edge is to define the siida’s various siida foundations, which, first and foremost includes the defining of inter-siida boundaries, but which might also include the clarification of other natural resource and land rights in connection with the Finnmark Act. This is a matter that was taken up as early as the 1990s, and herders have since then prioritized it as an urgent case, however, little of substance has happened during the last ten to fifteen years. The matter is important in the opinion of the herders, as year round management of land use constitutes the most important condition for successful siida- self-government. If the siida fails, and it does not happen on the terms of its own territorial limits and potential, then it is not a failure of the siida. At least outwardly, it might be seen as a failure of the siida and the siida-system, triggering in the legislation various draconian measures. This is the siidas’ fear in today’s environment.

The second “edge” is what I call *siidaguimmešvuohhta* (siida-fellowship). When the basis of the siida is not clear, then it is obvious that the siida-fellows’ basis is not clear either. Siida-fellows are, in such circumstances, stuck in a kind of status quo situation, which is actually the old Reindeer Herding Act-based district and unit system. Unclear territoriality hinders the siida in a sober assessment of household bases and the various different people’s part of the siida, and also of how the siida might add to its subsistence base with common activities as well as with knowledge and capability acquired by members of the siida.

The third “edge” is *mahtolašvuohhta* (expertise). This consists of a knowledge-base first, or traditional-knowledge, its conservation, use, and transmission. This principally includes the ability to realize in practice the siida’s functions and intentions. The other side of this is the underlying world view or way of thinking that has been passed on to us through our stories. The questions of knowledge arise in connection with encounters with other ways of thinking, such as that which accompanies the official administration as its basis for legislation affecting the siida. The question is first internal: Do we truly believe in our own knowledge-base, from the making of a rein button to the fable of the bundle of reins of *Ahčešeatni*? If we do, then it is the start of working and arguing for autonomy. This does not mean that the siida’s knowledge is totally reliable and unquestionable, but rather that the siidas have a right, by way of a constant learning process to themselves try to find, take note of and make use of the best aspects of what they have learned. This right also includes being open to the use of the results of research on the siida’s own terms.

The fourth edge is *siddastallan* (siida-keeping), which is also the leading edge. In *siiddastallan*, the siida presents itself as a compromise between human, reindeer and land. It is the kind of compromise that must be constantly renewed, also through continuous inter-siida communication. Siida keeping is the background for my writing this article in the way I have;

¹² I have invented the phrase “edge of discussion” using the word edge in the sense in which it appears in the compound *ealloravda* (herd-edge), where the herder is when “tidying – or more or less gently heading off a part of the herd”, but while herding he (the herder) never enters the herd.

the doctrine of old fashioned siida-talk states as its terms, as do certain science-critical approaches, that the people who are party to the discussion to whom siida-keeping belongs, should be recognized from the start and welcomed as self-determining participants in the discussion.

References

Same as in the Sámi text