

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AND THE GOVERNING OF NATURE

-GOVERNMENT OR GOVERNANCE?

Allan Sande and Jill Beth Otterlei. Bodø University College, Norway.

11.8. 2009

Slettet: 0

Abstract

Industrialisation and urbanisation in the Nordic countries create environmental problems such as the reduction of natural biodiversity. In 1967 and 1972 Sweden and Norway established special ministries of environment to solve the environmental problems. At national level there are similarities between the two Nordic neighbour countries as regards governing structures and national policy of environmental protection. However, at regional level there are also differences in the management of nature. This paper presents an empirical qualitative case study of national governing and regional management of the environment in both these Nordic countries. Using comparative methods, we have investigated the different organisation patterns of regional environment management. The empirical findings suggest that the Swedish system of governing is based on an integrated “top down” management model with the Norwegian system being more a governance system which is poorly integrated and “bottom up”. The Swedish management puts more emphasis on conservation of nature and has larger biodiversity than that of Norway. The discussion leads to the conclusion that organization of institutions does make a difference in the solution of environmental problems.

Multi-level governance of environment at regional levels in two different countries

In the High North the challenge is to conserve the last parts of the European wilderness and its bio-diversity. Human activities, urbanization, outdoor recreation and industrial exploitation destroy the habitats and eco-systems. The governments of Norway and Sweden are working to implement environmental policy aimed at solving the growing environmental problems in the High North. The national policies in Norway and Sweden are based on similar international agreements about conserving bio-diversity in the Nordic Council, European Union and United Nations. Local environmental problems are directly connected with the international environmental policy, international organisations and global governance (Hove and Undredal 2008: 111). But national implementation is based on the different regional and local structures of government, management and governance in Norway and Sweden. In this paper we want to discuss and analyze the institutional challenges of the national governments in the governing of nature and solving global environmental problems. The challenge is to coordinate social sectors and interest groups at different levels of multi-level governance in and between national states. Environmental management is an area of policy heavily dependent on the capacity of co-ordination and integration between different areas of policy and sectors in society. This is also the conclusion of the Auditor General of Norway (*Riksrevisjonen*) in a report on sustainable management of landscapes and bio-diversity in Norway: *A sustainable management of nature is dependent on the whole management of landscape (Riksrevisjonen 2007:7)*. The capacity of government depends on the institutional construction of management on national, regional and local levels. The question this paper addresses is the impact of different national institutional management systems of implementing environmental policy. In the research question we presume that the organization of management does have an impact with regard to the results of

implementation. The comparison of national and regional management of the environment in Norway and Sweden will provide the opportunity to explain the institutional variable, on the different outcome. We have investigated the same area and environment in Northern Scandinavia, with similar bio-diversity and natural habitats. In the case study we have chosen *Norbotten* County in Sweden and *Nordland* County in Norway. The counties are connected geographically and by way of natural habitats across the national borders. We have also studied the municipalities connected across the border. Because of similar natural landscapes and habitats belonging to the same ecosystem, the environmental problems and challenges facing the two countries also correspond. National environmental policy is also similar because the national states of Norway and Sweden have both ratified similar international agreements of conserving biodiversity. The major difference then is the two different historical and institutional systems of governing and management in Norway and Sweden. The Swedish system and structure is based on independent bureaucracy and collective governing by Swedish government (Sandstrøm et al. 2008:16). This is called the East-Nordic model of governing in Sweden and Finland and differs from the Vest-Nordic model of governing in Norway and Denmark. This model is based on governing by a central government ministry and a regional autonomic democratic government at county level. The Swedish national state is based on an integrated system of national and regional government, whereas the Norwegian national state uses a different model with delegation of tasks to integrated regional and municipality level governments (Sandstrøm et al. 2008:17). In this article we want to use these two different models of governing to investigate the implementation of similar environmental policy in similar natural habitats. The social comparison will hopefully show whether there exist qualitative differences in governing and management which can explain the different outcomes in implementing environmental policy. Development in the Norwegian case during the last 10 years has been contraction of national government (Grønli

Slettet: .

Slettet: d

1999:340). The tasks have been more complex and demanding, and this has challenged the traditional role of government (Olsen 1975:52). During recent years privatisation and new public management have given the administrative public sector a more fragmented and differenced structure. The new emerging pattern of public service makes it more difficult to govern and provide integrated management through central government. In studies of public service, the main reason for the lack of coordination at regional level also pinpointed the lack of coordination of national policy-making at national level (Hansen, Hanssen og Stigen 2008:200). The area of nature- and environmental policy depends on holistic government at national level. If this is lacking, it is extremely difficult to integrate and coordinate policy at regional and local levels. This question is the target of this research and paper: The integration and coordination of environmental policy at regional level in two different countries. Using comparative methods, we want to investigate the different Norwegian and Swedish processes and structures, and find some answers to the questions whether the structure of regional government and management can explain the different outcomes of implementation of the same international environmental policy of conserving arctic bio-diversity.

Slettet: .

Slettet: t

Slettet:

Slettet:

The challenge of the policy of conserving arctic bio-diversity in the High North centres round the protection against a lot of different impacts from larger societies and also large-scale industrial exploitation of natural resources. In the arctic landscape the process of bio-production only occurs during a three-month period in the summertime. Bio-production, ecosystems and habitats depend on using large geographic areas. Birds, animals and people emigrate long distances and use different ecological systems and niches during the seasons in order to survive the long Arctic night and winter. The challenge to protect the arctic environment is complicated because it requires integration and coordination of policy between national states, regions and municipalities. The implementation of global environmental policy of conserving biodiversity in this arctic region of Europe depends on interaction and

partnership with local people, indigenous peoples, local communities, non-governmental organisations (NGO's), private companies and public services in different national states and countries. In this article we want to present empirical material regarding the solutions found by the Swedish and Norwegian states to address this problem of integration and implementing environmental policy, inside similar natural habitats and the same arctic region of Scandinavia. We want to analyze the impact of the structure of nature- and environmental management at regional level as an institutional frame in achieving the goals of implementing the national environmental policy of conserving the arctic bio-diversity of Scandinavia. The comparison between two similar countries will provide a better understanding of the impact of local and regional management in the implementation of national policy of environmental protection. The first issue concerns differences in the implantation of similar environmental policy in a similar arctic environment. In Section Two we will discuss some of the theoretical concepts and theories in the study of multi –level government and multi –level governance. In the Third Section we will present the methodological design and in Section Four and Five we will present empirical material concerning the Norwegian and Swedish national government and regional management of natural environment. The comparison of these two systems, and analyses using the concepts of the theoretical frame, will be presented in Section Six. The results will be presented in Section Seven.

Slettet:

Slettet:

Slettet:

Perspectives on governing the environment

Management of nature and environment is human governing of other human use of natural resources in the eco-systems (Davidson-Hunt and Berkes 2003:75). Eco –systems are governed by political- and administrative processes which govern the human use of nature. The challenge for natural environmental management is to integrate and coordinate international, national, regional and local interest groups to use nature against the human

interests for conserving and not using nature (Ostrom 1998, Jentoft 1998, Carlsson 2008).

Management of the environment is the political task of making decisions amongst conflicting human interests, creating a balance between different political goals and finding solutions to social problems and conflicts of interests. In the Nordic countries the power of governing society and nature is centralized to national states, parliament, the government and ministries at national level and then delegated to counties and municipalities at regional and local levels. The national tasks, and different areas of environmental policy, are national obligations because of international ratification of international agreements such as The Rio Declaration and UNESCO agreements (Ulstein 2001, Hovi and Underdal 2008).

The perspectives on governing society are many, and one traditional perspective is hierarchical top-down government and the use of the bureaucracy. The tools are central power of legislation, use of professional staff and local implementing systems with formal organisations (Weber 1922, Carlsson 2008). The central authority takes the responsibility for and the initiative towards policymaking and legislation; public professional employees loyally implement the decisions taken. This situation we will define as contraction, defined as national consent and loyal regional implementation (Jacobsen 1978:199). This is an ideal model of government and central power-wielding in a national state (Weber 1922, Carlsson 2008). In this ideal model central government and parliament enact the integration and coordination of different areas of policymaking towards the whole of management of environment; the central decisions of policy are automatically implemented by loyal professionals at regional level. The integration and coordination of policy, legislation and organisation all take place at national level. The Swedish empirical case is similar to this ideal model of government.

Inside a national state this ideal model does not, however, suit the everyday work and implementation at regional and local levels. Many political science and sociological studies

Slettet:

have in fact shown the opposite results; more concentration of power at national level does not give the right results in regional and local implementation of national plans (Olsen 1988:49). Lack of implementation of national policy is a common theme in social science studies of national state governing and management of human activities. The explanation hinges round the fact that not only public actors take part in policymaking and implementing. Private actors, businesses, and non-governmental organizations also take part: We have created a consultative state which delegates policymaking and implementing to organizations in the private sector, or does the public task *in partnership* with the private sectors and non governmental organizations (Olsen 1988:49). The Norwegian tradition of government is based on decentralized authorities at regional and local levels, both with regard to policymaking and public management. This process implies a large number of local and regional actors taking part in the policymaking and the implementation of policy.

Slettet:
Slettet:
Slettet:

In the perspective of “bottom- up” government, the explanation of problems of implementation hinges round the fact that that conditions for the ideal government model do not at present exist in societies. The system of knowledge and analytical environmental problems in national policymaking differs greatly from the system used by professional staff at local level. At local level knowledge of the environmental problems is different. Different goals, problems and knowledge make it difficult to implement national policy of environment at regional and local level.

Slettet: not

Sociological and political science studies of the Norwegian state show the results of deregulation of central power in parliament and government (Grønlie 1999, Engelstad, Selle and Østerud 2003). This change from on ideal type of government towards another is called the process of detracton (Jacobsen 1978:200). This process means that central government delegates authority and power to other levels of management and governing organisations. This internal process then generates more specialisation and fragmentation of public

Slettet: the

Slettet:

management (Christiansen and Lægreid 2007). We expect environmental policy to consist of a similar situation of processes of detraction.

Slettet:

Another perspective on these processes is the use of governance (Peters and Pierre 2004). Governance is equal partnership between public government and private interests in the common collaboration regarding policymaking and implementation (Peters and Pierre 2004:78, Edvardsen and Hovik 2006, Røiseland and Vabo 2008). In this perspective, and the model of “bottom- up”, common collaboration will provide better opportunities for implementing common environmental policy because of the common interest of public and private actors in the implementation of the policy. Mutual dependence and common interest are important terms for actors’ collaboration and joint work (Røiseland and Vabo 2008:97). The policy of conservation of the natural environment depends on mutual interests between private and public sectors in the collaboration towards implementing policy. Not only public government makes policy; other interest groups and private organisations also take part in policymaking. The ideal model of governance is equal interests, power, and knowledge and resources between public and private partners. In reality, societies have different patterns involving inequality of power, resources and knowledge between local communities, classes, genders and nations. Partnerships do not take into account the explicit problems of differing meanings, interests and knowledge between partners, and because of hidden conflicts of interest the goals remain loose and vague. Governance as an ideal model based on mutual interest, collaboration and joint work in a united co-ordinated organization (Røiseland and Vabo 2008:92).

Slettet: 0

Slettet:

We want to investigate what sort of institutional model the two different national states use in the implementation of national nature- and environmental policy, and we want to use the perspectives of the ideal models of government or governance, as tools in the comparison. We want to investigate the capacity for making an integrated whole of environmental policy. The

systems of Norwegian and Swedish management of environment presently used form the empirical starting point of the study where the environmental problems of declining arctic biodiversity are solved in interaction with the human stakeholders of local nature. The investigation of solutions is based on the institutional organization of management with the patterns of government or governance. These perspectives are used to analyze the construction of government, responsibility and authority in regional implementation of national environmental policy. The actors in public management have different formal positions, educational backgrounds and systems of knowledge. They take part in different interactions and institutional systems of consultation with the local stakeholders. The empirical narrative of systems of management, actors and interaction in policymaking and implementation of national environmental policy will be presented as separate stories in Parts Four and Five. The different narratives will be compared and analyzed in Section 6. First we will present the design of the research project and the use of methods in the field work, interviews and comparative methods.

Slettet:

Slettet:

Slettet:

Qualitative case studies and comparative methods

This comparative study is based on the use of public documents, participant observation and qualitative interview with 52 institutional actors in Norway and Sweden. The material is used to write the two narratives of the different countries and compare these cases with regard to units and dependent and independent variables which can explain the different outcomes of identical processes of policymaking and institutional organisation of the public sector at national level (Ragin 1987). The comparison focuses on two similar Nordic national states located in the same natural environment implementing similar environmental policy using regional state level and municipality level in Norbotten County in Sweden and Nordland

County in Norway. The difference which makes the difference is a socially constructed border of yellow painted stones in the high mountains in Scandinavia. This line is a sign indicating two different systems of legal power and jurisdiction of territory. In the Swedish territory consisting of 98 249 km² and the County of Norrbotten, 253 000 Swedish people live. On the other side, 236 000 Norwegian people live in a territory of 38 000 km². In the County of Nordland there live 6.2 persons per km² and in the County of Norrbotten there live 2.6 persons per km². The empirical comparison of figures and number is an indication of similar conditions on natural habitats, geography and societies, but different systems of governing and outcomes in implementation at regional level. The comparison is based on comparing similar units, variables and processes in order to discover the difference which makes the difference. In the field work we interviewed representative leaders and public servants in Arjeplog and Jokkmokk Municipalities in Sweden, and Saltdal, Fauske and Sørfold Municipalities in Norway about the questions of the government and management of biodiversity and national parks in the common geographical region. The field work is based on elite interviews with the leaders of Division of Environment protection in Nordland County and other institutional leaders of the state county level. The Mayor of Nordland County and the representative leaders at state county level in Norrbotten and Nordland counties were interviewed about governing, government and partnership with the other country and local stakeholders in Norway and Sweden. It did prove possible to get the institutional leaders and stakeholders to present their experience and analyses of the similarities and differences between the two national systems. The two countries have a common population of biodiversity which is governed in partnership in the Nordic Council and by way of bi-lateral agreement between Norway and Sweden. The important private stakeholders are the Sami reindeer people, who live and use natural resources in both countries across the border. We also interviewed the leaders of two Norwegian Sami reindeer herding communities, the

Slettet:

leaders of four Swedish Sami reindeer herding communities and the President of the Sami Parliament in Sweden. The representative leaders for the Norwegian and Swedish management of reindeer herding and management of large predators were also interviewed concerning the management and collaboration between the countries. With the use of research results from other projects, public documents and participant observation, we have constructed a narrative showing the two different national states' systems of governing their common natural environment.

The Swedish nature- and environmental management system

The Swedish nature- and environmental management is a result of a national project embarked upon by the state at the beginning of the 1900's (Haraldsson 1987). Swedish policymaking has been embedded in the ideas of landscape of culture with people and a landscape of nature without people - wilderness (Mels 1999). The process of making a policy of natural conservation and an act governing natural conservation was initiated through a partnership between the Swedish government and The Swedish Royal Society of Science. The Swedish government gave this Swedish Royal Society of Science consisting of profession people, trained in the natural sciences, the task of making a policy of natural protection through a new Swedish act of natural protection. The Swedish government supported this new natural policy, and in 1909 it was approved by members of the Swedish parliament as the Act of Protection of Nature and Natural Objects. The partners in this process of national policy-making, were natural scientists at Universities in Uppsala and Lund and the Swedish Association of Tourism (Mels 1999). The Nature of Arctic Lapland represented at this time a frontier landscape, open for exotic tourism and natural science expeditions. Their interest for these areas for natural research and outdoor recreation purposes was embedded in the

policymaking, but the local stakeholders took no part at all in the decision-making process. According to this new act, the Swedish Parliament implemented 9 large areas for National parks in Sweden in 1909 and three of the largest were established in Norrbotten County. The national parks were established in the core area for Sami people located in the mountain range close to the Norwegian border. This territory is owned by the Swedish Crown and governed by Swedish government. The national decisions were made without any local participation (Mels 1999). The only local stakeholders, the Sami Reindeer people, had their rights to use natural resources inside conserved nature. ~~The Sami people lived as traditional fisherman,~~ hunters and reindeer herders in the new national parks. The act of conserving nature and settlement of national parks gave the Sami people fresh protection against industrial exploitation and commercial tourism.

Slettet: cut off

The process of policymaking was marked with collaboration between the government and the national conservation organisation and association of natural sciences. Today the Swedish natural and environmental organisations also have political influence in national decision-making, and this pattern resembles the idea of governance, but the organisations have poor representation at local and regional level in Sweden's periphery (Boström 2007, Van Coppet and Markheim 2007). The national organisations take part in policymaking in the European Union, Swedish Parliament and government. The Swedish central natural and environmental management (*Naturvårdsverket*) does not have a pattern of governance with the natural and environmental organisations as does the Norwegian system of government (*Direktoratet for naturforvaltning*) (Selle and Strømsnes 1996, Bortne, Grenstad, Selle and Strømsnes 2001, Strømsnes, Selle and Grenstad 2008).

Slettet:

Slettet:

Slettet: .

The Swedish national environmental management has instead developed patterns of partnership and governance with private and public industrial companies. In the development of the Swedish system, the professionally educated natural scientist and engineers dominate as

the experts in public management and government (Heden 1994). In 1963 the Swedish government established a national council for natural protection. This process of building institutions of governing continued, and in 1967 the Swedish Ministry of Environment (*Miljødepartementet*) and The Directorate of Natural conservation (*Naturvårdsverket*) were established as the first ministry of its kind in the world. Studies of this system in Sweden have shown the empirical result of a public sector of government with strong natural scientific staff and with little direct political governing from the Swedish government and parliament (Mels 1999, Hedren 1994, Bodstrøm 2007). The Swedish system for the environmental sector has partnership with industry and takes care of industrial monitoring and pollution. The system of knowledge is based on the use of scientific knowledge generated by the natural sciences and engineering technology. Policymaking and acts of natural conservation are based on natural law and the ideal model of nature is a biological system operation - as in biological mechanics. The solutions are mechanical using natural science and the tools developed by engineers. Local people lack scientific knowledge and destroy the natural systems and mechanics of nature. Human activities, and over-exploitation of natural resources, destroy the natural balance. In regard to this system of knowledge, the management of nature is based on reducing human activities and settlements in undisturbed nature. The system has divided the landscape into areas of wilderness, agriculture and industrial exploitation. In Norrbotten County the division of wilderness and cultural landscape has been given a constructed border of cultivation and human settlement (*Odlingsgrensen*).

The Swedish regional state management is organized into 19 counties. The system of management in Sweden is based on two levels of management, the national government and parliament, and the regional county as part of the central government. The county level does not practice regional parliamentarism and the head of the county (*Landshövding*) is appointed by central government in Stockholm. The board of the County administration in Norrbotten

Slettet:

has 270 employees and the largest department is the Division of Environment (*Avdeling for miljø*) with its 120 employees. All tasks of management of landscape, natural resources and conservation of biodiversity are integrated into one unit. The Swedish municipalities and Sami parliament are not allotted tasks in the management of nature. The representative leaders at local levels do not want delegation of power and responsibility because they have trust and confidence in state management. The local municipality lacks knowledge and people and, in the Swedish model of thinking, governing nature can only be practiced by the state which possesses the legitimate power and professional expertise to manage nature in the region. The regional state has not experienced competition regarding tasks and power from municipalities and NGO's at regional level. The management of natural parks and biodiversity at local level has been developed in collaboration with the Sami reindeer communities and Sami Parliament (Sandstrøm et al. 2008, Sande 2009). This collaboration in the management of wilderness has been developed to a commercial partnership between the regional state and Sami communities. The Swedish population and the Swedish municipalities lack this partnership and collaboration with the Swedish regional state in the governing of nature. The Swedish government has ratified international agreements regarding environmental protection similar to the Norwegian state. The difference is, comparing Norway and Sweden is that Sweden is a member of The European Union but has not ratified the UN / ILO convention 169 regarding indigenous people. Swedish state government at regional level is subject to EU legislation and policy. This has improved the integration of management of Sami reindeer herding, management of natural resources and national parks. The Swedish state has, to a certain degree on a commercial basis, given the responsibility for some tasks to communities of Sami reindeer herders. The general impression of the Swedish system is very little governance, instead using a system more similar to the theoretical model of government. The internal

Slettet:

Slettet:

processes are marked by contraction, with national government taking responsibility, making policy and implementing policy at regional levels.

Slettet: p

Slettet: is

Slettet:

The Norwegian natural and environmental management sector

The Norwegian natural and environmental system has at national level great similarities due to Nordic collaboration amongst the member states of the Nordic Council. The national states in the Nordic countries copy their policy and institutional organisation *at national level*. The Norwegian government and parliament approved a similar organisation to the Swedish model establishing The Ministry of Environmental Protection (*Miljøverndepartementet*) and The Directorate for Natural Management (*Direktoratet for naturforvaltning*) in 1972. The Norwegian system used the Swedish system as a model in their institutional policymaking and implementation (Jansen 1989, Bertsen 1994). In this model it was intended to construct an integrated whole of the government sector of the various ministries for the use of natural resources such as the ministries of agriculture, fisheries and industry. The national policy was similar to the Swedish model of government of natural environment, but because of national conflicts with other ministries, it turned out to be a small sector with poor professional natural scientific employees, legal power and a low budget. The Norwegian system of government consist of different professional civil servants with educational backgrounds ranging from law to agronomical skills, the management of forest, the management of wilderness, landscape architects, social sciences and biology (Jansen 1989:229, Osland 1997). The difference between Sweden and Norway here is that the Norwegian system has a multicultural professional staff and none of the professional groups dominate the system (Jansen 1989, Osland 1997, Jonsson 1999). Another difference in the Norwegian system compared to the Swedish system is that the Ministry of Environmental Protection has had great conflicts of

Slettet: r

Slettet: turned out o

Slettet:

Slettet:

interest with other ministries at national level and conflicts of interest at regional level in counties and local municipalities during the period from 1980 to 2000 (Jansen 1989, Osland 1997:149, Sande 2000). The Norwegian state implemented regional management of environment at state county level in 21 counties in 1984. The professional staff at regional state level is built up in the same way as at national level - with multicultural professional education (Jansen 1989, 222, Bertsen 1994, Klausen og Rommetveit 1996).

Slettet: s

Slettet: ar

Slettet: e

In Nordland County the tasks of management of natural resources, conserving biodiversity and conserved landscapes are delegated to State county level (*Fylkesmannen i Nordland, Miljøvern avdelingen*). The Department of Environmental Protection has 20 employees in two different sections of areal conservation and species conservation. The Department of Environmental Protection is small and lacks power, professional knowledge and budgetary power compared to its Swedish sister organisation, the *Avdeling for miljø* in Norrbotten County with 120 employees. This difference does not concern the area and population which are both similar, but has to do with the different structures of government at regional and local level in Norway. The Norwegian system has three levels of management and government of nature; national, regional and municipal. The Norwegian state is in itself divided into different independent sectors of government and management as the state is also an owner of territory (*Statsskog*), The state's monitoring agency for nature (*Statens Naturoppsyn*), The state management of reindeer herding (*Reindriftskontoret i Nordland*), The state division of management of agriculture (*Fylkesmannen i Nordland, Landbruksavdelingen*) and Nordland County parliament and municipality (*Nordland fylkeskommune*). The number of professional people employed in the management of nature and environment is altogether 98 people at regional state level in Nordland County. This is almost the same amount of people as for the Swedish case in Norrbotten County. One of the reasons for the lower amount of people in the Norwegian system is the delegation of tasks to municipal level carried out in the 1990's. The

Slettet: :

Norwegian state delegated the task of management of the environment to 430 municipalities, with every municipality employing one person as head of the environment connected to the secretary of the mayor (Osland 1997, 157). In Nordland County 43 heads of environment were employed at municipality level, but in 2009 there are only 15 persons left in at this municipality level. At municipality level there exist in all 435 Norwegian municipalities the same heterogenic patterns of different professional groups. The largest group of employed heads of environmental protection is natural managers educated at the Norwegian University of Environmental and Bio-diversity. In the three municipalities we have studied in Nordland County, the position of head of environmental protection has been removed and the tasks have been transmitted to the Section of Development of Business and Spatial Planning. At municipality level there exists reproduction of the heterogenic pattern of professions, just like the pattern existing at national and regional state level, here at the level of the 435 Norwegian municipalities at national level. Because of the small scale of many of these municipalities, there are different persons with different professional education in every municipality. In the three municipalities in the area studied, the professional group of agronomists dominates management of nature and environment. In comparison with the Swedish system at local level, the capacity of management in the Norwegian case is to a greater degree located at local level with political delegation of tasks, power and responsibility.

Slettet:

Slettet: P

Slettet: p

This system of heterogenic professions in Norway has different networks and scientific models of management. The main model is developed at the former Norwegian University of Agriculture (The Norwegian University of Environment and bio-engineering), and in this model, management is based on using and cultivating nature. The other model for management is developed at The Universities of Oslo and Trondheim, the institutes of biology. This model of management is based on natural selection, biodiversity and eco-systems (Aas and Skurdal 2000:77). The system of management in the Norwegian case has a

pattern of professional groups using a model encouraging cultivation at local and regional levels and the professional groups using the model of conservation at national level. The changing processes within the system have been marked by de-centralization and delegation, and power shifts at local level moving toward models for the cultivation of nature. The opposite process of centralization and power shifts continues at national level moving towards a model of natural selection and bio-diversity conservation. At local level in municipalities, people, political parties and NGO's are worried about pollution, industrial rubbish, the lack of opportunities for the cultivation of nature for business and outdoor recreation purposes. At central level political parties, NGO's and management is concerned about international obligations to conserve biodiversity (Hovik 2000:22). Inside the national system with professional groups, internal competition exists between these two different models for governing nature. At municipality level, political parties and professional people support the model of cultivation and the use of nature, whereas in central government in Oslo, national parties and professional staff support the model of conserving nature. The globalisation of natural policymaking and politics has changed the power of balance to international and national level (Ofthen 1993:43). This new network of governance at international level makes national policymaking more dynamic and local level more static. The national government uses international policy and institutions in the implementing of this policy at local and regional level. The general picture of the system in Norway is more based on de-traction and governance at local and regional level as compared to the Swedish case. The difference is that Norwegian municipalities do have legal power and relevant tasks and do also take part in the implementation of national policy, hereby implementing the national system at local level.

Slettet:

Slettet: ¶
¶

Social comparison of governing nature

Integrated management of nature?

Over time the two national states have developed different systems of governing nature at regional state and municipality level. The difference has come about because the Norwegian state uses three levels of management, and on the other side of the border the Swedish state only uses two levels of management of Swedish nature. In the Swedish case, the regional state level is part of the central government, while regional state management in the Norwegian state is governed by the regional county parliament. The governing of nature in Norway is delegated to the network of municipalities, while the Swedish system is delegated to the regional state which is part of national government and parliament. The second difference existing between the two systems is that the Norwegian municipalities and the regional state management have to a greater degree a professional staff of heterogenic groups, whereas the Swedish state at regional state level has one group of natural scientists and engineers. At central level in Stockholm, the *Naturvårdsverket* consists of a professional monocultural staff of natural scientists. In Sweden governing nature is a task belonging to the national and regional state using employed professional natural scientists. This system is, compared to the Norwegian system, much more “top- down” and hierarchical using the model of the conservation of nature. Even employed people at regional county level experienced the Ministry of Natural Government in Stockholm as a strongly monolithic structure of professional natural science. The Swedish system is robust and strong vertically, but lacks the flexibility to integrate local stakeholders, local communities and municipalities at regional state level. At regional state level, the Swedish system lacks participation and local democracy.

Slettet:

Slettet:

Slettet:

Slettet:

Slettet: and

The Norwegian system of governing nature has three levels of management and the staff possesses more varied professional backgrounds with different ideal models for governing nature. At different levels groups of professionals are employed from the natural sciences,

agronomic engineering, the social sciences and nature management. The Norwegian system uses models for governing nature based on conservation biodiversity at national level, as in the Swedish case, but at municipality level the three studied municipalities in Norway have professional employees using models of cultivation and use of nature, and their model for managing nature and the environment. The professional groups remain more loyal towards the local people because they live and work within the municipality. The Norwegian state has delegated power, responsibility and professional personnel to municipality level. This situation gives a different balance of power: the local system of governing nature is flexible towards the local stakeholders and user knowledge, and stands more robust against implementing national policy connected with the ratification of international agreements for conserving biodiversity.

Norwegian leaders and representatives tell a story of their own system as being characterised by partnership and collaboration between the three levels of management. The goal of regional collaboration is to create an integrated plan for the spatial management of nature. At regional county level the state has entered into processes of formal partnership with municipalities and local stakeholders. The municipalities, as governed by local parliament, govern spatial planning, environmental protection and the management of hunting and fishing. The management at municipality level uses former employees from the regional state county level, with professional skills in agronomical science. The professional staff skilled in the management of nature and agronomics carries out the tasks of managing natural resources. They collaborate with local stakeholders and local people in taking decisions concerning the management of natural resources. This is the pattern of local governance of natural resources for fish, small game hunting and large game hunting and local natural landscape management. The strongest collaboration and partnership exists for the management of the moose population and the fish population in rivers and lakes. The partnership involves strong vertical

Slettet:

Slettet:

and horizontally integration with a formal structure of governance existing between private stakeholders and public management.

The Norwegian system has three levels of democratic governance which is different from the Swedish system. The Swedish system is based on a hierarchical order with a strong top-down governing structure. In Sweden, in particular in Norrbotten County, municipalities do not have power, tasks or professional employees in the governing and managing of nature. One of the reasons for this is that the Swedish state owns 75% of the territory, and large areas consist of nature conserved by the Swedish authorities (in comparison the Norwegian state owns 55% of the territory in Nordland County). The municipalities have no legal power nor do they own the territory. All tasks are taken care of at state county level.

Slettet:

Norrbotten County borders to Norway in the west and to Finland in the east and a small minority of the peoples have Sami heritage. Four of the backcountry municipalities, on the borders with Norway and Finland, form the core area for Sami settlements in Sweden. In Norrbotten County there are 3900 Sami reindeer herders in 37 communities of Sami reindeer herders (*sameby*). The head of the Sami Parliament and the head of reindeer communities experience the Swedish regional state as more nationalistic and Swedish compared with the other 18 counties in the Southern part of Sweden. On the county board there exists a structure of employees with similar university education in natural science, agronomical science and civil engineering. *One* of the employees in the Division of Environment has professional skills in the social sciences or is a natural manager - as in the case of the Norwegian professional staff. The model for governing nature is based on conserving nature and the use of natural science knowledge in decision-making. National policy is implemented in the technical and professional work with little use of consultation with and participation from local users and stakeholders. The system is based on a model of hierarchical top- down governing and the use of national policy in everyday management of nature at county level.

Slettet:

Slettet:

The advantage of this system is that it provides opportunities for coordination and the integration of different policies for implementation at county level. The Swedish membership in European Union has also given the county level new tools of regional development. The Swedish county level is more integrated in relation to the vertical structure of The European Union. On the other hand, democratic municipalities and NGO's are less integrated in regional state management. In governing nature the Swedish central government governs the implementation of national policy of environment in 18 counties. The State county level in Sweden has more tasks, a stronger mandate, more professional natural scientists and resources than the State county level in Norway. A comparison between the county of Norrbotten with the county of Nordland, shows larger areas of conserved nature, a larger population of reindeer and Sami peoples and a bigger population of large carnivores in the Swedish case.

In management of national parks, reindeer herding, fishing and hunting, the Swedish county board has an institutional collaboration with the communities of Sami reindeer herders. The collaboration is based on subcontracting tasks in management of natural resources, surveillance of predators and different services related to national park management. The communities of Sami reindeer herders manage fishing, small game and large game inside the national parks and their own territory for reindeer grazing. The Swedish regional state has a regional system of co-management of natural resources on state owned territory. On the contrary the Swedish municipalities of Arjeplog and Jokkmokk do not have the same opportunities for collaboration and partnership. The leaders of these municipalities want more power in regional decision-making, but not the tasks and responsibilities involved. The Sami reindeer herders want more institutional power, private ownership to land and self-management of natural resources, but the Swedish government has not approved the Sami indigenous rights according to ILO-convention 169 for indigenous peoples. At regional state level, there is a strong top- down structure of governing from the capital Stockholm, and poor

Slettet:

conditions for horizontal integration of local stakeholders and municipalities in Norrbotten County.

One empirical piece of evidence showing lack of horizontal integration between the regional state, municipalities and communities of Sami reindeer herders, is the national conflicts of model for management of the world heritage area Laponia (Beach 2000, Carlsson 2008:49, Sande 2009). In the similar case of decision-making for expansion of World heritage region of Laponia to the Norwegian territory, the conflict has been solved through the use of partnership agreements and collaboration between different levels of management and stakeholders. The community of Sami people and Sami Parliament take part as equal partners with the regional state in decision- making regarding national parks and world heritage. The Sami community is represented in the Council for Carnivore Management and the management of reindeer herders is represented in decision processes for creating new national parks. In the Swedish case, in the same issues, there is much more “top- down” decision-making and a lack of local participation and partnership. The Swedish government made its application and implemented the World Heritage site of Laponia without the local participation of Swedish municipalities and the local Sami communities (Rådelius 2002, Nilsson Dalstrøm 2003, Sande 2009). Another case study shows the difference in the management of large carnivores in Nordland and Norrbotten counties. The Swedish system is completely a public task and the local stakeholders only get information; they do not take part in the decision-making in Council of large carnivores (Sandstrøm 2004, 27, Sandstrøm m.f. 2009). The Norwegian system of management is delegated to 8 regional councils for large carnivore management with the power, tools and responsibility for the implementation of national policy for conserving large carnivores. In the Swedish system national policy is implemented at regional level without horizontal integration of stakeholders and municipalities. In the Norwegian system the national policy is translated to regional

Slettet: T

conditions with the use of representatives from the regional parliament and Sami parliament. This system is more flexible towards local stakeholders and municipalities and more static in relation to national management. In the next section we will compare the relationship between national policymaking and the global system of governance and policymaking.

Global integration and local fragmentation

Norway and Sweden have signed several international agreements aimed at to integrating new scientific knowledge of bio-diversity at local and regional levels. This relative new paradigm and the models for conserving biodiversity have their strongest footholds in national government and management in the Norwegian system. In the Swedish system the attitudes held at national level and regional state level of management correspond well. The municipalities do not have any legal tasks, the tools and professional employees to govern nature in Sweden. In Norrbotten County national policy-making and implementation governs the human use of natural resources. In Nordland County national policy-making is transferred for use in a system of governance at regional level. Implementation is an issue with regard to local and regional democratic participation of the governing of natural resources. The structure of governing and implementing provides the stakeholders with opportunities to take part in the production of knowledge, and decision making related to management and implementation. The knowledge of biodiversity and policymaking is difficult to experience in everyday life and local politics (Alm and Often 1993:3). At local level it is difficult to transfer the model of conserving bio-diversity to the day- to- day tasks of local management (Often 1998:13). At global and international level the structure of governance provides the professional natural researchers, national managers, political interest groups and NGP's with a partnership in the development of policy and agreements (Hovi and Underdal 2008). This partnership between natural science researchers, social researchers and natural managers

Slettet:

offers a rapidly expanding dynamic system of globalisation of policy and knowledge, but with weak relations to local communities and municipalities. In this comparison, we have discovered a decentralized structure of governance at local and regional level in Norway with weak links to global level because Norway is not a member of EU. The system in Norway has three levels of democratic government and this provides the local stakeholders and municipalities with representation and partnership in the national governing of nature. The local participation links international policy more closely to local ideas and attitudes and knowledge of nature. At regional level co-management and partnership has been developed for governing nature. This model resembles closely the concept of governance.

The challenge in the Norwegian system lies in the conflicts of interests between international policy of conservation of bio-diversity on the one hand and on the other hand the interests of local communities to exploit natural resources in rural districts. One large conflict concerns the issue of the conservation of large carnivores on the one hand and on the other hand making a living from farming sheep and reindeer in the wilderness. The Norwegian government and parliament have ratified international agreement and take part in international organisations (Hovi and Underdal 2008). These different agreements are used in national policymaking and the making of acts of parliament. The agreement to conserve bio-diversity has to be integrated and coordinated with the other ministries in central government, 21 regional state management and 435 municipalities. In the process of implementation the system of environmental protection has gained more power and integration with the use of international agreements for conserving bio-diversity. At regional and local level the professional groups work with a model of cultivation of nature for human purposes. The new model of conservation of bio-diversity is difficult to transfer to and legitimise at local level. The reason for this is the lack of natural scientists at municipality level and the problematical task of translating the international policy of conserving bio-diversity in a local environment

Slettet:

Slettet:

by expanding the wilderness and keeping a large population of predators. From the local managers' point of view, the new national policy makes everyday work difficult because of static rules and static control. Nationally conservation of diversity and landscapes mean reductions of the local stakeholders' opportunities for using natural resources. The implementation of a national policy of bio-diversity creates growing local conflicts between local people, stakeholders and regional state management. The core symbol of this is management of large carnivores. Bears, lynxes and wolverines eat a lot of the local farmers' sheep and the Sami peoples' reindeer.

When assessing the different systems of management of nature in Nordland, the subsystem of management of established national parks lacks democratic representation and partnership in its decision-making. These parts of governing nature lack a system of democratic participation for local stakeholders and municipalities. The county governor of Nordland is, by The Norwegian act of Natural Conservation, forced to use the national policy of conservation the bio-diversity inside national parks. But the County parliament or county governor of Nordland does not have by themselves the capacity to ensure integrated management of larger habitats and socio-ecological systems in the region. At local level the municipalities are too small and have professional employees with another model for governing nature. The implementation of national environmental policy at local level gives an empirical picture of fragmentation and specialisation in the Norwegian context. The local manager and stakeholders use a different model for governing nature, and have different local knowledge of the causes of declining of biodiversity. This does not fit in with the national model of conserving biodiversity and international knowledge of natural sciences. The national policy is designed with the use of international agreements and participation in international organisations. This international partnership has given the professional group of natural scientists more power in the national system of governing nature. At municipality

Slettet:

Slettet: c

Slettet: t

Slettet: T

level the opposite situation exists with re-institution of professional groups using a model of cultivation as a guide for governing nature. In local decision-making private stakeholders interests do have an impact on implementation. Because of common interests, the municipalities, Nordland County Governor and Nordland Parliament have developed new institutional organizations to govern nature in co-operation. The partners use partnership agreements in their joint efforts for coordination of policymaking and implementation. This pattern is close to the concept of governance.

The Swedish state has other challenges in implementing national environmental policy. Sweden is a member of The European Union and is obliged to follow EU legislation and policy. The Norwegian state is not a member of the EU and is not to the same degree obliged to follow EU environmental policy. The regional state in Sweden is governed more strongly from Stockholm and Brussels. This presents an internal challenge because of the Swedish tradition of 400 years of independent self-government. Integration within the EU has led to an internal process of restructuring the administrative culture of decision-making and implementing European policies. In environmental policy, the Swedish state has a larger responsibility for conserving European bio-diversity, carnivores and wilderness. On the one and larger areas of Norrbotten County are now conserved as part of the EU programme *Natura 2000*. On the other hand, the county governor has lost some administrative resources due to EU integration. This antagonism between tasks and resources in the governing and management of nature is solved by outsourcing commercial tasks in the private market. The maintenance of infrastructure in national parks and surveillance of carnivores are designated as commercial tasks. Small private businesses and communities of Sami Reindeer herders compete for these commercial tasks. Thanks to commercial outsourcing, Sami communities are integrated in the management of bio-diversity and wilderness. The Sami communities are

stakeholders in the management of the wilderness, carnivores and bio-diversity. The participation in commercial tasks gives a structure of commercial governance at local level.

The Swedish state has a 400 year tradition of “top down” government of its 19 regional counties. The integration of European and International agreements and environment policy has resulted in strong implementation of this policy at local level in Norrbotten County. The national policy of conserving nature and biodiversity is integrated in a unified plan for the state owned territory. The internal structure is marked by strong vertical government and strong internal and horizontal integration of environmental policy in implementing different kinds of other policy areas. This results in a large geographical area with strong conservation of nature, wilderness and arctic bio-diversity. This regional system of conservation of nature benefits the Sami reindeer communities. The Swedish regional state has integrated tasks of management of nature with the management of Sami reindeer herding. This is a different pattern from the fragmented Norwegian system. The Swedish system of management of national parks is based on a commercial partnership between the Sami reindeer communities and Swedish authorities. The communities of the Swedish Sami reindeer herders are the stakeholders in the management of national parks. The Norwegian system, on the other side of the border, is based on non- commercial partnership between civil society, non-governmental organisations, Norwegian municipalities and county governor. The Norwegian state has a partnership with Norwegian non governmental organisations and municipalities in the management national parks. This pattern of local governance gives a different pattern of conflicts of interest and collaboration at regional and national level in Norway. The Swedish system generates conflicts of interest between different groups of Sami peoples, regarding who is a stakeholder and who is not against the Swedish state, and between the Sami parliament and Swedish society. The conflicts of interest exists inside the Swedish Sami parliament between Sami parties for reindeer herders and Sami parties for hunters and

Slettet:

fisherman without stakeholder rights. The Swedish parliament and government have not given the Sami community in Sweden recognition as indigenous peoples according to United Nations convention ILO 169. This has been achieved in the Norwegian parliament and government.

Government and governance

The comparison between Norway and Sweden clearly shows a result of different patterns of institution of governing and managing nature in the high northern region of Europe. The Swedish system is much more top down and vertically governed using just two levels of management. The legitimacy of environmental policy of conserving nature has a long tradition in the Swedish government and parliament. Sweden established a national policy of conserving nature in 1909 and founded 9 national parks as early as in 1909. The purpose of conservation pursues the interests of the natural sciences looking at nature as for an object for research. National parks in Sweden have strong rules for protection and permits only trespassing, natural research and reindeer herding. This national policy is implemented in a strongly integrated level by the regional state at county level. The Swedish system of governing nature is close to Weber's model of ideal government (1922). This pattern is based on internal coordination and integration of different areas of policy in the implementation of environmental policy at county level. This is a different pattern from the Norwegian system which uses three levels of management and local parliament in the governing of nature.

In the Norwegian case, the development of the system is based on collaboration between different groups of stakeholders and municipalities in the institution of a national system of governing nature and the environment. In the period of innovation of environmental institutions in Sweden, at the beginning of the 1900's, the Norwegian parliament had a policy

of using territory for industrial and agricultural purposes. The tasks related to managing and governing nature were allocated to institutions in The Ministry of Agriculture and The Ministry of Culture and The Church. In 1967 the Swedish parliament established the Ministry of Environment. In 1972 the Norwegian parliament made a similar system with the establishment of Ministry of Environmental protection. The Norwegian version of the Swedish system developed in another direction, because of the conflicts arising with other ministries and stakeholders at three different levels of management. In Norwegian society rural districts and farmers' interests enjoy a strong position in politics, parties and parliament (Rokkan 1987). The Norwegian patterns of settlement are more de-centralized in the periphery compared to Sweden. The city of Oslo has a weak position in Norwegian society, compared with the capital city of Stockholm in Sweden. The Swedish state can look back on 400 years of central government, whereas the Norwegian state only has 100 years of self-governing from the small capital city of Oslo. The difference in power between central government and rural districts explains the two different tracks of development. Local people and stakeholders are represented in municipalities and counties and take part in the policymaking and implementation of national decisions and institutions.

Slettet:

The two systems have developed different tasks, administrative resources and power. The Norwegian system has three levels of governing and management working both horizontally and vertically, and in addition division of tasks and responsibilities. This empirical model is more "bottom up" in governing and internal processes of detraction. The new theoretical concept of governance fits this system in Norway. The Swedish system employs a more empirical model of vertical "top down" governing and management. The internal processes are characterised by contraction of the system, and this fits with the theoretical concept of government.

Slettet: n

These two different systems do affect the content of policy and implementation at local level. In the Swedish system, professional natural scientists use a model of conservation and do not integrate stakeholder interests in implementing the national policy of conserving bio-diversity. On the other side of the border in the Norwegian system, professional groups using different models of governing nature collaborate with stakeholders and partners at three separate levels of management. According to the general theory related to decentralized government, these systems cost a lot in coordination and horizontal integration (Olsen 1988). The large and complicated task of managing bio-diversity in a large-scale eco-system is difficult in a de-centralized organisation. In the Norwegian case, the national policy is fragmented and these problems have not been solved at regional level with the system of partnership and collaboration.

Litterature:

Aas og Skurdahl (2000) Fiskeforvaltning i Norge: Skiftende og sammensatte idealer og målsettinger i 150 år. I: *Naturforvaltning og samfunnsfag 11*. Referat fra konferanse i Oslo 12. og 13. oktober 1999. *DN – notat 1999 – 6*. Trondheim: Direktoratet for naturforvaltning

Alm, Torbjørn og Andres Often (1998) Hva er biologisk mangfold. *Ottar* nr 4 1998. Tromsø: Universitetsmuseet i Tromsø.

Andersen, Ole Johan og Asbjørn Røiseland (red.)(2008) *Partnerskap – problemløsning og politikk*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Beach, H (2000) World heritage and indigenous peoples: The example of Laponia. In: *Negotiating Nature: Culture, Power and Environmental Argument*. Edited by: A. Horborg and G. Palsson. Lund Sweden: Lund University Press

Carlsson, L. and F. Berkes (2005) Co-management: concepts and methodological implications. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 75 (2005) 65-76. Elsevier.

Berge, Erling and Nils Christian Stenseth (1998) *Law and the Governance of Renewable Resources. Studies from Northern Europe and Africa*. California, USA: Institute for Contemporary Studies Oakland.

Berkes, F., J. Colding and C. Folke (2003) *Navigating Social- Ecological Systems. Building Resilience for Complexity and Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK.

- Berntsen, Bredo (1994) *Grønne linjer. Natur- og miljøvernets historie i Norge*. Oslo: Grøndahl Dreyer / Norges naturvernforbund. Oslo.
- Bortne, Øystein, Gunnar Grendstad, Per Selle og Kristin Strømsnes (2001): *Norsk miljøvernorganisering mellom stat og lokalsamfunn*. Det Norske Samlaget, Oslo.
- Carlsson, L (2008) Omstridd natur I teori och praktik. I: Sandström, C. S. Hovik og E. I. Falleth (red) (2008) *Omstridd natur. Trender och utmaningar i Nordisk naturförvaltning*. Umeå: Borea forlag.
- Christensen, Tom og Per Lægreid (2007) *The Challenge of Coordination in Central Government Organizations*, Working paper, Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies
- Edvardsen M., S. Hovik (2006) Private – Public Partnership: An Exceptional Solution in Natural Conservation in Norway: In: *Local Environment*, Vol.11. No 4. 361-272, Routledge. London.
- Dahlstrom, Nilsson, Åsa (2003): *Negotiation Wilderness in a Cultural Landscape. Predators and Saami Reindeer Herding in the Lapponia Heritage Area*. Universitetet in Uppsala: Uppsala Studies.
- Grønlie, Tore (red.) (1999) *Forvaltning for politikk. Norsk forvaltningspolitikk etter 1945*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget
- Hansen Tore, Gro Sandkjær Hanssen og Inger Marie Stigen (2008) Det gamle fragmenterte styringssystemet – Konsekvenser for samordning? *Norsk Statsvitenskapelig Tidsskrift* nr.3, 2008.
- Hedren, Johan (1994) *Miljøpolitikens natur*. Akademisk avhandling. Water and Environmental Studies. Linköping: Linköping Universitet.
- Hovi, Jon and Arild Underdal 2008: *Internasjonalt samarbeid og internasjonal organisasjon*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hovik, Sissel (2000) Gir desentralisering av oppgaver en fragmentert naturforvaltning? I: *Naturforvaltning og samfunnsfag 11*. Referat for konferansen i Oslo 12. og 13. oktober 1999. Trondheim: Direktoratet for naturforvaltning. *DN – notat 1999 –6*.
- Jacobsen, Knut Dahl (1978) *Teknisk hjelp og politisk struktur*. Universitetsforlaget
- Jansen; Alf-Inge (1989): *Makt og miljø. Om utformingen av natur- og miljøvernpolitikken i Norge*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Jentoft, Svein (1998) *Allmennings komedie. Medforvaltning i fiskeri og reindrift*. Oslo: Ad Notam, Gyldendal forlag A/S.
- Jonsson, Bror (1999) Økologisk kunnskap – et viktig element i dagens naturforvaltning? *Naturen* nr. 1, 1999.

- Klausen, Jan Erling og Hilmar Rommetveit (red) (1996) *Miljøpolitikk. Organisasjonene, Stortinget og forvaltningen*. Oslo: Tano Aschehoug.
- Mels, Tom (1999) *Wild Landscapes. The Cultural Nature of Swedish National Parks*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Often, Anders (1998) "Bevaringsbiologi": Et moderne synsefag som kjemper for det biologiske mangfold. *Ottar* nr. 4 1998. Tromsø: Universitetsmuseet i Tromsø.
- Olsen, Johan P. (1978) *Politisk organisering* Universitetsforlaget
- Olsen, Johan P. (1988) *Statsstyre og institusjonsutforming*. Det blå bibliotek. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Osland, Oddgeir (1997) Intensjonar og institusjonelle labyrintar. Om ekspansjonen av norsk miljøvernadministrasjon. I; Ann Nilsen 1997: *Miljøsociologi*. Samfunn, miljø og natur. Oslo: Pax Forlag A/S.
- Peters, B. G og J. Pierre (2004) Multi-level Governance and Democracy: A Faustian Bargain? in: Bache and M. Flinders (eds) *Multi-level Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ragin, Charles (1987): *The Comparative Method. Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press. Berkeley, US
- Riksrevisjonen 2007: *Riksrevisjonens undersøkelse av bærekraftig arealplanlegging og arealdisponering i Norge*. Dokument nr. 3:11 (2006-2007).
- Rådelius, C. (2002) *Sjælvstyre eller samforvaltning? Problem och muligheter utifrån en studie av verdensarven Lapponia*. Universitetet i Luleå, Sverige: Institusjon før Industriell ökonomi och samhällsvetenskap. Avdeling for samhällsvetenskap.
- Røiseland, A. og S. Vabo (2008) Governance på norsk. Samstyre som empirisk og analytisk fenomen. *Norsk Statsvitenskapelig tidsskrift* Vol.24, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Sande, Allan (2000) Lokal og global institusjonalisering av naturforvaltning. *I: Utmark i Salten, Endringer og utfordringer*. Audun Sandberg (red) NF. Rapport nr. 32. Bodø: Nordlandsforskning.
- Sande, Allan (2001) Naturlig sosial orden. I; *Norsk sosiologisk tidsskrift*, nr 4, årgang 9. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget
- Sande, Allan (2009) Verdensarven Lapponia i samenes land. Under vurdering i *Sosiologisk tidsskrift*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Sande, Allan (2009) *Villmark i grenseland. Sapmi eller Lapponia verdensarvområde. Et sammenlignende studie av forvaltning av natur i Norge og Sverige*. Oslo: Unipub forlag A/S.
- Sandström, C. (2006) *Regional forvaltning av rovdjur i Västerbotten och Norrbotten – om likheter och skilnader ur et samforvaltningsperspektiv*. Umeå Sverige: Fjällmistrarapport nr. 18.

Sandström, Camilla (2007) Institutional dimensions of co-management: participation, power and process. In: *Institutional dimensions of co-management*. Unpublished. Umeå: University of Umeå, Sweden.

Sandström, C. S. Hovik og E. I. Falleth (red) (2008) *Omstridd natur. Trender och utmaningar i Nordisk naturförvaltning*. Umeå: Borea forlag.

Selle, Per og Bjarne Øymyr (1995) *Frivillig organisering og demokrati. Det frivillige organisasjonssamfunnet endrar seg 1940-1990*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Selle, Per og Dag Wollebæk (1996) *Det nye organisasjonssamfunnet: Demokrati i omforming*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Selle, Per og Kristin Strømsnes (red) (1996) *Miljøvernpolitikk og miljøvernorganisering mot år 2000*. LOS-senterets utgivelsesserie. Tano, Aschehoug, Oslo.

Selle, Per og Kristin Strømsnes (red) (1996) *Miljøvernpolitikk og miljøvernorganisering mot år 2000*. LOS-senterets utgivelsesserie. Tano, Aschehoug, Oslo.

Selle, Selle og Grenstad (2008). *Hvorfor Bellona ikke lyktes i Norge*. Upublisert artikkel. Bergen: Institutt for sammenlignede politikk.

Skorstad, Berit (2005): *Miljø, kunnskap og moral. Tre casestudier av miljøomsyn*. Avhandling til graden Doctor Rerum Politicarum. Institutt for sosiologi. Det samfunnsvitenskapelige fakultet, Tromsø: Universitetet i Tromsø.

Ulfstein, G. (2001) Folkeretten og norsk miljøpolitikk. Muligheter og begrensninger. I: *Mot et globalisert Norge?* Bent Sofus Tranøy og Øyvind Østerud (red). Makt og demokratiutredningen 1998-2003. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.