



Environment & Society Portal



The White Horse Press

Full citation: Hillmo, Thomas, and Ulrik Lohm. "Nature's Ombudsmen: The Evolution of Environmental Representation in Sweden." *Environment and History* 3, no. 1 (February 1997): 19–43. <http://www.environmentandsociety.org/node/2911>.

Rights: All rights reserved. © The White Horse Press 1997. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purpose of criticism or review, no part of this article may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical or other means, including photocopying or recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission from the publishers. For further information please see <http://www.whpress.co.uk>.

Nature's Ombudsmen: The Evolution of Environmental Representation in Sweden

THOMAS HILLMO* AND ULRIK LOHM†

* 1961-1994

† *Dept of Water and Environmental Studies
Linköping University
S-581 83 Linköping, Sweden*

SUMMARY

In Sweden, during the 20th century, a number of different groups or institutions have nominated themselves as being Nature's representatives. This essay deals with the ideas, motives or reasons for nature conservation advanced by these groups. Three successive regimes of regulation are identified, which can be codified on the basis of their underlying characteristics as 'entailed estate', 'common land' and 'reservation'. The essay also reflects on the growing political interest in nature conservation and the gradual shift of power from the individual to the state, and how this transfer of power is authorised.

INTRODUCTION

This essay is about attempts to deal with the undesirable effects the swift technological and economic developments of the 20th century have had on our natural environment. The history of nature conservation in Sweden provides an excellent illustration of attempts to deal with these swift changes in society and the powers at play in bringing about these changes. It also throws light on the gradual shift of power in Sweden from the individual to the state, exemplified by controlling interests in the utilisation of land and water, and how this transfer of power has been authorised.

Our work will revolve around three themes. The first involves the ideas and motives for nature conservation. The reasons for protecting the countryside have changed, so that conservation – originally an eclectic concept, partly controlled by different groups of scientists – has gradually become an important social issue and an essential part of the policy making of the welfare state. Our second theme concerns the fact that the countryside is unable to plead its own cause. The natural

environment needs to be represented by someone, and a number of parties have come forward, claiming to represent its supposed interests: landowners, companies, farmers, authorities, institutions, organisations, individuals etc. The word *ombudsman* (approx: representative), which has a long tradition and belongs among the major Swedish conceptual innovations which have enjoyed international recognition, will be used here for this particular kind of representation.

During the 20th century a number of special groups have emerged with aspirations of being nature's real representatives. These advocates of nature conservation have nominated themselves as the natural environment's special ombudsmen and have in some cases been accepted in other areas of society. However, others have also claimed to be the natural environment's ombudsmen as illustrated by the following quotations:

Throughout the ages we, Sweden's farmers, have managed nature conservation free of charge for the Swedish people and we will continue to do so in the future so long as the National Environmental Protection Board and other such 'conservationists' leave us in peace.¹

The Swedish Forest Service manages the country's forests, land, lakes and waterways. All in all the board administers 20% of the country's forest land and approximately one tenth of the lakes and waterways requiring fishing permits. The Swedish Forest Service maintains that active, efficient forestry should be reconcilable with the interests of conservation as well as those of the general public.²

What we shall concern ourselves with here is the question of who has the authority, or who has received the authorisation to be the natural environment's spokesman in society, especially vis-à-vis various economic interests entitled to make use of its resources – in which context, nature preservation can be seen as the non profit-making utilisation of natural resources.

The third and final theme concerns the three regulating institutions which have managed the natural environment in Sweden during the 20th century. These regulating institutions – which on the basis of their underlying characteristics we have chosen to call: 'Entailed Estate' (Sw. *Fideikommisset*), 'Common Land' (Sw. *Allmänningen*) and 'Reservation' – have been associated with the recognition of new conservation principles. Regulations have embodied new ideas and incentives for the conservation of the natural environment, which have resulted in new characteristic forms of conservation, as the environmental ombudsmen authorised by society succeeded one another.

'Entailed Estate' came into existence in accordance with the 1909 Nature Conservation Acts which were in force until the institution of 'Common Land' was established in the 1950s. Soon after, 'Reservation' replaced the institution of 'Common Land' and has since been the prevailing regulating institution.

THE EMERGENCE OF NATURE CONSERVATION IN SWEDEN

Underlying ideas

The idea around the end of the last century of enforcing restrictions on the use of natural amenities was nothing new. But there was a whole new set of motivations and ways of looking at the issue. Up until the 19th century, regulations involving the use of natural amenities emanated from two principles, both of which have their origins in practical and economic motives. It was partly a question of various attempts to monopolise certain resources, the use and extraction of which was reserved as the right of certain groups; for example, by means of regal law or hereditary privilege of the nobility. But also, behind various regulations, can be discerned the ambition to manage the natural environment or retain its productivity.

However, during the 19th century this practical kind of nature conservation began to be supplemented by a set of other motives favouring the protection of the natural environment. During the 1830s, for example, the Romantic botanist, Elias Fries, began to advocate nature conservation for non-economic reasons. Fries maintained that from practising restraint in the exploitation of environmental amenities was justifiable from a moral point of view, as well as being a necessary consequence of the civilisation of mankind;

... restoring the countryside's lost beauty and refining its issue is the goal of civilisation; an inevitable condition for the well-being of the organic natural environment as a whole, and even more so for the spiritual development of mankind. When man decides to protect the countryside from his own destructive desires, he is walking the path of civilisation.³

The idea of an ethical approach to nature conservation was to be pursued further by P. A. Säve.⁴ This development has been explained as the emergence of a middle class view of nature which was highly influenced by the aesthetic values of the Romantic era.⁵

As Bo Sundin among others⁶ have shown, the nature conservation movement evolved from two different schools of thought. Säve represents the school with roots in the movement for the protection of animal life, which above all stressed the ethical and moral aspects of conservation. The well-being of animals was seen as one of man's moral responsibilities, while at the same time, measures for the protection of animal life would foster and favour efforts to improve the general level of morality in society.

The second school of thought, largely inspired by A E Nordenskiöld's⁷ national park proposal, was grander and more nationalistic, with an additional heavy emphasis on conservation motives of a scientific and rationalistic bent:

Consequently, in the probably not-too-distant future it will prove difficult to acquire a complete picture of the countryside in which our ancestors fought their first battle.

The countryside which has nurtured Scandinavians' unflinching love of freedom and fostered their brave bands of warriors. The countryside which has served as a vast museum in which all our scientists and artists have commenced their studies, and which has set the key for the songs of our poets, and for our philosophy of life as well as that of our fathers.⁸

The areas of countryside which had not yet been transformed by cultural development were to be excluded from exploitation and to be preserved, both as a natural historical record, as a scientific resource, and – as it says in one of the preparatory documents of the legislation on nature conservation – as ‘patriotic, illustrative reference material’. The national park was modelled on a prototype from the USA, where the establishment of national parks had begun in 1870. By means of the 1909 National Parks Act they came to form the mainstay of Swedish nature conservation. The second of the two 1909 Nature Conservation Acts – the Act on the protection of natural landmarks – was based mainly on a proposal from the German Professor of Botany, Hugo Conwentz.⁹

The establishment of nature conservation.

The issue of legislating on nature conservation was hardly a controversial one. From the initiation stage it took just over five years for the legislation to be passed without a debate in either house of the Riksdag. Its benevolent reception was just as much due to the way in which its foremost protagonists formulated the conservation issue, as it was to the form the legislation took.

There was general consensus on the principles of nature conservation; economic interests would not need to be affected by restrictions. The initial protagonists of conservation who put themselves forward as environmental ombudsmen were anxious to portray themselves as being fundamentally in favour of society progressing.¹⁰ To a great extent the National Parks Act underlined their main concern, i.e., protecting pockets of countryside in remote areas which were of little interest as far as exploitation was concerned. Moreover, conservation regulations were subordinate to land ownership rights. Conservation presumed either the individual landowner's consent or that the land was owned by the Crown.¹¹

The key to the success of conservation was partly due to the fact that it addressed meaningful scientific and cultural needs, needs which were also shared by those people representing economic interests. Nature conservation in theory and in practice converged with the need for expertise in industry. When the Swedish Forest Service or the forest industry, for instance, allocated areas of forest as nature reserves, this accorded with scientific aspirations to set up national parks in order to study the evolution of the natural environment in a state of non-interference.¹² This has been well illustrated by Gunnar Andersson, professor at the Forest Research Institute, who maintains that

... all truly rational silviculture has to be based on a thorough knowledge of the growth and growth requirements of forest trees. However, an important provision is the opportunity to observe them somewhere in their real natural state and not just forced by society's calculating hand.¹³

There was an obvious connection between knowledge of forest growth and practical and economic utilisation of the forest but, in the long term, scientific investigations into the natural environment of national parks would conceivably also yield knowledge of a practical and useful nature. Thereby, nature conservation would be seen as an important effect of the unprecedented 'scientification' – to use Gunnar Eriksson's words - of Swedish society which was currently underway. Preserving the natural environment, which was to be explored and charted and about which it was necessary to discover more, could be justified by pointing out that this was a good investment in terms of potential knowledge. Industrial success was fundamentally dependent upon the successful application of science.¹⁴

The natural environment also provided a national identity which had a nationally unifying effect, as well as impressing Sweden's unique role on an increasingly internationalised world. And if the Swedish countryside were not used as an exotic sales pitch for the export market, at least it would hold out the prospect of revenue from tourism. One important and politically viable argument in favour of national parks was the fact that they were expected to attract tourists who would then travel on the newly built railways in the north of Sweden.¹⁵ The very choice of the name 'national park' was made with tourism in mind:

The name undoubtedly has a considerable attraction to tourists, whom one ought to endeavour to attract to the prospective northern inland railway.¹⁶

The principle of 'nature conservation' was thus accepted without a lot of fuss, since it was not seen as a threat to the established interests in this field. On the contrary, in the Swedish Society for the Protection of Nature (SNF) there were representatives from a range of exploitative interests who had been appointed with direct reference to the Acts of 1909.

If conservation legislation had been seen as a threat to the rational management of agriculture, forestry or industry, it would have been a fairly simple matter to delay its implementation as was the case with concurrent attempts to legislate against water pollution.¹⁷ The most prominent advocates of conservation were very careful to call attention to their favourable attitudes towards progress as well as their willingness to compromise and reach solutions based on mutual understanding:

However, it has never in any way occurred to our conservationist friends or local heritage preservationists to take up arms against industry or its representatives, or to demand that the vast material interests which they represent should be forced to any

great extent to yield to a purely idealistic insistence on nature conservation and the preservation of local heritage. On the other hand, what they have actively wished for and endeavoured to achieve, is to be able to win industry over to the great patriotic cause, so that in their enterprises and their establishments they would be forced to show the greatest possible consideration to idealistic values of the aforementioned kind and not violate them unless it be absolutely necessary.¹⁸

The first environmental ombudsmen.

The Royal Academy of Sciences (KVA) played a major role in the establishment of nature conservation and from the outset it occupied a very strong position in this field. It was commissioned to carry out the first conservation inquiries and as we shall see, it had the necessary influence and opportunities to fight its cause indirectly too. The Academy's provisional Nature Conservation Committee had also mainly drafted the bills which entered the statute book in 1909. To some extent this legislation created the strong position of the KVA, both as an organisation and as body of expertise. In reality, this was official confirmation of the role which the Academy itself had assumed as the Swedish conservation ombudsman and thereby the foremost representative of the natural environment.

That the KVA was appointed as society's authorised environmental ombudsman was never questioned – for many good reasons. Because of the broad range of expertise represented in the Academy, and because of its commanding an overview and possessing a leading role in the scientific world, it was natural that the Academy should be at the centre of contemporary discussions on the subject of conservation. There, it was possible to gather the views of different groups, bring them into line with each other, summarise them and turn them into effective arguments. In its capacity as a bastion of science and a civil service department of the Crown, the Academy also ensured that the arguments had due weight behind them. The environmental ombudsmen within the KVA numbered among the top scientists; men with authority, prestige and influence, and the prominent representatives of a scientific elite in society's key positions.

The age of 'Entailed Estate' – nature as an inalienable right.

The Institute for the Protection of the Environment which was established through the 1909 Conservation Acts as society's answer to various conflicting claims on nature bears a striking resemblance to the model for managing estate property established with the setting up of 'Entailed Estates' towards the end of the 18th century. The fundamental principles behind the 'Entailed Estate' were continued existence and continuity.¹⁹ In conformity with the idea of the system central to conservatism, the 'Entailed Estate' rested on the idea that values which had been developed and in existence over a long period of time should be beyond

ephemerality. Such assets were regarded in principle as inalienable, and consequently had to be protected from short-term whims and temporary weaknesses. This involved strongly emphasising the responsibility of the present generation towards previous, as well as future generations.²⁰

Through the conservation legislation of 1909 the opportunity arose to appropriate areas of the Swedish countryside and turn them into some kind of 'Entailed Estate'. It is not difficult to envisage the idea of 'entailing the countryside' as an offshoot of the powerful image of man as trustee of the nature according to the traditions of western thinking.²¹ However, the establishment of national parks and natural landmarks assumed consensus – a condition for the 'Entailed Estate' was that it did not conflict with other principles already established in society, above all with the right of ownership.

Threats to important cultural assets, to national feeling and the quality of research were, according to advocates of the 'Entailed Estates', the most important reasons for establishing them. Technical and economic developments and the ensuing demand for raw materials and infrastructural organisation were on their way to destroying the irreplaceable cultural and scientific assets enshrined in primeval, virgin nature. The continuity of culture and natural history – and thereby ultimately cultural and national distinctiveness – were in jeopardy.

It was of great significance that the 'self-sacrificial' side of the 'Entailed Estate' could be backed up by more economically quantifiable motives based on usefulness in terms of valuable and useable knowledge. The 'Entailed Estate' did not involve any radical changes in society; no groups of any influence found themselves challenged and neither were great economic sacrifices in the offing for either state authorities or companies. Administrators to oversee the preservation of the natural environment were already on the state pay-roll and there was no question of making money available for the purchase or the protection of land since preservation concerned peripheral areas of Crown lands or areas which individual landowners voluntarily relinquished. In short, the 'Entailed Estates' needed no further legitimation.

Nature's ombudsmen, the KVA, were appointed as trustees of the 'Entailed Estates' which were set up with the support of the 1909 National Park Act. Within the framework of this act it was also possible for them to argue for the preservation of additional areas as well as acting as advisors in matters of selecting natural landmarks. Formally, matters of conservation were managed by a specially appointed conservation committee. From the point of view of public opinion, SNF was also an important resource for the KVA, and the ties between the semi-official government body and the voluntary movement were strengthened and secured as a result of joint staffing. In the SNF's year-book *Sveriges Natur*, (The Swedish Environment), the KVA was able to air its views on a number of issues, as well as reporting continuously on items on the agenda of the Nature Conservation Committee.

CONSERVATION ON A NEW COURSE

The thinking behind the conservationist ideology of the 'Entailed Estate' encompassed a number of contradictory and mutually irreconcilable ideas, and as time went by this fact became more and more evident. This paradox emanated from the fact that conservationists had never made a clear distinction between the concepts 'virgin' (or untouched, Sw. *jungfrulig*) and 'primeval' (Sw. *ursprunglig*). This came to have far-reaching consequences for conservation work as new scientific developments led to a radical redefinition of nature. Another conflict, which in time became even more pressing, was the question of the ultimate aim of conservation: for whom and for what purpose should the nature be protected?

Re-examining the natural environment

Despite the fact that the principal advocates of conservation were prominent scientists – not least in the fields of botany and quaternary geology – it would be some years on into the 1920s before it became clear that many of the areas of countryside which had been preserved as 'primeval remains of the natural landscape' were in fact surviving cultivated landscapes. To a certain extent it was the conservation measures themselves that refuted the myth of the ancient natural landscape and forced the revision of conservationist ideology. For example, it became obvious, when they were protected, that forest meadows were not the vestiges of postglacial, deciduous woodlands; when a ban was placed on the use of these meadows, in order to preserve them, they were gradually reclaimed by the forest.

The emergence of a new view of the southern and central Swedish landscapes as an essentially cultivated landscape has been tied to Mårten Sjöbeck's publication 'Farmer-owned Forests: Their Management and Exploitation', published in 1927.²² The main breakthrough, however, does not seem to have occurred until 1934, when the forest meadow appeared as the major theme in that year's issue of *Sveriges Natur*, and when Rutger Sernander,²³ a professor of botany and one of the fathers of conservationism, was eventually forced to alter his position and acknowledge that forest meadows '...in their present state are the precious remains from the husbandry of olden times'.²⁴

Seen in a larger perspective, the re-examination of the natural environment was the result of a scientific reorientation which had accelerated from the middle of the 19th century and which entailed a transition from systematic studies to studies which were more directed towards processes and the interactive forces at play in the natural environment. Biological research into the dynamic processes in the environment gained momentum, and was further fuelled by advances in neighbouring scientific fields. The reorientation was equally evident in the field of quaternary geology, which was the branch of science in vogue at the turn of the century as well as being a field in which Sweden had taken the lead.²⁵

The foundations of modern ecology were laid in the decades around the turn of the century by scholars such as A. Grisbach and E. Warming. It was F. Clements who brought Warming's thinking on a dynamically changeable nature to a conclusion, and in 1916, he formulated the idea of 'succession towards a climax'.²⁶ The image of nature as something static and self-evident started to give way to the view that the countryside was in a constant state of flux. At about the same time research with an ecological bias gained a foothold on Swedish ground for the first time – preparing the way for the reconsiderations of the 1920s.²⁷

New knowledge about the origin and evolution of the landscape was also relevant to the view of man's role as a biological and geological factor in the transformation of the landscape. Without the influence of civilisation the countryside would not have developed. Primeval countryside was simply a delusion; it no longer existed. Remaining were not venerable vestiges from prehuman times, but instead a landscape which was the product of interaction between man and the natural environment, and in which man could take a certain pride. At the same time, nature lost some of its former aura.

Protecting what and for whom?

As a result of the new view of the natural environment which was gaining ground, conservation efforts began to take on an air of a 'misguided mission'. In his biography of Sten Selander,²⁸ Martin Kylhammar also pointed to the fact that in the late 1930s conservation ideas based on the 'Entailed Estate' were starting to be seriously questioned by the leaders of the conservation movement itself. Environmental protection, as in the case of forest meadows, could be over-protective, and thereby a 'protect to death'.²⁹

However, the rational and scientific basis of conservation measures had begun to be questioned well before that. Not infrequently, deciding what to preserve was random and arbitrary. This lack of consistency was linked to the fact that conservation efforts were dependent to a large degree on random factors such as the force of initiatives and the geographical distribution of those forwarding proposals, as well as how accommodating landowners proved to be. Often what was preserved belonged to the category of odd or out of the ordinary. Proponents of conservation admitted that '...environmental protection has come to be characterised by a degree of uncertainty and chance, not to mention drowsiness'.³⁰

Threats to scientific conservation

There was yet another dimension to this conflict: large and small changes in society, which in various ways threatened to undermine the basic tenets of conservation. During the 1920s the tourist industry expanded. An increasingly large number of people had the opportunity to visit the remote national parks in the north of the country, which brought a negative reaction from the scientific

establishment, due to the fact that they felt that the scientific basis of protection was under threat.³¹ Threats to conservation seemed to be growing, partly under other guises. Concurrent with society's increasing affluence, demands were growing for more leisure time and in a social breakthrough in the 1930s an act was passed introducing twelve days' holiday. An increasingly large proportion of the population moved to towns and cities and became very tangibly alienated from the countryside. From the turn of the century up until the 1930s the percentage of farmers dropped from 80% to just over a third of the population. Over the same period the percentage of industrial workers quadrupled from 10% to 40%.

For the majority of the urban population, though, the remotely situated areas of national parkland were scarcely more accessible than before. Instead, for these people, the countryside surrounding urban areas became increasingly important for recreation and outdoor pursuits. At the same time land conflicts were rapidly increasing in these areas, due to urban expansion and the rationalisation of agriculture.

The countryside as a social resource.

New demands gave conservation a social dimension. The countryside offered a much needed break from the monotony of working life and the ordered chaos of urban living. It was possible to defend this need for contact with nature with the help of a more sophisticated economic rationality. Ample access to recreation areas and areas in which people could go walking could be seen as a wise investment in people's spiritual and physical well-being, which in turn would pay off in terms of healthy citizens and productive workers.³²

Two official reports 1936³³ pointed in the same direction, and even voices from within the SNF began to plead the case for a more varied approach to conservation, '...a sensible economy of natural resources, from ore to timber, from bird song to the feel of the countryside'³⁴ – wording which covered economic, scientific and cultural, as well as aesthetic and social aspects. This solution was the same as Sernander had prescribed in the Nature Conservation Report of 1935, namely the planned economic management of remaining natural assets, and the establishment of a government post for nature conservation. On the whole there was an understanding that conservation had reached a position whereby drawing up an inventory, implementing regional planning and providing heavily increased funds were seen as necessary measures.³⁵

The 1930s have been described as a transition period between two ideologies of environmental protection, between 'preservation' and 'conservation'.³⁶ The former can be illustrated by Karl Starbäck's thesis 'enjoy the countryside but disturb it as little as possible'.³⁷ This principle of environmental protection could also be worded considerably more categorically, for instance as a 'young farmer'

(as he was referred to) put it in 1910: 'Man must protect nature from man'.³⁸ Such a pronouncement can be contrasted with, a quarter of a century later, Sten Selander's by now well-known slogan: 'Environmental protection is for the benefit of man, not the countryside...'³⁹ This came closer to the basic intentions of the conservation ideal to protect the environment for man, in line with a philosophy of economy which stipulated that thrift should be practised over a wide spectrum of natural resources, over 'timber forests as well as bird song'.

NATURE CONSERVATION IN THE TRANSITION PERIOD

The mid-life crisis of nature conservation

The crisis of the nature conservation movement during the 1930s was connected to the emergence and establishment of new ideas. The old preservationistic ideas of nature conservation had been outflanked at the same time as new scientific findings were making inroads. This also had to do with a generation crisis within the SNF. Many of the pioneers had died in and around the 1930s. Even the chairmanship was somewhat ambulatory during the first half of the 1930s, and between 1935 and 1939 the SNF's membership dropped to less than half.

Cooperation between the SNF and the Local Monuments Preservation Association (SfH) was one indication of this crisis. One of the ways in which their cooperation manifested itself was through the joint publication of a year-book and periodical for a period of four years. However, the publication of a periodical with a larger circulation was unable to alter either the precarious situation of the SNF or the fact that they had assumed a secondary position in the columns of *Bygd och natur* ('Rural Settlement and Countryside').

The need for renewal in the nature conservation movement and the need to adapt its ideas to scientific reality as well as that of contemporary society became a matter of urgency. This also became Selander's main task when he became chairman of the SNF in 1936.

Selander played a key role in the re-examination of nature conservation which began in the second half of the 1930s. It is true to say that Selander was not the first to formulate the new philosophy, but he had an outstanding ability to capture new and often disparate ideas and combine them in a harmonious ideology. His skill when it came to popularising and enthusing people, as well as his ambition to implement these ideas in a practical programme, were of crucial importance both for the breakthrough of new thinking and in enabling the SNF to recover from its crisis.⁴⁰ Carl Fries⁴¹ in the Swedish Tourist Club (STF) worked in the same vein, and in the activities of both men a reconciliation between nature conservation and tourism can be discerned, made possible through the development of new thinking.

The old ombudsmen disband

The fact that it was the SNF's personnel, e.g. Sernander, and not the KVA who were commissioned to investigate the organisation of nature conservation was not necessarily a direct loss of face for the KVA. Sernander was a respected researcher and held in high esteem in conservation circles. All the same, this did constitute a shift of symbolic significance, in view of the KVA's dominant position in connection with commissioned investigations 30 years earlier. The KVA adopted an attitude of reserve towards Sernander's proposals, and in their statement of February 1936 they gave the proposals the thumbs-down.⁴²

Of course, the KVA had been the foremost vehicle of scientifically based nature conservation, and in their statement they persisted in urging that conservation was 'first and foremost a matter for science.' In this way they found themselves in direct opposition to the SNF, who wanted to reduce the role of science, claiming conservation to be a matter of a practical and social nature, but founded on scientific principles.⁴³ To a certain extent even the KVA's attitude had begun to soften towards the end of the 1920s. Captain H.N. Pallin's extreme preservationistic proposals to set up so-called 'pledge parks' – national parks which would be protected from all interference for all eternity – were rejected by the Academy who wanted to:

...resolutely dissociate themselves from the view which appeared to want the most appealing parts of our national parks in Lapland and other mountainous areas to remain accessible mainly to those lucky enough to have time and funds at their disposal in order to undertake formal expeditions to these places.⁴⁴

The KVA's final lasting successful undertaking was the setting up of the Muddus National Park in 1942. Altogether they had succeeded in getting five national parks established in addition to the nine which had been set up as a direct result of the 1909 legislation.

Ironically enough it was the extension of hydroelectric power – an important matter of strategy of the 1910s – which constituted the beginning of the end for the KVA's almost unshakeable position. Their strategy – 'to make greater gains later on' and become an interest on equal footing with technical and economic interests in negotiations on the countryside – had clearly failed. The change in strategy of the 1910s was signalled by acceptance of one encroachment on Stora Sjöfallet National Park by a hydroelectric project.

During the 1940s the committee's work became more closely tied to the task of documenting the disappearance of wildlife in prospective reservoirs. 'Nature's archive' was often taken to be synonymous with KVA's archive. In an internal memorandum on the rise and development of the KVA regret was expressed over the onerous and resource-consuming work of the commission in connection with the extension of hydroelectric power.⁴⁵

The new ombudsmen

The middle of the 1940s saw a reversal of the negative trend in voluntary nature conservation work and during the 1950s the favourable growth in membership was transformed into a truly mass mobilisation. A sharp increase in membership was experienced not only by SNF but also by the Swedish Ornithological Organisation and by the Swedish Youth Association of Field Naturalists, a youth organisation established during the 1940s. Conservation work on an idealistic basis had now been transformed into the national movement which was originally intended.

It was equally important for the voluntary organisations to receive political recognition. With the introduction of the 1952 Nature Conservation Act, the KVA finally lost its monopoly on the ombudsmanship. The running of the national parks passed into the hands of the National Board of Crown Forests and Lands and the KVA's advisory function as well as its function as commission of inquiry were shared between the SNF and the SfH, both of which were established by the Act as advisory bodies.

This shift in emphasis towards voluntary organisations working in the field of nature conservation implied that scientific expertise was no longer such an important criterion of good ombudsmanship. A broad social outlook, a practical knowledge of the workings of society and most of all close ties on a broad scale at grass-root level were the qualities that were given priority. On the other hand, the SNF had in a way come closer to the KVA's previous view that practical conservation must be based on a positive approach to negotiation and compromise.

'COMMON LAND' – FROM IDEA TO ACTION

As a result of the 1952 Nature Conservation Act, a new regulating institution was established, which embraced new principles governing the demands of various interests on the natural environment. The most important of these was accessibility. The universally appreciated assets, enshrined in the countryside, were to be available to everyone, irrespective of their social standing and economic resources. People of influence were also obliged to respect these principles. The countryside was to be 'Common Land'.

The development of 'Common-Land'

In more general terms, the breakthrough in favour of the new conservation ideas had already occurred in the discussions of the 1930s, and to a certain extent the war can explain why these ideas were not evident in legislation until the beginning of the 1950s. As a result of the Nature Conservation Report of 1946,

and later also the Shoreline Conservation Report, discussions were resumed at the end of the 1930s; this was also an indication of a continued and increased political interest in conservation issues.

In the Nature Conservation Report a distinction was made between local and general conservation. This distinction had already been made by Sernander in the 1935 Report but at that time it was, if anything, a question of rationalising conservation efforts and generally protecting areas and natural features which satisfied certain criteria. In the 1951 Report, on the other hand, local conservation referred back to the 1909 Acts on geographically fixed features or areas, whilst general conservation encompassed more comprehensive measures – not least those of a social nature. Also, during the 1950s local conservation was also extended to include ‘general countryside’, which, from a recreation point of view, is of equal importance.⁴⁶

More specifically there was a desire to guarantee the social aspect of nature conservation by introducing conservationist institution of ‘nature park’ – yet another of the ideas emanating from the 1930s. ‘Nature park’ referred to areas of countryside, the prime qualities of which were determined by their recreation value, their ‘importance for people’s intercourse with the countryside’. In the nature parks it was considered unnecessary to restrict other existing activities unless they conflicted with the interests of outdoor recreation.

Management of the natural environment

The proposed bill and the ensuing act constituted a breakthrough for the principal of environmental management, even if the term nature conservation was adhered to for another decade in official contexts.⁴⁷ The word ‘environmental’ was used to mean countryside in more general terms than the word ‘nature’, whilst ‘management’ referred to a more active approach to the administration and running of the countryside. In the official report this basic view was clearly expressed:

Nature conservation is not just a question of protecting certain species of animals and plants or specially demarkated areas but also embraces the question of the *raison d’être* of managing countryside and the assets it enshrines of various kinds; cultural, social and economic.⁴⁸

This is recognisable as the 1930s principle of ‘rational economy of natural resources’, which in the space of 20 years had reached maturity in an act of parliament.

‘Management’ involved a more planned approach to the economic administration of the natural environment, but also referred to management in a concrete sense, such as efforts in the form of land management, or regulating weirs, in order to retain or improve the natural environment’s assets. Technology was thereby seen as a tool of centralised management and not just as a threat.

The ideas behind the institution of 'Common Land'

The main justifications for having 'Common Land' were of an ideological nature. Technological advancement and economic development paved the way for significant social reforms. One of the most important social improvements was that people had more free time. However, the very same development that guaranteed social advances could also pose a threat to them. Concentration of the population in the towns and urban areas brought with it increased competition for land and water resources. Desirable recreation areas were to a large degree reserved for the well-to-do, while at the same time the right of the majority to leisure and recreation was threatened by restricted freedom of movement. From the point of view of equality and democracy it was considered unacceptable that assets, which were intended to be of benefit to everybody, should be put in jeopardy – a fact which was the main motive for establishing 'Common Land'.

In order to guarantee the rights of everyone to the common benefits of the countryside it was regarded as necessary to increase political influence on the use of natural amenities. This was achieved by transferring certain rights from private to public hands – the Shoreline Conservation Act is an example of such a restriction on the right of landowners to utilise their land.

A more profound change in the position of nature conservation in the 1950s was thus a more aggressive approach in politics to the balance between public and private interests. This was indicated by, amongst other things, the passing in 1952 of the Shoreline Conservation Act and the new Nature Conservation Act. The former sought to guarantee access to shores and beaches for recreation purposes and for the first time involved the application of reversed conservation principles: shores received general protection in the first place, and interference/exploitation was subject to the authorities granting permission. Both the acts entailed restrictions in the right to private ownership. By means of the regulations in the Act on Preservation of Natural Landmarks (Monuments), it also became possible to expropriate land and place it under legal protection.⁴⁹ In this way one of the weaknesses of the 1909 Act was removed.

To sum up, the main features of the institution of 'Common Land' were nature parks, the right of expropriation and general conservation regulations.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT –
NATURE CONSERVATION ON ITS WAY TOWARDS ACHIEVING A
'CONCLUSIVE SOLUTION'

Towards a planned use of the natural environment

During the 1960s environmental management became nationalised. The reorganisation into a centrally orchestrated public concern constituted the final stage in a development which arose from the 1930s' reforms programme and led

to the view that the state needed to increase its powers to steer development towards defined social and democratic goals. As we have seen, the demands for 'a planned approach to managing natural resources' had already been articulated in conservationist circles in the middle of the 1930s, and discussions of broadly-based planning on a national level were resumed in earnest after the war.

At the end of the war the need for 'national planning' was aired in a bill of parliament and the fundamental thinking that lay behind the building legislation of 1947 constituted an increase in the level of planning and regulation of land demands. The Shoreline Conservation and Nature Conservation Acts also meant that society's influence on land use increased.

Society went markedly on to the offensive during the 1950s as demands on natural amenities were in a progress of rapid change. This was based on the realisation that technology's swift transformation of the landscape had to be countered by a well thought-out strategy. Forward thinking, planning, co-ordination and increased effectiveness were important catchwords for the state's emerging strategy. Growing ambitions concerning areas bordering on land planning management of the natural environment also became evident during the 1950s. Increasing demands on water resources were looked into from many angles and the fact that one of the reports – that of the Water Management Committee – explicitly referred to concept of conservation was hardly a coincidence. The assessment of different demands, not least those pertaining to recreation, occupied a prominent position in the report, the most tangible result of which was the establishment of the National Water Inspectorate, with overall responsibility for planning and supervision in issues relating to the quality of the nation's water.

Similar endeavours to increase public influence and control over the use/exploitation of the natural environment may be seen in a number of other reports from the same period.⁵⁰ There were also renewed demands for planning from within the nature conservation movement.⁵¹

The administration of nature conservation

The fact that a new Nature Conservation Report was commissioned only seven years after the new nature conservation legislation had been enacted, is itself illustrative of the rapid change in society. This change was occurring at an increasing rate and conflicts concerning the natural environment were also tending to multiply. Outdoor pursuits in the 'welfare society' now revolved around the car, and made completely different demands on the countryside compared to those of the interwar years.

In the discussions surrounding the re-examination of nature conservation, it is possible to discern two significant arguments on grounds of principle which were deployed to justify an increase in the state's influence. Firstly, it was considered that technical and economic developments within a number of

sectors of society seemed to be on their way towards outflanking political wills and intentions, which in the long run might also prove a threat to democracy. In the commission's terms of reference, attention was directed towards the rapid rate of development, as particularly illustrated by the rapid growth of motoring, and the large-scale expansion of hydro-electric power schemes.⁵² Concerns over this speed of development, and over reduced manoeuvrability for political action, were part of a wider-scale crisis which gave rise to National Land-use Planning (FRP, Sw. *Fysisk Riksplanering*).⁵³

Secondly, it was argued that the resources necessary for maintaining effective management of the natural environment were of such a magnitude that only the state would be able to finance it. This, of course, was in turn connected to the gradual shift from the establishment of nature reserves in limited areas of the countryside towards the care and management of most of the landscape. This would not only require financial resources for drawing up an inventory, planning, administration etc., but in addition funds would be required for the active upkeep of the landscape – eg. costly measures of land management in order to maintain, or imitate, old methods of maintaining the land or financial grants for culturally viable, but unprofitable, land-use.

Efficiency was the central watchword, according to the terms of reference of the commission, which resulted in the establishment of the Nature Conservation Board (1 July, 1963).⁵⁴ The fact that nature conservation was assigned a civil service department says something about government's ambitions. The fact that it was the smallest department says something about the overall role of environmental management.

Centralised planning was seen as an important instrument for creating an overview and forward thinking was regarded as necessary for retaining political freedom of action. FRP was therefore a logical continuation of earlier more or less successful efforts along these lines. From an environmental management point of view, dealing with land and water issues collectively was seen as an attempt to achieve 'a conclusive solution to the management of the natural environment'. 'Drawing up an inventory', 'analysis' and 'careful consideration' were the central tenets of planning.⁵⁵

THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AS A DEPARTMENT WITHIN THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION SECTOR

The continued revision of policies pertaining to land and water, and natural resources in general, and policies on the management of natural amenities in particular, led to the displacement of environmental management as a central issue, in favour of a growing environmental conservation sector.⁵⁶ The Natural Resources Committee issued a report on research needs in the area of environmental management. According to its findings, when the committee analysed

'the environmental management of the future', the argumentation in favour of scientific environmental management was supplemented, from a qualitative point of view, by a completely new argument. In 1900 the 'virginal' argument had ruled supreme; the natural environment was an archive and an experimental field centre. In 1930 a more 'evolutionary' view had asserted itself. Representative features of the natural environment acquired a prominent position, and by preserving all existing types of landscape, even 'common or garden' ones, a pictorial sequence of natural and cultivated landscapes could be saved. During the 1960s, on the other hand, people began to talk of the enormous value of the 'least spoilt' areas as environmental indicators. These were relatively untouched areas, where no '...amount of other human interference has smothered or concealed man's initially subtle influence, which yet might subsequently prove all the more serious...'⁵⁷

After having been the dominant issue, matters pertaining to the countryside's appearance (rather than the natural environment) were pushed more and more into the background. In the title of the newly established authority: the Swedish National Environmental Protection Board (SNV, 1967) the words 'environmental protection' certainly advertised the board's intentions. In reality, however, 'environmental protection' – for better or worse – was just one department within the environmental conservation sector. The most important reason for coordinating the various different problem areas was the endeavour to achieve an overview and to see things as a whole. However, in practice it proved difficult to maintain an overview of the different sectors, which constituted the ideological and scientific tenets of their coordination efforts.

The environment became an extensive field which covered a number of different and varied activities. In practice the activities encompassed by the SNV continued to be divided among different departments for the management of the natural environment, air and water. Grave images of insidious and invisible threats gave environmental problems to do with the spread of chemicals a high priority, which was significant when it came to dividing the resources of nature conservation and conservation of the the environment.

Environmental management and funds

Managing the natural environment involved expenditure, as an inevitable consequence of new conservation policies based on management measures: efforts to increase people's access to experiencing the countryside, purchase of land and compensation in connection with the expropriation of land; also the central administration needed for planning and coordinating all these efforts.

In guidelines for future research, however, environmental management issues received little attention. In the Natural Resources Committee's financial proposals for research into environmental management during the period 1967-1973, environmental management (nature-care) received about one quarter of

the total funds of just over 37 million Swedish crowns.⁵⁸ Half the funds for environmental management, however, were to go on game research; this was justified in the description of the problem as '...pressures from grazing and damage caused by herbivores'.⁵⁹ Funds available for research into damage to crops by game were of the same order as the total funds available for research into landscape management. At the same time, one must bear in mind that the FRP was at this stage the forum for discussing these issues.

It would take too much space to go into details of the effect the tug of war over funds has had on the prospect of achieving the political aims of environmental management. The environmental management sector's lack of funds must be seen against the backdrop of the 1963 Riksdag resolution to the effect that civil service departments and state-owned companies should in principle be self-supporting.

The commission of 1960 was fully aware of this problem when it drew up the guidelines for environmental management policies. There was talk of financing services by means of charging certain major commercial interests, but this was actually just a minor diversion in the discussions of the early 60s. Seen against the backdrop of an expanding public sector and a prevailing economic boom, funding did not seem to be a particular problem. But when the recession began in the 1970s financial matters came to a head. It was not just a matter of increased pressure on public administration to rationalise and make savings; environmental management had to assert itself as a one individual aspect of the environmental conservation sector, where new spectacular problems of high priority were continually coming to the fore, pushing aside issues of nature conservation.

The ombudsman becomes a civil servant

The phase during which the popular conservationist movements were established as nature's ombudsmen and acquired a more direct say in moulding the policies of nature conservation was short-lived. One of the reasons for appointing the 1960 Commission on the Management of the Natural Environment was that in political quarters it was considered unfeasible that such a considerable bulk of the work – of considering and commenting on proposals and the works of inquiry – should be carried out by voluntary organisations. Both the SNF and the KVA had complained about their onerous and resource-consuming tasks, possibly in order to improve their chances of receiving increased funding and retaining their status.

This, however, was not to be the case. By the establishment of the Nature Conservation Board, the function of ombudsman was moved to the sphere of public administration. Voluntary conservation organisations were certainly able to retain some of their advisory functions, in that they could still be requested to consider and comment on more important matters of environmental management. Even so, this constituted a demotion, while the day to day work of

managing the natural environment was transferred to public administrators. In the 1962 government report on nature conservation, indications were given as to the future role of voluntary organisations. The increased efforts of government in this area were to 'have a considerable affect on the structuring and the aims of voluntary organisations'. In plain language this meant that 'providing information on nature conservation' at grassroot level was assumed to be their most important future task fields.⁶⁰

'Reservation' entailed making a clear division between environmental management on a voluntary basis – devoted to informing the public about managing the natural environment and influencing public opinion on the subject – and environmental management on a public professional basis, responsible for the overall planning as well as the day-to-day running of the nature-care. Bureaucrats relieved voluntary conservation organisations of their work. The ombudsman became a civil servant. 'Reservation' was justified mainly from the point of view of it being necessary to find a more rational balance between individual versus corporate interests on the one hand, and economic versus non-economic interests on the other.

The rapid development of technology tended to have consequences which were difficult to foresee and to cope with these consequences a clearer division and balance between different claims was called for. The FRP was an attempt on a major scale to redistribute land and water resources among their different users.

There was broad support for the opinion that society should take over complete responsibility for this work, since only the state was able to mobilise the resources and the expertise necessary in order to make an overall assessment of, and provide a balance between, the various different interests in society.

CONCLUSION

An important trend throughout the 20th century has been the growing political interest in nature conservation and an increasing public involvement in issues concerning land and water. From the nation's point of view, nature conservation policy can be seen as an important part of a more general endeavour to dampen the effects of rapid and radical changes in society, and to bring developments into concord with economic, social and cultural aims. Keynesian economic policy may serve as a model for aspirations of balance and harmony.

Restrictions on individual rights of use and enjoyment of natural resources can be and have in fact been justified in several ways:

1. Interfering with the natural landscape in various ways has consequences whereby the instigators are not the only ones to be affected. An increased political say is justified from a democratic point of view.

NATURE'S OMBUDSMEN

2. From the point of view of society, use of the natural landscape in a way that is unregulated and impossible to survey leads to an inefficient and irrational utilisation of resources, making central control necessary in order to exploit resources to the full.
3. The increased utilisation of natural amenities leads to conflicts. For reasons of fairness, and for the practical task of allocation, it is necessary to carry out an overall needs analysis and distribute the various resources accordingly.
4. There is a lack of expertise/will to 'manage the countryside properly', making it necessary for society to oversee and regulate activities to point things in the right direction.

The democracy argument was perhaps articulated most clearly in the discussions of the 1930s, later becoming overshadowed by arguments of maximisation (exploiting resources to the full) and of reduction of conflicts to the minimum, arguments which were particularly prominent in the National Land-use era. This shift in emphasis reflects the different conditions of the different periods.

The 1930s did not bring about any reforms. However, the measures discussed and subsequently implemented after the war were characterised by the ambition to reform society. The driving force was a desire to achieve and safeguard fixed ideological goals ('everyone's right to leisure and recreation').

Against this position favouring a more active response is a more reactive one, where regulations are seen as a matter of compulsion, based on the realisation, for example, that certain trends of development may degenerate if they are pushed too far. In this way they may interfere with and obstruct other forms of development, or threaten the vital assets of society. These trends constitute a growing threat, which set its stamp on the foundation of FRP.

The three regulating institutions which succeeded each other during the 20th century were as follows:

	'Entailed Estate'	'Common Land'	'Reservation'
Year	1909	1930s	1964
Salient motives	Academic and cultural	Social	Long-term economic
Ombudsmen	Scientific elite	Popular movement	Bureaucrat
Features	National parks	Nature parks	Environmental Protection Board

The conservation demands of the 'Entailed Estate' were rather elusive and related to vaguely defined cultural and scientific goals. As far as the establishment of the 'Entailed Estate' was concerned, there were three main related factors which can account for its relative success: Firstly, there was an influential ombudsman who backed up the claims and ensured their political recognition. Secondly, more 'idealistic' arguments could be supported by more practical, economic ones, eg. valuable knowledge. Thirdly, the 'Entailed Estate' did not clash physically with the demands of economic interests.

Consequently, the 'Entailed Estate' was an uncontroversial political solution and was essentially a concession to a powerful group of interests. Outside this group interest in natural management remained slight. The breakthrough to democracy involved a political change of course. Rapid economic developments created an economic surplus which could be invested in social reforms. One of the most important reforms from a historical point of view was the increase in people's leisure time. In this respect the countryside acquired a real value as a social resource.

In conjunction with a growing realisation of the countryside's social significance, political interest in the countryside also grew. Parallel to this a new kind of ombudsman – idealistic nature conservationists with SNF at the fore – began to increase in strength. By looking to the social consequences of their new knowledge of the countryside and adapting their ideology to a changing society, the SNF managed to get themselves out of a difficult internal crisis, and become a popular movement. As a result of receiving the authorised status of ombudsman they were able to gain political influence. However, technical and economic developments proved far too swift for the newly established institution of 'Common Land'. When it became a reality at the beginning of the 1950s it was almost a reflection of the situation as it had been in the interwar period.

As far as technology is concerned, advocates of nature conservation have certainly taken note of the double role of technology as 'an improver of the environment' as well as 'an impairer of the environment', yet the advances of technology have never been questioned. On the contrary, new possibilities have often been seen in new technology as illustrated by the following quotation from the great expansion era of hydro-electric power:

However, technology has not come to a standstill and atomic power is on its way. In 20 or 30 years' time clearing land in order to store energy in the form of water will be regarded as out-of-date. The method of constructing power stations far from consumer centres and transmitting power thousands of kilometres will be abandoned.⁶¹

On the other hand, what has often been questioned are the motives behind the application of technology, particularly when technology has been combined with market forces and motives of short-term profit. Under the 'Entailed Estate' there were hopes that by appealing to economic interests to show consideration

in their operations, it would be possible to 'win industry over to the great patriotic cause'. During the 1930s the demands of nature conservation increased and the thesis that 'continued exploitation requires good reasons' was formulated.⁶²

The more stringent demands of the SNF and others, involved their taking part as negotiation partners in important decisions on the exploitation of the countryside. This same shift can be discerned when it comes to the characteristics of nature conservation; in the 1910s the central issue concerned which areas modern development should be excluded from. From the 1930s onwards it was more a case of finding a harmonious balance between technology and the natural landscape. In the case of the architectural design of hydro-electric power stations, for example, this expressed itself in a move away from the ambitions of the 1910s to call attention to feats of engineering, towards letting architectural design blend into the landscape.⁶³ During the 1950s technology became viewed, firstly, as something to be regulated and controlled in order to minimise its harmful effects on the countryside, and secondly, as a means by which to manage the natural environment.

Today, less than 5% of the surface area of Sweden is, in some way or other, exempted from exploitation. Furthermore, the representativeness of these areas of Sweden as a whole is pretty poor; 98% of national park areas are in Lapland, as well as well over half the total area of nature reserves (since Vindelfjället Nature Reserve constitutes more than half of the total area of all nature reserves). The SNV now wants to rectify this by creating more and bigger national parks.⁶⁴

By the early 1990s, the Swedish landscape was divided into four distinct land-use types, defined by technical and economic developments: homogeneous production areas, with agriculture, forestry and industry; residential areas; recreational areas; and finally, nature reserves. It remains to be seen whether the boundaries between them will remain the same in the twentyfirst century.

NOTES

Thomas Hillmo (born in 1961) died tragically 1994 when he just had finished his Ph.D. thesis 'The arsenic process: Debate and problem perspective on a hazardous substance in Sweden 1850-1919'. The present article, which draws on a previous joint paper in Swedish, was at that time in draft version.

¹ I. Juberg, 'Om Tåkern – ett föredrag inför Östergötlands hushållningssällskap' (Valla Folkhögskola, 23 november, 1983).

² Allemansrätten. Leaflet produced by the Swedish Forest Service (without date).

³ E. Fries, *Växternas fädernesland. – 1: En samling af strödda tillfällighetsskrifter*. (Uppsala, 1843).

⁴ 1811-1887, antiquarian and secondary school teacher.

⁵ K. Johannisson, 'Det sköna i det vilda. En aspekt på naturen som mänsklig resurs', in T Frängsmyr, ed., *Paradiset och vildmarken* (Stockholm, 1984). P. Forsman, *Arbetets arv* (Stockholm, 1989).

- ⁶ B. Sundin, 'Från rikspark till bygdemuseum. Om djurskydds-, naturskydds-, och hembygds-rörelserna i sekelskiftets Sverige', in *Naturligtvis. Uppsatser om natur och samhälle tillägnade Gunnar Eriksson* (Umeå, 1981).
- ⁷ Adolf Erik Nordenskiöld (1832-1901), Finno-Swedish baron, scientist and politician. Professor and curator at the National Museum 1858, member of the Swedish Academy 1893. Discovered the North-East Passage along the north coast of Asia 1878-79.
- ⁸ A.E. Nordenskiöld, 'Förslag till inrättandet af Riksparker i de nordiska länderna', in *Per Brahes minne* (Åbo, 1880), p 10.
- ⁹ H. Conwentz, 'Om skydd åt det naturliga landskapet jämte dess växt- och djurvärld, särskilt i Sverige', in *Ymer* (häfte 1, 1904), pp 17-42.
- ¹⁰ H. Conwentz, 'Naturskydd vid planläggning och utförande af industriella anläggningar', in *Naturskydd och industri* (Stockholm, 1915).
- ¹¹ The king, or the royal power as institution, or the state as a juridical person.
- ¹² S. Sörlin, *Framtidslandet. Debatterna om Norrland och naturresurserna under det industriella genombrottet* (Stockholm, 1988).
- ¹³ G. Andersson, 'Om skydd av intressantare skogstyper, skogsväxter och skogsdjur'. *Skogsvårdsföreningens tidskrift* (1904), pp 293-304.
- ¹⁴ G. Eriksson, *Kartläggarna. Naturvetenskapens tillväxt och tillämpningar i det industriella genombrottets Sverige 1870-1914* (Umeå, 1978).
- ¹⁵ E. Dmann, E. Bucht and M. Nordström, *Vildmarken och välfärden* (Stockholm, 1982).
- ¹⁶ Proposition to the Swedish Government, nr 102 (1909), p 27.
- ¹⁷ L. Lundgren, *Vattenförening. Debatten i Sverige 1890-1921* (Lund, 1974).
- ¹⁸ Conwentz, *Naturskydd*.
- ¹⁹ Meaning that the property should not be divided. It was not possible to sell, mortgage or distraint the property.
- ²⁰ *Boetius, Förslag till lärobok naturrätt* (1799).
- ²¹ C. Glacken, *Traces on the Rhodian Shore* (Berkely, 1976).
- ²² B. Rosén, 'Carl Fries och markens historia' in *Svenska Linnésällskapets årsskrift 1984/85* (1985), pp 177-239. M. Sjöbeck, 'Lövslogen och människan', *Sveriges Natur* (1934), pp 76-91, 'Vad en löväng är och hur den har uppkommit', *Bygd och natur* (1942), pp 104-113.
- ²³ 1866-1944.
- ²⁴ R. Sernander, 'Linné och lövängen', *Sveriges natur* (1934), pp 55-75.
- ²⁵ T. Frängsmyr, *Upptäckten av istiden. Studier i den moderna geologins framväxt* (Stockholm, 1976).
- ²⁶ D. Worster, *Natures Economy. The Roots of Ecology* (New York, 1979) and F. Clements, *Plants Succession* (Washington, 1916).
- ²⁷ T. Söderqvist, *The Ecologists. From Merry Naturalists to Saviours of the Nation* (Stockholm, 1986).
- ²⁸ 1891-1957. Author, botanist, critic of drama and literature. Chairman of the SNF 1936-47. Assistant prof. in plant biology 1951. Member of the Swedish Academy, mainly a lyric poet.
- ²⁹ M. Kylhammar, *Den okände Sten Selander. En borgerlig intellektuell* (Stockholm, 1990).
- ³⁰ R. Sernander, 'Naturskydd och turistväsen', *Sveriges natur* (1928), pp 1-23.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*
- ³² S. Selander, 'Naturskyddet och samhället', *Svensk natur* (1936), pp 1-23.
- ³³ SOU (Swedish Government Official Reports) 1935:26, SOU 1938:45.

NATURE'S OMBUDSMEN

- ³⁴ SNF 'Annual report 1936/37', *Sveriges natur* (1937).
- ³⁵ P. Rosenius, 'Vården om landskapet', *Sveriges natur* (1937), pp 5-27.
- ³⁶ D. Haraldsson, *Skydda vår natur! Svenska naturskyddsföreningens framväxt och tidiga utveckling*, (Lund, 1987).
- ³⁷ K.E. Forslund, *Hembygdsvård* (Stockholm, 1914).
- ³⁸ G. Hallström, 'Ung bonde naturskyddare', *Sveriges natur* (1910), pp 95-99.
- ³⁹ Selander, 'Naturskyddet'.
- ⁴⁰ Kylhammar, *Sten Selander*.
- ⁴¹ 1895-1982. Author. 1937-53 Director at the Nordic Museum (Stockholm). Published various articles on nature and on animals.
- ⁴² Proposal from KVA.
- ⁴³ Selander, 'Naturskyddet'.
- ⁴⁴ *Sveriges natur* (1927), p 160
- ⁴⁵ B. Sundin, 'Environmental Protection and Natinal Parks' in T. Frängsmyr, ed., *Science in Sweden. The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences 1739-1989*.
- ⁴⁶ SOU 1951:5.
- ⁴⁷ C. Schaar, *Naturskyddsbegreppet i Sverige. Ursprung, historik och innebörd* (Lund, 1978).
- ⁴⁸ SOU 1951:5, p 206.
- ⁴⁹ SOU 1951:5, p109.
- ⁵⁰ SOU 1948:4, 1948:32, 1951:6, 1951:32, 1952:15, 1957:17, 1960:3, 1960:38, 1962:44, 1963:36.1964:42.
- ⁵¹ O. Lundgren, 'Naturen och den översiktliga planläggningen', *Sveriges natur* (1957), pp 69-78. M. Carlman, 'Naturskydd och bebyggelseplanering', *Sveriges natur* (1954), pp 35-43.
- ⁵² SOU 1962:36.
- ⁵³ H. Forsberg, 'Ordnad exploatering. Fysisk riksplanering växer fram', *Tema V rapport 13*, (Linköping, 1989).
- ⁵⁴ Which in 1967 became Statens naturvårdsverk (SNV, the Swedish National Environment Protection Board).
- ⁵⁵ FRP materials (Stockholm, 1969)
- ⁵⁶ Environmental management vs environmental conservation.
- ⁵⁷ SOU 1967:43, part 1, p 147.
- ⁵⁸ SOU 1967:44, part 2.
- ⁵⁹ SOU 1967:43, p 162.
- ⁶⁰ SOU 1962:36, p 404.
- ⁶¹ S. Sundius, 'Akkjåure, den dränkta nationalparken', *Sveriges natur* (1955).
- ⁶² Kylhammar, *Sten Selander*.
- ⁶³ K. Nilsson, *Industri möter landskap* (Alnarp, 1988).
- ⁶⁴ Nationalparksplan för Sverige. Naturvårdsverket, (Solna 1989).