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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present article is to investigate the ‘career’ of the High Coast as landscape. The High Coast in north-eastern Sweden has become a popular tourist site annually attracting hundreds of thousands of visitors from throughout the world. Its environment is not only considered pleasing from a recreational aspect, but also of extraordinary intrinsic value. Citing the fact that the area has evidenced the greatest land elevation anywhere since the end of the Ice Age, the High Coast was placed on UNESCO’s prestigious World Heritage List in the year 2000, thereby becoming the first site in all of northern Europe to earn that status purely on account of its natural environment. In the present article, aspects of the process whereby the High Coast’s value has been articulated and established are examined. Particular attention is paid to tourism and scientific, artistic and environmentalist activities pursued in the area during the twentieth century, and connections are made between these activities and the socio-economic development of the region. Furthermore, a comparison between the High Coast and the Grand Canyon in the south-western United States is made.
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INTRODUCTION

The province Ångermanland in north-eastern Sweden has long been associated with Ådalen – a region known for its vital forestry and pulp and paper indus-
tries, and populated by labourers and lumber barons.¹ This is no longer the case.
Today, it is the High Coast which comprises the focal point of Ångermanland.
The area somewhere in between the towns of Härnösand and Örnsköldsvik ‘is’
so evidently the High Coast that it is taken for granted, at least by those who
have not lived there for any stretch of time. The name can be found on maps and
road signs, in books and tourist brochures and many other marketing contexts.
That a company calls itself ‘Entry High Coast, Inc.’, and that a gigantic, newly-
completed hanging bridge over the Ångermanland River has been christened
‘the High Coast bridge’ (after a certain amount of discussion) are expressions of
this fact, along with the many stores, restaurants, and camping grounds which
advertise themselves as ‘the gem of the High Coast’ or at least claim to lie ‘at
the heart of the High Coast’.²

Another widespread and accepted perception today is that the environment
of the High Coast is of exceptional value. The High Coast not only contains a
national park and a series of nature reserves; due to the area’s extraordinary land
elevation since the Ice Age, it has also been placed on UNESCO’s prestigious
World Heritage list (2000), becoming the first site in all of northern Europe to
earn that status purely on account of its natural environment. ‘The remarkable
environment of the High Coast has fascinated Swedes for centuries. Now, the
pride of Norrland has achieved world renown’, according to the High Coast
website.³

However, the status of the High Coast ought not to be taken for granted.
Exactly where the geographic borders of the High Coast lie, and what the area
actually comprises, are questions still in dispute today. The interesting thing about
the High Coast is not only that the area is diffuse and seems to be expanding all
the time, but that the estimation of its fantastic environmental value and its very
name are relatively latter-day phenomena. In fact the name ‘High Coast’ was
not used until the 1970s. This new, rapidly accepted name effectively reflected
the physiognomy of the region – it is undeniably ‘high’ in places. But behind
the name and the establishment of the place, there is a story which begs the
question: How did the High Coast go from being an undefined region, or more
correctly, a number of regions with various names and other connotations, to a
well-known spot worthy of a place on the World Heritage list? In other words,
how has the High Coast made a ‘career’ as landscape, and who were the actors
involved in the process?

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF LANDSCAPE

The history of the High Coast can be analysed advantageously from a landscape-
theoretical perspective. In recent years, research on landscape has broadened sig-
nificantly and the literature emanating from the humanities focused on landscape
has thus become relatively extensive.⁴ What a large portion of this research has
in common is the theoretical point of departure, i.e. that landscape is not to be understood as either nature (‘natural landscape’) or culture (‘cultural landscape’) but rather as both. This perspective implies at least three things.

First, a landscape has both a concrete, physical dimension, featuring mountains, soil, water, flora, fauna, buildings, cultural information, etc., and a mental and symbolic dimension, featuring emotions, ideas, knowledge, etc. One might say that landscape is both something palpably spatial and material which exists ‘out there’, and something emotional and intellectual which exists ‘in there’, and which varies from person to person. Secondly, a landscape is not a static entity, a fixed scenery, but rather something which constantly undergoes transformation through geological, climatological, biological, technical, cultural, ideational and other processes. This implies, thirdly, that the concept landscape connects both the ‘sublime’ and the ‘commonplace’ and that the values ascribed to a landscape – aesthetic, financial, cultural, natural – and which are central for people in general and for nature and culture conservationists in particular, are not discovered and established once and for all, but are rather invented, socially constructed and historically situated.

There are a variety of methods available to those who would study the High Coast from a landscape theoretical perspective. My primary source of inspiration is environmental historian Stephen J. Pyne’s book *How the Canyon Became Grand* (1998). That I choose to emphasise this book in particular is not only due to Pyne’s successful manner of combining the history of geology with a constructivistic historical landscape analysis, but also because my thesis about the career of the High Coast as a landscape is strikingly reminiscent of the Grand Canyon’s (although there are differences as well). A brief presentation of Pyne’s study may clarify my reasoning.

Today, the gigantic Grand Canyon is one of the world’s most famous natural phenomena and, along with Niagara Falls and Yellowstone National Park, is North America’s foremost natural monument. The valley has been sculpted by millions of years of erosion, mostly due to the running waters of the Colorado River. But, as Pyne says, the Grand Canyon cannot only be understood as a natural phenomenon with obvious, positive value. That this canyon became ‘grand’ depends to a great degree on the meaning and the values with which the landscape has been successively instilled.

This landscape has been shaped by ideas, words, images, and experiences. Instead of faults, rivers, and mass wasting, the process at work involved geopolitical upheavals and the swell of empires, the flow of art, literature, science, and philosophy, the chisel of mind against matter. These determined the shape of Canyon meaning. As they converged in place and time, they distinguished the Canyon from among hundreds of other, competing landscapes.

The natural formations of the Grand Canyon were visited by Spanish explorers as early as the 1540s. But the landscape which these travellers found was
neither breathtaking nor particularly remarkable. The valley was apprehended rather as inhospitable, frightening, something to be avoided. In connection with scientific expeditions conducted during the eighteenth century, the area was revisited, but once again, the travellers found no nature of any particular value. Their gaze was instead fixed on the aboriginals who lived there; it was they who were seen as interesting objects of study, not nature. The fact is that it was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that the region began to crystallise as a particular place with special natural values. That the perception of the area changed at that particular moment in time was due to a combination of new sorts of ‘geopolitics’, ‘geosciences’ and ‘geopoetics’. While nature remained more or less the same, the political, scientific and cultural context changed.

Geopolitics stimulated a comprehensive inventory and topographic charting of the land. This geographic mapping contributed to the definition and proclamation of the new nation, at the same time as the national identity of the USA began to be coupled with nature, especially what was considered the country’s most magnificent natural scenes, like the Grand Canyon: ‘The more majestic the scene, the more celebrated it became; the more singular, the more valued.’ Even more significant than geography for the apprehension of the Grand Canyon was the new science of geology, which analysed and gave names to mountain formations and placed them in an historical and evolutionary context. The United States Geological Survey, established in 1879, conducted an inventory of the area’s geography and many of the country’s leading geologists dedicated significant amounts of their careers to the Grand Canyon. By proving the significance that the structure and paleontological content of the layers of rock had for the understanding of the development of the earth and of life, these researchers instilled the area with unique natural values.

At the same time as nationally and historically oriented science was developing, nature began to be paid attention in a new way in American artistic and literary circles. Landscape painting became a popular genre and nature romanticism blossomed within literature. A number of these artists were particularly interested in the Grand Canyon and thereby reinforced the perception of the place that scientists had already created. Via scientists and artists, natural philosophers and authors, the area was redefined and charged with positive value. In less than forty years, this elite transformed the Grand Canyon into a sublime icon for American nationalism. What this elite had fixed in word and colour would soon also be fixed in law when the Grand Canyon was declared a National Park in 1919.

As Pyne shows, the image of the Grand Canyon continued to change by degrees during the twentieth century. From having been a component in a limited, elite culture, the place soon turned into a place of pilgrimage for the general public and part of American popular culture. With this increased tourism followed increased exploitation and commercialisation; for many, the experi-
ence of having visited the place was the most significant element, regardless of whether or not one understood the scientific meaning of the geological layers. However, in the post-war era, the Grand Canyon has once again assumed an aura of natural romanticism and become a weapon in the environmental debate in America. The place has come to represent the ‘untouched wilderness’ and bitter struggles have been fought over the conservation of the Colorado River. Thus a re-evaluation of exploitation of the area has taken place. Below, I will approach the High Coast in a manner similar to Pyne’s environmental history of the Grand Canyon, using empirical examples from science, the arts, conservationism and tourism.

SKULE MOUNTAIN AND THE IDEA OF THE HIGHEST SHORELINE

The name ‘High Coast’ was first broached in the 1970s and can therefore not be used as an empirical term for an historical study of this type. In order to understand the career of the High Coast from an historical perspective, it is necessary to choose another point of entry, preferably that part of the area comprised of the Skule Forest and Skule Mountain (‘Skule’).

The reason why Skule today enjoys a place in the consciousness of many can partially be found in the book *The Forest of Hours* (1988) by the Swedish author Kerstin Ekman, a well-known name throughout Scandinavia who has also been translated into numerous European languages. However, in contrast with the High Coast, Skule has a long discursive existence behind it, at least since 1518, when the Swedish churchman Olaus Magnus (1490–1557) visited it and later marked it as *Skvla mons* on his magnificent map of the Nordic countries: *Carta Marina* (1539). Of ancient date are also certainly the tales of mountain trolls and bandits, for example the legendary ‘Skule Mountain Man’, to whom Ekman refers in her novel. The Swedish King Charles XI is said to have wished to climb to the secretive Skule Cave during a visit to the area in 1694, after which it was referred to as ‘the King’s Cave’. This moniker is however somewhat misleading, since the king was advised not to attempt reaching the cave and, apprised of the risks, mostly likely decided not to visit it. Difficult as it is to determine whether or not these stories are true, they do testify to the fact that Skule was not always seen as a pleasant place to be. Five hundred years ago Skule, with its so-called ‘devil’s fields’ (boulder-ridges), was, like the Grand Canyon, a frightening place best avoided.

And like the Grand Canyon, Skule drew the successive attention of travelling naturalists and topographers. Urban Hiärne and Olof Rudbeck the Younger described the area, as did Carl Linnaeus, Abraham A:son Hülphers and Göran Wahlberg, to name some of the more famous examples from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These travellers were however only marginally im-
pressed by the natural environment of the region. In his description of his travels in Lapland, *Iter Lapponicum* (1732), the young Linnaeus states that he found Skule Mountain to be ‘dreadfully steep’, and that he was close to losing his life during the torturous climb up to Skule Cave. Having finally arrived, he was disappointed: ‘Here, where I expected to find something curious, I found no more than a house in the rock made like a round plot or vault.’ For Linnaeus the Sami culture of the north – the ‘Lapps’ – was indeed of much more interest than this useless mountain.

The perception of Skule’s nature as something unique and important would not be established until the end of the nineteenth century. Once again, it was geographers and geologists who played the leading role, and once again it was a case of scientifically charting the country’s past. While the Grand Canyon became significant to the study of the most ancient history of the earth, Skule became significant for the study of developments after the most recent Ice Age.

With the breakthrough of Ice Age and evolutionary theories in the mid-1800s, what can be called a national nature research project was initiated in Sweden. Its goal was to study and describe how ‘Sweden’s’ environment had evolved from the (most recent) Ice Age through to historic time: How had the contours of the land and the waterways formed? In what order and when did the various types of flora and fauna, and finally mankind, colonise the land? How and why did the climate change? An important component in this research was to study the way in which the relationship between land and water had changed since the most recent Ice Age. These level changes had previously been considered as being the result of water diminishment. Now the phenomenon instead began to be related to the influence of the inland ice. The theory was that due to the sheer weight of this ice, the land mass had first been pressed down and then, as the ice melted away and the pressure subsided, a counter-reaction occurred. Thus land elevation.

Respected Swedish geologists, palaeontologists and botanists like Axel Erdmann, Alfred Nathorst, Gerard De Geer, Henrik Munthe, Arvid Högbom, Gunnar Andersson, Rutger Sernander and Lennart von Post all dedicated themselves to attempting to understand the process of land elevation, and as a result, the search for the highest marine shoreline began. The highest marine shoreline was perceived as the geographic border which could show how much of Sweden had previously lain under water. Furthermore, geologists felt that land elevation in Sweden had been highly irregular, the theory being that this irregularity could be described once the borderline had been localised. The highest marine shoreline’s level about the sea proved to vary strongly in different parts of Sweden.

For a long time, disagreement reigned among geologists as to where the marine shoreline actually lay and thus also where land elevation had been the most palpable. In 1888, geologist and polar researcher Gerard De Geer (later professor in Stockholm) proposed a law of land elevation which stated that the
elevation had been the greatest in the central regions of Sweden, something which he attempted to illustrate with maps describing land elevation curves. The theory received attention and was nearly raised to the level of accepted truth by many researchers, though not all. In contrast, geologist Arvid Högbom (later professor in Uppsala), who came from the province Västerbotten, just north of Ångermanland, and who unlike De Geer conducted extensive field research in Norrland, maintained that land elevation had probably been greatest along the coastal region of Norrland. That the shift in the shoreline there was notable even in contemporary times was something that could be proven thanks to the old water level markers, found chiselled into the coastal cliffs. Other proposals for such ‘land elevation centres’ were presented and only after a decade’s worth of controversy could the matter be decided in Högbom’s favour.

A follow-up problem to the question of the marine shoreline concerned localising the exact spot for maximum land elevation (where the highest coastline is at its highest in relation to the current sea level). It was here that Skule Mountain eventually entered the picture. In his nearly-forgotten doctoral dissertation *Studier öfver Baltiska hafvets qvartära historia* (Studies of the Quaternary History of the Baltic Sea) from 1892, geologist and conservationist Henrik Munthe describes the following discovery:

The peak of Skule Mountain reaches 292.7 m., according to the General Staff’s map of Sweden’s central region. A smaller area of ‘surge gravel’ (fine gravel with fist-sized, well-rounded stones), located a couple of metres above the typical, rougher beach gravel, arranged in neat banks, in the valley north of the highest points of the mountain, must be apprehended as the surge line itself, since nowhere else above this line could any traces of the sea’s activity be discovered, though here and there on the polished and grooved rock could be found small spots of moraine material (rock powder with scored stones) which, if the sea had indeed reached here, would have been swept away immediately. [According to measurements] this surge line lies 23.9 m. lower than the mountain top and is thus 268.8 m. above sea level.\(^{18}\)

Henrik Munthe argued that the marine shoreline’s highest point was to be found on the peak of Skule Mountain. This information enticed numerous other geologists to visit the place in question. New marine shoreline values were reported and after several years, Munthe’s record of 268.8 metres above sea level had been easily beaten. In an essay published in the *Geologiska Föreningens i Stockholm Förhandlingar* (Transactions of the Geological Association of Stockholm) in 1904, Arvid Högbom wrote, ‘As a median value for the marine shoreline of [Skule Mountain], I am inclined to set it at 284 m., in other words approximately 15 m. higher than the level assumed by Munthe’.\(^{19}\) With that, the question of the maximum land elevation in Sweden was considered to have been solved: The answer was to be found in the Skule region along the coast of Ångermanland. The primary cause for this was said to be the fact that during the most recent Ice Age, the inland ice had been at its thickest at that very place.
THE IMPORTANCE OF LAND ELEVATION

Thanks to its noticeable land elevation, Skule became famous not only within Swedish scientific circles but also internationally. Part of the reason for this was the grand 11th International Geological Congress, arranged in Stockholm in 1910. Beyond the conference itself, a number of field expeditions were arranged for the foreign delegates, so that they could behold Swedish nature with their own eyes. The destination of one of these excursions was Skule and its highest marine shoreline, and according to the guidebook commissioned in honour of the occasion, it is clear that the phenomenon was now seen as something remarkable. Arvid Högbom, who led the excursion, writes here that, ‘Das absolute Maximum, zugleich das Maximum in ganzen fennoskandischen Hebungsgebeit, 284 m., is am Skuluberget zwischen Hernösand und Örnskölsvik bestimmt worden’.21

Ever since that conference, the area now known as the High Coast has comprised a shrine for researchers who choose to study land elevation and other geological phenomena, such as river valleys and banks, caves and boulder ridges. For example, in 1913 South American geologist José Sobral wrote his doctoral dissertation on Contributions to the Geology of the Nordingrå Region.22 Another contribution earning much praise was made by Gerard De Geer’s student Ragnar Lidén, who estimated the speed of land elevation by counting the layers of clay along the Ångermanland River valley. These layers were assumed to represent annual intervals, and in order to tie this time scale to historic time, Lidén coupled his data to historically dateable shoreline on land. The first results of these studies, Geokronologiska studier öfver det finiglaciala skedet i Ångermanland (Geochronological studies in Ångermanland), were published in 1913 to international acclaim.23 Using the so-called ‘geo-chronological method’, together with other techniques (including pollen and diatomacy analysis), it later became possible to interpret the geographic development of the river itself, from its first outlet at the prehistoric settlement of Nämforsen river approximately 7,500 years ago, to the city of Sollefteå some 4,000 years ago, to today’s outlet in the bay on the current coast.24

However, as geological research continued to expand, the question of the position of the highest shoreline, as well as the spot for maximum land elevation, came into debate. In 1937 Skule Mountain was confronted with a challenger in the form of nearby Rosstjärn Mountain which, according to geologist Per Stolpe, was to have risen to all of 295 metres.25 However, shortly thereafter the value of 292 metres was reported from a new point on Skule Mountain. When the Swedish Geological Survey set out to compile maps over the highest shoreline for a new Swedish Atlas in the 1950s, it chose to hedge its bets by including both numbers as ‘the Swedish record in land elevation’.26 These numbers too
would be challenged and as late as 1961, geologist Gösta Lundqvist wrote that ‘Skule Mountain still gives quaternary geologists no peace’. Today, the most commonly cited value is 285 metres above sea level, and the value of the current land elevation is given as 8–9 mm per year. ‘Give or take a few metres makes it no less impressive’, as local author Lars Bergström puts it.

These geological interpretations of the land’s elevation since the most recent Ice Age would eventually be combined with other sciences, such as plant geography, archaeology and historical cultural geography, in an often successful, cross-disciplinary manner. One can perhaps, with Peter Galison’s concept, say that the landscape functioned as a ‘trading zone’ for researchers from various disciplines.

Unlike its geological mapping, the systematic archaeological study of Ångermanland (and the rest of Norrland) proceeded slowly. It actually really began picking up the pace in connection with lake storage capacity regulation and the installation of power plants in the 1940s. The famed rock carvings found at the prehistoric settlement of Nämforsen were of course paid particular attention. However, archaeologists and geographers also dedicated themselves to attempting to interpret the development of the ancient settlement. It was while carrying out this work that knowledge of landscape change and historical geography became significant. One of the pioneering works in this field was geographer Karl Ahlenius’ study Ångermanälvens flodområde: En geomorfologisk-antropogeografisk undersökning (1903; The Ångermanland river basin: A geo-morphological and anthropo-geographical survey). Ahlenius based his anthropo-geographical view primarily on the natural deterministic theories of Friedrich Ratzel, but the idea of the unique elevation of the place, which in turn made the area particularly interesting from a geographic point of view, was borrowed from the above-mentioned Arvid Högbom. The evolution of the vegetation of Ångermanland and its connection to land elevation was also described by, among others, the botanists Gunnar Andersson and Selim Birger in their magnum opus Den nordiska florans geografiska fördelning och invandringshistoria (1912; The geographical distribution and immigration history of the flora in the north of Sweden).

The geological studies made it possible to follow and date the gradual shift of the shoreline and therefore also the settlements in Ångermanland; or, to put it another way, to understand how early cultural development had been influenced by natural development. Thanks to this knowledge about the process of land elevation, the Swedish Central Board of National Antiquities believes it can today display and date relics from the Stone Age, the Bronze Age and the Iron Age, and from historic time, within a relatively limited area of the High Coast.
From the above argument one could conclude that it was field scientists who ‘discovered’ the area which later became the High Coast and invested the place with both natural and cultural values, primarily from a geological point of departure. However, as in the case of the Grand Canyon, authors, artists and tourists were also involved in this process as the twentieth century unfolded. Over time, the coast was given a particular glamour through the stories and paintings of famed Swedish cultural personalities including Ludvig ‘Lubbe’ Nordström, Birger Norman, Helmer Osslund, Arne Olsson and many more. Author and journalist Olof Högberg (1855–1932) is another well-known chronicler of Norrland, who is perhaps best remembered for his powerful suite of novels entitled *Den stora vreden* (1906; The great fury). Less known is the fact that Högberg was the co-author of the grade school textbook *Medelpad och Ångermanland* (1920), where he examines the land elevation phenomenon in a pedagogical manner for younger schoolchildren.

The textbook deals with a boy named ‘Peter Curious’ who, with the aid of the mysterious Grey Hunter, studies the mysteries of nature and culture around his hometown. In the first chapter, entitled ‘Where the sea once stretched’, they stand together atop Skule Mountain discussing how the place might have looked in another time. Peter himself notes several signs that the sea level must have been higher in bygone days. However, the Grey Hunter explains that it is not the water which has sunk, but rather the land which has risen out of the waves: ‘The scholars apparently have measured and figured out that the land rises some half-ell out of the sea every hundred years.’ As if by magic, Peter is then transported thousands of years back in time and ends up on the peak of Skule Mountain, which now comprises little more than a small island. Standing there with the cold water lapping at this boots, he gazes out over the desolate, stone-riddled blocks of ice and contemplates nature’s past. What a fantastic transformation Skule had undergone! This, Olof Högberg seems to be saying, is a region one could surely be proud to live in.

The elevated coast was also portrayed as a tourist attraction. Places like Skule, Nordingrå, Ullånger, Trysunda and Ulvöarna were mentioned in the context of the burgeoning enthusiasm for outdoor tourism as early as the end of the nineteenth century and a few travelogues from the areas began to appear in the Swedish Tourist Federations’s (STF) publications. The landscape was often compared to the well-established tourist destination of Switzerland, which became a common point of reference in Sweden. That this was so from the beginning can perhaps be explained by the fact that scientific researchers and outdoor enthusiasts were often drawn from the same category of individuals. But the articulation of land elevation and its meaning for an historically correct view of the landscape would remain intact, even when outdoor life, through increased vacation time and improved communications, became a matter for the broader
general public by the mid-1900s. For example, the article ‘Nordingrå’, written by well-known Norrland author Albert Viksten and published in the Swedish Tourist Federations’s 1936 yearbook, opens in this suggestive manner:

When the first people reached the coast of Ångermanland several thousand years ago, they encountered a whole other landscape than the current one. At that time, our land had gone through a comprehensive renewal due to the inland ice. The sea stretched far in over the coastal region and the areas now settled were comprised of an archipelago of storm-beaten islands, skerries and islets, where seals played among the schools of salmon. Skule Mountain [...] has the highest marine shoreline in our country (284 m.); in other words, land elevation has occurred here at a rather hasty tempo.

Using scientific data to describe and arouse interest for a place is nothing unique for the tourist industry. It is also common to take the story as far back in time as possible, since this lends the place a continual tradition, in Skule’s case all the way back to the Ice Age. What is interesting here is Viksten’s mentioning the unique land elevation, which was also done by other writers who described the area for the general public. Per Stolpe and Sten Grapengiesser wrote lyrically of the land elevation of the coast of Ångermanland in the popular periodicals Jorden runt (1929; Around the globe) and Norrland i natur och bild (1929; The nature and pictures of Norrland), respectively. And in the very first issue of local periodical Bygd och Natur (1939; Countryside and nature), botanist and conservationist Sten Selander wrote a declaration of love to ‘the land of harmonious contrasts’. There are probably many more similar texts which have mediated and reinforced this image over time.

In the Swedish Tourist Federation’s 1969 yearbook, whose theme is Ångermanland, a whole chapter is not surprisingly dedicated to ‘The Land Which Emerges from the Sea’. The impact land elevation has on nature is discussed from various perspectives and various locations, but the focal point of the story is once again Skule: ‘Skule Mountain is also a palpable illustration of this process of land elevation, which distinguishes a large part of Ångermanland and which is notable in the region still today,’ geologist Jan Lundqvist says. ‘The highest shoreline, the highest level reached by the sea, lies on Skule Mountain, higher than anywhere else in Sweden, 285.5 metres above sea level.

Through texts like this one Skule, like the Grand Canyon, went from being part of an elite culture to becoming known and embraced by a broader general audience. At the same time, land elevation eventually became part of the area’s regional identity. Today, the High Coast is of course seen as much more than an elevated coast formed by the force of the inland ice; but in order to emphasise the continuity of the landscape story, I wish to quote from the latest tourist guide (1998) to the area. It begins in the following manner: ‘There was no high coast in Ångermanland when the inland ice first receded. The only thing that could
be seen was a tiny islet just above the surface of the water. Today, this islet is the peak of Skule Mountain, some 295 metres above the sea.\(^{47}\)

THE CONCEPTUALISATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HIGH COAST

The late 1960s and early 1970s mark a new epoch in the history of the origins of the High Coast. As mentioned in the introduction, Ådalen was during most of twentieth century a vital national centre for forestry and pulp and paper industries. It was this industry first of all that made Ångermanland a rich and well known place. However, with the rationalisation and subsequent decline of agriculture, fisheries, saw mills and the pulp and paper industry in Sweden, the booming tourist industry began to increasingly emerge as a possible income replacement for the area. Simultaneously, questions about the environment, conservation and outdoor life had been raised to central federal concerns in Swedish welfare politics and in Social Democratic social policy. The government enquiry *Friluftslivet i Sverige* (1964–1966; Outdoor life in Sweden) was published in three volumes and was soon followed by *Hushållning med mark och vatten* (1971; Conservation of land and water).\(^{48}\) Thus physical federal planning was initiated and in connection with this, ‘northern Ångermanland’s steep coast’ was named one of three Swedish coastal areas featuring ‘special qualities’ for outdoor life. The place (more specifically the Nordingrå) was also featured in the governmental tourism committee’s final report, *Turism och rekreation i Sverige* (1973; Tourism and outdoor recreation in Sweden) as one of twenty-three prime recreational areas in the country.\(^{49}\) Just a few years earlier, the area’s tourism, natural values and conservation concerns had been addressed in a theme issue of the Swedish Conservation Association’s periodical *Sveriges Natur* (1966; The nature of Sweden).\(^{50}\)

On the county administrative level (Västernorrland), febrile activity was initiated in order to meet the new socio-economic and environmental needs and demands. The province’s tourist installations were inventoried and evaluated and a special inventory of natural, as well as cultural, values in Västernorrland (including Ångermanland) was conducted.\(^{51}\) The individual responsible for this work was bureau inspector Lars Guvå, a man who in time would become a significant actor in the discussion of the High Coast and whom we shall have reason to return to later on. In 1972, a special coordinating committee comprised of twelve individuals representing the municipalities of Örnsköldsvik and Kramfors and the county administration of Västernorrland was created. The group, soon taking the name ‘the High Coast Committee’, presented their three hundred page *High Coast Enquiry* two years later.\(^{52}\) How the name ‘High Coast’ was actually determined is a question which still remains to be investigated, but in the periodical *Höga Kusten* (1982), one can read the following:
In February 1972, in the midst of a hectic meeting of the High Coast Committee, the term ‘High Coast’ was minted. It immediately won over the committee and all who were in contact with it. And when the Höga kusten Enquiry was presented in 1974 for a surprised but sometimes delighted, sometimes negative audience, the name was etched into the hearts of many. Of this the conclusion can be drawn that the name ‘High Coast’ did not have a local connection with the people living in the area, but rather that it originated and was marketed ‘from above’.

The High Coast Enquiry can be seen as an expression of the great faith in rational environmental and social planning reigning in the Swedish welfare state during the 1970s. Its main report has without doubt been an important document in the career of the High Coast as landscape. In fact, it is probably the first detailed plan for a recreational area done on a regional level in Sweden. This is not the forum for an exhaustive analysis of the enquiry itself, but several principal themes can still be mentioned. The goal of the enquiry was to propose measures to (1) promote recreation, i.e. tourism, outdoor life and fitness, but also to (2) preserve and develop the natural and cultural landscape of the area and (3) create the opportunity for increased employment. In other words, the report more or less had the character of a ‘total program’ for the area’s environment and development, both as a recreational landscape and a region for employment. Beyond visionary elements like this, the report also offered a broad description of the physical landscape and, not unexpectedly, once again points out the land elevation’s significance for the uniqueness of the place: ‘Both the highest shoreline and the so-called land elevation reach their maximum height within the area of the High Coast.’

Aside from the main report with its many programmes, plans and maps, eight subsidiary reports and extensive study and propaganda material were compiled, including a gramophone record with newly-written, patriotic ‘High Coast music’. The record includes the song ‘Vind över vågen’ (Wind above the waves), which, in English translation, features the following romantic lines:

I am like a wind over the waves/ heading for steep ancient cliffs/ with a heart filled with desire for the High Coast/ where the clearest sky gives colour:/ I come with joy in my breast/ a sea breeze of romance/ to you with my desire for the High Coast/ and with love’s burning mystery.

Since the High Coast received such a prominent place in physical federal planning, at the outset there were no significant obstacles to securing financial resources for development. The High Coast Enquiry’s recommendations for adapting and redeveloping the landscape were included into the general plans of the municipalities in question and were soon realised with government support – tourist centres and camping grounds were built, trails were marked, quays constructed, ferry traffic increased, new information signs set up, old shacks renovated and rental cottages built. In Skule alone, slalom runs with chair lifts,
climbing trails and outdoor theatre were established. A special ‘nature room’ with exhibitions and local collections aimed at educating visitors was also constructed. The requisite miniature golf course was soon in place, as was the area’s own annual ‘Skule Music Festival’.\(^{56}\)

While these tourism measures were being taken, numerous other conservation and preservation measures were also developed. Aside from a conservation area, a number of natural preserves to protect ‘geological and biological values’, a bird sanctuary and protected natural monuments, Skule National Park (2,950 hectares) was established in 1984 as the icing on the cake.\(^{57}\) However, not only natural values were emphasised, but cultural environments and relics as well. One of these is the ‘Gene Fornby’ outside Örnsköldsvik, an Iron Age settlement which has been unearthed and become a sort of open-air museum telling the story of life and exploitation of natural resources in ancient times.

In connection with the work of the High Coast Committee, several local initiatives which belong in this context were also taken. The ‘Action Group for the High Coast, Docksta-Ullånger’, and a ‘Committee for the Planning of the High Coast’ founded by members of the National Agricultural Federation are but two. ‘High Coast Days’ and later the ‘High Coast Exhibitions’ became annual summer events; a ‘High Coast calendar’ and ‘High Coast paintings’ were produced; a ‘High Coast hockey team’ was organised in 1981, the same year that the ‘High Coast Marathon’ began to be run. At the Hola folk high school, weeklong courses in ‘High Coast Knowledge’ were started; and a colony of ‘High Coast artists’ was established as well. In recent times we have been offered everything from ‘High Coast beer’ and ‘High Coast wine’ to ‘High Coast fish’ (sour herring), and an imposing ‘High Coast Bridge’ has been erected. At the same time, the old name ‘Ådalen’ has been successively erased from local and national discourse and the public memory.

The term ‘High Coast’ was given further attention in books and the mass media. In 1975 Lars Bergström’s book Höga kusten was published, bearing the subtitle ‘Nature, people and tradition along the coast from Sundsvall to Örnsköldsvik – one of Sweden’s most beautiful and unique landscapes’. A year later, the tourist guide Västernorrland med Höga Kusten (1976) was published by the High Coast’s own imprint, CEWE Publishers.\(^{58}\) Among the contributors to the latter volume we find Lars Guvå. This same man later contributed to and eventually became publisher of the periodical Höga Kusten, which began appearing in 1975.

Alongside the local press, the periodical Höga Kusten is a welcome source for anyone who wishes to follow the public discussion of the area’s establishment as landscape (and the decline of Ådalen as well). On the one hand, the magazine has been an excellent tool in canonising the name and image of the High Coast as an area of unique nature and culture. During its first years of publication in particular, a great deal of space was dedicated to presenting natural phenomena
and special places, as well as portraits of famous authors, artists and other local profiles. At times, both aspects coincided, as in the article ‘Lubbe Nordström’s view of the High Coast’ or in the text ‘Preserving the High Coast – a duty for all’ (1977), written by then-Prime Minister Thorbjörn Fälldin, who also passes along the story of the land elevation:

> We know that in ancient times, the High Coast lay deep beneath the surface of the sea. The highest shoreline is located on Skule Mountain and lies some 294 metres above today’s. That future geologists will surely find the High Coast interesting is understandable against the background of the fact that land elevation in the area is today the greatest in all of Sweden, at 8–9 mm per year.⁵⁹

The fact that the High Coast did not exist during social activist Lubbe Nordström’s lifetime, and even less so in ‘ancient times’, seems not to have bothered the authors of these texts.

On the other hand, the periodical Höga Kusten has also been a forum for regional policy debate on the possibilities and problems of the High Coast, especially on how ‘natural and cultural tradition should be preserved at the same time as a realistic life based on the conditions of the day should be lived’, to quote nature enthusiast and journalist Nils Dahlbeck.⁶⁰ This equation has at times been apprehended as very difficult to solve. With time, economic grants diminished and larger projects in line with the proposals of the High Coast Enquiry became harder to realise at the rate first envisioned. The problematic financial situation was predicated on the fluctuation of income from tourism from year to year, and from summer to winter. ‘How can we attract tourists during the long, cold winter season?’ was a question often posed in the magazine.

Even the very idea of building a vital regional economy on tourism has been challenged, only to immediately be defended by others who insist that environmental tourism is a meaningful and important industry.⁶¹ In 1982, Lars Guvå wrote, ‘It is perhaps appropriate to compare the general development with the rate of land elevation. The ill-meaning critic, often without any ideas of his own, probably concludes gleefully that practically nothing has happened and that which has is as discernible as the land elevation itself’. However, Guvå insists that ‘the subjective, somewhat smug optimist, like yours truly, may think that these past ten years have been rather successful. […] Land elevation has meant that we have Sweden’s highest coast. We are also well on our way to creating the country’s finest coastal area’.⁶² What was needed to increase interest in the High Coast was first and foremost effective marketing, but also a better infrastructure, according to Guvå. The founding of the tourist organisation ‘Middle Sweden Travels’ (later renamed ‘Middle Sweden Tourism’) was a significant strategic move.⁶³ Another, I suggest, was the nomination of the High Coast to UNESCO’s World Heritage List.
THE WORLD HERITAGE PROCESS

The same year that the High Coast Committee began its work in 1972, the United Nation’s Organization for Education, Science and Culture (UNESCO) passed a special convention for the protection of the world’s foremost ‘cultural and natural heritage sites’, the so-called World Heritage Convention. Since 1978, environments and monuments which due to their ‘unique universal value’ are considered particularly significant to protect and preserve for future generations have been entered into UNESCO’s World Heritage List. In order to be declared part of the world’s natural heritage, at least one of four scientific and aesthetic criteria must be fulfilled. Sites nominated should:

1. be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth’s history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features; or

2. be outstanding examples representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals; or

3. contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional beauty and aesthetic importance; or

4. contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.

Determining what exactly boasts ‘outstanding universal values’ is naturally a complicated process – values of this sort are seldom universal. The nominees are however studied by special organs (the World Conservation Union studies natural heritage and the International Council on Monuments and Sites cultural heritage) whose evaluations in turn are studied by the World Heritage Bureau. The final decision is taken by the World Heritage Committee, which convenes once a year. At this moment (November 2004), the prestigious list contains 788 properties, whereof 611 are considered cultural, 154 natural, and 23 both cultural and natural. Not surprisingly, one of the first names on the list, appearing in 1979, was the Grand Canyon National Park.

Sweden joined the World Heritage Convention in 1985, and during the period 1991 to 1999, the first nine heritage sites in Sweden entered the list. Also during the 1990s, the thought of promoting the High Coast as part of the world’s heritage began to be discussed seriously. The manner in which these discussions were conducted is important to our understanding of how the career of the High Coast is to be understood. Who were the leading actors and
institutions? Who was in favour of the nomination, who was opposed to it and if so, on what grounds? It is also relevant to study the nomination applications in their various versions, as well as the debate following the final decision to declare the High Coast a World Heritage site in 2000. In what follows, I shall provide a brief summary of this process.

The initiative for nominating the High Coast to the World Heritage List was taken by the County Administrative Board of Västernorrland. But before they approached the Swedish Government, they first consulted the leaders of the concerned municipalities in the County, who turned out to be positive to the enterprise. To have this support was of utmost importance for the nomination process. The County Administrative Board also organised several public meetings in order to communicate the idea to the local population, and local interest groups and organisations as well. During these meetings most people were positive, but according to Mats Henriksson, who is currently working with the administration of the World Heritage, some were sceptical. These people were afraid that the project could imply new regulations, and that the coast where they lived their lives was going to be a big ‘open-air museum’ for foreign tourists to visit.

In these initial discussions, the High Coast was portrayed as a whole – as a natural *and* cultural landscape – within one area, where mainland, archipelago and the outlying waters were included. Culture was thus regarded as being as important as nature. But when the Swedish government, on behalf of the County Administrative Board of Västernorrland, decided to nominate the High Coast to UNESCO’s World Heritage List in 1998, it was nominated as a purely natural heritage site. What were the motives for that decision? The application provides a clear answer. Under the rubric ‘Statement of significance’, four reasons are presented, of which only one is aesthetic – that the landscape is one of great beauty – while the rest are strictly scientific (from geological, botanical and archaeological points of view). The scientific reasons are interestingly enough all related to land elevation, which in summation is portrayed in the following manner:

The greatest measurable land elevation (285 m.) and the most outstanding and most clearly formed geological traces of land elevation in Scandinavia can be found along the High Coast. The area is unique in its mighty land elevation. The High Coast reveals in concentrate the geological processes which have formed and continue to form Scandinavia after the Ice Age.

The development of flora after the melting of the inland ice is relatively well-known. The land which rises from the sea has been continuously colonized by flora and fauna. Various successions follow from this, prime examples including when sea coves become isolated and transformed into lakes of fresh water instead of brackish, or when the beaches are colonized by forest or turn into fens.

The culture-historical development from the Stone Age to the present day is also reflected in the land elevation. The oldest settlements always lie highest in the
terrain, along or over the older shorelines. Unique in the world is that relics from all the various cultural historical stages can be found here, and that they are gathered very closely together. Under the rubric ‘Criteria under which inscription is proposed’, where the High Coast’s so-called ‘outstanding universal values’ are presented, the above argument recurs. However, a small addition is that the place’s value from a touristic point of view is emphasised, at the same time as in another section, it is emphasised that tourism poses no risk to natural values – something that happened in the Grand Canyon. In summary, one can say that the High Coast was nominated as a world natural heritage site on the grounds of the extraordinary land elevation of the area, according to UNESCO’s Criterion Number 1. It was land elevation and the phenomena associated with it that made the place unique and valuable. This strategy seems however not immediately to have convinced the decision-makers. Some members of the World Heritage Committee were not only sceptical about classifying an area of land elevation as part of the world’s heritage, they also had a difficult time understanding what was actually meant by the term ‘land elevation’. Another important problem was of a technical scientific nature. How can land elevation be measured exactly, and how can one be certain that land elevation really was greatest on the High Coast? The Hudson Bay region in Canada was a fierce competitor in this aspect; land elevation there had actually been estimated as at least as much as on the High Coast. Furthermore, a comprehensive ‘maintenance plan’ for the High Coast was also lacking. The first application, which was considered at the World Heritage Committee meeting in Marrakesh in December 1999, was therefore tabled. How land elevation, or a landscape which constantly grows by 9 mm per annum, could really be preserved and protected is an interesting question, which however was never discussed. How does one ‘maintain’ land elevation, and why is that important for future generations? However, the Swedish administrators of the project did not give up. In order to answer the questions posed by the rejection of the first application, new geological conferences and field excursions were arranged, at the same time as a network of institutions was established. Together, the county administration of Västernorrland, the National Swedish Environmental Protection Board, the Swedish Central Board of National Antiquities and the Swedish Geological Survey subsequently complemented the High Coast’s application. The important thing was no longer to measure the greatest land elevation in the world, but rather the greatest land elevation caused by the most recent inland ice (so-called glacio-isostatic land elevation). The High Coast’s scientific history was also produced as an argument: ‘Long-term study of the High Coast proves that the region is a key area of global significance to a greater degree than Hudson Bay for the interpretation of geological, biological and culture-historical effects of the great inland ices and land elevation.'
The new application was submitted to UNESCO in April, 2000, and this time, the decision was positive. Criterion Number 1 was now seen to be achieved and at the meeting of the World Heritage Committee in Cairn, Australia, on 29 November 2000, the High Coast was declared a World Heritage Site. The combined efforts of regional actors, natural and cultural conservation authorities and the Swedish government finally bore fruit. With much pomp and circumstance, and in the presence of the current Swedish minister of the environment, Kjell Larsson, the World Heritage Site the High Coast was inaugurated in the summer of 2001.\(^73\)

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In contrast to the Grand Canyon, it is not hard to find the High Coast remarkably beautiful. The rolling coast and its russet-coloured granite, the diverse biology and the partially-preserved settlements from the fishing societies of ancient days combine to present a singularly suggestive rural environment. Undoubtedly, the landscape possesses, as they say, an ‘exceptional natural beauty’ – at least in the summertime, and at least for those who have learned to appreciate it, myself included. But it is not merely the physical landscape, or the immediate aesthetic experiences and other sensuous impressions it can provide, that comprise the High Coast. The High Coast owns a deep cultural dimension, based on the numerous environmental values which over a long period of time have been articulated by scientists, authors, artists and, in recent times, by conservationists, politicians and tourist agents. Many have loaned the landscape their voices and the physical landscape cannot be distinguished from their tales.\(^74\)

The discussion about Skule, land elevation and the highest shoreline, which was conducted for over a century, is one of the factors contributing to the construction of the High Coast. Here, there is of course scientific value for the geologist, archaeologist and biologist, but also for the tourist. He who stands atop Skule Mountain on a clear summer day has a fantastic view over forest, land and water. But for he who, like little Peter Curious, appreciates the natural history of the place – that the sea once reached all the way to the top, so that the mountain was but a tiny islet – the experience is different.

I would claim that land elevation has offered metaphorical and symbolic value. The place – and in particular Skule Mountain – has become an icon around which a regional identity revolves, just as the Grand Canyon became a national icon for the United States.\(^75\) The fact is that land elevation in Scandinavia has been ascribed positive qualities ever since the theory of water diminishment was rejected at the outset of the nineteenth century. Geographer and historian Zacharias Topelius, for example, happily availed himself of natural symbolism of this sort in order to instil nationalistic emotion in the population of Finland. ‘This is a new land, which with every generation emerges from the sea, and
each century rewards Finland with a new principality’, he wrote in *En resa i Finland* (1873; A journey through Finland). Thus for Topelius, Finland was ‘the Baltic’s most beloved child’, which, like Aphrodite rose from the lap of the sea, and which with the rising of the land would inspire society to rise up, too.\(^7\) The simile is reminiscent of Lars Guvä: ‘Land elevation has meant that we have Sweden’s highest coast. We are also well on our way to creating the country’s best coastal area.’

Land elevation has also been lent positive connotations in many parts of Sweden insofar as the phenomenon has been related to the fertile soil which the former seabed offers. But it just may be that this natural symbolism has had the easiest time flourishing in north-eastern Sweden because it is *here* that it seems to have been raised the most. This relationship has been described in Per Olov Enquist’s novel *Musikanternas uttåg* (1978; The march of the musicians), where the author describes God’s gift to the people of Norrland in the following manner: ‘The coast rises. The coast of Västerbotten grew, from year to year, somewhat bigger. They knew that this was not so for everyone: It was not so for the heathens of the Congo, nor for those who were forced to live in the south of the country. But Västerbotten grew and grew. A new century arrived, and it continued to rise.’\(^7\) Another popular variant is to describe the elevated land as a ‘reverse Atlantis’, which, for example, author and artist Gunnar Erkner does in his book *Långs Höga Kusten* (1984).\(^8\) Thus the value of the High Coast lies not primarily in the fact that the coast is particularly high – anyone can see that by having a look at the much more imposing fjords of Norway. The value lies in that fact that the coast has become high because of land elevation, which is seen as something unique.

Ethnologists have mentioned that people mirror themselves in the landscape in which their identities were formed.\(^7\) That some people who live and work along the High Coast have been stricken by local pride is understandable; indeed, perhaps it has been reinforced since being added to the World Heritage List. The question is, however, how many are there who actually care that the High Coast has Sweden’s, or maybe even the world’s, greatest post-glacial land elevation? Even if people have embraced land elevation and the highest shoreline through a process of cultural education, my hypothesis remains that there are not many who can see the phenomenon in the physical landscape – aside from concrete problems which emerge when the docks must be moved and when watercourses and fishing grounds disappear. Whether or not my hypothesis is true remains to be seen.\(^8\)

Finally, being declared a World Heritage Site generally implies certain things, and the High Coast is no exception. On the one hand, it implies restrictions in order to protect and preserve the environment for coming generations. This makes new, extensive changes in the natural environment like mining impossible, but also prohibits the expansion of major industry and the infrastructure. On the other, it provides new social and financial opportunities for further developing
tourism and recreation in a globalised world, where ‘attraction’ has become a key concept. As cultural geographer Klas Sandell has indicated, the High Coast already belongs to those areas whose recreational nature has been transformed from welfare project to experience industry. At the same time, the view of the area itself is influenced and transformed, perhaps the regional identity of the people who live there as well. Some most likely feel pride at living in a World Heritage Site, while others view the phenomenon with scepticism, something forced on them from above by the regional elite. And if particular attention is paid to a certain area, what happens to nearby areas, like Ådalen, which were previously famous but now end up in the shadows as post industrial ‘waste lands’? What happens to the history of these places?

Today, there are many international, national, regional and local interests competing in the High Coast region, and for all of these, the landscape is a resource. That value conflicts will arise in the future is probably unavoidable. What the World Heritage declaration will really mean to the High Coast and its hinterland is however still difficult to make a qualified guess on. For geologists, ethnologists, sociologists, economists, tourism researchers, environmental ethicists and others, there are undeniably many research tasks. However, each and every study of contemporary and future environmental matters is facilitated by a deeper understanding of that which has come before. For that reason, a more extensive environmental history study of the career of the High Coast as landscape than it has been possible to conduct in this article is a pressing task.
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