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Abstract
A global mining boom has recently occurred and conflicts due to mineral extraction in the context of environmental justice is visible all over the world. A recent conflict in Sweden, is in Gállok where mining exploration has been conducted on the traditional lands of the indigenous Sámi. Activists protested the exploration by occupying the site during three months in 2013. The conflict has received media attention and since media have influence on the public discourse and while Sami rights have received little official recognition in Sweden, this thesis aims at analysing the mining exploitation discourse by scrutinising the media coverage of the activism and conflict in Gállok. Mining advocates emphasise social effects like economic gain, jobs and future prospect and the importance of working co-existence between different stakeholder, while the mining critics stresses the importance of respecting and recognising Sami rights, long-term sustainability and negative social and environmental impacts from mining. The Government and the mining industry are dominant actors within the mining exploration discourse and truth claims of sustainable mining and the green economy, working co-existence and minerals as essential for and a prerequisite for sustainable development supports their interest. The activism and the Sami’s struggles for justice and recognition in Gállok can be regarded as part of the global environmental justice movement. Finally, the Swedish mining policies can be argued to be based on previous colonial politics, contributing to a continued marginalisation and oppression of the Sami people.

Keywords; Discourse, Environmental Justice, Mining, Sami Rights, Sweden

Abbreviations
CAB - County Administrative Board
CSR - Corporate Social Responsibility
EPA - Environmental Protection Agency
EIA - Environmental Impact Assessment
EJ - Environmental Justice
EU - The European Union
ILO - The International Labour Organization Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention no.169
MI - Mining Inspectorate
SSNA - Swedish Sami National Association
SSNC - Swedish Society for Nature Conservation
SGI - Sweden’s Geological Institute
UN - United Nation
UNDRIP - United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
WWF - World Wildlife Foundation
1. Introduction

The global sustainable development discourse can be understood through international and transnational negotiations and agreements on how to address issues of adaptation and mitigation of climate change. Attention on reducing the global carbon dioxide emissions exists, but there is also emphasis on technological development and renewable energy systems and the strive for establishing a green economy\(^1\) accompanied by a green growth (UNEP, 2011). Renewable energy systems and modern technology requires substantial amounts of metals and some of them are considered as rare earth metals\(^2\) (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013). The demand for minerals and their prices has increased globally during the beginning of the 21th century and this has contributed to an expansion of the international mining industry (Dahlberg-Grundberg & Örestig, 2017; Haikola & Anshelm, 2016).

This has in turn enabled mineral extraction and production in areas previously considered as to remote and/or high-risk areas with lower profit margins due to a lower deposit of minerals (Dahlberg-Grundberg & Örestig, 2017). Additional to these circumstances, technological development, an increased liberalisation of the global market and privatisation of the development of natural resources has contributed to this increase in global mineral extraction (Whiteman & Mamen, 2002). Mineral extraction can be considered as an activity often conducted on lands traditionally habituated and utilised by indigenous populations and this has resulted in widespread conflicts (Lawrence & Larsen, 2017; Whiteman & Mamen, 2002). In the context of global mineral extraction, states repeatedly fail to acknowledge indigenous rights (Lawrence & Larsen, 2017).

Globally, the access to natural resources and the possibilities to exploit them are highly uneven and this determine the present days huge global inequality in terms of the distribution of power and wealth (Brock, 2009; Collste, 2016). The exploitation of natural resources, whether it is mining, coal production, oil extraction or forestry activities, comes with both benefits and risks. Benefits in form of economic gain and power and risks like environmental degradation, climate change, waste and pollution (UNDP, 2014). These benefits and risk can be regarded as socially distributed and the benefits are mainly located to privileged groups in high-income countries, while the risks commonly are located to non-privileged groups in low- or middle-income countries, but also to non-privileged groups, such as indigenous people, in high-income countries (Brock, 2009; Collste, 2016). Due to this social distribution of environmental risks, concepts of political ecology and environmental justice has emerged (Hornborg, 2009). The concept of environmental justice is said to grasp matters of democracy, ecology and equality and the uneven distribution of environmental risks is central (Bell, 2015). The indigenous rights movement and their struggles for human rights, rights to land, culture and tradition, is a prominent voice within the environmental justice movement (Norman, 2017).

In Sweden, due this increased demand together with a low national mineral taxation, pro-mining policies and Governmental investment in mining infrastructure, a recent expansion of the

---

\(^{1}\) A global economy based on renewable energy instead of fossil fuels.

\(^{2}\) Rare earth elements contain 17 metals that are considered to occur in a limited amount in the earth’s crust.
mining industry has also occurred (Ojala & Nordin, 2015). Mineral extraction and other activities derived from industrialisation has, to considerable extent, been carried out in Northern Sweden where the indigenous lands called Sápmi³ are located (Horstkotte et al., 2014; Ojala & Nordin, 2015). Sweden is commonly regarded as an international forerunner regarding environmental standards and human rights issues (Lawrence & Larsen, 2017), although such activities have both historically and currently led to conflicts between the indigenous Sami and the settlers of these activities (Sandström et al., 2016; Horstkotte, Sandström & Moen, 2014).

One recent event that has gained some attention in Swedish media, is the mining exploration in Gállok⁴, where activists protested the mining exploration on site in 2013 (Dahlberg-Grundberg & Örestig, 2017; Ojala & Nordin, 2015; Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017). The impact of mining exploitation on indigenous rights is a matter that has received little academic attention in the context of Northern Europe and it can also be considered that Sami rights have received low official recognition in the Swedish political context (Lawrence & Larsen, 2017). The mining exploration process in Gállok has been ongoing for several years and a final decision has not yet been made. This conflict involves stakeholders⁵ such as the Swedish Government, mining companies, media, civil society including the Sami (Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017).

Persson, Harnesk & Islar (2017) argue that media can be considered as an influential actor in the sense that it gives voices to actors in society and that media participate in the creation of institutionalised cultural norms. Media also has the potential of favouring and reinforcing certain voices whilst silencing or marginalising others (Deacon, Baxter, & Buzzelli, 2015). According to agenda-setting theory, media have a significant effect on the public since it has the possibility of setting the agenda for what topics or issues that are regarded as most important by the public. The more reoccurring a topic is in media, the more likely it is viewed by the public as a prominent issue. In this sense media do not necessarily determine the public opinion about an issue, but it influences what issues the public think about and how they think about them (McCombs, Shaw & Weaver, 2014). Persson, Harnesk & Islar (2017) claim that there is a low national media interest regarding matters located in Northern Sweden and Sami struggles and this was manifested by low national media attention during the activism in Gállok in 2013. Such media exclusion is limiting the opportunities to create public debate on and gain recognition for Sami causes and thereby it is of interest to analyse the media coverage of the mining exploitation discourse by using the conflict in Gállok as a case.

1.1 Aim and Research Questions
The media coverage of the mining conflict in Gállok has not yet been researched to any substantial extent or in relation to the global environmental justice framework. The overall aim of this thesis is to analyse the Swedish mining exploitation discourse by scrutinising how the activism and conflict in Gállok is portrayed by Swedish newspapers. This has been done by performing a discourse analysis inspired by Michel Foucault. The research questions are;

---
³ Sápmi is the traditional lands in Northern Fennoscandia where the core settlement of the Sami is located, including Swedish, Finnish, Norwegian and Russian territory.
⁴ Gállok is the Sami word for Kallak.
⁵ Any organised or unorganised group of people that share stake or interest in a matter.
What opposing actors and arguments in the Gállok conflict can be discerned and how are they distributed?

What are expressed as reasons for conflict due to mining exploration in Gállok?

In terms of power and knowledge, what truth claims can be considered to support the dominant actor’s interests in the mining exploitation discourse?

How are the different discursive subject positions portrayed through media and what implications can this portrayal have for these subjects?

How can the activism in Gállok be understood in terms of the global environmental justice discourse?

Are there any oppressing structures or prevailing colonial heritage reproduced or visible through media?

2. Background

In this section, I will address some present discursive practices in the mining exploitation discourse, which will provide as context and understanding for the analysis. Firstly, I will briefly address the colonialization of Sápmi and indigenous rights, since it is emphasised that contemporary conflicts in Sápmi must be understood from a historical perspective (Ojala & Nordin, 2016; Lantto & Mörkenstam, 2008). Further, I will address previous research on mining exploitation in Sweden; Swedish mining politics, social and environmental effects from mining. Finally, I will define the environmental justice framework.

2.1 Sami History & Indigenous Rights

2.1.1 The Colonialization of Sápmi

The current huge global inequalities are largely due to the previous 450-year long colonial period (Pogge, 2005). Further, processes of globalisation and colonialism have had enormous negative impact for the world’s indigenous populations. Most colonial power has been executed by European civilisations over ‘non-western’ civilisations through political dominance, military action, occupation of property and territory and economically exploiting land, knowledge and natural resources (Horvath, 1972). The colonialization of the Swedish parts of Sápmi started during the 17th century due to the Swedish crowns interest in Sápmi’s natural resources and non-Sami residents started to migrate to Sápmi and the Swedish church established outposts in the region (Brännlund & Axelsson, 2011; Ojala & Nordin, 2015). The colonisation and Christianisation of Sápmi was intensified during the following two centuries. Policies and tax reductions where established to enhance state control over economic and natural resources, as well as the cultural and religious life (Ojala & Nordin, 2015; Sandström et al., 2006). In the beginning of the 20th century the Sami had become a minority group in the area and in addition to these demographical changes the Sami has suffered loss of authority and land rights (Brännlund & Axelsson, 2011).

Taking control over territory and natural resources and removing Sami rights is not the only oppression the Swedish state has conducted over the Sami. The driving force of colonialism has over century’s been built upon the belief that non-western cultures and its people are less evolved and subordinate to the western culture and its people. In Sweden, it was commonly
regarded during the 19th century that the Sami was a weaker and less evolved race. This resulted in state-led and financed racial biology conducted on the Sami which persisted until the 1950’s (Lundmark, 2002). The colonial history of Sápmi is generally not recognised to any substantial extent and the common knowledge of Sámi history and rights is poor among the Swedish public (Ojala & Nordin, 2015; Lantto & Mörkenstam, 2008). Also, Sami rights issues has officially received little recognition in the Swedish context (Lawrence & Larsen, 2017).

2.1.2 The Indigenous Sami

Historical findings indicated that the ethnic group that today is regarded as the Sami has lived in Sápmi for at least 2000 years and that the Sami where the first humans to settle in Northern Scandinavia (Allard, 2006; Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017; Swedish Government, 2015). During the first half of the 19th century, the Sami was commonly viewed as the indigenous people of Sweden, but this view changed around the 1850’s both in a scientific and political context, mainly due to the intensified colonialization of Sápmi and the emerging state-led racial biology (Lundmark, 2002). The Swedish Government acknowledged the Sami as Sweden’s indigenous people in 1977 and in 2011 the Sami was acknowledged as an ethnic group in the Swedish constitution (Sametinget, 2018d). In 1993, the Swedish Sami Parliament was established. It works as a consultative body with expert knowledge on Sami culture but it does not hold any real power or actual political influence (Lantto & Mörkenstam, 2008). The Sami Parliament has articulated the mining-boom and the liberal mining politics in Sweden is an expression of continuous state-led colonisation with no regards to Sami rights (Ojala & Nordin, 2016).

The Sami holds traditional indigenous knowledge called Árbediehtu. It is ancient and built upon knowledge of nature and its ecosystems and transmitted orally between generations. Árbediehtu provides a holistic interpretation where humans and nature are intertwined and looked upon as one entity. This knowledge is dynamic and constantly adapted to the prevailing environmental conditions with the purpose of not losing its overall perspective. According to the United Nation Convention on Biological Conservation this type of indigenous knowledge should be respected and regarded as equal to western knowledge and it has the possibilities to contribute to climate change adaptation measures and biodiversity conservation (Sametinget, 2018e). Lawrence and Larsen (2017) stresses that the wider sustainability science is nearly entirely detached from indigenous knowledge, science and rights.

The Sami is a heterogenous group of people and many Sami live and utilises land side by side with industrial activities, such as mining, hydropower, forestry and wind-power (Ojala & Nordin, 2015). Fishing, hunting, handicrafts, small-scale forestry and reindeer husbandry can be viewed as traditional Sami activities and tourism also is an activity the Swedish Sami are engaged in. These can all be considered as important and valuable from both a cultural and a socio-economic perspective and reindeer husbandry is the most apparent traditional Sami activities.

---

6 When race is mentioned in this thesis, it is under the premise that human races are a social construction that through centuries has been used to legitimise colonial oppression and racism.
7 It is specified in Article 8j and 10c in the convention.
8 Reindeer husbandry refers to the whole management of reindeers.
activity today (Allard, 2006; Brännström & Axelsson, 2011; Koivurova et al., 2015; Sandström et al., 2006). Reindeer husbandry commonly coincide with other activities, such as tourism and handicrafts (Sametinget, 2018a). For the Sami who conduct reindeer husbandry, it is commonly the most significant source of income (Brännlund & Axelsson, 2011; Horstkotte, Sandström & Moen, 2014).

In Sweden, the Sami has conducted reindeer husbandry since at least the 17th century (Kivinen et al., 2012) and prior to the 17th century the Sami community was mainly a hunting and gathering society (Moen & Keskitalo, 2010). The Reindeer Husbandry Act (1971:437) grants the Sami exclusive rights to conduct reindeer husbandry, if members in a Sami village. These rights are separated from land ownership, meaning that reindeer husbandry is carried out alongside other land uses (Sandström et al., 2016). The first act connected to reindeer husbandry was established in 1886 and while granting the Sami exclusive rights to herd reindeers it also removed their land and property rights. In the early 1900’s the official view and definition in the political context in Sweden was that ‘the real Sami’ were nomadic reindeer herders (Lantto & Mörkenstam, 2008).

There are approximately 4600 Sami reindeer owners in Sweden and about 2500 of these rely in reindeer husbandry as sole income (Sametinget, 2018b). About 225 000-280 000 semi-domesticated reindeers resides in Sápmi (Sametinget, 2018b). The reindeers graze freely all year round, migrating between areas depending on the season which make them entirely dependent on ecosystem services from the landscape in form of feed and water (Sandström et al., 2016). Old coniferous woods are serve as key habitats for reindeers due to its abundance of lichens which is the main fodder for the reindeers (Kivinen et al., 2012). Semi-domesticated reindeers in the circumpolar regions are an important species for its socio-ecological systems (Herrman et al., 2014). In Sweden, both mining and reindeer husbandry are national interests (Koivurova, et al., 2015).

2.1.3 Gállok
Gállok is an area located north west of the town Jâhkámåhkke in Northern Sweden. This land area is of central value for reindeer husbandry and the land has been utilised since time immemorial by the Sami (Koivurova, et al., 2015). Gállok is located on a peninsula along the river Lilla Luleälven and it is used by two Sami villages, Jâhkágasska Tjielld and Sirges. The planned mining site covers the whole peninsula and it has been identified as key reindeer habitats. Gállok works as resting, gathering and grazing grounds as well as an important migration route for the reindeers. Jâhkágasska Tjielld have more than 70 members and permission to herd 4 500 reindeers, while Sirges is the largest Sami village in Swedish Sâpmi and have more than 400 members accompanied by over 15 000 reindeers. These two Sami villages has been involved in the protests in Gállok (Herrman et al., 2014).

---

9 Both arboreal and ground grown lichen.
10 Jâhkámåhkke is the name of both the municipality and its largest town (Jokkmokk in Swedish).
11 Time immemorial is a legal term that can be regarded as evidence that the claimed land rights has been established a long time ago and under legally correct circumstances.
2.1.4 Conventions and International Organs
In 1989, The International Labour Organization launched their Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention no.169 (ILO). The convention defines what constitutes as indigenous and/or tribal and it aims at protecting these people’s rights and the right to not be discriminated due to their culture. Article 3 in the convention states that “indigenous and tribal peoples shall enjoy the full measure of human rights”. The convention also regards land use and development on indigenous lands and it claims that indigenous and tribal peoples always should be informed and consulted prior any decision-making that might affect them (International Labour Organization, 2017). The Sami Parliament and international organs has emphasised the importance of ratifying the ILO in Sweden (Ojala & Nordin, 2016; Lantto & Mörkenstam, 2008).

In 2007, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was adopted and it aims to protect and strengthen indigenous rights. The declaration emphasise that free, prior informed consent should be obtained from the concerned indigenous people when it comes to development of and activities on indigenous lands, relocation, adopting legislation and administrative measures. This will in turn provide larger insight and possibilities for indigenous people to part-take in planning and decision-making regarding activities carried out or close to their lands (UNDRIP, 2008). Also, the United Nation’s International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination and the European Convention on Human Rights are both relevant to the Sami. These conventions are instruments working against discrimination due to ethnicity or race (Sametinget, 2018c). Sweden is often regarded as an international forerunner when it comes to environmental standards and human rights, but Sweden has received international critique for its marginalisation of Sami rights and inability to follow these conventions (Lantto & Mörkenstam, 2008; Lawrence & Larsen, 2017; Sametinget, 2018c).

2.2 The Mineral Strategy
The Swedish Government launched a new Mineral Strategy in 2013 and it states that; “Sweden’s mineral resources should be used in a long-term sustainable manner, considering ecological, social and cultural dimensions so that natural and cultural environments are preserved and developed” (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013, p. 4). One of the main purpose with the strategy is to increase the competitiveness of, and enabling increased investment in, the Swedish mining industry. It states that a further extraction of minerals is necessary for reinforcing Sweden’s leading position in the European Unions’ (EU) mineral extraction, but also for the global economy and ensuring good quality of life (Governments Office, 2013). Also, the increasing concern for resource scarcity within the EU has emphasised Sweden’s potential position as a reliable producer of mineral and metals in Europe (Haikola & Anshelm, 2016). The mining industry’s importance for the Swedish economy and growth is lifted in the Mineral Strategy as well as the necessity to extract minerals and metals to enable the green technology and green growth (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013).

Haikola & Anshelm (2016, p. 510) states that the Mineral Strategy “is premised on a thoroughly market- liberal view of industrial expansion, the role of the state being identified as one of facilitating global capital movements (into Sweden) and stimulating market competition”. The state-investments regarding infrastructure, education and research connected to the mining industry is also
accentuated by the Government. Despite this, the state can primarily be regarded as a passive actor and its most central function is to remove obstacles that are hindering mining investments and capital flows. Abolition of taxes and accelerated environmental impact assessments (EIA) can be regarded as effects from the strategy itself, although it is stressed in the strategy that communication between concerned stakeholders is of essence (Haikola & Anshelm, 2016).

It is estimated that mining activities in Sweden will threefold by 2025 and that Sweden holds approximately 60 % of EU’s identified iron ore deposit (Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017) and 93 % of its contemporary iron ore production (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013). The so-called mining-boom in Sweden was apparent by an all-time high in the active claims, explorations permits and explorations costs during 2011. There are 18 active mines in Sweden today and 12 of these are located Norrbotten and Västerbotten, landscapes that makes up large parts of Swedish Sápmi (Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017).

2.3 The Mineral Act
The Mineral Act (1991:45) controls the exploration of concession metals and minerals\textsuperscript{12} on Swedish territory (SGU, n.d.,a). According to the Mineral Act, landowners and Sami people have equal rights in the mining exploitation process and they must be involved during certain stages in the permit processes. The Act also requires that exploration companies can show in their application how reindeer husbandry will be affected by the mine (Koivurova et al., 2015). The permitting process follows through several steps and all applications are handled by The Mining Inspectorate (MI) at Sweden’s Geological Institute (SGI). The first step is to apply for an exploration permit granting the applicant exclusive rights to explore an area and to investigate if the mineral deposit is in proper magnitude for mining. A working plan is to be set in consultation with all involved stakeholders, like land owners and utilisers. If the deposit is appropriate for mining, an exploitation concession must be proven in accordance with the Mineral Act. If an exploitation concession is granted, the company holds legal right to exploit the deposit for 25 years, which has the possibilities to be extended (SGU, n.d.,b).

The application for an exploitation concession legally requires an EIA but the company is not legally required to consult with the affected Sami villages when assessing the impact (Lawrence & Larsen, 2017). The impact assessment is reviewed by the municipality and the County Administrative Board (CAB). If a decision cannot be agreed upon, the final decision-making falls on the Swedish Government. After an exploitation concession is given the company must apply for permission at the Land and Environment Court with an accompanied impact assessment before a mine can be built (SGU, n.d.,b).

2.4 Environmental and Social Impacts
The contemporary mining industry and other industrial land uses, like hydro-power and large-scale forestry, are commonly competing for the same land as the Sami utilises (Sandström et al., 2016; Horstkotte, Sandström & Moen, 2014). Like for all large-scale development it contributes to economic, environmental and social trade-offs and it is often argued that

\textsuperscript{12} Minerals and metals that have an industrial use and value.
environmental and social values are subordinated to economic interests (Poelzer, 2015). Previous research states that large-scale industrial activities have negative effect for the Sami as well as for biodiversity and ecosystem services (Herrman et al., 2014; Horstkotte, Sandström & Moen, 2014; Kivinen et al., 2010; Sandström, et al., 2016; Ojala & Nordin, 2015). Mining poses as threat towards the possibilities to conduct reindeer husbandry. The mining site itself due to directs land losses and the accompanied infrastructure, such as roads, railway tracks and power lines, affect reindeer migrations routes and grazing lands negatively through habitat fragmentation (Herrman et al., 2014; Koivurova, et al., 2015; Ojala & Nordin, 2015). Human activity and noises are also a disturbance for reindeers (Lawrence & Larsen, 2017). Mineral extraction also causes permanent environmental change and risks in form of soil and water pollution (Ojala & Nordin, 2015; Poelzer, 2015). Some reason that it is not possible to restore all mining grounds to the pre-mining conditions (Haikola & Anshelm, 2016).

Some argued for broader participation in the mining exploration process and more involvement of the different stakeholders (Koivurova et al., 2015). In a historical context it is said that mining companies has not consulted affected Sami communities regarding the impact assessments, although this is less common today. The consultation does commonly happen, but it is criticised for being a limited one-way communication and the legislation do not enable Sami-participation to any significant extent in the permitting process. The EIA following the exploration concession only assess the effects from the mining site itself and do not regard the cumulative effects outside the mining area. The cumulative effects are assessed in the later EIA when the exploitation concession already is granted. This is addressed as problematic since the legal assessment of the assumed co-existence between reindeer husbandry and mining is made before all effects from the mining is presented and assessed (Lawrence & Larsen, 2017).

Since the consultation of the Sami is inadequate, actual experiences of impacts and indigenous knowledge remains unnoticed, or submissive at best (Allard, 2006). Lawrence & Larsen (2017, p. 1171) claims that “the Sami have little real influence over whether and how mining and exploration take place on their lands” and that indigenous rights and knowledge systematically is marginalised in the permitting process. They also argued that “impact assessments are woven into the fabric of neoliberal practices, whereby protective government measures are dismantled, and discourses of corporate social responsibility (CSR) relegate crucial responsibilities from government to corporations” (Lawrence & Larsen, 2017, p.1168).

2.5 Environmental Justice
The globally unequal social distribution of benefits and risk derived from the access to, and use of, natural resources are central within the field of political ecology and on these grounds, the environmental justice (EJ) framework has evolved. The EJ framework is to some extent a contested framework due to differences in its definition. I will follow Schlosberg (2017) who reasons that the EJ framework must focus on three intertwined forms of justice; recognition, participation and distribution. Schlosberg (2017, p.517) states that EJ demands “equity in the distribution of environmental risk, recognition of the diversity of the participants and experiences in

13 Political processes shapes environmental changes and ecological conditions, ecology is inevitably political and vice versa.
affected communities, and participation in the political processes which create and manage environmental policy”.

In terms of *distributive justice*, it regards, as mentioned previously, the uneven social distribution of the environmental benefits and risks (Cantzler & Huynh, 2016; Schlosberg, 2017). It is argued by the UN that access to ecosystem services and natural resources are of outmost concern in terms poverty reduction and the right to inclusion. Poor management of ecosystems and overexploitation of natural resources often leads to further marginalisation of, and structural inequality for, already exposed groups (UNDP, 2014). Procedural justice demands “the construction of inclusive, participatory decision-making institutions” and these procedures should recognise community knowledge and enable active participation that reflect the existing diversity in the community (Schlosberg, 2017, p.522). This entails a procedural redistribution of power, allowing marginalised groups to participate and influence the governance and decision-making processes of ecosystem services and natural resources (Wutich, et al., 2013).

*Justice as recognition* entails that the experiences and diversity of participants is recognised and respected, which means that it is necessary to recognise that social, cultural, institutional and symbolic aspects are underlying inequality (Schlosberg, 2017). Socio-economic aspects affecting the distribution can be class, race, gender and ethnicity (Bell, 2015; Taylor, 2000; UNDP, 2014). Schlosberg (2017, p.519) claims that recognition must be addressed and not only assumed in the social and political context, “if you are not recognised, you do not participate”. Since processes of globalisation and colonialism have had enormous negative impact for the world’s indigenous populations and nearly every political conflict or struggle involving indigenous people, includes environmental implications, making indigenous struggles current for the EJ movement (Cantzler & Huynh, 2016).

### 3. Method, Theory and Material

In this section, I will address and account for the choices made regarding method, theory and material. Firstly, I will provide an outline for the methodological approach and theoretical terms relevant for my analysis. Secondly, I will account for my empirical material and finally, I will account for how the analysis was executed in more detail and provide a short methodological discussion.

#### 3.1 Methodological Approach & Theory

Media can, as mentioned earlier, be a powerful and influential actor in society (Deacon, Baxter, & Buzzelli, 2015; Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017), which is why it is of interest to analyse the media coverage of the mining conflict in Gállok. The methodology field of discourse analysis is very extensive and no clear consensus regarding how to perform such analysis exists (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). The performed discourse analysis, its methodological approach and the theoretical starting points, are inspired by the French philosopher and historian of ideas Michel Foucault, who can be regarded as one of the most prominent persons within the field.

---

14 Benefits humans gains from using natural environment and properly functioning ecosystem services such as the use of aquatic ecosystems for drinking water, forest ecosystems for example wood or fuel and agroecosystems like growing food.
(Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). His theories and ideas are today broadly dispersed (Rose, 2016).

The Foucauldian discourse analysis is to some extent challenging to interpret and Foucault’s own ideas changed to some extent over time. The lack of a structured and explicit method leaves a rather implicit and open analytical approach (Rose, 2016). Since Foucault’s methodological approach is rather implicit and there is need for some interpretations by the person performing the analysis. By making these interpretations I have, according to Gutting (2005) created my overall sense of Foucault’s discourse analysis which probably have distorted Foucault’s own original thoughts to some extent. Therefore, I only claim my discourse analysis to be inspired by Foucault. Several of Foucault’s theoretical terms is intertwined in each other and in the following sections I will discuss and account for them and the claims made by Foucault that I find relevant to my thesis.

3.1.1 The Social Constructivist Premise

Worth mentioning in the beginning is the social constructivist premise. This ontological understanding is valid for all types of discourse analysis, including mine. This premise implies a critical approach towards an absolute truth or knowledge and that our understanding of the world cannot be regarded as constant or an objective reflection of ‘reality’. The use of language and its social context is affecting the creation of this reflection. What we regard as knowledge can be considered as something constructed and it is historically and culturally contingent. Knowledge is not constant and changes over time and it could have been different. A link exists between social processes and knowledge, in the sense that these processes create and maintain our understanding of the world. In this knowledge creation, we also construct what is considered as common truths, by talking of what is true and false. This notion of true and false affects our social actions in the sense that certain social actions are regarded as normal, while others are considered as unthinkable or abnormal in the same context. (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002)

3.1.2 Discourse, Discursive Formation & Intertextuality

The definition of discourse varies to some extent. However, a definition is needed for the understanding of its analysis. The concept of discourse is central both for the methodology and theoretical arguments of Foucault (Rose, 2016). According to Foucault, in The Archaeology of Knowledge (1972, p. 117), discourse can be defined as;

“a group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation [...] it is made up of a limited number of statements for which a group of conditions of existence can be defined. Discourse in this sense is not an ideal, timeless form [...] it is, from beginning to end, historical - a fragment of history [...] posing the problem of its own limits, its divisions, its transformations, the specific modes of its temporality”

In this sense, discourse can be viewed as a group of expressions or statements that determine and structure how we understand, think and talk about something. Discursive expressions do not exist isolated from the past nor the future, but are dependent on them, in the sense that what have been expressed in the past affect and determine what is possible to express in the future. Discourse produce knowledge and understanding about the world and our social actions are
affected by, and based on, this knowledge and understanding. In this sense, discourse determine and construct boundaries that regulates the possibilities of its practices and subjects. These boundaries regulate what is possible to express and talk about, they set limits for what can be considered as true or valid, normal or abnormal and it also regulates what social actions that are possible (Rose, 2016; Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Discourse is also referred to as specific type of language with associated institutions, agreements and laws and this specific language is developed and circulated within its institutions. The concept of discourse is grounded in linguistics and semiotics and discourse is articulated through all sorts of communication, such as verbal and visual images and texts and by its practices (Rose, 2016). This is how this thesis relates to the concept of discourse and the discourse analysed through the media coverage I have chosen to call the mining exploitation discourse. The analysis will address what can be considered as the inherent rules and boundaries of the mining exploitation discourse and what is possible to express within these.

The structure of discourse can be referred to as the discursive formation, which is a central term for Foucault. Foucault described the discursive formation as “systems of dispersion” (1972, p. 37) and it can be viewed as a structure or a system that consists of the connections and relations between the discursive expressions and practices (Rose, 2016). I regard the discursive formation as the structure of the mining exploitation discourse and I analyse what structure is visible in the media coverage by asking myself: What discursive expressions visible in the media coverage and who is expressing them? What is not visible? I view the discursive formation as a circle enclosed by a larger circle and this leads to questions of positioning; -What expressions and practices are positioned in the margins of, and in the central parts of the discursive formation?

Discourses are, as mentioned earlier, articulated by diverse expressions and the intertextuality of discourse refers to the relationship between the meanings carried by these expressions (Rose, 2016). As cited by Rose (2019, p. 142) “Intertextuality refers to the way that the meanings of any one discursive image or texts depend not only on that one text or image, but also on the meanings carried by other images or texts”. My interpretation of the intertextuality is that some discursive expressions and their meaning rely on each other, in the sense that certain discursive expressions can only be expressed provided that another discursive expression exists, expressed or assumed. To analyse the intertextuality of the discourse I have asked myself; -What discursive expressions, visible or taken for granted, depend on each other? What can be regarded as taken for granted by the discursive expressions and practices?

3.1.3 Power & Knowledge
Foucault held the belief that discourse is a type of discipline, which leads to his concerns on power. According to Foucault power is everywhere and it cannot be viewed as merely something imposed by powerful individuals or institutions from the top of society. Repressive or imposed power is present but according to Foucault it is not the only type nor the most powerful. Discourse and power is closely connected, and discourse is powerful because it is productive. Discourse is productive in the sense that it creates ‘knowledge’ and produces subjects and social effects, meaning the humans are subjected by discourse which disciplines them to act and think in certain ways (Rose, 2016; Hajer, 1997; Winther Jørgensen & Phillips,
Some discourses are dominant in society and this dominance cannot solely be explained by the notion that they are located within institutions that hold repressive or imposed power. The dominance of a certain discourse or institution also depend on the claim that their knowledge is the absolute truth (Rose, 2016).

This leads to the Foucauldian claim that power and knowledge are intertwined in each other and cannot be separated. “All knowledge is discursive and discourse is saturated with power, but because the most powerful discourses, in terms of the productiveness of their social effects, depend on the assumption and claims that their knowledge is true” (Rose, 2016, p. 144). This Foucauldian way of thinking of knowledge and power has effects for the concept of truth and he held the belief that what we considered as true is something constructed by discourse. There is no such thing as an ‘universal or absolute truth’, nor is it valid to believe that the creation of ‘knowledge’ is independent or objective (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002), just like the social constructivist premise. Because of this, it is not important to ask if something is true or false when doing a discourse analysis. The focus should rather be on how the effects of truth claims are generated (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Such epistemological understanding leads to questions on the absolute truth claims of the mining exploitation discourse. What can be regarded as the dominant truth claims within the mining exploitation discourse and who is claiming them? What implications do these claims have for involved actors? Another current question for discourse analysis is how a dominant actor’s interests is ensured in the context of a controversy or conflict (Hajer, 1997). Therefore, my analysis will regard how the reproduction of, what can be considered as the dominant actor’s in the mining exploitation discourse, interests is created.

3.1.4 Subject and Subjugation

Another theoretical claim that can be considered as important for Foucault’s discourse analysis, is his view on the relationship between discourse and its subjects. According to Foucault, humans are subjected by discourse which rejects the belief on human as sovereign. As argued in Foucault’s (1972, p. 55) The Archaeology of Knowledge; “discourse is not the majestically unfolding manifestation of a thinking, knowing, speaking subject, but, on the contrary, a totality, in which the dispersion of the subject and his discontinuity with himself may be determined”. The productive power of discourse creates and sets the boundaries for its social actions and practices. -What is possible to say or not say within different institutions, who gets to speak, about what, when and with what kind of authority? (Fejes & Thornberg, 2015). Human subjects have limited influence on discourse in regards of their own interests. The dominant interests within discourse is constantly produced and reproduced mainly by discourse and not by specific individuals or subjects. Although the dominant interests have the potential to change over time (Hajer, 1997, p. 51). Since the mining exploitation discourse holds different discursive practices and subjects, it is of interest to analyse what subject positions are visible in the media coverage and how are they portrayed?

Since the events in Gållok can be regarded as a conflict with opposing actors, a Foucauldian inspired analysis can be argued as most suitable due to Foucault’s view on power and subjects. Hajer (1997) argues that a specific actor’s legitimacy in a controversy or conflict cannot be fully understood by solely referring to its position in the discourse, but it must be analysed in relation to the inherent rules and its truth claims. Therefore, my analysis will also reflect upon
how the legitimacy of the opposing actor’s claims is affected by the media coverage, the inherent rules and truth claims of the mining exploitation discourse.

3.2 Empirical Material

My empirical material consists of printed editorials, debate and news-articles on the mining exploration and activism in Gállok in seven daily Swedish newspapers. This selection was based on two attributes; the political affiliation of the newspapers and its geographical coverage. I strived for diversity regarding these two attributes to get a broad scope and diversified picture of the media coverage, although the analysis only represents the chosen newspapers. The material was retrieved by executing a search on Retriever Media Archive, using the keywords; Kallak15 AND Gruv*. The material was limited by choosing printed articles between 2013-201816 and the articles in each newspaper were limited to editorials, debate- and news articles. The result from the search is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Newspaper, political affiliation, coverage and total number of editorials, debate and news-articles printed between 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Political affiliation</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aftonbladet (AB)</td>
<td>Social democratic independent</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagens Industri (DI)</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagens Nyheter (DN)</td>
<td>Liberal independent</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagens ETC (ETC)</td>
<td>Left &amp; environmental-oriented</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svenska Dagbladet (SVD)</td>
<td>Conservative independent</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrländska Social Demokraten (NSD)</td>
<td>Social democratic</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västerbottens Kuriren (VK)</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Local/Regional</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further selection was done by doing an initial reading of all articles and TT notices and short news articles were excluded in all papers. In the national papers, AB, DI, DN and SVD all editorials, debate articles and some more comprehensive news articles were selected. All news articles were selected in DI since there were no other articles. The coverage in NSD was far more comprehensive, which lead to the selection of all published editorials- and debate-articles and the exclusion of all news articles, except during 2013 where more comprehensive news articles on the activism in Gállok were selected. In VK, all debate articles and editorials were selected, although a few debate articles were disregarded since they already were included in the material when also published in NSD. Also, some more comprehensive news article was selected in VK. This selection of the empirical was made with the intention of limiting the quantity of the material to what was considered as a feasible amount allowing a qualitative and comprehensive analysis due to set time limits and methodological approach. The final selection consists of 82 articles and their yearly distribution is shown in Table 2. 73 of the articles are referred to in the analysis and all used citations are translated by myself.

---

15 Kallak (the Swedish word for Gállok) was used since all selected newspapers are all published in Swedish.
3.3 Discourse Analysis

In this section I will account for how the analysis was operationalised, what compromises and choices has been made and why. Since there is no explicit analytical approach, I will strive to maintain high transparency regarding my approach and steps made in the analysis, which Rose (2016) suggests.

3.3.1 Delimitations

Since discourses can exist parallel with each other and compete in their truth claims (Rose, 2016; Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002), it is of relevance to explain how I view the media coverage in terms of discourse. It could be argued that several different discourses are visible in the media coverage, for example an indigenous discourse, a mining discourse and so forth. Despite such possibilities, I interpret it as one discourse expressed through the media coverage. The media coverage is one way, and probably the most common way for the public, to understand the conflict in Gållok.

3.3.2 Operationalising the Analysis

Foucauldian discourse analysis is somewhat implicit in its procedure and it is suggested that efforts can be made to make the procedure more explicit. Rose (2016) argues that you as a researcher should immerse yourself to your material and look at your material with fresh eyes and try to leave preconceptions one has about the material behind, which I tried to do by re-reading numerous of times and try to remain open to new things. Rose (2016) also suggests that a first step for your analysis is to analyse the discursive expressions, the discursive formation and the intertextuality and to determine their social context. Simply put as who is saying what, under what circumstances? To analyse these, I started off the reading by applying some broad initial questions suggested by Fejes & Thornberg (2015), see Table 3.

Table 3. Questions for first reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What is expressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How is it expressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What is presented as truth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What subject positions appear?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reading was conducted in chronological order, one newspaper at the time, using NVivo Software, which is used for qualitative data analysis. During the initial reading I read without doing any coding or taking notes. This provided an overview of the most central discursive
expressions. Further I re-read the material several times and coded the discursive expressions, subject positions and discursive practices into nodes\textsuperscript{17}, which resulted in over 90 various nodes. To structure the discourse visible through media, I created three mind maps (see Appendix I). Also, I assessed the occurrence of the nodes in the material, which is listed automatically in Nvivo. This contributed to the mapping of the discursive formation, what discursive expressions and subjects exists in the central parts respective margins.

Next, I proceeded with the intertextuality of discourse. What is as taken for granted by these discursive expressions and in what social context they are made? What discursive expressions and truth claims are dependent on other, spoken or taken for granted expressions and claims? I also noted what I perceived as the most central truth claims and who made them. By analysing the discursive expressions, the discursive formation, the intertextuality, the subject positions and their social context, as Rose (2016) suggests, I have created a general understanding of the mining exploitation discourse visible in media to use as a starting point in operationalising my analysis further. Further, I applied my research questions. By applying these questions on the gained understanding of the mining exploitation discourse I made it possible to continue the analysis. I re-read the material repeatedly and revisited the nodes continually. As a final approach I proceeded by asking myself what is not visible and who is excluded.

I perceive this open approach advantageous since it allows for high flexibility and the possibility to revisit and return to your material countless number of times with questions for analysis, which Rose (2016) also lifts as beneficial. Another benefit as I see it, is that Foucault’s discourse regards and analyse the ‘small things’, what is taken for granted and what is not said or expressed explicitly (Rose, 2016). Which I find provide a broader dimension to the analysis and possibility to discuss and reflect upon what and who is excluded. Using Foucault’s theory also provides opportunity to scrutinise and visualise the consequences derived from discursive expressions, such as oppression or marginalisation and it can be used to visualise the power of language (Fejes & Thornberg, 2015). This is also an argument for using Foucault’s theory, since the indigenous Sami previously has suffered from marginalisation and oppression.

\subsection*{3.3.3 Reflexivity}
All scientific research has shortcomings due to empirical and methodological challenges and uncertainties and like for almost any other study, other methodological approaches and theories are possible. This methodological approach does not allow for a discussion on reliability, which nowadays is a common methodological discussion within traditional qualitative research. I argue that reliability is not a relevant term for discourse analysis due to the epistemological understanding that knowledge is constructed by discourse and due to the researchers position as a subject within discourse. According to Rose (2016) a discussion regarding reflexivity is more valid within the field of discourse, even though Foucault himself did not talk about reflexivity explicitly.

Foucault held the perspective that all form of knowledge production is discursive (Rose, 2016), which have some implications for me as a researcher. Because discourse both creates subjects and subjectivity, it is not possible for the researcher to obtain an objective position outside the

\footnote{\textsuperscript{17} Name of categories in the Nvivo software.}
analysed discourses. The researcher can be regarded as a subject within the discourse, which implies that the results of the analysis can be regarded as product of discourse. The research creates ‘truths’ on what is present within discourse, while the analysis is carried out within the given frames of the discourse. Exactly in what way the researcher affects the analysis is not possible to determine (Fejes & Thornberg, 2015). Although it can be said that the situatedness of the researcher and the research practice affects the analysis. Considering this, Rose (2016) argues that the researcher’s reflexivity is of importance. The researcher should critically reflect upon its own analysis and research practice. Because of this, it is worthwhile to reflect upon that I as a researcher am situated within what can be regarded as a critical sustainability discourse, which has affected the analysis, form and execution of the thesis. The same can be said for some of the used previous research, which is situated within what can be regarded as mining critical discourse.

The arguments about discourse, truth/knowledge and power must be relevant to your research practice as well as your materials. One way to critically reflect upon your analysis is to be humble towards your analytical claims and avoiding claiming that your findings reveal some absolute truth. You as a researcher have constructed an interpretation and analysis of the discourse at hand, you have made choices regarding your discussion and choosing some material over others which makes high transparency regarding these choices is of essence (Rose, 2016). Considering this, I have strived for a high transparency by accounting for my empirical choices, methodological approach and theoretical framework. Although in effort to strengthen the potential of my analysis, I have strived to provide a persuasive and argumentative analysis, which Rose (2016) suggests.

3.3.4 Ethical Considerations
The ethical considerations for the thesis is limited due to the empirical material in form of written text. Although, my role as a non-indigenous researcher in what can be considered as partly an indigenous context can pose ethical dilemmas and challenges. In regards of this situation, I have tried to apply ethical considerations regarding my use of language. That is why I have chosen to use the Sami names for the geographical area that are of concern for my analysis. I have also tried not to use or repeat names or expression which could be perceived as degrading or contributing to a continuous marginalisation of the Sami.

4. Analysis & Discussion
In this section I will present my empirical material by dividing the analysis into headings determined by the research questions. Under the headings Actors & Arguments, Reasons for Conflict and Subjects & Subjugation I will only refer to my empirical material, while theory, previous research and Swedish mining policies will be addressed in the discussion sections following each of these headings. This is done with the purpose of providing a clear picture of how the mining exploitation discourse is portrayed by media and to easily follow the lines of conflict and the discursive field. Additionally, I will analyse and discuss Power & Knowledge and Environmental Justice in relation to my empirical material.
4.1 Actors & Arguments

Here, I will address the first research question - What opposing actors and arguments in the Gállok conflict can be discerned and how are they distributed? Under the headings 4.1-4.1.5, I will only refer to my empirical material, while addressing previous research, theory and Swedish mining politics under the discussion part. The empirical material displayed that different opinions exist regarding the mining exploration Gállok and mineral extraction at large. The opposing side cannot be considered as homogenous in terms of their attitude towards mining as an activity. All mining critical voices opposed a future mine in Gállok and some are generally critical towards mining exploitations in Sápmi. At the same time, some mining critical voices did not oppose mining as an activity, they are rather concerned about the conditions under which the mining industry may act. Since these actors use similar and often common arguments, I will refer to this group of actors as mining critics. The proponents of building a mine in Gállok and the ones generally positive towards mining also use common arguments and this group will be referred to as mining advocates. These actors are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Opposing Actors of the Conflict in Gállok

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mining critics</th>
<th>Mining advocates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parts of civil society18</td>
<td>Ruling politicians in Jåhkåmåhkke municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sami Parliament</td>
<td>The Swedish Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Sami National Association19 (SSNA)</td>
<td>The Mining Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s 20</td>
<td>The exploration company21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientists</td>
<td>Scientists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>Parts of civil society22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO council</td>
<td>CAB in Västerbotten County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB in Norrbotten County</td>
<td>Local politicians in Northern Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives from the tourism industry</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
<td>Representatives from the tourism industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 Jobs, Economic Gain and Future Belief

One repeatedly used argument by the mining advocates is the assumed local economic gain and growth through private investments and jobs a mine will provide (Andersson, 2013; Ahl, 2013; Bernhardsson, 2017; Blume, 2013d; Johansson, 2013; Lööf, 2013; Sjöberg, 2013a; Stormare, 2017; Tervaniemi, 2013b; Åström & Bucht, 2013). Andersson (2013) stated that a mine will contribute to an “economic injection for both local and regional business. It would provide a large amount of jobs, opportunities for population growth and the opportunity for our children and young people to stay in our fantastic municipality if they want to”, with emphasis that it will provide for increased business within other sectors such as “restaurants, hotels, construction, mechanics, electricians, consultants, administrators, painters and tourist companies”. The mining critics

---

18 Activists, the Sami, local and non-local people, authors of articles.
19 Svenska Samers Riksförbund.
21 Jokkmokck Iron AB, Beowulf Mining AB.
22 Local and non-local people, authors of articles.
acknowledged that a mine will provide local jobs, but not the magnitude of jobs that the advocates suggests and that the foreign mining companies will bring their own work force (Nilsson, 2013; Holmberg, 2013; Tidholm, 2013; Priftis, 2014b). Mining critics equated the contemporary mining industry with “oil rigs on land” (Priftis, 2014; Tidholm, 2013), while advocates claimed that “most people who work in a mine live in the municipality or neighbouring municipality” (Ahl, 2013). The mining industry is also accused of contributing to loss of jobs within long-term businesses, like reindeer husbandry and nature- and knowledge tourism by critics (Brännberg, 2013; Holmberg, 2014).

One reoccurring argument connected to economic gain, used by the mining critics, is that the exploration companies commonly are foreign private equity companies, which causes profits to be positioned outside of Sweden (Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Länta et al., 2013; Nilsson, 2013; Willemsen, 2013). They implied that exploration companies only serve as prospector whom will sell the concession to the highest bidder (Holmberg, 2013; Lahtinen, 2013; Nilsson, 2013; Priftis, 2014; Tidholm, 2013). Mining advocates meet these arguments by stating that “of 16 mining companies in Sweden, 14 are considered Swedish and all 16 pay Swedish taxes” (Lööf, 2013).

Another common statement used by the mining advocates is that mining establishments will provide for future belief and possibilities to population growth for depopulation municipalities in Northern Sweden. The establishment of a mine is repeatedly referred to as a possibility for such municipalities to flourish (Andersson, 2013; Abrahamsson, 2013a; Bernhardsson, 2017; Kärrman, 2018b; Lööf, 2013; Nilsson, 2013; Åström & Bucht, 2013; Weihed & Öhlander, 2015). Andersson (2013) argued that “the highest priority in the municipality (Jåhkåmåhkke) is population growth” and Abrahamsson (2013b) stated that “tourism and reindeer husbandry are important, but they cannot create enough jobs to stop the relocation from the municipality”. The future belief argument is met by critics who claimed that modern-day mines have a very limited lifespan (Antti, 2013; Tidholm, 2013). The estimated life span of a mine in Gállok is uncertain and the exploration company displayed diverse bids on how long the iron ore deposit will suffice, such as 14 years (Sjöberg, 2013a; Snell-Lumio & Hövenmark, 2013), 20-25 years (Holmberg, 2013) and 20-30 years (Sjöberg, 2013b).

Harnesk et al. (2013) expressed that “mining advocates consider, on the other hand, a mine as the only way for the town or municipality to survive through the promised jobs and for them mines have come to mean future belief” and mining critics reasoned that a mine have the possibilities to remove all future belief for affected municipalities (Persson, 2016; Harnesk et al., 2013). Harnesk et al. (2013) argued that “future trust is important for a society, but it must not be created at any price, and especially not when other long-term sustainable alternatives are available”. Mining critics also problematised the lack of national politics for depopulation municipalities and that the Government continue to pursue a policy that benefits mining exploitation which keeps “locking large parts of Northern Sweden in a dependency on the mining industry’s quick but short-term jobs” (Harnesk et al., 2013). Harnesk (2013) also reasoned that mining is vulnerable towards global economic fluctuations, creating vulnerability for mining municipalities.
4.1.2 Geographical Claims, Co-existence and Stakeholder Consultation

In the Gállok case, mining advocates stressed that the mine will only occupy a limited part of the geographical area of Jåhkåmåhkke (Andersson, 2013, AB; Abrahamsson, 2013a; Bernhardsson, 2017) and this geographical argument is also used regarding the overall mining exploitation in Sweden (Ahl, 2013; Lööf, 2013). The CEO of the exploration company stated that the Sami have thousands of square kilometres to utilise and that a mine in Gállok only would occupy 15-20 square kilometres (Blume, 2013a; Sjöberg, 2013b). Abrahamsson (2013f) emphasised that there is plenty of room for the mining industry, reindeer husbandry, tourism and other businesses in Norrbotten county and Andersson (2013) underlined that almost half of the land area in Jåhkåmåhkke already is subject to environmental protection.

Mining advocates used this geographical argument together with a reoccurring emphasis on the necessity of developing a working co-existence between stakeholders. A common opinion shared by the advocates is that such co-existence is possible and that improved stakeholder communication and participation will enable it (Abrahamsson, 2013b, 2013c; Håkansson, 2013a; Lööf, 2013; Vikström, 2013e, Weihe & Öhlander, 2015, Åström & Bucht, 2013). Earlier stakeholder consultations in the permitting process is also suggested as a possible solution to reduce conflicts (Kärrman, 2018c). Abrahamsson (2013c) expressed that there is no need to set different activities against each other and that a working co-existence is dependent on “stakeholder consultation, dialogue and a willingness to compromise”. Mining advocates stressed that mining and tourism do not necessarily conflict each other and that the mining sometimes is a pre-requisite for a fruitful tourism industry (Marjavaara & Müller, 2014). Abrahamsson (2013b) stated that “for 100 years, mining companies, tourism companies and reindeer husbandry have co-existed in Kiruna and Gällivare and it should be possible in other parts (Gállok) of the county as well”. It is implied by mining advocates that efforts for improved dialogue has been made regarding the conflict in Gállok, but that the SSNA has declined this invitation, which is considered as “unfortunate” (Abrahamsson, 2013d). One suggested solution by mining advocates to solve conflicts and increase successful co-existence is to develop a manual for ethics for new mining establishments, to improve and to enable the dialogue between stakeholders (Ahl, 2013). Mining critics agreed that such manual can be good, but insufficient in terms of developing a long-term sustainable mining politics (Åström & Bucht, 2013).

This assumed co-existence is met by the mining critics and Länta et al. (2013) concluded that “when Sweden talks about co-existence, one actually advocates the primacy of mining, even if it means the demise of reindeer husbandry”. Critics also argued that each Sami village conducts reindeer husbandry in a unique way based on the prerequisites of the landscape. In Gállok, a mine will divide the land used by the Sami in two and co-existence is entirely impossible and “no technical solutions, dialogue meetings or compensation can significantly affect this fact” (Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Länta et al., 2013). Lundberg Tuorda et al. (2013) also stressed that when co-existence is impossible, “indigenous people, the environment and property rights must prevail foreign exploiters”. Mining critics problematised that stakeholder dialogue and participation on equal grounds is not possible due to the Swedish mining policy (Stormare, 2017; Harnesk et al., 2013). They suggested that “measures are needed to provide resource-rich and resource-poor stakeholders with the opportunity to participate on more equal terms” and that “we cannot hope that the dialogue will resolve fundamental ideological divisions” (Stormare, 2017).
4.1.3 Mining Legislation and Permitting Processes

The Swedish Mineral Strategy and the Mineral Act considered as one of the world most liberal (Holmberg, 2013; Harnesk, 2013; Nygren, 2013). The understanding that the mining industry profits from the mining legislation and the Mineral Act and that Sweden provides favourable conditions for the mining industry is expressed frequently by mining critics (Brännberg, 2013; Hildebrandt, 2013; Harnesk et al., 2013; Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Priftis, 2014; Snell-Lumio & Hövenmark, 2013; Wirtén, 2014). Critics also accused the mineral legislation for placing economic profits outside Sweden and it is stated that the Swedish Government donates assets to and uncritically promote and support foreign company’s exploitation of Sápmi (Länta et al., 2013; Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013). The Mineral Act is also criticised by mining advocates, although it is regarding the limited possibilities for municipalities to participate and influence in the permitting process. Both sides of the conflict criticised that the final decision-making regarding mine establishments are made on national level (Andersson, 2013; Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013).

Eriksson & Dahlberg (2013) stated that the Swedish mineral politics assumes that all mining exploration is desired no matter where it is conducted. Lundberg Tuorda et al. (2013) articulated that “nothing is standing in the way for mining and exploration companies, not even the legislation that is supposed to regulate their actions”. Mining critics also claimed the Mineral Strategy to apart from a long-term perspective, environmental considerations and sustainability and it favours short-sightedness and the mining company’s interests (Abresparr, 2013). Länta et al. (2013) uttered that “Sweden’s Mineral Strategy focuses almost exclusively on correcting the conditions for the mining industry. It barely includes a word is about how reindeer husbandry survives in a landscape torn by mines”. Annie Lööf (2013), the Minister of Enterprise at the time of exploration in Gállok, claimed that the strategy was developed together with “close to hundred organisations and expert authorities, including Urbergsgruppen, the Sami Parliament and the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency”, while it is stated in Stormare (2017) that “most of the adopted proposals (in the Mineral Strategy) came from mining advocates”.

A common augment connected to this critique, is that societal costs connected to mining exploitation such as infrastructure, community management and future environmental remediation are payed for by Swedish tax payers due to lacking legislation (Fridolin, Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2014; Holmberg, 2013; Persson, 2016; Priftis, 2014; Tidholm, 2013). Reoccurring examples where exploration and mining companies have made major interference on nature through mining activities, then gone bankrupt and left destructed nature, waste and environmental problems adrift are acknowledged by advocates and critics (Abrahamsson, 2014b; Persson, 2016; Tidholm, 2013; Hildebrandt, 2013; Hedman, 2013; Blind, 2017; Jangvad, 2015). Mining critics requested that that the Government in advance should clarify what locations are and are not appropriate for mining to avoid unnecessary conflict and intrusion on the environment (Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013).

An increased mineral taxation is demanded by mining critics (Gunnarsson, Olofsson & Tovatt, 2013; Harnesk et al., 2013; Von Seth, 2013). Hildebrandt (2013) and Arpi (2013) reasoned that if Swedish minerals are to be sold, it ought to gain the state and the local communities, while advocates claimed that an increased mineral taxation would “reduce interest for mining establishments in Sweden” and pose as a threat to future development in Northern Sweden (Lööf,
Lööf (2013) argued that Sweden’s stringent environmental legislation and standards enables a low mineral taxation and highlights the polluter pays principle, although it is claimed by critics that no requirements on economic stability is demanded on the exploration companies (Blume, 2013c).

Mining critics also claimed that current environmental legislation has flaws and enables exploration in areas despite existing interest and need to protect animal and plant species, which violates the EU Habitats directive. They stressed that Sweden must implement a more stringent environmental legislation and update the Mineral Act with the “purpose of strengthening environmental considerations, set goals for efficient resource management and circulation, and strengthening the Sami interests” (Harnesk, 2013; Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013).

Mining advocates accused the permitting process and impact assessments to be too complicated and uncertain and that it is more time consuming than previously to gain permits. It is expressed by advocates that the mining industry feel opposed by the current legislation and that the impact assessments are required to early in the permitting process (Kärrman, 2018a; 2018b; 2018c). Mining advocate claimed that “the legislation is essentially positive towards new mine establishments, but something is wrong when the authorities can interpret the legislation to hinder mine establishments” and “that we have ended up in a situation where it is very difficult for the mining industry to work” (Kärrman, 2018b). Mining advocates also claimed that increasing protests and appeals contributes to a decreasing interest in exploring the Swedish bedrock (Olsson, 2014).

The Government wants to review the current system that controls impact assessments, but not with the intent to loosen the environmental requirements, rather to streamline the process by using recent technology and promote for environmental friendly solutions (Kärrman, 2018b).

4.1.4 Environmental and Social Effects

One commonly occurring argument used by the mining critics is that mining causes serious negative environmental and social effects (Antti, 2015; Blume, 2013b, 2013d; Broberg, 2103; Brännberg, 2013; Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013; Harnesk et al., 2013; Holmberg, 2013; Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Länta et al., 2013; Nilsson, 2013; Olsson, 2013; Priftis, 2014). Critics frequently expressed that mining has a direct negative effect for the possibilities to conduct reindeer husbandry and it sometimes totally hinders it (Blume, 2013b; Brännberg, 2013; Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013; Harnesk et al., 2013; Holmberg, 2013; Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Länta et al., 2013; Tervaniemi & Naess, 2013). Länta et al. (2013) concluded that “the booming mining industry poses a direct threat to the reindeer husbandry and thus the basis for Sami culture”. A granted exploitation concession in Gállok is considered to “be the end to reindeer husbandry in the area and for Jåhkåmåhkke as a wilderness municipality” (Holmberg, 2013). The accompanying infrastructure is also expressed to have negative effects and interference for reindeer husbandry outside the mining area itself (Tervaniemi & Naess, 2013; Länta et al., 2013; Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013). Länta et al. (2013) concluded that “reindeers cannot feed on stone and they cannot migrate between seasonal grazing lands when a mining hole blocks the migratory rout”. Mining is also stated to interfere with fishing and hunting activities by critics (Nilsson, 2013).

In Gállok, the critics claimed that mining activities poses risk of polluting drinking waters supplies and damaging hydropower dams. There is also concern for a domino effect, once a mine in Gállok is built more hazardous mines, such as copper mines, will follow posing, an
even greater risk of water pollution (Blume, 2013d; Nilsson, 2013; Holmberg, 2013). Gunnarsson, Olofsson & Tovatt (2013) concluded that issues of environmental degradation and negative effects on biodiversity often is neglected in the mining exploitation debate, and some mining critics are sceptical towards the possibilities to restore nature post mining (Gunnarsson, Olofsson & Tovatt, 2013, Holmberg, 2013; Olsson, 2014). The limited possibilities to restore nature and biodiversity post mining are not due to lack of economic funding’s but due to that every area and habitat is unique and that ecosystems in Northern Sweden are more sensitive with slower generation of biodiversity (Gunnarsson, Olofsson & Tovatt, 2013). Mining critics also have concerns regarding the negative effects a mine in Gállok would pose to the World Heritage of Laponia (Davidson & Djurberg, 2017; Priftis, 2014), since two out of five criteria for the World Heritage is connected to reindeer husbandry. The ruling politicians in Jâhkâmåhkke acknowledged Laponia as important, but they do not agree that a mine in Gállok would pose as a threat towards its World Heritage Status (Bernhardsson, 2017; Vikström, 2013a).

4.1.5 Swedish Welfare, Foreign Investment and Green Technology

The mining industry’s importance for the Swedish economy and development, both historically and for the future, is lifted by both mining advocates and critics (Ahl, 2013; Tornberg, 2013; Lööf, 2013; Åström & Bucht, 2013; Von Seth, 2013). Lööf (2013) stated “a significant part of Sweden’s prosperity and welfare has for centuries been built on mining and processing of metals and minerals”, while Jonsson, Åhrén & Gabelic (2013) concluded that the colonialization of Sápmi were carried out with the excuse that Sweden needed the profits derived from extracting natural resources.

Lööf (2013) argued that a low mineral taxation, low degrees of corruption, political stability, good infrastructure and well-functioning institutions make Sweden attractive for foreign investment and this will ensure Sweden’s position as EU’s leading mining nation. The importance of competitive conditions in the mining industry is emphasised by advocates (Johansson, 2013; Lööf, 2013) and Sweden is described as the second most attractive country for mining investment globally (Priftis, 2014; Lööf, 2013; Wirtén, 2014). Mining critics claimed that the view of Sweden as Europe’s new “commodity pantry” exists (Holmberg, 2013). Bernhardsson (2017) reasoned that the decline of the exploitation concession in Gállok make the “local growth and investment climate move towards a new ice age”.

Also, minerals and metals are acknowledged as a prerequisite and basis for green growth and the IT-technology by both advocates and critics (Lööf, 2013; Kärrman, 2018b; Von Seth, 2013; Tornberg, 2013). The possibilities to extract metals for this purpose from the Swedish bedrock is pushed for by the minister of enterprise, both under the previous bourgeois alliance and the current red-green alliance Government (Lööf, 2013 & Kärrman, 2018b). Lööf (2013) also argued that it is preferable to have a sustainable mining in Sweden where stringent environmental legislation, high environmental demands as well as good working conditions within the mining industry exists. Instead of performing environmental destructive mining in other countries with weaker environmental legislation and protection.
4.1.6 Discussion

The expected job opportunities, economic profits and future belief derived from mining exploitation are repeatedly used by the mining advocates and it is positioned in the central parts of the discursive formation. This creation of economic growth through the mining industry is also emphasised in the Mineral Strategy (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013). The mining critiques acknowledged the jobs provided by a mine, although not in the expected magnitude. The question of long-term sustainability is issued in the context of jobs and critics claimed mining jobs to be short-termed, while jobs within reindeer husbandry and tourism are considered as long-term sustainable. One reoccurring central argument stressed by mining critics in the context of economic gain and jobs, is the claim of foreign exploration companies positioning the profits outside the concerned municipalities, which is met by critics who state that all mining companies pay Swedish taxes.

Mining exploitation is emphasised by advocates as a solution for depopulation in Northern Sweden and this is also aligning with the Mineral Strategy, which proposes that it is taken for granted that depopulation is viewed as something negative and that mining provides as a solution. This can be problematised from a historical perspective since it was the colonisation that largely contributed to non-Sami settlements in Sápmi (Brännlund & Axelsson, 2011). When emphasising that a mine will provide future belief, it is presumed that this future belief will benefit all, even though it is clear that this is not the case for the Sami villages utilising the lands in Gállok. Mining critics question the understanding of a mine as an obvious saviour for depopulation municipalities, in the margins of the discursive formation, by problematising that mining locks these municipalities in a dependency and the lack of sufficient politics to handle depopulation issues (Harnesk et al., 2013). This understanding and that mining advocates do not address alternative solutions for depopulation, also suggests that mining is taken for granted as provider for future belief and a solution depopulation issues in Northern Sweden.

Mining advocates commonly stress that there is enough geographical space for successful co-existence between different activities in Northern Sweden. The emphasised co-existence is a central positioned argument for the mining advocates and it is claimed possible through participation, communication, consultation and compromises. In turn, mining critics argued that such efforts do not pose as solution to conflict and by emphasising consultation and dialogue, the critics accuse the Government of overriding the responsibility for solving these conflicts onto the private sector. The emphasis on co-existence and stakeholder communication, proposes that it is assumed that co-existence always is achievable and that the Government hold the private sector responsible for solving these conflicts. In similarity to previous research where Lawrence & Larsen’s (2017, p. 1168) claims that “impact assessments are woven into the fabric of neoliberal practices whereby protective government measures are dismantled, and discourses of CSR relegate crucial responsibilities from government to corporations”. The opinion that co-existence between reindeer husbandry and mining is possible, is also emphasised in the Mineral Strategy (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013). Lawrence & Larsen (2017) also claims this view of co-existence as achievable to exist within the mining discourse. This is questioned by mining critics and Länta et al. (2013) concluded that when talking of co-existence, one talks about the primacy of mining. The willingness to compromise is also stressed by advocates (Abrahamsson, 2013b:2013c). In this context, it indicates that it is taken for granted that the ones who are supposed to compromise are the Sami, since a mineral deposit can be argued as more geographically bound and hold less potential to compromise.
It is questioned a few times by mining critics, that stakeholder participation on equal grounds is impossible, which also questioned in previous research when Persson, Harnesk & Islar (2017) argued that the stakeholders in Gållok conflict cannot be regarded as equal. The Mineral Strategy emphasise that stakeholder dialogue in an early stage in the planning process will enable a successful co-existence (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation, 2013). This emphasis on stakeholder consultation, dialogue and participation as a solution to conflicts by advocates, suggests that it is assumed to be achievable within current legislation, although previous research state that the current legal assessment of the assumed co-existence is made before the all impacts from the mining is presented and assessed (Lawrence & Larsen, 2017).

One reoccurring centrally positioned argument for the mining critics, which to some extent is shared by advocates, concern the Swedish mining politics and the Mineral Act. Mining advocates criticised it for not allowing the municipalities to participate to larger extent in the permitting process, while the mining critics accuse the Mineral Strategy and Mineral Act as unsustainable from a long-term perspective and gaining and paving the way for exploration-and mining companies. The argument of economic profits located outside Sweden due to legislation is reoccurring, but at the same time it is stressed by critical voices that “if natural resources are to be sold, both state and local communities should benefit from the deal” (Hildebrandt, 2013) and an increased mineral taxation is required by critics (Arpi, 2013; Gunnarsson, Olofsson & Tovatt, 2013; Harnesk et al., 2013; Von Seth, 2013). These statements indicate that it is considered as normal or feasible to exploit the Swedish bedrock if profits are located locally in Sweden.

The critics frequently expressed the legislation to be favouring the mining industry, although the belief that the mining industry feels opposed by the legislation is visible in the periphery. But even the mining advocates stated that “the legislation is essentially positive towards new mine establishments” (Kärrman, 2018b). This suggests that the claim that the Swedish mineral policy is beneficial for the mining industry is a common truth claim for the opposing sides, although the critics view this as something negative. This can also be claimed to exist in the Mineral Strategy, since its purpose is to increase competitiveness and investment in the Swedish mining industry (Governments Office, 2013).

The environmental legislation is also criticised for being insufficient by both sides. The mining industry feel opposed by the environmental legislation since it is possible to interpret the legislation unfavourable from their perspective and the impact assessments are claimed to be required to early in the too extensive process, while the critics wishes for earlier impact assessments in the processes and that the state should claim some areas to be unfit for exploration. In this context, Lawrence and Larsen (2017) state in previous research that the assumed co-existence and the cumulative effects are assessed after the exploitation concession is approved, supports the claim that the legislation is favouring the mining industry’ s interest. It is reasoned in Kärrman (2013b), that the Government believe that technology and environmental friendly solutions can make the permit process more effective, this indicates that it is taken for granted that technology and innovation are considered as solutions for such issues.

Previous research states that mining has negative effects on social and environmental values (Herrman et al., 2014; Horstkotte, Sandström & Moen, 2014: Kivinen et al., 2010). The intrusion a mine poses on the environment is acknowledged by both sides, but the concern for negative environmental and social effects is a central argument for the mining critics, with
emphasis on the implications for reindeer husbandry. Environmental effects are also lifted, such as water pollution and negative effects for biodiversity, although concern for biodiversity is positioned in the periphery since it is only lifted once by Gunnarsson, Olofsson and Tovatt (2013). Mining advocates acknowledge that mining contributes to large environmental intrusion, but they do not question the possibilities to use economical means to restore nature post mining, which some critics are questioning a few times (Gunnarsson, Olofsson & Tovatt, 2013, Holmberg, 2013; Olsson, 2014). This concern is also lifted in previous research (Haikola & Anshelm, 2013). Both critics and advocates demands the establishment of environmental funds for future restoration (Harnesk et al., 2013; Fridolin, Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013; Abrahamsson, 2013b). This implies that it is assumed possible to economically restore nature post mining, which in turn suggests that the claim of economic means and technological development as solutions to environmental and social impacts is a common truth claim. The understanding that technological solutions can avert impacts is also expressed to exist within the mining discourse in previous research (Larsen & Lawrence, 2017).

The mining industry’s importance for Swedish welfare and development is expressed by both critics and advocates, although mining advocates emphasise it more often. Jonsson, Åhrén & Gabelic (2013) highlights that this argument previously has been used under the flag of colonialism. This implies that it is assumed that mining is necessary for the Swedish economy. Mining advocates also underlines Sweden’s responsibility because of its mineral deposits, its importance for EU’s mineral supply and the green economy. The acknowledgement that mining is necessary for the green economy is align with the global sustainability discourse (UNEP, 2011). This suggests that a central truth claim within the mining exploitation discourse is that sustainable development is synonymous with renewable energy and green growth.

The welfare argument is further strengthened with the understanding that it is better to conduct sustainable mining in Sweden than unsustainable mining elsewhere (Lööf, 2013). This also suggests that it is taken for granted that sustainable mining in Sweden is possible. The emphasis on sustainable mining for renewable energy and the green economy is also visible in the Mineral Strategy (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013). The mining advocates highlights Sweden’s stringent environmental legislation and social responsibility as reasons for mineral extraction, which indicates that Sweden holds the self-image of a forerunner regarding such matters. This self-image is also claimed to exist by Lawrence and Larsen (2017). This is contradictory and problematic since mining critics and previous research claims that Sweden violate human and indigenous rights conventions. Hildebrandt (2013) writes that “the irony is, that the outrage often is excessive if Swedish companies are suspected of exploiting people in Africa, but in terms of their own nature and indigenous peoples, home blindness seems to prevail”.

4.2 Reasons for Conflict
Here, under section, I will address my second research question - What are expressed as reasons for conflict due to mining exploration in Gállok? Under the headings 4.2.1-4.2.3 I will only refer to my empirical material, while addressing previous research, theory and Swedish mining policies in the discussion. The media coverage provides to some extent a diversified picture regarding the reasons for conflict due to mining exploration in Gállok. Some reasons for conflict are explicitly expressed by mining critics, while others are more implicitly stated. The explicitly expressed reasons are mainly connected to questions of valuation, indigenous rights issues and sustainable development.
4.2.1 Valuation
One issue of valuation that is described by mining critics as reason for conflict, is the valuation between the national interest of mineral extraction and the national interest of Sami reindeer husbandry (Gunnarsson, Olofsson & Tovatt, 2013; Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Kärrman, 2017c; Willemsen, 2013). A few times, mining advocates refers to mineral extraction as a national interest, while reindeer husbandry and environmental interests are referred to as a Sami special or local interest (Arpi, 2013; Bernhardsson, 2017; Weihed & Öhlander, 2015). Weihed & Öhlander (2015) referred to both reindeer husbandry and environmental protection as special interests and stated that these are given precedence over the interest of mining in Gällok. They accused the CAB for “representing special interests”, while Jangvad (2015) praised the CAB for giving the interest of reindeer husbandry precedence over the interest of mining in Gällok. Broberg (2013) claimed that media, authorities and courts often regards reindeer husbandry as a Sami special interest, which contributes to the ignorance of Sami rights and the lack of appropriate assessment, valuation and balancing between interests. Eriksson & Dahlberg (2013) argues that mining jobs must be valued against jobs in other sectors threatened by mining and the losses of environmental values. The short-term period of the jobs that a mine will provide, is argued for by critics, to be valued higher than jobs within other long-term sectors, like reindeer husbandry and tourism (Fridolin, Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2014).

The question of valuation can also be applied to environmental values and interests. The secretary general of WWF argues that the interest of environmental protection can be regarded as subordinate to the interest of mining (Wirtén, 2014). The statement that the Government repeatedly has given the interest of mineral extraction primacy to the interest of reindeer husbandry, Sami culture and environmental interests is frequently stated by mining critics (Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Antti, 2015; Jangvad, 2013; Länta et al., 2013; Persson, 2016; Wirtén, 2013). Kärrman (2017c) claimed that that conflicts due to mining exploitation will prevail in the future, because of the complexity regarding questions of valuations and the difficulty in making all stakeholders satisfied (Kärrman, 2017c).

4.2.2 Indigenous Rights
The lack of acknowledging Sami rights is repeatedly described by mining critics, in the case of Gällok and other mining exploitation in Sápmi, as reason for conflict and it is stressed that “the state must take its responsibility to clarify the ambiguities surrounding the Sami rights” (Kärrman, 2017c). Mining critics emphasised that Sweden has received international critique from the UN, due to its violation of Sami rights and inability to honour international conventions (Broberg, 2013; Blume, 2013a; Håkansson, 2013a; Länta et al., 2013; Priftis, 2014; Persson, 2016; Jonsson, Åhrén & Gavelic, 2013; Wynne, 2013). The mining critics claimed that the Swedish mining policy and Mineral Act contributes to the violation of human- and indigenous rights and the exploration in Gällok displayed as an example that these conventions are not honoured (Broberg, 2013; Länta et al., 2013; Willemsen, 2013).

The emphasis on free prior informed consent is made by mining critics (Håkansson, 2013a; Jonsson, Åhrén & Gavelic, 2013; Länta et al., 2013; Wynne, 2013). Mining critics also reprimand Sweden for not ratifying the ILO, which would provide self-determination rights for
the Sami and the lands they traditionally have utilised (Blume, 2013c; Broberg, 2013). Broberg (2013) argued that the Government does not obligate its own recognition of the Sami as an indigenous people. It does not take responsibility regarding the issues of Sami equal rights and opportunities and that Government after Government continue to push these matters into the future. Broberg (2013) also claimed that the current national legislation does not acknowledge Sami rights and that “the government must take on UN criticism and create an indigenous policy that complies with international conventions”.

The understanding that the lack of respect for, and inability to acknowledge Sami rights, are connected to the previous colonialization of Sápmi is expressed by mining critics (Jonsson, Åhrén & Gabelic, 2013; Priftis, 2014). The contemporary mining boom and the politics supporting it is stated to contribute to a continued colonialization of Sápmi by mining critics, although it is not directly performed by the state but through foreign companies. The SSNA claimed that “the colonialization of Sápmi is not a historical phenomenon. It still happens today when the Swedish Government enters and prepares the road for the mining industry in Sápmi and puts our existence at stake” (Willemsen, 2013). Sweden’s ignorance of the UN critique is also problematised as a sign of a colonial heritage and the fact that the CAB functions as a trustee when it comes to Sami hunting rights is also argued to be based on colonial politics (Jonsson, Åhrén & Gabelic, 2013).

4.2.3 Sustainable Development
“Basically, these conflicts are about people having different views on what a sustainable development entails” and it is stated that the previous common opinion that a mine provides future prospect no longer is obvious for all (Kärrman, 2017c). Such different views are visible since it is argued that mining advocates consider economic growth as a prerequisite for development and the ability to care for the environment, while mining critics view the environment as most crucial for a sustainable development (Stormare, 2017). Harnesk et al. (2013) concluded that “the mining boom is paid socially, culturally, ecologically and economically by the local communities, while profits disappear elsewhere. It is an unsustainable development for all of Northern Sweden and Sweden”.

Both mining critics and advocates reasoned that it is possible to incorporate high environmental standards and ambitions within the mining industry in Sweden (Antti, 2015; Lööf, 2013; Weihed & Öhlander, 2015; Wirtén, 2013). Mining advocates emphasised that sustainable mining is possible and that the extraction of metals is a prerequisite for a sustainable development (Lööf, 2013). Mining critics reasoned that “the mining industry can contribute to sustainable development if it is conducted properly, but the legislation must be tightened and there should be areas where mines cannot be established, as in national parks” (Wirtén, 2013). Antti (2015) argued that a sustainable mining industry is possible, but it does not entail that mines can be established at any price and that “sometimes, the interest of mining must be discarded in favour to other land-uses, otherwise the vision of a sustainable mining is just empty words”.

Harnesk (2013) stated that “the current mining exploitation does not have sustainable development and long-term social development as a starting point”, while Abresparr (2013) argued that “the ongoing mining boom is a threat to the essential sustainable development we need”. Abresparr (2013) criticised the Mineral Strategy to lack a long-term perspective, sustainability and environmental
considerations and that it aims to extract as much minerals from the bedrock under the shortest amount of time. He expressed concern for the global mining boom and argues that “the solutions for achieving a sustainable society and a reduced outtake of mineral from the earth’s crust must be global” and that “Sweden’s mining politics should be a forerunner and reflect how to meet these challenges”. The explicit emphasis on reuse and recycling of minerals and metals as a first-hand choice is expressed two times by mining critics (Abresparr, 2013; Ström, 2013a), while mining advocates claimed that recycling and reuse is not enough to meet current demands (Lööf, 2013). Mining critics described reindeer husbandry and the tourism as long-term sustainable activities (Harnesk et al., 2013; Holmberg, 2013, Fridolin, Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013) and mining is expressed as an industry that prioritize short term profits above sustainability and long-term welfare (Abresparr, 2013). Harnesk (2013) stated that the conflict Gållok and other resistance of mining exploitation in Sápmi are “taking place at the intersection of two political positions; the long-term responsibility for a sustainable development versus short-term quarterly capitalism focusing on fast profits at lowest cost and as little responsibility as possible”.

4.2.4 Discussion

The explicitly mentioned reasons for conflict are expressed by mining critics, and they regard questions on valuation, indigenous rights and different views on what a sustainable development entails. Mining advocates to not explicitly address reasons for conflict, but their emphasis on co-existence through communication and consultation indicate that they consider it to be inadequate which leads to conflict. Jonssoon, Åhrén & Gabelic (2013) argued that mining conflicts are not due to lack of communication, they are due to shortcomings in the legislation and “when the legislation has shortcomings, the Government cannot override the responsibility for solving the problem on the private sector. It is a matter for the Government and Parliament”. Brännberg (2013) concluded that “the entire responsibility for the conflict (in Gållok) rests on the Government”.

The consideration between the interest of mineral extraction vs. the interest of reindeer husbandry consist of the assessment between economic and social values from mining vs. social, cultural and economic values from reindeer husbandry. Mining critics argued that social, cultural and environmental values have been and are subordinate to economic values in the mining exploitation discourse, which also is argued in previous research by Poelzer (2015). So far in the permitting-process in context of Gållok, the interest of reindeer husbandry and environmental values such as the World Heritage of Laponia, has been granted priority to the interest of mining, which is questioned as unsustainable by advocates (Weihed & Öhlander, 2015; Bernhardsson, 2017). Mining critics also claimed that mining jobs are considered more valuable than jobs within reindeer husbandry and tourism (Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013; Fridolin, Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2014). This suggests that it is taken for granted that mining jobs have a higher societal value than jobs within competing industries.

Previous research states that the mining boom is evident in Sweden and given permits and active claims have increased (Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017), this indicates that it is considered as normal within the mining exploitation discourse when economic values from mining is given precedence to social, cultural and environmental values and abnormal when vice versa. This also suggests that minerals only are considered to have a value when extracted from the
bedrock. This is questioned by critics in the periphery when Blind (2013) stated that the development of Jåhkåmåhkke do not stop just because “we let the ore remain in the ground, let the forests stand and leave the lichen for those who need it most”. Reindeer husbandry is sometimes reduced to a special interest in the media coverage, instead as the constitutionally protected national interest it is. This leads to marginalisation of reindeer husbandry, since a national interest is considered to have a higher societal value than a special interest. This reduction also indicate that the view exist that the national interest of reindeer husbandry is not equal to the national interest of mining.

Another expressed reason for conflict, is the by mining critics commonly claimed ignorance of Sami rights and the international conventions supporting them, which is also visible in previous research (Ojala & Nordin, 2016; Lantto & Mörkenstam, 2008). This ignorance is in turn problematised by mining critics, in the margins of the discursive formation, to be connected to the previous colonialization of Sápmi and the mining legislation is accused to be built upon colonial politics. The colonialization of Sápmi is not recognised to any substantial extent in the media coverage, which to some extent confirms the statement made by Ojala & Nordin (2015) that the public level of knowledge and recognition of Sami history and indigenous right issues are low. The recognition of the colonisation and Sami rights is only done by some of the mining critics. Ojala & Nordin (2015) emphasise that the contemporary conflicts due to Sami rights must be understood from a historical perspective. This perspective is assumed missing for the mining advocates, since they do not address issues of Sami rights, the colonisation nor the violation of international conventions and the international critique Sweden has obtained, which implies that such issues are not taken for granted by, nor functioning as truth claims for the mining advocates.

Economic, social and ecological values, can all be connected to sustainable development and it is explicitly stated in the margins by Kärrman (2018c) that the reasons for conflict is due to different opinions regarding what a sustainable development entails. These different opinions are also observable in the media coverage, when reindeer husbandry and tourism is referred to as long-term sustainable activities, while mining is claimed to be the opposite. Even though the sustainability of the mining industry is questioned by critics by disapproving of the current mining policy’s, the claim that sustainable mining is achievable in Sweden is made by both mining critics and advocates and The Mineral Strategy also hold this understanding (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013). This indicates that the claim that sustainable mining is possible is a central common truth claim in the mining exploitation discourse.

Reuse and recycling is only mentioned two times in the media coverage, which makes these issues positioned in the periphery of the discursive formation. There is some emphasis in the Mineral Strategy regarding recycling and it stated that “recycling of metals and minerals can and need to be increased” (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013), but recycling is stated to be largely ignored by the Government in previous research (Haikola & Anshelm, 2016). What is not visible in the media coverage in the context of sustainable development, is the changes in resource use and behaviour, by reducing and changing the consumption of goods, that sometimes is emphasised as necessary for achieving sustainable development. Abresparr (2013) argues for a reduced outtake of minerals which is connected to resource use and
behavioural changes, although such issues can be considered as positioned outside or in the very periphery of the mining exploitation discourse since they are not addressed, except one time by Abresparr (2013).

4.3 Power and Knowledge
In this section, I will address my empirical material, theory, previous research and mining policies and answer my third research question - What truth claims can be considered to support the dominant actor’s interests in the mining exploitation discourse? In terms of power and knowledge as Foucault describes it, discursive power is closely connected to absolute truth claims (Rose, 2016). In terms of what is expressed through the media coverage, the Government and the mining industry can be regarded as the dominant actors within the mining exploitation discourse. Mining critics repeatedly argued that the Swedish mining politics and legislation is profitable for the mining industry (Hildebrandt, 2013; Harnesk et al., 2013; Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Priftis, 2014; Snell-Lumio & Hövenmark, 2013; Wirtén, 2014), which also the mining advocates acknowledged (Kärrman, 2018b). Brännberg (2013) stated that “the Government sits in the lap of the mining explorers”.

The Government is granted repressive power, which allowance them a certain dominance, but the mining industry is not granted such power. Still the media coverage indicates that the mining industry is a dominant actor within the mining exploration discourse. To analyse this, one must consider discursive power and what absolute truth claims that supports their interests (Rose, 2016). Two central truth claims within the mining exploitation discourse that supports the mining industry’s interests, is the claim that mining is possible to conduct within the frames of sustainable development and the claim that mining is needed for, and even a prerequisite to sustainable development and the green economy. These two claims are both visible in the media coverage, but also in the Mineral Strategy (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013). These two truth claims grant the Government and the mining industry dominance and they are positioned in the central parts of the discursive formation. These truth claims are also central in the global sustainability discourse, where the green economy and renewable energy systems are tools for achieving a sustainable development (UNEP, 2011).

The sustainability of current mining activities is questioned by critics, mostly by discussing issues of short-term gain vs. long-term sustainability and the current legislation controlling the mining industry are regarded as the foremost problem, which implies that sustainable mining can be achieved by improving the legislation. Another taken for granted truth claim made by the mining advocates, present within the mining exploitation discourse, that favours the dominant actor’s interests is the assumption the sustainable development, in form of green economy and renewable energy, is achievable through the neoliberal economic system, although this is questioned in the periphery by some mining critics. This limits the possibilities to speak about any alternatives definitions of sustainable development and economic systems, although Brännberg (2013) claimed that “basically, the entire responsibility for the conflict rests on the Government, which is responsible for both the mineral law that gives capitalist adventurer precedence over all other interests and the right policy and the economic system, capitalism, which deplores the rural areas of service and jobs”.
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As for knowledge, the concern for equality and environmental issues have not been present in the modern-day society for such a long time, but social and environmental issues are concerns for sustainable development which is a relatively new discourse. The industrialization has been built upon using natural resources and striving for economic growth and prosperity and this is central for ‘western culture’. Since knowledge is historically and cultural contingent, but not constant (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002), this is one way to problematise how it came about that environmental and social values can be regarded as subordinate to economic values in the context of mining (Poelzer, 2015). Indigenous knowledge is not recognised nor respected within the mining exploitation discourse, since it is not mentioned in the media coverage but also due to the Sami’s limited possibilities to participate and influence in the permitting processes with their knowledge and experiences. This positions Sami knowledge outside the mining exploitation discourse, in similarity to previous research where Lawrence and Larsen (2017) claim that contemporary sustainability science is largely detached from indigenous science and knowledge. It implies that it is taken for granted within the mining exploitation discourse that what we consider as western knowledge is equal to ‘the right’ knowledge and to express something else would be regarded as abnormal. Lawrence and Larsen (2017) carried out a community based impact assessment alongside the mining company’s impact assessment together with the concerned Sami, to capture the knowledge and experiences of the Sami in the context of mining exploitation. The two impact assessments contrasted each other and the mining company rejected the impact assessment based on Sami knowledge and experience as ‘invalid research’. This also implies that indigenous knowledge is not respected nor acknowledge within the discourse.

4.4 Subject and Subjugation

Here I will address my fourth research question; -How are the different discursive subject positions portrayed through media and what implications can this portrayal have for these subjects? Under the headings 4.4.1-4.4.4 I will only refer to my empirical material, while addressing previous research in the following discussion. The mining exploitation discourse holds different subjects and I will analyse how, what I perceive as the most central subjects, are subjugated by the media coverage. How can this subjugation affect the public understanding of the different subjects and could it impair their legitimacy and/or credibility in the conflict?

4.4.1 The Activists

The media coverage provides to some extent a diversified image of the activism in Gállok. There is a noteworthy difference in the coverage between local and national media in terms of representation. The local/regional papers NSD and VK, provides a greater number of articles regarding the issue during 2013 (see Table 2). The activism is claimed to be part of a larger resistance of the increasing mining exploitations in Sweden and the intensified continuous exploration of Sápmi (Harnesk et al., 2013). The activists are a heterogenous group claimed to consist of Sami people, environmentalists, local and non-local people and entrepreneurs from the tourism business. The activism is manifested through physical occupation of the site, where activists resides in camps. Physical road blocks have been built, sometimes with the activist’s own bodies, to hinder the company from accessing the grounds. Some activists have climbed company excavators and road blocks to hinder test mining and some have cemented themselves
to the grounds, forcing the police to remove them with tools (Blume, 2013b; Björkland, 2014b; Ström, 2013c). The conflict in Gållok is described as harsh (Arpi, 2013; Tidholm, 2013) and the activism has contributed to reoccurring conflicts and clashes between the activists, the police, local politicians and the CEO of the exploration company (Blume, 2013d; Brännberg, 2013; Jonsson, Åhrén & Gabelic, 2013; Vikström, 2013c; Von Seth, 2013).

Mining advocates described the activism as illegal and the activists are accused of violent resistance, disturbance of the public order, assault against officers and arbitrary conduct (Abrahamsson, 2013a; Blume, 2013d; Vikström, 2013c; Åström & Bucht, 2013). Abrahamsson (2013a) stated that “the freedom of demonstration to not allow for all kinds of actions”. At the same time, mining advocates stressed the exploration company’s legal right to explore in Gållok (Abrahamsson, 2013a), although it is mentioned two times that the activist have been removed by the police without legal support (Hildebrandt, 2013; Vallgårda, 2013). Tornberg (2013) emphasised that the exploration permit in Gållok “have been taken by democratic institutions and it is important that such decisions are respected and not sabotaged by violence and damage”. The CEO of the exploration company referred to the activists as “non-local hippies” and “mentally ill” (Ström, 2013d). He also describes the activists claim of negative social and environmental effects as “qualified twaddle” and “nonsense” (Blume, 2013a).

Mining critics referred to the activism as civil obedience, a passive civil resistance and peaceful protests (Abresparr, 2013; Brännberg, 2013; Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Nilsson, 2013). One activist argued that civil disobedience has helped built societies all over the world and that such actions are needed when the legislation is incomplete (Vikström, 2013b). In similarly to, Harnesk et al. (2013), who concluded that civil society are lacking the tools to affect and participate in the permitting processes. Brännberg (2013) claimed that the media has benefitted the exploration company by only recognising sabotage and threats directed towards mining supporters in the debate, while threats in fact has occurred from both sides. The activism is mainly referred to as confrontations and conflicts, but there are a few alternative descriptions visible in the local and regional coverage. Large music events, workshops and weddings have been arranged on the camp site (Berntsson, 2013a; Berntsson & Nordkvist, 2013; Sällström, 2013).

It is evident in the local and regional media coverage that the activism has contributed to a polarised debate Jåhkåmåhkke. This debate is described to be spiteful and harsh by mining advocates (Abrahamsson, 2013b; Lööf, 2013; Sjöberg, 2013a; Vikström, 2013b). Abrahamsson (2013b) expressed that “the high-pitched tone in the debate must be replaced by constructive dialogue”. The mining advocates often refers to the activists as non-local people, while the mining critics reasons that the exploration company is the one to be considered as non-local (Brännberg, 2013; Harnesk, 2013). Abrahamsson (2013d) stated that “the local representatives from the exploration company has acted clumsy” but at the same time have “non-local professional activists contributed to whipping up a harsh mood”. Mining advocates also claimed that the activists have low or no support by the local population and the ruling political majority in Jåhkåmåhkke (Abrahamsson, 2013a), which critics claimed to be untrue (Harnesk et al., 2013).
4.4.2 The Mining Exploration Company

The mining exploration company active in Gállok is referred to by two names, Beowulf Mining AB (BMAB) and Jokkmokk Iron Mines AB (JIMAB). BMAB is a British company and JIMAB is their Swedish subsidiary (Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Länta et al., 2013). These names illustrate that they are mining companies, but it is stated by mining critics that neither are mining companies, they merely serve as prospectors that will sell the exploitation concession to the highest bidder, which is regarded as negative (Lahtinen, 2013; Holmberg, 2013). BMAB is also exploring in other parts of Sápmi (Blume, 2013a; Holmberg, 2013). The exploration companies in Sápmi are often referred to as foreign and unserious by mining critics. Both mining critics and advocates lift examples where these companies have explored for minerals, damaging nature and leaving these sights adrift without paying for or restoring the environment (Hildebrandt, 2013; Länta et al., 2013; Persson, 2016; Tidholm, 2013). Mining critics refer to these exploration companies as “letter box companies” (Priftis, 2014 & Tidholm, 2013).

Hildebrandt (2013) expressed that the exploration company in Gállok do not seem to understand that it is positioned within a World Heritage and it has shown inability to interact with the local population. The test mining in Gállok is claimed to be lined with delays and the exploration company had deviated from the approved working plan four times, which the activists claimed to impair the exploration company’s credibility (Ek, 2013). BMAB/JIMAB is accused of conducting test drillings without legal permit in 2011, destroying forest for the private land owners. The exploration company offered to pay a 20 000 SEK fee, but it was reduced to 9 160 SEK by the MI (Hildebrandt, 2013). The same company also conducted exploration in Gállok during the winter time in 2012 without an approved working plan and without prior informing the Sami village, which the Jåhkågasska Sami village claimed had negative effect for the reindeer husbandry (Håkansson, 2013b).

4.4.3 Sápmi, Nature & The Indigenous Sami

Mining critics expressed that a large part of the current mining exploration is conducted within the reindeer husbandry area, but Sápmi as an area is only mentioned a few times by mining critics (Broberg, 2013; Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013; Fridolin, Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013; Willemsen, 2013). The geographical area in the context of mineral exploitation is more commonly referred to as Northern Sweden and critics claimed it to be regarded by the rest of Sweden as a “commodity reserve”, “commodity port”, “commodity bank” and “colonial area” (Arpi, 2014; Hedman, 2013; Jonsson, Åhrén & Gabelic, 2013; Tidholm, 2013). Nilsson (2013) stated that “Northern Sweden holds a mineral treasure that has been known for centuries”. The iron ore deposit in Gállok is described as great (Andersson, 2013) and as “Europe’s largest unbroken mineral deposit” (Kärrman, 2018a; Olsson, 2014). The Swedish media is criticised for not being interested in what happens in Northern Sweden and this is claimed to be due to the subjugation of Northern Sweden as a commodity reserve (Arpi, 2013; Priftis, 2014; Tidholm, 2013). Priftis (2014) claimed that the Swedish mining politics is conducted “without a national anchorage – the public outside the local communities concerned, are not even aware of the mining policy. It goes under the radar because the media do not care what transpires in the country's peripheries”.

Gunnarsson, Olofsson & Tovatt (2013) reasoned that it is commonly forgotten in the mining debate that minerals and metals are finite resources and Arpi (2014) emphasised that “some
natural resources are finite. Therefore, it is reasonable not to have an overly light-hearted free-trade thinking about them. The profits of the mining companies should also give rise to the Swedish Government's cash register and gain relevant local communities”. Eriksson & Dahlberg (2013) claimed the Mineral Act was developed at “a time when mineral deposits were viewed as an inexhaustible bank account that you could effortlessly withdraw money from”.

The media picture of the Sami is quite homogenous in the sense that reindeer husbandry always is mentioned in the context when Sami culture is lifted (Broberg, 2013; Länta et al., 2013). Mining critics repeatedly stated that the Sami has had their rights violated (Broberg, 2013; Harnesk et al., 2013; Länta et al., 2013). Fridolin, Eriksson & Dahlberg (2013) concluded that “the Sami are an indigenous people and a recognised minority who has been exposed to state-sanctioned racism for centuries”, in addition critics argued that the Sami must be granted the rights of an indigenous people (Fridolin, Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013; Harnesk et al., 2013).

Time immemorial is only emphasised a few times by mining critics (Blind, 2013; Fridolin, Eriksson & Dahlberg, 2013; Persson, 2016).

4.4 Discussion

The frequent subjugation of the activism as violent and illegal can be regarded as positioned in the central parts of the discursive formation and the activism is only referred to as non-illegal two times by mining critics (Abresparr, 2013; Lundberg Tuorda et al., 2013). This subjugation and the emphasis of the exploration company’s legal permit to test mine in Gállok, proposes that it is assumed that the activism is ‘wrong’ and that the exploration company is ‘right’ and it is only visible in the margins that the activists have been removed without legal support. This kind of activism is considered as abnormal, although it is stated in Harnesk et al. (2013) that the civil society is lacking the tools to participate in decision-making and permitting processes. Previous research also states that inclusive participation by different stakeholder is limited and that the Sami have limited influence in decision-making processes (Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017; Lawrence & Larsen, 2017). In this sense, the inherent rules of the mining exploitation discourse limit and construct what kind of actions that are possible for civil society and this kind of activism is one way for civil society to participate.

The debate in Jåhkåmåhkke is also referred to as “harsh” and “high-pitched” by advocates and they claimed that it must be replaced with “constructive dialogue”. This also implies that the activism is regarded as abnormal. The subjugation of the activists as “non-local professional activists”, “mentally ill” and “non-local hippies” with no local-support could negatively affect the public perception of their credibility and legitimacy, since media have a considerable influence on the public discourse (Deacon, Baxter, & Buzzelli, 2012), although it is not possible to empirically support that this portrayal had such effect.

The subjugation of the exploration companies in Sápmi as foreign and unserious is mostly made by mining critics, although mining advocated acknowledge previous problems with companies leaving destroyed nature adrift and not paying for the restoration of nature (Abrahamsson, 2013b; Lööf, 2013). Mining critics also claimed these companies to be conducting exploration in other part of the world under circumstances described as irresponsible for both nature and humans (Tidholm, 2013). Persson, Harnesk and Islar (2017, p.20) state that the exploration company answered – “what local people?” when asked how the local people in Gállok would feel about a mine. This subjugation as unserious does not seem to impair their credibility and legitimacy, since it is claimed that fever companies than ever are declined permit to explore the
Swedish bedrock (Olsson, 2013). The Mineral Strategy emphasise a large expansion of the Swedish mining industry and its necessity for the green economy and a sustainable development (Swedish Ministry of Enterprise & Innovation, 2013), and these claims supports the exploration companies’ interests.

The most commonly used reference of the geographical area in the context of mining exploitation is Northern Sweden and Sápmi is only mentioned a few times by mining critics, which positions Sápmi in the periphery of the discursive formation. This can in turn be problematised in the sense that, knowledge is historically and culturally contingent (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). The lack of acknowledging Sápmi as an area in the media coverage, marginalises the Sámi people’s traditional utilisation of this land. Time immemorial is only mentioned by critics a few times and the lack of emphasis on this juridical evidence that could strengthen the Sami legitimacy in the media coverage, also contributes to further marginalisation of Sami rights and the positioning of such issues in the margins of the discursive formation.

It can also be argued that nature, Northern Sweden and Gállok is subjected to merely a resource, since it is referred to as a “commodity port, mineral treasure” and “one of Europe’s largest known unbroken iron ore deposit” (Kärrman, 2018b). Critics stated that minerals and metals previously were considered as an endless resource and Eriksson and Dahlberg (2013) accused the mineral and mining policies to be built upon this view. Since expressions of recycling and reuse and minerals as an endless resource are positioned in the margins, it implies that the subjugation of nature and minerals as an endless resource still is an existing view in the mining exploitation discourse.

The importance of reindeer husbandry for the Sami culture is lifted by mining critics and its importance is also emphasised in previous research (Allard, 2006; Koivurova et al., 2015). This subjugation of the Sami as reindeer herders exclude and marginalise other parts of the Sami population and position them outside the mining exploration discourse. Other parts of the Sami population are only mentioned once by Nilsson (2013) when arguing that mining interferes with fishing and hunting activities, which also are considered as traditional Sami activities (Allard, 2006; Brännström & Axelsson, 2011). This marginalisation of other parts of the Sami population can be connected to the previous common view in Sweden during the late colonisation, that the ‘real Sami’ were reindeer herders (Lantto & Mörkenstam, 2008), since knowledge in culturally and historically contingent (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).

4.5 Environmental Justice

In this last section of the analysis I will address my fifth research question; -How can the activism in Gállok be understood in terms of the global environmental justice discourse? I will analyse and discuss my empirical material in relation to previous research and environmental justice (EJ). EJ is not mentioned explicitly in the media coverage, although the conflict and activism in Gállok can be regarded as a part of the global EJ discourse. Meanwhile, the understanding of EJ as a concept cannot be regarded as part of the Swedish mining exploration discourse since the term is not mentioned explicitly and it is positioned outside the discourse. The issues of the social distribution of risks and benefits, procedural justice and justice as recognition is central for EJ (Schlosberg, 2017; Wutich et al., 2013) and such issues are present within the mining conflict in Gállok. In terms of distributive justice, it is stressed in the media coverage that economic benefits from mining exploitation in Sápmi mainly are located outside
the local communities, while the negative environmental and social effects are socially distributed to the local community and the Sami in specific. This distribution is socially dependent and it can be argued that previous colonialism, ethnicity and culture contributes to this unjust distribution.

In terms of procedural justice, mining critics argued that participation in the permitting processes are not inclusive nor on equal grounds. It is emphasised in previous studies that the Sami is a marginalised group and their possibilities to participate as equal stakeholders are limited, possibly non-existent (Allard, 2006; Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017; Lawrence & Larsen, 2017). The limited possibilities to participate is also addressed by mining critics and they stressed that an adjustment of Swedish mining politics to align the ILO and UN conventions of indigenous and human rights is necessary. This would grant the Sami rights and possibilities to self-determination and this could be step towards a redistribution of power to allow for marginalised groups to participate and influence the governance and decision-making regarding ecosystem services and natural resources, which is argued as necessary for achieving EJ (Wutich, et al., 2013). Poor management of ecosystem services and overexploitation of natural resources often leads to further marginalisation of and structural inequality for already exposed groups (UNDP, 2014), which the continued exploitation of Sápmi can be argued to contribute to.

In terms of justice as recognition, it is necessary to recognise that social, cultural, institutional and symbolic aspects are underlying inequality and to acknowledge and respect the experiences and diversity of participants (Schlosberg, 2017). This implies that the colonialization of Sápmi and the state-sanctioned racism the Sami have suffered should be recognised and practically addressed within the mining exploration discourse. Fridolin, Eriksson & Dahlberg (2013) claimed the Sami national day as “a day to both dare to see and recognise the historical injustices that the Swedish government has committed and to celebrate and lift the Sami culture”. They explicitly mention the “state-sanctioned racism” but they do not recognise the colonisation in this context. The colonialization of Sápmi is explicitly mentioned by mining critics in 7 articles (Blind, 2017; Jonsson, Åhrén & Gabelic, 2013; Priftis, 2014; Lahtinen, 2013; Länta et al., 2013; Åström & Bucht, 2013; Willemsen, 2013). Sami history is thereby recognised to some extent and existing in the margins of the mining exploration discourse, but the question of interest is rather by whom is the colonialization of Sápmi acknowledged? Since the mining advocates do not mention or problematise this nor acknowledge Sami rights, it cannot be considered as a common truth claim for the opposing actors and thereby is the diversity and social aspects underlying injustice not recognised by all actors. The historical perspective stated as essential for the understanding of modern-day conflicts in Sápmi in previous research by Ojala & Nordin (2016) is lacking and positioned in the periphery of the mining exploitation discourse. It also underlines Lantto and Mörkenstam’s (2008) claim in previous research that the Sami still struggle for recognition in Sweden. Nygren (2013) argues that the struggle for justice and Sami rights in Gállok is equivalent to the miner’s struggle for justice and rights in South Africa in the sense that “the protests share a common opponent of a state that safeguards the interests of foreign companies rather than their own people and the surrounding environment”.
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5. Conclusions

The conflict in Gállok and its activism is claimed to be one of the most nationally debated in the context of Sápmi (Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017). This thesis has aimed at analysing the mineral exploitation discourse in Sweden by scrutinising the media coverage of the mining conflict in Gállok and the final research question is; -Are there any oppressing structures or prevailing colonial heritage reproduced or visible through media? According to agenda setting theory, media do not necessarily determine the public opinion about something but it set the agenda for what issues that are regarded as important by the public and media influences how the public think about these issues (McCombs, Shaw & Weaver, 2014). In terms of occurrence in the media coverage the conflict in Gállok has received limited attention on the national level during 2013-2018 but the occurrence is somewhat more extensive on local and regional level, although the media attention is highest during the time of the activism (see Table 2). In terms of occurrence of the different actors, both mining critics and advocates are granted space, although they address different arguments and views on the conflict. This limited media attention can be argued to be connected to previous colonialism and contribute to a continuous marginalisation of the Sami. It can also affect the possibilities for the Sami to gain recognition for their cause in the Swedish society, since media attention sets the agenda for what the public regards as critical issues (McCombs, Shaw & Weaver, 2014). Also, the subjugation of the various subjects, such as the activist, the Sami and nature, within the mining exploration discourse affect how the public think about and understand the conflict and Sami rights issues.

Media also have the potential of favouring and reinforcing certain voices and silencing or marginalising others (Deacon, Baxter, & Buzzelli, 2015). In terms of marginalisation, it is interesting to reflect upon who is expressing what and if the different arguments and claims are recognised or addressed by the opposing actor. It can be argued that the media coverage contributes to a further marginalisation of the Sami, since the colonialization of Sápmi only is lifted by mining critics in the margins of the discursive formation, and the colonialism in the context of mining conflicts in Sápmi is not addressed at all by the dominant actors. The same can be said for Sami rights issues and Sweden’s violation of international conventions on human and indigenous rights, which are also central arguments for the mining critics. While repeatedly stated by mining critics, these issues are not acknowledged nor addressed by the dominant actors. This marginalisation can also be argued to be connected to previous colonialism and contribute to the by Ojala & Nordin (2015) and Lantto and Mörkenstam (2008) stated low public knowledge on Sami history and rights. It also implies that the Sami still struggle for recognition in Sweden and that the mining advocates do not seem to share the ontological understanding of the previous colonialization of Sápmi.

The mining advocates are rather homogenous in their arguments and their central positioned arguments in favour of mineral exploitation in Gállok are the positive economic and social effects the mining industry provides, such as job opportunities, future belief, Swedish welfare and attraction of foreign investment. They also stress the Swedish sustainable mining industry’s importance for the global economy, the EU’s mineral supply and the green economy and renewable energy. The mining critics in turn, is not a homogenous group in terms of arguments
and claims and the main issue separating them is the diverging understanding on the possibilities to conduct sustainable mining. Some mining critics reasons that sustainable mining and co-existence is possible. But sometimes, like in Gállok when co-existence is not possible, Sami rights and the environment must prevail exploration interests, while a few critics argued for a stop of the unsustainable exploitation in Sápmi and a reduced outtake of minerals. The central positioned arguments of the mining critics concern critique of the Swedish mineral policy, negative environmental and social impacts from mining, with emphasis on the effects for reindeer husbandry, violation of Sami rights and short-term vs. long-term sustainability.

Mining critics clearly state that reasons for conflict in Gállok is due to the valuation between different interests and the violation of indigenous rights, although the media coverage also indicates that the reasons for conflict is due to existing different views on what a sustainable development entails. Mining advocates frequently emphasise the importance of a working co-existence between stakeholders and that this is achieved through improved stakeholder communication, consultation and compromise. These expressions by the mining advocates imply that reasons for conflict in Gállok is due to lacking communication and consultation and that the responsibility for solving such conflicts lie on the private sector, in similarity to previous research where Lawrence and Larsen (2017) claim that discourses of CSR are intertwined in neoliberal practices, which overrides protective responsibilities from the Government onto the private sector. Meanwhile the mining critics claimed the responsibility for the conflicts due to mining exploitation lies with the Government and the politics supporting the exploitation.

Two central truth claims that creates discursive power and uphold the dominant actors interest are the claims that sustainable mining is possible and that mineral extraction is a prerequisite for the green economy and a sustainable development. These truth claims are shared with the global sustainable development discourse and powerful institutions like the UN and the EU. Another present truth claim that grants these actors dominance and uphold their interests, is the assumption that technology, innovation and economical means are solutions to environmental problems and restoration of nature after mining. Also, Sweden’s importance for the EU’s mineral supply, is a claim that supports the dominant actors. All these truth claims limit the possibilities to talk about something else than the green economy as sustainable development within the mining exploitation discourse. The assumed ontological understanding that sustainability and justice is achievable within the neoliberal economic system, also limits the possibilities to problematise any alternative ‘green’ futures and it can be considered as abnormal to express such views within the mining exploitation discourse. In terms of knowledge, the mining exploitation discourse can be regarded as dependent on and constructed from colonial practices established during the previous centuries, since it is evident the Sami people still suffers from marginalisation and oppression due to mineral exploitation in Sápmi. Mining critics also suggests in the margins of the discursive formation, that the non-stop mining exploitation contributes to a continues colonization in Sápmi (Priftis, 2014; Willemsen, 2013).

The subjugation within the mining exploration discourse expresses itself in diverse ways, like the subjugation of nature and Northern Sweden as a resource, the Sami as reindeer herders and the activism as illegal and messy are present, which in turn probably affect the public’s understanding of the conflict in Gállok. The inherent rules of discourse determine and limits what actions and expressions that are possible for civil society, and the activism in Gállok is an expression of this construction. The activism in Gállok can be argued to be a discursive practice
that to some extent challenges the truth claims and the boundaries of the mining exploitation discourse.

The activism and conflict in Gállok can be regarded as a part of the global environmental justice movement, since struggles for distributive and procedural justice is present as well as justice as recognition. In conclusion, the final decision regarding a mine in Gállok has not yet been made by the Government. Since the activism in Gállok is one of the most attentive modern-day conflict in Swedish Sápmi (Persson, Harnesk & Islar, 2017) and it is evident in the media coverage that a diversified group of actors consisting of activists, the CAB in Norrbotten county, the EPA, scientists, the Sami Parliament, SSNA and different NGO’s, all oppose the building of a mine in Gállok. Therefore, the final decision regarding a mine in Gállok could indicate whether such activism and opinion formation could challenge the boundaries of the mining exploitation discourse.
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