Responding to the Anthropocene

URSULA MÜNSTER, THOMAS HYLLAND ERIKSEN AND SARA ASU SCHROER (EDS.)

RESPONDING TO THE ANTHROPOCENE

PERSPECTIVES FROM TWELVE ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

sap SCANDINAVIAN ACADEMIC PRESS

Responding to the Anthropocene: Perspectives from twelve academic disciplines

Published with support from Oslo School of Environmental Humanities and the Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, University of Oslo.

Cover design: Punktum forlagstjenester
Cover photo: Pierre Huyghe, *Variants* (2021–ongoing). Courtesy of the artist; Kistefos Museum; Hauser and Wirth, London. Photo: Ola Rindal
© Pierre Huyghe.
Book design: Punktum forlagstjenester
Typeset in: Garamond 11/14
Paper: Munken Print Cream 90 g
Print: AIT Grafisk
Printed in Norway

ISBN 978-82-304-0362 -4

Scandinavian Academic Press
C/O SPARTACUS FORLAG AS
P.B. 6673 St. Olavs plass, 0129 OSLO
www.scandinavianacademicpress.no

CHAPTER 9

The Nature and Politics of Documents

The Anthropocene as a Document Site

Kristin Asdal

Before I became an academic, I was a full-time environmental activist for many years. I was reminded of my former activist office when the leader of the organization that I used to co-direct was interviewed in one of our daily newspapers. In the interview, Gina Gylver (Hovda 2022) describes what she considered a wonderful atmosphere, yet in an extremely messy office. I guess, however, that the office she was describing must be in considerably better shape than the older office space where many of us used to work and stay – and partly live – thirty years ago as full-time activists of Natur og Ungdom (Nature and Youth).

Our offices, at the time, consisted of a series of quirky rooms and a relatively dirty kitchen along a dark and narrow hallway at the very top of an old, now demolished building in Stenersgata in downtown Oslo. In between a mishmash of random objects

and run-down furniture were stacks of papers and newspapers, magazines and books. We also had a computer, a printer, a fax machine, a telephone line and, of course, a mailing address and a mailbox. What we cared for and were working to protect was nature, the environment. But what we worked *with* was loads of paper – documents and technologies to write and distribute facts, protests and arguments in a range of different formats: press releases, background notes, articles in our own activist magazine, meeting agendas, calls for meetings, posters, banners and so forth.

When caring for nature and the environment, studying documents and paperwork may seem like a detour, away from the real thing, real nature, the real issue at stake. In order to enable the caring *for* nature, it comes easy to think that we need to be *in* nature, to have direct access to it, to be able to feel, smell and perhaps touch it. Surely, the importance of living with, in and by nature should not be underestimated. Yet, in caring for nature, paperwork is an indispensable part of the struggle. In fact, nature care and nature struggle very often happen with the help of, via and also *in* documents. To put it differently, documents are significant sites of nature care, and they are key tools in the environmental struggle (see Asdal 2015). Getting close to nature struggles entails getting close to documents that often work as tools that intervene in and act upon nature. In short, documents are key to the Anthropocene, the environment and sustainability issues. If you want to access the environment, sustainability issues, nature and the Anthropocene, you often must do so via paper, documents, texts and paperwork.

Examples of this are legion. Just think of the UN Report *Our Common Future* (Brundtland 1987), a commission launched by the UN and headed by Norway's then Prime Minister, Gro Harlem Brundtland. When we for decades now have been discussing the issue of sustainability, this goes back to this report

and the approach to the environmental issue and the concept of sustainability that it launched. Documents are also key in other ways. Another example is international environmental negotiations. Here, other forms of UN work are significant, too. For instance, what would have become of the climate issue if not for the climate negotiations and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report? Obviously, in combatting climate change, not only are such final formal reports significant, but so too is the very document work that precedes it: how sentences are formulated so that they can both strictly direct action (or the opposite, preclude action) and yet be sufficiently open as to include multiple divergent interests and nations (see, e.g., Lahn 2022; Riles 2000). And there are other examples, too: propositions put forward to parliament, later to be voted upon to ban, for instance, whaling, the fishing of vulnerable cod stocks, the free emission of sulfur dioxides that cause acid rain, and so forth. All are documents that direct action upon nature.

This essay is about the nature and politics of documents and their role in and for the Anthropocene and the environmental issue. Like any other document, it is written in a particular genre. The genre in which it is written draws on the essay format just as much as the standard academic journal article. How will you, as a reader, recognize this? Throughout, I refer not only to academic work but also to my former activist work. In doing this, I seek to emphasize the link between documents and nature work not only by way of academic reasoning but by demonstrating and outlining a personal example. By this example I will seek to convince you about the importance of paperwork in nature-work. Thus, the paper has a clear academic ambition and it aims not only of telling my own story, but to outline different academic positions and ways of reasoning around this issue of documents and paperwork. My aim is to do also this quite lightly, but in providing references,

I will point you toward further reading. Throughout this writing, the objective is moreover to invite you into my own particular method and way of working – what I call a practice-oriented approach to documents and to that of analysing them (Asdal 2015), a method consisting of six methodological and analytical moves that I have developed with colleague Hilde Reinertsen (Asdal and Reinertsen 2022). I will point you toward these six moves as part of this essay. I will show that this method can be read as a way of combining resources from the humanities and the field of science and technology studies (STS) – or, put differently, I want to show ways of working across the humanities and science and technology studies and the actor-network theory that was developed in this latter field of research. I will address how this is a move toward what I will call a double material semiotics. I will return to this latter point later in this chapter.

Documents and their counter-movements: return to sender

How do documents come to act upon and intervene in the world? Documents do not travel by themselves or travel alone. Sometimes, however, a simple 'click' on your keyboard can be all it takes to move a document from one place to another. Digital documents travel by other means, infrastructures and machinery than physical copies do. In any case, no matter how documents move and travel, they need to be assisted in their movements. As for the Brundtland report, it must have been moved by a range of different actors and agencies to come to life not only as a report

but also as a concept to which we now all refer. I have not traced the life and movements of the Brundtland report, but I do know that I assisted in its movement. Financed by public money and a state-funded agency, the organization that I worked for received funding so that we could travel around Europe equipped with the Brundtland report in order to distribute it to environmental activist groups and organizations throughout the continent. Such document work and document movements (Asdal and Reinertsen 2022) may have both surprising and different outcomes than initially intended. In our case, not only did we help distribute *Our Common Future,* but we also, in the same movement, helped install the cutting-edge inscription device (Latour and Woolgar 1979) of the time – telefax machines – at the offices of the environmental groups that we visited. In fact, this later enabled a counter-document movement when we became dissatisfied with how the Brundtland report was followed up in practice by its eponymous author, who was the prime minister. Protesting against what we saw as measures that were far too weak to combat climate change, a series of document protests were sent on the move – to Brundtland's prime ministerial office – via telefax. Inscriptions were literally inscribed on paper, put into this machine – an inscription device in Latour's words – and in our particular way, put to work as a document tool to combat climate change. Yet, maybe leaning toward *texts* was nevertheless the wrong thing if what we wanted was real change to combat acute environmental problems?

When I left the youth environmental organization (there are quite strict age limits for members) and started studying philosophy and history, I encountered what to me stood out as an exotic and surprising discourse. I understood that what I learned, went by the name 'the linguistic turn' (for an introduction, see Asdal and Jordheim 2018). Plainly put, I was introduced to the

academic understanding that there was no connection between the textual and the written on the one hand, and that which was beyond the text – on the text's outside, on other. In short, the real world could not be understood via texts. Texts were, so to speak, encapsulated in their own reality.

Later, when I encountered what goes by the name *the material turn* (e.g., Bennett 2010), this was, in a way, the same problem approached from the opposite angle. The argument here is that we, as students and researchers, must go directly to material objects, nature and technology in our analysis. Sometimes this way of thinking includes the understanding that the textual world is in opposition to and excluded from the world of materiality and objects. Rather than being concerned with texts and the textual, we should move straight to things, objects and materialities.

In this way, the world seems to be split in two: materiality and the real world on the one hand, and discourse, the linguistic and the textual, on the other.

What I want to demonstrate is not only that these are unsatisfying positions but also that there are alternatives to them. We do not need to base our work on this split between the textual and 'the worldly' – between words and worlds. In fact, there are ways out of this problem, and one of the resources for this can be traced within a particular branch of science and technology studies – in combinations or re-combinations, as I wrote above, with the humanities, including environmental humanities.

Let me turn to a short story.

Since the inception of science and technology studies in the 1960s, environmental issues have been one of the main research interests. In fact, the environmental problem was one of the reasons why this research field was established. 'Science for the People' used to be its credo, motivated by bringing knowledge back to those who were most affected by problems caused by

science and technology in the service of warfare or environmental destruction (Asdal, Brenna and Moser 2007). One of its key beliefs was that science ought to be more socially relevant.

Science and technology studies (STS) remains a socially engaged research field. But at its core, it is also oriented toward analyzing and understanding the production of knowledge (e.g. Knorr-Cetina 1981), be it in medicine or care settings, laboratory research or the models and market-making of economics. It is a form of sociology of knowledge that is both empirically driven *and* oriented toward theory and philosophy. In short it is a form of empirical philosophy (e.g., Mol 2002), and a version of this empirical philosophy is the method and approach that goes under the name of actor-network theory or ANT. ANT was, in fact, developed by borrowing semiotics from the humanities, which was then developed further into a *material semiotics*. Researchers who spearheaded the direction of research that would come to be known as ANT (people like Bruno Latour, John Law, Madeleine Akrich, Michel Callon, and, in later versions, Annemarie Mol, Vololona Rabeharisoa and Ingunn Moser) became famous for researching knowledge practices and the material artifacts by which the production of facts as well as human agency were enabled. What this research direction is *particularly* known for, however, is for urging students and researchers in the social sciences and humanities to bring nature into account in our analyses (e.g., Latour 1999). It was said that nature should not be left to natural science and that the division of labor that used to exist between the scientists taking care of nature and the social sciences and humanities taking care of the social represented a huge problem (e.g., Asdal 2005). Such a division of labor between the social and natural sciences was unattainable, it was reasoned. Moreover, ANT was directed not so much toward studying and analyzing *meaning* as social change – practices and transformations as they

unfold. However, this turn to materiality is not to imply a move toward an unmediated materiality. As I referred to above, the concern was rather with how inscription devices are indispensable instruments in producing and moving knowledge. The understanding is that scientific facts are realized through inscription devices. Hence, within this way of reasoning and working, there is no such division between our writing and inscription devices and the real world that is assumed to be beyond them. Science is about employing such instruments, largely called inscription devices, to produce, to realize facts (Latour 1987). So, what about the role of documents in the environmental struggle?

'Document work' in preparing to act for the environment in the Anthropocene

Let me return to where I started, with the offices of Natur og Ungdom. What were we actually doing there? Most institutions and offices that work for the environment work with the aid of documents – be they digital or in other formats. Different offices and institutions also often work on different genres or versions of documents. Policy documents – white papers, governmental propositions and what in the Norwegian context is called 'NOUs,' Norwegian Official Reports (*Norsk offentlig utredning*) – come to mind. All of these documents are written, if not in the same genre, then at least in a related one: They often aim at being quite neutral and unemotional in their form and tone. Often they prepare the ground for how an issue, for instance an environmental issue, should be handled. In fact, this is a cornerstone

in a well-functioning democracy: You can disagree strongly on how to handle an issue – but the information provided *on* the issue should be correct and trustworthy.

In the offices of Natur og Ungdom (see Persen and Ranum 1997), we did not write policy documents (even if we very often read them and very often tried to influence what was to be written in them!). Often, we worked on a quite particular genre that we called a 'background note.' That is, when we were out on a campaign, for instance, to protest against a polluting factory, we made sure to arrive well-prepared – which implied that of having done our document work. Our actions were often meant to come as a surprise, but when we were there, at the gate, we had collected detailed information about the factory, its polluting activities, what the problem or issue was, why it was illegal or ought to be illegal and what, we reasoned, needed to be done about it. The background notes were not long, only a few pages, meant to be read quite easily by journalists for instance, for whom it was partly intended. But the background notes were also written in a very factual way. Like in the NOUs, the information was to be trustworthy so that it could be built upon and taken further by others. In fact, without this document work, it would be difficult to act on the pollution problem, difficult to participate in defining the problem and difficult for others to bring the case and the issue further. In short, environmental action is document work (Asdal and Reinertsen 2022)! And, if we are to understand how environmental issues are handled and environmental problems are acted upon or come into existence, we need to attend to document work. As I wrote above, the examples are legion, with scientists spending years writing and negotiating the different versions of these documents.

Documents as key tools in democracy

From the above example, it should be quite clear that documents are also tools. Documents are not simply 'flat'; they are items that are meant to address problems, issues and cases somewhere else – beyond themselves. A white paper submitted by the government to parliament is a tool for producing a policy on a particular issue, for example, renewable energy, the petroleum industry, green taxes, etc. Not only can documents be tools for the government to realize *its* policy, but they can also be tools that invite the public in and give the people a voice. Documents are key tools in democracy; they are 'little tools' of democracy (Asdal 2008) that may allow for viewpoints and positions to be articulated, to be taken into the democratic process – and perhaps even be heard and taken into account. A very concrete example of this is the 'hearing round' or public consultation process, in the format that follows the submission of a public inquiry (an NOU), for instance, or the process that is regularly initiated when there are plans, public or private, to establish a factory, an installation or a new activity that may have environmental consequences. In fact, such public consultation processes have been vital in the development of Norwegian environmental policy, and this is something environmental activists and NGOs (non-governmental organizations) will often take advantage of and actively use. This is related to how documents often move by established procedures; they are part of document movements (Asdal and Reinertsen 2022) that follow a particular well-established route, by law or by custom.

In a very interesting study on the quite recent conflict over the construction of wind turbines in areas where there are also strong interests and established Sámi rights, master's student Linnea Aslaksen (2021) followed this process through the document

circuitry and document movements that made up the case. It is already an established right that the state shall take steps to ensure that the Sámi people can further develop and strengthen their own culture. Moreover, as Indigenous people, they have the right to be consulted on issues that affect them (Regjeringen.no, n.d.). So how did the process proceed this time? Not only do such processes very much proceed *via* documents, but they are also interesting to study as document practices. This particular case turned out to be rather complex to follow. For instance, Aslaksen shows how the document process involved efforts to determine the value of the landscape – thus, there were also tools of quantification and calculation involved – all of which was important to investigate in analyzing the document work and its outcome. In addition to being complex, the case was also long and cumbersome. In fact, the case made it all the way to the Supreme Court, where the Sámi won the right to the area where the wind turbines now are standing. Aslaksen was not there in person to follow the case throughout this process, which lasted several years. But she could follow it nevertheless through the documents. In this way, a practice-oriented approach to studying documents may help us understand how the environment is shaped and transformed, acted upon and also very often contested. Moreover, we can grasp how the very struggle happen in and by way of documents and document movements.

To be sure, documents are not mere tools or movements. They are also texts (and, in fact, their textuality is partly what enables them to act as tools). Documents are composed of signs, words, sentences and narratives – often in combination with a series of different textual devices such as charts, figures and perhaps photos. They are also sometimes written according to a particular template. If we return to the NOUs, for instance, one soon notices how these documents belong to a particular genre

of documents that are part of a series. For instance, the NOU on climate change vulnerability (NOU 2010: 10) not only has a title, but it also has a number that is part of a series referring to where in the series of a particular year it belongs. As I mentioned earlier, they are often also written in a particular style – NOUs are quite often written rather drily, fact-based and produced in a distinctly styleless style. Comparing how different public documents perform this style may also teach us quite a lot about the very issue in question – issues that will also be modified and sometimes transformed by the way they are written.

Documents as sites for the forming of nature issues

Not only may documents *teach* us about issues, but they may also take part in enacting – forming and shaping – the relevant issue. In short, there are document issues (Asdal and Reinertsen 2022). This means that public documents, despite their careful and neutral form, may be rather active. They may act upon issues – modifying and transforming them by the way they address the matter at hand. Yet, it can sometimes take a lot of time, many readings and 'deep dives' into such documents to see how this happens and its effects or consequences. This means that we often need to be quite patient, read closely and – not least – curiously and open-mindedly. Sometimes, documents that at face value stand out as quite insignificant, not particularly interesting or different, initially appear as though they do *one* thing, can be seen to be doing something else entirely when we look into them more closely.

This was the case with a document that, in the history of Norwegian environmental politics, was made to appear as a document where the government was finally taking the environmental issue on board and acting upon it. Very concretely, the issue in question was pollution, most notably from large enterprises, which had turned into a huge problem in many local communities in the post-Second World War era. One particular controversy played out around the aluminum smelter in Årdal, a community on the Norwegian west coast, which was also an agricultural region. And as the aluminium produced at the factory were sold globally, the emissions from the smelter – fluorine most notably – stayed behind in the local community and polluted the factory surroundings.

When the farmers' livestock fell sick, with difficulties standing on their feet and chewing, the farmers suspected that it was connected to the emissions from the smelter. The factory management denied any such connection, but the causal relations were later established by veterinary science, which proved that the animals had attracted fluorosis – a sickness caused by fluorine poisoning. My own research into these events took the form of a close document study – where I was tracing the material and document process of samples from the factory surroundings being moved on to the veterinary lab, and the ensuing animal feeding experiments at the veterinary institute in Oslo. Thus, this also became a study of how environmental facts are produced and how politics build on such facts to act vis-à-vis the environment. Coming back to how such processes also take part in establishing the very issue in distinct ways, it is worth noting how the pollution issue was to be formatted very much as an *emissions issue*. The farmers were compensated for their economic losses but also had to change their ways of practicing agriculture to be less vulnerable vis-à-vis the factory. However, as it turned

out when I read and re-read the archive documents: The expert report – in the format of what we today call an NOU, which was commissioned to handle the growing pollution problem – farmers and others were not viewed as the relevant actors to partake in solving the problem. To the contrary, it was noted that people too close to the problem could end up being – as it was called 'smoke-minded' – that is as if themselves polluted by the issue, assumingly too involved to be able to think clearly and rationally. Those who were deemed to be the relevant actors in solving the problem were engineers who *knew* the industry.

The report, I realized, did not so much establish the environmental issue as formatting an *industry issue*. This also meant that it was the Ministry of Industry – and not, for instance, an independent environmental agency (the Ministry of the Environment had not yet been established) – that was tasked with responsibility for the issue, under which a new pollution agency came into being. In fact, reading these documents closely, we can see how this way of 'modifying' the issue into belonging to the industry occurred at many levels in the expert-report document. For instance, it was each polluting factory that were detailed by name, localization, history, and production activities, and then carefully written into the report, and not the farmers, their biographies, their ways of living. We learn how the industry is important to economic development and that even if pollution issues are problematic at local levels, one can not risk such 'neighbor issues,' as they are called, hindering an industry that is welcomed and encouraged at a national level.

From this expert report document, we can also read how nature was made governable in important and consequential ways: New substances, namely pollutants, are described by their different names and effects. Then next it is precisely such substances that the new pollution control agency is being equipped to target.

In narrating and analyzing the above events, I have taken documents in themselves to be document sites – sites for events (Asdal and Reinertsen 2022). Documents are not only written texts that inform us about what lies beyond them. Documents are also sites where events happen, form and play out in their own right. This is part of the practice-oriented method that I suggest we equip ourselves with when working with documents. I have tried to show how documents can take part in forming issues, and I have also suggested that we can try to detect how this happens by searching for an ongoing 'modifying work': the various moves that happen in the text that may, when taken together, transform the issue. And remember, in defining issues in particular ways, one also quite easily comes to define who – with what competence and expertise – should handle the issue and problem.

Obviously, expert and commissioned reports do not always do the same thing, even if the format or genre is relatively similar. Sometimes the act of *comparing* different reports can be a viable strategy to understand what is happening in an environmental issue. In the history of the environment, the climate problem is a relatively recent problem for governments to tackle. For many years, the main issue was rather that of trying to agree about whether there *was* such a thing as a climate problem. The NOU 10 (2010) about climate change vulnerability is different. Here, the problem is accepted. In fact, when reading this document, which is also written in a quite sober style, neither very emotional nor outraged, the reader is told that the problem *is* real and, in fact, is here to stay. Elsewhere we have called this a kind of 'brutal governmental prose' (Asdal and Reinertsen 2022). Why is that? Because the combination of its sober style and careful, detailed way of laying out the problem, delineating how things we care about may be lost in the future brings the brutal consequences

of the climate problem to the fore. We can explore how this is done in the report, we can observe how different reports do nature-issues differently, and thus work differently as tools to act upon them. We can also seek to trace how different reports come into existence: the controversies around them as well as beyond them.

The climate problem was one issue that strongly occupied Natur og Ungdom. This was during the second half of the 1980s, and it was when the above-mentioned Brundtland report was quite new. Not only did this report establish the concept of sustainability, but it also established how the the environmental issue was to be tackled: caring for the environment while still pursuing economic development and growth. Thus, in a sense, the environment and the economy were brought together by the concept in a quite particular way. The Brundtland report may also serve to remind us that not all documents have equal effects and consequences. Some documents are almost immediately put into a drawer, never gaining prominence. Others have a major influence and play a part in defining problems; they also do conceptual work that is later brought into policy reports, media and our daily vocabulary. The concept of sustainability is a case in point. So how does this happen? This is related, as I already alluded to at the beginning of this chapter, to document movements – to how documents can travel between actors and between agencies and also in and across time. It may be interesting and important to know how and by which means documents travel. Sometimes these means are financial support.

Let me return to the document protests, document-counter-movements and the telefax campaign as a protest against the government's lack of ambitious climate action. Today the technology is certainly outdated. But the point remains: Documents need to be set 'on the move' in order to have any impact.

Technologies such as telefax machines and computer networks are technological arrangements that allow this to happen. Still, different technologies enable this in very different ways, and the means and arrangements by which documents travel are certainly part of what we can bring into a practice-oriented document analysis on how nature and the environment are addressed and how actors engage in such struggles.

Government offices and parliaments can be approached and studied as document sites in their own right. In fact, very little can happen in a parliamentary setting without documents. Here, regarding document movements, the itineraries of documents are quite well-defined beforehand. How documents travel is part of the parliamentary procedure. However, sometimes documents enter these circuitries and change the ways parliaments work and also add immensely to parliamentary work. The whaling controversy in the late nineteenth century is a case in point. This certainly changed parliament – new groups of actors were elected because of it, and parliament came to decide upon an experimental law to protect the whale from being hunted. Having studied this case and the immense document work in which it became encapsulated also helped me understand parliaments differently: Not only are they document sites, but they are also quite profoundly sites for politics of nature (Asdal and Hobæk 2016), a site where members of parliament not only work on social affairs and underpin decisions on nature, based in science. Parliaments are also sites where the social and the natural meet and where the social and the natural converse with one another in interesting and often surprising constellations. This speaks importantly to the topic of document movements: Documents travel, but documents also bring things with them. It is via document movements that the species, which at the time became known as the blue whale, entered parliament. Because the whale

entered via a range of different document formats for then to be worked upon, hunted, sought reined in, understood and regulated, all as part of parliamentary document procedures that make and remake the politics of nature and shape the conditions of the Anthropocene – and democracy.

References

Asdal, K. (2005). 'Returning the kingdom to the king: A post-constructivist response to the critique of positivism,' *Acta Sociologica* 48(3): 253–261.

Asdal, K. (2008). 'On politics and the little tools of democracy: A down-to-earth approach,' *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory* 9(1): 11–26.

Asdal, K. (2011). *Politikkens natur – naturens politikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Asdal, K. (2015). 'What is the issue? The transformative capacity of documents,' *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory* 16(1): 74–90.

Asdal, K. and Hobæk, B. (2016). 'Assembling the whale: Parliaments in the politics of nature,' *Science as Culture* 25(1): 96–116.

Asdal, K. and Jordheim, H. (2018). 'Texts on the move: textuality and historicity revisited,' *History and Theory* 57(1): 56–74.

Asdal, K. and Reinertsen, H. (2022). *Doing Document Analysis: A Practice-Oriented Method*. London: SAGE Publishing.

Asdal, K., Brenna, B. and Moser, I. (eds.) (2007). *Technoscience: The Politics of Interventions*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Aslaksen, L. (2021). 'Fra en ordinær sak til en nasjonal kontrovers – Konkurrerende verdsettinger av vindkraftverk og reindrift:

En praksisorientert analyse av saksdokumentene til Storheia Vindpark,' Master's thesis. University of Oslo.

Bennet, J. (2010). *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Brundtland, G. H. (1987). *Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*. Geneva: UN Document A/42/427.

Hovda, K. (2022). Engasjementet som stilnet uroen. *Dagens Næringsliv*, January 14, 2022, https://www.dn.no/magasinet/oyeblikket/klima/natur-og-ungdom/engasjementet-som-stilnet-uroen/2-1-1144714.

Knorr-Cetina, K. (1981). 'The micro-sociological challenge of macro-sociology: towards a reconstruction of social theory and methodology,' In *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macro-sociologies*, K. Knorr-Cetina and A. V. Cicourel (eds.), pp. 1–47. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Lahn, B. (2022). 'Carbon connections: On the work of making climate change an issue for politics and government,' Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oslo.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (1999). *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. and Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mol, A. (2002). *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Persen, Å. B. and Ranum, N. H. (1997). *Natur og ungdom: 30 år i veien*. Oslo: Natur og ungdom.

Regjeringen.no. (n.d.). *The Sami people.* Available from: https://www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/indigenous-peoples-and-minorities/Sami-people/id1403/ (accessed December 1, 2022).

Riles, A. (2000). *The Network Inside Out*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Norsk offentlig utredning. (2010). NOU 2010: 10: 'Tilpassing til eit klima i endring – Samfunnet si sårbarheit og behov for tilpassing til konsekvensar av klimaendringane,' Klima- og miljødepartementet. https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2010-10/id624355/sec3.